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Abstract. The current article is a brief review of the Finno-Ugric substrate appellatives in the Russian dialects of the Upper Kama. Special attention is paid to the identification and differentiation of the substrate types (viz. living or extinct Finno-Ugric dialects) along with its relative chronology. A new tentative etymology is proposed for some Russian dialectal words.
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1. Introduction

It is clear that the study of Finno-Ugric influences on the lexicon of Russian dialects is valuable not only for Russian dialectology and etymology but also for historical Uralistics, because the lexicon of Finno-Ugric origin in Russian dialects (especially the northern ones) often preserves lexical shapes and meanings that are lost in modern Finno-Ugric languages (resp. dialects) or those accepted from extinct Finno-Ugric idioms.

This article is a brief review of the Finno-Ugric substrate appellatives in the Russian dialects of the Upper Kama and the first attempts at identifying and differentiating of the substrate types (viz. living or extinct Finno-Ugric dialects) along with its relative chronology. The term ‘appellative’ used as a ‘common noun’ there.

1.1. Linguistic substrate and methodology of its interpretation

The main notion of this study – linguistic substrate – is applied in the most general sense. In this sense, the linguistic substrate is “a linguistic variety or set of forms which has influenced the structure or use of a more dominant variety or language within a community”, as defined by Crystal (2008: 463). For the process preceding the extinction of a substrate idiom and the adoption of substrate features by a dominant idiom, it is necessary to add the term substrate influence
given by Aikio (2009: 9) meaning the “incorporation of linguistic features from a receding language to an expanding idiom during the course of language shift and replacement”. Particularly, the **lexical substrate influence** “is the most reliable source of information concerning the characteristics of the substrate languages”, as is stated by Saarikivi (2006: 26) and, in similar words by other scholars (for a more in-depth view mainly based on the material of the Finno-Ugric substrate in the Russian dialects, see Veenker 1967, and 1992, Vostrikov 1990, Myznikov 2004, and Saarikivi 2006).

The key principles of interpreting the lexical substrate rest upon the methods of areal linguistics. Thus, for the successful etymological interpretation of the lexical substrate, it is necessary to take into account the shape, the semantics, and the area of supposed substrate lexeme (with the involvement of information about the distribution of its accentological, phonetic, word-formative variations and derivatives). In his most notable monographs Myznikov (2004, and 2007) applied the methods of areal linguistics during the interpretation of loanwords (resp. substrate appellatives) in the northern-western Russian dialects and deduced that it is possible to differentiate three types of lexical substrate: 1) **Complete substrate** (the earliest). Recorded at a various parts of the region it could be compared with one or the other language type, but it never could be traced to certain lexical data; 2) **Incomplete substrate** (later than complete substrate). It could be compared directly to the material of living languages, although recorded outside a contact area; it represents bygone language interaction and subsequent ethnic and language assimilation; 3) **Adstrate**. Recorded in contact areas, it is the result of recent assimilation; it possesses a great intensity and a narrow area (for details see Myznikov 2004: 27).

### 1.2. A short review of previous studies

Some of the Finno-Ugric loanwords in the Russian dialects of the Upper Kama were already considered earlier in papers by Sjogren (1854), Grot (1854), Pogodin (1904), Meckelein (1914), and Kalima (1919, and 1927), but one should note that there was a lack of dialectological and etymological dictionaries before the middle of 20th century, so the aforementioned scholars developed many of their considerations under a question mark (and it is does not mean that all mistakes were avoided). In addition, substrate theory was comprehended, widely discussed, and methodologically developed only in the middle of 20th century (see e.g. Vinogradov 1956, and Veenker 1967).
Scholars who collected substrate lexicon during the field expeditions in the Upper Kama and attempted to define this lexicon include Matveev (1959, 1962, and 1964), Poljakova (1971, and 2009), Krivoščěková-Gantman (1981), and Vostrikov (1986). Particularly, Alexander Matveev collected a large amount of field data on both slopes of the Northern and Middle Urals and etymologised it rather acceptably. A lot of Finno-Ugric substrate lexemes in the Russian dialects of the Upper Kama were recorded and published only by Matveev (1959, 1962, and 1964).

Nevertheless, dialectological and etymological dictionaries of the late 20th and early 21st centuries supplied science with lots of new and unique material that requires special research (and using an integrated approach) based on the latter achievements of substrate theory.

2. Finno-Ugric substrate in the Russian dialects of the Upper Kama

The information in section 2.1. deals with the structure of population of northern Russian migrants to the Urals and the area of the Finno-Ugrians of the Upper Kama till the beginning of Russification. The information in section 2.2. deals with the present state of the Finno-Ugric substrate in the Russian dialects of the Upper Kama, is based on the author’s preliminary observations and field expeditions (Čerdynskij and Krasnovišerskij districts of Perm' krai, 2006–2010).

2.1. Historical background

Despite the fact that ancient Novgorod and Vladimir-Suzdal' druzhinas started to migrate to the Upper Kama very early, there were no constant Russian settlements until the 15th century (Oborin 1990: 61–62, and Poljakova 2009: 23, 53). After 1472, when Perm' Velikaja was annexed to Muscovy, the people of Lake Beloe, the Severnaja Dvina basin, and Vologda, Ustjug, and Vjatka and other people mainly from northern Russia were migrating to the Upper Kama (Preobraženskij 1989: 151–152, Aleksandrov 1989: 16, Oborin 1990: 72–73, and Poljakova 2009: 23–28, 53–60). Additionally, the migration of Russian (and to a lesser extent Komi-Zyrian) peasants from Pomor'e to the Urals took a spontaneous turn in the 16th–18th centuries (Preobraženskij 1989: 175, and Oborin 1990: 94, 158). Until their migration to the Urals, these northern Russian people had been interacting with the different Finno-Ugric peoples of northern Russia – with Baltic Finns, Saami, Komi-Zyrians, Nenets and apparently with some extinct
Finno-Ugric groups. (This interaction led to the extensive stratum of Finno-Ugric influence on all language subsystems of the northern Russian dialects (Veenker 1967, 1992, Vostrikov 1990, and Myznikov 2004, 2007), so the differentiation of earlier (of northern Russia) and later (of the Urals) Finno-Ugric substrate types in the Russian dialects of the Upper Kama is an individual complex problem.) Alongside this, the Russian dialects of the Upper Kama emerged from the northern Russian dialects principally.

Russian migrants had been mostly populating the Urals from the North, thus they came into contact with northern Komi-Permyaks there for the first time. Because of the difficulties faced on the way to the Upper Kama, men had been mainly going there, therefore they frequently entered into marriages with Komi-Permyaks (Poljakova 2009: 30, 60). Consequently, their children adopted phonetic, lexical and other features of Komi-Permyak at the very least, or even grew up bilingual. At the onset of the 20th century most of the northern, eastern and southern Komi-Permyaks had been Russified (Aleksandrov 1989: 25, and Oborin 1990: 46). Additionally, the influx of Russians resulted in the resettlement of autochthons inside the region, thus Komi-Permyaks from the Čerdynskij district had been resettling in the South-West and in the East to the Kosa, In'va, Obva, Jaz'va rivers (the colonizers of the last river formed the Komi-Yodzyak group (KJaD: 10–13)) (Preobraženskij 1989: 161, and Aleksandrov 1989: 21). In former times Komi-Permyak dialects were spread between Čerdyn' and Oni, near Usol'e, in the Obva, Siva, Nerdva basins, as Batalova (1975: 7–10) assumed. The Komi-Yodzyak substrate type is not widespread as Komi-Permyak or Mansi; it can be met mainly in the Russian dialects of the northern parts of the Višera (Kama's) basin as a result of late migrations inside the region (FE). There are memories from locals (recorded in the village of Akčim in the Višera Basin) about the resettlement of the Komi-Yodzyak and the Russian population of Yaz'va and tributaries to the northern part of Višera (18th–early 20th centuries) (CAS). The people of Čusovaja and Višera basins, who had originally spoken some western dialects of Mansi (Čerdyn', Ust'-Ulsuj, Čusovaja, Kungur dialects), had completely adopted Russian, or had moved away through the Urals between the 16th and late 19th centuries (Gluškov 1900: 23, 71, and Skitova 1961: 5).
2.2. The present state of Finno-Ugric substrate in Russian dialects of the Upper Kama

In the previously mentioned work of Myznikov (2004), there are some characteristics of substrate appellatives that pertain to dialectal words (based on the northern-western Russian dialectal material). Particularly, the areal criteria is one of the main criteria for identification of the type of substrate, if a substrate apppellative has a static and stable area for a long time. In addition to the time of the formation of a substrate, also the Russian dialectal array that was used as a superstrate during formatting of a substrate is important for the safety of a substrate. The most favourable conditions for the safety of a substrate are in marginal dialectal areas, because if a substrate area spreads among some large Russian dialectal continuum, a washing-out of substrate units occurs usually rather rapidly: appellative substrate lexicon that is typical for this area is not recorded in the third generation of informants; toponymy and some phonetic features remain (Myznikov 2004: 304–305).

As my preliminary observations and field expeditions illustrate, these characteristics correlate with the Finno-Ugric substrate in the modern Russian dialects of the Upper Kama – the geographical distribution of substrate appellatives coincides approximately with modern or bygone areas of the inhabitation of Finno-Ugric autochthons of the western Urals; the Finno-Ugric substrate in the Russian dialects of peripheral areas of the Upper Kama is well-alive, instead of the central/metropolitan districts of this region, where the Finno-Ugric substrate virtually lost, it generally manifests itself in the toponymy (e.g. Mansi toponymic substrate in Čusovaja basin etc. (Matveev 2011: 248)). In most of the Russian dialects of the Upper Kama, there are some phonetic features influenced by (or supported by) the Finno-Ugric languages of the Urals, for example, the pronunciation of the alveolar lateral approximant [l] (луна is for луна ‘the moon’, зеркало is for зеркало ‘a mirror’), the replacement of a voiceless velar fricative [x] by a voiceless velar plosive [k] (клеб is for хлеб ‘a bread’, комяк is for хомяк ‘a hamster’), often – the unstable pronunciation of some sounds in loanwords (батилы, бакилы are for бахилы ‘soft leather working shoes’) and much more. Russian informants from the northernmost peripheral areas of the Upper Kama preserve few quite archaic phonetic features that also could be supported by the Finno-Ugric substrate: e.g., chokanye (грибница is for грибница ‘a mushroom soup’, кунча is for кунча ‘a marten’), the pronunciation of an alveolar soft trill [ɾ] in front of velar consonants (слухарька is for
3. On differentiating and identifying Finno-Ugric substrate types

For the purpose of compiling the list of the Finno-Ugric substrate appellatives, I selected all supposed Finno-Ugric loanwords from the dictionaries of the Russian dialects of the Upper Kama (proposed by other scholars earlier and by the author for the first time); then I compared these supposed loanwords with similar lexical facts against the Russian dialectal background. If a similar lexical fact extends anywhere outside the Upper Kama in the European part of Russia, it is automatically excluded from the list of substrate appellatives. Then the supposed substrate lexeme is compared with the local toponymy of the Upper Kama and the lexical facts of the Finno-Ugric idioms (living or extinct) of the Upper Kama (Komi-Permyak language with its dialectal variations, the Komi-Yodzyak dialect, and western and northern Mansi dialects).

Now it is necessary to explain the principles of how the material is presented. The material is provided in the following order: the Russian dialectal appellative (with its accentological, phonetic, word-formative variations and derivatives); the transliteration of the Russian appellative in Latin characters (in round brackets); the translation of the appellative to English; the abbreviation of the Perm' krai district(s) (in square brackets) where this appellative was recorded (if there is a date after the abbreviation, this material taken from the Russian written monument of the Upper Kama); similar toponyms; dialectal or language belonging to the proposed Finno-Ugric etymon with its translation to English. Because of a lack of certain information about Finno-Ugric substrate (resp. extinct) idioms, Russian and Finno-Ugric lexemes being compared are separated by a tilde (instead of traditional ‘<’ mark meaning ‘borrow from’ or ‘originate from’). In order to prove the Finno-Ugric origin of the Russian lexeme, there are cognates of the Finno-Ugric etymon (or its reconstructed proto-language shape) given if possible.

New etymological decisions proposed by the author are marked by an asterisk.
3.1. (Common) Komi-Permyak substrate type


3.1.1. Northern Komi-Permyak substrate type

арт (art) ‘a reasonableness, a gumption’ [Čer] (SRNG 1: 278).
~ northern Komi-Permyak арт ‘an order’ (KPRS: 20). < Pre-Permic *arwa- ‘to understand, to think, to consider’ (KÉSK: 34).


~ northern Komi-Permyak вад ‘a forest lake (with waterlogged shores)’ (KPRS: 52), cf. Permic cognates in Komi-Zyrian dialects, вад ‘marshy, swampy place, quagmire, bog; meadow lake with still water, waterlogged shores, and a marshy bottom’ (SSKZD: 36). A more distant etymology is unclear, though there are three probable hypotheses (see details in KÈSK: 46, MSFUSZ: 46–47, Saarikivi 2006: 35).

* вачбак (vačbak) ‘a dry tinder’ [Kr] (AS 1: 113). < Komi-Permyak *vatšbaka ‘id.’, the composite from Komi-Permyak *ватш in words ватшкöп ‘an imitation of a falling tree sound’, ватшкöтны ‘to crunch, to crack (about a falling tree)’ (KPRS: 57), cf. also Komi-Zyrian (Udora dialect) вач кисьбыны ‘to crumble away, to get spilled with a noise’ (SSKZD: 40), and from Komi-Permyak *бака in words кыдз бака ‘birch tinder’, бакатшак ‘bracket fungus’ (KPRS: 24).


tal ордым, ордим ‘path, forest road; opening, a cutting (in a forest)’ (SSKZD: 260). <? (KÈSK: 207).

3.1.2. Southern Komi-Permyak substrate type


### 3.1.3. Komi-Yodzyak substrate type


* **пырóm** (*пирот*) ‘cover formed by fallen trees’ [Kr] (Krivoščêkova-Gantman 1981: 53–54, AS 4: 163). Toponymy [Kr] (Čagin 2004: 93). ~ Komi-Yodzyak *пёрм* ‘cover (shelter)’ is from Komi-Yodzyak **пёрно** ‘to drop in, to penetrate’ (KJaD: 169), and Komi-Yodzyak -о́м, the suffix of past participle (KJaD: 67–69, 73). But: cf. also Komi-Permyak **пьрóm**, participle from Komi-Permyak **пьрны** ‘to come (in, to), to drop (in, at), to enter, to go (in, into)’, ‘to get into, to climb (on, into), to penetrate’, ‘to percolate’ (KPRS: 391–392). Komi-Yodzyak **пёрно** and Komi-Permyak **пьрны** are both from common Permic *пир- ‘to drop in’ (KÈSK: 237).

**рус** (*ру́с*) ‘branches, boughs (most often – of a birch), that one binds to a layer and uses for a fishing weir’ [Kr] (Matveev 1964: 303). ~ Komi-Yodzyak **рус** ‘a small birch twig’ (KJaD: 174).

3.2. Mansi substrate type


* тума́н (tuman) ‘lake’ [Kr] (AS 6: 48). ~ northern Mansi tumən (Matveev 1959: 75), Mansi (Middle and Low Loz'va, Pelym, northern dialects) tumēn, Mansi (Konda dialect) tumēn, tumēn ‘lake with running (flowing) water’ (WW: 679).


юкора (jukora) ‘overturned tree with roots’ [Al] (Matveev 1959: 80). ~ Mansi (Middle Loz'va, northern dialects) jekwər, Mansi (Pelym dialect) jəkwə, Mansi (Konda dialect) jekur ‘a root, a butt (a butt length)’ (ibid.).

4. Conclusions

The current list of the Finno-Ugric substrate lexemes in the Russian dialects of the Upper Kama is not exhaustive, but one can make some preliminary statements. The most significant lexical substrate is Komi-Permyak; it appears all over the Upper Kama and in all thematic groups of vocabulary. Moreover, northern and southern Komi-Permyaks had been separated geographically until Russification (after the Perm' Velikaja downfall), and this led to the development of innovations or maintenance of archaic language features within the dialectal (northern and southern) groups (Lytkin 1962: 26–27). Thus, Komi-Permyak балянянь, баляняня ‘honesuckle’ is a northern Komi-Permyak innovation (see above in section 3.1.1). At the same
time in southern Komi-Permyak dialects and in Komi-Zyrian dialects the native Permic lexeme ыжман is used to denote the word ‘honey-suckle’ (see above in section 3.1.2). Both words remain in the Komi-Permyak substrate in the Russian dialects of the Upper Kama, and besides variations of the баланьня lexeme form a clear and narrow area in the northernmost area of the Perm' krai, while Russian reflexes of the lexeme ыжман is spread evenly in the central parts of the Upper Kama, where southern Komi-Permyak dialects had been prevailing (Batalova 1975: 5–10). However, during the analysis of most of the Komi-Permyak substrate lexemes, it was hard to differentiate the northern and southern Komi-Permyak influence.

In complying to the substrate types suggested by Myznikov (see above in 1.1) there are three Finno-Ugric substrate types in the Russian dialects of the Upper Kama: a) the incomplete Komi-Permyak substrate: most often it could be compared to the material of modern Komi-Permyak dialects, but it is possible to outline an area of a specific (and, probably earlier) substrate type within the northern Komi-Permyak substrate type. Spreading in the Čerdynskij and Krasnovišerskij districts, until the Russian colonization this area likely had been settled by some Komi tribes whose dialect was transitional between northern Komi-Permyak dialects and southern Komi-Zyrian dialects (of the Upper Vyčegda and of the Upper Pečora); b) the incomplete (tending to complete) Mansi substrate: it could be compared with one or the other Mansi dialect, but it rarely could be traced to certain Mansi lexemes. Substrate Ust'-Ulsuj and Čerdyn' Mansi dialects (the same as Čusovaja and Kungur dialects) were closely related to the western Mansi dialects that is to Pelym, Middle Loz'va and Lower Loz'va dialects (Kannisto 1913–1918: 17, Pápay 1906: 367–368); c) the Komi-Yodzyak adstrate: it appears in the Russian dialects in a territory wider than the area of modern Komi-Yodzyak, evidently because of the inter-dialectal nature of hunting terminology (see the concepts in section 3.1.3).

Of course, adequate areal conclusions are hindered by the incomplete study of the dialectal lexicon of the Finno-Ugrians of the Urals, and the resulting uneven representation of this lexicon in Finno-Ugric dialectal dictionaries. Nevertheless, etymological analysis of Finno-Ugric substrate lexemes in the Russian dialects allows us to trace bygone areas of substrate Finno-Ugric idioms (e.g., Komi-Permyak in Čerdynskij, Krasnovišerskij, Solikamskij, Usol'skij, Dobrjanskij, Karagajskij, Il'inskij, Permskij, Oxanskij, Kungurskij districts, Mansi in Krasnovišerskij, Aleksandrovskij, Lys'venskij, Čusovskoj districts), reconstruct lost (or modified) forms in the Finno-Ugric lexicon; specify the details of the semantics, and recover the
lexical data that is not marked by Finno-Ugric dictionaries (e.g., Komi-Permyak *serd, *vatšbaka, *kidas) etc.
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