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Abstract. This paper deals with the emergence of a mixed language variety spoken by Udmurt-Russian bilinguals in the Russian republic of Udmurtia. Called Suro-Požo ‘mixed, mixture’ by its speakers, this language code is characterised by variation in the use of Udmurt, Russian, double and hybrid discourse markers, as data analysis has revealed, which has specifically focused on subordinators and question tags. According to the frequency distribution of the native and borrowed discourse-regulating items in the analysed corpus, several classes of Suro-Požo discourse markers are represented overwhelmingly by Russian forms, indicating the starting point of a diachronic process of fusion (Matras 1998, 2000) of the two systems of discourse marking on the way from code-mixing to a mixed code (Auer 1998a, 1998b).
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1. Introduction

When reference is made to Modern Udmurt, one differentiates between two main language varieties, namely standard and vernacular (Edygarova 2013 and forthcoming). Whereas the first is an acquired language, used by a small number of Udmurt speakers for professional purposes mostly in written form, the latter is based on local Udmurt dialects and serves as a means of everyday oral communication for the majority of Udmurts. Vernacular Udmurt, which is, unlike its standardised counterpart, not subject to purist language practices, is especially vulnerable to contact-induced language change in the situation of the intense asymmetric language contact with the dominant Russian language. Thus, one of its main characteristic features is the frequent use of borrowed Russian lexical and grammatical elements; there is also heavy code-switching between the two languages (Edygarova 2013, Kaysina forthcoming).
In this paper, I argue that vernacular Udmurt, due to the high degree of Russian influence it experiences, can be considered a mixed Udmurt-Russian language variety, at least in the early stage of its development. The emerging code is usually referred to as Suro-Požo ‘mixed, mixture’ by its speakers, highly competent Udmurt-Russian bilinguals who are, as a rule, aware of speaking Udmurt in a different, much more Russified way, as compared to the older generation of Udmurts.

This paper deals particularly with Russian discourse markers which seem to play a decisive role in the emergence of the Udmurt-Russian mixed code. Since they are frequently inserted in Udmurt speech, Russian discourse-organising elements compete with their Udmurt equivalents, and may entirely replace the latter. If discourse markers of Russian origin are used predominantly in otherwise Udmurt discourse, one can actually speak of a mixed language variety, as the folk name Suro-Požo indicates.

2. Theoretical background

In the following, the Udmurt-Russian bilingual data are analysed within the theoretical framework suggested by Peter Auer (1998a, 1998b). Auer differentiates between three prototypical forms of the juxtaposition of two languages in bilingual speech: code-switching, language mixing and fused lects. The three are seen as a continuum, with a possible transition from the level of pragmatics (code-switching) to that of grammar (fused lects). Thus, code-switching is a pragmatic-stylistic device used creatively by individual speakers. Language mixing, functioning as a group style, occupies the intermediate position on the continuum and is characterised by an unfixed grammatical structure, whereas fused lect is a stabilised mixed language variety defined by positive structural regularities. The gradual movement from code-switching to fused variety through language mixing is considered a natural tendency of development in a bilingual community, though stabilization at a certain point on the continuum is also seen as one possible scenario.

According to Auer (1998b: 15–17), relatively unbound grammatical elements, such as discourse markers, constitute one of the starting points of the transition from language mixing to fused lect. Being used along with their autochthonous counterparts in the intermediate stage of the continuum, borrowed discourse-organising elements start to
take over the function of meta-pragmatic discourse framing, with the result that one system of discourse and text organisation is completely replaced by another.

A somewhat similar approach is found in the analysis of bilingual discourse markers proposed by Yaron Matras (1998, 2000). Matras uses the term *fusion* to describe the phenomenon of non-separation of two systems of discourse marking in bilingual speech. *Fusion* is defined as a gradual process of development, which, synchronically, presupposes the alternate use of equivalent discourse-regulating elements from two languages in contact. Diachronically, this may lead to the wholesale replacement of a class of indigenous items, especially in the case of minority languages, thus leading to language change.

According to Matras (2000), *fusion* of the systems of discourse marking is considered to be cognitively motivated and explained by an unconscious attempt on the part of bilingual speakers “to reduce the mental effort ... to monitor and direct the hearer’s responses and reactions to the speaker’s utterances ... by eliminating the language specific options available to them” (Matras 2000: 514). In other words, due to the effort of reducing their mental load, bilinguals are thought to make use of discourse markers from a *pragmatically dominant language* (Matras 2000: 520–521), which is the “cognitively advantageous language”, i.e. it plays the main role in “regulating mental processing activities” (Matras 1998: 286).

In the following analysis of the emerging Udmurt-Russian mixed code, the term *discourse markers* will refer to the functional category of various kinds of discourse-regulating elements, *utterance modifiers* to use Matras’s term (1998), including fillers, hesitation markers, tags, conjunctions, sentence particles, phasal adverbs and focus particles, i.e. the class of items which, according to Matras (2000: 516), serve to monitor and direct the way the propositional content of the speaker’s utterances is processed and accepted by the hearer.

### 3. Research data and methodology

The present study is based on the corpus of vernacular Udmurt compiled during field research in the Udmurt Republic in July and August 2011. The analysed data comprise 3.5 hours of spontaneous conversations involving 10 Udmurt speakers aged 15–60 from different backgrounds. All informants were Udmurt-Russian bilinguals with a high degree of competence in both languages, representing
different dialectal varieties of Udmurt from the northern, central and southern parts of Udmurtia.

Discourse markers, both of Russian and Udmurt origin, were the subject of the present analysis only if they occurred in an overwhelmingly Udmurt environment. The cases of *alternational language mixing* (Auer 1998b: 5–10) were not taken into account.

4. Discourse markers in the emerging Udmurt-Russian mixed code

The following examples illustrate the way Russian discourse-regulating elements are inserted into Udmurt text:

1) *Nu, to est’,* so užan kutskem ber-a-z, well in other words she work start after-IN-3SG.POSS
   klub-in tuž tros voštiškon-jos vań, so skryt-oe
   club-IN very many change-PL EX this hidden-NOM.N
   videoabljudnie naprimer...
   video watching for example
   ‘Well, in other words, after she started her work, there were very many changes in the club, such as video cameras.’

2) *Ku val sije učjr, so kamera-os ej val voobšče.*
   when PST such incident those camera-PL NEG PST at all
   ‘When there was such an incident, those cameras were not there at all.’

3) *Vot uže ku sije učjr lu-i-z ini,*
   but already when such incident happen-PST-3SG already
   vrode kak kar-i-zj ožj, čto kamera-os pukt-i-zj,
   like do-PST-3PL so that camera-PL install-PST-3PL
   čto kulę lu-o-z ̃uisa.
   that necessary become-FUT-3SG that
   ‘But after such an incident had happened, they, like, installed cameras, saying it would be necessary.’
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4) \textit{Vdrug} noš kiče ke alama pi-os, umojtem pi-os likt-o-zj

\textit{if again some bad boy-PL bad boy-PL come-FUT-3PL}

\textit{no, noš make alama-jez lu-o-z šuia.}

\textit{and again something bad-DET happen-FUT-3SG that}

‘That if some bad boys come again, something bad will happen again.’

5) \textit{Mar bon eššo?}

\textit{what MPA else}

‘What else?’

6) \textit{Voštiškon-jos vsjo ravno so vań.}

\textit{change-PL anyway it EX}

‘There are some changes anyway.’

7) \textit{So ali možet ug šedís-š, čto kul’tura bolee-menee}

\textit{it now maybe NEG feel-PRS.3SG that culture more or less}

\textit{uže umojges luñj kutsk-e iní Alnaš-in.}

\textit{already better become begin-PRS.3SG already Alnash-IN}

‘Maybe one does not realize now that the culture in Alnash is getting more or less better.’

8) \textit{Možet so udmurt-jos so-je ug šed-o,}

\textit{maybe it Udmurt-PL this-ACC NEG feel-PRS.3PL}

\textit{žuč-jos pělın-ges so vsjo ravno.}

\textit{Russian-PL among-COMP it still}

‘Maybe Udmurts do not feel it; it is still more among Russians.’

9) \textit{Daže kiži šu-o-d, nu daže samoj so prazdnik-jos o-o ved’}

\textit{even how say-FUT-2SG well even most it holiday-PL QTAG}

\textit{nu otiñ vjl ar.}

\textit{well there new year}

‘Even, how to say, well, even the most important holidays, aren’t they, well, like the New Year.’
10) **To est’** soiz **vot** čto **imenno** vaň
    that is that DPA EX MPA that particularly EX
    otdel’no kilšarìš udmurt, kìžì bon šu-o-d ini so,
    separately for example Udmurt how MPA say-FUT-2SG MPA it
    nu udmurt vîl ar o-o ved’, udmurt íamìs mart,
    well Udmurt new year TTAG Udmurt eight March
    **vot** sîché.
    DPA so

    ‘That is, what is absent is that there is separate, for example, Udmurt, how to call it, well, Udmurt New Year, isn’t there? Udmurt March 8th, something like that.’

11) **Nu,** malpa-ško, **veranì ke so-je, med kîldît-o-zî šuîsa.**
    well think-PRS.1SG speak if it-ACC OPT organize-FUT-3PL that

    ‘Well, I think, if I have to talk about it, that they should organize it.’

12) **Vsjo ravno dîr ortê-ša so lu-o-z šuîsa, malpa-ško.**
    anyway time pass-GER it be-FUT-3SG that think-PRS.1SG

    ‘Anyway, I think that it will exist some time later.’

While reporting on positive changes in the cultural life of her village after the appointment of a new head of the local department of culture, a 15-year-old female informant from Alnaši, in the southern part of Udmurtia, actively uses Russian discourse markers of various kinds (in bold). Among them are e.g. the subordinator čto ‘that’, the phasal adverb uže ‘already’, the modal word možet ‘maybe’, focus particles (daže ‘even’ and samoj ‘most’), degree/discourse adverbs (voobšče ‘at all’, eššo ‘else’, bolee-menee ‘more or less’ and imenno ‘particularly’), elements of meta-commentary (to est’ ‘in other words’, vot ‘so’, vsjo ravno ‘anyway’ and naprimer ‘for example’) and fillers (nu ‘well’ and vrode kak ‘like’). On the other hand, several Udmurt discourse markers (underlined), such as the complementizer šuîsa ‘that’, the subordinator ke ‘if’, the coordinator no ‘and’, the degree modifier tuž ‘very’, and modal particles (bon, aj and ini), are found in the speech of the informant as well. What is particularly interesting is the “doubling” of the indigenous discourse element by its corresponding Russian item, as is the case with the adverbial subordinator čto ... šuîsa ‘that’ (Sentence 3) and the phasal adverb uže ... ini ‘already’ (Sentence 7). In addition, a hybrid element, consisting of the Udmurt affirmative particle o-o ‘yes’ and the Russian modal particle
Thus, this speech fragment indicates that the emerging language variety Suro-Požo licenses certain variations in the use of Russian and Udmurt discourse markers. In the following sections, the acceptable alternating usages of both borrowed and indigenous discourse-organizing elements, as well as their quantitative distribution, are analysed in detail by means of subordinators and question tags.

4.1. Variation in the use of subordinators

A quantitative corpus analysis revealed the three most frequently occurring types of subordinators: those marking conditional, complement and causal clauses. Although Udmurt possesses its own subordinators of all three types, the parallel insertion of Russian subordinating devices is common practice in Suro-Požo, which leads to several structural variants of the clauses in question.

To illustrate, conditional clauses in Russian-Udmurt mixed code can be marked by the Udmurt subordinator ke ‘if’, which, as is typical of the Udmurt language, occupies the final position in a clause or follows the clause constituent it modifies:

13) \( Ali \) vera-mi̲ ke, soos kuataš-o-zj.
now say-PST.1PL if they be offended-FUT-3PL

‘If we tell them now, they will be offended.’

At the same time, several occurrences of the Russian prepositive subordinator esli ‘if’, introducing conditional clauses, are found:

14) Keña ke kil-jos ljuboj kîl-in tod-ono
some word-PL any language-IN know-PART
kad’ pot-e, esli ton eščjo vuzkariš.
like seem-PRS.3SG if you also shop assistant

‘It seems necessary to know some words from any language, especially if you are a shop assistant.’

Moreover, the cases of framing a clause by means of the Russian-Udmurt doublet, in which both subordinators preserve their syntactic position, i.e. clause-initial and clause-final, are also widespread:
16) *Esli* *ke* *so-je* *šonerak* *valanj,*
if if this-ACC correctly understand
then it burning star competition-INSTR tell

‘If you want to understand it correctly, I have to tell you about the competition Burning Star.’

The same possibilities, i.e. through the postpositive Udmurt *šuisa* ‘that’ (11, 12), the prepositive Russian *čto* ‘that’ (7), and the bilingual *čto ... šuisa* ‘that ... that’ (17) doublet, are available in *Suro-Požo* to build complement clauses:

17) *Mon* *glavnoje* *dogovorit’sja* *kariškem-jn* *val* *Kuačiči-jen,*
I main.point agree do-PART PST Kuatchi-INSTR

*čto* *mi* *Kuačiči-os-iz* *nui-ško-m* *šuisa.*
that we Kuatchi-PL-ACC bring-PRS-1PL that

‘The main point is that I agreed with Kuatchi (village name) that we would give them a lift.’

Unlike the conditional *ke* (16), the complementizer *šuisa* never directly follows its clause-initial Russian equivalent *čto* in a doublet. This can be explained by the strictly fixed clause-final position which the gerundial form *šuisa* ‘saying’ occupies in the function of a complementizer in Udmurt. *Ke,* on the contrary, can also occur in the clause-internal position after focused clause constituents, as example 18 shows:
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18) **Udmurt ik udmurt-ez no ke viile ke źut-o,**
Udmurt even Udmurt-ACC even if up if raise-PRS.3PL
śum poti-ško-m, a eščjo palen-jiš ljkšt-sa
be.glad-PRS-1PL but additionally abroad-EL come-GER
udmurt-jos-įz źut-o ke ...
Udmurt-PL-ACC raise-PRS.3PL if
‘If Udmurts raise an Udmurt, we are glad, but if people from abroad raise Udmurts …’

The conditional subordinator *ke* ‘if’ here modifies, firstly, the direct object *udmurt-ez* ‘Udmurt’, secondly, the adverb *viile* ‘up’ and, finally, the verb phrase *udmurtjos-įz źut-o* ‘raise Udmurts’. By analogy, the Udmurt *ke*, directly following the Russian *esli* in (16), can be considered to be a modifier of the latter, which could imply the emphatic function of the bilingual doublet. The latter was also proposed with reference to the double marking of this kind by, for example, Baran (2000: 25–26), Kel’makov (2011: 226) and Wertheim (2003: 338–339) in Uzbek, Udmurt and Tatar, respectively. On the other hand, the clause-initial placement of *ke* after *esli* can be regarded as merely one of the synchronic variants of conditional marking in **Suro-Požo**, i.e. the doublet does not intensify the meaning of the conditional clause; rather, the Russian subordinator alone is not sufficient at this stage of development and, hence, some additional focusing is needed, which is fulfilled by the Udmurt *ke*. Therefore, the synchronic variation in the use of conditional and complement clauses in **Suro-Požo** can be summarized as follows:

**Table 1. Variation in the use of conditional and complement subordinators in Suro-Požo.**

| Conditional clauses | Complement clauses |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| [... Udmurt *ke*], ... | ..., [... Udmurt šuįsa]. |
| [Russian *esli* ... Udmurt *ke*], ... | ..., [Russian *čto* ... Udmurt šuįsa]. |
| [Russian *esli* Udmurt *ke* ...], ... | |
| [Russian *esli* ...], ... | ..., [Russian *čto* ...]. |

Similar processes of the initial pairing of indigenous and borrowed conjunctions as a diachronic step, possibly resulting in the loss of native elements, were also documented by Brody (1995: 139) and
Stolz and Stolz (1997: 23) in contacts between Spanish and indigenous American languages.

As for causal clauses in Suro-Požo, there is a competitive use of the Udmurt subordinator *mali ke šuono* ‘because’ (19) and its Russian synonym *potomu čto* ‘because’ (20):

19) No oti̱n trosges erik, o-o, mali ke šuono mon
    but there more freedom yes because I
    piči̱-jez nunok-si̱ soos-len gurt-ji̱,
    young-DET grandchild-POSS.3PL they-GEN village-EL
    soin mon-e tužges ik jarat-o.
    so I-ACC stronger even love-PRS.3PL

    ‘But there is more freedom, that’s right, because I am their youngest grandchild from the village, so they love me the most.’

20) A: Tak, čaj ju-o-dži dir uk?
    well, tea drink-FUT-2PL certainly MPA

    B: Oj, um ni dir, potomu čto mi eščjo
    oh NEG any.mor e certainly because we also
    malpa-ško-m gurt-e poti̱ṉj i papa vožma,
    think-PRS-1PL village-IL go and dad wait-PRS.3SG
    soin.
    that’s why

    ‘A: Well, you will certainly drink tea, won’t you?
    B: Oh, certainly not, because we are also going to the village and dad is waiting; that’s why.’

The compound Udmurt causal subordinator *mali ke šuono* ‘because’, originating from the modal construction with the meaning ‘if to say why’, has been actively inserted in Standard Udmurt since the 1940s due to the intensive development of written Udmurt (Šutov 2009: 389). Regularly used at school and in the mass media, it penetrated vernacular Udmurt varieties and is thus also part of the Suro-Požo inventory. In contrast to typical autochthonous Udmurt subordinators, *mali ke šuono* ‘because’ always precedes the clause it marks. The above-mentioned doubling of Russian and Udmurt subordinating conjunctions is not found in clauses of cause, probably due to the clause-initial insertion of both synonymous forms, but since there is evidence of the syntagmatic neighbourhood of clause-initial conjunct-
tions (borrowed left to indigenous) in bilingual doublets from other language constellations (Brody 1987: 511–512; Stolz and Stolz 1997: 27), the compound forms of both subordinators, which, if doubled, would result in a rather heavy construction, seem to be a more plausible explanation in this case. In addition, the Russian subordinator potomu čto ‘because’ was widely used in Standard Udmurt in the 1920s and 1930s (Vaxrušev et al. 1974: 81), and then it was replaced by its Udmurt counterpart mali ke šuono ‘because’, i.e. the borrowed item became part of vernacular Udmurt long before the native one, which excludes the process of doubling as a diachronic step, as described above.

The linear ordering of the causal subordinators in question is still found in Suro-Požo, not as pairing but as cases of self-repair, as in (21). An Udmurt mother of trilingual children, who is proud of herself and her offspring speaking Udmurt, Mari and Russian, explains why Russian is the main language of interaction at home for her family:

(21) A: dor-a-mi konečno nu k sožaleniju but home-IN-POSS.1PL of course well unfortunately možno šujni įuč-en veraški-ško-m. possible say Russian-INSTR speak-PRS-1PL

B: Mali?

why

A: Mali? Nu ne zna-ju, nu porze no podti-ško-mj, why well NEG know-PRS.1SG well Mari and take-PRS-1PL įučse no, udmurtse no, no mali ke šuono/ Russian and Udmurt and but because hm potomu čto / mali ke šuono televizor-in no įuč eh because because television-IN and Russian

radio no įuč, uram-e poto įuč, radio and Russian street-EL go-PRS.3PL Russian kočitín įuč...
everywhere Russian

The female informant starts the causal clause with the Udmurt subordinator but then, after a short hesitation, switches to the corresponding Russian conjunction and, finally, inserts the self-repair immediately after the switch. Russian is characterised as the socially dominant language of the majority in this example but, obviously, it is the
pragmatically dominant language, to use Matras’s term (2000: 520–521), for the informant as well. Having claimed that she was an excellent Udmurt pupil at school at the beginning of the conversation, the speaker tries to show this by the choice of the Udmurt subordinating marker, which is associated with pure, correct and, hence, prestigious Standard Udmurt. However, at the point where the linguistic-mental operation of argumentation is processed, the control over the choice of the element is lost, causing the switch to Russian, the language to which the speaker generally “directs maximum mental effort” (Matras 2000: 521).

The frequency distribution of the analysed subordinating conjunctions in the corpus is as follows:

Table 2. Frequency distribution of conditional, complement and causal subordinators in Suro-Požo.

|            | Udmurt | Russian | double | total |
|------------|--------|---------|--------|-------|
| conditional| ke     | esli    | esli ... ke | 78    |
|            | 57 (73%) | 2 (2.4%) | (esli ke) 19 (24%) | |
| complement | šuiša  | čto     | čto ... šuiša | 50    |
|            | 22 (44%) | 25 (50%) | 3 (6%) | |
| causal     | mali ke šuono | potomu čto | 27 | |
|            | 8 (30%) | 19 (70%) | | |

Whereas the Udmurt conditional subordinator ke ‘if’ is still used predominantly in Suro-Požo compared to its Russian and double corresponding elements, the number of uses of the Russian causal conjunction potomu čto ‘because’ is clearly greater than that of the Udmurt mali ke šuono ‘because’. The distribution of the Udmurt complementizer and its Russian synonym is somewhat similar. As for the doubling, it is rather frequent (24%) in the case of the conditional and rare (6%) or not found at all in complement and causal clauses. In fact, the Russian complementizer čto, like the causal subordinator potomu čto, was part of the written Udmurt register till the 1950s (Vaxrušev 1974: 51, 53), i.e. the two former borrowings, though now banned from the standard variety, are more readily accepted by Suro-Požo speakers than the Russian esli, which, in turn, is presently almost only licensed in a bilingual doublet. Thus, these results provide a further indication that the double marking of functionally equivalent
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bilingual elements is an intermediate step in the diachronic process of language change.

4.2. Alternating use of question tags

A slightly different process happens in connection to the category of question tags in Suro-Požo. As a rule, tags are built by means of the Udmurt affirmative particle o-o ‘yes’, as in (22):

22) Tań tati tani košk-e šures, o-o?
DEM here DEM go-PRS.3SG road QTAG

‘The road is over there, isn’t it?’

There are also cases where the Russian equivalent element da ‘yes’, often in combination with the Russian modal particle ved’, is inserted instead:

23) Soos tatči uz ini ljk-e sobere, da ved’?
they here NEG anymore come-FUT.3PL after that QTAG

‘They will not come back after that, will they?’

Finally, hybrid elements, consisting of Udmurt affirmative particles (o-o, ben and i-i ‘yes’) joined together with the Russian modal particle ved’, frequently occur, e.g.:

24) Tak, tın-ad piž-ed vań uk, o-o ved’?
well you-GEN flour-POSS.2SG EX MPA QTAG

‘Well, you do have flour, don’t you?’

Ved’ is one of the early Russian borrowings in Udmurt and is widely used in its modal function. The compound form of the question tag o-o ved’ is therefore a semi-calque built in analogy with the Russian da ved’.

Table 3 presents the frequency distribution of the three variants of question tags found in the analysed corpus of Suro-Požo.
| Question tag | Udmurt | Russian | hybrid |
|--------------|--------|---------|--------|
| o-o          | 51     |         |        |
| o-o ved’     |        | 31      |        |
| da ved’      |        | 2       |        |
| ben ved’     |        | 1       |        |
| i-i ved’     |        | 1       |        |
| da           |        | 1       |        |
| aha ved’     |        | 1       |        |
| total        | 51 (58%) | 4 (4.5%) | 33 (37.5%) |

The prevailing Udmurt form o-o, accounting for 58% of all occurrences, is followed by the rather frequent hybrid formations (37.5%), while the purely Russian question tags are clearly in the minority. Again, the development of *Suro-Požo* tags can be considered to be a possible diachronic process, moving from Udmurt items to their Russian synonyms via the hybrid forms. Thus, this finding is consistent with that obtained in the analysis of *Suro-Požo* subordinators in 4.1, with the difference that the intermediate step of the transition from native to borrowed elements, in the case of question tags, is not doubling, common for subordinating markers, but hybridization.

In summary, the corpus analysis of the subordinating conjunctions and question tags described above shows variation in the use of Udmurt, Russian, double or the hybrid discourse-regulating elements in question, meaning that the structure of *Suro-Požo* still lacks obligatory grammatical regularities, which allows one to place it currently in the *code-mixing* phase of Auer’s continuum (1998b).

5. Frequency distribution of discourse markers in *Suro-Požo*

The variation described on the basis of subordinators and question tags in 4.1–4.2 has also been found in the use of other discourse-regulating classes of elements in *Suro-Požo*. The overall quantitative distribution of Udmurt, Russian, double and hybrid discourse markers in the analysed corpus is presented in Figure 1.
According to the chart, the share of Udmurt discourse elements accounts for about 52 per cent. Russian items constitute 43 per cent of Suro-Požo discourse markers. Hybrid and double elements each occur at about two per cent. Leaving these two transition phenomena aside, a direct comparison between the purely Udmurt and purely Russian competitors results in a statistically highly significant distribution (p-value = 2.233774e-08, binomial test), revealing that Udmurt discourse-regulating items, in total, are still dominant in Suro-Požo.

However, a more selective quantitative analysis, i.e. within each group of the most frequently occurring discourse markers in the corpus, reveals a slightly different result. Whereas the majority of elements are still predominantly of Udmurt origin, such discourse organising items as meta-comments, coordinators and connectives are preferably Russian borrowings, as Table 4 shows.

---

1 The Pareto-analysis as well as the following binomial test were performed in the statistics programme R (http://www.r-project.org).
Table 4. Frequency distribution of Udmurt and Russian discourse markers in *Suro-Požo*.

| discourse markers | Udmurt | Russian | Binomial test |
|-------------------|--------|---------|---------------|
| meta-comments     | 181    | 345     | p < 0.001     |
| focus particles   | 417    | 168     | p < 0.001     |
| coordinators      | 168    | 257     | p < 0.001     |
| modal particles   | 384    | 42      | p < 0.001     |
| connectives       | 11     | 159     | p < 0.001     |
| phasal adverbs    | 120    | 18      | p < 0.001     |
| question tags     | 51     | 4       | p < 0.001     |
| subordinators     | 99     | 71      | p < 0.05      |
| modal words       | 103    | 78      | p < 0.05      |
| fillers           | 110    | 124     | p > 0.05 (not significant) |

A more detailed analysis of the above-listed groups of function words would probably result in a much narrower discrepancy in the frequency distribution of some equivalent bilingual forms. Thus, for example, the high frequency of Udmurt focus particles can be explained by the frequently occurring particle *no*, which in combination with indefinite and negative pronouns (e.g. *kośkin no* ‘everyone’ or *nokiņ* *ṭin no* ‘nowhere’) often appears not as an intensifier per se but more as a part of frozen pronominal expressions. Likewise, the sizeable group of Udmurt modal particles are presented, for the most part, by the interrogative particle *a*, used as a compulsory indicator of the sentence mood in yes-no questions and so serving a different function compared to the bulk of modal particles. Therefore, a further corpus study of this phenomenon is needed.

To summarize the present results, the predominant use of Russian discourse markers, at least at some levels of text and discourse organisation, indicates that the process of the replacement of the indigenous system of discourse marking is in progress, and hence the emergence of a mixed Udmurt-Russian code, in which Russian items frame Udmurt discourse in a meta-pragmatic way.

6. Conclusion

This paper focused on the role of bilingual discourse markers in the emergence of the Udmurt-Russian mixed code *Suro-Požo*. A detailed
The emergence of an Udmurt-Russian mixed code

analysis of subordinators and question tags in the compiled corpus revealed variation in the use of these two classes of discourse-organising elements, i.e. the alternating insertion of both Udmurt and Russian synonymous forms is currently licensed by the speakers, which allows one to define Suro-Požo as code-mixing, to use Auer’s term (1998b).

In parallel with this, the double marking of equivalent bilingual subordinating conjunctions and the hybridization of question tags are taking place. Both phenomena were argued to indicate a transmission step in the diachronic process of fusion (Matras 1998, 2000), possibly leading to the wholesale replacement of the Udmurt system of discourse marking.

Though tolerated by the speakers, the mixing of the two languages is generally highly criticized in the Udmurt-Russian speech community. Therefore, the trigger of the switch from prestigious Standard Udmurt forms to their Russian counterparts can be considered to be of a cognitive nature, caused by the pressure of the pragmatically dominant Russian language, in accordance with Matras (2000).

The quantitative analysis of the most frequently occurring discourse markers in the corpus indicates that the overwhelming majority of discourse-regulating items in Suro-Požo are still of Udmurt origin, with the exception of meta-comments, coordinators and connectives. Consequently, with these Russian elements contributing a great deal to the meta-pragmatic structure of Suro-Požo, the latter can be seen as being at the starting point of the transition from code-mixing to a mixed code (Auer 1998b).

Address:
Inna Kaysina
Mehringstraße 16
39114 Magdeburg, Germany
E-mail: kaysina@uni-bremen.de

Abbreviations
1 – first person, 2 – second person, 3 – third person, ACC – accusative, COMP – comparative, DEM – demonstrative, DET – determination, DPA – degree particle, EL – elative, EX – existential, FUT – future, GEN – genitive, GER – gerund, IL – illative, IN – inessive, INSTR – instrumental, MPA – modal particle, N – neuter, NEG – negation, NOM – nominative,
OPT – optative, PART – participle, PL – plural, POSS – possessive, PRS – present, PST – past, QTAG – question tag, SG – singular
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Kokkuvõte. Inna Kaysina: Udmurdi-vene segakoodi esiletulek diskursemarkerite alusel. Artikkel käsitleb segatud keelevarianti, mida kõnever Venemaa Udmurdi vabariigi kakskeelsed. Andmete analüüs näitab, et seda keelekoodi, mida kõnelejad nimetavad Suro-Požo ‘segatud, segu’, iseloomustab udmurdi, vene, kahekordsete ja hübrisidsete diskursemarkerite kasutuse varieerumine, mis tuleb eriti esile alistavate sidesõnade ja küsijätkude puhul. Diskursust reguleerivate omakeelsete ja laenatud elemendid segakoodi esitatud süsteemi diakroonilise fusiooniprotsessi (Matras 1998, 2000) algust teel koodisegust segakoodi (Auer 1998a, 1998b).

Märksõnad: diskursemarkerid, alistavad sidesõnad, küsijätkud, koodisegu, segakood, udmurdi keel, vene keel, Suro-Požo