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ENCOUNTERING THE TSAR: NENETS EPIC SINGING AS A REPRESENTATION OF HISTORICITY

ABSTRACT
This article discusses Nenets epic songs, focusing on two texts collected at the beginning of the twentieth century in relation to the divergent historicities they represent. The process of gathering and publishing folklore is analysed as folklorisation, whereby the texts have come to represent a negation of the modern, but not giving voice to the singers or their communities. Nenets epic songs have served Finnish nationalism and Russian imperialism in creating hierarchies between Finns and their linguistic relatives and between different Russian ethnic groups, including Russians and the Nenets. The process of traditionalisation is discussed as a local strategy of recreating meaningful narration that relates both to tradition and other contextually relevant discourses. The songs discussed are shown to depict not specific past events, but rather Nenets historical experiences and understandings about their subaltern position and agency within the imperial context.
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In 1912, Finnish linguist and folklorist Toivo Lehtisalo met a company of Nenets near the town of Mezen in northwestern Russia. He ended up spending some time with the community, specifically an elderly woman, Katerina Vyuchei, who was, according to Lehtisalo, a talented singer and narrator. Lehtisalo transcribed 11 of Katerina Vyuchei’s narratives, and later edited and published them in Juraksamojedische Volksdichtung ‘Nenets Folklore’ (1947). Katerina’s songs reflect two kinds of imperceptible worlds—namely, the past and the mythic realms—as is often the case with Nenets epic poetry. In this article, I focus on two of her songs and the ways in which culturally patterned ways of narrating intersect with culturally patterned ways of experiencing and understanding the past—in other words, with historicity. In the narratives, the Nenets protagonists move across the imperial landscape, meet administrators and the tsar himself, and negotiate their rights to govern in the north. The songs’ heroes are powerless and vulnerable in front of the imperial administration until they receive signs of power from the tsar, correct the administrators, and become governors in their own lands.

My reading aims in two directions. I am, firstly, interested in the processes whereby the poems were transcribed, published, and
later interpreted together with similar kinds of sung epic poems. This process, which I call folklorisation (Anttonen 2005: 32), is embedded in the ideologies of modernity and, as I will show, hinders historical interpretations of the Nenets. I aim to show how the songs themselves were collected in an encounter that situated others and their historical narration at the margins of or beyond historical knowledge. Then, I interpret the songs as representations of meaningful acts within which Nenets historicity and agency are narrated through the poetic means available to the singer. Through this process, called traditionalisation, the performer aims to authorise their performance as tradition in order to enhance its situated power and meaning. The process of folklorisation, on the contrary, tends to freeze Nenets epic performances as non-modern texts that do not speak to the coevalness (Fabian 1983) of the performers or the audiences and the researcher who recorded the folklore. We would not know Katerina Vyuchei’s songs if not for folklorisation, which has also had a significant impact on the ways in which the songs have been (or have not been) studied. This is why it is crucial to unravel this process. Traditionalisation focuses on the performance as meaningful in its own context as a tradition or in reference to it, thus gaining its authority from a marked use of language, but not as a mere representative of the past or non-modernity. Analysing the ways in which Katerina Vyuchei traditionalised her songs about the protagonists travelling to the tsar allows me to illustrate how her narration is structured and linked to the Nenets epic registers. This is crucial to my discussion of the poems as representations of a historicity, a ‘culturally patterned way of experiencing and understanding history’ (Ohnuki-Tierney 1990: 4). I show how Katerina Vyuchei used tradition both as a strategic and thematic source in depicting the past, making her narration locally meaningful and, at the same time, commenting on the Nenets relations and status within the broader Russian society. Similar to what has been described by Timo Kaartinen (2010: 29–31) in another ethnographical context, the Nenets point of view and agency in the narration are preserved despite the fact that the narration also depicts the subaltern position of the Nenets. This is why texts collected in contexts of othering and colonisation may also serve to give voice and agency to their subjects.

THE CONQUEST

Before moving onto the analysis, I provide a brief introduction to the colonisation of the Nenets and the legislative and administrative processes that relate to the poems discussed. The Nenets represent an ethnic and linguistic community living in the arctic tundra zones of Russia and Western Siberia. On the eve of the First World War and the October Revolution when Lehtisalo was doing fieldwork amongst them, the Nenets numbered around 18000 (J. F. Lukin 2013: 1–2). They were living as nomadic or semi-nomadic reindeer herders, hunters, and fishermen as one of the native (inorodcheskie) communities of imperial Russia. The Ural Mountains, which separated the Nenets’ territorial areas and formed a border for Russian colonisers, were later dubbed the divide between Europe and Asia. Areas west of the mountain range were colonised by the Novgorod Rus’ beginning in the fourteenth century, following the Muscovy annexation of Novgorod in 1478, at which point those areas became a part of Russia. Later, at the end of the sixteenth century, the Muscovy also began to expand east to the Ural Mountains to areas that had been part of the Khanate of Sibir’ of the Golden Horde. The Russian conquest of the
north was a slow process, typically preceded by first-hand commercial contacts together with cooperation in hunting and fishing between local Indigenous peoples and Russian merchants. Such encounters occurred in parallel with or followed by a flow of peasants fleeing serfdom and looking for new prospects. The military, administrative, and legal waves of colonisation followed or intertwined with these earlier encounters. Accordingly, the governance of the lands during the initial phases of colonisation can be characterised as nominal. The first waves of merchants, serfs, and administrators entailed the construction of fortifications in order to protect the tsarist administration and merchants, and to build bridgeheads for further movement eastwards and with the tax paid in furs, called yasak. Colonisation was a violent process during which constant uprisings and revolts ended in wars between the native populations and Russian troops. Administration also took Indigenous leaders hostage in order to collect yasak (Forsyth 1992: 28–47, 117–228; Lëzova 2000; Dameshek and Remnev 2007; Alekseev [ed.] 2010: 120–126; Perevalova 2019).

The first comprehensive law concerning the native populations was included in the so-called Speranskii reform of 1822, according to which Indigenous peoples were divided into three different groups. Those settled were equated with peasants, and fell under the general administration and jurisdiction of the state. The nomadic (kochevye) and the wandering or foragers (brodiachie or lovtsy) represented two communities with their own administrations and courts. However, the nomadic groups paid their taxes in money while the wandering groups paid in furs. This reform was significant in several ways, representing, for example, a first legal act defining the status of the Indigenous peoples within the Russian Empire. Related to the theme of this article, it is also important to note the right to a native administration along with the changes that followed from that right in Obdorsk (contemporary Salekhard) and the surrounding Nenets territorial areas. Before the Speranskii reform, Khanty Prince (Russian kniazets) Taishin led the Obdorsk princedom for centuries. He also took care of the native administration and what was considered the most significant part of it, the collection of the yasak. The Khanty are a neighbouring Indigenous group of the Nenets. The Taishin family had close ties with the tsar and the tsarist administration, and they ruled the northernmost areas from the end of seventeenth century onwards. In addition to Prince Taishin, there were several other Indigenous princedoms in Western Siberia, but only the princedom of Obdorsk had contact with the Nenets living primarily north of Obdorsk. Prince Taishin's Nenets contacts were one of the reasons for the family's strong position in the administration: there was a long-lasting image of the Nenets being too savage to be administered by anyone else. In practice, Taishin's position meant that the Nenets starshiny 'chiefs' brought furs to Taishin, who then accounted for them in Berëzov. For instance, in 1816, the administrative documents name Prince Taishin as the overseer of the tax collection amongst 15 Nenets chiefs accountable for the taxation within their families (Lëzova 2000: 194; Perevalova 2019: 47, 74). There were, however, constant tensions already before and after the Speranskii reforms. For example, several chiefs refused to return their taxes to Prince Taishin, and, instead, took them straight to Berëzov themselves in 1821–1830 (Lëzova 2000: 194).

Because of Speranskii’s reforms, the Nenets were granted self-governance, although Prince Taishin was unwilling to share his power. This, together with misconduct related to tax collection and trade, rumours about
the violent Orthodox mission amongst the European Nenets, and social and economic changes to reindeer herding, resulted in ongoing restlessness in the Obdorsk region during the early nineteenth century. After the rather peaceful late-eighteenth century, Nenets bands raided Obdorsk, and aggressions occurred between the native peoples themselves. Despite Prince Taishin’s reluctance, Paigol Nyrmin Tylov was nominated as the main chief or prince of the Nenets in 1824 (Lëzova 2000: 197; Perevalova 2019: 47, 74–75, 106–110). Nevertheless, the Indigenous elite experienced constant disputes over their power in the north. After the demise of Paigol Nyrmin in 1827–1829, Prince Taishin seized power once again. The situation changed when, just before Prince Taishin, Nenets Naëna Khudin went to St. Petersburg, where he was christened and Grand Duke Mikhail Nikolaevich of Russia (son of Tsar Nikolai I of Russia) was named his godfather in 1854. Naëna Khudin was christened Aleksandr Mikhailov Narin Khudin, and together with various gifts he also received the right to act as the chief of the Samoyeds—or, the Nenets. Later, in 1863, the governor of Tobol’sk visited Obdorsk and noted that several Nenets chiefs wanted to travel to St. Petersburg in order not to handover their taxes to Prince Taishin, instead paying them directly to Berêzov. In 1864, Paigol Nyrmin, grandson of the earlier Paigol Nyrmin, was nominated as the main chief of the Nenets, with Lakuri Khudi and Khymdanan Ader designated as his assistants. They began overseeing the taxation and the local court of the Nenets in the same building with Prince Taishin (Lëzova 2000: 202–206).

FOLKLORISATION AND TRADITIONALISATION

The epic poems analysed in this article relate to the above-described nineteenth-century relations between the metropole and its northwestern periphery and between ethnic minorities, especially their elites. My analysis aims to hybridise the history through a reading of oral poetry as an expression and recreation of a particular historicity, which has been in dialogue with different, simultaneous historicities. Despite the fact that the recent history of Siberia has emphasised the multifaceted nature of the conquest (see, e.g., Forsyth 1992; Slezkine 1994; Dameshek and Remnev 2007; Perevalova 2019), no study has focused on Indigenous forms of historicising in their own terms, instead examining them as a part of Russian history. The Russian historical narrative, again, has typically produced a division between Russian and Indigenous histories and between elite and non-elite views (Bakhrushin 1927; Forsyth 1992: 109–110; Slezkine 1994; Dameshek and Remnev 2007; Perevalova 2019). Therefore, the Indigenous peoples of Western Siberia have been, similar to many other objects of anthropology, often represented as people without a history as long as there are no written sources available about them (Wolf 1982) or as people living in a different time (Fabian 1983). Additionally, their history has been narrated as part of the history of the Russian Empire and using periods meaningful to the state, with their own agency not told within these narratives. In this context of writing history, hybridising means both discussing why the Nenets historical narration has not been studied as well as interpreting such narratives. I discuss these within the frames of folklorisation and traditionalisation.
Karina Lukin

The process of folklorisation refers to acts of recognising certain cultural practices, often oral communication, as folklore and, thus, worth collecting, archiving, and publishing. According to Pertti Anttonen (2005: 32), folklorisation is the result of a ‘discovering gaze’ in which ‘the collectibles from non-modernity […] speak for the modernity of the society that collects and displays them.’ During this process, communication ‘discovered’ becomes categorised as ‘a particular type of social knowledge, which is then given epistemic power to legitimate the very practice of representation’ (Anttonen 2005: 57). This kind of gaze is naturally embedded not only in the nationalistic processes thoroughly discussed in folklore studies (Wilson 1976; Bendix 1997; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998; Ó Giolláin 2000; Baycroft and Hopkin 2012), but also in colonialism (Naithani 2010; Briggs and Naithani 2012). In the above-cited discussions, the non-modern appears to represent Europe’s own past (through uneducated folk) as well as the primitive life of non-European peoples. The category of folklore has served as a source of this past, evidence of it, but also as an object of the past of humankind or of a vanishing authenticity, and, thus, something to be saved and represented. Folklore is oblique, and, as a category of knowledge, it has long served in depicting informants as simple and ignorant instead of observing situated meanings pointing, not only to the subordinate and local discourses, but also to the dominant ones (Anttonen 2005; Wilce 2009; Briggs 2021).

When oral tradition is performed, processes of traditionalisation also take place perhaps alongside possible folklorisation. Traditionalisation is a process whereby performers and audience make use of and recognise the tradition and its connections to past discourses in the performance. This may include, for example, framing discourse as tradition or indexing it through verbal or nonverbal communication. Hence, traditionalisation is about actively linking current narration with past discourses, but ‘not with some objective quality of pastness that inheres in a cultural object’, as in folklorisation, but with contextually meaningful ties (Bauman 2004: 26–27, also 147–149). Analysing texts collected more than 100 years ago, it is no longer possible to scrutinise the situated meanings of the performance or the audience reception, which are obviously significant in verbal historicisations as well as for traditionalisation (Tonkin 1992: 1–49). Consequently, my analysis focuses on the meanings that arise from the meta-textual strategies used by Katerina Vyuchei, which have been situated as how she constructs her singing in relation to the Nenets epic registers and, thus, to traditionalisations. It is important to note that traditionalisation is not necessarily about constructing close, stable, or inevitable links to the tradition, but may also include establishing gaps or creating relationships to other discourses known by the performer and their audience (Briggs and Bauman 1992). This is related to the selectiveness of any historicity, on the one hand, and to the multiple ways of representing histories within them, on the other. Both are stressed by Ohnuki-Tierney (1990: 20) as important features of historicities. I would add to this that the representations themselves seek a dialogue with other forms of narration both within historicity and in relation to the larger society.

Performing the songs to Lehtisalo, Kate-rina Vyuchei was simultaneously taking part in the processes of folklorisation, choosing texts to perform for a Finnish scholar, and processes of traditionalisation, implying the authority of oral tradition in her poetics and practice. These processes are embedded in the fieldwork, where
the discovering gaze of Lehtisalo and Katerina Vyuchei’s talent enter into a dialogue. From the point of view of historicity, it is important to note the different epistemic premises of the Nenets epic registers when they take part in the processes of folklorisation or traditionalisation. In the folklorisation, Katerina Vyuchei’s songs represent replicas that could be recorded and then published as folklore representing non-modernity—that is, the past. Katerina Vyuchei, again, has chosen to perform songs that historicise the imperial past so that different Nenets points of view and ways of structuring narration meet with Russian imperial spaces and discourses over the Nenets subaltern status. Here, the songs represent a historicity, a way of understanding and experiencing the past. In what follows, I shall scrutinise the folklorisation first and then unravel the Nenets historicities.

FOLKLORISATION AND ITS TEMPORAL PREMISES

Katerina Vyuchei was, according to Lehtisalo’s travelogue, an elderly woman who during her youth moved from the Bol’shezemel’skaja tundra to Kanin Peninsula in the company of Zyrians, the Komi reindeer herders (Toivo Lehtisalo 1956: LXXXII). Her movement from the easternmost areas of European Russia to the westernmost territorial areas of the Nenets was long, around 800–900 kilometres, and related to the development of large-scale reindeer herding not only amongst the Nenets but also amongst a neighbouring ethnic group, the Komi. Because of the rapid growth of herds and simultaneous reindeer epizootics in the area, the Komi were hiring Nenets as herders and looking for new pastures. This resulted in the movement of both people and reindeer, as well as local conflicts. One should note that this kind of East–West movement was not typical, although seasonal, nomadic migrations between southern forest tundra and northern arctic areas provide a rather ordinary picture. The relocation of Katerina Vyuchei explains how songs describing events beyond the Ural Mountains were sung in the westernmost territories of the Nenets, although the songs might also have travelled from singer to singer through certain contingent encounters. The movements in Katerina Vyuchei’s songs and the circulation of them after her performance provide different images.

Katerina Vyuchei’s songs are all about movement, quintessential to the Nenets epic poetry and their nomadic lifestyle (Pushkarëva 2000; Golovnëv 2004; K. Lukin 2015). The two songs discussed in this article, published in 1947, are number 69 under the section narrative epic songs and number 75 labelled ‘jarabts’ under the section Erzählende Klagelieder (‘narrative crying songs’). The song texts share a circular structure. In both, the protagonist is a young man accused of murders and, thus, taken first to the court in the town of Obdorsk (Tundra Nenets Salya’ xarad), where his case cannot be tried. He is thus sent to Berëzov (Tundra Nenets Xo’mar”), to Tobol’sk (Tundra Nenets Tobol’mar”) in song number 69, to Kondinskoe (Tundra Nenets Ense’mar”) in song 75, and eventually to the tsar. There, the protagonist manages to convince the tsar of his decency and receives a letter—in the text, song 75 also indicates signs of power—with which he returns through the towns via which he originally arrived (Pushkarëva 2000: 9–10; Golovnëv 2004; K. Lukin 2015). In each town, the Russian administrator reads the letter, regrets his earlier decision, and is hanged. Song 69 ends in the protagonist returning to Obdorsk and beginning to govern there. In song 75, the hero also visits his home camp in the tundra, geographically completing the circle.

Before discussing the songs’ poetics and historicities, I disentangle the songs’ histories
as texts and knowledge, and their circulation in scholarly discourses through the process of folklorisation. I do this in order to highlight the different orders of organising knowledge about the past in processes where texts end up published in the first place and later became part of folklore studies, ethnography, and the history of the Nenets.

Toivo Lehtisalo’s fieldwork and his premises for collecting and publishing Nenets folklore become understandable within the framework of folklorisation informed by Finnish nationalism and the colonial discourses embedded within it. His fieldwork was financed by the Finno-Ugrian Society, a scholarly community founded in Helsinki in 1883 in order to ‘spark patriotic spirits’ and offer financial help so that young scholars could continue the work of Matthias Alexander Castrén in studying what was called ‘the Finnish family’ (Salminen 2008: 10). Castrén had travelled extensively in northern Russia and Siberia, and his work is closely linked to the development of ethnography as well as comparative linguistics and mythology in imperial Russia and the Grand Duchy of Finland, a part of the Russian Empire (Branch 1968; Ahola and Lukin 2017; K. Lukin 2017; Salminen 2019). In mapping Russia, its minorities, and its history, Castrén’s activities and texts regarding the linguistic and cultural affinity of the Finns with several minorities in Russia served both Finnish nationalism and Russian imperialism. When working with tradition, folklorisation worked in these two directions. First, it looked for and discovered poetry linked to Finno-Karelian and would, thus, uncover the history of ancient Finnish poetry and its worldview. Folklorisation created temporal hierarchies between speakers of kindred languages so that Finns were situated as higher in civilisation than most other communities within the Finno-Ugric family (Anttonen 2005; Kuutma 2005). The Nenets, together with speakers of other Samoyed languages, were defined as residing within the lowest state of civilisation (e.g., Castrén 1857). Second, the work of Castrén produced knowledge about the cultural and linguistic variety of the Russian Empire within an ethnographic project framed as history. Castrén’s work was planned and financed by the Russian Academy of Sciences (Branch 1968). Accordingly, colonial tones of discourse were embedded within Finnish nationalism and the scholarly activities related to it from at least the nineteenth century onward.

These tendencies were reflected in the quality of the texts Lehtisalo collected: he focused on mythic and shamanic folklore and sung epic traditions, although it must be noted that he also collected a notable amount of individual songs and proverbs. Lehtisalo also followed the general trend of his times in that he transcribed less communication that would not be specially marked by meta-linguistic or performative signs. Lehtisalo did not elaborate much about his ideas regarding the texts he published. That is, he published only a short article in Finnish, where he continues Castrén’s idea of Nenets epic singing as poetically inferior to the Finno-Karelian tradition. He also stated that most poems are ‘more or less like fairy-tales; especially the ones that describe the life, heroic deeds, and the wars of the ancient Samoyeds (Toivo Lehtisalo 1922: 86). In his collection of folklore, Juraksamojedische Volksdichtung ‘Nenets Folklore’, Lehtisalo divided the sung texts into several different categories, fairytale-like (märchenartige, märchenhafte), shamanic (schamanistische, Zauberlieder), epic or narrative (erzählende), and crying (Klagelieder) songs, to name a few. The fact that Lehtisalo categorised the texts as folklore—as expressions of Nenets national spirit distantly related to
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Finno-Karelian epic poetry—shows that he took little interest in the knowledge they contained, such as information about Nenets historicities. The publication of the texts was important for the sake of exposing the history of Finns, the diversity of folklore globally and its various comparisons, and studying the Tundra Nenets language. Comparisons, based on diffusionist ideas about the circulation of motives and tale types, appeared in a never-published manuscript (SUS: Lehtisalo). The texts themselves remained uninterpreted for decades.

In the years that followed, Soviet scholars began actively collecting Nenets folklore. This resulted in the publication of several new collections, and continued the emphasis on the epic and mythic tradition (Kupriyanova 1965; Tereshchenko 1990; Labanauskas 2001). Despite the different ideological tendencies, the Soviet paradigm was guided by the premises of folklorisation, and uncovering the vanishing pieces of texts and the possibly last (good) singers of the tradition. Research followed Marxist evolutionary lines and interpreted folklore historically as a source of the stages of development of Nenets society from the early stages of what was called a patriarchal society to the later stages (Kupriianova 1965: 55–56; Khomich 1984). Additionally, themes denoting the actual historical events, such as the revolts of Vavlë Neniang in the early nineteenth century, were highlighted and compared to the revolutionary spirit (Kornienko 1932; Khomich 1984; K. Lukin 2020). Furthermore, folklore was thought to provide an artistic representation of a culture’s inner real-life including its customs, morals, interethnic relations, and livelihood in the past (Vasil’ev 1984). Soviet, specifically post-World War II, interpretations continued to value folklore as an expression of traditionality which could hardly touch modernity, instead reflecting the ancient past. Such interpretations were inherently linked to the concept etnos, developed in Soviet ethnography. The theory around the concept, as discussed by David Anderson and Dmitri Arzyutov (2019: 741, passim.), linked etnos—in other words, the ethno-linguistic community—to ‘its ethnonym, common territory, and distinctive worldview (…)’ and was keenly interested in defining the historical homeland and biological foundations of each etnos. In these discussions, Nenets folklore is tied to the historical interpretations of the empire, where the position of the Nenets as one etnos of the empire is naturalised.

Researchers of Nenets epic poetry have conventionally categorised the songs as syudbabc and yarabc, using Tundra Nenets vernacular labels. Recently, Elena Pushkarëva (2000) drew attention to one more genre of the Nenets songs that is more historical in nature compared with syudbabc and yarabc. In her study, she also analysed one of the texts of Katerina Vyuchaei, leaving the other analysed in this article possibly because it is named yarabc in Juraksamojedische Volksdichtung (the other text does not have a label). According to Pushkarëva, the songs she categorised as khinabc are not easy to classify, because the khinabc partially share themes, poetics, and a performance style with two other epic sung genres. In addition, she mentions that the concept khinabc may also refer to individual songs, which again are not epic in nature. Pushkarëva repeatedly discusses the historical or chronological nature of the khinabc and ends up disputing their realism because of the mythical or fantastical elements in the narration (Pushkarëva 2000: 7–10, 54). Pushkarëva’s study stands as rather unconventional and fresh, because it brings into focus the epic texts previously unstudied due to their realistic or historic features. The texts seem to cross the line of an imagined traditionality that has been so powerfully told to live outside the spheres of
the modern and, thus, also chronological histories.

Despite the unconventional nature of her work, Pushkarëva adheres to the divide between myth and history, noting that the kbinabc represents a mythologised history. Both Pushkarëva and Lehtisalo treated the songs of Katerina Vyuchei as tradition and, thus, grant them a label that has kept them separate from Western or Russian rational, chronological historical writing. More recently, Andrei Golovnëv (2004) published thematically similar narratives to those Katerina Vyuchei sang, discussing them together with Perevalova (Golovnëv 2004: 7–8, 11; Golovnëv and Perevalova 2017; Perevalova 2019: 31) in relation to their value in providing an understanding of the meaning of politics and the embeddedness of politics and vernacular religion amongst the Indigenous elite. It seems typical that the narration Golovnëv and Perevalova discuss depicts local disputes such as poaching and murders and their reconciliation and punitive sentences. Their historical interpretations highlight the obvious differences between folklore and history, and, thus, both Perevalova and Golovnëv frame folklore and research as two different points of views of the leadership or of the Nenets culture. Folklore is deemed internal, whilst research represents an external view. I find Perevalova’s view, according to which the Nenets leaders were able to strategically use both the internal and the external views, extremely interesting. Still, the premise of her and Golovnëv’s work lies in writing Russian history and placing Indigenous narratives within it. Therefore, such work continues to grant secondary value to oral traditions as a source of history rather than interpret it within its meaningful frames (Golovnëv 2004: 7–8, 11; Golovnëv and Perevalova 2017: 115; Perevalova 2019: 31). I, therefore, include Perevalova’s and Golovnëv’s works within the processes of folklorisation.

Folklorisation has not made note of or has downplayed the processes of communication within which the utterances inscribed took part, trivialising their complex interrelations in the local and interlocal webs of communication. The question regarding the historical nature of folklore, often represented within the process of folklorisation, remains problematic, because oral tradition does not represent modern, rational discourses of universal or even local history. Instead, oral tradition provides the possibility of reading and learning about situated historicities. This does not mean that an oral tradition or their performers are ignorant of historical writings or would not take part in historical discourses. Quite the opposite: oral traditions rather often describe the past and comment on other discourses about it. Moreover, the texts identified as representing folklore might also represent culturally relevant ways of relating past, present, and future and seek a dialogue with other representations. I, therefore, highlight the fact that folklore should not be understood as something predating modernity or the Russian conquest, or reflecting premodern temporalities. Instead, oral tradition, like any other form of communication, may have its basis in modernity or in dialogue with it and the experiences or events reflecting the violence of colonial encounters (Briggs 2021). In the following analysis, I aim to show that the texts collected in the early twentieth century become understandable within the frames of Nenets historicities. Within these, the Russian imperial experience and its material features have their own positions. Whilst they relate to imperial orders, they are narrated within the the Nenets registers of communication so that the points of views, objectives, and results of the narration hybridise the Russian imperial pasts.
THE IMPERIAL LANDSCAPES MYTHOLOGISED

This textual analysis is based on an understanding of Nenets epic singing as a special communicative register consisting of locally and variably named genres poetically interrelated, yet also separated from each other (Pushkarëva 2000; Pushkarëva and Khomich 2001; Niemi and Lapsui 2004). Register here is understood as a conventional poetic idiom shared and recognised within a linguistic community (Foley 1995: 15–16; Tarkka 2005: 40). The different genres of Nenets epic singing emphasise divergent moments of life and differ somewhat in their poetics. Thus, for example, the syudbac represents myths told in the third person, whilst the yarabc and khinabc are told in the first person with themes more mundane and contemporary. The genres share the six-syllable line structure, themes, and contents, and the lines or longer stretches of lines are easily borrowed from one text or genre to another. Additionally, the enchanted character of the texts—that is, the porous nature of gods and men, or otherworld and this world—is pervasive for Nenets epic singing. The relationship between the register and genre lies beyond the focus of this article (Koski 2011: 322–344; Frog 2015). Instead, I emphasise the intergeneric nature of the epic genres—that is, the formation of a poetic idiom—and how the leaky borders spill features of this and the otherworld to understandings of the narrated past.

The defining features of Nenets sung epic registers—in addition to their six-syllable line structuring—include the voice produced in the back of the throat, the singing style based on vocality, solo singing, restricted tonal substance, and isometricity (Niemi 1998: 78–82). There are numerous other features of performance, such as the use of a helper performer and the use of gestures to name of few. These are all meta-communicative features that imply traditionalisation. One of the implicit understandings produced by the meta-textual elements and the traditionalisation in Tundra Nenets is that the performer is not the first narrator of the text nor the owner of it, but the narrator of what was told to them through the personification of the song. Therefore, the origins of a song lie in the otherworld, for which the events narrated unfold when sung (Kupriianova 1965: 37–40; Niemi 1998: 62; Pushkarëva 2003: 216–241). Therefore, the text itself together with the actors in it originate in the otherworld, and the performer is capable of and has spiritual powers to communicate with agents beyond the audience’s senses. As a result, the veracity of the text stems from different epistemic notions related to Western historiography and folklorisation. According to Nenets conceptions, epic singing’s veracity results from the proper relationship of the performer with the otherworldly agents. The epistemic stance can be recognised in the use of the poetical features that produce the texts’ relation to the tradition and, therefore, the epic register itself.

In addition to the above-mentioned features, the texts’ contents are related to and recognised by the audience in relation to other traditional texts. Both of Katerina Vyuchei’s songs analysed here begin with plotlines that create expectations for aetiological motives, and thus are related to the texts Andrei Golovnëv historically published and analysed. Indeed, a large part of the songs consists of narration that occurs in the tundra and recounts intra- or interethic disputes eventually tried in court. In song 69, the protagonist accidentally or intentionally kills three starving Khanty men, and, in song 75, the male protagonist’s sister kills their little brother, father, and a dog,
although her brother is accused of the murders. Mythic narratives with comparable themes end in protagonists becoming deities or spirits important to the narrator’s listeners’ environment (Golovnëv 2004: 267–269, 276–285). I argue that Katerina Vyuchei’s songs are creatively continuing the plotline of a myth in order to enlarge the geographical and political spheres of narration and simultaneously complicate both Nenets and imperial registers of storytelling of colonial encounters. She takes advantage of the shared idiom and moves between genres so that mythic themes describing the relationships between the Nenets and their deities end up being a narrative about Nenets encounters with imperial Russian figures.

Recently, Anna-Leena Siikala (2002: 158–169) and Lotte Tarkka (2013: 207, 384, 423–425, 457) interpreted similar kinds of Finno-Karelian epic texts as mythic history. The mythic history arranges the past as enchanted frames, working in two directions. First, it articulates the otherness of the past and the otherworld, and, second, familiarises it by relating it to the world in which the performers and audience live. Siikala’s and Tarkka’s insistence on the intergeneric significance and the enchanted nature of narration are of vital importance to my analysis. Amongst the Nenets, narratives provided a source for historicity, where the tundra—understood as an everyday landscape—could be narrated into a mythic or otherwise narratively heightened landscape with features imperceptible except through singing.

In the songs analysed, Katerina Vyuchei narrates the imperial landscapes that for most Nenets were likewise beyond the senses using the epic register. She, therefore, frames the imperial landscape and the protagonists within historicities emanating in the register. This carries crucial consequences for the epistemologies of the songs. As noted above, their veracity derives from the otherworldly connections, implying that Katerina Vyuchei received knowledge concerning the events about which she is singing in a dialogue with the personification of a song. Additionally, the events are thought to take place as the song is performed. Thus, its agents act as the story unravels. Accordingly, the past comes about as it is narrated. Consequently, the past itself is inherently otherworldly when told. It is here that the traditionalisation produces a different way of experiencing history if compared with the folklorisation described above. Where folklore text represents an imagined past of Finns or of humankind for folklorisation, when the same text is traditionalised by a Nenets performer, they recreate the past events to be experienced. Both are about understanding the past: folklorisation is tied to disenchanted schemes of progression typical for its modern gaze; Katerina Vyuchei’s traditionalisation links the narration to the Nenets storyworlds and spills mythic elements into the past. Indeed, the enchanted nature of the narration is further created within the processes of traditionalisation. Using these further points of traditionalisation, I refer to the intertextual links Katerina Vyuchei built to Nenets mythic narration. These links are related to the above-mentioned frames of expectations and the strategies of creating distance and strangeness analysed below. The movement from the home camp to the strange lands represents a signifying feature of the narrative registers and the strangeness is produced by the distance of the movement itself. The distance also tends to denote the otherworldliness of the landscape (K. Lukin 2015). The movement and strangeness relate to power such that the spiritual or otherwise important knowledge and relationships are dispersed in the tundra landscape, where the protagonist of the epic narrative travels in order
to uncover meaningful knowledge and establish solidarity (Leeuwen 2007: 43; K. Lukin 2015).

The textual strategies of creating distance and strangeness permeate Katerina Vyuchei’s songs. For example, when the administrator in Obdorsk decided that the case cannot be tried there and sends the protagonist forward, Katerina Vyuchei sings about the long journeys of the imprisoned protagonist from one town to another in short and concise forms. The parallel repetition of similar whole lines creates a sense of ever-growing distance. Thus, Katerina Vyuchei recreates the lines describing the travel and the forced movement of the protagonist three times, when he is taken to Berëzov, Tobol’sk (song 69), or Kondinskoe (song 75) and to the tsar’s town:

| anyi’ khanado" | again they took me |
| syuw khanambada" | they drove me |
| pido" taryem’ ma": | they said like this: |
| "teki nyernyana | ‘the one ahead of us |
| tyeda’ sirkar | look, now |
| teki khayeryoda" | the one glancing |
| tyenyewaruw | do you know it |
| amge ngebando" | what could it be? |
| ‘many taryem’ mam’: | I said like this |
| "amgem’ tyenyewam’ | ‘what should I know |
| syakha’ manecyam?" | when have I seen? |
| pido’ taryem’ ma": | They said like this: |
| “Kho’ mar”yar | ‘of Berëzov |
| yalya” ngedaki".’” | lights they should be ‘ |
| kho’ mar”yan | To Berëzov |
| syuw tewra. | they brought me. |
| maradm’ pomna | Along the town |
| syuw khanabi’ | they drove me. |
| wad’ nyokhona | On the door of the wall |
| wenyeko syari | a dog was tied |
| yesya cyepocykana | with an iron chain |
| wenyeko lakedarnga, | the dog wrenched. |
| marad’ yerwotan’ | To the town’s leader |
| syuw tyulya". | they brought me. |

(Lehtisalo 1947: 362)
Katerina Vyuchei’s parallel wholes reproduce verbs of motion, images of the town, and the ignorance of the protagonist about them. In the extract above taken from song 69, the verbs of motion highlight the deprivation of agency of the protagonist: he is not actively moving, but he is taken, carried, and brought. This not only emphasises the forced movement, but also the inability to choose his own route. The hero’s ignorance and lack of agency are also underlined by the questions from his drivers and his answers, confirming that the landscape is totally unknown to the hero. In song 75, for example, the ignorance is stressed with the help of the probabilitative mood of the verb ngesy ‘to be’, when the hero says, ‘Kho mar ngedaki’ (I guess it is Berëzov’). These kinds of strategies are pervasive in Nenets epic poetry. The parallel structures are indeed typical for long epic narration globally, which not only helps the performer to produce coherent narrative structures, but also enhances listening to and following along with the epic singing. The structures also produce meanings and, here, the repeating expressions of movements and growing distance cause a sense of strangeness. The question–answer structure together with the use of probabilitative mood stressing the ignorance of the protagonist, are also typical for Nenets epic poetry. Within the poems at hand, the lack of agency clearly lies in contrast to the poem’s earlier descriptions of travel in the tundra, where the protagonist actively moves with his reindeer. The strategy of distance and strangeness is not only about poetics, but is also deeply related to what has been called sentient ecology (Anderson 2000) or the law of the tundra (Stammler 2005). These terms refer to reindeer herders’ and hunters’ holistic knowledge of the environment and its agents, and the impact this has on their decisions. The movement demands this kind of knowledge, because one must be reciprocally related to the surrounding agents in order to make the correct decisions. At the same time, this means that the distance possibly refers to a deficient knowledge and possible danger, as well as involuntarily inflicting harm.

Overall, Katerina Vyuchei’s textual strategies link her songs to the other epic registers of the Nenets. She not only links but also creates a new representative of the register and, thus, the strategies are meta-textual: they speak about the relation of the song to other similar songs. This relationship produces a field of meanings related to the otherworld typical for epic registers. The epic singing, again, construes Nenets historicities in important ways: they describe pasts using mythic and otherwise unseen agents, and have considerable impact on the general knowledge and its structuring principles in the linguistic community. The crucial difference to the pool of epic singing is that their protagonists tend to primarily move in the tundra environment familiar to the Nenets. Katerina Vyuchei’s protagonist moves within the landscapes of imperial Russia. He passes the cities in order, from those closest to the Nenets until the metropole. The imperial landscape cannot avoid attaining otherworldly meanings, given the songs’ basis within the mythic registers and the epistemic notions that stress the otherworldly origin of the texts. The mythic qualities, then, flow into the imperial landscapes and enchant it. Similarly, the process of establishing solidarity with the tsar becomes narrated within the same frames used in the epic registers.
DIALOGUES BETWEEN THE SUBALTERN AND THE IMPERIAL

The epic registers are also affected when they relate to the imperial landscapes and agents, which is evident in the use of Russian vocabulary. Reading the texts intertextually with other recordings of the Tundra Nenets epic registers, we note that the language not only highlights Tundra Nenets, but also the interaction between Nenets and Russian. Whilst Russian never enters the vocabulary of the syudbabc—that is, myths told in the third person—the other epic registers appear to allow Russian loans, expressions, and quotes. These naturally describe the interaction of the Nenets with Russians, as do the themes in many of the poems. I also find the choice of loan words and quotes meaningful and an important act highlighting the interaction with the imperial power. Direct quotes require, within the already quite reflective art of singing epic songs, a sense of reflexivity, pointing toward utterances that report someone else’s speech (Lucy 1993). In epic narration, the performer not only describes the movements of the protagonists, but, in quoting speech, they also perform the agents and their words (Tarkka 2013:169). Nenets epic registers prefer direct quotes, which often represent questions and answers, representing advice or orders to those about to embark upon a journey. Not everyone can provide advice or orders—only those with a specific power and at a specific age can. Others tend to silently agree and act, or note ‘pudar mambad / khanya sawa nyi nga’ (‘if you say so / how is it not good’).

When narrating the arrival of the protagonist to the Siberian administrative centres, Katerina Vyuchei quotes the administrators. She sings, ‘marad yerwotar / pol tanakhalnga / “top samodyin / wor samodyin / syan khibyarim’ / syan khadasan”?’ (‘the town chief / stamped his foot on the floor / “thief Samoyed / pagan Samoyed / how many men / how many have you killed?”’) (Lehtisalo 1947: 323) Again, Katerina Vyuchei used parallelism to describe similar scenes in each town. The chiefs stamp their feet and gravelly accuse the protagonist. These quotations do not represent advice nor questions or answers similar to the Nenets epic registers that usually highlight politeness despite the possible social differences of the speakers. The lines ‘lop samodyin / wor samodyin’ (‘pagan Samoyed / thief Samoyed’) denote the stereotypical images that the Russian administrators ascribed to the Nenets: they were perceived as wild and violent thieves and as heathens, which both appear in the direct quote as slander. In addition to the offence, the quote’s two lines also consist of Russian, which further underlines the reported speech’s similitude to the actual words of the administrator. Their use in the epic poem clearly reflect the fact that the Nenets were actively and sufficiently a part of the Russian imperial state in order to know how they were spoken of and addressed by the administrative elite. Thus, the quote also stresses the socially inferior status of the Nenets in the imperial court or administrative system, rendering it a part of the singing. Moreover, the distinction between the heathen and the Orthodox was a central dichotomy within the Russian Empire. This dichotomy not only produced divisions between dominant imperial actors and subaltern inhabitants, but Orthodoxy was also taken to be a defining feature of Russian citizenship (Leete and Vallikivi 2011; Toulouze 2011). This quote then recreates the manner in which this divide between modern and non-modern was produced.

The parallel structures not only contrast with earlier movements in the tundra well-known to the protagonists, but also to the
following description of the encounter with the tsar. The imperial towns characterised within the parallel structures share features, such as a wall and a gate and a dog tethered by a chain. By contrast, Katerina Vyuchei describes the tsar’s house as bright (yalya mya”). The tsar himself is not called yerw (‘leader’), which is used to refer to the administrators of colonial towns, but parengoda, a Tundra Nenets expression for ‘tsar’, as well as pili” nyesa (‘eternal father’), which seems to represent a parallel expression, possibly a translation from the Russian epithet for the tsar.

Katerina Vyuchei also places in opposition the ways in which the administrators and the tsar each communicate with and relate to the Nenets protagonist. The administrators do not question the crime, but the number of victims. This clearly contrasts with the way in which the encounter with the tsar is narrated. The tsar asks questions and listens to the protagonist. The narration tends to emphasise the fair-mindedness and good nature of the tsar, also depicting the encounter with the tsar in the same manner as the encounters with the other actors in the poem—that is, beyond the Siberian administrators. When the protagonist meets the tsar in song 75, he gifts him black and arctic fox furs and in return receives a letter in an iron box, a woven overcoat, a hat, and a sword. Then, the tsar states in a direct quote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>salyan’ khardan’</th>
<th>to Salekhard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>khuna tewbat</td>
<td>arriving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tyiki yasyikkhana</td>
<td>in this box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myaryo tanyewa.</td>
<td>there is a letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335 tyiki myaryomt</td>
<td>This letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salya’ yerwotan’</td>
<td>to the chief of the town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mitar.</td>
<td>give.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salya’ yerwotan’</td>
<td>To the chief of the town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tewbat</td>
<td>arriving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340 tyiki noi pannemt</td>
<td>this woven overcoat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syerad</td>
<td>wear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tyiki sawamt</td>
<td>This cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syerad,</td>
<td>wear,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tyiki palir</td>
<td>this sword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345 khewdenat ngeye!”</td>
<td>put at your side.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lehtisalo 1947: 366)

This represents typical advice in the epic registers of the Nenets oral tradition. The protagonist who travels to faraway places or to the otherworld typically drifts in a position where he must negotiate in order to perform his task or form an alliance with the agents of the storyworld. Even before the journey, a clever protagonist could foretell what they would need in order to cope. Katerina Vyuchei structured her song according to this principle and her hero, finally arriving at the tsar’s palace and getting the opportunity to meet face-to-face with the eternal father, exposes his tools of negotiation. It is here that the text begins to
break the border or the imperial arrangements that it strengthened or previously followed. If in previous encounters with the Siberian administrators, the protagonist was deficient in his agency and silenced, here he takes it all back. He first protests his innocence, thus taking the chance to describe the wrongdoings of the Siberian administrators. Second, he presents a bagful of the most valuable furs to the tsar. The furs represented one of the core reasons for the conquest of Siberia: they were central to the imperial economy and foreign relations. Consequently, the furs materially bound the tsar and the Indigenous elite, because the elite were tasked with collecting *yasak*, the tax which Indigenous peoples paid in furs. Thus, it was also in their shared interest to remain on good terms with the hunting and tax-paying people. Yet, we also know that the Indigenous peoples were often in debt, not only to their trading partners, but also to the tax collectors, which caused misery and tension in the northern regions (e.g., Forsyth 1992: 158–162). Nevertheless, the furs provided the Nenets and other Indigenous peoples with a material device via which to regulate their relations with those in power. This then provides them with a vibrant agency, which is well demonstrated in the song’s text.

Furthermore, in recent research on the relationship between the Indigenous elite and the tsar, Perevalova demonstrated how the Indigenous elite used their visits to the tsar as a tool of control and power. From the point of view of the metropole, this represented diplomacy, in which the relationship between the tsar and the Indigenous elite was regulated with the help of deeds (*gramoty*). In principle, the role of the deeds ended following Speranskii’s reforms; but, in practice, the visits and the exchange of furs and the administrative honour continued long into the nineteenth century (Perevalova 2019: 56–57, 100–106). The Indigenous elite, however, used the tsar’s gifts in the north to publicly show their power in the towns. The gifts and deeds were also passed down as central signs of the power of ‘Indigenous dynasties’ (Perevalova 2011, 2019: 113–115). In addition, the paraphernalia that the tsar gifted are signified both by the poetics and the power of the textual references and by the actual ways in which these were used. In the poem’s register, the items given are comparable with mythic and ritually powerful items that the epic poems’ protagonists either have or obtain during their journeys. These typically include shamanic drums or bows, or spiritual animals, all of which enhance the power and agency of the hero. The items gifted by the tsar similarly elevate the protagonist’s authority and influence. The source of power is the tsar, who not only presents the items, but also gives advice on how to use them. Thus, the letter should be given to the administrators who should read it, whilst the rest of the paraphernalia the protagonist should wear before arriving at Salekhard. Although the items tend to lie at the centre of the narration and the known behaviour of the Nenets chiefs, I highlight how their centrality denotes the relationship between the protagonist and the tsar, the imperial chief (Siikala and Siikala 2005: 271). It is the establishment of this relationship which renders the travel, the encounter, and the subsequent homecoming meaningful.

The power of the letter is extremely interesting, because neither the members of the Indigenous elite nor the non-elite members could read or write before the late nineteenth or early twentieth century. Still, the administrative and imperial power granted to written pieces of paper—in this context, representing so-called *gramoty* ‘deeds’—was immense and acknowledged by both administrators and the Indigenous elite (also Perevalova 2019: 119–120). We can here see how the divide between
the oral tradition and literacy so central to modern hierarchies also became part of the oral communicative registers of the Nenets. The clothes and the sword, again, are narrated to have been used only in imperial situations, where the protagonist must demonstrate his administrative position. Thus, he wears them before going to Salekhard and removes them before returning to his home camp in the tundra. Indeed, the clothes and swords have also been kept and stored by the elites and their descendants, and they are eagerly presented to the fieldworkers.

The gifts given by the tsar secure the protagonist’s journey back to the north, but importantly also rank him as one of the agents in the imperial system. His letter makes the formerly insulting administrators cry and voice their regrets, and subsequently lavishly entertain the protagonist or be hanged. The former divisions and deficient agency have thus disappeared and the power resulting from the tsar enables the protagonist to act within the administration. In the epic registers, the protagonist’s homecoming is often narrated, placing emphasis on the reunion with the family or a wedding celebration. Nevertheless, the journey back is seldom emphasised to such an extent as it is in the songs of Katerina Vyuchei. She clearly wanted to highlight the results of the long journey and the higher status in relation to the administrators in the town, rather than speak about the Khanty Prince who must content himself with co-ruling alongside the protagonist. The travel and return to Obdorsk evidently point to the changed status of the protagonist and the overall administrative situation resulting from his long journey and the power gained.

**CONCLUSIONS**

In the end, Katerina Vyuchei’s songs tend to highlight the supreme power of the tsar and thus take part in the orders of imperial Russia. They also tend to criticise the Siberian administrators. Indeed, one of the captivating features of these songs must have been the ridiculous image they created of the administrators in the towns and their unfortunate fates in the narration. These features describe the subaltern position of the Nenets and the ways in which they were produced within the tsarist administration. Consequently, the songs themselves exist in dialogue with the imperial orders of modernity within which the tradition was seen as not belonging to it, but traditional. As I have also argued above, the communicative situation within which the texts were transcribed, were also replete with the obliqueness of modernity: Lehtisalo wanted to collect texts that would enable him a glimpse backwards and Katerina Vyuchei chose to sing texts that relied on their traditional authority and which she thought represented the folklore the Finnish linguist sought. In their encounter, an indigenous actor, Katerina Vyuchei, narrated a past tied to the Nenets relationships with the Russian imperial power, its inner categorisations, and various hierarchies. The decisive difference between the folklorisation of Lehtisalo and traditionalisation of Katerina Vyuchei lies in opposition. Whilst the folkloristic gaze relies on a rupture and holds onto it, traditionalisation is about situating the authority of tradition in the context of the performance. In my analysis of the poems, I aimed to interpret not only the difference between folklorisation and traditionalisation, but the possible historicities that lie behind and were recreated by Katerina Vyuchei. Lehtisalo and Katerina Vyuchei were communicating through two different historicities. Lehtisalo’s
understanding stressed folklore’s value as a thing of the past which could also be used as proof of Nenets backwardness or traditionality. Katerina Vyuchei’s understanding of history highlights the mythic and otherworldly nature of the past, which cannot be explained away as mere features of the epic register’s style. Choosing to narrate a past using an epic register is a conscious choice, which equates mythic with past worlds, their protagonists, and their landscapes. This equation renders the past a mythic country, but similarly brings imperial, contemporary details to the storyworld. Within this process, Nenets heroes become powerful in circumstances where they have been viewed as subaltern. In narrating both the subaltern position and the mythic heroism, Katerina Vyuchei recreates the Nenets historicity and the experience of the past where Indigenous agency is also voiced.

The strategies of the Nenets epic register are themselves codes which create expectations for structures and contents for narration. The actors, their acts, and their contexts are not as contingent as the encounters within the world. Thus, the ways of narrating the contingencies also become entwined with the strategies of the register. Katerina Vyuchei recreates the register: she begins with themes that expect the protagonist to be named a local deity, but instead continues to narrate a hero who becomes an imperial actor with administrative power. His power does not, however, lie in the paraphernalia received from the tsar alone, but is inherently linked to the entire journey the protagonist completes. This includes the distance and the experience of the strange, his resourceful negotiations with the tsar, and his return following the tsar’s advice. These all assign his administrative power within frames that are central to the Nenets historicity, emphasising the knowledge gained through hard, sometimes pitiful, but in the end triumphant travel in unknown and unseen landscapes where new and valuable knowledge is available. Within these frames, the mythic qualities of the landscape typical for an epic register extend to imperial centres and the metropole such that the administrators and the tsar can be compared to the deities, gods, and giants with whom the epic register’s protagonists also communicate. This comparison is valid because of the register, the shared idiom that forms an important condition of knowing about the past within the Tundra Nenets linguistic community. Consequently, the register has been discussed as a form of Nenets historicity.

A significant point to Katerina Vyuchei’s songs is their implicit epistemic relation to the otherworld, based on the idea that the performer is singing texts narrated to them by an otherworldly agent. In addition, it is important to note that this also implies that the events unravel when told. Accordingly, Katerina Vyuchei is not only recollecting or repeating a story, but making the past happen again. The past is thus not unchanging and static, but—if the relationship with the otherworldly agents is proper—regenerated and happening through performance.
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NOTES

1 I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers and the editors of JFAS for their helpful and critical comments on this manuscript. This research was funded by the Academy of Finland (‘Imperialism in vernacular terms. Appraising the coloniality of folklore, tradition and heritage through and by the Nenets’, grant number 330374).
2 Russian is transliterated following the ALA-LC. Tundra Nenets is transliterated following the system introduced by Niemi and Lapsui (2004). I have omitted the diacritics from the British standard and the sign ° from the Tundra Nenets transliteration.

3 The verbatim translation is ‘of other/alien descent’, and thus has several possible translations. I prefer ‘native’, used, for example, by Forsyth.
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