

**Nganasan – Tundra Enets contacts:
geography, chronology, sociolinguistic settings, and their linguistic results**

Valentin Gusev (University of Hamburg & Institute of Linguistics, RAS),

Olesya Khanina (Institute of Linguistics, RAS)

The paper presents sociolinguistic circumstances and linguistic results of contact between two neighboring ethnic communities speaking related Samoyedic (Uralic) languages. Both Nganasan and the Tundra variety of Enets are spoken on the Tajmyr peninsula, in the North of Central Siberia; both are highly endangered languages spoken by a small proportion of small ethnic groups (the 2010 all-Russian census counted 733 Nganasans, 81 of them speaking their language, and 196 Enets, 40 of them speaking their language; our fieldwork experience suggests that there are about 70 Tundra Enets, 20 of them speaking the Tundra variety of Enets, and about 120 Forest Enets, 30 of them speaking the Forest variety of Enets).

From Dolgikh (1949a, 1949b, 1960, 1962a) and (Khanina & Meyerhoff 2018) based on data from Dolgikh (1961, 1962b) we have compiled a dynamic geographic map of the Nganasan and the Tundra Enets contact areas as they changed in time since the 16th century (start of the Russian colonization) till now. For the information on the 20th century Nganasan – Tundra Enets contacts, as well as their sociolinguistic settings, we use field data collected in summer 2017. In particular, we have discovered the details of a wave of Tundra Enets migration to the Avam Nganasan tundra that happened around the 1930s, but has never been mentioned in the literature. This wave is also remarkable for being one of the main reasons of the disappearance of Tundra Enets: a large part of them quickly assimilated to the Nganasans and lost their language within one generation, shifting to Nganasan.

Different chronological stages of Nganasan – Tundra Enets language contact led to different outcomes in the linguistic structures of the two languages. Period of stable neighborhood and intermarriages till the end of the 19th century resulted in mutual lexical borrowings. E.g. an interjection of startle and fright: Nganasan *əbəj* > Tundra Enets *abej*, *aboj*, *əboj*, *əbej*, *eboj*, *abij* (Tundra Enets has no /ə/ phoneme, and so this Nganasan sound gave an array of possible variants in Tundra Enets); ‘flour’ Tundra Enets *d'aud'ia* from *d'ia* ‘earth, ground’ and *ud'ia* ‘food, meat’ > Nganasan *d'aa ηəmsu* where *ηəmsu* is ‘food, meat’, but *d'aa* is meaningless in this language (Nganasan for ‘earth, ground’ is *mou*).

The migration of Tundra Enets to the Avam Nganasan lands with their subsequent switch to Nganasan may have resulted in some grammatical substrate influence in Nganasan, e.g. morphophonology of the Nganasan Habitual affix reminds that of Tundra Enets and is quite atypical for Nganasan. Besides, a specific variety of Tundra Enets formed in the Nganasan surroundings which was mainly Tundra Enets, but was marked by active use of Nganasan discourse markers (first of all, for hesitation), some Nganasan morphology (e.g. Tundra Enets -*sij* is an affix of an Anterior participle used in non-finite contexts only, while its Nganasan cognate -*suə/-sɟə/-śüə/-śiə*, IPA [so, se, sjo, sie], is used only finitely as a Past marker: Avam Tundra Enets used -*sij* as a finite marker in contexts of the standard Tundra Enets Past), some phonetic adaptation of Tundra Enets words to Nganasan phonology (either Tundra Enets sounds underwent the same changes as Russian loanwords in Nganasan did, e.g. /p/ > /f/, as there is no /p/ in Nganasan, or they changed to etymologically cognate variant, e.g. /tʃ/ > /sʃ/, or they got involved into the same variations that were common in Nganasan, e.g. /b/ > /b/ or /w/).

Such description of contact phenomena related to different time periods is possible due to the extensive data on these languages collected since the 1970s. Data were collected in numerous locations, and so all regional varieties of the two languages, each with its own record of contacts, are accessible and can be compared to each other. However, the very question of how Nganasan and Tundra Enets have influenced each other has never been studied, and this paper is the first attempt to do so, backed up by the authors’ independent experience in each of the languages.

- Dolgikh, Boris O. 1949b. Rodovoj i plemennoj sostav narodnostej severa Srednej Sibiri [Clans and tribes of indigenous Northern people of Middle Siberia], *Kratkie soobschenija Instituta etnografii* [Short reports of the Institute of ethnography] V, 70-85.
- Dolgikh, Boris O. 1960. *Rodovoj i plemennoj sostav Sibiri v XVII v. [Clans and tribes of Siberia in the 17th century.]*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk SSSR.
- Dolgikh, Boris O. 1961. *Mifologičeskie skazki i istoričeskie predanija èncev* [Enets Myths and Historical Legends]. Trudy Instituta Ètnografii im.N.N.Mikluxo-Maklaja. Novaja serija, Vol. LXVI. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk SSSR.
- Dolgikh, Boris O. 1962a. Rodovaja ekzogamija u nganasan in èncev [Clan exogamy by Nganasan and Enets]. In *Sibirskij Ètnografičeskij Sbornik, IV Očerki po istorii, xoz'ajstvu i bytu narodov Severa* [Essays on the History, Economy and Material Culture by Peoples of the North]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk SSSR. 197-225.
- Dolgikh, Boris O. 1962b. *Bytovye rasskazy èncev* [Everyday Enets Stories]. Trudy Instituta Etnografii imeni N.N.Mikluxo-Maklaja. Novaja serija, Vol. LXXV. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk SSSR.
- Khanina, Olesya & Meyerhoff, Miriam. 2018. A case-study in historical sociolinguistics beyond Europe: reconstructing patterns of multilingualism of a language community in Siberia. To appear in *Journal of historical sociolinguistics* 2018.