

Kur-Urmi (Kili) in a perspective of small-scale mixed languages

Natalia Stoynova
(University of Hamburg)

Key words: Tungusic, Kur-Urmi, Kili, small-scale mixed languages, contact among genetically related languages

Mixed varieties based on genetically related languages, referred to here as ‘small-scale mixed languages’, are rarely mentioned in a general discussion on mixed languages, although they seem to be widespread. For instance, in the volume Mazzoli & Sippola (2021) focusing on non-prototypical mixed languages, two such cases are addressed.

→ Small-scale mixed languages are reported to lack an important characteristic of mixed languages, i.e. clear borders between source language_A elements and source language_B elements.

→ For small-scale mixed languages (as for other outcomes of language contact between close languages, see Epps et al. 2013), it is technically hard to differentiate between elements of source language_A vs. source language_B.

→ Many small-scale mixed languages belong to “blended languages”, i.e. unstable varieties emerging in bilingual border areas, which are in uninterrupted contact with both source languages. Bakker (2017:227) mentions them among challenging cases going beyond the core of mixed languages.

→ The picture observed in small-scale mixed languages is similar to or even diachronically related to a specific type of code-switching attested for closely related languages, i.e. congruent lexicalization in terms of Muysken (2000), see this claim for Tojol-ab’al (Mayan) in Law (2017).

I address these claims with data of Kur-Urmi (Kili), an under-described Tungusic language. Earlier, it was attributed as a dialect of Nanai (Sunik 1958). In recent papers, it is mentioned as a separate language manifesting features of two branches of Tungusic, i.e. combining the Nanaic morphosyntax with the Ewenic lexicon (see Janhunen 2024:10).

Classifications of Tungusic give controversial results for Kur-Urmi (Nanaic in Whaley & Oskolskaya 2020, Ewenic in Kazama 2003, Jurchenic in Oskolskaya et al. 2022). A problematic attribution of Kur-Urmi is discussed in Sunik (1948), Doerfer (1973, 1975, 1984), Hözl (2017).

This paper considers:

→ Nanaic vs. Ewenic elements in the Kur-Urmi basic vocabulary. Not only presence/absence of a cognate in Nanaic vs. Ewenic, but also sound correspondences will be taken into account. The preliminary results argue for a mixed lexicon (27% shared with both Nanaic and Ewenic, 32% shared with Nanaic, 21% shared with Ewenic; 20% specific).

→ The inventory of morphological markers. Most of them are common for Nanaic and Ewenic or specific for Nanaic, but several ones are Ewenic.

→ Grammatical structures. Several domains showing a complicated picture will be discussed: negative, spatial, and comparative constructions.

The main data come from the Kur-Urmi dictionary (Sunik 1958) and corpus (2020).

Acknowledgments

* This publication has been produced in the context of the joint research funding of the German Federal Government and Federal States in the Academies’ Programme, with funding from the

Federal Ministry of Education and Research and the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg. The Academies' Programme is coordinated by the Union of the German Academies of Sciences and Humanities.

References

Bakker, Peter. 2017. Typology of mixed languages. In: Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & R.M.W. Dixon (eds.). *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic typology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. P. 217–253.

Doerfer, Gerhard. 1973. Das Kur-Urmiische und seine Verwandten. *Zentralasiatische Studien*, 7. P. 567–599.

Doerfer, Gerhard. 1975. Ist Kur-Urmiisch ein nanaischer Dialekt? *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, 47. P. 51–63.

Doerfer, Gerhard. 1984. Die Körperteilbezeichnungen des Kili (Ein Beitrag zur Frage der dialektologischen Klassifikation). *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények*, 86. P. 238–246.

Epps, Patience, John Huehnergard & Na'ama Pat-El. 2013. Journal of Language Contact, 6. A special issue: *Contact among genetically related languages*. <https://doi.org/10.1163/19552629-00602012>.

Hölzl, Andreas. 2017. *Kilen: Synchronic and diachronic profile of a mixed language*. Paper presented at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, 24th LIPP Symposium, Munich, June 21–23, 2017, Language in Contact: Yesterday – Today – Tomorrow.

Janhunen, Juha. 2024. Tungusic as a language family. In: Vovin, A., Alonso de la Fuente, J.A., and J. Janhunen (eds.). *The Tungusic Languages*. London: Routledge. P. 1–19.

Kazama, Shinjirō. 2003. *Basic vocabulary (A) of Tungusic languages*. Kyōto: Nakanishi Printing.

Kur-Urmi corpus 2020 – Yegorova, Anastassiya, Gusev, Valentin, Elena Kalinina, et al. 2020. A corpus of Kur-Urmi Nanai, http://nanai.web-corpora.net/nanai_kur_urmi_corpus/search (Accessed on 08.01.2024).

Law, Danny. 2017. Language mixing and genetic similarity. *Diachronica*, 34. P. 40–78. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dia.34.1.02law>

Mazzoli, Maria, and Eeva Sippola (eds.). 2021. *New Perspectives on Mixed Languages: From Core to Fringe*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501511257>.

Muysken, Pieter. 2000. *Bilingual speech: a typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oskolskaya, Sofia, Ezequiel Koile, & Martine Robbeets. 2022. A Bayesian approach to the classification of Tungusic languages. *Diachronica*, 39(1). P. 128–158. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dia.20010.osk>.

Sunik, Orest P. 1948. O jazyke nanajcev na r. Kure [On the language of the Nanai on the river Kur]. *Izvestija AN SSSR, Otdelenie literatury i jazyka*, 7 (6). P. 537–551.

Sunik, Orest P. 1958. *Kur-urmijskij dialect: Issledovaniya i materialy po nanajskomu jazyku* [The Kur-Urmi dialect: Studies and materials on the Nanai language]. Leningrad: Učpedgiz.

Whaley, Lindsay J. & Sofia Oskolskaya. 2020. The classification of the Tungusic languages. In: Robbeets, Martine, Saveliev, Alexander, and Natalia Hübner. (eds.). *The Oxford Guide to the Transeurasian Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. P. 81–91.