

L.A. Grenoble

**SWITCH OR SHIFT: CODE-MIXING, CONTACT-INDUCED CHANGE  
AND ATTRITION IN RUSSIAN-EVENKI CONTACTS**

Многовековое российское присутствие в Сибири приводило к контактам между русским языком и языками разнообразных коренных народов. Взаимное влияние приводило к появлению новых феноменов, к пользованию многими языками одновременно и последовательно у одних и тех же говорящих. В статье исследуются особенности переключения кода в общении с эвенками, носителями тунгусского языка в северо-восточной Сибири.

**1. Introduction: Russian-Evenki Contact**

There has been a Russian presence in Siberia for many centuries, with the result being sustained contact between Russian speakers and speakers of the various Siberian languages. This contact has had a profound impact upon indigenous and non-indigenous languages alike (see, for example, Blankenhorn 2003). Although change is not always unidirectional – for example Krasovicky and Sappok (2000) discuss the impact of one Tungusic language on the Russian phonemic system – the time period beginning with the post World War II era and beyond has been marked by ever-increasing language shift away from the indigenous languages to Russian, resulting in profound changes in the phonology and morphosyntax of many Siberian indigenous languages, and by accelerated attrition in many groups to the point of serious language endangerment. In addition to Russian contact, the Siberian language context is characterized by intermittent but long-term contact of a number of language groups, because historically many of indigenous groups were nomadic hunter-herders. Many of these people were characteristically multilingual, and some are to this day.

The present paper focuses on the impact of Russian on one of these languages, Evenki. Evenki is a Tungusic language which is currently spoken in small groups (of 100–200) in scattered areas throughout much of northeastern Siberia. Out of an ethnic population of approximately 35,527, there are an estimated 5335 speakers or 15% ([www.raipon.org](http://www.raipon.org)). Children in some regions continue to learn Evenki as a first language, although in many cases it is replaced by Russian as a first or primary language when they enter the school system. Evenki is an SOV, left-branching, agglutinating language characterized by ATR vowel harmony.

Evenki currently live in Siberia in concentrated areas in the Amur basin, in southern Sakha and, to a lesser extent, in the territory of the former Evenki autonomous okrug in Krasnojarskij kraj. Historically, Evenki were nomadic reindeer herders and hunters and roamed over much of Siberia, where they had contact with speakers representing multiple different linguistic groups. Russian contact with the western-most Evenki probably began at the end of the 16th century; by the beginning of the 17th century, the Russians had penetrated far into Siberia (Forsyth 1992). Russian-Evenki contact became much more intense over the course of the 20th century. By the 1920's linguists and ethnographers were hard at work in recording, describing, and writing pedagogical materials for many of the languages of the North. As a result of these and later efforts, we have documentation from times when there were vibrant speaker communities of different regions; documentation includes dictionaries (Василевич 1958; Мыреева 2004), descriptive grammars and sketches (Булатова 2002; Колесникова 1966; Константинова 1964; Цинциус 1997) and text collections (e.g. Романова & Мыреева 1971), to name just a few. There are also descriptions of regional dialects (e.g.

Булатова 1987; Василевич 1948). These texts were collected from monolingual speakers, but have been edited for publication. Thus while on the one hand there is extensive documentation, on the other hand there are major gaps in the documentation. The literary or standard language was first created in 1931 on the basis of a dialect from the Southern Evenki dialect group (first the Nep dialect in 1931, and then in the Poligus dialect in 1958). To the best of my knowledge, there are no speakers of this particular dialect today. This standardized variety never achieved the status of a norm which cut across dialects. Moreover, the Eastern dialects are more robustly spoken and the differences between the literary language and the Eastern dialects are significant.

As this history indicates, Russian and Evenki speakers have been in contact for centuries. Two broad categories of changes can be identified in Evenki: (1) those that are indicative of sustained contact, but not shift; (2) those that are indicative of language shift and attrition. Extensive language shift and loss is now the norm. Russian-Evenki code-mixing is not an indicator of full bilingualism but is rather symptomatic of language attrition. The kinds of code-mixes are a diagnostic for the extent of attrition. The effects of contact are largely unidirectional, with Russian having an impact on Evenki, and Evenki having less impact on Russian. All speakers show interference from Russian although the extent varies. For those speakers with advanced attrition, the speech is arguably all in Russian, with Evenki translations. In other words, it is not the case that Evenki is inserted into the Russian. Rather, the speaker is speaking Russian and translating it into Evenki.

### **The study**

The data for used for this research are of two types, all coming from field recordings made by myself and N. Ja. Bulatova (ILI RAN, St. Petersburg), a linguist and native speaker of Evenki. The first is a set of field recordings collected in the village Iengra (Sakha/Yakutia) in 1998 and 1999. People were simply interviewed in free, open format in Evenki. The recordings consist of spontaneous narratives (mostly life stories), conversations and questions from more structured interviews. The second corpus consists of texts collected in Tura, Krasnojarskij kraj, in 2008. We elicited frog story narratives using the picture book *One Frog Too Many* by Mercer and Marianna Mayer. We chose this book instead of the more frequently used *Frog, Where Are You?* (Mayer 1969) because the story takes place almost entirely outdoors and was more in keeping with the Siberian setting, although all speakers objected to the story and the pictures as unfamiliar («не наши»). A total of 12 texts were collected; 6 are suitable for analysis of code-mixing; in the remaining six the Evenki breaks down too early and the speakers abandon the task. By design both methods were intended to elicit texts in Evenki, our focus of research, but all texts (except two versions of the frog story) contain Russian. In some, more than half of the text is in Russian (as determined by a word count).

The way that each corpus was recorded is indicative of language vitality in each of these areas. In Iengra, all discussion – before, during and after the recording – was in Evenki. Exceptions to this general rule occurred at social gatherings where we spoke Russian, but someone would remember a good story and then tell it in Russian. Here it is difficult to evaluate what impact my presence had on the language of conversation, but in Tura, discussion was in Russian, and then switched to Evenki when we began collecting metadata about the speakers. Here the primary language of communication was unequivocally Russian. Within each corpus, there is great variation among speakers as to their relative command of each language.

### **Sociolinguistic settings**

The Evenki speech communities in Sakha (Yakutia) and Krasnojarskij kraj differ in several significant ways. First, there are dialect differences which mean that many of the written materials (primarily pedagogical) are not readily usable for both groups. Second, the speech

communities in Iengra is robust, compared to Tura. The primary language of everyday communication in Tura is Russian; many subjects were unaccustomed to speaking in Evenki and struggled to sustain it. In contrast, in Iengra Evenki is at least a home language for many people; at the time of the recordings (1998, 1999) they also used it outside of the home in certain social domains and in the school in conjunction with language revitalization. There were still Evenki-speaking children whose first language, before entering the school, was Evenki, not Russian. For a number of people (in particular those families closely tied to traditional activities such as reindeer herding), Evenki was the preferred language of communication. In contrast, in Tura Evenki is not used on a daily basis. Even fluent speakers noted that they were out of practice («отвыкла», «давно не говорила»).

## 2. Code-mixing and language loss

In communities exhibiting language loss, two related phenomena are often at work. One is language shift at the community level. Whereas at an earlier time the speech community was characterized as using L1 (Evenki) as a primary language of communication, with L2 (Russian) as a secondary language, in cases of community-level shift, L2 has become the preferred language (L2 → L1). In cases of advanced shift it is the preferred method of communication in all domains and across all generations. This stage may have been preceded by more or less “balanced” bilingualism, although in instances of accelerated language shift, this is not necessarily the case. Hand-in-hand with shift at the community level, we find shift at the level of individual speakers. In the present study we are concerned with adult attrition, where adult Evenki speakers have ceased using it on a regular basis.

Studies of attrition have primarily focused on emigrant populations and are divided into two basic groups: (1) those which research the adult emigrant speakers who, finding themselves in a new linguistic environment, cease using their first language(s) in all domains; and (2) children, or heritage learners, whose heritage speech is characterized by incomplete or interrupted acquisition. Such children typically learn the heritage language at home, or emigrate at a young age with their families, and upon entering the school system, for example (see Polinsky 2007). In contrast, in the Evenki situation we find adult speakers who have not emigrated anywhere but, because of shift at the community level, show signs of varying degrees of attrition. At the same time, many exhibit imperfect learning of Russian. From a linguistic standpoint, this is an interesting population, as for some individuals it is unclear what is L1 and what L2, while for others one language is clearly preferred over the other, although the preference may vary with domain. Russian is the preferred system in education, government and medicine, while Evenki the preferred system in traditional settings, such as reindeer herding and hunting. The preferred system in the home is a problematic question. This population, and others like it, are in need of further detailed research to better understand just who is speaking which language, in which setting, and with what proficiency.

To begin understanding these complexities, I use code-mixing as a diagnostic tool. I follow Muysken’s (2000: 4) distinction between code-switching (CS) and code-mixing (CM): the former can only be used to refer to alternations between codes; there are other kinds of shifts possible, and for these code-mixing is the appropriate term. There is a fundamental difference in what is going on. The different terms imply fundamental differences in linguistic structure. In CS, the speaker does switch between languages (or codes), while in CM, the speaker is speaking one language (the matrix or base language), and the material from the other language is “inserted” into that language rather than alternating with it. Note that this presupposes that one can identify the matrix or base (see Zabrodskaja 2009 for more discussion); I argue here that in cases of attrition, there is no question but that the base is Russian.

Thus CS and CM are really two different phenomena and the differences are useful in studying shift and attrition. Differences in mixing patterns have to do with differences in typo-

logical structures of the languages in contact as well as sociological and other extralinguistics factors. Muysken (2000) distinguishes three different kinds of code-mixing phenomena, which are understood to be partially overlapping categories:

1. INSERTION of material (lexical items or entire constituents) from one language into a structure from the other language. This presupposes a matrix language into which linguistic items from another language are inserted. As this suggests, the syntax is determined by the matrix language. Deuchar et al. (2007: 309) point out that insertion is found in colonial settings and recent migrant communities, where the speakers' proficiency in the two languages is not the same, in other words, speakers have greater proficiency in one or the other language.

2. ALTERNATION between structures from languages. In general, alternations involve constituent-sized elements (such as clauses or phrases); critically, each alternation represents the syntax of the language. Alternations are more typical in stable bilingual communities and communities where there is a tradition of language separation (Deuchar et al. 2007: 309). Note that alternations require some knowledge of the syntax of each language.

3. CONGRUENT LEXICALIZATION of material from different lexical inventories into a shared grammatical structure; "the grammatical structure is shared by languages A and B, and words from both languages A and B are inserted more or less randomly" (Muysken 2000: 8). Congruent lexicalization is found with typologically similar languages; the pattern is favored when the two languages have approximately the same social prestige. Congruent lexicalization is thus not relevant for the present study.

In what follows I will use this framework as a diagnostic tool for the code-mixing we observe. Based on these definitions, we would anticipate that insertions would be more common where L1 and L2 proficiency are not equal. From the outset, however, we should pay attention to the underlying assumptions of this framework: that the kind of code-mixing we find is in part dependent upon the typologies of the languages involved. In the Evenki case of accelerated attrition, however, the problem is that the typology of Language B (the language undergoing change) may be changing to match the typology of matrix language.

### **3. Russian-Evenki CM and Attrition**

We can now turn to a discussion of CM and attrition. To what extent is CM a diagnostic of attrition? First of all, note that we might anticipate that there would be fewer switches and mixes in the Frog Stories. In eliciting these narratives, speakers were told to speak in Evenki only. The Frog Story presents a concrete, finite task of telling a relatively short story; fluent speakers could reasonably be expected to maintain a single language throughout. That said, all initial and closing discussion was in Russian; Russian was clearly the primary language of communication. In contrast, the Iengra corpus consists of more open elicitation. Evenki was more the matrix language of the conversations than Russian. People told life stories as answers to questions or requests for stories (e.g., *tell us what happened when your husband killed a moose*) or the narratives were embedded in ongoing conversation (conducted in Evenki). To the extent that this methodology is an effective means of getting people to forget the recording situation and simply speak naturally, it would not be unexpected that they would CM if that is part of their usual speech pattern. As it turns out, there is no text in the Iengra corpus without some switches into Russian. In the Frog Stories, two texts are told entirely in Evenki. The others show switches, to varying degrees, as summarized in Table 1. There are a few ways to count the texts. Here I have calculated the percentage of the text in Evenki versus Russian, to get some sense of the amount of code-mixing, as measured in words. The Frog Stories range in length from the longest at 511 words to the shortest at 323 words.

Table 1. *Word counts: Tura Frog Stories*

<i>Speaker</i>	total words	Evenki words	percentage Evenki
A	323	323	100%
B	511	511	100%
C	358	352	98%
D	465	388	83%
E	401	350	87%
F	475	217	46%

Speakers (all women): (1) A, age 51, born in Chitinskaja oblast'; (2) B, age 59, Ekonda; (3) C, age 36, Tura; (4) D, b. 1964, Chirinda; (5) E, age 32, Kislokan; and (6) F, age 50, Sovrechka.

A comparison of word counts of a comparable segment of the Iengra corpus (which is in fact much larger) is not particularly informative about differences or similarities between the two and code-mixing:

Table 2. *Word counts: Iengra corpus*

<i>Speaker</i>	total words	Evenki words	percentage Evenki
E	186	184	99%
K	914	892	98%
L	479	447	93%
A: #1	629	577	92%
A: #2	546	376	69%

All women except E recorded 1998 in Iengra. L: 55; Pujagir clan (father's side); Dogoimngu (mother's side); K: 68, Buta clan; A: 53, Buta; E: male, 12, clan unknown

In particular in the Iengra corpus, identifying mixes in Russian is problematic and not particularly useful. However, it is noteworthy that the youngest speaker uses only two Russian words (*мине смешно* < *мне смешно*) and, although these phonetically appear to be borrowed, the entire construction is Russian, not found in Evenki. As seen in Table 2, the amount of Russian which speaker A uses varies greatly with the text. And finally, texts from speakers whose language was really a mix of both Evenki and Russian are not included here, as identifying which language is which is really impossible; this is illustrated in (10). This is one trait which distinguishes the Iengra speakers from the Tura speakers.

In the Tura Frog stories (Table 1), there are two texts with absolutely no Russian: A & B. There is one with only a few words of Russian: C. If we determine percentage of the text in one language or another based on word counts, then Text D is 83% Evenki and Text E is 87%. As a methodology this seems shaky, in large part because it only gives a very large overview of words in each language, without any indication of whether these are one-word insertions or constituents, how long a stretch of speech in one language or the other is. Yet Text F is very telling on this measure though: less than half, or 46%, is in Evenki. The numbers do indicate that in Texts A-C, the speaker is speaking primarily Evenki, while in F that is not at all clear. This measure also presupposes that it is possible to identify the language of single-word switches, while in fact this is often ambiguous. There are a large number of Russian lexical borrowings in Evenki. Older borrowings conform to Evenki phonotactics, which prohibit word-initial consonant clusters and words beginning with /r/ (Konstantinova 1964:29): Ev *urbafka* < R рубашка (attested as *urbakə* in Vasilevich (1958: 450)); Ev *ispitfka* < R спичка. At this earlier stage, phonotactics would have been a helpful diagnostic for distinguishing borrowings from switches. Currently, however, one sign of increased Rus-

sian influence is that more recent borrowings do not adapt to Evenki phonology but are borrowed wholesale from Russian:

- (1a) stado-du:                   knigə-l-βə  
 herd-DAT                   book-PL-ACC  
 ‘in/at the herd’           ‘books’
- (1b) piroʃk-i:-βə               oxo:tnik-i-l  
 piroshk-PL-ACC           hunter-EPV-PL  
 ‘piroshki’                 ‘hunters’

As seen in examples (1a), word-initial consonant clusters are maintained (/st/, /kn/) and Evenki inflectional morphology is added to the Russian nominative singular form. In (1b), both words are formed from the Russian nominative plural. The morpheme *-i*, the Russian nominative plural, is interpreted by speakers as a plural marker in *piroʃki:βə*, followed by the accusative suffix. In contrast, in *oxo:tnikil* it is interpreted as an epenthetic vowel, presumably because it is followed by the Evenki plural morpheme *-l*. The only examples of this kind of combination of Evenki and Russian morphology occur in this specific combination of a Russian nominal plural morpheme and an Evenki case morpheme; it is quite rare. Instead, the more usual pattern, as we shall see, is to use just the Russian form without Evenki morphology.

Examples like these complicate the question of when a word is borrowed, i.e. a loanword that is part of the Evenki lexicon, and when it is an inserted code-switch, i.e. a switch in linguistic systems to Russian. Morphology is now the only key; phonology seems to have been lost as a diagnostic tool. In what follows I will treat those forms with Russian morphology as code-switches, and those with Evenki morphology as borrowings. (Significantly, in my field recordings there are no instances of Evenki lexical morphemes used with Russian derivational or inflectional morphemes. This underscores the unidirectional nature of language change in these situations.) Thus in (2),

- (2) ну, годовичную школу   этə-ʧə:-β  
 well year-long school   complete-PST-1SG  
 ‘Well, I finished school’

the phrase ‘годовичную школу’ is a code-switch, with the Russian accusative case but the finite verb is Evenki with full inflectional morphology. In contrast, in (3) and (4), we have borrowings using the Evenki dative case in both examples:

- (3) Июнь-du:   bitʃə:n           badaga  
 June-DAT   be-PST-3SG   it.seems  
 ‘It was in June, it seems’
- (4) Василевич сорок   седьмой-du:   əmə-ktə-ʧə:-n  
 Vasilevich   40   seven-DAT   come-PST-3SG  
 ‘Vasilevich arrived in (19)47’

As in (2), the finite verbs in each of these excerpts are unarguably Evenki, with full inflectional morphology. (The word *badaga* ‘it seems’ in (4) is a borrowing from the Sakha (Yakut) language and is common in the Evenki varieties spoken in contact with Sakha.)

If we turn to analysis of code-switching in Iengra, where the speakers are more fluent in Evenki, it quickly is clear that the criteria for distinguishing borrowings from L1 to L2 from switches between L1 and L2 are insufficient. For example, in Text L, we find the following:

- (5) *sirazu* ‘immediately’ versus Russian *сразу*

Although *sirazu* follows the diagnostic of conforming to Evenki phonotactics, is it a borrowing? It occurs twice, without repetition of an Evenki word, in contrast to the speaker's use of *op'at* 'again'. This word occurs four times in the text. In three instances, it is immediately preceded or followed by Evenki *jan* 'again'. This repetition of a switched word in the matrix language is typical of CM in general, and occurs frequently in this corpus, as in:

- (7) Bi:     октябрь-du:     *семьдесят*     o:-dʒa-ja:-n     *в октябре*     nadandʒa:r  
 1SG    October-DAT                             make-IMPV-FUT-3SG                             70  
 'I will be *seventy* in October, *in October* 70'

This example is interesting because the speaker repeats both the number and the date in each language, but there is considerable back and forth between the two languages on a word-by-word basis.

One of the fundamental differences between borrowings and switches is that borrowings are not idiosyncratic but are used by a community of speakers. For example, month names are consistently given in the Russian nominative singular with Evenki case endings; this is consistent across all dialects I have encountered and with all speakers (here in the dative case, to state 'in a month'; see also (3)). But in general identifying such codified borrowings is extraordinarily complicated when the language is in shift and there is no single, readily identifiable homogeneous community of speakers. Deuchar et al (2007) propose using dictionaries to determine if this is the case. They admit that in the case of what they call minority languages, this is not a good diagnostic tool. I would go further to say that although the occurrence of a word in a dictionary may mean that it is part of the larger lexicon, its absence says nothing. Perhaps this is different with the advent of internet-based dictionaries such as the *Urban Dictionary* ([www.urbandictionary.com](http://www.urbandictionary.com)), but in general printed dictionaries fail to keep up with rapidly-changing lexicons and show a strong tendency to prescriptivism. At any rate, in the case of endangered languages, this is not practical. Where Evenki is considered, there is great variation within even one village.

As one final illustration of the problem is in (8):

- (8) *voobščē* 'in general'
- |      |  |               |           |      |               |       |
|------|--|---------------|-----------|------|---------------|-------|
| K:   | Bi:  | <i>вообще</i> | ənkiv     | tara | kixana        |       |
|      | 1SG  |               | NEG       | this | interested.in |       |
|      | 'In general I was not interested in this'                    |               |           |      |               |       |
|      |  |               |           |      |               |       |
| A#2: | <i>вообще-то</i>   | əʃə           | bira-ka:n | birə | bira-nɕa      | həgdi |
|      |  | NEG           | river-DIM | is   | river-AUG     | big   |
|      | 'In general it's not a small river, but a big (large) river' |               |           |      |               |       |

Both tokens are counted in Table 2 as instances of Russian (more specifically, Russian insertions), but the basic problem is that measuring and quantifying such switches because in both cases, there are native Evenki strategies available for this concept. But the count forces an artificial conclusion. A closer analysis of the data shows that the amount of Russian is significant with the semi-speakers, who are not sufficiently fluent to maintain a conversation in Evenki. Yet the counts in Table 2 reveal little about the fluency of these speakers. We see that speaker A uses considerably more Russian in the story about preparing an elk her husband had caught (A #2) than she does in a narrative about chasing after her son who was partying in the taiga (A #1). This is probably a result of the fact that she had told the elk story many times in Russian, as it was a remarkable incident. But her Evenki is very fluent. This is demonstrated in a small way in (8), with the use of Evenki derivational morphology to indicate size (the diminutive and augmentative suffixes), while in the Frog Stories only one of

twelve speakers used any such morphology. All others used independent adjectives, following a more Russian (Indo-European) pattern.

#### 4. Language shift and loss

With this background in mind, we can now turn to the data.<sup>1</sup> With more fluent speakers, we find two basic types of code-mixing with reference to linguistic competence:

(1) With speakers who have a relatively fluent command of each language, there can be frequent code-mixing, depending on the conversation and the setting. This mixed speech is characterized by alternations with some insertions. A broad generalization is that each alternation conforms to the grammatical norms of each individual language. Representative examples are given in (9) and (10):

- (9) Iengra, Text A:#1
- 1 Tali: itʃəʃim – ɲi:-kət atʃin.  
I look over there – there's no one there
- 2 *Сапоги на каблучках надела, плащ надела,*  
*I put on my heeled boots, I put on my coat,*
- 3 tətɪm-də ju:m.  
I put [them] on and went out.

Example (9) shows very typical CM for the bilingual speakers in this corpus. There is an alternation between languages, seen in the two Russian clauses in line 2, which are followed in line 3 by first an Evenki clause which summarizes those clauses and then another clause which closes the sentence. Example (10) is more complicated, as there is not always an alternation between full clauses, with *это* in line 1 followed by Evenki:

- (10) Iengra, Text A#2
- 1 *Это* umun toki gudin.  
*That's* the stomach of one elk.
- 2 *Это огромный желудок, как два мешка*  
*It's a huge stomach, like two bags.*
- 3 Sereža ugirdevi ɲəkəmkə:rən, əʃə dəbdərə.  
Serezha tired to lift [it], he couldn't.
- 4 *С одного края дырку сделал, вылил, с другого края начал выливать, никак не выливается.*  
*He made a hole in one end, drained it, from the other end he started to drain it, no way would it pour out.*
- 5 *Оказывается, dulinduli:n ʃ'ikuda: надо было.*  
*It turns out, it had to be cut in the middle.*

<sup>1</sup> Morphemic glossings are omitted unless important to understanding the data so as to facilitate reading of the code-mixing.

(2) With speakers for whom Evenki continues to be L1, CM tends to include both insertions and alternations. But extensive insertions are often accompanied by a breakdown in morphosyntax. This is illustrated in (11):

(11) (recorded in Iengra, 1998)

1	Bi:	nonon	gorot-tu:	давление	эну:kden		
	1SG	formerly	city-DAT	blood pressure	fell.sick		
2	последней	inenji-l-du:	dili-β	прямо	такой	наверно	грипп
	last	day-PL-DAT	head-1SG	direct	such	probably	flu
3	ekun-ŋu	bixin.					
	or something	was					
4	час-tu:	обем-teninnereβ	час-tu:	лечение	taduk	эhi:lə	ванна
	час-DAT	we eat lunch	час-DAT	treatment	then	then	bath
5	после	эмэ-һэ	как-то	тизало	вечером	o:ran	
	after	come-CVB.ANT	somehow	hard	in.evening	became	

Approximate translation:

‘I was in the город when I was sick from *давление*, in the *last* days my head *so very bad* it was *flu* or something like that. We would have *lunch* for an *hour*, an *hour* of *treatment*, then, then *bath* for an *hour*. *Afterwards* having come back, it got *somehow hard* in the *evening*.’

This kind of speech is a candidate for a mixed language: in many places an Evenki content or lexical morpheme has been replaced by a Russian word; Evenki inflectional morphology is consistently used. (The cause of this may be situational: the speaker is telling about events which she experienced in Russian, not in Evenki.) Nouns have been borrowed in the nominative singular form, as evidenced by the devoicing of the final consonant, which in turn triggers voicing assimilation with the Evenki suffixes (as in *gorot-tu:*). Adjectives are generally borrowed in the masculine singular nominative form; it is difficult to know how to interpret *последней* in line 2. Russian is so deeply intermixed with Evenki that it is hard to follow the transcription system established here for Russian in Cyrillic and Evenki in IPA. The sentence structure is approximately Evenki, with verb-final sentences in lines 1, 3 and 5. The initial clause of line 5 is however ungrammatical in both languages: the Russian preposition *после* requires a nominal object which would normally be followed by a finite clause (as in *после того, как мы пришли*) or the converb (deverbal adverb) *придя* in Russian is roughly equivalent to the Evenki converb of anteriority, which is used for an action which precedes the action of the main, finite verb. Neither language uses the syntax found here.

In the Iengra field recordings, speakers use a variety of Russian conjunctions in conversation. These are sporadic, idiosyncratic “usings” which are not codified or predictable. In example (12), the use of Russian *то ... то* ‘now...now’, ‘first...then’ is striking because the surrounding discourse is entirely in Evenki:

- (12) *mo* sirga-β kumtəβu-βki: ə-ŋnə-m kumtə-lgə-rə  
*now* sled-1SG turn.over-PART.HABT NEG-A.HABT-1SG turn.over-un-NFUT
- mo* sirga-β suksaβu-βki:  
*now* sled-1SG break-PART.HABT

‘*now* my sled would turn over, I couldn’t upright it,  
*now* my sled would break’

The use of the conjunction in this example is readily understood by the interlocutors, all of whom are bilingual, but at the same time is superfluous and redundant: the Evenki habitual participles convey the meaning of a repeated action and would not normally be used with any conjunctions.

In line 2 of (13), *пока до посёлка* appears to be a switch into Russian, while in line 3 it is less clear if just *пока* is a switch into Russian, or if it is used as Evenki:

- (13) Iengra, speaker born in
- 1 goro: okin istʃaŋa:-β tar  
 far until reach-FUT-1SG there
- 2 *пока до посёлка* istʃaŋa:-β  
*until to village* reach-FUT-1SG
- 3 *пока* Ljuda-βa baka-dzina:-β  
 until Ljuda-ACC find-FUT-1SG

‘It was far until I would get there, far *until* I would get *to the village*, *until* I would find Ljuda.’

These examples are symptomatic of the fact that Russian syntax has penetrated Evenki at a very deep level, in particular with regard to clause combining and subordination.

Regardless of level of fluency, mixes are largely limited to the word level and above. There are very few instances in both corpora where a Russian inflectional morpheme is used with an Evenki root. There are ample examples of a Russian root used with Evenki morphology but these could be argued to be borrowings. Where there is either advanced attrition (in the case of Evenki) or imperfect acquisition (in the case of Russian), the more common pattern is to find morphological breakdown within the language itself. Thus we find lack of agreement in the Russian of Evenki speakers, as in:

- (14) *давление сильно высокий* (Iengra, versus expected *давление очень высокое*)
- (15) *раньше редкий профессия* bi-tʃə:-ø (Iengra, for expected *редкая профессия*)  
 be-PST-3SG

‘[this] used to be a rare profession’

Although adjectives are borrowed in the nominative singular masculine form, I would argue that their position in each of these examples means that they are used in Russian, with lack of agreement.

Difficulties with case morphology in Evenki, either using the expected Russian case but with Evenki morphology (e.g. with speech verbs marking of the addressee in the dative instead of the expected accusative or allative) or confusion about which case is appropriate. Examples where both Russian and Evenki morphology are used in the same noun or NP are extremely rare:

- (16) *В пятьдесят шестой-ду:* dʒulba ilibultʃa:tin. (Iengra, Text L)  
*In 56-DAT* houses started to build

Here the use of both *ə* ‘in’ and the Evenki dative case is extremely rare in the corpus; here the borrowing of the numerals into Evenki probably helped influence this particular mix.

Finally, it is problematic to consider the speech of semi-speakers with advanced attrition as instances of CM. Such is the case of the following speaker, who self-identified as fluent in Evenki. The following excerpt is from a Frog Story recorded in Tura, not included in Table 1. It provides a snapshot of language loss; thanks to the meta-comments and questions by the speaker, her pauses and switches are readily analyzable as the result of having forgotten Evenki:

(17) Frog Story: speaker, age 41 (born 1967), recorded 2008; NB is interviewer

- |    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 1  | Bəjətkən-du burə asa-βa <i>коробочку</i><br>[They] gave the boy-DAT a bag-ACC a box-ACC                                    |  |
| 2  | <i>И еще можно, да?</i><br><i>And keep going, right?</i>   | <i>Все, что здесь, да?</i><br><i>Everything that's here, right?</i>              |
| 3  | <i>Так. (.)</i><br><i>So.</i>  | <i>Так.</i><br><i>So.</i>  |
| 4  | <i>Я сказала мальчику, да? (.)</i><br><i>I said to the boy-DAT, right?</i>   | <i>Так... «смотреть» как будет?</i><br><i>So...how do you say 'look'?</i>        |
| 5  | itʃətʃə-rə-<br>look-N.FUT  | itʃətʃə-rə-n.<br>look-N.FUT-3SG  |
| 6  | <i>Так. ɲinakin itʃətʃərən.</i><br><i>So. The dog looks.</i>   | <i>Так. Я сказала, ɲinakin itʃətʃərən?</i><br><i>So. I said "the dog looks"?</i> |
| NB | Mhmm   |  |
| 7  | <i>Так...</i><br><i>So</i>   |  |
| NB | <i>Ну ладно, пусть достаточ=</i><br><i>Ok, fine, that's enou=</i>  |  |
| 9  | <i>=еще могу сказать, что мальчик доволен, веселый, да?</i><br><i>=I can also say that the boy is content, happy, yes?</i> |  |
| NB | Mhmm   |  |
| 8  | Bəjətkən (.)<br>boy  |  |
| N  | Mhmm   |  |
| 11 | Bəjətkən <i>улыбается.</i><br>the boy <i>smiles</i>  |  |
| 12 | <i>И так скажу смеется, да?</i><br><i>And so I'll say laughs, yes?</i>   |  |
| 13 | Bəjətkən ɲətədʒərən.<br>The boy laughs.  | Bəjətkən ɲətədʒərən.<br>The boy laughs.  |

(.) = brief pause; ... = longer pause

This example provides an interesting case of changes in code that are tied to changes in footing in Goffman's (1981) terms. The speaker here has at least two different speaking roles. One is in dialogue with the linguists eliciting and recording the session; this conversation is in Russian. The other is as the narrator of the Frog Story; here she attempts to provide the narration in Evenki. There is possibly a third speaker role, where she speaks to herself (i.e., speaker as addressee). She answers her question (posed in line 4) in line 5; in line 5 she appears to be speaking to herself, searching for the correct form of the word and repeats it with a subject NP in line 6. This is not code-mixing of the type that Muysken's (2000) typology addresses. Here the speaker is more translating from Russian into Evenki than switching between the two.

This is an extreme example, but there are multiple cases of interference from Russian in the Frog Stories; six of the twelve consultants could not effectively complete the task. Changes in footing are common in all but two of the stories, those stories which are told exclusively in Evenki. (But here too the change in footing occurs at the beginning and end of the stories, in the switch from Russian to Evenki back to Russian.) With the remaining Frog Stories, we find that comments to the linguists and meta-comments about the speech event itself are in Russian:

(18) *Frog Story*, Text E

- |   |   |              |                           |                     |
|---|---|--------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Эмом<br><i>This</i>                             | həgdi<br>big | baɟʒalaki:<br><i>frog</i> | nuʃan-man<br>3S-ACC |
| 2 | «толкнул» не знаю<br><i>pushed I don't know</i> |              |                           |                     |
| 3 | halgan-du:n токнул<br><i>leg-DAT-3S pushed</i>  |              |                           |                     |

This example shows interesting interference from Russian and, simultaneously, confusion in the Russian – the speaker is looking for the word ‘kicked’ and comes up with the wrong word in Russian. Note also the dative instead of the expected instrumental.

(19) *Frog Story*, Text D

- |   |   |                                  |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| 1 | Bəjətəkən ani:βunma<br><i>The boy present</i>   | itʃərən<br><i>saw</i>            |
| 2 | aβsaβa<br><i>bag</i>  | itʃərən isərən<br><i>saw saw</i> |
| 3 | <i>я так и так на литературном,<br/>I, this way and that way, in the literary language</i>      |                                  |
| 4 | <i>я как методист на своем говоре могу<br/>I, as a methodologist, can [speak] in my dialect</i> |                                  |
| 5 | <i>буду, буду я на своем говоре<br/>I will, I will [speak] in my dialect</i>                    |                                  |
| 6 | isərən, aβsaβa<br><i>saw, bag</i>   | isərən<br><i>saw</i>             |

Here the speaker vacillates between use of standard Evenki [tʃ] and the pronunciation [s] of her dialect. As the meta-comments indicate, she is very much aware of her pronunciation; she is hardly speaking naturally. I interpret the ellipsis in lines 3-5 as further indication that the

setting is Russian-language dominant; these meta-comments to the linguists indicate that Russian is our language of communication, which is temporarily suspended for the purposes of narration.

Significantly, with all speakers, Russian appears to have had an impact on clause combining, with a strong tendency toward Russian-style finite subordinate clauses, regardless of which language is the matrix language.

## 5. Conclusion

In conclusion, several points can be made. First and foremost, the code-mixing seen here is not symptomatic of a grammaticalized mix of codes. Although this is certainly possible, and has been documented among Evenki speakers (see Pakendorf 2009), that is not what is happening here. A potential counterexample is (11), but here the speaker's mixes are idiosyncratic, not part of a larger system. They would be understood by other Evenki speakers, but only because they too are bilingual. Instead, we find several trends:

(1) There is a continuum of code-mixing types, depending on a number of factors, including the speaker's overall levels of bilingualism. In the Iengra texts, the two speakers who showed the least amount of mixes use Evenki as a first language. In the Frog Stories, the speakers using the most mixes (texts E and F), use Russian as a first language.

(2) Some of the mixes are due to structural convergence. I have not fully demonstrated this here, but here are some arguments. First of all, although Russian and Evenki are typologically different, both languages use suffixes. Russian differs in that it also uses prefixation; there is no evidence of Evenki acquiring prefixes. At the same time there is no real use of Russian morphology with Evenki lexemes or roots; rather, Russian words are borrowed or inserted, with Evenki inflectional morphology.

Historically Evenki subordination was done through a complex converb system; subordinating conjunctions were not used. At present, we see a number of mixes where a conjunction or temporal adverb is inserted from Russian. We also see a calquing of Russian constructions. For example, Russian interrogative words can be used as subordinators; now Evenki uses Evenki interrogatives or inserts Russian ones. The same is true of the use of temporal adverbs which were not used for signaling subordination or temporal relations.

(3) Speakers for whom Evenki is the first or primary language use simplified Russian morphology. To what extent this is systematic and to what extent idiosyncratic and ad hoc, created on the fly, is a question for further research.

(4) The differing nature of CM in the two corpora, and across speakers and even by individual speakers, captures differences in the languages in real time. Evenki is in general being lost through shift to Russian, but the overall proficiency varies greatly. Some speakers are still fully fluent in Evenki and use it as their primary language of communication, while others are at best rememberers of the language and function entirely in Russian. Between these two ends of the continuum, we find differing levels of proficiency. Thus it is not surprising that we do not find homogeneous uses of CM across the Evenki speech community as it is not itself a uniform community.

## Bibliography

- Булатова, Н.Я.: 2002, 'Эвенкийский язык', *Языки народов России. Красная книга*, глав. ред. В.П. Нерознак, Москва, 267–272.
- Булатова, Н.Я.: 1987, *Говоры эвенков Амурской области*, Ленинград.
- Василевич, Г.М.: 1958, *Эвенкийско-русский словарь*, Москва.

- Василевич, Г.М.: 1948, *Очерки диалектов эвенкийского языка*, Москва – Ленинград.
- Колесникова, В.Д.: 1966, *Синтаксис эвенкийского языка*, Москва – Ленинград: Наука.
- Константинова, О.А.: 1964, *Эвенкийский язык: фонетика, морфология*, Москва – Ленинград.
- Мыреева, А.Н.: 2004, *Эвенкийско-русский словарь*, Якутск.
- Романова, А.В. & Мыреева, А.Н.: 1971, *Фольклор эвенков Якутии*, Ленинград: Наука.
- Цинциус, В.И.: 1997, 'Эвенкийский язык', *Языки мира. Монгольские языки. Тунгусо-маньчжурские языки*, Москва.
- Blankenhorn, R.: 2003, *Pragmatische Spezifika der Kommunikation von Russlanddeutschen in Siberien. Entlehnung von Diskursmakern und Modifikatoren sowie Code-switching*, Frankfurt am Main.
- Deuchar, M.; Muysken, P. & Wang, S.-L.: 2007, 'Structured variation in codeswitching: towards an empirically based typology of bilingual speech patterns', *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10, 298–340.
- Forsyth, J.: 1992, *A History of the Peoples of Siberia: Russia's North Asian Colony 1581–1990*, Cambridge.
- Krasovicky, A. & Sappok, C.: 2000, 'The Russian dialect system in contact with Tungus languages in Siberia and the Far East', Gilbers, D. et al. (eds.), *Languages in Contact*, Amsterdam, 199–207.
- Mayer, M.: 1969, *Frog, Where Are You?*, New York: Dial Press.
- Mayer, M. & Mayer, M.: 1975, *One Frog Too Many*, New York: Dial Press.
- Muysken, P.: 2000, *Bilingual Speech. A Typology of Code-Mixing*, Cambridge.
- Pakendorf, B.: 2009, 'Intensive contact and the copying of paradigms. An Even dialect in contact with Sakha (Yakut)', *Journal of Language Contact*, Varia 2, 85–110.
- Polinsky, M.: 2007, 'Reaching the end point and stopping midway: Different scenarios in the acquisition of Russian', *Russian Linguistics* 31/2, 157–199.
- Zabrodskaja, A.: 2009, 'Evaluating the Matrix Language Frame model on the basis of a Russian-Estonian codeswitching corpus', *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 13, 357–377.