

FINNO-UGRIC SUBSTRATE APPELLATIVES IN RUSSIAN DIALECTS OF THE UPPER KAMA

Roman Gaidamaško

Institute for Linguistic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences

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.

Keywords: Upper Kama, Finno-Ugric substrate appellatives, Russian dialects

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2013.4.2.11>

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), Krivoščekova-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' družinas 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 appellative 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’, *зерькало* 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 *хозяк* ‘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., *чокanye* (*грибнича* is for *грибница* ‘a mushroom soup’, *кунича* is for *куница* ‘a marten’), the pronunciation of an alveolar soft trill [r^l] in front of velar consonants (*глухарька* is for

глухарка ‘a wood grouse hen’, *четверьг* is for *четверг* ‘Thursday’) etc. (FE, SGSRP, AS, CAS, SPG, SGTP, SRGSP, and CSRGSP).

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' kraï 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

вежáнь (*vežan'*), *вежáнья*, *вежáня*, *вежáнька*, *везáнька* ‘a god-mother’ [Kos, Jur] (SRGKP: 59). ~ Komi-Permyak obsolete *вежáнь* ‘id.’ (KPRS: 60). < common Permic **veža* ‘holy, sanctified, sacred’, and **an'v* ‘a woman’ (KÈSK: 32–33, 50).

* *козóль* (*kozol'*) pl. ‘fresh red spruce shoots’ [Jur] (SPG 1: 401, SRGKP: 122). ~ Komi-Permyak (Коčëvo idiom) *козóль* ‘spring spruce shoots’ (KPRS: 178), or Komi-Permyak *кóз голи* ‘a spruce cone’ (KPRS: 191). ~ Komi-Zyrian *коз коль* ‘id.’ (KRK: 277, SSKZD: 162).

* *ни́ндуль* (*nindul'*), *ми́ндуль*, *пи́ндуль* ‘*Russula foetens*’ [Gajn, Jur, Ox] (Matveev 1964: 300, SRNG 18: 167, SRGKP: 149, CSRGSP). ~ Komi-Permyak *ни́ндуль* ‘id.’ (KPRS: 274), the composite from Komi-Permyak *нин* ‘a bast’, and Komi-Permyak *дуль* ‘a saliva’ (Merkuševa 2003: 9–10).

сopд (*sord*) [Sol 1641], *сëpд* [Kos] ‘a grove’ (SLPP 2: 269, SGTP: 407). Тoponymy [Čer, Gajn, Коč, Kos] (Čagin 2004: 76, SGTP: 358). ~ Komi-Permyak (Коčëvo idiom), Komi-Yodzyak *s'ord* ‘back part of an area (a plank bed, a field)’ (KÈSK: 253). Or: < Komi-Permyak **serd* (not recorded by the Komi-Permyak dictionaries). < common Permic **serd* (for the details about the development of Komi *ó/ę* from common Permic **ε*, see KÈSK: 23). > Komi-Zyrian (Vyčegda (Upper and Lower), Syktyvkar dialects) *сëpд* ‘a spruce forest in a low-lying place’ (SSKZD: 334).

* *ýмpа* (*umra*), *мýмpа*, *мы́мpа* ‘*Heracleum sphondylium*’, ‘*Angelica archangelica*’, ‘*Angelica sylvestris*’ [Čer, Kr, Kos, Jur, Kar, Il] (SPG 2: 475, SRGKP: 152–153, AS 6: 76, CSRGSP). ~ Komi-Permyak *умpа*, northern Komi-Permyak *омpа* ‘*Angelica*’ (KPRS: 293, 513). ~ Komi-Zyrian dialectal *омpа*, *омpа гум*, *умpа*, *умpа гум* ‘id.’ (SSKZD: 299). < Pre-Permic **umbra-* (KÈSK: 205).

* *чечу́ля* (*čečulja*), *чичу́ля* ‘a hunk of bread or a pie’ [Čer, Kr, Sol, Jur] (SPG 2: 530, SRGKP: 259, AS 6: 194–195, CSRGSP). ~? Komi-Permyak child's *чэчы*, *чöчы* ‘something tasty, sweet’ (KPRS: 534, 543). ~ Komi-Zyrian dialectal *чечуль* ‘a hunk’, ‘a lump’ (KRK: 698), Komi-Zyrian (Upper Sysola dialect) *чечулялны* ‘to crumb (a bread)’ (SSKZD: 409).

шop (*šor*) ‘a brook’ [Sol 1623, Čer 18th, Jus, Kud] (SPP 6: 128, SGTP: 404), (?) *шóры* ‘any wet place’ [Čer] (CSRGSP). Тoponymy [Čer, Kud] (SGTP: 404). ~ Komi-Permyak *шop* ‘a brook’, Komi-Permyak (Usol'e dialect) ‘a source, a spring’ (KPRS: 565). < common Permic **šor* ‘a brook, a stream, a current, a river’ (KÈSK: 322).

шутем (*šutem*) [Čer 1626, Kun 1706, Čer 18th], *шутём*, *шутёма*, *шутёмина*, *шутóмина*, *шутёминка*, *шутёмчик*, *шутьмó*, *шутьмá* pl., *шутьмы́* pl. [all over] ‘an abandoned field overgrown by grass and bushes’, *шутёмный* [Sol 17th, all over], *зашутметь* ‘to be overgrown (about a field)’ [Gajn] (SPP 6: 130, Matveev 1959: 40, Matveev 1964: 309–310, SGSRP: 699, Krivoščekova-Gantman 1981: 58, SPG 2: 445, 564, SRGKP: 244, SGTP: 405–406, AS 6: 243, CSRNG, CSRNGSP). Toponymy [Čer, Sol, Il, Per, Ber, Kiš] (Čagin 2004: 79, 82, 84–85, 87, SGTP: 407). ~ Komi-Permyak *шутём* ‘fallow land, uncultivated land’ (KPRS: 573), cf. also Komi-Permyak *сютём* ‘without grain, crops’, ‘a place that is not sowed’ (Krivoščekova-Gantman 1981: 58), Komi-Zyrian (Sysola, Luza dialects) *шутьём* ‘uncultivated land, fallow land; a cleared forest area’ (SSKZD: 438). The absence of Finno-Ugric cognates proved a problem for identifying loanword direction, Russian < or > Komi (Kalima 1927: 50–51, SW: 268), but Poljakova in (SGTP: 406) resolved this problem in favor of a Komi origin of Russian lexemes in view of Komi-Zyrian *шутны* ‘to sour, to ferment’ from common Permianic **šut-* (KÈSK: 324–325). This hypothesis has indirect evidence in the Russian lexeme finale *-ём* that is analogous to widespread Komi suffixes *-ём/-ёма*, *-эм/-эма* (Kövesi 1965: 212–239). The connection of Russian *шутём* and Hungarian *sütni* ‘to burn’, supposed by Vostrikov (1986: 75), is inaccurate because this etymological decision discounts the time of the appearance of Russians on the Urals.

яг (*jag*) ‘a forest’ [Kos, Dob] (SGTP: 407). Toponymy [Jus, Kud] (ibid.). ~ Komi-Permyak *яг* ‘a young pine forest; a fir tree forest’ (KPRS: 592). < common Permianic **jag* ‘a pine forest’ (KÈSK: 337).

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-Permianic **arwa-* ‘to understand, to think, to consider’ (KÈSK: 34).

балебан (*baleban*), *балеван* ‘*Lonicera caerulea*’ [Gajn] (SRGSP: 52). ~ northern Komi-Permyak *балянянь*, Komi-Permyak (Levičanskoe idiom) *баляняня* ‘id.’ (KPRS: 25). Northern Komi-Permyak innovation (Fedoseeva 2002: 96–97).

быглян (*bygljan*) ‘a small wooden cylinder used as a toy’ [Gajn] (SRGSP: 174). ~ northern Komi-Permyak *быглян* ‘a ball; something round’ (KPRS: 48). < common Permianic **büg-*, **bügil-* ‘ball, spherical’ (KÈSK: 43).

вад (*vad*) ‘a lake’ [Kos] (SGTP: 53, SRGSP: 181). Toponymy [Čer, Gajn, Kos] (Krivoščekova-Gantman 1974: 31; SGTP: 53).

~ 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).

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

вэжур (*vežur*) ‘a russule’ [Gajn] (SRGSP: 197). ~ Komi-Permyak *везьюр* ‘chanterelle’ (KPRS: 61). < Pre-Permic **wišz-* ‘green, yellow’, and **jüre* ‘root’, ‘head’ (KÈSK: 49, 335).

вишьяны (*viš'jany*) ‘homespun trousers’ [Čer] (SRGSP: 245). ~ Komi-Permyak *вешьян*, *вешьян* ‘trousers, pants’ (KPRS: 69).

кидас (*kidas*), *кідос*, *кідус*, *кидáчча* ‘a hybrid of a marten and a sable’ [Čer, Kr] (SRNG 13: 198, 200, AS 2: 41, SPG 1: 388, CSRGSP). ~ Komi-Permyak **kidas*. Permic cognates manifested in Komi-Yodzyak *кидас* ‘id.’ (KJaD: 125), and in literary Komi-Zyrian *кидас* (KRK: 267), Komi-Zyrian (Pečora, Upper Vyčegda dialects) *кидöс* ‘id.’ (SSKZD: 154). Komi words are from the base *кид-*, as in Komi-Zyrian *кид* ‘untamed, running away from human (said about animals)’, ‘a shy, unsociable person’, and from derivational suffixes *-as*, *-es/-es* (Hausenberg 1972: 47–48).

киль (*kil'*) ‘onion peel’ [Gajn] (Matveev 1964: 294, CSRGSP). ~ Komi-Permyak *киль* (*киль-*) ‘a peel, husks’, ‘a dandruff’ (KPRS: 173). < Pre-Permic **kvl'z-* ‘film (a pellicle), dandruff’ (KÈSK: 124).

оль (*ol'*), *олёк*, *олина* ‘a low sparse forest, more frequently – a coniferous forest (of a spruce, fir tree), infrequently – a birch forest in low wet places’, *олеватый*, *олистый* [Čer, Kr] (Matveev 1959: 32, Matveev 1964: 300, CSRGSP). Toponymy [Čer] (Matveev 1959: 32). ~ Komi-Permyak *оль* ‘a birch-spruce forest on waterlogged hummocky low places’, ‘wet, marshy place’ (KPRS: 292), cf. Permic cognates in Komi-Zyrian dialects, *оль*, *ольвыв*, *ольтас* ‘a wet herbaceous place with a low forest’ (SSKZD: 259).

урдым (*urđym*), *урдымóк* ‘narrow forest road for removal of woods’ [Čer] (SGTP: 385–386, CSRGSP). Toponymy [Sol] (Čagin 2004: 86). <? Komi-Permyak **урдым/ордым*. ~ Komi-Zyrian dialect-

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

3.1.2. Southern Komi-Permyak substrate type

буждом (*buždom*) ‘slope on a riverside’ [Kud] (SGTP: 44). Toponymy [Коџ, Kos, Kud] (Krivoščekova-Gantman 1974: 30, SGTP: 44). ~ Komi-Permyak participle *буждом* ‘landslip, scree’ (KPRS: 44). < common Komi **buž-* ‘to crumble away’ (KĚSK: 41–42).

* *бурган* (*burgan*) ‘hole in a gully where water falls’ [II] (SPG 1: 66). Toponymy [Gajн, Коџ, Jus, Kud, Kar] (GNVP: 69). ~ Komi-Permyak participle *борган* ‘purling faintly’, ‘a place of a stream falling; a purling cascade (in a small river)’ (KPRS: 37). < Komi-Permyak *боргыны* ‘to flow with a noise; to run with a purl (about a water)’ (ibid.).

вабергач (*vabergač*) ‘whirlpool in a river’ [Kud] (SGTP: 53). ~ Komi-Permyak *вабергач* ‘id.’ (KPRS: 52) is from Komi-Permyak *ва* ‘water’, ‘river’, ‘wet, damp; moist’ (ibid.), and Komi-Permyak *бергавны* ‘to revolve, to spin, to whirl’, ‘to go round, to turn round and round’ (KPRS: 28). < common Permian **berg-* (KĚSK: 38–39).

вож (*vož*) ‘low place near a river’ [Dob] (SGTP: 68–69). Toponymy [Gajн, Us, Dob, Kud, II, Ver] (GNVP: 66, 128, 131, Čagin 2004: 76, SGTP: 68–69). ~ Komi-Permyak *вож* ‘tributary’ (KPRS: 77). < Pre-Permian **woša-* ‘fork (a branching)’ (KĚSK: 60).

жман (*žman*), *ижман*, *ижуман*, *ужман*, *южман* ‘*Lonicera caerulea*’ [Sol, Kar, Jur] (Matveev 1964: 293, SRNG 12: 80, Krivoščekova-Gantman 1981: 54, SPG 1: 344, CSRGSP). ~ Komi-Permyak *ыжман*, Komi-Permyak (Ošib idiom) *ижман* ‘*Lonicera caerulea* (bushes and berries)’ (KPRS: 153, 578). ~ Komi-Zyrian *ыжман*, *ыжнёнъ* ‘*Lonicera caerulea*’ (SSKZD: 443). <? (KĚSK: 328–329).

* *зыля* (*zylja*), *зылька*, *зырька* ‘frozen cow's dropping, piece of horse dung’ [Jur] (SRGKP: 110, 183). ~ Komi-Permyak *зыля* ‘a lump of a frozen horse dung’ (DXPJa: 100).

кушка (*kuška*) ‘meadow, glade (a clearing)’ [Sol] (SPG 1: 458, SGTP: 187). ~ Komi-Permyak *куш* ‘naked; bare’, ‘bald’, cf. also Komi-Permyak *кушин* ‘bald patch, treeless place; hewn space, clearing’ (KPRS: 206–207). < Pre-Permian **kušz-* ‘naked’ (KĚSK: 148).

октас (*oktas*) ‘forest area cleared for an arable land; slash and burn clearing’ [Kud] (SGTP: 245–246). ~ Komi-Permyak *октас* ‘id.’ (KPRS: 292). < Pre-Permian **äktz-* (KĚSK: 204).

* *ты́на* (*tupa*) ‘owl’ [Kar] (SPG 2: 454). ~ Komi-Permyak *ты́нка* ‘owl; eagle-owl’ (KPRS: 493). < common Komi **tup-* ‘dishevelled, fluffed’, ‘head of hair’, ‘bunch (e.g., of hair)’ (KÈSK: 286–287).

тыво́к (*tyvok*) ‘wet, low, hummocky place’ [Kud] (SGTP: 379). ~ Komi-Permyak *ты* ‘a lake’ (KPRS: 499). < common Permianic **ti* ‘id.’ (KÈSK: 292).

3.1.3. Komi-Yodzyak substrate type

вачка́н (*vačkan*) ‘Coturnix coturnix’ [Čer] (Matveev 1959: 22, Matveev 1964: 289). ~ Komi-Yodzyak *вочка́н* ‘Turdus’ (KJaD: 102). < Pre-Permianic **wzčz-* ‘species of bird’ (KÈSK: 48).

гурка́н (*gurkan*), *курга́н* ‘hind part of an elk back; pelvis’ [Čer, Kr] (Matveev 1959: 23; Matveev 1964: 291). ~ Komi-Yodzyak *зөрк* ‘cavity of a body, trunk, interiority’ (KJaD: 108). < common Permianic **gürk* ‘interiority, cavity’ (KÈSK: 85).

кой (*koj*), *коёк* ‘hunter’s shovel’ [Čer, Kr, Čus] (Matveev 1959: 25, Matveev 1964: 294, Krivoščekova-Gantman 1981: 53, AS 2: 30). ~ Komi-Yodzyak *кой*, *көйөк* ‘id.’ (KJaD: 127). < common Permianic **koj* ‘spade (shovel)’ (KÈSK: 128). Komi-Yodzyak *көйөк*, judging by its finale, is the reverse loanword from Russian.

* *пыро́м* (*pyrom*) ‘cover formed by fallen trees’ [Kr] (Krivoščekova-Gantman 1981: 53–54, AS 4: 163). Toponymy [Kr] (Čagin 2004: 93). ~ Komi-Yodzyak **nөрөм* ‘cover (shelter)’ is from Komi-Yodzyak *nөрнө* ‘to drop in, to penetrate’ (KJaD: 169), and Komi-Yodzyak *-өм*, the suffix of past participle (KJaD: 67–69, 73). But: cf. also Komi-Permyak *пырө́м*, participle from Komi-Permyak *пырны* ‘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 *nөрнө* and Komi-Permyak *пырны* are both from common Permianic **pir-* ‘to drop in’ (KÈSK: 237).

рус (*rus*) ‘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).

чурк (*čurk*), *чуро́к*, *чурочек* ‘coastal rock’, *чурко́вый*, *чуро́шный* [Čer, Kr, Kud] (Krivoščekova-Gantman 1981: 51, SGTP: 402, AS 6: 210–211, CSRNG, CSRGSP). Toponymy [Kr] (Čagin 2004: 90, 94, SGTP: 402). ~ Komi-Yodzyak *ч’урк* ‘wooded hill, rising ground’ (KJaD: 197). < common Permianic **č’urk* (KÈSK: 314).

3.2. Mansi substrate type

* *ëxala* (*ëxala*) ‘dried fish’ [Lys] (SPG 1: 251). ~ Mansi (Pelym dialect) *joχäl* (Matveev 1959: 59), northern Mansi *joχäl*, Mansi (Middle Loz'va dialect) *jâχel*, *joχlä*, *jâχlä* ‘id.’ (WW: 164).

кулун (*kulup*) ‘hunting net on a sable’ [Al, Čus] (Matveev 1959: 63). ~ Mansi (Pelym dialect) *khulp* (ibid.), northern Mansi *χülëp*, *χülp*, Mansi (Middle Loz'va dialect) *khulp*, *khulëp*, *khülp*, Mansi (Pelym dialect) *khulëp*, *khulp* ‘fishing net, trap’ (WW: 119).

рын (*ryp*) ‘scarred knag on a tree’, *рынной*, *рыновыӱ* [Kr] (Matveev 1959: 71, AS 5: 40). ~ Mansi (Middle Loz'va, Pelym and northern dialects) *rëpës* ‘swirl (on a birch)’ (WW: 449).

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

* *урот* (*urot*), *уротина* ‘a valley between mountains’ [Kr] (Matveev 1959: 77, SGTP: 386). Топонимы [Kr] (Matveev 1959: 77). ~ northern Mansi *ur-vāta*, Mansi (Middle Loz'va dialect) *ur-vəṭ* ‘slope of a hill’ (WW: 701). Or: ~ western Mansi **urətt* ‘in the middle of mountains’ is from Mansi *ur* ‘flat-topped mountain, rising ground, long ridge’, and Mansi *-ətt*, the suffix of the plural locative case for hard consonant stems (Veenker 1969: 57, Rombandeeva 1973: 39–40).

юкора (*jukora*) ‘overturned tree with roots’ [Al] (Matveev 1959: 80). ~ Mansi (Middle Loz'va, northern dialects) *jeekwər*, Mansi (Pelym dialect) *jəkwər*, Mansi (Konda dialect) *jeekur* ‘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* ‘honeysuckle’ 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 remains in the Komi-Permyak substrate in the Russian dialects of the Upper Kama, and besides variations of the *баляняня* 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, an 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 **sęrd*, **vatšbaka*, **kidas*) etc.

Acknowledgements

The study was supported by the Russian Humanities Scientific Fund project no 13-34-01-018. The author thanks Aliide Naylor for editing the English in the first version of the article, and the two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments.

Address

Roman Gaidamaško
Institute for Linguistic Studies of the Russian Academy of
Sciences
Tučkov per. 9
199053 Saint Petersburg, Russia
E-mail: gaidamashko@gmail.com

Abbreviations of Perm' kraj districts

Al – Aleksandrovskij; **Ber** – Berėzovskij; **Čer** – Čerdynskij; **Čus** – Čusovskoj; **Dob** – Dobrjanskij; **Gajn** – Gajnskij; **Il** – Il'inskij; **Jur** – Jurlinskij; **Jus** – Jus'vinskij; **Kar** – Karagajskij; **Kiš** – Kišertskij; **Koč** – Kočėvskij; **Kos** – Kosinskij; **Kr** – Krasnoviřerskij; **Kud** – Kudymkarskij; **Kun** – Kungurskij; **Lys** – Lys'venskij; **Ox** – Oxanskij; **Per** – Permskij; **Sol** – Solikamskij; **Us** – Usol'skij; **Ver** – Vereščaginskij.

References

- Aikio, Ante (2009) *The Saami loanwords in Finnish and Karelian*. Academic dissertation. Oulu: University of Oulu.
- Aleksandrov, V. A., ed. (1989) *Na putjax iz Zemli Permskoj v Sibir'*. Moscow: Nauka.
- AS = Skitova, F. L., ed. (1984–2011) *Slovar' govora d. Akčim Krasnoviřerskogo rajona Permskoj oblasti (Akčimskij slovar')* 1–6. Perm': Izdatel'stvo Permskogo universiteta.
- Batalova, R. M. (1975) *Komi-permjackaja dialektologija*. Moscow: Nauka.

- CAS = Card-file of “*Slovar’ govora d. Akčim Krasnovišerskogo rajona Permskoj oblasti (Akčimskij slovar’)*” (stored at the Department of General and Slavic Linguistics of the Perm State National Research University).
- Čagin, G. N. (2004) *Perm’ Velikaja v toponimičeskix dokazatel’stvax*. Perm’: Izdatel’stvo Permskogo universiteta.
- Crystal, David (2008) *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. 6th ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- CSRGSP = Card-file of “*Slovar’ russkix govorov severa Permskogo kraja*” (stored at the Department of General and Slavic Linguistics of the Perm State National Research University).
- CSRNG = Card-file of “*Slovar’ russkix narodnyx govorov*” (stored at the Institute for the Linguistic Studies of Russian Academy of Sciences).
- DXPJa = Lytkin, V. I. (1955) *Dialektologičeskaja xrestomatija po permskim jazykam* 1. Moscow: Izdatel’stvo AN SSSR.
- FE = Material from the author’s field expeditions (Čerdynskij and Krasnovišerskij districts of Perm’ kraj, 2006–2010).
- Fedoseeva, E. N. (2002) *Leksika severnogo narečija komi-permjackogo jazyka*. Candidate dissertation. Syktyvkar: IJaLI Komi NC UrO RAN.
- Gluškov, I. N. (1900) “Čerdynskie voguly”. *Ėtnografičeskoe obozrenie* 45, 2, 15–78.
- GNVP = Krivoščekova-Gantman, A. S. (1983) *Geografičeskije nazvanija Verxnego Prikamja*. Perm’: Knižnoe izdatel’stvo.
- Grot, Ja. K. (1854) “Oblastnye velikoruskie slova finskogo proisxoždenija”. In: I. I. Sreznevskij, ed. *Materialy dlja sravnitel’nogo i ob’asnitel’nogo slovarja i grammatiki* I–III, 65–68. Saint Petersburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj AN.
- Hausenberg, Anu-Reet (1972) *Nazvanija životnyx v komi jazyke*. Tallinn.
- Kalima, Jalo (1919) *Die ostseefinnischen Lehnwörter im Russischen*. (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, 44.) Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.
- Kalima, Jalo (1927) “Syrjänische Lehngut im Russischen”. *Finnisch-ugrische Forschungen* 18, 1–3, 1–56.
- Kannisto, Artturi (1913–1918) “Ein Wörterverzeichnis eines ausgestorbenen wogulischen Dialekts in den Papieren M. A. Castréns”. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 30, 8.
- KÈSK = Lytkin, V. I., and Guljaev, E. S. (1970) *Kratkij ètimologičeskij slovar’ komi jazyka*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Kövesi, Magda (1965) *A permi nyelvek ősi képzői*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- KPRS = Batalova, R. M., and A. S. Krivoščekova-Gantman (1985) *Komi-permjacko-russkij slovar’*. Moscow: Russkij jazyk.
- KRK = Beznosikova, L. M., ed. (2000) *Komi-roč kyvčukör*. Syktyvkar: Komi knižnoe izdatel’stvo.
- Krivoščekova-Gantman, A. S. (1974) “Geografičeskaja terminologija komi-permjackogo jazyka”. In A. S. Krivoščekova-Gantman, ed. *Lingvističeskoe kraevedenie Prikam’ja* 1, 19–43. Perm’: Izdatel’stvo Permskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogičeskogo instituta.

- Krivoščekova-Gantman, A. S. (1981) "Komi-permjackie zaimstvovanija v russkix govorax Verxnego Prikam'ja". *Ėtimologičeskie issledovanija* (Sverdlovsk) 2, 46–62.
- KJaD = Lytkin, V. I. (1961) *Komi-jaz'vinskij dialekt*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR.
- Lytkin, V. I., ed. (1962) *Komi-permjackij jazyk*. Kudymkar: Komi-permjackoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Matveev, A. K. (1959) *Finno-ugorskie zaimstvovanija v russkix govorax Severnogo Urala*. (Učenyje zapiski Ural'skogo universiteta. Jazykoznanie, 32.) Sverdlovsk: Ural'skij universitet.
- Matveev, A. K. (1962) "Novye dannye o finno-ugorskix zaimstvovanijax v russkix govorax Urala i Zapadnoj Sibiri". In Serebrennikov, B. A., ed. *Voprosy finno-ugorskogo jazykoznanija*, 127–142. Moscow and Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR.
- Matveev, A. K. (1964) "Zaimstvovanija iz permskix jazykov v russkix govorax Severnogo i Srednego Urala". *Acta Linguistica Hungaricae* 14, 3–4, 285–315.
- Matveev, A. K. (2011) *Materialy po mansijskoj toponimii gornoj časti Severnogo Urala*. Ekaterinburg: Izdatel'stvo Ural'skogo universiteta.
- Meckelein, Richard (1914) *Die finnisch-ugrischen, turko-tatarischen und mongolischen Elemente im Russischen*. I: *Die finnisch-ugrische Elemente im Russischen*. Berlin: Mayer & Müller.
- Merkuševa, T. N. (2003) *Leksika flory i fauny južnogo narečija komi-permjackogo jazyka*. Abstract of candidate dissertation. Iževsk.
- MSFUSZ = Matveev, A. K., ed. (2004) *Materialy dlja slovarja finno-ugrosamodijskix zaimstvovanij v govorax Russkogo Severa* 1. Ekaterinburg: Izdatel'stvo Ural'skogo universiteta.
- Myznikov, S. A. (2004) *Leksika finno-ugorskogo proisxoždenija v russkix govorax Severo-Zapada: ėtimologičeskij i lingvogeografičeskij analiz*. Saint Petersburg: Nauka.
- Myznikov, S. A. (2007) *Atlas substratnoj i zaimstvovannoj leksiki russkix govorov Severo-Zapada*. Saint Petersburg: Nauka.
- Oborin, V. A. (1990) *Zaselenie i osvoenie Urala v konce XI-načale XVII veka*. Irkutsk: Izdatel'stvo Irkutskogo universiteta.
- Pápay, István (1906) "Reguly Antal urali téképe". *Földrajzi közlemények* 34, 9, 349–370.
- Pogodin, A. L. (1904) "Severnorusskie slovarnye zaimstvovanija iz finskogo jazyka". *Varšavskie universitetskie izvestija* 4, 1–72.
- Poljakova, E. N. (1971) "Slovo sogra v permskix pamjatnikax XVII veka i v sovremennyx govorax Permskoj oblasti". In Skitova, F. L., ed. *Živoje slovo v russkoj reči Prikam'ja* 2, 85–94. Perm': Permskij universitet.
- Poljakova, E. N. (2009) *Lingvokul'turnoe prostranstvo Permskogo kraja*. Perm': Izdatel'stvo Permskogo universiteta.

- Preobraženskij, A. A., ed. (1989) *Istorija Urala s drevnejšix vreměn do 1861 g.* Moscow: Nauka.
- Rombandeeva, E. A. (1973) *Mansijskij (vogul'skij) jazyk.* Moscow: Nauka.
- Saarikivi, Janne (2006) *Substrata Uralica. Studies on Finno-Ugrian substrate in northern Russian dialects.* Academic dissertation. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- SGSRP = Beljaeva, O. P. (1973) *Slovar' govorov Solikamskogo rajona Permskoj oblasti.* Perm': Izdatel'stvo Permskogo pedagogičeskogo instituta.
- SGTP = Poljakova, E. N. (2007) *Slovar' geografičeskix terminov v rusškoj reči Permskogo kraja.* Perm': Izdatel'stvo Permskogo universiteta.
- Sjogren, A. M. (1854) "Materialy dlja sravnenija oblastnyx velikoruskix slov so slovami jazykov severnyx i vostočnyx". In: Sreznevskij, I. I., ed. *Materialy dlja sravnitel'nogo i ob"asnitel'nogo slovarja i grammatiki* I–III, 145–165. Saint Petersburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj AN.
- Skitova, F. L. (1961) *Verxnevišerskie govory na sovremennom ètape razvitiya.* Abstract of candidate dissertation. Leningrad.
- SLPP = Poljakova, E. N. (2010) *Slovar' leksiki permskix pamjatnikov XVI–načala XVIII veka* 1–2. Perm': Izdatel'stvo Permskogo universiteta.
- SPG = Borisova, A. N., and Prokoševa, K. N., eds. (2000–2002) *Slovar' permskix govorov* 1–2. Perm': Knižnyj mir.
- SPP = Poljakova, E. N. (1993–2001) *Slovar' permskix pamjatnikov XVI–načala XVIII veka* 1–6. Perm': Izdatel'stvo Permskogo universiteta.
- SRGKP = Podjukov, I. A., ed. (2006) *Slovar' russkix govorov Komi-Permjackogo okruga.* Perm': PONICAA.
- SRGSP = Rusinova, I. I., ed. (2011) *Slovar' russkix govorov severa Permskogo kraja* 1. Perm': Izdatel'stvo Permskogo universiteta.
- SRNG = Filin, F. P., and Sorokoletov, F. P., eds. (1965–2010–) *Slovar' russkix narodnyx govorov* 1–44–. Moscow and Leningrad (Saint Petersburg): Nauka.
- SSKZD = Sorvačeva, V. A., ed. (1961) *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' komi-zyrjanskix dialektov.* Syktyvkar: Komi knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- SW = Wichmann, Yrjö, and Uotila, T. E. (1942) *Syrjänischer Wortschatz nebst Hauptzügen der Formenlehre.* (Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae VII.) Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Veenker, Wolfgang (1967) *Die Frage des finnougriſchen Substrats in der russischen Sprache.* (Indiana University Publications. Uralic and Altaic Series, 82.) Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Veenker, Wolfgang (1969) *Vogul suffixes and pronouns: an index a tergo.* (Indiana University Publications. Uralic and Altaic Series, 110.) Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Veenker, Wolfgang (1992) "Finnougrisch-slavische Wechselbeziehungen". In Honti, László et al., eds. *Finnisch-ugrische Sprachen zwischen dem germanischen und dem slavischen Sprachraum*, 175–184. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Vinogradov, V. V., ed. (1956) *Doklady i soobščeniya Instituta jazykoznanija AN SSSR*, 9. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR.

Vostrikov, O. V. (1986) "Neskol'ko substratnyx vključenij v russkix govorex Srednego Predural'a". In Kolesov, V. V., ed. *Severnorusskie govory v inojazyčnom okruženii*, 69–76. Syktyvkar: Permskij universitet.

Vostrikov, O. V. (1990) *Finno-ugorskij substrat v russkom jazyke*. Sverdlovsk: Izdatel'stvo Ural'skogo universiteta.

WW = Munkácsi, Bernát, and Kálmán, Bela (1986) *Wogulisches Wörterbuch*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Kokkuvõte. Roman Gaidamaško: Soome-ugri substraat-apellatiivid Ülem-Kama vene dialektides. Käesolev artikkel on lühike ülevaade soome-ugri apellatiivide substraadist Ülem-Kama vene keele dialektides. Erilist tähelepanu on pööratud substraaditüüpide identifitseerimisele ja eristamisele ning suhtelise kronoloogia tuvastamisele. Esitatakse mõned esialgsed etümoloogiad vene dialektide sõnavarale.

Märksõnad: Ülem-Kama, soome-ugri substraat, apellatiivid, vene dialektid