

UDC 94(481-922.1)"17/18"(045)

DOI: 10.37482/issn2221-2698.2020.38.140

## Language contacts between Pomors and Norwegians during expeditions to Svalbard in the second half of the 18th — first half of the 19th centuries\*

© **Tatiana S. MINAEVA**, Doc. Sci (Hist), professor

E-mail: [t.minaeva@narfu.ru](mailto:t.minaeva@narfu.ru)

Northern (Arctic) Federal University named after M.V. Lomonosov, Arkhangelsk, Russia

© **Vladimir A. KARELIN**, Cand. Sci (Hist), associate professor

E-mail: [karelin\\_vladimir@mail.ru](mailto:karelin_vladimir@mail.ru)

Military Academy of Logistics named after Army General A.V. Khrulev, St. Petersburg, Russia

**Abstract.** Svalbard, despite its remoteness from the mainland and traditional routes of communication, is an Arctic territory that has been attracting the attention of various countries and peoples for several centuries. In the 18th — first half of the 19th century, the archipelago was actively developed by Pomors, engaged in mammal hunting there. In the 19th century, Norwegians revealed their economic interest in Svalbard. Historical studies have repeatedly examined the cases of contacts between Pomors and Norwegians during mammal hunting expeditions to Svalbard, but none of the authors have studied the language contacts between Pomors and Norwegians during the development of Svalbard. The authors used an interdisciplinary approach and analyzed documentary and literary sources to formulate a hypothesis about the practice of Pomor-Norwegian contacts, incl. those in Russenorsk. The study presents a new issue for scientific discussions by both historians and linguists, which can serve as a basis for the development of international cooperation between Norway and Russia.

**Keywords:** *development of Svalbard, mammal hunting, Pomor-Norwegian trade, Pomor-Norwegian contacts, Russenorsk, language contact.*

### Introduction

The history of the development of Svalbard is a multifaceted topic that allows us to study such processes and phenomena as the folding and development of international relations in the use of Arctic natural resources [1, Hacquebord L.], Arctic shipping and foreign trade [2, Thuen T.], comprehensive studies of the archipelago [3, Avango D., Hacquebord L., de Haas H.R., Kruse F., Aalders Y.I., Gustafsson U.I.], human adaptation to severe climatic conditions [4, Jasinski M.E.] etc. In historical documents and studies of Russian and foreign authors, cases of contacts between Pomors and Norwegians during mammal hunting expeditions to Svalbard in the second half of the 18th — first half of the 19th century were repeatedly mentioned. Most of the researchers only found such contacts, because they did not aim to study the interaction of Pomors and Norwegians during these expeditions. E.g., M. Conway [5, pp. 273–274] and T.B. Arlov [6, pp. 147, 150] prepared extensive monographs on the history of the development of Spitsbergen as a whole, and A.F. Shidlovsky [7] and V.Yu. Wiese [8, pp. 44, 56, 62] collected, first, information about Pomor mammal hunting in the archipelago, although in each of these works, one can find brief infor-

---

\* For citation:

Minaeva T.S., Karelin V.A. Language contacts between Pomors and Norwegians during expeditions to Svalbard in the second half of the 18th — first half of the 19th centuries. *Arktika i Sever* [Arctic and North], 2020, no. 38, pp. 140–151. DOI: 10.37482/issn2221-2698.2020.38.140.

mation about Pomor-Norwegian contacts. More detailed information on the participation of Pomors in Norwegian expeditions of the early 19th century is in the report of O. Lønø [9] and J.P. Nielsen [10], who provide some actual details of mammal hunting. However, none of the authors, except J.P. Nielsen did not think about the problem of communication between Pomors and Norwegians about the language in which these contacts were made. This issue is important in the context, firstly, of revealing the peculiarities of the development of Pomor-Norwegian relations, also during the development of Svalbard, and secondly, of studying Russenorsk as a language that appeared and developed just that time. In “Russland kommer nærmere. Norge og Russland 1814–1917” J.P. Nielsen suggests that industrialists used Russenorsk but wrote that there was no documented evidence of this [11, Russland kommer nærmere. Norge og Russland 1814–1917, p. 182]. Indeed, historians have no archival documents at their disposal to give an exact answer to the question of what language the Pomors and Norwegians spoke in Svalbard, but some materials help to study this problem.

#### *Evidence of Pomor-Norwegian contacts during mammal hunting expeditions to Svalbard*

The connections of Pomors and Norwegians during mammal hunting expeditions to Svalbard have been known since the middle of the 18th century. One of such short contacts in 1744 was reported by T. Hultgren [12, p. 197]. She found in the border inspection protocols a message from the Norwegian major Peter Schnitler about a meeting in Talvik (Alta) with a Russian feedman from Arkhangelsk, who had wintered here with his team in anticipation of a “good wind” to Svalbard. The feedman also told the Norwegian that the crew of a Russian vessel usually consisted of 10 people.

M.V. Lomonosov was also aware of the beginning of Pomor-Norwegian relations. In 1764, he was preparing the arctic expedition of V.Ya. Chichagov learned from the entrepreneur Amos Kornilov that Pomor ships often perish on the way to Svalbard or on the way back, and some escaped by leaving small vessels in Norway [13, Perevalov V.A., p. 244]. Documents about a similar case were published in a study by Bryzgalov V.V., Ovsyannikov O.V., Yasinski M.E. [14, pp. 31–32].

In 1759, two Pomor vessels on the way to Svalbard were ice-covered, but people were saved in small carbases, they took with them for mammal hunting. Winds threw them on the uninhabited island of Kamen in Finnmark. The Norwegian Andreas Peterson came there to mow hay, and once, he found 15 people on the island. Only four of them could still walk. Peterson brought them to Hammerfest, from where local pastor Klaus Christian Kilstrup and merchant Peter Burch organized a rescue expedition and brought the survivors who were starving to death in Hammerfest. After 14 days, the Russians recovered, and they were given a ship on which they were able to return home and which they promised to return. Later, there was a problem with the compensation of losses of the Norwegians, as the ship wasn't returned. But relations were settled when Russian merchants who hired industrialists agreed to pay for the ship and compensate for other costs when they received news of the amount of debt.

Another meeting between the Norwegians and the Pomors who stopped on the way to Svalbard marked the beginning of joint Russian-Norwegian crafts in the archipelago. In 1778–1779, in Hammerfest, the watchman Filat Semyonov spent the winter with the ship and his crew, who was going to Svalbard next summer. Norwegian merchant Peter Christian Buck agreed with him that F. Semyonov would take Buck's son, Edward, and another 4 Norwegians with him. On May 23, 1779, the “Morzh” sailed from Hammerfest, but when it reached the Bear Island, it got stuck in the ice and was forced to return to Vardø. On the way, Edward Buck fell ill and died in Vardø<sup>1</sup>. The failure of the expedition and the bereavement forced Buck to temporarily abandon new attempts at joint expeditions.

At the end of the 18th century, Danish authorities abolished trade monopolies in the northern provinces of Norway and allowed mediated trade with Pomors, incl. barter. Norwegian settlements in Finnmark — Vardø, Tromsø, Hammerfest — received a hundred cities. The freedom of trade provided created the conditions for new initiatives, incl. joint ones. The first wintering of Norwegian mammal hunters on the islands of the archipelago took place in 1794-1795. The expedition was again organized by the trading company of the Buck merchants from Hammerfest. A vessel for the expedition was bought in Russia. The team consisted of Norwegians, Sami, and Russians, incl. a feeder and harpooner<sup>2</sup>. Probably, Buck trading company, again, hired one of the Russian feeders for the expedition, who visited Hammerfest during the expedition to Svalbard, allowing him to take several of his team's Pomors with him. Three people died during the winter (two from scurvy, one in the field), among them the Russian hunter Nikifor Stranov [15, Arlov T.B., p. 147].

The wintering result was not so significant, especially considering the dead team members, so that many people who wanted to follow the example of the Buck company appeared. In addition, the unknown was stopped by the conditions and techniques of mammal hunting, the lack of information about the places of permanent habitat of marine animals in the vicinity of the archipelago, additional confirmation of the profitability of risky Arctic navigation was required. This gradually became known during constant communication with Russian feedmen and mammal hunters.

According to Norwegian sources, the Norwegian regular voyages to Svalbard began in 1819<sup>3</sup>. Until this time, only random encounters of Pomors and Norwegians on the islands of the archipelago are known. The surveys of Russian mammal hunters about Svalbard published in 1818 reveal that, according to Pomors, the archipelago was completely uninhabited, and they did not

<sup>1</sup> Edvard Kraft Petersen Buck (1752-1779). Genealogy. URL: <https://www.geni.com/people/Edvard-Kraft-Buck/6000000004658001632> (accessed 12 December 2019).

<sup>2</sup> Samoylovich R. Ostrov Shpitsbergen i pervaya russkaya nauchno-promyslovaya ekspeditsiya [Svalbard island and the first Russian scientific expedition]. *Izvestiya Arkhangel'skogo obshchestva izucheniya Russkogo Severa* [News of the Arkhangelsk Society for the Study of the Russian North], 1913, no. 4, p. 164. URL: <https://ekb.aonb.ru/index.php?id=70&year=1913> (accessed 15 December 2019).

<sup>3</sup> Noen ord om den forste ishavsfangsten fra hammerfest. URL: <http://polarlitteratur.no/tekster/minner-fra-polaregnene/noen-ord-om-den-forste-ishavsfangsten-fra-hammerfest/> (accessed 15 December 2019).

meet people there<sup>4</sup>. In the 1920s, the Norwegians had organized about 60 mammal hunting expeditions to the archipelago. Since 1821, Tromsø began to participate in mammal hunting in the archipelago, but Hammerfest still retained leadership.

The increase in mammal hunting activity of the Norwegians naturally led to the appearance in documents and newspapers of evidence of contacts between Norwegian and Pomor mammal hunting expeditions. So, e.g., in 1835, the skipper of the Norwegian schooner "Patriot" I.K. Lodgard in the very north of the archipelago saw 2 Russian rooks with a team of winterers, originally consisting of 32 people, four of whom died and five were sick [9, Lønø O., p. 24]. In the same year, the ship "Zosima i Savvatiy" set out for Svalbard with a team of 16 people under the direction of the feedman Gerasim Osipov. The half-feedman Vasily Kalinin, for stabbing along the way to Svalbard was removed from a ship in Norway and taken into custody. The vessel continued sailing but fell into a storm and was shipwrecked near the archipelago. Norwegian skipper ship Abraham Gamen saved Pomors. They were delivered to Hammerfest, where the feeder G. Osipov told about the incident, was "brought to slander and released," sailors from the wrecked ship "confirmed that everything said by Osipov was true, and after the oath they were released" [14, Bryzgalov V.V., Ovsyannikov O.V., Yasinski M.E., p. 56]. Probably this salvation is also mentioned in the work of T.B. Arlov, when the author writes about the salvation in the summer of 1835 by the Norwegian ships "Trifan" and "Fortuna" of the crew of two Pomor ships that went mammal hunting for Svalbard [6, Arlov T.B., p. 150].

Two tragic incidents on Svalbard in 1851 are well known. In 1851, a mammal hunting expedition led by the peasant of the Kemsy district Ivan Gvozdaryov ended in numerous killings of its members. Only three — the brothers Vasily and Yakov Isakov and Petr Druzhinin returned alive, announcing that the rest of the team had died during the mammal hunting on Svalbard. During the investigation, it turned out that, after killing the feedman and leaving the two hunters on the island, the criminals, captured the ship, went to Norway, threw three more people overboard along the road. In Berlevog, they sold Gvozdarev's property, and got drunk on the proceeds and strangled of another member of the crew. The remaining three members returned home<sup>5</sup>.

Another tragedy occurred in 1851 with an expedition to the ship "St. Nikolai" went from Arkhangelsk with a feeder Vasily Kalinin to the archipelago. 12 of the 18 members of his expedition died from scurvy. The survivors could not sail away from the island since the bay was chained with ice. On July 3, Norwegians, also engaged in mammal hunting, accidentally went to the Pomors, and promised help. Two days later, there were 9 Norwegians in the camp of Pomors. Together with them, retaining the ability to move 3 Russians were able to cut a path for the ship in ice. On July 12, 6 Pomors, with the help of 4 Norwegians, set off and arrived on July 23 in Hammer-

---

<sup>4</sup> Doprosy russkikh promyshlennikov o Shpitsbergene [Interrogations of Russian industrialists about Spitsbergen]. URL: [https://www.kolamap.ru/library/doc/1818\\_dopros.htm](https://www.kolamap.ru/library/doc/1818_dopros.htm) (accessed 15 December 2019).

<sup>5</sup> SAAR F. 2. Inv.1. C. 5100. Pp. 11–72.

fest. "St. Nikolai" stayed there for the winter, and the surviving crew members on different vessels went to their places of residence <sup>6</sup>.

Documentary materials and ethnographic essays show that the Pomors on Svalbard always went with several stops, one of which could be in Norway (e.g., in Vardø). There they waited for the weather favorable for sailing, waited for the storm, drank, spending the money received in the deposit <sup>7</sup>. A stop at a Norwegian port could last from a few days to several weeks. The return route of the mammal hunters could also pass through a Norwegian settlement. In it, the feedman could sell the prey or part of it: "All these peasants: entrepreneurs and lazy people, arrows and inept keep money in the pocket of the feedman until they come to some Vargaev. There they, according to them, "will harden", that is, they will renew their orgies again, as long as they walk, until the Norwegians forcefully drag them into the boat at the intensified requests of the feedman" <sup>8</sup>. After visiting Norway, the Pomors were left with the easier part of their journey home.

Based on the above materials, it can be concluded that contacts between the Pomors and Norwegians during mammal hunting expeditions to Svalbard were a frequent occurrence. Russian mammal hunters could stop in Norway on the road to Svalbard and back, were part of entrepreneurs' expeditions with the Norwegians, met on the archipelago, and survived shipwrecks thanks to the help of the Norwegians. Archival documents and historical essays describe examples of communication, but they never indicate in which language it occurred and whether the interlocutors had problems understanding each other. The stylistics of the text of the sources and their contents, regardless of the described situation, give the impression that the Pomors and Norwegians could communicate quite freely in the studied time, without having any educational institutions for learning each other's language.

### *Norwegian-Russian trading language*

The Norwegian-Russian trading language (Russenorsk) appeared as a result of the development of the maritime-Norwegian exchange trade, which originated in the Middle Ages. But after the 16th century, free trade in Finnmark was banned, and the monopoly on its administration passed to the Bergen and Trondheim merchants; official trade relations between the Pomors and the merchants of Northern Norway ceased. However, illegal trade continued because Pomors met with Norwegians in fisheries off the coast of Northern Norway and made a mutually beneficial exchange of flour for fish. After the abolition of monopolies in 1789, trade volumes began to gradually grow.

During the years of the continental blockade of England, trade ties between Arkhangelsk and Northern Norway strengthened. In 1806, due to the complicated international situation, the

---

<sup>6</sup> SAAR.F.1. Inv.4. T. 1. C. 1291. Pp. 1–13bp.

<sup>7</sup> Maksimov S.V. *God na Severe* [A year in the North]. Moscow, 1890, p. 556. URL: <https://www.booksite.ru/fulltext/maks/imov/> (accessed 15 December 2019).

<sup>8</sup> Kharitonov A. *Arkhangel'skie promyshlenniki na Grumante (Shpitsbergene)* [Arkhangelsk industrialists on Grumant (Svalbard)]. *Otechestvennye zapiski* [Homeland's notes], 1849, Vol. LXVI, no. 10, p. 294.

export of bread from the Baltic and White Sea ports was stopped, but the Russian government made an exception for Norway. The English fleet blocked Danish-Norwegian trade with Western countries. In Norway, starvation began due to a shortage of bread, and to save the population, at the request of Denmark, Russia allowed the export of rye and wheat with grain and flour from Arkhangelsk<sup>9</sup>.

The expansion of trade relations led to the emergence and development of a special contact language, pidgin [15, Peterson R.E., p. 249]. The appearance of a pidgin (including Russenorsk) is explained, e.g., by the polygenetic theory, according to which a pidgin can arise spontaneously everywhere where conditions are laid for it, i.e. where there is a need for a common language between people who did not have other means of communication [16, Broch I., Jahr E.H., p. 20].

The Norwegians involved in the trade did not know the Russian language, just as the Pomors did not know Norwegian. However, both parties felt the need for communication and tried to use well-known words for communication not only in Russian and Norwegian, but also in Dutch, German, English, and Sami.

Doctor of Economics D. Harper, analyzing signs and sign systems in trade, explained that pidgin is a spontaneously arising social technology or institution. Pidgin provides participants with an effective means of communication in trade, because it is easier and cheaper to adopt the existing system of signs than to invent their own [17, Harper D.A., p. 65]. Based on the idea of the equal position of participants in Pomor-Norwegian trade and their equal interest in trading operations, he also suggested that “the symmetry of exchange relations also led to similar proportions of words from the Russian and Norwegian languages entered in the “russenorsk leksikon” [17, Harper D.A., p. 66].

These provisions can be supplemented by the conclusions of the linguist E. Yakhr, who wrote that long-standing contact between two socially equal languages can also give Pidgin proper if the need for learning each other’s language does not exist due to the restriction of direct contact [18, Jahr E.H., p. 107]. Pomor trade in Norway was purely seasonal and took place in the summer months. Unable to prepare a more valuable product (dried fish) from the summer catch, which was mainly exported to Spain and Italy, the Norwegians had to either salted this fish or sell it fresh to the Russians. The limited period of Pomor-Norwegian trade also determined the corresponding “seasonality” of the use of Russenorsk, according to its researchers [19, Lunden S.S., p. 213].

Russenorsk began to develop, probably in the second half of the 18th century and fully developed by the beginning of the 19th century with its vocabulary and grammar. The main vocabulary was related to trade transactions, including words for different names of goods and prices, weighting, payment terms and charges of theft. The language made it possible to discuss weather conditions and shipping routes, parts of the vessel, types of social interaction — work, church attendance, tea drinking, and drinking.

---

<sup>9</sup> SAAR. F.4. Inv.3. C. 432. Pp. 1–7.

In Northern Norway, this language was called “moja-på-tvoja” or “kakspreck” (as you say). M.M. Prishvin, who visited Hammerfest in 1907, was incredibly surprised to hear the conversation of the Pomors with a local girl in some strange language in which the writer recognized English, Russian, and German words. Pomors reached an agreement with a girl in this language about accommodation in a Norwegian house, where he came with a writer. Next M.M. Prishvin writes that this is “a special Russian-Norwegian volapuk, simply called there: “moja-på-tvoja”<sup>10</sup>.

With the development of Pomor-Norwegian trade, the advent of legislatively fixed privileges of its participants and the extension of these privileges to new sea settlements, the number of ships coming from the Arkhangelsk province to Norway increased. The largest number of them traditionally went from Arkhangelsk, Onega, Kola, Kemi and Sumckiy Posad, although residents of Mezen, Shuya, Soroki and other settlements were also engaged in trade.

As it was established by Norwegian researchers, the range of use of Russenorsk was gradually expanding at the beginning of the 19th century. The language was distributed primarily in the area of the major shopping centers of Finnmark and Troms, and by the 1840s it was in the territory from Kola to Tromsø [16, Broch I., Jahr E.H., p. 68]. On the ease of communication between Norwegians and Pomors in the early 20th century testified M.M. Prishvin: “I suddenly feel at last all the frivolity of my trip to Norway without a guide, without preparation. While the Pomors were with me, I rode like if I was in Russia, and now I only feel my helplessness”<sup>11</sup>.

As follows from the surviving sources of the late 19th — early 20th century, Russenorsk was known to traders, fishermen, customs officers, Russian consuls from the Norwegians, who sometimes acted as arbitrators in trade disputes between Russians and Norwegians. However, it should be noted that already in the middle of the 19th century on the Norwegian side, only fishermen and their families spoke Russenorsk, in their work pidgin was used when necessary by consuls and customs officers. Wholesalers began to learn the Russian language and began to perceive Russenorsk as a primitive language, unworthy of use. Slowly, too, they began to study and teach their sons the Norwegian language, e.g., in the Kem skipper school.

#### ***Linguistic communication between Pomors and Norwegians during mammal hunting expeditions to Svalbard: hypothesis and conclusions***

First of all, I would like to draw attention to the fact that communication between Russian mammal hunters and Norwegians took place: a) in the territory of the Norwegian settlements, Pomor vessels visited on the way to and from Svalbard, b) on the archipelago during the trades.

In the case when Pomor expeditions, following the established tradition, wintered in Norway in order to start mammal hunting as early as possible in the spring, their participants had to either master Russenorsk or gradually learn the necessary number of Norwegian words for communication. As S.V. Maximov wrote from the words of Pomor, “Before you do not speak with him

---

<sup>10</sup> Prishvin M.M. Za volshebnyy kolobok [After the magic gingerbread man]. URL: <http://prishvin.lit-info.ru/prishvin/proza/za-volshebnyy-kolobok/glava-i-volshebnyy-kolobok.htm> (accessed 15 December 2019).

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

in any other language, to shout their words: get the hell out of you”<sup>12</sup>. Given the fact that Pomors, speaking in Russenorsk, perceived it as Norwegian, this means that the mammal hunters really should have been in the 18th — first half of the 19th centuries. Use either Russenorsk or Norwegian.

The crews of Russian vessels staying in Norway for a short time hardly knew Norwegian and did not have to learn it. But since they needed to buy or sell something in Norway, it is quite possible that among the members of the crew, there were people who had knowledge of Russenorsk.

The way to Norway from Arkhangelsk and from Svalbard was known not only by the feedmen, but by all means someone else from the team in case of the death of the feedman, i.e. these were the Pomors who had the experience of sailing in Norway, and consequently, the experience of communication (most likely, in Russenorsk). Sometimes mammal hunting expeditions were attended by feedmen who had previously been engaged in trade with Northern Norway. So, e.g., Ivan Gvozdarev, who died in 1851 on Svalbard in 1827, participated in trade with Norway and was detained for trying to import wine, rum, and chintz from Norway<sup>13</sup>. His father, Yakov Gvozdarev, also traveled on business to northern Norway.

During the hunting campaign on the Svalbard, the contacts between the Pomors and the Norwegians were short-term, most often they were caused by emergency. Under these conditions, it was possible to ask for help or explain the disastrous situation, knowing Russenorsk, although in extreme cases gestures could also be used. Russian consuls could also help the rescued Pomors after arriving in Norway, incl. with the execution of any documents and with the solution of other important issues.

In Pomor expeditions going to Svalbard, the main thing was the feedman. He knew the route and places of camps on the archipelago, controlled the ship, the organizer of the expedition entrusted him with equipment and supplies. It was the feeder on behalf of the merchant who could sell the production in Norway on the way back. In addition to the feeder, the crews included experienced hunters and harpooners, as well as ordinary workers, novices and laymen recruited from peasants, retired soldiers, and burghers. Consequently, only the feedman needed to be fluent in the Russenorsk or Norwegian language and, as mentioned earlier, someone else from the team, just in case. The crew could include a half-feedman, who helped the feedman and adopted his knowledge and skills. E.g., Vasily Kalinin, who went in 1851 as a feedman to Svalbard went there as a half-feedman.

Feeders and half-feeders were most often from the settlements that actively participated in the Pomor-Norwegian trade — Kemi, Onega, Arkhangelsk, Mezen. They had the opportunity to learn Russenorsk, if not in their families, then in their midst, learning the art of navigation and

---

<sup>12</sup> Maksimov S.V. *God na Severe* [A year in the North]. Moscow, 1890, p. 556. URL: <https://www.booksite.ru/fulltext/maks/imov/> (accessed 15 December 2019).

<sup>13</sup> SAAR. F. 2. Inv. 1. C. 864. P. 352.



gaining experience in going to Norway and talking there with merchants and fishermen. You can cite several phrases in Russenorsk, taken from the records of one of the first collectors of information about this language, J.K. Quigstad, made in conversation with the customs cashier A. Andreassen from Tromsø [16, Broch I., Jahr E.H., pp. 113–114]. These examples show that, knowing Russenorsk, Norwegian and Pomor industrialists could communicate and receive the necessary information.

*Drasvi, gammel go ven på moja! (Hello my good old friend!)*

*Nogoli dag tvoja reisa på Arkangel otsuda? (How many days did you get here from Arkhangelsk?)*

*Tri vegel, grot storm (eller motvin). (Three weeks, heavy storm (or headwind).)*

*Grot stoka på gaf. (Severe storm at sea.)*

*Koda tvoja stan-op? (Where did you stay?)*

*Ja på madam clerk tri daga ligge ne. (I stayed for three days at Mrs. Clerk's house in Elvenes.)*

*Mangoli år tvoja? (How old are you?)*

*Pedisat (50). Tvoja starik. (You are an old man.)*

*Njeto. Ja grot sterk (No. I am very strong.)*

*Kak tvoja levom? Basiba, korosjo. (How are you? Thanks, good.)*

Thus, we can conclude that in the composition of the Pomor mammal hunting expeditions there were always at least two people who knew Russenorsk or could communicate in Norwegian. Hunters and harpooners, who did not have experience in joint crafts with the Norwegians, and ordinary workers in Russenor or in another foreign language did not speak and, at best, could know some words or phrases. Norwegian crews were formed in the same way. Vessels departed from Hammerfest and Tromsø — centers of Pomor-Norwegian trade, where fishermen and merchants knew Russenorsk. On the eve of the expedition, the skippers tried to get information about mammal hunting from the Pomors in Norway. The remaining crew members, whose families had never been engaged in trading with Pomors, did not know Russenorsk. Russenorsk was a trading language, lexically limited, but, as sources show, it could be used not only for concluding trade transactions. Consequently, on Svalbard language contacts were made, most likely, through Norwegian skippers, Pomor feed and half feed. Communication took place in Russenorsk or colloquial Norwegian.

The study of international linguistic contacts during expeditions to Svalbard involves further searches for sources, primarily Norwegian, which would contain information about the presence of Pomors in Northern Norway on the way to Svalbard or on the way back, which can help in determining the language on which communication took place and on the archipelago. Similar information should also be sought among the customs and court documents and office records of local authorities both from the Russian and the Norwegian side. Studying the language of Pomor-Norwegian contacts during the development of Svalbard in the second half of the 18th — the first

half of the 19th century we can expand the understanding of Russenorsk and reveal new details of both the history of Russian-Norwegian relations, and the process of developing Svalbard.

### References

1. Hacquebord L. Three Centuries of Whaling and Walrus Hunting in Svalbard and its Impact on the Arctic Ecosystem. *Environment and History*, 2001, vol. 7, no. 2, special issue "Beyond Local, Natural Ecosystems" (May), pp. 169–185.
2. Thuen T. Two epochs of Norwegian-Russian trade relations: From symmetry to asymmetry. *Acta Borealia*, 1993, 10 (2), pp. 3–18.
3. Avango D., Hacquebord L., de Haas H.R., Kruse F., Aalders Y.I., Gustafsson U.I. Between markets and geo-politics: natural resource exploitation on Spitsbergen from 1600 to the present day. *Polar Record*, 2011, vol. 47, iss. 1, pp. 29–39.
4. Jasinski M.E. Russian Hunters on Svalbard and the Polar Winter. *Arctic*, 1991, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 155–182.
5. Conway M. *No man's land*. Oslo, Damms Antikvariat, 1995. 377 p.
6. Arlov T.B. *Istoriya Arkhipelaga Shpitsbergen* [History of the Svalbard archipelago]. Moscow, Arktikugol' Publ., 2016. 592 p. (In Russ.)
7. Shidlovskiy A.F. *Shpitsbergen v russkoy istorii i literature* [Svalbard in Russian history and literature]. Saint Petersburg, 1912. 81 p. (In Russ.)
8. Vize V.Yu. *Russkie polyarnye morekhody iz promyshlennykh, torgovykh i sluzhilykh lyudey XVII–XIX vv.: Biograficheskiy slovar'* [Russian polar navigators from producers', commercial and service people of the 17th-19th centuries]. Moscow; Leningrad, Glavsevmorput' Publ., 1948. 72 p. (In Russ.)
9. Lønø O. *Norske fangstmenns overvintringer*. Oslo, 1972. 72 p.
10. Nielsen J.P. *Ishavet er vår åker. Norsk Polarhistorie*. Oslo, Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 2004, Bd. III, pp. 47–109.
11. Nielsen J.P., ed. *Russland kommer nærmere. Norge og Russland 1814–1917*. Oslo, Pax Forlag, 2014, 643 p.
12. Hultgren T. *Den russiske fangsten på Svalbard*. Tromsø, University of Tromsø Publ., 2003, 324 p.
13. Perevalov V.A. *Lomonosov i Arktika* [Lomonosov and Arctic]. Moscow; Leningrad, Glavsevmorput' Publ., 1949, 503 p. (In Russ.)
14. Bryzgalov V.V., Ovsyannikov O.V., Yasinski M.E. *Evropeyskaya Arktika: morskije zveroboynye promysly Vygovskogo staroobryadcheskogo obshchezhitel'stva v XVIII – XIX vekah* [European Arctic: mammal hunting of the Vygov old believers' community in the 18th-19th centuries]. Arkhangelsk, Lodiya Publ., 2016. 188 p. (In Russ.)
15. Peterson R.E. Russenorsk: a little known aspect of Russian-Norwegian relations. *Studies in language*, 1980, no. 4/2, pp. 249–256.
16. Broch I., Jahr E.H. *Russenorsk – et pidginspråk i Norge*. Oslo, Novus Forlag, 1981, 165 p.
17. Harper D.A. *Trade, Language and Communication: Proc. Colloquium on Market Institutions & Market Processes, Economics Department, New York University, September 2004, and Workshop in Politics, Philosophy and Economics, Economics Department, George Mason University, January 2005*. 118 p.
18. Jahr E.H. On the pidgin status of Russenorsk. *Language contact in the Arctic: northern pidgins and contact languages*. Berlin; New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 1996, pp. 107–122.
19. Lunden S.S. Tracing the ancestry of Russenorsk. *Slavia Orientalis*, 1978, no. 27/2, pp. 213–217.

Received on January 15, 2020