FLORIAN SIEGL (Tromsø)

THREE NGANASAN-EVENKI/DOLGAN MORPHOSYNTACTIC PARALLELS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

Abstract. The following study discusses three morphosyntactic features of Nganasan, the negative verb 'not want', the distribution of the copula in predicative noun/adjective constructions, and the grammaticalization of a directional postposition into an allative case marker. Whereas for all these features, some Samoyedic parallels are available, there exist equally good parallels in two of Nganasan's potential contact languages Evenki and Dolgan. Although contacts with the aforementioned languages have been postulated in research on Nganasan earlier, prior studies have concentrated on lexical borrowings. This article attempts to show that these three morphosyntactic features are the outcome of contact induced convergence.

Keywords: Nganasan, Forest Enets, Tundra Enets, Tundra Nenets, Dolgan, Evenki, Even, language contact, morphosyntactic convergence.

0. Introduction

When approaching the Nganasan language from the perspective of the other Northern Samoyedic languages Tundra Nenets, Forest Nenets, Tundra Enets and Forest Enets, a number of Nganasan peculiarities are easily observable. Among the most prominent are different morphological means in the expression of the locative case as well as divergent behavior concerning the realization of tense and aspect (Helimski 1997a : 482). This variation is however not the main concern of this paper. Instead, I have singled out three Nganasan morphosyntactic peculiarities where Nganasan differs significantly from its other Northern Samoyedic relatives, whether spoken on the Taimyr Peninsula or elsewhere. The phenomena under discussion concern the negative modal verb 'not want', the predicative conjugation of nouns and adjectives in the past tense and the function of the allative case. In the following, I will show that concerning these three Nganasan morphosyntactic peculiarities, it is problematic to postulate a common Northern Samoyedic origin. Instead, for every instance, a good morphosyntactic parallel in Evenki or Dolgan can be found. Although contacts with its Tungusic and Turkic neighbors have been postulated in research on Nganasan earlier, prior studies have concentrated on lexical borrowings. In this respect, the following discussion tries

to open a new door for the study of Taimyrian language contacts by going beyond the field of lexical borrowing recently summarized by Anikin and Helimski (Аникин, Хелимский 2007) and initiating a discussion of comparative morphosyntax. By this, I intend to add more linguistic data to the often assumed Evenki/Dolgan influence on Nganasan for which little morphosyntactic data has yet been presented.

1. Earlier accounts on Nganasan-Evenki-Dolgan contacts

The study of linguistic contacts in areas whose languages are insufficiently covered is always problematic as assumptions need to be made on limited data sets. Furthermore, since language contacts reflect cultural contacts, a dedicated investigation should ideally discuss historical and/or ethnographic data in order to clarify the historical and social settings of contact situations. However, for distant areas such as the Yeniseian North, which was incorporated into the Czarist Empire as late as the 17th century, adequate historical data is scarce. This, then, affects every study as much of the historical evidence is of an ethnographic nature.[1] Adequate linguistic data has only become available in the second half of the 20th century or even later, so signs of language contact may be blurred and increasingly difficult to observe. Prior to the early 20th century, language contacts on the Taimyr Peninsula allowed multiple contact constellations which have affected larger numbers of speakers.[2] Since the second half of the 20th century, language contacts have been reduced to tandem situations involving Russian and a local native Taimyrian language. Other language contacts are nowadays almost absent and if such contact is still attested, it concerns individual multilinguals but no longer larger numbers of speakers of Taimyrian indigenous languages.

When approaching the topic of language contact on the Taimyr Peninsula, the evolving picture is rather surprising. First, the linguistic diversity on the Taimyr Peninsula is clearly greater than the Siberian average because speakers whose languages belong to four different language families, Tundra Nenets, Forest Enets, Tundra Enets, Nganasan (all Samoyedic, Uralic), Dolgan (Turkic), Evenki (Tungusic), Russian (Indo-European) as well as Taimyr Pidgin Russian aka *Govorka* have met. Nevertheless, the study of Taimyrian language contacts is in its infancy. Whereas the role of Evenki for the formation of Dolgan as well as Dolgan-Russian contacts have been studied to some degree (e.g. Убрятова 1966; 1985; Stachowski 1997; 1999), the study of other contacts are at best classified as *desideratum* (e.g., Katzschmann 2008 : 32ff) but usually not undertaken. Second, whereas loanwords are among the better known instances of language contact (Хелимский 1994; Stachowski 1999; Убрятова 1985; Аникин, Хелимский 2007), language contact morphosyntax is largely *terra incognita*. Again, the Evenki influence on Dolgan morphosyntax has been addressed to some degree (Убрятова 1966; 1985; Артемьев 2010), and the Nganasan substrate in the Dolgan non-referential use of the second person

---

[1] E.g., Лопуленко, Аксянова 2005 or Дьяченко 2008.
[2] The only apparent exception are Tundra Nenets-Dolgan contacts. Since the larger languages are spoken on the borders of the Taimyr Peninsula, they have usually influenced their immediate neighbors, but the geographic distance between both languages has apparently not led to significant language contacts above the personal level.

possessive suffix has been investigated (Stachowski 1998; 2010; Siegl 2015c), but this is most certainly just the tip of the iceberg.

Given that speakers of the aforementioned languages have been living in the same area since the late 17th century, our limited knowledge concerning potential language contacts is astonishing. For this, at least two preliminary explanations are at hand. First and foremost, our limited knowledge is a direct result of the current state of documentation of these languages. For Dolgan and Forest Enets, several grammars and grammar sketches, textual materials and dictionaries are available (Убрятова 1985; Артемьев 2001a; 2001b; Сорокина 2010; Siegl 2013; Siegl, Rießler 2015). Nganasan is still insufficiently covered, despite the existence of some grammaticographic and lexicographic materials (Katzschmann 2008 : 41—42). The second major Nganasan dialect, the Vadeev dialect, remains largely unknown.

Concerning Tundra Enets and Taimyr Tundra Nenets, the situation is worse. Apart from a text collection for each language (ET; JaL), both languages remain otherwise grammaticographically uncovered. Finally, the local variety of Taimyr Evenki is beyond reach as no primary materials are available and this variety seems now to be extinct.[3] This, of course, will also affect the following study as I have to follow the assumption that despite the well-known phonological differences in Evenki dialects, the morphosyntax of Evenki is rather uniform, even if this assumption turns out to be incorrect.[4] Second, the fact that the Taimyr Peninsula has been a melting pot where speakers whose languages belong to three different indigenous language families have been mixing has been a challenge for interdisciplinary scholarship.[5]

Leaving the state of synchronic documentation aside, our incomplete knowledge of the historical development of morphosyntax of the languages under discussion certainly poses problems. Given the fact that much of the

---

[3] The two Evenki enclaves on the Taimyr Peninsula belong to two different dialects. Whereas Evenki in Potapovo and Chantajskoje ozero should belong to the Podkameń dialect, the apparently extinct Evenki dialects on the eastern and central part of the Taimyr Peninsula must have belonged to the Ilimpij dialect (Василевич 1948 : 112ff, 159ff).

[4] The same assumption underlies Tundra Nenets studies (e.g. recently Nikolaeva 2014 : 4—5) which is heavily based on the predominant role of the Western varieties in earlier and contemporary work on the language. Nikolaeva claims that "Western dialects quite easily allow the agent-like argument to be expressed by a locative or dative noun in some grammatical constructions, such as passives and causative [———]. This feature seems to be a grammatical calque from Russian, but it is virtually impossible in Eastern Tundra Nenets" (Nikolaeva 2014 : 5). As Jalava (2014) reports, similar passive forms are indeed attested in Taimyr Nenets. By contrast, the superprobabilitative mood appears to be unknown in Taimyr Nenets (Jalava 2012 : 133). Another clearly observable peculiarity of Taimyr Nenets is the weak articulation of the glottal stop. Finally, as the Taimyr dialect of Tundra Nenets has absorbed many speakers of Tundra Enets, there is a potential for substrate features, but an investigation remains a desideratum for further research.

[5] Whereas language contact across language families has been usual (e.g. Dolgan-Evenki, Dolgan-Nganasan, Evenki-Nganasan), interdisciplinary research has not. From an areal perspective, language contact where speakers of three indigenous people belonging to three different language families have met are not numerous in Northern Siberia. Apart from this example from the Taimyr Peninsula, Ket-Evenki-Selkup contacts in Central-Western Siberia, as well as Kolyma Yukaghir-Even-Yakut and Tundra Yukaghir-Chukchi-Even-Yakut contacts in North-Eastern Siberia are perhaps the only in Continental Siberia. Sakhalin Island (Nivkh-Ainu-Tungusic) would perhaps be another good candidate.

historical syntax of Samoyedic is still unknown, Nganasan features that diverge from other Taimyrian Northern Samoyedic languages are not necessarily the outcome of language contacts, but may be instead language internal innovations. Further, similar features in adjacent genealogically unrelated languages may also be instances of typologically similar developments and therefore ultimately instances of chance. Finally, in cases of areal features which presuppose some kind of language contact, the question of origin is often impossible to answer. In the following I have singled out three features for which comparative data from other Samoyedic languages make it plausible that Nganasan has undergone a different development. For each feature I offer a potential parallel in either Evenki or Dolgan. Whether these features are indeed the outcome of language contact will nevertheless remain speculative, especially for traditional practitioners of historical-comparative Samoyedology. After presenting the three potential instances of contact-induced change, I will re-approach the question of potential language contacts from a theoretical perspective.

2. The negative verb 'not want' in Nganasan and its Tungusic parallels

Among the Northern Samoyedic languages, several verbs expressing negation without an overt negative marker are known. Whereas all languages have dedicated lexemes expressing 'not know' and 'not be able', Nganasan differs from the other Northern Samoyedic languages as a further verb expressing 'not want' *d'ündamtǝsa* (Wagner-Nagy 2011 : 129ff) and *d'ündam-talǝd'a* (Katzschmann 2008 : 473 footnote 416) is known. This verb itself is classified as rare and neither Wagner-Nagy nor Katzschmann have clausal examples for it.[6] This small peculiar set of verbs is diachronically weakly understood, but at least the reflexes of 'not know' and 'not be able' are presumably of older origin since related forms appear in all Northern Samoyedic languages. For 'not know' both semantics and form are uniform:[7]

1) a. TN *ехэра(сь)* 'не знать'
   тюку сер-м' ехэра-ва"
   DEM   thing-ACC not.know-SG.1PL
   'We don't know this thing' (T65 : 113)

   b. FE *d'oxoraš* 'not know'
   d'oxora äki po-xon ńi-đ-uč tota-gu-ʔ
   not.know.SG.1SG this year-LOC.SG NEG.AUX-R.3PL-PST count-DUR-CN
   'I do not know, this year they were not counted' [LDB Yamal]

   c. Ng *d'erusa* 'not know'
   ǝmlǝd'i sǝd'ǝǝ ŋad'ümüǝ sǝd'ǝǝ mǝnǝ d'eru-tu-m
   such[ACC] way[ACC] impure[ACC] way[ACC] 1SG not.know-CO-SG.1SG
   'I do not know such a way, such an impure way' (Wagner-Nagy 2011 : 131—132)

---

[6] The peculiar status of this verb becomes visually even more obvious in Wagner-Nagy's comparative chart (Wagner-Nagy 2011 : 129).

[7] The following abbreviations will be used: Tundra Nenets (TN), Forest Enets (FE), Nganasan (Ng), Tundra Enets (TE), Dolgan (Dg), Evenki (Evk) and Even (Ev). The glossing of Samoyedic examples extracted from text collections follows the principles of Siegl 2013. Glossed data from other sources has been partly adjusted to these principles. The glossing of Dolgan examples follows Siegl 2015c. Tungusic data is glossed following Nedjalkov 1997. Unpublished field data is presented in the same way as in Siegl 2013; 2015c. The conventions are explained in the appendix origin of data.

Concerning 'not be able', the etymological picture is slightly blurred.[8] In Tundra Nenets, *я"мась* is used and *дямаць* appears, albeit very infrequently in older Forest Enets data:[9]

2) a. TN *хар-ми   хо-сь   я"ма-в*
      knife-PX.ACC.1SG find-CON not.can-SG.1SG
      'I cannot find my knife' (T65 : 689)

   b. FE *чики сер   дюру-сь   дяма-в*
      this   thing forget-CON not.can-SG.1SG
      'This thing, I cannot forget it' (Сорокина, Болина 2009 : 136)

Instead, both Enets languages and Nganasan show a different verb which is of common origin but shows a different syntactic realization. In Forest Enets, *lođič* 'not be able' behaves as *ďoxoraš* 'not know' as it triggers the infinitival converb on the verb it governs:

3)   FE *äki bađa muď piri   maď   lođiä-u*
         this word 1SG   always say.CON not.being.able-SG.1SG
         'This word, I never can say it (~ I have forgotten how to say it)'
         [LDB II 80]

In contrast, in both Tundra Enets as well as Nganasan, the etymologically related verb shows indeed the standard negation pattern of negative auxiliaries NEG.AUX + VERB_{CONNEGATIVE} as already shown in example (1b):

4) a. TE *aburi-da   idokaši   le?i-da   idoe?*
         head-PX.ACC.3SG lift.INCH.3SG.PST not.can-SG.3SG lift.CN
         'He wanted to lift his head, but he could not' (Wagner-Nagy 2011 : 120)

   b. Ng *basagaľi miŋ ləđi-ti-mi?   ńakiđi-? maa-gəľičə*
         iron.CAR 1PL not.can-CO-1PL buy-CN   what-EMPH.ACC
         'We cannot buy anything without money' (Wagner-Nagy 2011 : 124)

Similar negative verbs are attested in a number of Tungusic languages. Whereas these Tungusic languages seems to lack an equivalent for the Northern Samoyedic 'not know', it has a number of verbs expressing the concept 'not be able'. Some examples from standard literary Evenki (Болдырев 2007 : 751ff) and Even (Роббек, Роббек 2005):

5) Evk a. *алба-* 'не мочь'
         нуӈан хутаканми   алба-дяча-н   бакадя-ми
         3SG   suitcase.REFL.POSS not.can-IMPF-3SG find-INF
         'She could not find her suitcase' (Болдырев 2007 : 751)
         b. *дуп-* 'не мочь'[10]
         хунат орорви   онидями   дуп-тэ-н
         girl   reindeer.REFL.POSS.PL find.reindeer-INF not.can-PST-3SG
         'The girl could not find her reindeer' (Болдырев 2007 : 753)
         c. *албадай* 'не мочь, не быть в состоянии' (Роббек, Роббек 2005 : 39)

---

[8] See also Wagner-Nagy 2011 : 117ff. The discussion here differs in some details as I do not see reasonably evidence for classifying the Tundra Nenets and Forest Enets verbs as "semantically not empty negative auxiliary" but as negative verbs due to their syntactic behavior. For the sake of completeness it needs to be mentioned that several Khanty varieties use a functionally similar, yet etymologically unrelated verb (see Wagner-Nagy 2011 : 127).
[9] This verb is not attested in my collected data.
[10] Further, also *мулли-* or *мулликān би-* 'не уметь, не мочь' is mentioned by Boldyrev but this verb is excluded here.

Furthermore, both languages Evenki (6) and Even (7) have a negative lexical verb 'not want':

6) Evk a. *бā-* 'не мочь; не хотеть, отказываться, противиться'
      асаткан ба-деча-н   тэгэмуде-ми
      girl   not.want-IMPF-3SG stand.up-INF
      'The girl did not want to stand up' (Болдырев 2007 : 753)

    b. *ŋинанкир толгокива ба-дерэ   ирудя-ми*
      dog.PL   sled.ACC.DEF not.want-PST.3PL draw-INF
      'The dogs did not want to draw the sled' (Болдырев 2007 : 753)

7) Ev   *бāдай* 'не хочеть делать что-то'
      ноŋан бāн   явчинадай
      3SG   not.want.3SG guard.reindeer.in.night.INF
      'He does not want to guard the reindeer in the night' (Роббек, Роббек 2005 : 50)

As mentioned above, Nganasan is the only Northern Samoyedic language that has a negative verb 'not want' *d'ündamtəsa ~ d'ündamtaləd'a*. Although the Nganasan verb (and as a matter of fact the Northern Samoyedic negative verbs) are not lexical borrowings from Tungusic, the appearance of such verbs in this area is probably more than just chance. Further, as shown above, the fact that Nganasan has a negative verb 'not want' which is absent from other Northern Samoyedic languages shows that Nganasan is much closer to Tungusic than its closest Samoyedic relatives. Whereas it is quite likely that the existence of such negative verbs must be areally linked to Tungusic, the (former) existence of the verb 'not want' in Nganasan should be considered a result of individual Nganasan-Evenki contacts.

3. Predicative conjugation of nouns and adjectives in Nganasan and its Dolgan parallels

In several Samoyedic languages, predicative nouns and adjectives allow verbal encoding.[11] Such nominal predicates of the type 'I am a hunter' or 'I am young' are encoded with the verbal endings of the so-called subjective conjugation. For the following discussion, only data from Taimyr Samoyedic will be used.

Concerning the encoding of such predicatives, Tundra Nenets, Forest Enets and Tundra Enets do not require a free-standing copula, neither in the aorist nor the past tense:

8) FE   a. *uu onai enči-d*
       2SG real person-2SG
       'You are an Enets'

    b. *to d'od'igun   kasa äči-d-uš*
       that period.LOC.SG [man youngster]-2SG-PST
       'In those days you were a young boy' [LDB & NKB I 140]

---

[11] See Hajdú 1975 and Wagner-Nagy 2011 : chapter 8 for a cross-Samoyedic investigation; the discussion concerning Forest Enets in Wagner-Nagy 2011 differs in several major instances from mine (Siegl 2013 : 334ff; 2015a). As the following discussion is focusing on structural similarity between Nganasan and Dolgan, a detailed cross-Samoyedic analysis is not required.

9) FE a. *uu ibľeigu-d*
   2SG small-2SG
   'You are young'
   b. *uu ibľeigu-d-uš*
   2SG small-2SG-PST
   'You were young' [LDB & NKB I 140]

10) Taimyr Nenets
   a. *mań ńeńei ńeńecə-dmˀ*
   1SG real person-1SG
   'I am a Nenets' [ENS My father]
   b. *manto-ś*
   Tundra.Enets-3SG.PST
   'She was a Tundra Enets' [ENS My father]

11) Taimyr Nenets
   tə-ˀ maľəŋkəna təmna jilxi-n-əś
   this-GEN during still young-2SG-PST
   'You were still young then' [LNF 26.09.2011]

In comparison, Nganasan behaves somewhat differently. In the aorist tense, Nganasan follows the other Northern Samoyedic languages, and verbal endings attach directly to nouns and adjectives:

12) Ng a. *мэнə басутуо-м*
   1SG hunter-1SG
   'I am a hunter' (NRRN 407)
   b. *mənə ńaagəə-m*
   1SG good-1SG
   'I am good/beautiful' (Wagner-Nagy 2011 : 312)

By contrast, a free-standing copula is required in the past tense. Further, the preceding noun or adjective needs to be marked verbally again which results in predicative double marking:

13) Ng a. *Мэнə деди-м u-сӥö-м*
   1SG father-1SG be-PST-1SG
   'I was a father' (Терещенко 1973 : 160)
   b. *mənə náagəə-m i-sʲüə-m*
   1SG good-1SG be-PST-1SG
   'I was good/beautiful' (Wagner-Nagy 2011 : 312)

In prior and contemporary research, the predicative conjugation in Nganasan has been classified as occupying an intermediate position between Selkup and the other Northern Samoyedic languages (Терещенко 1973 : 161; Wagner-Nagy 2011 : chapter 8) and from a pan-Samoyedic position, this assumption is sound. Selkup shows clear tendencies for the cliticization of the copula, but the free-standing inflected copula can still appear on occasion. By contrast, the Nenets and Enets languages have cliticized the inflected copula and the copula has been dropped which has resulted in the verbal-like encoding of nominal predicates.[12] Nganasan occupies an intermediate position since in the aorist, it

---

[12] As the negation of predicative nominals show, this category is clearly not verbal and therefore I have coined the label "semi-verbal" (Siegl 2013 : 335—336, 338—340; 2015a).

follows the Enets and Nenets languages where a formal copula element is no longer identifiable and the verbal endings attach directly to the predicative noun or adjective. In the past tense, Nganasan follows Selkup[13] where a free-standing copula is required. Further, Nganasan and Selkup have preserved the original proto-Samoyedic past tense marker *-*så* which has developed into the interrogative mood in Forest Enets, Tundra Nenets and Forest Nenets.[14] The past tense forms in the latter languages (both Nenets languages and Forest Enets) are innovations since the past tense marker is the word-final morpheme and has resulted from the clitization of a freestanding copula. This then is responsible for the typologically unusual ordering PERSON-TENSE. By contrast, Nganasan and Selkup have preserved the old order TENSE-PERSON:

14) a. TN   *jile-đm^ʔ*   <live-AOR.1SG>   *jile-đm-ć*   <life-1SG-PST>
    b. FE   *diri-đ^ʔ*   <live-AOR.1SG>   *d'iri-đu-d'* <life-1SG-PST>
    c. Ng   *tu^ʔom*   <come-AOR.1SG>   *tui-süə-m* <come-PST-1SG>
    d. Taz Selkup[15] *qo-ŋa-k*   <find-AOR.1SG>   *qoo-sa-k*   <find-PST-1SG>

Although there are indeed inner-Samoyedic parallels which unite Nganasan and Selkup morphosyntactically, a meaningful parallel can also be found in Dolgan. In the present tense, Dolgan attaches verbal endings directly to nouns and adjectives in predicative position. A free-standing copula is not required:

15) Dg a. *min bar-abin*
         1SG go-PRS.1SG
         'I am going'
    b. *min teete-bin*
         1SG father-PRS.1SG
         'I am a father' [AAB II 36]
    c. *min eder-bin*
         1SG young-PRS.1SG
         'I am young' [AAB II 37]

In the past tense, a free-standing copula is required:

16) Dg   *bert oduu   kihi e-te*
         very interesting man be-PSTI.3SG
         'He was a very interesting man' (Попов 2011 : 183)

Although Dolgan lacks double person marking, the fact that Dolgan requires a copula in the past tense is areally significant.[16] This phenomenon should not be underestimated as the other contact language of Nganasan, Evenki, shows an entirely different construction. In the present tense, both predicative nouns and adjectives do not require an overt copula in the third person. In other persons, the copula is obligatory. Furthermore, the predicative noun does not receive person-marking either:

---

[13] See also the Selkup discussion in Wagner-Nagy 2011 : chapter 8.
[14] But not in Tundra Enets which poses problems for the assumed reconstruction of the Proto-Samoyedic tense system (Siegl 2014).
[15] Helimski 1997b : 567.
[16] Yakut (e.g., Убрятова 2006 : 94ff) but also several other Turkic languages show a similar distribution of the copula. Consequently, this rules out Nganasan influence on Dolgan.

17) Evk a. *Si   aja   havalimni bi-si-nni*
    2sg good worker be-PRS-2SG
    'You are a good worker' (Nedjalkov 1997 : 59)
   b. *Ami-m engesi (bi-si-n)*
    father-PX.1SG strong be-PRS-3SG
    'My father is strong' (Nedjalkov 1997 : 61)

Even if the proposal that Dolgan should have contributed to the two-fold predicative encoding in Nganasan might be too strong, the areal implication is certainly worth highlighting. Although Selkup is genealogically close, it is areally distant. The fact that Dolgan, as a known contact language of Nganasan, shows a similar distribution of the copula in present and past tense context which differs from Selkup is indeed intriguing. Evenki is irrelevant as the language requires a copula in the present tense and lacks verbal endings on the predicative.

4. The function of the Nganasan allative case and parallels in Evenki

The third substrate feature in Nganasan to be discussed concerns the function of the allative case *-d'a*. Functionally, this case encodes movement towards a goal, but not general movement which is encoded by the dative case (see e.g., Katzschmann 2008 : 365). From a pan-Samoyedic perspective, the Nganasan allative case has parallels in other Northern Samoyedic languages where one finds an etymologically related free-standing postposition. Whether the Nganasan allative is already fully grammaticalized and has made the final transition from a free-standing phonological word to a bound case marker is not fully settled. In several examples in Labanauskas' text edition (NRRN), the allative marker is attached to the noun resulting in a new PX-CX pattern, but there are still instances where the postposition is not suffixed and still free-standing:

18) Ng *конда?а-ту эку мазу-ту дя*
    carry.AOR-SG.3SG PTC chum-PX.GEN.3SG PP
    '... carried it, apparently to his chum' (Wagner-Nagy, p.c.)

In contrast, in both Forest Enets and Tundra Nenets,[17] the postposition is still free-standing. It encodes directionality, but not movement for which the lative/dative would be used:[18]

19) a. FE *to̔ odda d'ađ d'ađ-da-xa-da*
    so boat.PX.GEN.3SG toward go-PTCP.IPF-LAT.SG_{POSS}-PX.GEN.3SG
    'So, while walking toward its boat ...' [NKB Mouse]
   b. TN *мя"-ни ед' яда-н*
    chum-PX.GEN.1SG toward go.AOR-2SG
    'You are walking toward my chum' (T65 : 91)

---

[17] In the restricted data available for Tundra Enets, an etymological cognate could not be identified. Instead, the postposition *no-* is used similar to FE *d'eđ* (e.g., ET 83: 14, 84: 72, 88: 6, 97: 14, 100: 12).
[18] Tereščenko (Терещенко 1979 : 83) mentioned that the different encoding of movement toward a goal vs. general movement would be much more productive in Nganasan than in Enets and Tundra Nenets. A prolonged search in the folklore collection compiled by Labanauskas (JaL) supports Tereščenko's observation as hardly any examples appeared. In Forest Enets, the functional split is well advanced and numerous examples are attested in my corpus as well as in ET.

Although as far as I know, a reconstruction for the postposition has not been proposed, the variation FE *d'eđ* Ng *d'a* TN *jed*ˀ which shows regular strengthening *j > d'* and the regular spirantization of dental stops in Forest Enets makes a common origin quite likely.[19] Further, the semantics 'movement toward a goal' do match in the three languages which adds further reasons for assuming a common origin as the form-meaning correlation appears sound.

Leaving aside Samoyedic languages for a moment, it is surprising to see that the shape of the Dolgan postposition *d'iek* (Standard Yakut *диэк*), which expresses directionality, is rather close. This is apparently only a coincidence:

20) Dg *ıt   küöl d'iek   kürä-bite*
         dog lake toward run-PSTII.3SG
         'The dog ran toward the lake' [NSK I 72]

The shape of the postposition *d'ieri* (Standard Yakut *диэри*) which encodes a terminative spatial reading 'until' is surprisingly close, too. As it triggers a different rection, it should be treated as a separate postposition:

21) Dg *ıt   küöl-ge d'ieri kürä-bite*
         dog lake-DAT until run-PSTII.3SG
         'The dog ran to the lake (but not into it)' [NSK I 72]

Similar to the other languages, the goal of movement is encoded by the dative case in Dolgan, but the Dolgan dative case shows features absent from Samoyedic as it also encodes location.

Returning to the Samoyedic languages, it needs to be mentioned that the postposition shows some language particular peculiarities with occasional syntactic parallels in at least one of the other languages for which data is available. The only feature shared by all three languages Forest Enets, Tundra Nenets and Nganasan in which the postposition is a regular adjunct is clearly the least intriguing. This has been illustrated in examples (18) and (19) and does not require repetition. Further, for Tundra Nenets and Nganasan, the same postposition is known to express benefactivity. Whereas Nganasan adds another benfactive suffix to the postposition,[20] a benefactive meaning is inherent in Tundra Nenets:

22) a. Ng *кəнтə дя-ӡə-ту   ту"о*
          sled   PP-BEN-PX.3SG come.AOR.3SG
          'A sled came for him' (Терещенко 1979 : 85)
   b. TN *небя-ни   ед' халя-ко-м' хаӈада-м-зь*
          mother-PX.GEN.1SG PP fish-DIM-ACC ask-1SG-PST
          'I asked for a little fish for my mother' (T65 : 91)

Finally, the valency patterns of several verbs in Nganasan and Forest Enets require the same postposition:

23) a. Ng *Тытыдя-мə   сатəрə-дя   басуту*
          mothers.younger.brother-PX.1SG arctic.fox-ALL hunt.AOR.3SG
          'My mother's younger brother is hunting arctic foxes' (Терещенко 1979 : 83)

---

[19] Concerning sound changes see e.g., Mikola 2004 : 68, 81.
[20] The benefactive declension in other Northern Samoyedic languages seems not to allow this.

b. FE *mud' bodu-ʔ   käńi-đʔ säsor đeđ   kađa-š*
1SG tundra-LAT go-1SG fox[GEN] toward hunt-CON
'I went into the tundra to hunt for foxes' [ANP Fox hunting]

c. Ng *коптуа турку-дя сәнӱли"ә*
girl   lake-ALL   look.AOR.3SG
'The girl is looking at the lake' (Терещенко 1979 : 83)

d. FE *täta-bu-i-ńʔ   mal'e čas   đeđ*
dress-CON-PST_{CO}-PX.GEN.1SG already clock[GEN] toward
seŋli-bu-i-ńʔ   mal'e   šiđiät čas-iš   kańi-š
look-CON-PST_{CO}-PX.GEN.1SG already eight hour-TRSL go-3SG.PST
'While I was dressing and looked at my watch, it turned 8 o'clock
already' [ZNB Hat]

For Nganasan, some more verbs are reported to require (-)*d'a* (Терещенко 1979 : 83). All of them express real or metaphorical movement such as 'speak to', 'shout at', 'be happy for' or 'be angry about'. By contrast, ditransitive verbs cannot be used with (-)*d'a* and the same is valid for Tundra Nenets and Forest Enets. Still, the Nganansan allative case has a further function unparalleled in other Northern Samoyedic languages.[21] Apart from its spatial meaning, (-)*d'a* can encode a temporal meaning, e.g., *дялы* 'day' → *дялы-дя* 'during the day', *нору* 'spring' → *нору-дя* 'in spring', *тәӈә* 'summer' → *тәӈә-дя* 'in summer' (Терещенко 1979 : 85, 288). Precisely this function of the Nganasan allative case shows significant overlapping with the Evenki allative case in *-tki*[22] which is, as I suggest here, more than just a coincidence. According to Boldyrev (Болдырев 2007 : 190—191), the Evenki allative case is used to express movement towards a goal (24a), a target of speech and vision (24b, 24c). Further, it is used to encode a stretch of time (24d):[23]

24) Evk a. *ӈинакин уркэл-тыки суручэн*
dog   door-ALL   run.PST.3SG
'The dog went toward/to the door' (Болдырев 2007 : 190)

b. *хунат пассажир-ил-тыки тэпкэсинчэн*
girl   passenger-PL-ALL   shout.PST.3SG
'The girl shouted at the passengers' (Болдырев 2007 : 191)

c. *бэеткэн цветок-ил-тыки, мо-л-тыки, дылача-тки, няня-ду*
boy   flower-PL-ALL   tree-PL-ALL sun-ALL   sky-DAT
бисилтыки туксу-л-тыки, дуннэ упкаттыкин ичэтчэвки
be.CON   cloud-PL-ALL   earth whole   look.HAB.PTCP
'The book is looking at the flowers, the trees, the sun, the clouds
in the sky, at the whole world' (Болдырев 2007 : 191)

d. *долбонива тыгдэ тыгдэдечэн, тымани-тки этэчэн*
night.ADV rain rain.PST.3SG morning-ALL stop.PST.3SG
'In the night, it was raining, but toward the morning it stopped'
(Болдырев 2007 : 191)

---

[21] Again, with the exception of Tundra Enets for which sufficient data is absent. Also, Dolgan *d'iek* is not used to express this function.

[22] In Boldyrev's account, the case is called направительный падеж (Болдырев 2007 : 145, 190—191). Tereščenko, too, called Nganasan (-)*d'a* направительный падеж (Терещенко 1979 : 82ff).

[23] Boldyrev (Болдырев 2007 : 145, 190—191) also mentions a fourth semantic function of the Evenki allative which is connected to causality, but this function could not be identified in Nganasan.

Again, although the presented Nganasan and Evenki data are suspiciously similar, a Samoyedic explanation would be in principal possible. Semantic extensions from spatial to temporal meaning are not unexpected with locational cases and do not necessarily require language contact. But, a little detail from Forest Enets offers further support for the postulation of Evenki influence on Nganasan in this domain. Although Forest Enets does not use the etymological cognate of Nganasan *ďa* on adverbs, it appears that a productive Forest Enets temporal and spatial adverbializer -*nuju* (Siegl 2013 : 134, 217ff) is indeed a grammaticalization based on the suffixation of an otherwise rarely appearing postposition *noju* (Siegl 2013 : 213). Intriguingly, *noju* encodes a similar directionality function as the Nganasan *ďa* postposition:

25) a. FE *bu to noju ďaďa*
   3SG lake[GEN] towards go.3SG
   'He went towards the lake' [ZNB I 51]

 b. Ng *Колызытыэ басутуо наду турку-дя хэзытытыгэй*
   fisherman hunter[GEN] together lake-ALL go.FUT.3DU
   'The fisherman and the hunter will go to the lake' (Терещенко 1979 : 83)

And as a matter of fact, Tundra Enets also follows Forest Enets since the same development from spatial postposition (26a) to temporal adverb marker has taken place (26b):

26) TE a. *Сэ"о кати туддио' но кани*
   seven girl lake[GEN] toward go.3SG
   'The seven girls went to the lake' (ET 88: 6)

 b. *Пеузоду-но пирэада кома*
   evening-ADV cook.NLZ.LAT.SG want.3SG
   'In the evening he wanted to cook him' (ET 81: 31)

This data suggests that the development from a postposition expressing directionality to a temporal and spatial adverbializer has happened in three Taimyr Samoyedic languages; still, only Nganasan encodes directionality and temporality with the same morpheme. Forest Enets, which shares the etymologically related postposition *ďeď* with Nganasan, has split this function. When comparing this situation with Evenki, where the allative case encodes movement and location in time, the functional similarities are too close to assume that this is due to chance. For the sake of completeness, a look at Dolgan *ďiek* and *ďieri* are necessary. For the time being it appears that *ďiek* is indeed a spatial postposition without any temporal extension:

27) Dg *haas köhöllör moara ďiek*
   spring move.in.caravan.PRS.3PL north toward
   'In spring they are moving northwards' [E I 51]

The other postposition *ďieri* shows a temporal extension, but the terminative meaning is preserved:

28) Dg *üs čas-ka ďieri gini kel-iege*
   three hour-DAT until 3SG come-FUT.3SG
   'He will arrive by three o'clock' [NSK I 73]

This means that among the Taimyrian languages for which sufficient data is available, the uniform encoding of spatial and temporal relations by the same morpheme expressing directionality is restricted to Nganasan. Therefore, it appears that the use and function of the Nganasan allative case has been influenced by Evenki as the functional parallel is too significant to be just an instance of typological chance:

Table 1

The encoding of directionality and temporality in Taimyrian languages

function \ language	Nganasan	Evenki	Dolgan	Forest Enets	Tundra Enets	Tundra Nenets
directionality	*ďa*	*-tki*	*ďiek / ďieri*	*ďeď*	*no*	*jedˀ*
metaphorical movement (e.g. see, hunt)	*ďa*	*-tki*	*ďiek / ďieri*	*ďeď*	?	?
temporal use	*ďa*	*-tki*	other	other	other	other

5. Some theoretical thoughts concerning the underlying language contact scenario

Having presented data which suggests that in the three sketched situations an explanation based on language contact seems promising, I continue the discussion from a more theoretical perspective. As all three suggested instances do not show overt structural borrowing of bound morphology or lexical items, the standard procedures of historical-comparative approaches are irrelevant. Instead, we deal with convergence, as the function of etymologically unrelated forms in genetically unrelated languages show signs of similar traits. What makes these instances harder to grasp is the fact that they belong to a sphere of language contact which predates contacts with Russian. Contacts with Russian are often easy to find and comparatively easy to explain. For example, both Komi and Dolgan use the instrumental case as a marker of secondary predication, similar to Russian:

29) a. Komi *Tödsa,   myj Kiev-yn   medvoďźa öksy-jas-ön*
              know.3sg that Kiev-INES first   prince-PL-INST

              loiny   normann-jas.
              become.PST.3PL Norman-PL

              'It is known that the Normans were the first princes in Kiev' (M. Leinonen, p.c.)

   b. Dg *urut   uskuola-ga ülelee-či e-te   vospitateľ-nnan*
            earlier school-DAT work-CON be-PSTI.3SG educator-INST

            anı   radih-innın   üleelir
            now radio.operator-INST work.PRS.3SG

            'Earlier she worked as an educator at school, now she works as a radio operator' [AAB II 34]

For Dolgan, it is also known that the transition has taken place comparatively late as there are indeed examples for the use of the dative case in earlier texts:[24]

---

[24] The dative case in Dolgan (and Yakut) encodes both movement and location. Artem′jev who has correctly identified the transition from dative to instrumental case as Russian influence (Артемьев 1999 : 81—82, 102—103) tried to link the earlier

30) Dg *bu   ogo   aga-ta   ńučča   aptaa-ga   e-te*
      DEM child father-PX.3P russian sorcerer-DAT be-PSTI.3SG
      'The father of this child was (as) a Russian sorcerer' (DF 29: 328)

This means that for Dolgan, the encoding of secondary predicates switched from dative to instrumental sometime in the 20th century. This is important as Dolgan has a distinctive Russian substratum which is seen as the result of the assimilation of Russian speaking Old Believers in the 19th century. Whereas in the 19th century shifting Russian speakers introduced both structural and lexical material into Dolgan, the kind of shift from dative to instrumental was initiated by speakers of Dolgan who introduced a new syntactic function to the use of the Dolgan instrumental case in a later phase in the 20th century. The prerequisite for both types of contact is of course bilingualism which allows the kind of transfer as attested below. Relying on Winford (2003; 2010) it is quite obvious that diffusion and convergence as the three examples of this case study suggest is neither simply borrowing nor substratum influence, but often a mixture of both. The languages in contact must have been maintained languages, but it is impossible to single out source language and recipient language speaker activities which have triggered the resultant convergence. The outcome of diffusion can result in partial or full convergence but as cross-linguistic data shows, the results are impossible to predict (see also Heine, Kuteva 2010) and in the Taimyrian case, impossible to reconstruct.[25] Although the Taimyr Peninsula has been an area of bi- and multilingualism since the 17th century, the lack of suitable (historical) sociolinguistic data imposes severe restrictions.[26] We cannot reconstruct the potential sociolinguistic situation whether we deal with maintained languages, prolonged instances of bi- and multilingualism, individual or collective bi- and multilingualism, situations of language shift (either continuous or abrupt) — at best some trends can be observed, especially for proper Taimyr Evenki. At least since the 19th century, Evenkis were under increased socio-cultural pressure and underwent assimilation with the Dolgans, a process which reached its end with the total assimilation of Evenki speakers after the 1950s.[27] The Evenki assimilation introduced a number of structural innovations as substratum features which are absent from Standard Literary Yakut.[28] This means that bilingualism was unstable

---

use of the Dolgan dative as a marker of secondary predication to Evenki influence which also uses the dative case in a similar function (see also Nedjalkov 1997 : 162). As the Dolgan dative case is historically a continuation of an old locative case and a number of Turkic languages encode secondary predication with a locational case, Evenki influence is not necessary to postulate.

[25] Whether such convergence results in increasing linguistic complexity (e.g., Trudgill 2011) is a question which is equally interesting, but logically independent from contact.

[26] Whereas the edges of the Taimyr Peninsula are populated by speakers of the currently most numerous Taimyrian languages (Tundra Nenets in the West, Dolgan in the East), both languages are newcomers and arrived in the early 17th century. Prior evidence suggests that the Taimyr Peninsula was populated by Tundra Enetses, Nganasans and Evenkis and potentially several Forest Enets clans. The last Forest Enets clans arrived on the Taimyr Peninsula in the early 19th century (Siegl 2013 : 40ff; Khlobystin 2005).

[27] Several elderly speakers of Dolgan from Popigaj claimed that they heard Evenki in the 1950s but that the language was spoken only by elderly individuals (Siegl, fieldnotes). Romanova. Myrejeva and Baraškov showed that the language shift of Evenki speakers in the North and North-West of Jakutia was very rapid in the first half of the 20th century (Романова, Мыреева, Барашков 1975).

[28] Siegl 2015c offers a short list with potential additions.

and shifting Evenki speakers are responsible for convergence as they made parts of Dolgan grammar and lexicon look more like their native language. Evenki was the substratum language but also the agent language whose features were transferred to the recipient language Dolgan. Unfortunately, when expanding the discussion to the potential Nganasan-Evenki contacts which seem to be older than Dolgan-Evenki contacts on the Taimyr Peninsula, the sketching of a potential contact scenario based on existing historical and ethnographic appears to be impossible.[29] What seems to be possible is to compare the proposed cases of contact and resulting convergence by an analysis of the underlying pattern of transfer and its outcome.

5.1. Nganasan-Evenki parallels

The third example discussed above, the potential grammaticalization of a free-standing postposition to a suffixed case marker in Nganasan will be discussed first as it is the easiest to handle. As suggested above, the grammaticalization of *ďa* into a case marker followed an Evenki pattern for which a dedicated case is known. As the semantics of the Nganasan and the Evenki cases match, the transition postposition > case marker under Evenki influence to match the Evenki allative in *-tki* is quite likely. The question of agentivity and related matters are, however, impossible to answer and this will not be attempted; it is quite likely that such convergence required a longer time of stable bilingualism as the target of convergence belonged to the periphery of grammar. What remains important is the fact that this grammaticalization pattern did not affect linguistic complexity. Whereas the locational case system in Nganasan acquired a fourth case, the case system did not acquire a new dimension, as directionality was encoded previously by a postposition for which etymological cognates are attested in Forest Enets and Tundra Nenets. An increase in semantic and grammatical complexity did not result from this contact.

Turning to example one, the negative modal verb *ďündamtəsa*/*ďündamtaləďa* 'not want' is a good example for a process whose identification has already been a major concern in the pioneering work of Ulrich Weinreich on language contact, namely the relation of structural/typological proximity to convergence (e.g., Matras 2010). Although predominantly of concern in morphology and syntax,[30] I do not see any reasons why this argument could not be transferred to semantics. As the comparative discussion in section 2 had shown, the existence of negative modal verbs is a common feature characteristic of Northern Samoyedic. As the verb 'not know' is shared by all Northern Samoyedic languages, the phenomenon is at least of old age, even if it may turn out to be of non-Samoyedic origin. Nganasan differs

---

[29] Further, it appears that the emergence of *Govorka* in the 19th century must have resulted in a new communication pattern on the Taimyr Peninsula. Apparently, the role of bilingualism and multilingualism declined as a new means for interethnic communication became available. This might also be a partial explanation for why language contacts of native Taimyrian languages with each other are hard to trace as such contacts must have happened prior to the emergence of Taimyr Pidgin Russian and ended when *Govorka* became the preferred language of interethnic communication.

[30] From a Taimyrian perspective, the Nganasan substrate in the PX.2P use of Dolgan is a good candidate as the function of possessive suffixes in Nganasan and Dolgan are typologically similar on the phrase level (Siegl 2015c).

from the other Northern Samoyedic languages in that it is the only language for which a specialized verb 'not want' is known. The fact that it is no longer used in contemporary Nganasan could be seen as a connection to its foreign, probably Evenki origin; with the end of Nganasan-Evenki bilingualism, a verb with clear Evenki semantics became foreign and fell out of use. Although the etymologization of *d'ündamtǝsa/d'ündamtalǝd'a* remains impossible, the fact that Nganasan shows a verb for which a clear semantic parallel is available in Tungusic, is apparently more than just chance. As similar negative modal verbs have been present at the moment of language contact, the creation and introduction of a new verb into a similar existing system seems not to be unlikely. Again, the contact scenario cannot be determined, but I suggest that this development must be temporally linked to the period in which the grammaticalization of *d'a* following Evenki semantics must have happened. Summing up this discussion, the proposed instance of language contact did not increase linguistic complexity, since a similar category negative modal verb had already existed prior to the period of contact.

5.2. Nganasan-Dolgan parallels

In contrast to the aforementioned Nganasan-Evenki parallels which are presumably of older age, Nganasan-Dolgan linguistic contacts continued at least until the mid of the 20th century, especially among the Vadeev Nganasan who have been living in more proximity to Dolgans. Further, ethnological and historical documents as well as reliable ethnographic data from the 1930s collected by Popov and Dolgix make the investigation of Nganasan-Dolgan contacts easier. However, by contrast to Nganasan-Evenki contacts, Nganasan-Dolgan parallels show convergence in which patterns have only been partly replicated. A detailed analysis of the Nganasan substrate in the PX.2SG use of Dolgan (Siegl 2015c) revealed that the referential use of the possessive suffix shows language individual variation. Dolgan follows Nganasan and Northern Samoyedic in general (see Siegl 2015b) by marking a re-activated topic in subject position by PX.2SG to create coherence:

31) a. Ng *Сигиʼʼǝ-рǝ   кобтуа   диндиси   конаʼʼа*
           giant-PX.2SG   girl[ACC] speak.CON go.PFT.AOR.3SG
           'Hearing the girl speaking, the giant left' (NDT 39: 50)

   b. Dg *onton iti hir-iŋ   honon d'e habıllıbıta*
          then   this earth-PX.2SG there PTC close.PASS.PSTII.3SG
          hapsiem   kim de tıppataga   ol   hirni
          completely who NEG near.NEG.PSTII.3SG that earth.ACC
          'Then this place there was closed completely. Nobody came near his place' [APS Camp]

But, only Samoyedic uses the same PX.2SG in non-verbal predication of the equative type. This feature is absent in Dolgan:

32) Ng   *ǝмти-рǝ   бахя кǝрсу*
          this-PX.2SG   bad thing
          'This is a bad thing' (NDT 47: 69)

On the contrary, only Dolgan allows the marking of discourse adverbials with PX.2SG, a feature unknown in Samoyedic:

33) Dg *emne   egel   dʹi bolnicatan   o n t u ŋ*
      medicine.PART bring.IMP.2SG PTC hospital.ABL that.PX.2SG
      dʹogorum   dʹiete
      friend.PX.1SG say.PSTI.3SG
      'Bring me some medicine from the hospital! After that, my friend said'
      [NSK Boat trip]

The distribution of the copula in predicative position seems to be another example following this pattern of partial convergence. In the aorist (Samoyedic) or present tense (Dolgan) the verbal endings attach directly to predicative nouns and adjectives. In the past tense, Nganasan and Dolgan require an overt copula, but Nganasan differs from its genealogical relatives and its linguistic neighbors by double person marking on both the predicative noun/adjective and the copula. This suggests that we are observing partial convergence which is triggered again by partial restrictions imposed by the grammar of Nganasan. One finds ample cross-linguistic evidence for this behavior. (e.g., Matras 2010).[31]

6. Conclusions and outlook

In this article, I have tried to show that three peculiarities of Nganasan morphosyntax for which sound cross-Samoyedic evidence is absent could be explained by language contact with two potential contact languages of Nganasan — Evenki and Dolgan. This pioneering study tried to offer some potential examples for such Nganasan-Evenki-Dolgan language contacts beyond the level of lexical borrowings. As morphosyntatic contacts and resulting convergence are often accompanied by substrate features in phonology, there are indeed some promising candidates for future investigations. Among Samoyedic languages, only Nganasan is known for having vowel harmony. Although this is usually perceived as a conservative trait of Nganasan which is said to have preserved relicts of Proto-Samoyedic vowel harmony (see references in Katzschmann 2008 : 333—336), it should not be forgotten that both contact languages Dolgan and Evenki show vowel harmony too (Артемьев 2001a : 47—50; Nedjalkov 1997 : 314—315). Furthermore, Nganasan, Dolgan, Forest Enets, Evenki and partly Tundra Enets show a transition from anlaut **j-* > **dʹ-*. The only Taimyrian language which has not participated in this development is Taimyr Tundra Nenets. Further, Tundra Nenets does not participate in another Taimyrian isogloss, namely the marking of agents of passives by a case expressing movement. Here again, the participating Taimyrian languages Forest Enets, Tundra Enets, Nganasan, Dolgan and Evenki behave similarly, but this isogloss stretches further south and east (see Siegl 2013 : 422—424).

Because contact linguistics and areal linguistics go hand in hand, further research on Taimyrian language contacts will have implications for both fields of research. The task of this paper was to pave the way for further research and demonstrate that the cultural contacts of Nganasan with its neighbors Evenki and Dolgan have left linguistic traces not only in the lexicon but also in the grammar.

---

[31] A similar instance of partial convergence in Forest Enets concerns the use of the Russian coordinating conjunction *i*. Unlike Russian which uses *i* as a conjunction on phrase and clause level, fluent speakers of contemporary Forest Enets use *i* only for clausal coordination (Siegl 2013 : 425—426).

Address

Florian Siegl
University of Tromsø — the Arctic University of Norway
E-mail: florian.siegl@uit.no

Origin of data

Even
Р о б б е к   В. А., Р о б б е к   М. Е. 2005, Эвенско-русский словарь, Ново-
    сибирск.
Evenki
Б о л д ы р е в   Б. В. 2007, Морфология эвенкийского языка, Новосибирск.
N e d j a l k o v, I. 1997, Evenki, London (Routledge Descriptive Grammar).
Dolgan
DF — Н. В. Е м е л ь я н о в [ed], Фольклор Долган, Новосибирск 2000 (Па-
    мятники фольклора Сибири и Дальнего Востока 19) (reference: text, page).
П о п о в Н. А. 2011, Аваам биэс үрэктэрин үстүн, Дудинка.
[Consultant, fieldmanual, page] = reference to material from elicitation.
[Consultant, title] = reference to transcribed and annotated narrative.
Forest Enets
С о р о к и н а И. П., Б о л и н а Д. С. 2009, Энецкий словарь с кратким
    грамматическим очерком, Санкт-Петербург.
[Consultant, fieldmanual, page] = reference to material from elicitation.
[Consultant, title] = reference to transcribed and annotated narrative.
Nganasan
NDT — К. И. Л а б а н а у с к а с [ed], Ня” дүрымы” туобтугуйся, Дудинка
    2001 (Фольклор народов Таймыра 6).
NRRN — Н. Т. К о с т е р к и н а, А. Ч. М о м д е, Т. Ю. Ж д а н о в а,
    Словарь нганасанско-русский и русско-нганасанский, Санкт-Петербург
    2005.
Tundra Enets
ET — И. П. С о р о к и н а, Д. С. Б о л и н а, Энецкие тексты, Санкт-Пе-
    тербург 2005 (reference: text, line).
Tundra Nenets
JaL — К. И. Л а б а н а у с к а с [ed], Ямидхы” лаханаку”. Сказки седой ста-
    рины, Москва.
Т65 — Н. М. Т е р е щ е н к о, Ненецко-русский словарь, Москва 1965.
[Consultant, title] = reference to transcribed and annotated narrative.

Glossing

General conventions: e.g. ACC — overtly expressed case; e.g. [ACC] — covertly expressed
case; e.g. SG.1PL — verbal ending with reference to number of object; e.g. R.3PL — verbal
ending reflexive conjugation; e.g. 1SG — free standing pronoun; e.g. PX — possessive
suffix nominative series, reference to singular possessum; e.g. PX.ACC — possessive non-
nominative series, reference to singular possessum.

 Other conventions: ABL — ablative; ACC.DEF — definite accusative; ADV — adverbial-
izer; ALL — allative case; AOR — aorist tense; BEN — benefactive; CAR — caritive; CN —
connegative; CO — aorist linking element; CON — converb; DAT — dative case; DEM —
demonstrative; DIM — diminutive; EMPH — emphasizer; FUT — future tense; HAB.PTCP —
habitual participle; IMP — imperative; IMPF — imperfective tense; INCH — inchoative
aspect; INES — inessive case; INF — infinitive; INST — instrumental case; LAT — lative
case; LAT.SG$_\text{POSS}$ — possessed lative singular case allomorph; LOC.SG — locative singular;
NEG — negative particle; NEG.AUX — negative auxiliary; .NEG — negative suffix; NLZ —
nominalization; PART — partitive case; PASS — passive; PFT — perfective aspect; PL —
plural; PP — postposition; PRS — present tense; PST — past tense; PST$_\text{CO}$ — co-tense
marker; PSTI — first past tense; PSTII — second past tense; PTC — particle; PTCP.IPF —
imperfective participle; REFL.POSS — reflexive possession; TRSL — essive-translative.

REFERENCES

H a j d ú, P. 1975, Prädikative Nominalflexion in den samojedischen Sprachen. —
    ALHung. XXV, 1—30.
H e i n e, B. K u t e v a, T. 2010, Contact and Grammaticalization. — The Hand-
    book of Language Contact, Oxford (Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics),
    86—105.
H e l i m s k i, E. 1997a, Nganasan. — The Uralic Languages, London—New York
    (Routledge Language Family Descriptions), 480—515.
 —— 1997b, Selkup. The Uralic Languages, London—New York (Routledge
    Language Family Descriptions), 548—579.
J a l a v a, L. 2012, Tempuksen ilmaiseminen tundranenetsin moduksissa. — Per
    Urales ad Orientem. Iter polyphonicum multilingue. Festskrift tillägnad Juha
    Janhunen på hans sextioårsdag den 12 februari 2012, Helsinki (MSFOu 264),
    131—144.
 —— 2014, Indirectivity and Resultativity in Tundra Nenets. — FUF 62, 207—240.
K a t z s c h m a n n, M. 2008, Chrestomathia Nganasanica, Norderstedt.
K h l o b y s t i n, L. P. 2005, Taymyr — the Archeology of Northernmost Eurasia,
    Washington (Contributions to Circumpolar Anthropology 5).
M a t r a s, Y. 2010, Contact, Convergence and Typology. — The Handbook of
    Language Contact, Oxford (Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics), 66—85.
M i k o l a, T. 2004, Studien zur Geschichte der samojedischen Sprachen. Aus dem
    Nachlass herausgegeben von Beáta Wagner-Nagy, Szeged (Studia Uralo-Al-
    taica 45).
N e d j a l k o v, I. 1997, Evenki, London (Routledge Descriptive Grammar).
N i k o l a e v a, I. 2014, A Grammar of Tundra Nenets, Berlin—Boston (Mouton
    Grammar Library 65).
S i e g l, F. 2013, Materials on Forest Enets, an Indigenous Language of Northern
    Siberia, Helsinki (MSFOu 267).
 —— 2014, The Counterfactive Mood in Forest Enets and Its Origin. — FUF 62,
    184—206.
 —— 2015a, Negation in Forest Enets. — Negation in Uralic Languages. Amster-
    dam (Typological Studies in Language 108), 45—73.
 —— 2015b, The Structure of NPs with Referential PX.2P in Northern Samoyedic.
    — Tomsk Journal of Linguistics and Anthropology 1(7), 21—31.
 —— 2015c, The Non-Possessive Use of PX.2P in Nganasan and Dolgan — a Reap-
    praisal. — Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen 39, 67—100.
S i e g l, F., R i e ß l e r, M. 2015, Uneven Steps to Literacy. The History of the
    Dolgan, Forest Enets and Kola Sámi Literary Languages. — Cultural and
    Linguistic Minorities in the Russian Federation and the European Union:
    Comparative Studies on Equality and Diversity, Heidelberg—New York
    (Multilingual Education 13), 189—230.
S t a c h o w s k i, M. 1997, Dolganische Wortbildung, Kraków.
 —— 1998, An Example of Nganasan-Dolgan Linguistic Contact. — Turkic Languages
    2, 126—129.
 —— 1999, Konsonantenadaption russischer Lehnwörter im Dolganischen, Kra-
    ków (Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia 6).
 —— 2010, On the Article-like Use of the Px2SG in Dolgan, Nganasan and Some
    Other Languages in an Areal Siberian Context. — Finnisch-Ugrische Mittei-
    lungen 32/33, 587—593.
T r u d g i l l, P. 2011 Sociolinguistic Typology. Social Determinants of Linguistic
    Complexity, Oxford—New York.
W a g n e r - N a g y, B. 2011, On the Typology of Negation in Ob-Ugric and
    Samoyedic Languages, Helsinki (MSFOu 262).
W i n f o r d, D. 2003, An Introduction to Contact Linguistics, Oxford (Language
    in Society 33).
 —— 2010, Contact and Borrowing. — The Handbook of Language Contact,
    Oxford (Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics), 170—187.
А н и к и н А. Е., Х е л и м с к и й, Е. А. 2007, Самодийско-тунгуско-маньч-
    журские лексические связы, Москва.

А р т е м ь е в Н. М. 1999, Категория падежа: системный анализ (на материале долганского и якутского языков), Санкт-Петербург.
—— 2001a, Долганский язык. Часть 1. Введение, общее вопросы, фонетика и графика, Санкт-Петербург.
—— 2001b, Долганский язык. Часть 2. Морфология, Санкт-Петербург.
—— 2010, Тунгусо-маньчжурские и долганские грамматические соответствия. — Н. М. А р т е м ь е в, Долганы. Исторические и этнокультурологические материалы, Санкт-Петербург, 98—103.
Б о л д ы р е в Б. В. 2007, Морфология эвенкийского языка, Новосибирск.
В а с и л е в и ч Г. М. 1948, Очерки диалектов эвенкийского (тунгусского) языка, Ленинград.
Д ь я ч е н к о В. И. 2008, Долганы. Краткий исторический очерк. — Тюркские народы Восточной Сибири, Москва, 340—346.
Л о п у л е н к о Н. А., А к с я н о в а Г. А. 2005, Нганасаны. Общие сведения. Происхождение и этническая история. — Народы Западной Сибири. Ханты. Мансы. Селькупы. Ненцы. Энцы. Нганасаны. Кеты, Москва, 554—556.
Р о м а н о в а А. В., М ы р е е в а А. Н., Б а р а ш к о в П. П. 1975, Взаимовлияние эвенкийского и якутского языков, Ленинград.
С о р о к и н а И. П. 2010, Энецкий язык, Санкт-Петербург.
Т е р е щ е н к о Н. М. 1973, Синтаксис самодийских языков, Ленинград.
—— 1979, Нганасанский язык, Ленинград.
У б р я т о в а Е. И. 1966, О языке долган. — Языки и фольклор народов Сибирского Севера, Москва, 41—68.
—— 1985, Язык норильских долган, Новосибирск.
—— 2006, Исследования по синтаксису якутского языка, Новосибирск (СО РАН. Избранные труды).
Х е л и м с к и й, Е. А. 1994, Нганасанские заимствования в долганском языке: к выходу в свет долганского словаря М. Стаховского. — Таймырский этнолингвистический сборник 1, Москва, 234—237.

ФЛОРИАН СИГЛ (Тромсё)

ТРИ МОРФОСИНТАКСИЧЕСКИЕ ПАРАЛЛЕЛИ В НГАНАСАНСКОМ, ЭВЕНКИЙСКОМ И ДОЛГАНСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ И ИХ ИМПЛИКАЦИИ

В представленном исследовании обсуждаются три морфосинтаксические черты нганасанского языка: отрицательный глагол 'не хотеть', дистрибуция копулы в конструкциях с предикативными существительными/прилагательными и грамматикализация послелогов направления в маркер аллативного падежа. Для этих морфосинтаксических черт в равной степени существуют параллели в двух языках, потенциально контактных с нганасанским — эвенкийском и долганском, хотя параллели возможны и в самодийских языках. Контакты в упомянутых языках уже постулировались в исследованиях по нганасанскому языку, правда, посвященных в основном лексическим заимствованиям. В статье обсуждается ситуация, когда три рассматриваемые морфосинтаксические черты являются результатом конвергенции, обусловленной языковым контактом.