Adverbial clauses with Russian conjunctions in three languages of Russia: a morphosyntactic congruence perspective

In this paper, we will discuss adverbial clauses with Russian conjunctions in three languages of Russia: Nanai (Southern Tungusic < Tungusic), Forest Enets (Samoyedic < Uralic), and Hill Mari (Finno-Ugric < Uralic), cf. (1). Table 1 presents Russian subordinators attested in the spoken corpora of the considered languages and shows the percentages of adverbial clauses with each Russian subordinator out of all clauses of the corresponding semantic type.

(1) **jeslʲi** *čǝdǝn* *ȃl-at* *gǝnʲǝ*
     if.R few be-NPST.2SG if
     '**If** there are few people, {there is simply only one game}.' (Hill Mari)

Table 1. Russian conjunctions in adverbial clauses
(% of clauses with RusConj [with RusConj | without RusConj]

	Nanai		Forest Enets		Hill Mari	
jesli 'if'	15,71%	[30 | 161]	5,29%	[28 | 501]	49,1%	[82 | 85]
kogda 'when'	5,23%	[17 | 308]	2,87%	[16 | 542]	0%	[0 | 277]
čtoby 'in order to'	1,14%	[2 | 174]	47,06%	[64 | 72]	51,06%	[48 | 46]
poka 'while'	14,29%	[4 | 24]	10,6%	[16 | 135]	77,42%	[24 | 7]
potomu čto 'because'	33,33%	[2 | 4]	94,44%	[17 | 1]	96,97%	[32 | 1]
poka + NEG 'until'	25%	[2 | 6]	75%	[6 | 2]	72,73%	[8 | 3]
xotja 'although'	0%	[0 | 2]	0%	[0 | 5]	35,29%	[6 | 11]
total	7,74%	[57 | 679]	10,46%	[147 | 1258]	31,75%	[200 | 430]

Some cross-linguistic generalizations on the borrowability of subordinating conjunctions appealing to their semantics and pragmatics have been formulated in the literature, cf. the hierarchies of borrowability by Matras (2007: 56) and Grant (2012) (see also Forker, Grenoble 2021 on Russian conjunctions in languages of Russia).

In this paper, we will focus not on semantic factors regulating the use of non-native subordinators, but on morphosyntactic ones. Table 1 shows that the sets of Russian conjunctions used in the languages in question are more or less the same, but the relative frequencies of these conjunctions are very different. We will explain the attested frequency asymmetries appealing to the congruence vs. incongruence between native subordination strategies used in the recipient language vs. those of the donor language (Russian) (cf., e.g., Weinreich 1953: 25; Harris, Campbell 1995: 123–125; Aikhenvald 2007: 32; Sebba 2009 on morphosyntactic congruence, or structural compatibility, between the grammars of contacting languages as a factor responsible for constraints on pattern borrowing and code-switching).

For each semantic type of adverbial clauses, we will assess the degree of morphosyntactic congruence based on: a) finiteness vs. non-finiteness of the adverbial clause, b) presence/absence of a conjunction-strategy; and c) if a conjunction is used, its linear position.

The general tendencies are as follows. On the one hand, Russian conjunctions are avoided when full congruence takes place. This explains, e.g., the absence of the Russian *kogda* 'when' in Hill Mari: the Hill Mari temporal clause is a finite clause with a preposed conjunction, as in Russian. On the other hand, Russian conjunctions are also avoided when full incongruence takes place. This explains, e.g., why the Russian *čtoby* 'in order to' is infrequent in Nanai, where purpose clauses are encoded by a dedicated purposive converb with no native conjunctions.

We will also discuss the cases of "incongruence overcoming". These are, e.g., doubling, when both the indigenous conjunction and the Russian one are used in the same clause (as in (1)), and the use of finite verbal forms (as in Russian) in the adverbial clauses that are normally non-finite.

Corpora (oral spontaneous text collections)
- Nanai — ca. 40 000 tokens, collected by S. Oskolskaya and N. Stoynova in Khabarovsk Krai (2011–2017);
- Forest Enets — ca. 75 000 tokens, collected by O. Khanina and A. Shluinsky in the Taimyr peninsula (2009–2012);
- Hill Mari (http://hillmari-exp.tilda.ws/corpus) — ca. 63 500 tokens, collected by the Lomonosov Moscow State University team (2016–2018).

Abbreviations
2 — 2nd person, NPST — non-past tense, R — Russian, SG — singular.

References

Aikhenvald A. Y. 2007. Grammars in Contact: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective // *Aikhenvald A. Y., Dixon R. M. W.* (eds.). Grammars in Contact. A Cross-Linguistic Typology. Oxford: Oxford University Press. P. 1–66.

Forker D., Grenoble L. 2021. Some structural similarities in the outcomes of language contact with Russian // *Forker D., Grenoble L.* (eds.). Language contact in the territory of the former Soviet Union. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. P. 259–287.

Grant A. 2012. Contact, convergence, and conjunctions: a cross-linguistic study of borrowing correlations among certain kinds of discourse, phasal adverbial, and dependent clause markers // *Chamoreau C., Léglise I.* (eds.). Dynamics of Contact-Induced Language Change. New York/Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. P. 311–358.

Harris A., Campbell L. 1995. Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matras Y. 2007. The borrowability of structural categories // Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective. // *Matras Y., Sakel J.* (eds.). New York/Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. P. 15–29.

Sebba M. 2009. On the notions of congruence and convergence in code-switching // *Bullock B.E., Toribio A.* (eds.). The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-switching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weinreich U. 1953. Languages in contact. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.