RUSSIAN IN BESERMAN ORAL DISCOURSE:

CODE-MIXING AND BORROWING[1]

Maria Usacheva & Olga Biryuk

Moscow State University*

mashastroeva@gmail.com/ biryuk.olga@gmail.com

Abstract

The paper is devoted to the influence which Russian as a dominant language exerts on Beserman dialect of Udmurt. Analysis is based on a corpus of dialogues recorded and transcribed in Shamardan (a Beserman village in Udmurtia, Russian Federation). It is shown that Russian influence in forms of code-mixing and borrowing can be seen at all language levels: phonetics, inflectional morphology, vocabulary, syntax, discourse. It is stated that the changes could result in a mixed idiom, but the dialect is likely to die because it is not passed to next generations anymore.

Keywords

code-mixing, borrowing, Beserman, Russian, Udmurt

EL RUSO EN EL DISCURSO ORAL DEL BESERMAN:

CAMBIO DE CÓDIGO Y PRÉSTAMOS

Resumen

El artículo estudia la influencia que el ruso como lengua dominante ejerce sobre el Beserman, dialecto del udmurto. El análisis se basa en un corpus de diálogos grabados y transcritos en Shamardan (un pueblo

---

dónde se habla Beserman, en Udmurtia, Federación Rusa). Se muestra que la influencia rusa en forma de cambio de código y de préstamo se puede observar en todos los niveles de la lengua: la fonética, la morfología flexiva, el vocabulario, la sintaxis y el discurso. Se afirma que los cambios experimentados podrían dar lugar a una lengua mixta, aunque el dialecto es probable que muera ya que no se transmite de generación en generación.

Palabras clave

cambio de código, préstamos, Beserman, ruso, udmurto

1. Introduction

This article concerns the Beserman dialect of Udmurt. Besermans is a relatively small (according to the All-Russian population census, there are 2201 people identifying themselves as Beserman) ethnic group occupying the basin of Cheptsa river and the Kirov region of the Russian Federation. Besermans consider themselves to be a nationality different from Udmurts and to speak a unique language. But in the scientific literature the Beserman idiom is considered to be a dialect of Udmurt language which is characterized by an unusual combination of specifically Beserman language phenomena (concentrated in vocabulary and phonetics) with certain traits of northern and southern Udmurt dialects (mostly morphological and phonetical) (see Teplyashina 1970, Kelmakov 1998, Ljukina 2008). More concrete, R. Idrisov (2013) demonstrates that among 110 units of words denoting basic concepts (100 of them taken from the Swadesh's list[2] and 10 from the supplemental list of Jakhontov[3] there are 99 units which are common for Beserman idiom and Udmurt language. For these reasons, we treat Beserman as a dialect of Udmurt.

The question of Beserman ethnogenesis is still discussed and is far from getting any satisfactory answer. For different hypotheses see Napolskikh (1997), Teplyashina (1970),

---

[2] The Swadesh's list (see Kassian, Starostin, Dybo & Chernov 2010) represents 100 most stable items of the basic vocabulary of human languages. After certain modifications, it has become a very important tool of comparative linguistics.

[3] S. Yakhontov has offered a modified version of Swadesh's list and divided it into the most stable part (35 words) and the part that is lost more quickly (65 words). A common praxis of lexicostatistical studies now is to combine the Swadesh's list of 100 words with the following 10 cognates offered by Yakhontov: far, heavy, near, salt, short, snake, thin, wind, worm, year. For the reasons and details see Burlak & Starostin (2005: 12-13).

Nasipov (2010). But it is indisputable that the history of the ethnic group is rich in contacts with speakers of different languages from several language families. Some of these languages – primarily Tatar, Udmurt and Russian – still keep their important role in formation of the idiom in question. Here we will focus on the influence which Russian exerts on oral speech of Beserman speakers living in Shamardan (Yukamenskoye district, Udmurtia, Russian Federation).

All Beserman speakers living in Shamardan are multilingual. They speak at least Beserman dialect which they strictly separate from Udmurt literary language, Udmurt and Russian. Beserman is the means of every-day communication. Udmurt is acquired at primary school. It is used while reading school textbooks and regional newspapers and in talks with Udmurt neighbors from the same village. Russian is learned at school. It is the official language of the country, i.e. the language of all situations except every-day communication: it is used to speak with officials, teachers at secondary school, while watching TV, reading most newspapers and books etc. Being the main means of communication in most situations, Russian has a great influence on the speech of Beserman people. The easiest way to analyze this influence is to look at a corpus of texts which contains transcriptions of Beserman oral speech. To make such analysis is the main aim of this paper.

It should be noted that the problem of the influence of Russian on Udmurt has already attracted the researchers' attention. Different aspects of it from Udmurt-Russian code-switching and code-mixing to adoption of Russian grammatical features in Udmurt have been studied. For the most recent results in this field see, for example, Solomennikova (2012), Shirobokova (2011), Kaysina (2013). However, as far as we know, the Beserman dialect has not been taken into account from this point of view yet.

We start by defining the object of our study. We investigate the influence of Russian on Beserman by analyzing the cases of code-mixing and recent lexical borrowing. The terminus "code-mixing" is used here in the same sense as in Muysken (2000) referring to cases when lexical items, grammatical (and, as we must add, phonetical) features of several languages are used in one utterance. Examples of code-switching, i.e. "the rapid succession of several languages in a single speech event" (Muysken 2000: 1), as in (1), also appear in our corpus of Beserman texts:

(1) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Bakč'a-ja-z	sə̂l-e.	Vot	vo	sə̂l-e,	sə̂l-e,	a	ja
kitchen.garden-Loc-P.3	stand-Prs.3Sg	DM$_{rus}$	DM$_{rus}$	stand-Prs.3Sg	stand-Prs.3Sg	Conj$_{rus}$	me$_{rus}$

duma-l-a	uže...	e,	ani-je!	Malpa-j	n'i	gurt-a-z	pə̂r-i-z	šuə̂sa.
think-Pst-3Sg$_{rus}$	now$_{rus}$	DM	mother-P.1	think.Pst	now	house-Ill.-P.3	enter-Pst-3	Conj

She is in the kitchen garden, here, here she is, and I was sure that she was there, she was, oh, my gosh! I was sure, that she had entered the house (underlined fragment of the sentence is in Russian).

Such cases are beyond the scope of this article, but we would like to notice that examples of code-switching from our corpus seem not to be motivated by any external factors like change of the speech situation, of the addressee etc. So, the situation with Beserman, Russian and Udmurt, at least in Shamardan, is not that of "ideal multilinguism" (Weinreich 1963). But nevertheless the language competence of the speakers elder than 25 years old seems to be very good: they speak with each other fluently, the cases of switching to Russian are relatively rare and the length of Russian fragments of discourse normally does not exceed 1-2 sentences (at least in informal talks).

We must stress that we distinguish code-mixing from lexical borrowing. It is not a trivial task since there is a considerable amount of Beserman roots loaned from Russian. Thus, R. Idrisov (2013) shows that in the sample of 1912 non-derived Beserman roots 48% are common Permic, 14% loaned from Turkic languages, 17% loaned from Russian and 21% do not have reliable etymologies (Idrisov 2013). It is a common praxis to treat as borrowed words those which are included in normative dictionaries of the investigated idioms (for Udmurt this strategy was used in, for example, Solomennikova (2012)). But the on-line dictionary of the Beserman dialect (http://beserman.ru) is still under elaboration. So we treat as loanwords those lexical units which are phonetically and morphologically adopted. All the other cases when Russian words appear in our corpus we consider to be the cases of code-mixing. For example, the lexical unit *petuk* 'rooster' is loaned from Russian, but it was phonetically transformed according to Beserman phonetic rules, whereas *petux* 'rooster' is a Russian word with Russian phonetic structure

(Beserman system of consonants does not include the sound [x] (Idrisov 2013: 33-34)), so its appearance in a Beserman text is a case of code-mixing.

As for grammar features, we also (along with code-mixing) take into account the cases of loaning a Russian grammatical unit in order to cover a gap in Beserman system.

After defining the object of our investigation let us describe the corpus of texts we used. We shall try to show how the Russian influence is manifested in 19 texts (about 2,5 hours of oral speech) recorded and transcribed in Shamardan in January and July 2010. The texts were collected during experiments concerning conditions of the choice between local cases and postpositions for expressing spatial relations. There are three groups of texts corresponding with the tree types of experiments: 10 monologues describing the events developing in a 4-minute cartoon; 6 dialogues where the main speaker explains the second speaker how to place cards on a picture; 3 dialogues containing explanations how to move three figures through a model of the Shamardan area.

Cartoons, cards, figures, locations and roots were identical for all the speakers. The texts were recorded from 11 speakers (6 men and 5 women). Two speakers were young women between 25 and 30 years old, the rest were elder than 60. The reason is that there are only a few Besermans under 30 living in Shamardan permanently (it is a pity because young Besermans in general speak quite fluently). As for children, they do not acquire Beserman as a mother tongue being able only to understand Beserman oral speech and using some words. In the given 19 texts Russian influence can be retraced at practically all the levels of the idiom: phonetics, morphology, vocabulary, syntax, and discourse.

2. Phonetics

In Beserman there is a strong tendency to conform to the Beserman phonetic rules in speech. But nevertheless the Russian influence exists even at this level. We will illustrate it with two examples.

First, as mentioned before, in Beserman system there is no sound [x], but it may occur in Russian words used in fluent speech instead of phonetically adopted Beserman ones:

(2) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Kwin',	n'ul',	vit'-et'i-jez	petu**x**.
three	four	five-Ord-P.3	rooster_{rus}

[counting the figures] *Three, four, and the fifth is a rooster.*

Such pronunciation of the word denoting 'rooster' is treated by the native speakers we have worked with as being Russian (not Beserman). In their judgment, the Beserman word for 'rooster' is [petuk], as in (3):

(3) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Petu**k**	no	kureg	no	soos	mə̂n-o	vič'ak	š'iš'kə̂-nə̂.
rooster_{rus}	and	hen	and	they	go-Prs.3Pl	everybody	eat-Inf

The rooster and the hens, everybody is going for eating.

Second, there is also influence in suprasegmental domain. Udmurt stress is fixed on the final syllable of the word. N. Ljukina mentions that Russian words are often loaned in Beserman with conserving of Russian stress (Ljukina 2007: 134). According to our data, there is a tendency (at least in Shamardan) to pronounce loanwords with Beserman stress. But in fluent speech some Russian words with Russian stress may occur, though not very often. Compare:

(4) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Tatə̂n...	tat'jə̂n		ik	pič'i	pi-len	kol'**a**ska-jez,	pič'i	veloš'iped-ez.
here	here	[correct: tatə̂n]	DM	little	boy-Gen1	pram_{rus}-P.3	little	bicycle_{rus}-P.3

There is a pram of a little boy, a little bicycle here.

3. Morphology

From now on we will take into account two phenomena on each language level examined – code-mixing and borrowing.

3.1 Code-mixing

In our corpus occur the following cases of using Russian morphological tools instead of Beserman ones. Thus, instead of Beserman *inchoative* construction "*kuč'kᶐnᶚ* 'to start' + infinitive" appears the Russian construction "*davaj* 'let' + infinitive":

(5) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

I	davaj	až'-lan'	mᶐnᶚ-nᶚ.
and	Inch$_{rus}$	forward-All	go-Inf

And they began to go forward.

Constructions with inchoative meaning also represent a very interesting type of code-mixing which appears in our corpus several times involving different morphological units. Namely, Russian means of expressing a grammatical meaning is sometimes used together with (or contaminated with) its Beserman analogue. In such cases the meaning is actually expressed two times by morphological units from different idioms. Example (6) represents this peculiar "double-marking" of inchoative meaning, examples (9) and (10) below – of optative and debitative meanings correspondingly. "Double-marking" appears to be the most common strategy of borrowing which can be found on all language levels except phonetics (more examples will be presented later).

(6) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

L'eg'it'...l'eg'it'	pi	pešt-i-z,	i	davaj	žug'iš'kᶚ-nə	kuč'k'-i-z-ᶚ.
young young	man	fall.down-Pst-3	and	Inch$_{rus}$	fight-Inf	begin-Pst-3-Pl

The young man fell down, and (they) began to fight.

There are also cases of using a Russian *negation* marker instead of a Beserman one:

(7) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Petuk	<u>n'e</u>	so.
rooster$_{rus}$	Neg$_{rus}$	this

This is not a rooster.

This case of morphological code-mixing occurs in the corpus occasionally. The speakers strongly tend to use the Beserman marker. Example (8) belongs to the same speaker as (7), and it appeared in the same dialog:

(8) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

<u>Evəl</u>	eta	petux.
Neg	this$_{rus}$	rooster$_{rus}$

This is not a rooster.

Next, *optative* can be expressed through contamination of Beserman and Russian morphological tools:

(9) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Mar	ke	otən...	aj,	olo	kəž'ə vəldə...	ja	goroč'ka,	<u>puskaj</u>	<u>med</u>	lu-o-z...
that	Cond	there	DM$_{rus}$	or	how DM	DM	little.hill$_{rus}$	OPT$_{rus}$	OPT	be-Fut-3

u-g	tod-iš'k-ə	kəž'ə	vera-nə.
Neg.NPst-3	know-Prs-Sg	how	tell-Inf

There is something... auch, or as it is known... well, let it be a little hill, I don't know, how to put it.

Compare:

(9a) Russian:

Puskaj	bud'-et.
Opt	be.Fut-3Sg

Let it be.

Example with "double-marking" of *debitative* meaning:

130

(10) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

I	van'	tânad	otân	lu-o-z	veloš'iped,	vel'ik	otân	tânad	<u>dolžen lu-âno</u>.
and	is	you.Gen1	there	must.be-Fut-3	bicycle_{rus}	bike_{rus}	there	you.Gen1	must_{rus}must.be-Deb

And you must have in there a bicycle, you must have a bike in there.

2.2 Borrowing

There are also several cases of loaning morphological units from Russian in order to cover the gaps in Beserman system. One of them is using the Russian word *davaj* to form *imperative of the first person* which does not exist in Beserman (Teplyashina 1970: 236):

(11) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Soldat	vera	Ivan-lâ: "D<u>avaj</u>	mon	pe	tâb-o	kâz	jâl-e	až'-o,
soldier_{rus}	say.Pst.3Sg	Ivan-Dat Imp.1_{rus}	I	Quot	climb-Fut.1Sg	firtree	top-Ill	see-Fut.1Sg

mar	ke	u-g	a	až'iš'kâ.
that	Cond	Neg.NPst-3	Q	be.seen

The soldier said to Ivan: "Let me climb the firtree top, maybe something is seen (from there)".

(12) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Maša,	<u>davaj</u>	aš'mes	kuč'k-o-m	skal-jos	dor-iš'en.
Masha	Imp.1_{rus}	Refl.1Pl	start-Fut-1Pl	cow-Pl	neighbourhood-Egr

Masha, let us start with the cows.

The other case is the Russian word *samoj* which function in Beserman as *superlative* marker (in Beserman there is no other means to express this meaning) (Teplyashina 1970: 179):

(13) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

samoj	umoj
Superlat_{rus}	good

the best

This marker can be joined also to words functioning as nouns:

(14) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Veloš'iped	wan'	vậl-ận,	<u>samoj</u>	vậl-ận.
bicycle_{rus}	there.is	top-Loc	Superlat_{rus}	top-Loc

There is a bicycle above, at the top.

4. Vocabulary

4.1 Code-mixing

Such cases are relatively rare, but they do exist:

(15) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Tabere	Paša	L'emskoj-ən	opet',	korka	š'er-a-z,	<u>da**l**'n'ij</u>	korka	š'er-a-z.
then	Pasha	L'emskij-Loc	again_{rus}	house	behind-Loc-P.3	distant_{rus}	house	behind-Loc-P.3

And then, Pasha is now in Lemskij (a settlement near Shamardan) *again, behind the house, behind the distant house*

(note that the Russian word *dal'n'ij* 'distant' is used instead of the Beserman widespread word *kậďokậš'* 'distant'; bold type indicates stress).

4.2 Borrowing

In our corpus of texts two cases of borrowing the vocabulary units occurred. In the first case, the new word is coming together with the new actual. With the lapse of some time, such words are phonetically and morphologically adopted:

(16) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

I	majeg	jậl-a-z	sậl-e	puktậ-mận	č'ậgận.
and	stake	top-Loc-P.3Sg	stand-Prs.3Sg	put-Res	cast-iron.pot_{rus}

And somebody has put a cast-iron pot at the top of the stake, and now it is there

(in Russian the word denoting 'cast-iron pot' is pronounced as [chugun]).

132

(17) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Pios	murt	lə̂kt-e	traktor	dor-e	traktor-z-e	zavod'-tə̂-nə̂.
man	human	come.back-Prs.3Sg	tractor_{rus}	neighbourhod-Ill	tractor_{rus}-P.3-Acc	start.up-Tr-Inf

A man is coming back to a tractor to start it up

(compare Russian *zavod'i-t'* 'to run up' where -*t'* is an infinitive suffix).

In the second case, the Russian word (chashja 'a thick forest' is a Slavic word, see Vasmer 1986-1987) replaces the Beserman one. In this case the word also can be phonetically (18) or/and morphologically (19) adopted:

(18) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Pič'i	pi	vel't'ə̂-mə̂n	č'ašja-je.
little	boy	walk-Res	forest-Ill_{rus}

Little boy went to the forest

(compare Russian *chash'a* 'a thick forest').

(19) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Odig-ə̂z	pə̂d-ə̂z	gol'ik,	odig-ə̂z	noski-jen.
one-P.3	leg-P.3	bare	one-P.3	sock_{rus} -Instr/Comit

One leg is bare and the other is in the sock

(the Russian word *noski* is a plural form of a word *nosok* 'sock'; note also that there is an old Beserman word *pə̂d nə̂r* 'sock, socks').

It is a productive model in Beserman to adopt the frequent plural forms of Russian nouns as words denoting one object. Here are two more examples of this kind:

(20) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:
piroški-os
pie-Pl

pies (The Russian word *piroshk'i* is a plural form and already denotes many pies.)

(21) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

štan

trousers

one pair of trousers

(The Russian word *shtany* is *pluralia tantum*; in Beserman *-y* is lost in Nominative, but it still occurs as *-i* in the oblique stem of the noun.)

In the case of replacing a Beserman word through a Russian one also a semantic shift may occur. A good example is the word *sad*. In Russian it denotes a plot planted with trees, bushes and flowers or trees and bushes growing on such plot (Dal 1978). In Beserman this word has replaced the word *č'ešpel'* 'bushes, small young trees' and has acquired a meaning 'leaf-bearing tree' (having in this meaning also a plural form). (As far as we know, there is no Beserman word expressing the concept of a leaf-bearing tree – as there is no Beserman word denoting the coniferous tree).

Here we must say a few words about the difference among words belonging to different morphological classes with respect to the degree of adaptation. First of all, *pronouns* are never adopted. *Numerals* are adopted extremely seldom. Thus, we know only one numeral adopted from Russian - *pervoj* 'first'. For *postpositions* we also know only one case of substitution by a Russian word. Namely, the Beserman postposition *mestaje* (*mesta*-Ill) 'instead of' is a loan translation of the Russian preposition *vm'esto* (*v-mesto* = in-place.Acc) 'instead of'. *Adverbs* are adopted rarely, and their degree of phonetic adaptation is close to that of nouns which may either be adopted (consider the word *opet'* 'again' in (15) which in Russian is pronounced as [op'at']; this word has completely substituted an old Beserman word *nə̂š* 'again') or not (22):

(22) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Obratno	tatč'ə̂	lə̂kt-i-z.
backwards_{rus}	here	return-Pst-3

[She] returned here, backwards

(Note that there is a widespread Beserman adverb *berlan'* 'backwards'.)

134

Nouns are adopted most often, and they may be phonetically or/and semantically adopted or not (see (16) and (18) above). There are also cases of grammatical adaptation of nouns, most of them concerning the number of the noun (see (19)-(21) above).

Adjectives are often adopted, and they may also demonstrate phonetic and semantic shift or not (see (15) again).

Verbs are generally adopted without semantic shift but they are very good adopted phonetically. Furthermore, Beserman demonstrates two productive models of verbal adaptation. First, some verbs are adopted through taking the verbal stem (phonetically adopted, if necessary) and attaching Beserman inflexions – sometimes even derivational suffixes – to it. The second (and much more universal) strategy is to take the infinitive of the Russian verb and to attach the inflectional forms of the Beserman verb *karə̂nə̂* 'to do' to it. To use such a strategy is often the first reaction during the speech generation even if a good Beserman verbal equivalent exists. But while speaking to us Besermans often corrected themselves at once:

(23) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Soldat	soje	opat'	spaš't'i	kar-e,	e,	jurt-[e]
soldier	he.Acc	again$_{rus}$	to.save$_{rus}$	do-Prs.3Sg	Autocorr	save-[Prs.3Sg]

n'e	jurt-e,	n'e spasajet,	a	jurt-e.
Neg$_{rus}$	save-Prs.3Sg	[not saving]$_{rus}$	but	save-Prs.3Sg

The soldier again saves him…no, saves, not "spasajet" but "jurte".

Conjunctions are adopted very actively replacing the Beserman ones. In general they are adopted neither phonetically nor functionally. Compare:

(24) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Ben,	so	daže	n'e	č'už-g'ez,	a	kə̂č'eke	go[rd]...	marə̂m...
yes	it	even$_{rus}$	not$_{rus}$	yellow-Compar	but$_{rus}$	some	red	maybe

Yes, it is even not yellow but red or the like... maybe…

Finally, during the borrowing of words the "double marking" of sense may occur. Thus, a Russian word expressing a concept may occur together with a Beserman one which has the concept in its semantic structure as a component. Compare:

(25) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Mə̑nam	even'	bol'she	kureg-jos-ə̂.
I.Gen1	have.no.anymore	more$_{rus}$	hen-Pl-P.1

I have no hens anymore.

It is notable that the order can be reversed (in Beserman there is a very small amount of expressions where the order of constituents can be reversed most of them being onomatopoetic ones):

(26) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

bol'she	even'
more$_{rus}$	is.not.anymore

Not anymore.

Thus, the following hierarchy of susceptibility of different morphological classes to borrowing can be built for Beserman dialect:

conjunctions < nouns < verbs < adjectives < adverbs < postpositions < numerals < pronouns.

In the case of susceptibility to borrowing Beserman is a very typical idiom. A close hierarchy (perhaps more detailed) can be drawn from (Matras 2009: 166-208).

5. Syntax

5.1 Code-mixing

According to our corpus, Russian influence on Beserman syntax was not at all as huge as on the vocabulary. There is a large amount of Beserman constructions which in

our corpus (and according to our experience) are never replaced with Russian ones. One of them, for example, is a construction "finite verb + *mə̂n*-participle" which has a resultative meaning (see (16)). But nevertheless there are some cases where Beserman constructions can be replaced by Russian ones. The first of them is the construction with sentential actants:

(27) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Ažʼ-i-z	što	nə̂l	murt	šʼud-e	odig-ez	petux-ez	evə̂l,	pičʼi	pi
see-Pst-3	Conj$_{rus}$	girl	human	feed-Prs.3Sg	one-P.3	rooster$_{rus}$-P.3	not	little	boy

petux	punna	mə̂n-i-z	bižʼ-ə̂sa.
rooster$_{rus}$	for	go-Pst-3	run-Conv

He saw that the girl was feeding [birds] and that one chicken was missing, and the boy ran for the chicken.

Compare:

(27a) Russian:

Uvʼidʼe-l-∅	što	dʼevuška	kormʼ-it	kur-∅.
see-Pst-M.Sg	Conj	girl	feed-Prs.3.Sg	hen-Gen.Pl

He saw that a girl was feeding hens.

(27b) illustrates the common Beserman construction with the verb *ažʼə̂nə̂* 'to see':

(27b) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Pi…	pičʼi	pʼi	lə̂kt-i-z	gibija-m-ə̂šʼ	koržʼinka-z-e	kelʼt-i-z,
boy	little	boy	come.back-Pst-3	pick.mushrooms-Nzr-El	basket$_{rus}$-3-Acc	leave-Pst-3

ažʼ-i-z-ə̂	odig-ez	kureg-ez	potə̂-mə̂n	volʼnoj.
see-Pst-3-Pl	one-3	hen-P.3	come.out-Res	free$_{rus}$

The little boy came back from picking mushrooms, left his basket and saw that a hen had come out, [and now it is] free.

The second construction is the comparative one:

(28) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

So	<u>kak budto</u>	ǯ'až'eg	pi-jez-lâš'	bâž-z-e	kurč'-e	n'i.
he	Compar_{rus}	goose	son-P.3-Gen2	tail-P.3-Acc	bite-Prs.3Sg	Emph

It seems that he is biting the gosling's tail.

There are several types of Beserman comparative constructions. The most universal of them is the construction with *kad'* 'like':

(29) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Ben,	ulla	pal-a-z	<u>kaď</u>.
yes	lower	side-Loc-P.3	like

Yes, it seems to be a bit lower.

Russian and Beserman comparative words can be used together forming a construction with "double marking":

(29a) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

So	tin'	pânâ	pi-jen	tuš'-en	visk-ân	<u>kad'</u>	<u>kak by</u>.
it	well	dog	son-Instr/Comit	trough-Instr/Comit	between.Obl-Loc	like	like_{rus}

Well, it seems to be between a puppy and a trough.

It should also be noted that sometimes (hardly ever) the Russian verb frame is used together with the borrowed verb itself:

(30) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Tak,	fs'o,	razobra-l'-i-š'	kureg-jos-ân,	ben	a?
well_{rus}	that's.all_{rus}	deal-Pst-Pl-Refl_{rus}	hen-Pl-Instr/Comit	yes	Q

Well, that's all, we have finished with the hens, haven't we?

Compare:

(30a) Russian:

Razobra-l'-i-s'	s	kur-am'i.
deal-Pst-Pl-Refl	with	hen-Instr.Pl

We have finished with the hens.

The third construction is the coordinative one. The Beserman coordinative constructions with conjunction *no…no* 'and' (31) is often replaced with the Russian one with conjunction *i* 'and' (32):

(31) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Ad'ami-z-ə̂	<u>no</u>	kut-i-z	<u>no</u>	vu	pušk-ə̂	dong-i-z.
man-P.3-Acc	and	catch-Pst-3	and	water	in.Obl-Ill	push-Pst-3

[He] caught the man and pushed [him] into the water.

(32) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Ivan,	soldat	soje	pə̂d-t'i-z	kə̂sk-e	kə̂sk-e	<u>i</u>	ž'ut-i-z	vu-ə̂š'.
Ivan	soldier$_{rus}$	he.Acc	leg-Prolat-P.3	draw-Prs.3Sg	draw-Prs.3Sg	and$_{rus}$	pull.out-Pst-3	water-El

(As for) Ivan, soldier is drawing and drawing (him) by his legs and pulled out of the water.

The Russian construction occurs much more often than the Beserman one. Besides, the "double marking" may also occur here:

(33) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

L'eg'it'	pi-z-e	<u>no</u>	miš'k-e	<u>i</u>	jə̂...jə̂rč'ə̂-t'i-z	kutə̂-sa	vu-e	donga.
young	man-P.3-Acc	and	wash-Prs.3Sg	and$_{rus}$	hair-Prolat-P.3	catch-Conv	water-Ill	push.Pst.3

[He] washes the young man and after catching [him] by his hair pushes [him] into the water.

6. Discourse

6.1 Code-mixing

In use of discourse markers (DM) the general tendency of combining the Russian and the Beserman variants ("double-marking") can be seen again:

(34) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

<u>Ja</u>	<u>ladno</u>,	pun-i-d	ke	pun-i-d.
well	well$_{rus}$	put-Pst-2	Cond	put-Pst-2

Ok, if you have put [it] than you have put [it].

Another strategy is to replace one of the components of a complex Russian DM with a Beserman equivalent of this component:

(35) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Nu	ten'.
well	here

Well, we've finished.

Beserman *ten'* 'here' corresponds to Russian *vot* 'here', and *nu ten'* in (35) is used just as Russian marker *nu vot*.

6.2 Borrowing

Russian DMs can be also borrowed directly:[4]

(36) Beserman Udmurt fieldnotes:

Bur-laš'an',	otên	tin'	na	marêm	eto...	ooo,	<u>oj, bl'in</u>...	otên	van'	na	tênad
right-Recess	there	here	Emph	that	DM$_{rus}$	oh	oh DM$_{rus}$	there	be.Prs.3	Emph	you.Gen1

<u>eto</u>	dêdêk-jos-êd	van'	na.
DM$_{rus}$	pigeon-Pl-P.2	be.Prs.3	Emph

---

[4] Note that in a close-related Komi there is also a good amount of discourse words borrowed from Russian (Leinonen 2014).

From the right side, there is... hm, oh, oh, damn, there is you have... eee... there are pigeons (underlined markers are adopted from Russian).

All the DMs appeared in our corpus are presented in Table 3 and Table 4 (see Appendix). In Table 3 for each DM the following information is given: a) its function in the discourse; b) its origin (Russian, Beserman, Russian-Beserman (mixed) or unknown); c) its phonetic form; d) number of occurrences in the corpus; e) number of speakers which have used it. The number of speakers and the number of occurrences decreases from the top of the table to its bottom. Note that the functions of the markers are labeled very roughly. The studying of Beserman DM is only at an initial stage, so we can in no case pretend to present a complete analysis of them. The functional labels are given there just for illustrative purposes.

Table 4 demonstrates the correspondence between Beserman markers and their supposed Russian analogues. Again, for each marker the origin (Beserman or Russian), the function, the phonetic form, number of occurrences in the corpus and number of speakers which have used it are given.

The data given in the Appendix are summarized in Table 1:

Origin	Degree of generality			
	The most frequent (5-10 speakers)	Less frequent (2-4 speakers)	Rare (1 speaker)	All
Russian	11	18	34	63
Beserman	17	10	8	35
Mixed ("double-marking")	0	4	0	4
Unknown	2	11	8	21

Table 1. The distribution of DM of different origin used in Beserman dialogs according to their degree of generality

Here the "degree of generality" means number of speakers who used DMs of given origin. DMs which appeared as a result of the "double-marking" strategy are labeled as "mixed". Calques from Russian are concerned to have Russian origin.

One can see from Table 1 that the amount of DMs which are supposed to be borrowed from Russian tend to increase with the decreasing of the amount of people using it. Roughly speaking, we can say that Russian DMs tend to be individual (except *nu* which has practically substituted the corresponding Beserman marker *ma*). The amount of markers with Beserman origin, on the contrary, tend to decrease with the decreasing of the amount of speakers – roughly speaking, they tend to be more common. On the other hand, the total amount of Russian DMs significantly exceeds the total amount of Beserman ones (63 vs 35 respectively). The entire situation looks like that the influence of Russian on Beserman has significantly grown recently: different speakers have acquired different DMs which have not stabilized yet in the language praxis of the community. DMs and connectors are claimed to be the group which is borrowed more quickly than other grammatical function words (Matras 2009) and than many other common linguistic items (Leinonen 2014), so the beginning of the active borrowing of them seems to be a good criterion of a new wave of significant influence from an external idiom.

7. Conclusions

Results of the analysis presented in this paper are summarized in Table 2:

Type of influence	Language level				
	Phonetics	**Morphology**	**Vocabulary**	**Syntax**	**Discourse (DMs)**
Code-mixing	Words with Russian phonetic structure and/or Russian stress	Inchoative Optative Debitative Negation	Rare	Comparative constructions Constructions with the sentential actants Coordinative construction	Not very often
Borrowing	------------	Imperative of the 1st person Superlative	conjunctions < nouns < verbs < adjectives < adverbs < postpositions < numerals < pronouns	Valency patterns (extremely rare)	Very often

Table 2. Russian influence on Beserman Udmurt on different language levels

142

Observing all cases of Beserman-Russian code-mixing and of borrowing from Russian into Beserman which are presented in our corpus of texts we can see that the degree of influence is not as great as it might seem to be. A really great amount of units borrowed from Russian essentially appears only among nouns, but such loanwords tend to be phonetically, morphologically and even semantically adopted. Loanwords belonging to other parts of speech either occur seldom or are phonologically adopted. As for morphology, there are not many tools borrowed, most of them fulfilling the gaps in the Beserman system. The most frequent discourse markers in general have Beserman origin. The syntax practically has not been influenced by Russian. In the discourse of 25-30 years old speakers there are more adopted constructions and morphological borrowed units than in the discourse of 60-85 year old people, but the disparity is not very big. A possible reason is that young Besermans use their mother tongue while talking to each other and to their relatives.

The degree and peculiar properties of Russian influence on Beserman dialect lead to the suggestion that in more favorable sociolinguistic situation the result could be a mixed idiom with predominantly Russian vocabulary and Beserman basis of grammar. The loaned language units are likely not to be copied without noticeable changes, but to be adopted, even in special strategies of borrowing ("*karə̂nə̂* 'to make' + infinitive", "double marking"). Examples of mixed languages are numerous (for one of the most recent of them, Gurundji Kriol, which arose in the 1970s- 80s, see McConvell & Meakins 2005). Mixing with other idioms (or, in other terms, copying vocabulary units and grammar features of them (Johanson 2002) seems to be a normal phenomenon in a language's life. Linguists have even started to take it into account while building family trees of languages (McMahon & McMahon 2006). But Beserman dialect unfortunately has no chance to reach this stage. It is supposed to die in recent years because people under 25 do not speak Beserman. All the grandchildren and little children of people we worked with in Shamardan do not speak Beserman. Most of them even do not understand Beserman speech. The idiom is also not taught at school. Thus, Beserman Udmurt seems to be a sad example confirming Lars Johanson's statement that codes never die of structural changes

of any kind, they "die because they are no longer acquired by the new generations" (Johanson 2002: 267).

References

Burlak, Svetlana A. & Sergey A. Starostin (2005) *Sravnitelno-istoricheskoye yazykoznaniye* [Comparative Linguistics], 2nd edition, Moscow: Akademiya.

Dal, Vladimir I. (1978) *[Tolkovyj slovar zhivogo velikorusskogo jazyka]*, v. 1-4, Moskva.

Idrisov, Ruslan I. (2013) *Turkish Loanwords of Different Periods in Beserman Udmurt* [Tjurkskije zaimstvovanija raznykh periodov v besermianskom dialekte udmurtskogo jazyka], Thesis, Moscow, Manuscript.

Johanson, Lars (2002) "Do languages die of 'structuritis'? On the role of code-copying in language endangerment", *Rivista di Linguistica*, 14(2), 249-270.

Kaysina, Inna (2013) "The adoption of Russian Conjunctions in Udmurt", ESUKA-JEFUL 2013, 4-2, 131-144.

Kassian, Alexei, George Starostin, Anna Dybo & Vasiliy Chernov (2010) "The Swadesh wordlist. An attempt at semantic specification", *Journal of Language Relationship*, 4, 46-89.

Kelmakov, Valej K. (1998) "A brief sketch of Udmurt dialectology. Introduction. Phonetics. Morphology. Texts on Udmurt dialects. References" [Kratkij kurs udmurtskoj dialektologii. Vvedenije. Fonetika. Morfologija. Dialektnyje teksty. Bibliografija], Izhevsk: Udmurt State University.

Leinonen, Marja (2014) "Borrowability of function and discourse words: the Komi case", *Language Contacts: the State of the Art*, Helsinki, August 28-30, 2014, Report.

Ljukina, Nadezhda M. (2007) "Word Stress in Beserman Patois of Udmurt [Slovesnoje udarenije v besermianskikh govorakh udmurtskogo jazyka]", *Current Problems of Science and Education* [Sovremennyje problemy nauki i obrazovanija], 6, Moscow: Akademija obrazovanija, 132-135.

Ljukina, Nadezhda M. (2008) *The peculiarities of the language of Balezino and Jukamenskoje Besermans*, PhD-thesis. [Osobennosti jazyka balezinskikh i jukamenskikh besermian.] Moscow, Manuscript.

Matras, Yaron (2009) *Language Contact*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McConvell, Patrick & Felicity Meakins (2005) "Gurindji Kriol: A Mixed Language Emerges from Code-switching", *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 25(1), 9-30.

144

McMahon, April & Robert McMahon (2006) "Keeping Contact in the Family: Approaches to Language Classification and Contact-induced Change", in Yaron Matras *et al.* (eds.), *Linguistic Areas. Convergence in Historical and Typological Perspective*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 51-74.

Muysken, Pieter (2000) *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Napolskikh, Vladimir V. (1997) *Introduction to Historical Uralistics* [Vvedenije v istoricheskuju uralistiku], Izhevsk: Udmurt Institute of History, Language and Literature, Ural Branch of Russian Academy of Sciences Publ.

Nasipov, Ilshat S. (2010) *Finno-Ugric Loanwords in Tatar: Synopsis and Taxonomy* [Finno-ugorskije zaimstvovanija v tatarskom jazyke: sinopsis i taksonomija], Doctoral thesis, Kazan, Manuscript.

Shirobokova, Larisa (2011) *Udmurt-Russian Bilingualism (Udmurt Republic, Sarkan Region, Muvyr Village)*, PhD-dissertation, Budapest, Manuscript.

Solomennikova, Anastasija P. (2012) "Code-switching and Code-mixing in the Udmurt Speech of Udmurt-Russian Bilinguals (fieldwork experiment)" [Perekljuchenije i smeshenije koda v rechi udmurtsko-russkikh bilingvov (opyt polevogo issledovanija)], *The Questions of Philology* [Voprosy filologii], 3 (42), 89-98.

Teplyashina, Tamara I. (1970) *The Language of Beserman* [Jazyk Besermian], Moscow: Nauka.

Vasmer, Max (1986-1987) *Russian Etimological Dictionary* [Etimologicheskij slovarj russkogo jazyka], 4 volumes, Moscow: Progress.

Weinreich, Uriel (1963) *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*, 2nd edition, The Hague: Mouton.

Appendix

Frequency of DMs in the corpus

function	Beserman / Russian	marker	corpus frequency	number of speakers
emphasis	bes	n'i	182	10
question	bes	a	162	10
emphasis	rus	nu	113	10
emphasis	bes	na	72	10
agreement	bes	ben	264	9
emphasis	bes	uk	95	8
end/beginning of the episode	rus	tak	90	8
beginning of the new episode	rus	a	76	8
request for attention	bes	ik	59	8
declining the speaker's responsibility for the content of the utterance	bes	mar a	34	8
perplexity	rus	eto(t)	21	8
change of topic	bes	sə̂re\so bere	60	7
verification	bes	ben a	49	7
agreement against the wish of the speaker	bes	ja	37	7
understanding	rus	a	21	7
perplexity	rus	naverno	14	7
autocorrection	bes	e	11	7
agreement	rus	aha	62	6
end of the episode	bes	tin'	45	6
emphasis	bes	ma	18	6
request for some time	rus	š'a(s)	14	6
end of the episode	rus	fs'o	13	6
agreement	?	mh	81	5
request for some time	bes	moga	38	5
end of the episode	rus	vot	36	5
quotation	bes	pe	28	5
hesitation	?	eeee	25	5
[yet failed to be determined exactly]	rus	eššo	19	5
negation	bes	evə̂l	13	5
declining the speaker's responsibility for the content of the utterance	bes	mar ke	10	5
change of topic	bes	ta(be)re	37	4
hesitation	rus/bes	marə̂m eto(t)	33	4
agreement against the wish of the speaker	rus	ladno	21	4
declining the speaker's responsibility for the content of the utterance	bes	marə̂m (marə̂me)	19	4
[yet failed to be determined exactly]	rus	tože	15	4
hesitation	?	mmm, emmm	14	4

feedback	rus	a?	11	4
backchannel	rus	a	10	4
agreement	rus	da	10	4
beginning of the new episode	rus	i	8	4
error report	?	oj	7	4
agreement against the wish of the speaker	rus/bes	ja ladno	6	4
change of topic	rus	dal'še	6	4
[yet failed to be determined exactly]	?bes	no	34	3
agreement	?	m-m	12	3
verification	rus/bes	ben vet'	10	3
agreement against the wish of the speaker	rus	puskaj	8	3
perplexity	bes	leš'a	7	3
agreement against the wish of the speaker	rus	nu ladno	5	3
end of the episode	bes	ten'	5	3
perplexity	?	a	4	3
problems of speech production	?	oh	3	3
perplexity	bes	vâldậ	3	3
approximation	rus	poč't'i (što)	19	2
verification	bes	valad-a	7	2
disagreement	?	m-m	7	2
surprise	?	o	5	2
perplexity	rus	možet	5	2
hesitation	?	mh	5	2
hesitation	bes	ậ	5	2
declining the speaker's responsibility for the content of the utterance	rus	kak by	4	2
word search	rus	nu	4	2
autocorrection	?	fu	4	2
backchannel	bes	valaj	3	2
[yet failed to be determined exactly]	rus	v obš'em (-to)	3	2
request for some time	rus	sejčas	2	2
recomposing	rus	koroč'e	2	2
perplexity	?	o	2	2
error report	?	aj	2	2
end of the episode	rus/bes	nu ten'	2	2
autocorrection	rus	to jest'	2	2
[yet failed to be determined exactly]	bes	šu	2	2
[yet failed to be determined exactly]	rus	vet'	2	2

Besides in our corpus of texts occur a lot of markers, which are used only by one speaker. They are:

Beserman origin: *mare, tin' n'a (tin' na), valamon, e, anije!, todiš'kod a, ə̂zem, marə̂m a, ož' a.*

Russian origin: *tak vet', a, a č'o, a evə̂l, bl'in, e, n'et, fs'o ravno, gad, imenno, kak budto, kak raz, kon'ešno, n'et, nu puskaj, nu tin', nu vot, poďi, podožďi, pogoďi, po-mojemu, primerno, razve, t'eper', t'ipa, tak-to, ten' tak, tol'ko, vern'eje, vet' tak vet', vidat', vo!, vrode, znač'it*

Unknown origin: *e, hm, m, m-m, o, t'fu, uh, uhm.*

148

Amounts of DMs with different functions in the corpus

function	Beserman			Russian			mixed			unknown		
	marker	corpus frequency	number of speakers	marker	corpus frequency	number of speakers	marker	corpus frequency	number of speakers	marker	corpus frequency	number of speakers
agreement against the wish of the speaker	ja	37	7	puskaj	8	3	ja ladno	6	4			
				nu puskaj	1	1						
				nu ladno	5	3						
				ladno	21	4						
TOTAL		**37**			**35**			**6**				
declining the speaker's responsibility for the content of the utterance	marke	10	5	vrode	2	1						
	marema	1	1	kak by	4	2						
	marəm (marəme)	19	4	kak budto	5	1						
	mar a	34	8									
TOTAL		**64**			**11**							
verification	valad-a	7	2	veť tak veť	1	1	ben veť	10	3			
	todiš'ko d a	2	1	tak veť	22	1						
	ož' a	1	1	razve	1	1						
	əzem	2	1									
	ben a	49	7									
TOTAL		**61**			**24**			**10**				
request for some time	moga	38	5	sejčas	2	2				m	1	1
				š'a(s)	14	6						
				pogoďi	1	1						
				podožďi	1	1						
TOTAL		**38**			**18**						**1**	
perplexity	vəldə	3	3	ťipa	1	1				o	2	2
	leš'a	7	3	poďi	1	1				a	4	3
				naverno	14	7						
				n'et	1	1						
				eto(t)	21	8						
				a č'o	1	1						
				vidať	1	1						
				možet	5	2						
TOTAL		**10**			**45**						**6**	
end of the episode	tin'	45	6	vot	36	5	nu tin'	1	1			
	ten'	5	3	nu vot	1	1	nu ten'	2	2			
				fs'o	13	6						
TOTAL		**50**			**50**			**3**				
emphasis	uk	95	8	nu	113	10						
	na	72	10	kak raz	2	1						
	n'i	182	10	imenno	1	1						
	ma	18	6									
TOTAL		**367**			**116**							

change of topic	ta(be)re	37	4	t'eper'	2	1							
	səre\ sobere	60	7	dal'še	6	4							
TOTAL		**97**			**8**								
autocorrection	e	11	7	vern'eje	2	1	a evəl	1	1	t'fu	1	1
				to jest'	2	2				fu	4	2
				n'et	2	1				e, n'et	1	1
				gad	1	1						
TOTAL		**11**			**7**			**1**			**6**	
agreement	ben	264	9	kon'ešno	1	1				uhu	1	1
				da	10	4				m-m	12	3
				aha	62	6				mh	81	5
										m	3	1
										uhm	1	1
TOTAL		**264**			**73**						**98**	