COGNITIVE STUDIES | ÉTUDES COGNITIVES, 26
Warsaw 2026

Article No.: 3530
DOI: 10.11649/cs.3530

Citation: Horváth, Cs. (2026). "The night turned starless yesterday": Mansi language use and ethnolinguistic vitality during the Russian invasion of Ukraine. *Cognitive Studies | Études cognitives*, *2026*(26), Article 3530. https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.3530

Csilla Horváth

University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
csilla.horvath@helsinki.fi

"The Night Turned Starless Yesterday": Mansi Language Use and Ethnolinguistic Vitality During the Russian Invasion of Ukraine

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to analyse and discuss the consequences of the Russian invasion of Ukraine for the use and ethnolinguistic vitality of the Mansi language. Mansi is a severely endangered language spoken in Western Siberia. It has no official status; its use is partly supported and partly contested by the state. The direct and indirect consequences of the invasion have resulted in the declining use of the Mansi language and the strengthening of its position as a secret language, used for discussing sensitive or taboo subjects.
Keywords: Mansi language; Western Siberia; ethnolinguistic vitality; taboo

1 Introduction

Several reports have been published on the impact of the full-scale Russian invasion on the use of the Ukrainian language, both within Ukraine (e.g., Yaremko & Levchuk, 2023; Racek et al., 2024) and abroad, particularly in Poland (e.g., Levchuk, 2023; Shevchuk-Kliuzheva, 2024). Considerably less information is available regarding the extent to which the war has altered minority language use within Russia. The present paper aims to discuss the consequences and effects of the Russian invasion of Ukraine for the use and ethnolinguistic vitality of the Mansi language in the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug – Yugra. The paper presents the results of the latest Russian census concerning the Mansi population and language, describes the status of colonisation, the endangerment, and the contested nature of Mansi language acquisition and use, and highlights the direct and indirect effects of the invasion on the composition of speaker communities and the domains of Mansi language use.

The data presented in this contribution was collected through participant observation and semi-structured interviews during fieldwork, carried out eight times in the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug – Yugra, specifically in its capital, Khanty-Mansiysk. Observation of Ob-Ugric social media has been conducted online since 2012, and more actively since 2020, as the COVID-19 pandemic and the Russian invasion of Ukraine have rendered travel to Khanty-Mansiysk impossible.

To ensure the safety and anonymity of the participants, their names, sociolinguistic characteristics, and any other data that could facilitate their identification have been omitted from this paper. Data collection concluded on 24 February 2025.

2 Mansi

2.1 Demographic Data

Mansi (formerly known by the exonym Vogul) is an endangered, contested language which belongs to the family of Uralic languages and is spoken in Western Siberia, especially in the territory of the Khanty-Mansi

Autonomous Okrug (cf. Virtanen & Horváth, 2023). Mansi is mainly spoken by the Mansi, an indigenous people of the Russian North.

Since the first census conducted across the Soviet Union in 1926, the size of the Mansi population has grown steadily. According to the results of the 2020 Russian census, there are 12,308 Mansi living in the Russian Federation (*Naselenie korennykh malochislennykh narodov Rossiĭskoĭ Federatsii* [Census RF 2020 5/17], n.d.). The number of speakers, which fluctuated until 1970, began to decline rapidly after the 1979 census, reaching a low of 938 Mansi speakers by 2010. However, this downward trend appears to have halted by 2020, as the results of the latest census indicate a slight growth in the number of speakers. According to the 2020 census data, 1,346 people claimed proficiency in Mansi (*Natsional'nyĭ sostav naseleniia* [Census RF 2020 5/1], n.d.), 1,236 of whom were ethnically Mansi (*Vladenie iazykami naseleniem naibolee mnogochislennykh natsional'nosteĭ* [Census RF 2020 5/5], n.d.).

According to the 2001 Ukrainian census data, 43 Mansi resided in Ukraine, five of whom identified Mansi as their mother tongue (*Rozpodil naselennia za natsional'nistiu ta ridnoiu movoiu*, n.d.).

2.2 Sociolinguistic Situation

According to the UNESCO classification (UNESCO, 2011), the only remaining dialect of Mansi is severely endangered, as few speakers within the child-bearing generation transmit the language to their children, and most remaining active speakers belong to the grandparent generation. The digital vitality (cf. Kornai, 2013) of Mansi is nearly non-existent. Nevertheless, a handful of fluent and heritage speakers continue to use it on social media, and several initiatives aim to develop Mansi language technology tools, both within the speaker community and abroad (Horváth et al., 2017, 2025).

Mansi plays a minor role in its Russian-dominated, multilingual environment and is heavily affected by urbanisation. It is not an official language at either the regional or municipal level in Russia. Mansi is not used in the judicial system; no laws, regulations, or administrative provisions are published in the language, with the notable exceptions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Furthermore, Mansi is absent from public transport and official signage. While it remains in use in Mansi homes and has a limited presence in education, it holds growing importance in various leisure activities and maintains a monopoly in religious rituals.

3 Mansi as a Colonised Language

3.1 Researchers in Russia

Similar to the documentation of the languages and cultures of other indigenous peoples in Siberia, the first occasional reports on the Ob-Ugric languages originated from the travelogues of missionaries (e.g. Novitskiĭ, 1941), statesmen (e.g. Witsen, 1692), or military officers (e.g. Strahlenberg, 1726). The authors of these works focused on exotic or even fantastic elements of indigenous cultures, providing inadequate or biased accounts of them, and included very little accurate linguistic data.

These reports were followed by descriptions produced as a result of the first scientific expeditions, financed by the Russian state and conducted by researchers, primarily of foreign origin (e.g. Miller, 2009; Pallas, 1771–1776). These expeditions aimed to map the region in order to explore it, facilitate travel and the construction of infrastructure, and discover minerals and other resources. Ultimately, the objective was to integrate Siberia into the Russian Empire. When discussing indigenous peoples, these works focused on their social and political relationships with the Russian state; a detailed description of indigenous languages and language use was not within the scope of these accounts.

3.2 Researchers from Abroad

From the perspective of the Russian state administration, the fieldwork conducted by Finnish and Hungarian linguists in the 19th and 20th centuries did not differ from previous scientific expeditions. These researchers,

however, were driven by a fundamentally different motivation for studying the indigenous peoples of the Ural region. Their interest in the languages and cultures of peoples considered potential candidates for kinship with their respective nations was motivated by a desire to better understand the origins of the Finnish and Hungarian nations (Leete, 2014, pp. 80–88).

Due to this motivation, Finnish and Hungarian researchers focused on layers of Mansi oral culture they regarded as the most ancient and "pure", often disregarding other elements. They sought out speakers in remote communities, whom they described as "most primitive" (Pápai, 1890, p. 121) or "unspoilt" (Toldy, 1850, p. lxxii). When discussing individual Mansi speakers, researchers also noted their criteria for selecting informants. Some preferred to employ interpreters who were not even Mansi (Ahlqvist, 1999, pp. 114–116) or who could adapt to the researchers' strict schedule (T. Kannisto, 1963, p. 28). Other language consultants were praised for their ability to speak and understand different varieties of Mansi (Munkácsi, 1889, pp. 225–226). However, even when researchers lauded their teachers for their intellectual qualities, these compliments often contained phrasing that would hardly be considered complimentary by modern standards.

In the second half of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st centuries, certain Mansi intellectuals were presented with copies of the publications resulting from these fieldwork trips. Written in Finno-Ugric transcription and accompanied by Hungarian or German translations, these works remained inaccessible and incomprehensible to the Mansi until various research groups transcribed them into the contemporary Mansi writing system and provided Russian translations (e.g. A. Kannisto, 2016; Munkácsi, 2015).

4 Mansi as an Endangered Language

4.1 History of Multilingualism

The academic research into the Mansi language and its use began almost two centuries ago. The first researcher to visit the Mansi-speaking regions was Antal Reguly (1819–1858), who visited these regions between December 1843 and September 1844 (cf. Reguly, 2008). Reguly was followed by August Ahlqvist (1826–1889), who visited the Mansi three times, in 1858, 1877 and 1880 (cf. Ahlqvist, 1986). Bernát Munkácsi (1860–1937), partly in collaboration with the ethnographer Károly Pápai (1861–1893), spent 11 months on fieldwork in 1888 and 1889 (cf. Kozmács, 2012). The last researcher to conduct extensive fieldwork among the Mansi was Artturi Kannisto (1874–1943) between 1901 and 1906 (cf. A. Kannisto, 1903, 1904, 1907a, 1907b, 1908). As a result of these studies, the Mansi language is one of the best-documented languages of Siberia, and historical data are available on the ethnolinguistic vitality of the language as well.

The researchers of the Mansi language did not provide comprehensive reports on the contemporary situation of ethnolinguistic vitality or detailed descriptions of the patterns of language use. Nor did they ask for or cite the opinions of the Mansi, speakers or non-speakers, about their reasons for using or not using, transmitting or not transmitting the language. However, they made remarks on the changes in ethnolinguistic vitality they were experiencing at certain locations (e.g. Ahlqvist, 1999, p. 25), and lamented the nature (e.g. Munkácsi, 1889, pp. 236–237) or the inevitability (e.g. T. Kannisto, 1963, pp. 55–56) of Russification. The history of bilingualism (and probable multilingualism) in Mansi society undoubtedly started in the distant past, as already the earliest linguistic researchers complained about language shift, assimilation and language endangerment.

4.2 The Role of Multilingualism in Language Acquisition

According to the results of the 2020 Russian census, 12,233 of the Mansi respondents claimed to speak Russian, and they showed growing diversity in speaking other languages as well. Among those answering the question about their language skills, 416 mentioned English, 114 German, 39 Komi, 25 Khanty, 17 Russian Sign Language, 11 Mari, 8 Tatar, 6 Turkish, 4 Ukrainian, 3 Nenets, two each for Bashkir, Hungarian or Japanese, one each for Arabic, Chechen, Chinese, Kalmyk, Korean, Mongolian, Tajik, Yakut or Yiddish, and 26 some other language (*Vladenie iazykami korennykh malochislennykh narodov Rossiĭskoĭ Federatsii*

[Census RF 2020 5/18], n.d.). While these figures might be imprecise, they clearly indicate that technically all Mansi-language speakers are bilingual, first and foremost in Russian, but also in other languages.

While historically Mansi-speakers were bilingual, especially in the languages of neighbouring minorities, e.g. in Khanty or Komi, and competence in Russian was less typical, the Mansi community maintained monolingual Mansi language use. The sociolinguistic settings have changed, and in the 21st century it is more typical for a Mansi speaker to be bilingual in Mansi and Russian, occasionally supplemented with competence in the language of one of the immigrant ethnic minorities, such as Tajik, Ukrainian or Turkish. The Mansi-speaking community has a limited number of domains of language use in which to maintain Mansi, and due to the high rate of inter-ethnic marriages, it is exceptional for Mansi speakers to use Mansi with their spouse or children.

Due to the narrow range of domains of language use and limited economic significance, the Mansi language is located at the bottom of the hierarchy of local languages. These factors, together with widespread bilingualism, cause difficulties not only in language use but also in intergenerational language transmission, and thus ultimately contribute to the endangerment of the Mansi language.

5 Mansi as a Contested Language

5.1 Terminology

According to – federal legislation, the Mansi belong to the category of the so-called small-numbered indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East of the Russian Federation (in Russian: *коренные малочисленные народу Севера, Сибири и Дальнего Востока Российской Федерации*). Decree No. 132-r on the sustainable development of indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation (*Rasporiazhenie Pravitel'stva RF ot 04.02.2009 №132-r "O Kontseptsii ustoĭchivogo razvitiia korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa, Sibiri i Dal'nego Vostoka Rossiĭskoĭ Federatsii"*, 2009), issued on 4 February 2009, registers 40 such ethnic groups. The small-numbered indigenous peoples are defined as ethnic groups consisting of no more than 50,000 people, who live in the traditional territories of their ancestors, preserve their traditional way of life and occupations, and consider themselves to be an independent ethnic community. The category distinguishes not only between indigenous and immigrant minorities, but also between indigenous groups consisting of more or less than 50,000 people. The small-numbered indigenous peoples are subject to the local legislative system of the area where they reside.

The Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug – Yugra grants special rights to three small-numbered indigenous peoples: the Khanty, the Mansi and the Forest Nenets.

Regarding the rights of small-numbered indigenous peoples concerning the use of their language, it is important to emphasise the differences in the understanding of the term 'native language'. Although in local scientific discussions 'native tongue' (*родной язык*) is used in the sense of the speaker's primary language – the language first acquired or the language of early childhood – among the representatives of indigenous peoples and legislators, the term is used to mean the language correlating with one's ethnicity, namely the language of one's ancestors.

5.2 Legislation

The legislation of the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug officially grants special rights and support to representatives of the three local indigenous peoples in many areas of life, including healthcare, housing and education, as well as language use, folklore, reindeer husbandry, and traditional forms of religious practice. Legislation emphasises the importance of 'maintaining and revitalising traditional lifestyle, traditional economic activities, rational nature management, and developing the culture and languages of small nations' (Law No. 73-oz; *Zakon Khanty-Mansiĭskogo avtonomnogo okruga – IUgry ot 19 noiabria 2001 g. N 73-oz "Ob obshchinakh korennykh malochislennykh narodov v Khanty-Mansiĭskom avtonomnom okruge – IUgre"*, n.d.).

The Okrug provides social, economic, and legal protection for the languages of the indigenous peoples living in the Autonomous Okrug. The authorities of the Okrug are obliged to preserve, study, and develop

the languages of indigenous peoples; to develop, adopt and implement measures and programmes aimed at their preservation (Law No. 89-oz; *Zakon Khanty-Mansiĭskogo avtonomnogo okruga – IUgry ot 4 dekabria 2001 goda N 89-oz "O iazykakh korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa, prozhivaiushchikh na territorii Khanty-Mansiĭskogo avtonomnogo okruga"*, 2001). The legislation makes no distinction between the indigenous minorities of the Okrug, while the implementation of the law results in a different level of support for each group.

In the case of support for the Mansi language and culture, while certain elements of the culture are supported, the use of the Mansi language is only tolerated, usually in tandem with (a variety of) Khanty, and always together with Russian, while language acquisition, language education and language revitalisation receive insufficient or unprofessional support (cf. Horváth, 2020).

6 The Mansi and the Russian Invasion of Ukraine

6.1 Sources of Information

Limited official information is available regarding Mansi participation in the Russian invasion of Ukraine. Unlike the census data, which – at least in the case of the indigenous peoples of the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug – was accurate at least in magnitude, official statistics on Russian casualties are considered unreliable. More credible estimates and partial lists of confirmed losses are available through the BBC News Russian service, the independent media outlet Mediazona, and the Latvia-based news agency Meduza.

Further data on the impact of the Russian–Ukrainian war concerning the Mansi and their language use was collected from the regional Russian and Mansi press, various social media sites, and private communication.

6.2 Indigenous Peoples in the Invasion

The Russian invasion of Ukraine, which started on 24 February 2022, is an escalation of the Russian–Ukrainian War, which has been going on since Russia's annexation of Crimea and the Donets Basin in 2014. On 21 September 2022, the so-called 'partial' mobilisation of military reservists in Russia started with an announcement by Vladimir Putin. By 2 October 2022, 2,500 citizens had been mobilised from the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug.

Little information is available on the number of Russian casualties in the invasion. On 24 February 2025, Mediazona listed 93,641 confirmed casualties and estimated the total number of casualties at around 120,000 people (Mediazona, 2025), while the Russian service of BBC News posted about 95,026 confirmed casualties (Ivshina, 2025), and Meduza estimated the total number of Russian casualties at around 160,000–165,000 (Meduza, 2025). According to the statistics provided by Mediazona, 926 of the confirmed losses were registered in the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug.

The website Indigenous Russia has published the names of 605 identified indigenous soldiers on a list entitled "Representatives of indigenous peoples of Russia killed/missing in action in the war with Ukraine". The list contains 150 Tyvans (295,384/252,953), 149 Nenets (49,646/24,487), 66 Chukchi (16,200/2,607), 55 Khanty (31,467/9,230), 25 Evens (19,913/5,304), 24 Koryaks (7,485/2,633), 24 Telengits (2,730/–), 19 Evenks (39,226/5,831), 11 Dolgans (8,157/4,836), 9 Mansi (12,228/1,346), 9 Izhma Komi (4,748/–), 9 Shors (10,507/2,927), 7 Siberian Yupiks (1,657/172), 6 Nivkhs (3,842/708), 5 Saami (1,530/259), 5 Udeges (1,325/193), 4 Selkups (3,458/975), 3 Itelmens (2,596/532), 2 Nganasans (687/300), 2 Tubalars (3,620/–), 2 Nanai (11,623/3,180), 2 Chelkans (1,290/506), 1 Yukaghir (1,802/359), 1 Kamchadal (1,547/–), 1 Khakas (61,365/29,010) 14 individuals without a specific ethnic designation (Indigenous Russia, 2025).[1]

[1] For the purposes of comparison, the ethnonyms are followed by the population figures and the number of speakers in brackets, as recorded in the 2020 Russian census data. The Tyvans, Khakas and Izhma Komi are not officially registered as small-numbered indigenous peoples of the Russian North. The Telengits, the Izhma Komi, the Tubalars and the Kamchadals are featured in the census as separate ethnic groups; however, their languages are not distinguished (Izhma Komi from Komi, Telengit and Tubalar from Altai, Kamchadal from Russian), thus no data is available on the number of speakers.

6.3 Indigenous Peoples of the Okrug in the Invasion

The number of Mansi, Khanty or Nenets soldiers fighting in the Russian army during the Russian invasion of Ukraine as mobilised reservists, contracted soldiers, contracted inmates of penal institutions, members of private military organisations, or by other means, is unknown. According to the data collected via private communication, despite the lack of news on further mobilisation, the recruitment of soldiers to the Russian army has been continuous since 2022, and it affects Mansi men of conscription age in increasing numbers.

Based on the previously mentioned data, estimates can also be made about the participation of the indigenous peoples of the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug in the invasion. Assuming that the 36 confirmed casualties from this Okrug, mentioned by Indigenous Russia, are also accounted for by Mediazone, it would mean that the indigenous casualties make up 3.89% of the total number of losses in the Okrug, while according to the results of the latest census, these nationalities form 1.87% of the total population of the Okrug.

According to the same data, even the most remote indigenous communities appear to have been affected by the consequences of the war. Since there is no significant Tundra Nenets population living in the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug, the nine Nenets soldiers who came from the Okrug were most likely representatives of the region's Forest Nenets[2] minority. Similarly, if the identified Mansi soldier did indeed come from the Sverdlovsk Oblast,[3] he was most probably a representative of the Ivdel Mansi community.[4]

7 Consequences of the Russian Invasion of Ukraine on Mansi Language Use

7.1 Loss of Young Speakers

The most immediate impact of the Russian invasion of Ukraine on the ethnolinguistic vitality of the contested languages is the loss of young speakers. While no official information is available on the Mansi soldiers' Mansi proficiency, estimates can be deduced from public online sources.

Three of the nine identified Mansi soldiers were born and raised outside the traditional Mansi-speaking territories of the Okrug. Kutmarov I. A. (1987–2023) was born in the Kondinskoye settlement (*Poteri 58562: Kutmarov Ivan Aleksandrovich*, n.d.). Kondinskoye used to be the cultural and administrative centre of the Eastern Mansi, but since the Eastern Mansi dialect is regarded as being moribund or extinct, it is highly unlikely that the soldier had any proficiency in Mansi. Sangilev M. V. (1989–2024) was born in the town of Nyagany (Morozova, 2024). Nyagany, a young urban settlement without a considerable Mansi population, would be an unusual location in which to acquire the Mansi language. Balishev B. A. (1997–2024) was a resident of Beliy Yar (TSentral′naia raĭonnaia biblioteka, Surgutskiĭ raĭon, 2024). Beliy Yar is located close to the city of Surgut, far from the traditional Mansi-speaking territories. In all likelihood, these two soldiers did not speak Mansi either.

The other six Mansi soldiers, on the other hand, probably or presumably were Mansi speakers. Bukharin A. G. (1990–2024) was born in the village of Vanzetur (Obshchestvennaia organizatsiia "Spasenie IUgry", 2024), while Anyamov Ye. V. (?–2023) and Rombandeev I. Ye.[5] (?–2024) were born in the village of Sosva

[2] Forest Nenets is a severely endangered Samoyedic language, spoken in Western Siberia. For a long time it was considered a Nenets dialect, until recently it has been treated by scholars as a language separate from Tundra Nenets. However, Russian legislation does not distinguish the speakers of Forest Nenets from the speakers of Tundra Nenets, both groups are called Nenets.

[3] The majority (8) of the identified Mansi soldiers came from the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug, while one is reported to have come from the Sverdlovsk Oblast.

[4] About 100–150 Mansi live more or less regularly in the small Mansi settlements of the Sverdlovsk Oblast. These settlements are located near the town of Ivdel, thus, the residents are usually referred to as Ivdel Mansi. The Mansi variety spoken by the Ivdel Mansi is slightly different but mutually intelligible with the Mansi varieties spoken in the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug.

[5] In the official statement, Rombandeev I. Ye. is reported to have been born in Sosva, Sverdlovsk Oblast (*Poteri 62105: Rombandeev Igor' Evgen'evich*, n.d.), but since Sosva, Sverdlovsk Oblast, is a settlement with no considerable Mansi population, it is more logical to assume that he instead came from Sosva, Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug, where approximately half of the inhabitants are Mansi (Abramov, 2018).

(*Spisok pogibshikh na voĭne s Ukrainoĭ*, 2024; Sos′vinskaia sredniaia shkola KhMAO, 2024). Both villages are located in traditional Mansi territories and are mostly inhabited by Mansi, thus if both of the soldiers' parents were Mansi, the soldiers likely grew up as native or heritage speakers. Rombandeev N. V. (1978–2023), Saynakhov Ye. A. (1999–2023) and Anyamov A. P. (1987–2024) were raised in the Saranpaul settlement (*Ėks-politseĭskiĭ iz KhMAO*, 2024; *Poteri 42015: Saĭnakhov Evgeniĭ Arkad'evich*, n.d.). Anyamov A. P., for example, is remembered as being a member of a Mansi family of six children, with both parents coming from a tiny Mansi village; he regularly attended a Mansi summer camp (Saranpaul′skiĭ kraevedcheskiĭ muzeĭ, 2025) and excelled in indigenous sports such as axe throwing, lasso throwing or sled jumping (*V metanii topora*, 2024). Saranpaul is the central settlement of the region in the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug where the ethnolinguistic vitality of the Mansi language is the strongest. Many of the young speakers and, according to personal communication, also the majority of the mobilised Mansi soldiers were born in this region and were educated in Saranpaul.

7.2 Symbolic Use of the Mansi and Their Cultural Heritage at State Celebrations

The already existing symbolic presence of the Ob-Ugric cultural heritage in the common spaces and official events of the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug (cf. Horváth, 2017) became more prominent following the beginning of the Russian invasion of Ukraine. Ethnic settlements organised victory parades on 9 May, with residents, some dressed in national costumes, marching in the crowd holding placards with photographs of their ancestors. These celebrations, along with other patriotic-political events, were extensively documented on social media platforms as well.

Indigenous actors and elements of the indigenous peoples' cultures were also used at the federal level. Employees of governmental institutions with a Khanty or Mansi profile were present at rallies supporting presidential policies, holding signs saying "For Russia", "For the president" or "For victory". At another political rally, Mansi children, dressed in national costumes and holding Russian flags, surrounded the governor of the Okrug, while the actors of the Ob-Ugric theatre took part in a federal patriotic dance challenge, performing a composition consisting of stylised segments of Ob-Ugric folk dances, ending with the actors forming the letter Z with their hands.

7.3 Decreasing Public Language Use

Political surveillance and control lead to a reduction in the number of utterances, a smaller variety of messages and, ultimately, a reduced willingness to communicate in public. Surveillance of communication has also altered the previous patterns of online language use. While the COVID-19 pandemic led to an unexpected digital boom among Khanty and Mansi speakers, resulting in new trends, new genres and new users, this digital prosperity was followed by a relapse after the Russian invasion of Ukraine (cf. Horváth, 2023). As a result of the ban on Western platforms, users hibernated their profiles on these sites (cf. Horváth, 2025). Some remained active on Russian social media accounts, some registered on new, secure platforms (such as e.g. Telegram or WhatsApp), and some started using a VPN in order to return to the abandoned Western platforms. The common feature of the different strategies is that users rarely compose original texts, preferring to post photos without captions or share other users' posts.

Silence as a linguistic and cultural phenomenon has been a category in the study of the indigenous peoples of Western Siberia for decades, and has recently emerged as an important independent research subject (e.g. Laptander, 2020). In the case of Ob-Ugric peoples, being silent – that is, being present while retiring from active communication – is understood to be an indigenous conflict-resolution strategy.

While users indicate their presence on social media by posting politically neutral photographs, the digital domain of the Mansi language lacks not only openly critical remarks but also content supporting the war or state propaganda. This conspicuous absence suggests that users may maintain negative attitudes towards these topics, or at the very least, they deliberately avoid political alignment in the public sphere.

8 The Secret Mansi Words of War

8.1 The Importance of Mansi Language Use in Religious Activities

The Mansi language has a monopolistic position in traditional religious rituals. Although the missionary activity of various Christian institutions, especially the Orthodox Church, as well as Soviet intolerance of religious activities, have both tried to eliminate indigenous ritual practices, the Mansi have maintained a complex religious system of their own for centuries. This worldview includes syncretic elements from world religions, while its core consists of a polytheistic system of local gods and spirits.

There are figures in the Mansi pantheon that are worshipped in most of the Mansi territories, but besides the cult of these gods, the veneration of local and family guardian spirits plays an important role in Mansi religious life. According to the literature (cf. Baulo, 2013; Gemuev & Sagalaev, 1986), Mansi settlements feature local, territorial sacred places where the guardian spirits of the community are venerated. Additionally, Mansi families traditionally kept effigies of family guardian spirits and ancestors within their homes. Thus, speaking to gods and guardian spirits can also be interpreted as speaking to ancestors and other deceased members of the Mansi community; consequently, the Mansi language is understood as the only means of communication through which to maintain discourse with them.

The Mansi gods and guardian spirits are traditionally regarded as the providers of good health and prosperity to the Mansi; thus, being able to communicate with them is crucial for guaranteeing the well-being of the community. Since the well-being of both the individual and the community depends on correctly addressing the gods and guardian spirits, as well as adhering to specific rules, restrictions, and taboos, these rituals and the discourse surrounding them must be conducted in Mansi.

8.2 Taboo and Secret

This exclusive position of the Mansi language in rituals includes other situations concerning religious beliefs or the transcendent as well. The sphere of the sacred covers not only prayers, offerings and rituals *per se*, but also includes any kind of activity of transcendental importance, such as the various taboos concerning death, female hygiene, sexual acts, orientation, habits, crimes, family secrets and secrets in general.

The most famous matrix of Mansi taboo expressions is the so-called "bear language" (cf. Horváth et al., 2016). The bear, a prominently sacred animal venerated by the Mansi, is believed to understand human speech; thus, it is respectful and cautious to use taboo words while speaking about the bear, the parts of its body, or any activity connected with it (especially bear hunting) so that the bear will not understand. The taboo words of this "bear language" consist of Mansi words that have a different, special meaning when used in connection with the bear (e.g. *сосыг* 'currant' but also meaning 'eye' when speaking of the bear's eyes), and words that may be used solely in connection with the bear (e.g. *хащлуӈкве* 'to be angry' as opposed to *кантлуӈкве* 'to be angry' when speaking of a human).

In the contemporary sociolinguistic situation, not only the Mansi taboo expressions but the entire Mansi language is considered a secret language. It is a general tendency for Mansi speakers to use Mansi only with conversation partners whom they know relatively well. Mansi speakers prefer to use the Mansi language when there is no third person without sufficient knowledge of Mansi within hearing range. Young and middle-aged speakers, in particular, prefer switching to Russian when they notice unfamiliar people within earshot. At the same time, Mansi is positively used as a secret language to discuss delicate, intimate, dangerous and private topics.

Since increased political control has reduced the amount of public discussion on social media sites, some Mansi speakers not only prefer to write exclusively private messages or emails but also extend the exclusivity of these messages by writing them entirely in Mansi. This tendency not only expands the domain of language use but also results in the creation of new vocabulary; in order to avoid the use of Russian loanwords, people prefer to use poetic phrases and neologisms. Thus, the frequent use of descriptive multi-word expressions while writing about the invasion fits in with both taboo language traditions and the history of creating neologisms.

8.3 The Mansi Vocabulary of War

War is called *khontlan warmaly* (*хōнтлан вāрмаль*, literally 'fighting thing') in Mansi, but the term is used in connection with World War II rather than the Russian–Ukrainian war. In official communication, the Russian invasion of Ukraine is labelled as *spetsialny voenny operatsiya* (*специальный военный операция*, a 'special military operation'), which is the Mansi translation of the Russian *специальная военная операция* (Horváth, 2023, p. 110). In colloquial Mansi, as demonstrated in examples (1) and (2), the war, the invasion, the front and the battle are simply referred to as *lyuly ma* (*лӣль мā*), that is, the 'bad place'.

(1) *Ӯсувт кāсыӈ сāт хум хōтпат лӣль мāн кēтавет*. [In our town men are sent to the bad place every week.]

(2) *Туп мōлхōтал хулыслум, […] ōс лӣль мāн минас*. [I only heard yesterday that [person] went to the bad place too.]

Besides meaning literally 'bad' or 'ugly', the adjective *lyuly* may be understood metaphorically as well, when speaking of something disgusting or inappropriate. For example, horse manure is called *luw lyuly* (*лув лӣль*, literally 'horse bad', that is, 'equine impropriety') in a Mansi mythical song from the nineteenth century (Munkácsi, 1902, p. 6). According to a Mansi epic song, a mythological hero killed a forest giant, and when the body of the forest giant hit the ground, his organs turned into lakes and islands. The forest giant's stomach turned into a lake that is called *Lyuly nampa tur* (*Лӣль нампа тӯр*, literally 'the lake with the bad name'), while his penis turned into a river which is called Lyuly nampa ya (*Лӣль нампа ӣ*, literally 'river with the bad name') (Munkácsi, 1910, p. 248).

Another strategy, as shown in examples (3) and (4), is the omission of any reference to the invasion or the front, by stating that people are being sent or are going somewhere without further explanation of the destination.

(3) *Ань ты накт ос тасāвит […] пыгыт минасыт.* [This time, so many boys from [village] are going.]

(4) *Ӣтил māньщи пыганув ōс минӭгыт.* [Our dear Mansi boys are going too.]

No explicit neologisms were coined to describe military terminology; nevertheless, the Mansi phrasing appears to indicate the various means of recruiting soldiers for the Russian army. The passive voice and the verb 'to send', as in example (5), supposedly refer to the Mansi soldiers in question being mobilised.

(5) *Апщиг тув илттыг кетвесыг, нэмхотъют аты номсах тох. […] […] апщитэ ос тув кетвес. […]т халт […] тан пуссын акв порат кетвесыт.* [The brothers were sent out all of a sudden, nobody expected it. [Person]'s brother [person] was sent there too. Among the [profession] also [person] was sent there at the same time.]

The active voice and the verb 'to go', on the other hand, apparently refer to Mansi volunteers who went to the front after signing contracts, as in example (6).

(6) *[…]ос […] тэнки тув минасыг.* [[Person] and [person] went there of their own accord.]

Poetic expressions are used to describe emotionally charged situations. In example (7), the shock at the sudden mobilisation is described as extinguishing the lights of the universe.

(7) *Кит апщиг, тэн […]т рупитасыг. Молты эт посэтталыг ты емтыс, хонтлэг.* [Two brothers, they were working at the [institution]. The night turned starless yesterday, they are fighting.]

In example (8) the death of indigenous soldiers is described with the passive form of the verb 'to extinguish, to destroy or to ruin', instead of referring to death using the usual neutral taboo term *āтимыг ēмтуӈкве* 'to become nothing, to become non-existent'.

(8) *Мань пувланувт тай това маньщи, ханты пыгыт порславесыт.* [From our small villages, several Mansi and Khanty boys have perished.]

In example (9), the invasion is compared to a hurricane that is beyond the reach of ordinary humans and that can be stopped only by supernatural powers.

(9) *Ман ос пуссын покищев, молях тот вот ротмысыт.* [We all pray, may this wind calm down.]

While warfare and military service have not traditionally been regarded as taboo by Mansi speakers, the contentious political discourse surrounding the Russian invasion of Ukraine has transformed these subjects into a "secret topic". Such matters may now be discussed frankly only in private settings and through the medium of the Mansi language, often by employing or creating taboo expressions to replace Russian loanwords.

9 Conclusion

Mansi is a severely endangered language, spoken mostly by the Mansi, an indigenous people of the Russian North. The speakers of the Mansi language have been subjects of colonisation for centuries, and the Mansi language materials documented through their cooperation have been appropriated for a long time. The Mansi language has no official status or economic significance, and despite official support granted by federal and local administrations, its use and acquisition are contested by the state.

The Russian invasion of Ukraine, which began on 24 February 2022, caused many direct and indirect changes in the ethnolinguistic vitality of the Mansi language. Alongside the absence and loss of young Mansi speakers, the use of the Mansi language itself has been hindered by increasing governmental control over the domains of language use and the limiting of freedom of speech within them. The change in the number of speakers and the tightening of control over the domains of language use has resulted in a decline of Mansi language use in community communication, including the temporary or permanent abandonment of criminalised social media sites. At the same time, Mansi speakers have switched to more secure, private channels of communication, often preferring to use Mansi rather than Russian when writing about events concerning the invasion.

Although data concerning the lost Mansi speakers or the measures of governmental restrictions resulting in the reduced amount, frequency, domains and platforms of communication are neither accurate nor definitive, it can already be concluded that the damage and other changes in the ethnolinguistic vitality of the Mansi language caused by the Russian invasion of Ukraine are only comparable to the losses following World War II.

References

Abramov, I. (2018, February 16). *Mansiĭsko-Sos'vinskaia kul'tbaza*. Retrieved February 15, 2025, from https://ilya-abramov-84.livejournal.com/91340.html

Ahlqvist, A. (1986). *Muistelmia matkoilta Wenäjällä 1854–1858*. Karisto.

Ahlqvist, A. (1999). *Sredi khantov i mansi*. Izdatel′stvo Tomskogo Universiteta.

Baulo, A. V. (2013). *Sviashchennye mesta i atributy severnykh mansi*. Bakso.

Ėks-politseĭskiĭ iz KhMAO pogib na SVO cherez chetyre mesiatsa posle podpisaniia kontrakta. (2024, April 18). Muksun. Retrieved May 15, 2025, from https://muksun.fm/news/2024-04-18/eks-politseyskiy-iz-hmao-pogib-na-svo-cherez-chetyre-mesyatsa-posle-podpisaniya-kontrakta-5060198

Gemuev, I. N., & Sagalaev, A. M. (1986). *Religiia naroda mansi*. Izdatel′stvo "Nauka".

Horváth, Cs. (2017). The Mona Lisa of Khanty-Mansiysk: Expanded urban linguistic landscape from Siberia: Written and visual, online and offline. In D. Pralica & N. Šinković (Eds.), *Digitalne medijske tehnologije i društveno-obrazovne promene 7* (pp. 93–103). Univerzitet u Novom Sadu.

Horváth, Cs. (2020). *The vitality and revitalisation attempts of the Mansi language in Khanty-Mansiysk* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Szeged]. SZTE Doktori Repozitórium. http://doktori.bibl.u-szeged.hu/id/eprint/10757/

Horváth, Cs. (2023). The "Fearsome disease" and the "Fighting thing": Comparing the discourse of the COVID-19 epidemic and the Russian invasion of Ukraine in the Mansi press. In J. Kleut & S. Janjić (Eds.), *Digitalne medijske tehnologije i društveno-obrazovne promene 11* (pp. 103–116). Filozofski fakultet.

Horváth, Cs. (2025). The role of Ob-Ugric native speakers and heritage language speakers in creating Khanty and Mansi print, broadcast and social media. In M. Manias-Muñoz, S. Bober, & C. Willis (Eds.), *Minority language media: Current challenges in a fragmented mediascape* (pp. 239–263). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-71228-9_10

Horváth, Cs., Nagy, Á., Szilágyi, N., & Vincze, V. (2016). Where bears have the eyes of currant: Towards a Mansi WordNet. In V. Barbu Mititelu, C. Forascu, C. Fellbaum, & P. Vossen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Eighth Global WordNet Conference* (pp. 131–135). Global Wordnet Association.

Horváth, Cs., Rueter, J., & Trosterud, T. (2025). A Mansi FST and spellchecker. In T. Trosterud, L. Wiechetek, & F. Pirinen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th Workshop on Constraint Grammar and Finite State NLP* (pp. 32–37). University of Tartu Library.

Horváth, Cs., Szilágyi, N., Vincze, V., & Nagy, Á. (2017). Language technology resources and tools for Mansi: An overview. In F. M. Tyers, M. Rießler, T. A. Pirinen, & T. Trosterud (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop for Computational Linguistics of Uralic Languages* (pp. 56–65). The Association for Computational Linguistics. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W17-0606

Indigenous Russia. (2025). *Predstaviteli korennykh narodov Rossii, pogibshie / bez vesti propavshie na voĭne s Ukrainoĭ*. Retrieved February 24, 2025, from https://indigenous-russia.com/archives/29542

Ivshina, O. (2025, February 21). *Nevidimye poteri*. BBC News Russkaia sluzhba. Retrieved February 24, 2025, from https://www.bbc.com/russian/articles/cgq98nyvq9no

Kannisto, A. (1903). Matkakertomus vogulimailta I. *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja*, *21*(6), 7–9.

Kannisto, A. (1904). Matkakertomus vogulimailta II. *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja*, *22*(3), 1–2.

Kannisto, A. (1907a). Matkakertomus vogulimailta III. *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja*, *24*(3), 1–3.

Kannisto, A. (1907b). Matkakertomus vogulimailta IV. *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja*, *24*(4), 1–4.

Kannisto, A. (1908). Matkakertomus vogulimailta V. *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aika kauskirja*, *25*(5), 1–8.

Kannisto, A. (2016). *Dramaticheskie predstavleniia na medvezh'em prazdnike mansi*. Pechatnyĭ mir.

Kannisto, T. (1963). Artturi Kanniston tutkimusmatkat Siperiassa vuosina 1901–1906. Päiväkirjamuistiinpanoja ja kirjeitä. *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja*, *64*(1), 1–161.

Kornai, A. (2013). Digital language death. *PLoS ONE*, *8*(10), Article e77056. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0077056

Kozmács, I. (2012). *Munkácsi Bernát élete*. AB-ART.

Laptander, R. (2020). *When we got reindeer, we moved to live in the tundra: The spoken and silenced history of the Yamal Nenets*. University of Lapland Printing Centre.

Levchuk, P. (2023). The Ukrainian language in Polish public space after the Russian aggression against Ukraine in 2022. *Cognitive Studies | Études cognitives*, *2023*(23), Article 3053. https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.3053

Leete, A. (2014). *Guileless indigenous and hidden passion: Descriptions of Ob-Ugrians and Samoyeds through the centuries*. Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Mediazona. (2025, February 24). *Russian casualties in Ukraine: Mediazona count, updated*. Retrieved February 24, 2025, from https://en.zona.media/article/2022/05/20/casualties_eng

Meduza. (2025, February 24). *160 tysiach pogibshikh rossiĭskikh soldat*. Retrieved February 24, 2025, from https://meduza.io/feature/2025/02/24/160-tysyach-pogibshih-rossiyskih-soldat

Miller, G. F. (2009). *Opisanie sibirskikh narodov*. Pamiatniki istoricheskoĭ mysli.

Morozova, L. (2024, January 18). *Poisk propavshikh na SVO*. VK. https://vk.com/wall183433958_908

Munkácsi, B. (2015). *Mān'si mākhum pēs ĭis ērgyt / Starinnye pesni naroda mansi*. IUgorskiĭ format.

Munkácsi, B. (1889). Nyelvészeti tanúlmányútam a vogulok földén 1. *Budapesti Szemle*, *60*(206–237).

Munkácsi, B. (1902). *Vogul népköltési gyűjtemény I*. Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.

Munkácsi, B. (1910). *Vogul népköltési gyűjtemény II*. Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.

Naselenie korennykh malochislennykh narodov Rossiĭskoĭ Federatsii [Census RF 2020 5/17]. (n.d.). Federal′naia sluzhba gosudarstvennoĭ statistiki. Retrieved April 1, 2023, from https://rosstat.gov.ru/storage/mediabank/Tom5_tab17_VPN-2020.xlsx

Natsional'nyĭ sostav naseleniia [Census RF 2020 5/1]. (n.d.). Federal′naia sluzhba gosudarstvennoĭ statistiki. Retrieved April 1, 2023, from https://rosstat.gov.ru/storage/mediabank/Tom5_tab1_VPN-2020.xlsx

Novitskiĭ, G. (1941). *Kratkoe opisanie o narode ostiatskom 1715*. Novosibgiz.

Obshchestvennaia organizatsiia “Spasenie IUgry”. (2024, June 21). *V khode vypolneniia zadach spetsial'noĭ voennoĭ operatsii pogib urozhenets p. Vanzetur*. VK. Retrieved May 15, 2025, from https://vk.com/wall-147337033_8875

Pallas, P. S. (1771–1776). *Reise durch verschiedene Provinzen des Russischen Reichs*. Kaiserl. Academie der Wissenschaften.

Pápai, K. (1890). A vogulok és osztyákoknál. *Ethnographia*, *1*(3), 117–130.

Poteri 42015: Saĭnakhov Evgeniĭ Arkad'evich. (n.d.). Retrieved May 15, 2025, from https://poteru.net/soldier/42015

Poteri 58562: Kutmarov Ivan Aleksandrovich. (n.d.). Retrieved May 15, 2025, from https://poteru.net/soldier/58562

Poteri 62105: Rombandeev Igor' Evgen'evich. (n.d.). Retrieved May 15, 2025, from https://poteru.net/soldier/62105

Racek, D., Davidson, B. I., Thurner, P. W., Zhu X. X., & Kauermann, G. (2024). The Russian war in Ukraine increased Ukrainian language use on social media. *Communications Psychology*, *2*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44271-023-00045-6

Rasporiazhenie Pravitel'stva RF ot 04.02.2009 №132-r “O Kontseptsii ustoĭchivogo razvitiia korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa, Sibiri i Dal'nego Vostoka Rossiĭskoĭ Federatsii”. (2009). https://fadn.gov.ru/documents/osnovopolagayushhie-dokumentyi/acts/file-download/cqegbzjmgzemcle5qswh1i1oq3ornacq

Reguly, A. (2008). *Kalendarium*. Tinta Könyvkiadó.

Rozpodil naselennia za natsional'nistiu ta ridnoiu movoiu. (n.d.). Derzhavnyĭ komitet statystyky Ukraïny. Retrieved November 15, 2015, from http://2001.ukrcensus.gov.ua/results/nationality_population/nationality_popul1/select_5/?botton=cens_db&box=5.1W&k_t=00&p=0&rz=1_1&rz_b=2_1%20%20%20%20&n_page=1

Saranpaul′skiĭ kraevedcheskiĭ muzeĭ. (2025, July 27). *Voĭna, v kotoroĭ my srazhalis'*. VK. Retrieved July 28, 2025, from https://vk.com/wall-193548311_4987

Shevchuk-Kliuzheva, O. (2024). Forced migration and family language policy: The Ukrainian experience of language. *Cognitive Studies | Études cognitives*, *2024*(24), Article 3318. https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.3318

Sos′vinskaia sredniaia shkola KhMAO. (2024, June 18). *I vnov' utrata…* VK. Retrieved May 15, 2025, from https://vk.com/wall-193636084_4965

Spisok pogibshikh na voĭne s Ukrainoĭ: Aniamov Evgeniĭ Vital'evich. (2024). Retrieved May 15, 2025, from https://200.zona.media/%D0%A5%D0%B0%D0%BD%D1%82%D1%8B-%D0%9C%D0%B0%D0%BD%D1%81%D0%B8%D0%B9%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%B8%D0%B9_%D0%B0%D0%B2%D1%82%D0%BE%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0%BC%D0%BD%D1%8B%D0%B9_%D0%BE%D0%BA%D1%80%D1%83%D0%B3_-_%D0%AE%D0%B3%D1%80%D0%B0/%D0%B7%D0%B0%D0%BA%D0%BB%D1%8E%D1%87%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%BD%D1%8B%D0%B5/%D0%90%D0%BD%D1%8F%D0%BC%D0%BE%D0%B2_%D0%95%D0%B2%D0%B3%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%B8%D0%B9_%D0%92%D0%B8%D1%82%D0%B0%D0%BB%D1%8C%D0%B5%D0%B2%D0%B8%D1%87.html

Strahlenberg, P. J. von. (1726). *Vorbericht eines zum Druck verfertigten Werckes von der Grossen Tartarey und dem Königreiche Siberien, mit einem Anhang von Groß-Rußland.* Schneider.

Toldy, F. (1850). Reguly Antal s a finn-magyar kérdés. In *Reguly album* (pp. v–cxxix). Kozma Vazul.

TSentral′naia raĭonnaia biblioteka, Surgutskiĭ raĭon. (2024, July 13). *GEROĬ SVO – Balyshev Boris Andreevich (g.p. Belyĭ IAr)*. VK. Retrieved May 15, 2025, from https://vk.com/wall-72208628_15922

UNESCO. (2011). *UNESCO's Language Vitality and Endangerment Methodological Guideline: Review of application and feedback since 2003*. Retrieved March 4, 2019, from http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/unesco_language_vitaly_and_endangerment_methodological_guideline.pdf

V metanii topora emu ne bylo ravnykh. (2024, August 20). Muksun. Retrieved May 15, 2025, from https://muksun.fm/news/2024-08-20/v-metanii-topora-emu-ne-bylo-ravnyh-na-svo-pogib-molodoy-upravlenets-iz-hmao-5171848

Virtanen, S., & Horváth, Cs. (2023). Mansi. In D. Abondolo (Ed.), *The Uralic languages* (2nd ed., pp. 665–702). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315625096-15

Vladenie iazykami korennykh malochislennykh narodov Rossiĭskoĭ Federatsii [Census RF 2020 5/18]. (n.d.). Federal′naia sluzhba gosudarstvennoĭ statistiki. Retrieved April 1, 2023, from https://rosstat.gov.ru/storage/mediabank/Tom5_tab18_VPN-2020.xlsx

Vladenie iazykami naseleniem naibolee mnogochislennykh natsional'nosteĭ [Census RF 2020 5/5]. (n.d.). Federal′naia sluzhba gosudarstvennoĭ statistiki. Retrieved April 1, 2023, from https://rosstat.gov.ru/storage/mediabank/Tom5_tab5_VPN-2020.xlsx

Witsen, N. (1692). *Noord en Oost Tartarye*. No publisher.

Yaremko, L., & Levchuk, P. (2023). Language consciousness and Ukrainian students' attitudes towards the Ukrainian language in a time of war. *Cognitive Studies | Études cognitives*, *2023*(23), Article 2922. https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.2922

Zakon Khanty-Mansiĭskogo avtonomnogo okruga – IUgry ot 19 noiabria 2001 g. N 73-oz "Ob obshchinakh korennykh malochislennykh narodov v Khanty-Mansiĭskom avtonomnom okruge – IUgre" (s izmeneniiami ot 31 dekabria 2004 g., 12 oktiabria 2009 g., 17 oktiabria 2018 g., 21 dekabria 2022 g.). (n.d.). Retrieved February 2, 2020, from https://www.dumahmao.ru/decisions/detail.php?ID=7086

Zakon Khanty-Mansiĭskogo avtonomnogo okruga – IUgry ot 4 dekabria 2001 goda N 89-oz "O iazykakh korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa, prozhivaiushchikh na territorii Khanty-Mansiĭskogo avtonomnogo okruga". (2001). Retrieved February 2, 2020, from https://web.archive.org/web/20250311153654 / http://docs.cntd.ru/document/991009915

The publication was financed at the author's expense.

This publication was prepared using the CLARIN-PL research infrastructure (http://clarin-pl.eu).

The author declares that she has no competing interests.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited.

© The Author 2026

Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland
Publishing history: Received 2024-08-01; Accepted 2025-07-26; Published 2026-02-01.