Potanina O., Filchenko A.

RUSSIAN CONTACT-INDUCED INNOVATIONS IN EASTERN KHANTY[1]

The paper[2] addresses the issues of contact-induced structural change in the native Siberian Eastern Khanty dialects. Contemporary data from Eastern Khanty spoken discourse demonstrate increasing frequency of examples of grammatical convergence, in which the original grammar of Eastern Khanty replicates the grammar of the socially dominant Russian. These examples fall under various structural types, including: phonological disharmonies, auxiliary verb construction strategies, word-order alternations, complex predicate splits, analytical imperatives, analytical conditionals, relativized and finite RC strategies. It is argued that all manifest structural innovations are induced by contact with Russian in the fully bilingual environment.

Key words: *language contact, code switching, borrowing, grammatical convergence, contact induced innovations, Eastern Khanty, Siberia.*

1. Introduction

It is fairly uncontested that languages undergo contact-induced changes throughout their evolution. It is also obvious that the intensity and kinds of such contact-induced change vary in concert with the general dynamics of the area where such a language evolved throughout its history (Filchenko, 2011). Our recent documentation and description experience in the area demonstrate most vividly the multifactorial contact influence on Eastern Khanty from Russian, the language dominating in the region over the period of at least 150 years, and markedly so within the recent 50–60 years.

Contact interaction and contact-induced systemic changes of Eastern Khanty are apparent. The present day situation of the Eastern Khanty speakers choosing Russian over Khanty can be defined as the situation of language shift. The situations of language contact leading to language change are differentiated from those leading to language shift, which is understood as a social phenomenon inseparable from a specific language situation (Vakhtin, 2007). In the context of Vasyugan dialect of Eastern Khanty, the situation appears quite complex. In the predictable age stratification, Khanty younger than 60 years of age, who can produce isolated lexemes or short clauses, shifted entirely into dominating and socially preferable Russian, thus manifesting the "break generation" which stops natural cross-generational language transfer. This clearly signifies the language shift situation leading to an inevitable language loss. Some Khanty over the age of 60 maintain mother tongue proficiency, although its functional sphere is reduced too radically due to a decreasing number of speakers. This is generally seen as signifying the situation of language contact. In their single digits, these speakers are the sole sources of data for the language documentation and description projects. However, these speakers use predominantly Russian within the family context (although they admit that some 10–15 years ago Khanty was used much more frequently, often as a secret code) (Potanina, 2013). According to N. Vakhtin, language loss is associated primarily with the loss of the last speakers, and on the other hand, with the gradual loss of the language structure itself as a result of increasing lexical borrowings and grammatical convergence with the dominant language (Vakhtin, 2007). Both scenarios appear to characterize Vasyugan Khanty dialect. Although in light of the dramatically small number of speakers, it is perhaps, more appropriate to discuss language loss in individual speakers, it is

nevertheless true that the described types of examples are consistently registered in the majority of the remaining known language consultants.

In the context of language contact, one should differentiate the phenomena (and the respective notions) of code-switching, grammatical convergence and borrowing. Code-switching in a bilingual context implies free, often unconscious and inconsistent use of two languages within one discourse. The majority of cases of code-switching are consequences of bilingualism (since there is no need to distinguish oneself as a distinct ethnic or social group). In the Eastern Khanty data, the prevailing majority of code-switching examples find counter-examples of equivalent lexical and grammatical units without code-switching. There is always a chance that a particular feature or a unit is principally more frequent in the Russian code of a particular speaker, even though the speaker is principally aware of the Khanty equivalent.

Lexical borrowing implies integration of donor-language lexical units (dominating Russian) into recipient-language (Eastern Khanty) in compliance with the recipient-language phonological and morphological rules. An important differentiating feature for distinguishing between code-switching and borrowing is exactly the use of the donor lexical units (Russian) in recipient discourse (Eastern Khanty) while either preserving donor (code-switching) or recipient morphology (borrowing). It should also be mentioned that code-switching is often provoked by the situational context – for example, by the very presence of the Russian-speaking linguists or other conversationalists, as well as by the socio-cultural context – set practice of Russian language usage in specific discourse types (professional, administrative, etc.).

Grammatical convergence is understood as a contact-induced systematic simile of grammatical structures of two languages (Thomason, 2001).

It is obvious that in all the discussed situations of language contact a certain continuum of features is observed. In terms of borrowing from Russian into Khanty, a certain chronology of feature distribution can be noted with a general trend from typical borrowing → towards code-switching and grammatical convergence. In a way, the presence or absence of such features could be used as diagnostics for the chronology of borrowing. Stricter adherence of the borrowed units to the recipient phonological and morphological conventions corresponds to the earlier time of borrowing, and vice versa.

2. Data

It should be acknowledged that the issue of contact-induced structural change has not been the specific object of our study, and rather emerged as a by-product of the language and documentation and description work. Furthermore, this issue generally has not been an object of dedicated studies on Western Siberian data, albeit sporadic notes and article-length publications on the lexical borrowings from Russian into Khanty do exist. This paper thus introduces some previous unsystematic observations and preliminary discussion of contact-induced structural change of Eastern Khanty based primarily on our field research data.

All speakers of Eastern Khanty dialects under study are fully bilingual Khanty-Russian speakers, who currently use solely Russian for everyday communication, including in the family, even though a decade or two ago they had been using Eastern Khanty with their relatives and tribesmen, often as a secret code. Currently, the remaining Eastern Khanty speakers reside discontinuously, in different villages, always comprising an insignificant ethnic and linguistic minority.

The empirical base for the discussion are the data from Vasyugan and Aleksandrovo dialects, with few examples of Vakh dialect represented in available published data collections by Castren and Karjalainen – dating to 1900's, Steinitz – dating to 1930's, Tereskin – dating to 1950's, Gulya dating to 1960's, and Kalinina – dating to 1960–1970's. Our own data have been collected between 1992 and 2014.

The Eastern Khanty dialects of interest belong to the so called eastern dialectal group of Khanty (Tereskin, 1961; Gulya, 1966) and are spoken on the tributaries of the river Ob in its middle flows in the north of Tomsk region of Russia, on the Western Siberian plain. Based on our recent field surveys, the number of speakers of these idioms – the endangered Finno-Ugric language of the Uralic language family reduced to 1–2 on the Vasyugan river and 1–2 in Aleksandrovo Ob area. All speakers are aged 60 and over.

It should be noted that Eastern Khanty dialects, and Vasyugan and Aleksandrovo in particular, are recognized to present a reportedly more archaic system of features, with stark divergence from the most of other Khanty dialects, and most markedly from the Northern reindeer Khanty dialects of Lower Ob river in the Tyumen region of Siberia. Thus, many of the referenced original structural features of Khanty are not typical for the majority of Khanty dialects and speakers.

3. Contact-induced innovation evidenced in the Eastern Khanty

3.1. *Contact induced innovation evidenced in the Eastern Khanty phonetic system*

In the domain of phonology, adherence of Russian borrowings to the recipient Eastern Khanty prominent phonological features, such as backness vowel harmony and backness vowel – velar consonant co-occurrence testifies to the earlier time of borrowing, while the violations of these phonological features corresponds to the later borrowing time (cf. Tab. 1-2).

Table 1: Lexical borrowing vis-a-vis recipient phonology: vowel harmony (VH)
and vowel – velar/uvular consonant harmonization CV [+/–front]. (Filchenko, 2008a: 37)

+CV[+/-front] / +VH	-CV[+/-front] / +VH	-CV[+/-front] / -VH
k`öʃkä 'cat'	*klap`ɨ* 'bed-bugs'	*kənt`or* 'office'
qan 'tsar/khan'	*kap`usta* 'cabbage'	*kəlx`osnik* 'kolxoz farmer'
kəp`ejkä 'kopek'	*kəl`oʃa* 'rubber-shoes'	*kəras`in* 'kerosene'
kənw`etkä 'candy'	*kənsam`ol* 'komsomol'	*səwr`ani* 'assembly'
Early borrowings	**Later borrowings**	**Latest borrowings**

Table 2: Lexical borrowing vis-a-vis recipient phonology: consonant cluster avoidance
(CC-cluster). (Filchenko, 2008a: 40)

-CC-cluster	-CC-cluster	+/-CC-cluster
kirik 'sin'	*kər`an* 'crane'	*krus`it' wertä* 'load'
Early borrowings	**Later borrowings**	**Latest borrowings**

3.1.1. Contact induced in Eastern Khanty morphology

Eastern Khanty demonstrates very rarely any examples of borrowed morphology from Russian. Few examples that have been attested illustrate borrowing in code-switching, an improvised unsystematic process (cf. examples (1a-b)).

1a. Vas: *Miron-<u>om</u>*   *waɣ-kal-ɨ.*
      Miron-INSTR   name-PST1-PS.3SG
      'He was named Miron'

1b. Vas: *Valentin…   muɣuli-kam-ovitʃ..?*
    Valentin...   which-INDEF-ovich ('-*ovich*' is a typical male patronimic
    in Russian and some Slavic languages)
    'Valentin what's-his-name-ovich?'   (*the speaker has not been using this
    construction in Russian)

3.1.2. Lexical verb borrowing

Apart from the above rare examples, morphological markers typically are not borrowed into Eastern Khanty. However, in the spontaneous speech of most contemporary speakers there are consistently numerous tokens of improvised analytical verbal constructions using Russian content verb in its infinitive form accompanied with the Khanty verb 'do/make' serving as an auxiliary bearing appropriate verbal morphology. This type of examples (2a-b) have high token frequency and the construction type is quite productive. It is used "on-line" where the respective Eastern Khanty lexical fails the speaker.

2a. Vas: *jəɣ   tʃərä   tom   l'oq   pereskatʃit'   wer-s-ät*
    3PL   very   DET   track   "jump.over"   do-PST2-3PL
    'They jumped over the track real fast' (TSPU field archive, 2005)

2b. Vas: *mä   jöɣ-a   toŋ   wɨletʃit'   wer-käl-im.*
    1SG   3SG-ILL   COND   heal.INF   do-PST1-1SG/1SG
    'I would have healed him. (TSPU field archive, 2008)

This construction type can be contrasted with the canonical lexical borrowing of earlier periods (compare (2c)), where the innovative verbal stem is formed based on the donor (Russian) lexeme, normally a variant of a verbal stem, and takes appropriate Khanty verbal derivational and inflectional morphology.

2c. Vas: *tʃərə   mola-ɣsə-wəl,   tʃərə   mola-ɣsə-wəl*
    very   pray-INTR/RFL-PRS.3SG   very   pray-INTR/RFL-PRS.3SG
    '((He) prays real hard, prays real hard' (TSPU field archive, 2006)

2d. Vakh: *qoji   əntə   ropi-ltə-wəl,   əntə   li-wəl*
    who   NEG   work-TR(caus)-PRS.3SG   NEG   eat-PRS.3SG
    '(He) who does not work, does not eat' (Gulya, 1966: 85)

In the terminology of J. Wohlgemuth (2009) these types of borrowing from a donor-language (model) to a recipient-language (replica) belong to the borrowing accommodation strategies: the former case (2a-b) – to the auxiliary verb construction strategy (light verb strategy) (Wohlgemuth, 2009: 102), while the latter (2c-d) – to the indirect insertion strategy (Wohlgemuth, 2009: 97). In the light verb strategy (2a-b), the borrowed verb–replica remains unchanged, more-or-less neutral in its lexical-grammatical class affiliation and bearing the semantic information of the new complex predicate, while the grammatical information (inflectional morphology) of the new verbal predicate is born by the «auxiliary» verb 'do' (do-strategy is typologically prevalent, for example in Turkic languages) (van der Auwera, 1999)). In the indirect insertion strategy (2c-d), the borrowed verb–replica requires additional morphological and syntactic adaptations to equalize it to the native verbs, most frequently by an explicit verbalization with derivational affixes, often reflexivizers (2c) or causativizers (2d). In the process, the original forms of the borrowed verbs belong to either of the two types: examples of the type (2a-b) – to the model: citation form/infinitive), or of the type (2c-d) – to the model: abstract stem (Wohlgemuth, 2009: 76). In the citation form/infinitive model, the donor verb is borrowed in its infinitive form, which is perceived in its entirety (together with its infinitive affix) by the recipient

language as a verbal stem. In the abstract stem model, the original borrowed verb represents true abstract stem, which is not seen as a free form in the donor-language (cf. examples (2c-d), Russian stems *moli-* 'pray' → Khanty /*mola-*/, and *rabot-* 'work' → Khanty /*ropi-*/ are not attested as free units, only as verbal roots of various verb forms).

Another and similar code-switching innovation in Eastern Khanty, concerns coding of some verbal grammatical categories, such as for example reflexive / middle voice, by using the auxiliary verb constructions with a Russian content verb as a reflexive infinitive and the Khanty verb 'do' carrying all appropriate verbal inflectional morphology (2e-f).

> 2e. Vas: *mä   käʃnä   qotl   pritsa   wer-l-əm*
> 1SG   "every"   day   "shave(RFL)"   do-PRS-1SG
> 'I shave every day' (Filchenko, 2008a: 348)

> 2f. Vas: *niŋ-äm-nə   mä-n   käʃnä qotl prit'   wer-wəl*
> woman-1SG-LOC   1SG-ACC   "every" day "shave(TR)"   do-PRS.3SG
> 'My wife shaves me every day' (Filchenko, 2008a: 348)

In the native Eastern Khanty reflexive / middle voice constructions, where the arguments with the semantic roles of Agent and Target are co-referential, active verbal predicates are used, while the second, Target argument position is taken by constituent accompanied by the explicit reflexive marker referring back to the Agent argument (2g-h).

> 2g. Vas: *mä   köt-äm   mä-näm   öɣö-käs-əm   kötʃäɣ-nä*
> 1SG   hand-1SG   1SG-RFL   cut-PST3-1SG knife-COM
> 'I cut my (own) hand with a knife (purposefully)' (Filchenko, 2008a: 346)

> 2h. Vas: *män-nə   köt-äm   mä-näm   öɣö-käs-əm   kötʃäɣ-nä*
> 1SG-LOC   hand-1SG   1SG-RFL   cut-PST3-1SG knife-COM
> 'I cut my (own) hand with a knife (incidentally)' (Filchenko, 2008a: 346)

Example (2g) codes volitional, purposeful action by an active-direct clause (Agent=A=Nom), while example (2h) codes non-volitional action by the so-called ergative-like clause (Agent=A=Loc) (Filchenko, 2008b: 422–438).

However, the same speakers, on a different occasion may code identical propositions without resorting to code-switching and borrowing, with native verbal predicates within canonical transitive constructions (cf. (2e-f) vs. (2i-j)):

> 2i. Vas: *mä   käʃnä qotl lus-ɨm   toɣoj jor-l-ɨm*
> 1SG   "every" day beard-1SG   away cut-PRS-1SG/SG
> 'I shave (cut my beard) every day' (Filchenko, 2008a: 346)

> 2j. Vas: *niŋ-äm-nə   mä   lus-ɨm   käʃnä qotl toɣoj jor-l-atə*
> woman-1SG-LOC   1SG   beard-1SG   "every" day away cut-PRS-3SG/SG
> 'My wife shaves me (cuts my beard) every day' (Filchenko, 2008: 346)

3.2. *Other lexical borrowing*

In contemporary natural narrative data, Russian borrowing is fairly frequent, illustrating lexical borrowing of content lexical units as well as of the free markers of coordination, subordination and discourse coherence.

3.2.1. Borrowing of coordination and subordination markers

Borrowed Russian coordination and subordination markers often represent conjunctions used in syntactic contexts typical for Russian conjunction use (Russ. *potom* → E. Khanty *potom* 'after', Russ. *vetʃno* → E. Khanty *vetʃnə* 'always', Russ. *ʃ'as* → E. Khanty *ʃas* 'now', Russ. *uzhə* → E. Khanty *uʃə* 'already', Russ. *ili* → E. Khanty *ili* 'or', Russ. *a* → E. Khanty *a* 'but', etc.), whereas native equivalents are available and used at other times (cf. (3a) vs. (3b) and (3c) vs. (3d)).

3a. Vas: <u>*a*</u>   *joɣ-pa*   *potom*   *mən-wəlt,*   *tʃellä*   *məŋ-a*   *lɨsmaɣtə-wəlt*
      "but"   home-ALL1   "then"   go-PRS.3PL   very   1PL-ILL   laugh-PRS.3PL
      'But then they go home…, will laugh at us real strong' (Filchenko, 2008a: 337)

3b. Vas: *put*   *köɣr-əm*   *pɨr-nə*   *qul*   *wel-tə*   *jaɣ*   *jö-ɣäs-ət*
      kettle   cook-PP   back-LOC   fish   kill-IMPP   people   come-PST3-3PL
      'Then, when the kettle cooked, the fisherman came in ' (Filchenko, 2008a: 167)

3c. Vas: *"ʃas*   *nuŋ-ə-pa*   *joɣo-l-ɨm!"*
      "now"   2SG-EP-ALL   beat.up-PRS-1SG/SG
      "«<u>Now</u>» I will give you some (beating up)!" (TSPU field archive, 2006)

3d. Vas: *itʃ'ä*   *män-ä*   *in-tə*   *məj-a*
      now   1SG-ILL   eat-IMPP   give-IMPR.2SG
      '<u>Now</u>, give me something to eat!' (Filchenko, 2008a: 177)

3.2.2. Borrowing of discourse markers, cohesion markers, deictic words

In the process of internal code-switching (code-mixing) lexical units frequently used in Russian for a wide range of discourse cohesion purposes are used in Eastern Khanty speech functioning as deictic words, markers of subjective modality, information structuring markers and hesitation markers (Russ. *vot* → E. Khanty *wot* 'so', Russ. *nu* → E. Khanty *nu* 'well…', Russ. *eto* → E. Khanty *etə* 'this, like so', etc.) and modal words (Russ. *mozhet* → E. Khanty *moʃet* 'perhaps', Russ. *kazhetsa* → E. Khanty *kaʃetsa* 'it seems', etc.). Many of the native equivalents of these markers are still well preserved and used by the same speakers in a controlled speech.

4a. Vas: <u>*wot*</u>   *tʃimin*   *wer*
      "here"   DET   affair
      '<u>So</u>, this is how it is'

4b. Vas: *"mä…"* <u>*govorit:*</u> *"eto…*   *mä*   *nuŋ-a*   *joɣ*   *tu-ɣas-ɨm"*
      1SG   "say"   "this"   1SG   2SG-ILL   home   bring-PST3-1SG/1SG
      'I, «<u>he says</u>», «<u>like so</u>» … I did bring you home'

4c. Vas: <u>*taʃe*</u>   *palatka*   *əntə*   *onəl-ɣil*
      «even»   «tent»   NEG   know-PST0.3PL
      '(They) didn't <u>even</u> know tents.'

4d. Vas: *tom*   *rätʃ*   <u>*uʃə*</u>   *peredi*   *mən-wəl*
      DET   Oldman   "already"   "infront"   go-PRS.3SG
      '…that old man is <u>already</u> going <u>ahead</u> (of them)' (Tomsk field archive, 2005)

4e. Vas: *moʃet*   *mä*   *nuŋ-a*   *tʃuɣun*   *me-l-əm*
           "perhaps"   1SG   2SG-ILL   "cast-iron"   give-PRS-1SG
           '<u>Perhaps,</u> I should give you a cast-iron kettle?' (TSPU field archive, 2006)

Interestingly, the obligation/necessity markers are almost never borrowed, preserving the use of the native Khanty verb *mas-* 'need, must'. In example (5), the speaker self-repairs from a Russian *nadə* to a Khanty *mas-wəl*.

5a. Vas: *motovos*   *jo-s*   *tʃì...*, *pesok*   <u>*nadə*</u>..., *rasgruʃat wer-tä* <u>*mas-wəl*</u>...
           tractor come-PST2.3SG DET "sand" "need" "unload" do-INF need-PRS.3SG
           '… the tractor came, to do this thing… <u>needs</u> to sand… <u>needs</u> to unload sand' (TSPU field archive, 2006)

What can be noted, however, is that in convergence with the dominant Russian, the native modal verb *mas-* though preserved lexically, undergoes paradigm reduction fossilizing in the invariant PRS.3SG inflected form, apparently replicating Russian (cf. (5a) vs. (5b) vs. (5c)).

5b. Vas: <u>*mas-wəl*</u>   *niŋ-quj-ət-pä*   *qojə-pa*   <u>*mən-tä wəl-tä*</u>
           need-PRS.3SG   woman-man-PL-ALL1   who-ALL1   go-INF be-INF
           '(I) <u>need to go live</u> with my daughter, with her family, or elsewhere' (TSPU field
            archive, 2008).

5c. Vas: *mä-mpi*   *joqan qasɨ wəs-əm,*   *joɣ*   *mäɣ-ä* <u>*mən-ta mas-wəl*</u>
           1SG-RFL   married man be-PST0.1SG home   land-ILL go-INF   need-PRS.3SG
           'I am a married man, I need <u>to go home</u>' (Kalinina, 1970)

Also, example (5b) illustrates frequent switch to a Russian order of modal and content verbs within the complex verbal predicate, which in the SOV Eastern Khanty should not split and implies content verb infinitive followed by the clause-final finite modal verb (cf. (5b) vs. (5c)).

3.3. *Restructured Imperatives*

Narrative data also demonstrates occasional innovative optative/imperative constructions with the borrowed *tawaj/dawaj* (Russ. *davaj*). In these examples, the Eastern Khanty recipient optative/imperative model is replicating the Russian donor model (at least for the 1DU and 1PL S/A referents), in that the *dawaj* 'lets' (2SG imperative form of the verb 'give') is followed by the Present-Future tense form of the content verb with appropriate person/number inflections, while the native Eastern Khanty model implies full morphological imperative paradigm (cf. (6a) vs. (6b)).

6a. Vas: *"nu, davaj käniltä-l-mɨn"*
           "so" "lets" hide-PRS-1DU
           "So, <u>lets hide!</u>" (TSPU field archive, 2006)

6b. Vas: *(pust') min   nomsaŋ* <u>*wəl-ɨməna*</u>!
            let   1DU   smart   be-IMPR.1DU
           '(Let us (both) <u>be</u> smart!' (EKhNeg_1.7)

3.4. *Convergence of complex clause models: conditional clauses*

Among other evidence of Russian contact-induced structural innovation in Eastern Khanty the naturally-occurring narrative data demonstrates "borrowing" of various models of complex clause coordination and subordination. One of such examples is the use of the model of conditional clauses

apparently replicating respective Russian syntax. In example (7a), the Russian conditional construction with the conjunctions *esli… to…* (Russ: '*if…, then…*') is replicated in Eastern Khanty, while the native conditional constructions are morphologically marked on the condition predicate (7b).

7a. Vas: <u>*esli*</u>   *sajm-ali*   *əntim,* <u>*to*</u>   *tʃoɣo* *jul-wən*
        "if"   stream-DIM   NEG "then" snow   melt-PRS.2SG
        '<u>If</u> there is no stream, <u>then</u> you melt some snow' (TSPU field archive, 2008)

7b. Vas: *əntə*   <u>*mən-ŋ-än,*</u>   *wöɣ-nä*   *tul-uj-ən*
        NEG   go-CND-2SG force-COM   pull-PS-2SG
        '<u>(If) you don't go</u>, you'll be taken by force' (Gulya, 1966: 121)

3.4.1. Convergence of complex clause models: relative clauses

In this section we will discuss new patterns of forming complex clauses in Eastern Khanty from a language-contact perspective. The attested examples of grammatical convergence can be illustrated by the innovative syntactic structures that appeared in Eastern Khanty presumably under the influence of Russian. The field data collected in the last 15 years evidence that the major structural transformations have affected complex clauses. In the present section we will focus on the contact-induced tendencies in the formation of relative clauses (RCs).

Eastern Khanty employs nonfinite subordinate clauses for a variety of functions. The nonfinite embedded clauses are used as a highly productive strategy for complex clause formation. In Eastern Khanty the dependent clause is nominalized – the participle functions as the sentential head and forms the subordinate RCs. In the SOV Khanty language, relative clauses are prenominal modifiers and are sentence initial. The prototypical Khanty RCs employ the nominalization pattern whereby the matrix clause has fully finite syntax and the RC is nominalized.

8a. Vas: <u>*mä*   *wer-m-äm*   *rɨt*</u>   *mən-əs*
        1SG   make-PP-1SG boat   go-PST2.3SG
        'The boat I made disappeared'. (TSPU field archive, 2013)

8b. Vas: <u>*nöŋ*   *mən-t-än*   *lök*</u>   *qoɣ*   *wel-wəs*
        2SG   go-IMPP-2SG road   long   be-PRS.3SG
        'The road you are taking is long'. (TSPU field archive, 2013)

The prototypical RCs in Khanty are formed utilizing the gap strategy, which is defined as the strategy that "does not provide any overt indication of the role of the head within the RC" (Comrie, 1981: 144). In Eastern Khanty RCs there is no overtly expressed argument co-referential with the head and expressing the grammatical functions of the head. Eastern Khanty allows relativization of all grammatical relations on the Keenan-Comrie hierarchy of accessibility to relative clause formation (Keenan, Comrie, 1977).

The recent field data, however, present certain innovations in relative clause formation that are not found in the archival data and grammar descriptions of the 1960s. These innovative tendencies will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

Some recently recorded texts demonstrate a frequent tendency toward post-head and finite RCs, which is obviously formed under the influence of Russian syntax of complex clauses.

9. Vas: *mä*   *qolentə-l-əm*   *merəm,* *muɣuj jaleswə-wəl   aŋk-im*
      1SG   listen-PRS-1SG tale   which   tell-PRS.3SG mother-1SG
      'I am listening to the story my mother is telling'. (TSPU field archive, 2013)

In example (9), the matrix argument "tale" with the semantic role of Target is co-referential with the argument with the semantic role of Target in the finite dependent clause (Trg-NP[Trg]$_{rel}$).

The R-element is represented as zero in the dependent clause. What is innovative is that this strategy is a type of the relative-pronoun strategy which is not frequently found in Eastern Khanty and represents the result of the Russian influence. In example (9) the relativizer *muɣuj* reflects the inanimacy property of the R-element which allows us to term the strategy as a relative-pronoun strategy. Being a borrowed strategy, it triggers OVS word order which is sporadic in finite clauses. In example (10), the RC is headless as the explicit head is absent in the finite matrix clause. Headless RCs occur frequently in Eastern Khanty to denote specific and non-specific referents. But again headless RCs have a fully finite syntax and are introduced by a relativizer (ØLoc-NP[Loc]rel).

> 10. Vas: *mä   wel-s-əm   <u>qo   kötʃköl qasɨ käs-äɣi   wajaɣ lök</u>*
>   1SG be-PST2-1SG where hunt   man   find-PST0.3SG animal track
>   'I was there where the hunter found the prints of the animal'. (TSPU field archive, 2013).

Our field data attest to the examples of the relativization of the constituents with temporal meaning employing the same strategy: the finite clauses are linked by the relativizer *qunta* 'when' which is illustrated by the headless RCs in the example below.

> 11. Vas: *mä   onəl-l-əm,   <u>qunta joŋən   aj-ni   tiɣ-äɣi</u>*
>   1SG   know-PRS-1SG   when summer little-woman be born-PST0.3SG
>   'I remember (the summer) when the girl was born'. (TSPU field archive, 2013)

In example (11) the O-argument with the semantic role of Target is not overtly expressed but contextually is co-referential with the Locative argument (with a temporal meaning) in the finite (Trg-NP[Temp]rel).

In Eastern Khanty the demonstrative pronouns may often function as relativizers.

> 12. Vas: *mä   wer-käs-im   kötʃəɣ <u>ti   ni   öɣö-wəl   n'an'</u>*
>   1SG   make-PST3-1SG/1SG knife DET   woman cut-PRS.3SG   bread
>   'I made the knife the woman is cutting the bread with'. (TSPU field archive, 2013)

The finite RC has an SVO word order and is linked to the matrix clause with the help of a relativizer *ti*. This innovative structure also allows headless RCs. In example (13) the headless finite RC also has an SV word order.

> 13. Vas: *män-nə   onəl-l-əm   <u>tom   qu   ju-wəl</u>*
>   1SG-LOC   know-PRS-1SG   DET man   walk-PRS.3SG
>   'I know the man who is walking over there'. (TSPU field archive, 2013)

The examples discussed above which represent about 15% of the RCs in modern narratives are postpositive finite modifiers introduced by interrogative and demonstrative pronouns functioning as relativizers. The head can be omitted in headless RCs or can be placed within the RC thus yielding an internally headed RC.

The diachronic depth of the described finite relative constructions is limited by the data available for Vasyugan Khanty and recorded by Steinitz in the 1930s. In the closely related Vakh dialect the data collected by J. Gulya in the 1950-60s, similar finite correlatives introduced by the interrogative pronoun are found (14a-b) (Potanina, 2008: 78):

> 14a. Vakh: *<u>qoji əntə   ropiltə-wəl,</u>   əntə   li-wəl*
>   who NEG   work-PRS.3SG   NEG eat-PRS.3SG
>   <u>'Who does not work, does not eat'</u> (Gulya, 1966: 85).

In example (14a), the implicit Agent-argument of the matrix clause is co-referential with the Agent-argument of the prepositive finite RC (Ag-NP[Ag]rel) represented by the interrogative pronoun

'who' functioning as a relativizer. The example of Vakh finite RCs in (14a) is an example of correlative clauses which do not overtly express the grammatical categories of the head differentiating animacy/inanimacy only, which defines the choice of the relativizer. However, the relatively fixed word order prevents ambiguity in semantic roles and grammatical functions of the arguments.

14b. Vakh: *möɣöli mä-nä   mas-wəl,*   *t'u məj-iɣilə-ɣas*
       which 1SG-LOC need-PRS.3SG DET give-TR-PST3.3SG
       'What I need, he gave me' (Gulya 1966, 86).

In example (14b), the argument with the semantic role of Target in the matrix clause expressed by the demonstrative pronoun 'that' is coreferential with the Target-argument in the prepositive finite RC (Trg-NP[Trg]$_{rel}$), introduced by the interrogative pronoun 'which' functioning as a relativizer.

The examples (14a-b) demonstrate certain hypotactic characteristics of the complex sentence explicitly coding interdependence between the matrix clause and the finite dependent clause. In example (14a), the RC is introduced by a relative pronoun implying some antecedent. As for the example (14b), it uses the demonstrative pronoun *t'u / t'i* functioning as a resumptive to mark the return to the matrix clause. Unlike the example (14a), which is a headless RC introduced by the interrogative pronoun, in the example (14b), the position of the missing head is occupied by a highly referring demonstrative pronoun. This tendency toward the headless strategy might be explained in terms of the semantics of the missing head that probably has no specific semantic content and the propositions are generic statements, while the proposition in (14b) has more specific semantics which correlates with the obligatory presence of the argument referentially identical to the interrogative pronoun introducing the finite RC (Potanina, 2005: 405).

Under the influence of Russian the use of demonstrative and deictic particles as arguments of one clause to refer to another whole clause became an important device for indicating some relationship among sentences. The presence of such highly referring arguments was originally not obligatory. However, in the more recent data, as demonstrated by the example (15), following the Russian pattern, the use of the highly referential argument in the matrix clause *toɣəpa* 'there' (co-referential with the prepositive finite RC) becomes obligatory.

15. Vakh: *qol't'-əɣ   jö-s-ən,*   *toɣ-əpa mən-ä*
     where-PRL   come-PST2-2SG there-ALL1 go-IMPR.2SG
     'Go there where you came from!' (Gulya, 1966: 96).

The Loc-argument of the matrix clause is co-referential with the Locative role of the whole prepositive finite RC (Loc-NP[Loc]$_{rel}$), introduced by the interrogative pronoun in the function of a relativizer 'where from' and the locative referential element *toɣəpa* 'there'. The example conveys some general idea implicit in the use of the Imperative in the matrix clause as in (15), where it does not matter where one came from, one should go back there (Potanina, 2005: 406). In general, the pronoun *toɣə-* codes an indefinite/not visible distant locative in Khanty (Gulya, 1966: 201). Examples like (15) are sporadic and are not characteristic of the unwritten Eastern Khanty language, and are probably more frequent in written languages where reference is often made to entities and events which are not visible to the writer or reader (Perkins, 1992: 67). In te unwritten Eastern Khanty, the arguments with highly specific semantics are more frequent.

Another Eastern Khanty innovative strategy allows the overt presence of the head noun both in the subordinate and the matrix clause, which is another important device for indicating interdependence of clauses. The head NP of the matrix clause is repeated explicitly in the relative clause (Potanina, 2013: 80). In Eastern Khanty, this innovative non-reduction strategy can be identified as correlative (Comrie, Kuteva, 2011). The constraint in Khanty is that it is not possible to have a co-referential pronoun instead of the repeated NP in the dependent clause.

16. Vakh: *mä   il-l-əm   intot   t͡ʃu   niŋ-əm   wer-äm   intot*
      1SG   eat-PRS-1SG   food   DET   wife-1SG   make-PP   food
      'I eat food cooked by my wife'.   (TSPU field archive, 2009).

17. Vakh: *jüɣ   wə-ɣal   jop   qul   wel-m-äl   jop*
      3SG   take-PST.3SG   fishing.rod   fish   kill-PP-3SG   fishing.rod
      'He took the fishing rod, that he used for catching fish (before)'. (TSPU field archive,
      2009).

According to B. Comrie and T. Kuteva (2011), the non-reduction is the second major relativization strategy in the languages of the world, whereby the head noun appears as a full-fledged noun phrase within the relative clause.

4. Conclusion

Contemporary data demonstrate increased frequency of examples of grammatical convergence, in which, unlike in code-switching, the grammar of Eastern Khanty replicates the grammar of the socially dominant Russian. These examples are though falling under various structural types (phonological disharmonies, auxiliary verb construction strategies, word-order alternations (complex predicate splits), analytical imperatives, analytical 'if-then' conditionals, relativized and finite RC strategies, etc.) they nevertheless all manifest Russian contact-induced structural innovations in the fully bilingual Khanty-Russian environment.

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 – first, second, third person;	INTR – intransitivizer;
ABL – ablative;	LOC – locative;
ACC – accusative;	NEG – negation;
ALL – allative;	PL – plural;
CND – conditional;	PP – perfective participle;
DU – dual;	PRL – prolative;
DET – determiner;	PRS – present tense;
DIM – diminutive;	PS – passive;
E. Khanty – Eastern Khanty;	PST – past tense;
EP – epenthetic;	RFL – reflexive;
ILL – illative;	Russ. – Russian;
IMPP – imperfective participle;	SG – singular;
INSTR – instrumental;	TR – transitivizer;
IMPR – imperative;	Vas. – Vasyugan dialect;
INDEF – indefinite;	Vakh – Vakh dialect.

References

Comrie B., Kuteva T. 2011. Relativization on Subjects. *In: Dryer, M. S. & Haspelmath, M. (eds.), The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library, chapter 122. Available online at http://wals.info/chapter/122.

Filchenko A. 2008a. *Aspects of the Grammar of Eastern Khanty*. Tomsk: TSPU-Press.

Filchenko A. 2008b. Funkcionalno-pragmaticheskij aspect padehnoogo oformlenija argumentov v vostochno-hantyjskih dialektah. Issledovanija po teorii grammatiki. *In V. A. Plungian, Issledovanija po teorii grammatiki* [Functional-pragmatic aspect of argument case marking in Eastern Khanty. In V. Plungian Studies in the Theory of Grammar.]. Moscow, Gnozis. V-4, 422-438.

Filchenko A. 2011. Experience of areal analysis of Khanty, Selkup and Chulym dialectal data. *Tomsk State Pedagogical University Bulletin*, 3 (105), 148–155.

Gulya J. 1966. Eastern Ostyak Chrestomathy. Bloomington.

Perkins R. 1992. *Deixis, grammar and culture*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Potanina O. 2005. Relativization strategies in Eastern Khanty. *Proceedings of the University of Cambridge Third Postgraduate Conference in Language Research (ed. E. Beltrán).* Cambridge. 403–410.

Potanina O. 2008. Grammaticalization and Relative Clauses in Eastern Khanty. *In ed. by E.Vajda, Subordination and Coordination Strategies in North Asian Languages. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 300*. Amsterdam-New York, John Benjamins. 77–84.

Potanina O. 2013. Manifestations of language attrition among Eastern Khanty speakers. *Tomsk Journal of Linguistics and Anthropology*, 2 (2), 75–82.

Tereshkin N. 1961. *Ocherki dialektov hantyjskogo jazyka. Vahovskij dialect. Ch-1* [Grammar sketches of Khanty dialects. Vakh dialect. P-1]. Leningrad: Nauka.

Thomason S. G. 2001. *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Edinburgh University Press.

Wohlgemuth J. 2009. A typology of verbal borrowings. *In Walter Bisang, Hans Henrich Hock, Werner Winter. Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs* 211. Berlin-New York. Mouton de Gruyter.

Data Archives

TSPU field archive – Tomsk State Pedagogical University field data archive, data bundle – 2005.

TSPU field archive – Tomsk State Pedagogical University field data archive, data bundle – 2006.

TSPU field archive – Tomsk State Pedagogical University field data archive, data bundle – 2008.

TSPU field archive – Tomsk State Pedagogical University field data archive, data bundle – 2009.

TSPU field archive – Tomsk State Pedagogical University field data archive, data bundle – 2013.

Kalinina – L. Kalinina. Eastern Khanty folk lore collection - Tomsk State Pedagogical University field data archive – 1970.

EKhNeg – Eastern Khanty Negation Questionnaire – Tomsk State Pedagogical University field data archive – 2012.

Potanina O., Candidate of Science in Philology, Associate Professor, Dept. Foreign Languages IIF.
National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University.
Pr. Lenina, 30, Tomsk, Russia, 634050.
E-mail: olgapotanina@yahoo.com

Filchenko A., Ph.D. Linguistics, Candidate of Science in Philology, Professor.
Chair World Language and Literature Nazarbayev University.
Kabanbai batyr, 53, Astana, Kazakhstan, 010000.

Associate Professor, Dept. Indiegnous Languages of Siberia FFI.
Tomsk State Pedagogical University.
Pr. Komsomolsky, 75, Tomsk, Russia, 634041.
E-mail: filtchenko@policy.hu

Потанина О. С., Фильченко А. Ю.

КОНТАКТНЫЕ ИННОВАЦИИ В ВОСТОЧНО-ХАНТЫЙСКОМ ПОД ВЛИЯНИЕМ РУССКОГО ЯЗЫКА

Представлено описание аспектов контактно-обусловленных структурных изменений диалектных форм хантыйского языка – местного идиома Западной Сибири. Современные языковые данные восточно-хантыйского разговорного дискурса демонстрируют растущую частотность примеров грамматической конвергенции, при которой исконная грамматика восточно-хантыйских

диалектов реплицирует грамматику социально-доминантного русского языка. Примеры грамматической конвергенции составляют ряд структурных типов: нарушения фонологической гармонии гласных, использование стратегий с аналитическими конструкциями с вспомогательными глаголами, изменения базового порядка слов, сплиты сложных предикативных конструкций, аналитические императивы, аналитические условные конструкции, изменения стратегий релятивизации и стратегии финитных атрибутивных придаточных предложений. Все описываемые структурные инновации в восточно-хантыйских диалектах распространяются под контактным влиянием русского языка в полностью билингвальной среде.

Ключевые слова: *языковые контакты, переключение кодов, заимствования, грамматическая конвергенция, контактные инновации, восточные ханты, Сибирь.*

Потанина О. С., кандидат филологических наук, доцент.
Национальный исследовательский Томский политехнический университет.
Пр. Ленина, 30, Томск, Россия, 634050.
E-mail: olgapotanina@yahoo.com

Фильченко А. Ю., кандидат филологических наук, Ph.D. Linguistics
профессор, зав. кафедрой мировых языков и литературы.
Назарбаев Университет.
Кабанбай батыр, 53, Астана, Казахстан, 010000.

Доцент кафедры языков народов Сибири ФИЯ.
Томский государственный педагогический университет.
Пр. Комсомольский, 75, Томск, Россия, 634041.
E-mail: filtchenko@policy.hu