

Fishing Lexicon of Prikamye (A Region near the Kama River in the West of the Ural Mountains): Content, Archaisms and Innovations

Ivan Alekseevich Podyukov

Perm State Humanitarian-Pedagogical University, Perm, Russia

Abstract: The article discusses content, peculiarities and current state of folk speech of Prikamye, related with amateur and commercial fishing. The studied fish names, tools and methods of fishing, baits, wind names and details of fluvial topography, which are considered by fishermen, other groups of fishery lexicon of Perm Krai are revealed in Russian dialects of Prikamye and in speech of amateur fishermen. These nominations are reviewed in terms of their origination and features of functioning and described according to their stylistic properties. The article highlights the relation of Prikamye fishing lexicon with fishery lexicon and fishing wordings of other languages of Prikamye population. The article also characterizes foundations of image nominations from fishery sphere, as well as archaic names related with disappearance of these or those phenomena from fishery traditions and new names originating currently as a consequence of increasing international cultural contacts.

Key words: Folk fishery terminology • System links of nominations in fishery speech • Peculiar features of imagery and cultural connotation of fishery lexicon • Local specificity and current state of language of traditional crafts

INTRODUCTION

Folk crafts are an inherent portion of any national culture. They reflect dimly remembered world and age-old folk experience of exploration of natural resources. In ancient times fishery was not a sport but a toil: fishery was one of the most important tools of life support and subsistence, especially in the territories with poorly developed agriculture. Nowadays fishery more and more becomes a sport, one of the most amusing and popular entertainments. However, not recently in the hard years of the 20th century during severe famine fish was one of the main food product. Old timers of Prikamye remember this fairly well: *“During the War we could survive only due to the Kama River. Mother Kama with its fish rescued”*. Folk knowledge of silent inhabitants of water depths, knowledge of fish habits were fixed in fishery speech.

Modern linguistics is intensively involved in study of peculiarities of fishery lexicon of European languages, especially with regard to its local specificity. In particular, Joern-Martin Becker (Greifswald, Germany) investigates into fishery dialect terms - names of fishes, fishery tools, fishery ponds, fishing transport in Brandenburg, Pomerania and Mecklenburg, revealing certain

internationalism of fishery nominations, high number of lexical correspondences of low German and Slavic fishery terminology of the 19th-20th centuries [1. S.: 24-39]. Similar language situation is described by H. Carlander [2. pp: 96], indicating at retention of Indian names of fishes, hatches, tools in the lexicon of Mississippi fishermen.

Fishery lexicon is a reliable material for reconstruction of interlingual and intercultural contacts. Joshua Nash [3. pp.118-131] reviews linguistic history of Pitcairn Island and Norfolk Island: reflection of fishery peculiarities in toponymy of Island, naming methods of fishing, spatial and time orientation of fishermen. August Rubrecht [4] analyzes how European colonists applied English ichthyonyms for nomination of new species of fish. The study discusses reflection (especially in fish names) of ancient mythological ideas in fishery lexicon [5. C. 321-336], describes specificity of dialect and folk idiomatic fish names. Robert Watt [6. pp. 1- 23] presents classified by species groups material of Scottish dialects, reflecting numerous folk analogs for trade (official) fish names. Paul Seelbach [7. pp. 1-7] describes informal, local, characteristic for Michigan fish names (including those that are vanishing or already vanished). Explorers of Russian folk dialects also actively address folk

ichthyonymy, describe dialect name of fishery tools and other fishing notions (Ostretsova L. M., Khalyukova Yu. V., Mikheyeva N. V. [8. pp. 130–138; 9. pp. 35–38 ; 10. pp. 99–105]).

Perm language material of fishery area is not introduced into scientific scope and remains unstudied. Meanwhile, in Perm Krai there are more than 29 000 of major and minor rivers, about 800 lakes, 3 water storage basins, nearly 500 major ponds; in terms of natural and artificial water basins Perm Krai occupies the first position in Ural. The rivers of Prikamye are rich with various fish breeds: in the basin of Upper and Middle Kama there are 42 species of fish relating to 9 orders and 15 families. Hence, the Prikamye fishery lexicon is developed sufficiently well. The corpus of folk fishery lexicon includes such subject matters as names of fishes, fishing methods, fishery tools and their constituent parts, names of natural and artificial baits, fishery transport, important for fishing names of depth contours, types of winds and streams, etc. Sophistication of the lexicon can be attributed to the fact that in rural areas up till now old-fashioned fishing methods and tools are used, whereas at the same time new accessories are applied (mainly due to technical advancement and improvement of international links).

Procedures: The discussed here material has been observed in folk speech of both northern and southern districts of Prikamye, as well as in speech of rural and urban amateur fishermen. This material was acquired using the method of direct questioning of informants, in some cases the method of involved observation (this method involves direct participation of author and collector in team fishing). The description of thematic classes of nominations was based on semantic analysis, comparative method was used within analysis of connotative characteristics of words and alternate nominations.

DISCUSSION

In Perm dialects and speech of amateur fishermen of Prikamye we detected numerous ichthyonyms. Their differentiation is quite interestingly marked with variety of folk names of large fishes. The necessity to create many names of one fish type is related with requirement to specify indications to fish age, cycles of biological development, environment and areal of this species. Another important circumstance is the need to express emotional perception of large and valuable fish,

fishes traditionally cognized mystically. Thus, in existing in Prikamye beliefs about pike its definite demonic essence is stressed: “*There was plenty of pikes before the War. It's as usual, no good when plenty of pike. This is a Tsar fish, it has a cross mark in the head, it's a churchy fish. It's dangerous. Some people do not call it a pike but only a bitch* [wordplay in Russian: *shchuka* (pike) -- *suka* (bitch)]” (Usolsky District, Perm Krai). The mentioned by informant definition of a pike as *a bitch* is deliberate, it should be considered not only as vocal similarity of the words: offensive, abusive names in folk speech are often used as talisman.

A pike can be named according to its areal: *glubinka* [from *glubina* - depth] - a deep-water pike, *zelyonka* [from *zelen'* - green vegetation] - a pike living in a grassed basin, *travyanka* [from *trava* - grass] - a pike dwelling in shallow waters, in river vegetation. The fish is often named in a descriptive manner – *zubastaya* [toothy]. The name *zhaba* [toad] indicates at such sign of pike as large jaws and at dwelling of this fish in grassed basins. Another expressive name of a large pike is *kobylya* [mare]; it is remarkable that the word *kobylya* in Perm dialects is used as a characteristic of a tall healthy young woman, maiden. The name *khozyaika* [mistress] indicates not only at commanding role of this fish in a basin (it acts as biological ameliorator since it consumes small-sized coarse fish species). Exactly the pike was considered in the past as demonic master of water. Exclusive attention to this fish is manifested in assignment of feminine names. Thus, a large pike can be named as *katya* [Kate] and a small pike as *nyura*, *nyurka* (derivatives of Anna). Seemingly, the reason to compare fish with woman can be related both with symbolism of names and with reconsideration of blurred initial nomination. Probably, the name of small pike *nyurka* (also *anna* from Sverdlovsk) is initially relate with Komi word *n'ur* ‘bog, moor’ (cf. Arkhangelsk *nyurá* ‘shallow water). Convergence of names of natural bodies and names of people is sufficiently frequent in Russian dialects and reflected in dialect names of small-sized fishes, such as *agáshka* (from *Agafia*), *paránka* (from *Paranya*). The pike nomination *Katya* is probably related with development of initial cultural associations of this name in Russian language (etymologically it means “pure” but symbolically is applied for assessment of a sinful woman).

In addition to expanded system of nominations for large and valuable fishes the local dialects include numerous names for small-sized fishes. Small-sized river fish, the species type of which is either undetermined or insignificant, is named in Prikamye *argán*, *argáshnik*,

arinka, *arishka*, *maryashka*, *mul*, *muléts*, *múlya*, *mulyava*. As a rule, these are sufficiently neutral names with blurred internal form. Existence of several parallel names for coarse non-commercial fishes is characteristic for Russian dialects in general. As mentioned by V. T. Kolomiyets [11. pp. 60], this can be attributed to the fact that within naming of natural bodies of low significance chorological succession was normally violated, which resulted in occurrence of new and new names for one and the same fish species in one region. Lexicon of fishermen frequently contains metaphoric playful estimations of small-sized fishes, such as *ovyos* [oat] (cf. in Perm dialects *as oat*, *comparable with oat grain* about something of small size), *gvozdiyo* [from *gvoz*d - nail], *pipiska* [weenie], *perkhot'* [scurfs]. The same are scornful names of small-sized bream: *shchepka* [chip], *fanera* [veneer], of any young fish: *shkolnik* [schoolboy], *pioneer* [Young Pioneer]. Ichthyonymy is actively replenished with the names which metaphorically describe dimensions, color of fishes (*utyug* [smoothing iron] about large crucian carp, *shakhtyor* [miner] about large black grayling).

Itemization and stylistic mottle of fishery lexicon are illustrated by dialect names of a fisherman, fishing fancier. Together with dialect hyperonyms, *rybaka* (fisherman in Russian, but with deliberately wrong stress), *rybolovshchik* (the same as fisherman but unusual word), expressive characteristics of a fisherman are in use: playful words *koroed* (bark beetle), *makar* (proper name). The name *koroed* is not related only with bark beetles, one of the best baits, but also compares fishing with childishness (cf. colloquial *koroed* concerning little child, slightly playful and robust). Appraisal of a fisherman as *makar* is more probably motivated with initial etymological meaning of the name (Greek name *Makarios* means "blessed, happy"). The name *pingvin* (penguin) metaphorically characterizes a fancier of ice fishing, who due to specific clothes and motionless sitting on ice resembles the Antarctic aquatic flightless bird.

The corpus of Prikamye fishery lexicon contains numerous names indicating at "specialization" of fishermen according to their favorite fishing tackle: *ostrogózhnik* or *luchnik*, *kololshchik*: who catches fishes using spear; *mormyshatnik*: who prefers to fish using artificial bait mormyshka; *chertyatnik*: who fishes using non-bait mormyshka tackle - *chertik*; *zherlichnik*: who prefers to use zherlitsa; *nedotoshnik*: who fishes using *nedotka* (fishing drag net); *vitolshchik* who catches fishes using trap net (*vitil*). As for innovations, the word *spinner* can be mentioned: fisherman using spinning reel.

Fishery specialization in terms of fish species is used more rarely; *nalimyatnik* - master to catch burbot (Russian: *nalim*), *karasyatnik* - expert in catching crucian carps (Russian; *karas'*).

The notion "to fish" (Russian: *rybachit'*) is rendered by dialect neutral variants: *rybalit'*, *rybat'*, *rybit'*, *rybachit'sya*, *rybolovit'*; sometimes the verb *lovidit'* (to catch, distorted Russian *lovit'*) is used within the same meaning. In addition, this notion is expressively estimated and commented in the wording *chyortika draznit'* (provoke devil): to try one's luck in fishing, informal. This fixed phrase, comparing fishing with flirtation of human with supernatural powers, estimates it as irrational, unpredictable.

Fishing is also denoted with numerous dialect variants. Significant verbal series can be observed in dialects for various types of netting – *tónit'*: to net fishes, *sétit'*: to fish using net (Russian; *set'*), *sakát'*: to catch using sack, *meryozhit'*: to fish using drag net (Russian: *meryozha*), *nevodit'*: to fish using seine net (Russian: *nevod*), *bnrodit'*: to fish using small drag seine (Russian: *breden'*), *syrpat'*: to fish using small net *syrp*. The verbs also denote fishing using this or that method: *mushkarit'*: to use artificial green-fly (Russian: *mushka*), *strózhit'*: to use spear (Russian; *ostroga*), *korablít'*: to fish using korablik, special floating tackle, *luchit'*: to fish using light of wood fire on boat and spear. Concerning fishing methods in Prikamye, the following verbs are also applied: *podlyodnichat'*: to fish through hole in ice, ice fishery; *berezhnichat'*: to fish using traps installed near fish weir, *nórit'*: to fish using seine in winter time through hole in ice, *dorózhit'*: to fish from floating boat using trolling tackle (Russian: *dorozhka*) (a tackle in the form of long cord with hook or lure). In some cases the verbs also denote catching of certain fish species – *nalimit'*: to fish burbot (Russian: *nalim*). Some of the aforementioned wordings are widely distributed in other Russian dialects (for instance, *nevodit'* is also known as a word in Irkutsk, Krasnoyarsk, Vyatka, Tambov, Vladimir, Pechora, Sverdlovsk, *dorózhit'* is known in Vladimir, Vologda, Middle Ural, Yenisei Distinct).

Fisherman experience of competition between human and fish is fixed in fishery lexicon, which can be evidenced by such nominations, which give detailed characteristics of these or those notions of particular importance for fishing. Thus, for nomination of the most exciting moment of angling with a rod, that is, bite, the Perm fishery dialects and lexicon contains the words *dyorg*, *podyorg*, *potyčka*, *potyazhka*, *tychok*, *tyuk*, *shevelyonka*, *khapok*. The classification of bite types in this terms is

highly important for fisherman - the bite type determines habits of different fishes, informs fisherman about type of playing with fish. Together with common wording (*dyorg*, *podyorg*) the fishery lexicon includes names of weak biting (*potychka*, *tyuk*, *shevelyonka*) and strong biting (*khapok*). One more example of fishing details reflected in the lexicon includes characteristics of fishing rod. Thus, a fishing rod with good distant throwing is called *posylistoye*, *medlenny stroi* (slow tuning) - a fishing rod which bows directly from handle. The word *chuyalka* (from *chuyat'* = to feel, to hear, to perceive) characterizes quality of response of bite to fisherman hand, capability of fishing rod to response to bite.

Local specificity of fishery lexicon of Prikamye in many respects is related with numerous Finno-Ugrian borrowings. For instance, the borrowed name for roaches is *kelt*, *kelch*, cf. Khanty *kelchi*, Siberian roaches. The words *árgysh*, *ar*, *árik* for nomination of small-sized fishes originate from Komi *ar*, *arga* - little dish, baby fish (probably, initially this name was borrowed from Turkic languages, cf. Uyghur *arys* - caravan, Shor *arys* - fellow traveler; hence, the name can reflect aggregating behavior of small-sized fishes). The borrowed lexicon is presented also in the names of fishing tackles. The name of special webbed fish trap for catching of large fishes in a torrential, *syrp*, is correlated with Mansi *sirp* - a kind of fishing net. The name of fish weir is also borrowed: *tshup* (from *tshup* - dike, pond in Finno-Ugrian languages, cf. Khanty "tšip" - whitewater in river head). The name of stationary net, *kulóm*, is related with Finnish *kalin*, *kalime* - a part of seine, cf. also Khanty *kaiew* - net, Hungarian *halo* - net.

Current fishery lexicon is characterized with numerous European borrowings (first of all, from the English language). In this regard many names of baits for lure fishing are illustrative. In addition to regular Russian names of wobbler types, *plovets* (swimmer), *sostavnik* (constituent), *vertushka* (spinner), the following nominations are also known: *ripper*, *twister*, *devon*, *streamer*, *krenk* (the latter means wobbler baits rolling around during fishing - from German *krank* - ill, probably, via the English language).

It should be noted that borrowed lexicon is frequently transformed in terms of phonetics, word formation, grammar. Thus, the name *taimen* in Prikamye is transformed into *tal'men*, *tyumen*; grayling (Russian: *kharius*) (from Finnish *Harjus*) is transformed into *khairus*, *khalyus*, *kharis*, *kharets*, *gairus*. In other cases variation of name is some kind of word game aimed at creation of stylistic effect (*taras* [Russian masculine

name] instead of crucian carp (Russian: *karas'*), *podlets* (rascal) instead of *podleshchik* (bream), *sunduk* (coffer) instead of *sydak* (zander).

Final Remarks: As illustrated by the linguistic material, fishery lexicon of Prikamye remains sufficiently original up till now. It can be used for judgment about specificity of fishery and its development, about peculiarities of fishing as deeply emotional hobby, which requires absolute immersion into wild world and deep knowledge of details of such life. Imagery of fishery lexicon, differentiation of its lexicon reflect specifically fisherman point of view, peculiar attitude both to objects of nature and to nature itself. Numerous borrowings evidence ancient cultural and linguistic relations of Russians with other people, first of all with Finno-Ugrians.

CONCLUSIONS

Nowadays the nominations related with obsolete fishing tools and methods passes from fishery speech into passive existence. At the same time folk fishery lexicon is actively replenished with borrowings from European languages, innovations related with technical advances. Fishery nominations in actual local tradition are characterized with existence of pronounced system links (genus-species relations, relations of synonymy and variability). In addition to strictly terminological nominations a significant portion of the fishery lexicon consists of expressive characteristics of numerous real-life fishery objects.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This article was supported by Grant 008 P titled Linguistic way of life of Prikamye village, Program of strategic development of Perm State Pedagogical University. I am grateful for assistance of Prof. Chagin G. N., ethnographer and fishery expert, whose concepts prompted me to develop this topic, as well as to Dr. Joern-Martin Becker, Greifswald University (Germany).

REFERENCES

1. Becker, Joern-Martin, 2011. Fremdwörter oder gemeinsame Sprache – Slawische Fischereitermini in der niederdeutschen Sprache Hinterpommerns in 19. Jahrhundert. - *Komunikacja miedzydludzka. Leksyka. Semantyka. Pragmatika*. Szczecin, S., pp: 24-39.

2. Carlander Harriet Bell, 1954. History of fish and fishing upper Mississippi River. Jackson, pp: 96.
3. Nash, Joshua, 2009. Naming the Sea. Offshore Fishing Grounds as Place names on Pitcairn Island and Norfolk Island. - *Shima: The International Journal of Research into Island Cultures*, 3(2): 118-131.
4. Rubrecht, 2006. Old World Names for New World Fish. - Magazine article from *Verbatim*, Vol. 31, # 2, 2006. - <http://www.questia.com/library/1G1-181856959/old-world-names-for-new-world-fish>.
5. Razauskas Dainius, 2009. Mythological Constituent of Slavic Ichthyologic Terminology // *Studia Mythologica Slavica*, # XII. Ljubljana. C, pp: 321-336.
6. Watt Robert, A., 1989. A Glossary of Scottish Dialect Fish and Trade Names. - *Scottish Fisheries Information Pamphlet/ Number 17*: 1-23.
7. Seelbach Paul, W., 2002. Names of Michigan fishes. Detroit, pp: 1-7.
8. Ostretsova, L.M., 1981. Subject Group: "Catching Tools" in Dialects of Middle Ishim // *Materials and Studies of Siberian Dialects*. Krasnoyarsk, pp: 130-138.
9. Khalyukov Yu, V., 2009. Names of Commercial Fishes in Fishery Lexicon of Oryol Oblast // *Zhivaya starina*, 2: 35-38.
10. Mikheyeva, N.V., 1976. On Fishery Lexicon of Ural Cossacks (Names of Tackles and their Parts) // *Voprosy russkoi dialektologii: Proceedings*. Leningrad, pp: 99-105.
11. Kolomiets, V.T., 1983. Origin of Common Slavic Fish Names. For the 9th International Congress of Slavonic Researchers. Kiev, Naukova Dumka.