



Received: 02.02.2020

Accepted: 17.02.2020

Published: 14.06.2020

JOTS, 4/2, 2020: 469-498

Additional Turkic and Tungusic Borrowings into Yukaghir V

Yukagir Dilindeki Türkçe ve Tunguzca Alıntılara İlaveler V

Peter PIISPANEN

Stockholm University (Stockholm/Sweden)

E-mail: peter.piispanen@finska.su.se

Continuing on previous research, in this fifth installment of a paper series a total of twenty-four newly found borrowings from Turkic (ten borrowings), Tungusic (seven borrowings) and Russian (seven borrowings) into the Yukaghir languages and dialects of the far northeastern Siberia are presented with semantic and phonological details as loanword etymologies. cursory discussions about the vocabulary also in the surrounding languages is given, and the etymologies of Yukaghir toponymy are discussed as a special section of interest.

Key Words: Lexical borrowing, Tungusic, Turkic, Mongolic, Yukaghir, Russian, dialectology.

1. Introduction

This paper continues the research into newfound loanword etymologies for the Yukaghir languages and dialects of the far northeastern Siberia from Turkic, Tungusic and Mongolic languages.¹ Throughout this paper series, it has become quite clear (through the sheer number of suggested borrowings) that many of the reconstructed Yukaghir roots (in Nikolaeva 2006) with only very limited attestation in one or two dialects (documented in any of the Yukaghir sources listed under Abbreviations of the linguistic sources) are, in fact, borrowings. Most of these are chronologically so late that Late Proto-Yukaghir reconstructions for them are neither reasonable nor required. In other cases, the items of different dictionary entries actually belong together on the basis of phonological, semantical and etymological considerations, again reducing the number of reconstructible Late Proto-Yukaghir roots. A concrete result is thus the finding that lexical borrowings into Yukaghir are much more common, and from many more sources, than previously believed. Most of these borrowings are from Yakut, Ewen, Ewenki or Russian. A few appear to be from Yup'ik languages (*forthcoming*), while others may have originated in other now extinct Paleo-Siberian languages - some of which are seemingly unrelated to any historical or documented language in the area - and which includes a variety of Northern Nivkh and a form of Chukchi. In the case of Yakut (in some cases obviously Pre-Yakut), many of the donor sources for borrowings can be found in the JRS, but naturally more extensively so in Pekarsky (1959). The EDAL has been very helpful in tracing the etymology of several, but not all, Tungusic, Mongolic and Turkic borrowings.

It should also stand clear that by combining lexical information from numerous different sources it is fully possible to trace borrowings, ancient or recent, in the different languages of the Far Northeastern Siberian area. In tracing step-by-step chains of borrowings throughout many languages, without these necessarily being *Wanderwörter*, phonological and semantical considerations are

¹ I wish to thank my colleagues Alexander SAVELYEV, Marko CRNOBRNJA, Kağan KOCAOĞLU, and Mikhail ZHIVLOV for their valuable and useful input on an earlier draft version of this paper. All remaining errors are, of course, my own.

naturally indispensable. One unstated purpose of this line of research, beyond the self-evident goal of etymologizing, has been to provide a reasonable background and linguistic history for the Yukaghir languages themselves, which for centuries have remained little studied, understood or documented, and no etymological dictionaries exist yet (Knüppel 2013). Once enough information on historical phonological changes and processes and sources of lexical borrowings into different dialects have been gathered it should be possible to draw a more comprehensive map of the historical situation. As these words are written, this has not yet by any means been carried out to completion, but I hope that works such as this will push this agenda forward.

In every part thus far in this paper series, I have taken the opportunity to discuss some topic of interest to Yukaghir studies introduced before the newly suggested lexical borrowings. In 2018a (Part I), phonology and Yukaghir borrowings into surrounding languages were generally evaluated. In 2019a (Part II), the Altaic language hypothesis and chronological theories were discussed, and then in 2019b (Part III), a two-part double-paper, corrections to older Yukaghir documentation (on Chuvan, and Omok and Spiridonov's dialectal Kolyma Yukaghir materials) as well as borrowed grammatical markers were presented (in the first half), and, further, the concept of Para-Yukaghir languages was touched upon briefly (in the second half). In 2020 (Part IV), the nominal derivational suffix *-jə was discussed. In this part then, that is Part V, the etymology of Yukaghir toponymical terms will be discussed in a detailed analysis. Another installment of this paper series, Part VI, or perhaps as a separate paper due to its different nature, is being planned, and it will interestingly include what appears to be direct Mongolic borrowings into Yukaghir, among other matters.

2. On Yukaghir Toponymy

Before dealing with the presentation of newly found borrowings into Yukaghir, let us have a brief look at Yukaghir toponymical etymologies. When perusing NIKOLAEVA's dictionary on Historical Yukaghir (2006), numerous documented places, rivers, lakes, mountains, people, *etc.* are presented in one or more

Yukaghir dialect or language. Many of these are properly etymologized and earlier forms can be reconstructed. However, it appears as if NIKOLAEVA did not at all consult the handy work on Tundra Yukaghir toponymy and etymologies (Kurilov 1997), because this would have considerably changed the analyses in several cases. Kurilov, as a native speaker, employs complex morphological analysis using several different morphemes, which are also described elsewhere in detail for both Kolyma and Tundra Yukaghir, respectively (Maslova 2001: 113-121, 175-179). Armed with this knowledge, I will reanalyze several toponymical words by comparing the two works, and therewith suggest several corrections and etymologies as per the below:

TY *kinńera*, and phonetic variants, ‘a place, a mountain’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 212) is actually an opaque compound composed of TY *ki(n)* ‘two’ and *ńara* ‘small hill’, with the literal meaning of ‘местность, имеющая две небольшие горки = terrain with two small slides’ (as per Kurilov 1997: 19). The word as such did not exist as a root at the level of Late Proto-Yukaghir, and the reconstruction should therewith be scrapped. Another TY place name, *kidanaa* (Nikolaeva 2006: 19, with an unnecessary reconstructed form) is, according to Kurilov (1997: 19) agreeably formed through a similar process; TY attribute *ki(n)* from *kijuol* ‘быть в количестве два = to be in the amount of two’ + *-d-* to separate the vowels at the morpheme boundary + TY *anaa* ‘mountain’, rending the meaning into ‘местность, на который находятся две горы = area of two mountains’.

TY *inńir-čibed-önńie* ‘name of a river’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 132, 173) means, according to Kurilov (1999: 17), имеющий исток ручей = having a creek source. The word TY *inńir* means ‘source’ and is of Tungusic origin (< Proto-Tungusic **uńi*~**üńi* ‘small river, brook’ (EDAL 620), the middle segment, *-čibed-*, is contrary to the dictionary not a separate word, but actually, morphologically, a suffix {-*či*} (Maslova 2001: 121) plus an affix {-*be-*} (Maslova 2001: 113; the same combo is found with TY *saqčibe* ‘slope by a river’), and the affix {-*d-*} to separate the vowels at the morpheme boundary (just like a genitive marker does), and TY *önńie* is a ‘river’. As such, all parts of this name can be etymologized, with one part being a borrowing, and it is therefore not reasonable to reconstruct this compound al-

ready at a Late Proto-Yukaghir level. The name is old, however, and it is noteworthy that the river, according to Kurilov, is today called *Kuhayan aattaax*, an obvious Yakut name.

TY *čõᅇd'ijaa* ‘the name of a lake’ and TY *čõᅇd'ijaa-öönᅇie* ‘the name of a river’ (reconstructed in Nikolaeva 2006: 140) have internal Yukaghir etymologies according to Kurilov (1997: 34), where the first part is identical to TY *čõᅇd'ə* ‘fat, grease’. The segment *-aa* represents a naming suffix (Piispanen 2016: 261). The river name therefore literally means ‘greasy river’, and it is hardly justifiable to reconstruct the lake and river names already at the Late Proto-Yukaghir levels. Rather, these should be combined with the materials of the above entry for the root **čõᅇ-* (Nikolaeva 2006: 140), where various Yukaghir words with the meanings ‘fat’, ‘tasty’, etc. are to be found.

TY *qočoqčõj* ‘the name of a lake’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 382) is a Yakut borrowing, but of Yukaghir origin, according to Kurilov (1997: 33). We are thus dealing with a back-borrowed hydronym in this case. Etymologically, the word comes from the TY root *qad'uu* ‘cold’ (which I note originates in PY **qanć-* ‘cold’, and which actually has Uralic cognates, *personal observation*) plus the suffix *-ča*: (Nikolaeva 2006: 79), and which in Yakut changed to (**qanćəča*: > **qončečej* >) *qočoqčõj* ‘lit. cold lake’. The ending of *-čõj* starkly marks this as a Yakut word as noted by Kurilov. As such, a Late Proto-Yukaghir form for this Yakut borrowing is not justified. Also, I note that a similar convoluted phonological process has probably produced the isolated and non-etymologized KY word *močoqatčən* ‘a man’s double’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 270), as borrowed from some Tungusic source, as suggested by the Tungusic diminutive ending.

TY *taqsii* ‘the name of a place’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 426) was reconstructed at a Late Proto-Yukaghir level and is non-etymologized, but Kurilov (1997: 31-32) glosses this as a Yakut word literally meaning ‘там, где есть выход = where there is a way out’. Thus, the word can be etymologized and does not need to be reconstructed on any earlier level, being a Yakut toponymical borrowing.

TY *tudeye-juońel* ‘the name of a place’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 439) was needlessly reconstructed at a Late Proto-Yukaghir level and non-etymologized, because Kurilov (1997: 32) had already etymologized the word as a compound segmented as *tude(l)* ‘it’, the locative case marker *-ye*, and *juo(ŋ)* ‘head’ (cognate with Finnish *juuri* ‘root’; Piispanen 2013a: 176) and nominal derivational suffix {-l} (Maslova 2001: 116), giving it the meaning of ‘имеющий голову, с головой = having a head’, all parts being natively Yukaghir.

TY *joyul-waad-enu* ‘the name of a river’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 449) is etymologically Yukaghir, but the middle segment should not be reconstructed on the level of Late-Proto-Yukaghir, because **waa:* does not exist as a root. The compound can instead be analyzed as TY *joyul* ‘nose’ (which is a Tungusic borrowing; Piispanen 2015b: 247-248), followed by a suffix {*waa-*}, and then the affix *-d-*, again used to separate vowels at the morpheme boundary (Kurilov 1997: 18), and followed by TY *enu* ‘river’. The literal meaning is thus simply ‘nose lake’.

The first part of TY *čiill’il’ie-monqe-d’umur* ‘the name of a place’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 131) has been reconstructed on an earlier level, but this is wholly unnecessary because its individual components have already been properly analyzed and etymologized elsewhere (Kurilov 1997: 34). The word *čiill’il’ie* can be segmented as TY *čii(l)* ‘люди = people’ + possessive suffix *-l’i(l’e)* + diminutive suffix *-l’ee*, with the rest of the compound being TY *monqe* ‘сопка, холм = hill’ and TY *d’umur~čumur* ‘хребет, спина = ridge, back’. KURILOV, suggests that the full meaning of the compound is ‘там, где было много людей = where there were lots of people’, but perhaps a more proper translation would be ‘ridged hill of the people’.

TY *čuoŋqijaa* ‘the name of a lake’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 142) has been suggested an etymology meaning ‘sonorous lake’ (Kurilov 1997: 35), by assuming the segmentation of TY *čuoŋqioń* ‘звонкий, громкий на звук = sonorous, loud to the sound’ and suffixations including the diminutive *-die* (Maslova 2001: 113). I suggest that this analysis does not hold up to scrutiny, however, as both truncation and unparalleled irregular phonological alterations must be assumed. Instead, I suggest that the name literally means ‘goose lake’, cf. TY *čuoŋqa* ‘bean goose (Anser fabalis)’, in this name, the word for *goose* is simply being followed by the common naming suffix {-*jaa*}. Noteworthy is that this Yukaghir word for *bean goose* is

actually a borrowing from Yakut *čörkōj* ‘teal’, which in turn was borrowed from Mongolic, cf. Written Mongolian *čürügü* ‘teal’ (see the last part of this paper series for this etymology).

TY *juundaaq(-nerile)* ‘the name of a place’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 200) has been given a Late Proto-Yukaghir reconstruction as for the first part of the compound, but this is unnecessary because form has already been explained elsewhere (Kurilov, N.N. 1997:18); etymologically, we are dealing with TY *juunadaa(j)* ‘начать бегать = to start running’, and TY *nerile* ‘земляной холм, состоящий из одних утесов, скал = earthen hill with rocks and cliffs’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 298). Kurilov agreeably assumed that the original Yukaghir name was **juunadal-nerile*, but which through the influence of the Yakut changed into the modern form, including the Yakut ending of *-q*. Indeed, Nikolaeva noted that the word has atypical phonological structure, and this Yakut influence may well be the reason for it. This analysis would render the meaning of the compound name as ‘местность, где олени не подпускают близко = terrain where the deer keep close’, which seems reasonable, or, perhaps, I suggest, ‘earthen hill place where (the reindeer) may roam’.

TY *piiresmuol* ‘the name of a lake’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 352) can be etymologized with TY *piire-* ‘to be not enough’ (in the entry above the entry for the lake). The ending of *-muol* is common exactly with lake names, and the literal meaning of the lake name is therewith ‘insufficient lake’, suggesting that it is *poor in fish*. The lake is not included among those listed by Kurilov (1997), but the analysis above suggests that the lake name does not need be reconstructed at the Late Proto-Yukaghir level, and that, instead of having an entry of its own, it should be grouped with other words originating from PY **pi:rə-* ‘to be poor, insufficient’.

With these toponymic names explained, the etymologies of numerous places named by the Tundra Yukaghirs should be clearer, and placed better into perspective within the framework of Yukaghir historical linguistics and its phonologic and semantic processes, including the elimination of some older reconstructed forms in a few cases, and the fusion of materials in others.

3. New Turkic borrowings into Yukaghir

Below I present *ten* new suggested Turkic borrowings into the Yukaghir languages and varieties.

New borrowing

Negidal *čajilā~čaila* ‘far’ (Schmidt 1923: 12) OR Udege *čaila* ‘far away’, borrowed as: PY **čejl-* > KY *čejlu-* ‘far’; KK *t’ejli-*; KJ *čeilu-*; KD *čeili-*; SD *cejli*, ? *cajlime-*; TY *čejluu-*; TK *t’ejlu-*; TD *čeili-*; KY *čejluke-* ‘to get older’; TK *t’ejlukie-* ‘to move away’; KJ *čeiluge* ‘far’; SU *čeiguga* [rect. *čeiluga*] ‘close’; KY *čejlukej* ‘long ago’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 128).

I have always wondered about the etymological origin of the Yukaghir root and this offers an explanation albeit a mysterious one. Comparanda include Proto-Mongolic **ča-* ‘that, beyond’ (EDAL: 406) & Proto-Tungusic **čāyū* ‘следующий = following (TMS 2: 376-377); that, further (not very far) (EDAL: 406)’. Doerfer (1985: 20) suggests that the root is borrowed from Mongolic into Tungusic, but there is actually no real reason for assuming so. This Proto-Tungusic root, actually **čā-* suffixed numerous ways, has representatives in Ewen, Ewenki, Solon, Oroch, Udege, Ulcha, and Manchu, and borrowing from Mongolic is only hesitantly suggested in the TMS. Particularly noteworthy are the forms of Ewenki *čāyilā ~ čāylā* ‘недалеко; поодаль (находиться); посторонись! = near; at a distance (to be); get out!’; Ewen *čāgilān ~ čāwla ~ čayala* ‘на следующем, на дальнем, за дальним, за следующим; там, поодаль, туда, дальше, подальше; за, кроме = for the next one, on the far, beyond; there, at a distance, farther; behind, besides’; Negidal *čayilā ~ čajilā* ‘там, поодаль = there, at a distance’; Udege *čaila* ‘далеко, вдали, вдалеке = far away’. Semantically (‘far away’, not ‘near’²) and phonetically, the closest match (identical actually) with the Yukaghir form is found only in Negidal and Udege. We thus appear to have: Negidal or Udege > Yukaghir, instead of Ewen or Ewenki as the usual Tungusic donor languages.

² Only the documented SU form has the meaning of ‘close’, while all other Yukaghir forms basically mean ‘far (away)’, and so this latter was likely also the original meaning after borrowing. In some dialects, the we also observe the semantic extension of ‘far (away)’ > ‘far away in time, long ago; to get older’.

The Negidal word was documented by Prof. BARÁTOSI-BALOGH. Are Negidal borrowings in Yukaghir really possible? There is one other possible example, which materialized through a discussion with M. Crnobrnja, although the direction of borrowing is not clear, and Ewenki as intermediary language is assumed: Negidal *kēlčī* ‘dug out larch of hunter’s trap’ <> Ewenki *kēlčī* ‘hunting drag ski (wide short board with a curved end in front)’ <> KY *kōliče* ‘ski’ (Piispanen 2019a). In this case, this root for ‘far’ does not seem to be attested in Ewen, Ewenki or Yakut, and so it is unclear how the word has reached Yukaghir. As a final note on this, we could assume an unattested Ewen, Ewenki, or even Yakut form as the source for the Yukaghir form, but for now it seems we have to assume this a rare attested Negidal borrowing.

New borrowing

Proto-Turkic **očok* ‘hearth, fireplace’ (EDT 22) > Yakut *ohox* ‘камин, печь = fireplace, oven’ (JRS 279), borrowed as KY *ohoq* ‘stove, oven, fireplace’ (Maslova 2001:170; 2003:550).

The Yakut word is of Turkic origin, which proves the direction of borrowing. KY also has a parallel, native word for ‘печь = fireplace, stove’ with *čibal’*. Phonology suggests that the borrowing may have been made prior to the regular Yakut sound change **-k > -x*.

New borrowing

Proto-Turkic **Kor(t)-* ‘налим; щука; белуга = burbot; pike; huso, beluga’ (EDAL 725; Федотов 1: 260) > an unattested Pre-Yakut form, borrowed as: KD *kortl’ie*, *kotle-* ‘burbot (Lota lota)’; TY *kösl’e*; TK *kösl’e*; TD *kot’le*; SU *kortle*; B *-gortley*, *-kotelndzsha*; MU *körtle*; TY *kösl’edie* ‘the name of a lake’, *kösl’eki* ‘the name of a lake’, *kösl’ečaa* ‘lake rich in burbot’; TD *ko(r)tlen-titaband’e-oludula* ‘lizard [lit. frog looking like a burbot]’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 222).

NIKOLAEVA suggests the reconstruction of an early Yukaghir form of **körtl’e*: ‘burbot’ to represent all of the above, whereas it should actually be **kortl’e*: instead, as shown by the Turkic origin. Old Yukaghir forms do display the retained first syllable vowel *-o-*, which was irregularly raised to *-ö-* in some later languages. The odd, for Yukaghir, consonantal cluster of *-rtl-* has arisen through suffixation of the borrowed bare root of **kort-* with *-le-*, a diminutive suffix (Nikolaeva 2006: 81), rendering the borrowed word the literal meaning of ‘small burbot’. The lateral *-l-* has then been spontaneously palatalized in most languages. Nikolaeva correctly explains the Tundra Yukaghir forms with *-s-* as

having arisen from an earlier *-rt-, and presents as evidence a parallel phonological development with KY *marql'ö*: 'girl' > *maslö*: 'girl', with the implication that this process may occur irregularly in all branches of Yukaghir.

The borrowing must be old indeed because it is attested in practically all branches of Yukaghir. There is a problem with the determination of the exact donor languages as the word is not attested in Yakut (EDAL: 725), although I believe that this word for 'burbot' did use to exist also in Yakut, but has since fallen out of use. The Turkic root, in what must reasonably be reconstructed as ***Kortu** 'burbot' (which is also the assumed unattested Pre-Yakut form), and its modern, attested representatives Tatar *qurti* 'burbot'; Khakas *xorti* 'burbot'; Shor *qortu* 'burbot'; Oyrat *qortu* 'burbot', should not be confused with Proto-Turkic ***čortan** 'eel; pike' (EDAL: 452; VEWT: 116, Лексика: 178, Stachowski 1993: 108). Kazak *qortpa* 'beluga' and Noghidai *qortpa* 'beluga' may also belong to the former root (like EDAL: 725 suggests). Further, there is Tatar *qurtan* 'pike' and ?Chuvash *karkke* 'trout', *kərtəš*, *kərəš* 'ruff' (subsequently borrowed as Mari *kiriš* 'trout'). All of the above forms can be analyzed by separating the forms into three different semantic groups:

Group 1: Looking up Федотов 1: 260, we therein find a first group with: Chuvash *kərtəš*, *kərttəš*, *kərəš* 'ерш = ruff', with cognates in Tatar *ertyš*, *kyrtyš* 'ruff', and Bashkir *juryš*, *jyrtyš* 'ruff'. This is borrowed as Mari *kyryš* 'ерш = ruff'. I am, however, not at all aware of the etymological origin of the Turkic forms. There is Written Mongolian *qadaray* 'ерш = ruff' (Lessing 1960: 903), and other similar Mongolic forms (< ***kadaray**), but that seems unrelated due to phonological differences.

Group 2: Then, we have a second group with: Tatar *qurti* 'налим = burbot', cognate with Khakas *xorti* 'burbot'; Shor *qortu* 'burbot'; Oyrat *qortu* 'burbot'. These forms are reasonably represented by ***Kortu** 'burbot', which is also the here assumed, unattested Pre-Yakut form.

Group 3: Also, we have a third group with: Kazakh *qortpa* 'beluga', cognate with Noghidai *qortpa* 'белуга = beluga'. On the Mongolic side we have Written

Mongolian *qorbu* ‘beluga’ (Lessing 1960: 965); Khakas *xorov*; Kalmyk *xorwə*. Written Mongolian also has *qarba* ‘a kind of fresh-water fish’ (Lessing 1960: 935). In line with these, the third group Kazakh and Noghidial forms look like Mongolic borrowings. The Mongolic forms could be described a Proto-Central-Mongolic ***korbu** ‘beluga’.

We then need to assign a place for Tatar *qurtan* ‘щука = pike’, but this appears to be a phonetic variant, actually, in this case, a form possibly contaminated by all of those other similar fish-names starting with *q-* from the original Tatar *čortan* ‘pike’. The latter form has clear cognates in Turkish *čortan* ‘угорь = eel’ and Turkmen *čortan* ‘pike’; Bashkir *sörtan*; Nogidal, Nogidal and Karakalpak *šortan*, Kyrgyz and Oyrat *čorton*, Uzbekh *čürtan*; Khakas *sortan*; Tuvan *šortan*; Yakut *sordon*; Chuvash *šärtan*, all having the meaning of ‘pike’. Thus we should safely reconstruct Proto-Turkic ***čortan**, only with the meaning of ‘pike’, but not ‘eel’, the latter being a semantically shifted form found only in Turkish. Then, possibly connected to the Turkic forms through borrowing is Negidal *kojcaan* ‘a kind of fish’, but it may not be the case at all. There is also a somewhat similar Manchu *kurče*, *kurčün* ‘a kind of sea fish’, but again this may mean nothing.

Where does Chuvash *kərkkə* ‘trout’ fit in? The Chuvash form is actually phonetically reminiscent of Ewen *köörike*, *kurike* ‘a kind of fish’, but again it is unclear if this means anything. Thus, in conclusion, I suggest, there existed two quite similar Proto-Turkic roots with very similar semantics that should be kept apart: ***Kortu** ‘burbot’ & ***čortan** ‘pike’.

New borrowing

Yakut *tomtor* ‘возвышение, холм, пригорок, бугор, курган; населенный пункт в чонском наслег, хочинского улуса вилюйск = elevation, hill, hillock, knoll, mound; settlement in the Chonsky part of the Nasleg village, in the Vilyuy ulus’ (Pekarsky 1959: 2723), borrowed as: KY *tomtor* ‘lawn’ (Maslova 2001: 173).

This is another rare Yakut borrowing into modern Kolyma Yukaghir, documented only in one source. The phonology is a perfect correspondence, and regarding the semantics, it should be noted that the translated meanings assigned the Yukaghir lexicon given in the works of Maslova are sometimes not perfectly

accurate in English, which is evident when comparing this lexicon to that found in other Yukaghir dictionaries. Thus, based on the Yakut semantics, the meaning in Yukaghir may be closer to ‘grassy knoll’ than ‘lawn’, but this is conjecture only.

New borrowing

Yakut *nallyntsa-ńallyntsa* ‘название речки (по нелькано-аяпскому пути), правого притока р. Мохоту; река, правый приток р. мохоту = name of a small river (along the Nelkan-Ayap route), the right tributary of the Mokhot river’ (Pekarsky 1959: 1670, 1708), borrowed as: B *nalitscha* ‘stream’; ME *nallytscha* (Nikolaeva 2006: 287).

Two old documented dialectal Yukaghir words for ‘stream’ are, in fact, the hydronym for ‘a small, known Tungusic river’. The name is known also in Yakut, from where it was clearly borrowed based on the phonology, and there is thus no need to reconstruct any Yukaghir proto-forms for this hydronym.

New borrowing

Proto-Turkic **suk-* ‘втыкать, вставлять; полая древесина, свисток = to stick in, to insert; hollow wood, whistle’ (VEWT: 432; EDT: 805, 811; EDAL: 1277) > Yakut *uk-* ‘to stick in’ (< **suk-* >) > TY *sugure-* ‘to stick (INTR)’; TK *sugure-*; TJ *shugure-*; TD *sugure-*; TY *sugurer-* ‘to stick (TR)’; TK *sugurer-*; TD *sugurer-* (Nikolaeva 2006: 418).

The Yakut borrowing into various Tundra Yukaghir dialects must have occurred before the aphaeresis of the root-initial **s-* in Yakut (suggested to be before the XIIIth century by Stachowski 2005: 197).

New borrowing

Proto-Turkic **küre-* ‘to run away’ (EDT: 737, VEWT: 310, ЭСТЯ/5: 146) > Yakut *küree-* ‘убегать; уходить (тайком); скрываться = to run away; to go away (secretly); to hide’, *küreejex* ‘беглец; бродяга = fugitive; tramp’ (JRS: 201), borrowed as: KY *kerpə-* ‘to sweep, to remove snow; to swing, to flap’; KJ *kerpe-*; KY *kerpəžə-* ‘to dangle’; SD *kerpeži-*; KY (*numön-*)*kerpija*, (*numön-*)*kerpi*: ‘broom, lit. house-sweeper’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 208).

The Yukaghir root, after borrowing, is suffixed with the verbal suffix **-pə* (Nikolaeva 2006: 82; previously erroneously only known to exist in TY), although the difference in vocalism remains unexplained. The Yakut verb is also used in expressions such as ‘to escape from prison’, and ‘to leave the job’. This Turkic root has undergone numerous semantic shifts, cf. Kyrgyz *kürgüçtö-* ‘загонять скот = to drive cattle’, *kürgüj-* ‘возглас, которым гонят ягнят = to cry to chase the lambs’. I note that this root is even found in modern Turkish (*kar*) *küremek* = to shovel (away snow)’, a semantically shifted form and comparison brought to my attention by KOCAOGLU at the Georgetown University, and which to the best

of my knowledge has thus far remained non-etymologized. The underlying semantic meaning behind the Turkic root has clearly always been ‘to drive away; to chase away; to sweep away, to remove, to scatter’. This meaning is also evident in Yukaghir into which it was borrowed with ‘to sweep’ and ‘to remove snow’, which parallels that found in Turkish, and with additional secondary semantics of ‘to dangle, to swing’. The KY compound (*numön-kerpijə* ‘broom’ literally means ‘house-sweeper’. The Turkic root also appears to be borrowed, I suggest, as Ewen *koro-* ‘прогонять = to drive away’ (TMS 1: 416) although the EDAL (745) insists without argumentation and seemingly incorrectly that this is an original Tungusic root, despite the fact that this root only existing in one Tungusic language. Then, on the Mongolic side there is well-attested Proto-Mongolic **kur(u)-* ‘быстрый; момент, мгновение; спешить = rapid, quick; moment, short time; to hurry’ (MGCD: 390; KW: 198), which appears to somehow be connected to the Turkic root. Interestingly, this Turkic root was also borrowed into Proto-Samojed as **kürê~*kür-* ‘to run’ (Piispanen 2018b: 363-365).

New borrowing

Yakut *һооуи* ‘вожжи (оленьей упряжи) = reins (reindeer harness)’ (JRS: 262), borrowed as: KY *һо:үәд-igeje* ‘rope on the right side of a reindeer team, lit. reins rope’, *һо:үә-ša:l* ‘pointed stick used for driving reindeer, lit. reins stick’, *һо:үәүт* ‘front right reindeer in a team, lit. rope reindeer?’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 305).

This is another reindeer-related borrowing from Yakut to Yukaghir as the phonology and semantics make perfectly clear. No Late Proto-Yukaghir reconstruction is therefore required. The Yakut word also has a direct correspondence in Ewenki *һоғ* ‘узда, повод, вожжи, ремень = bridle, halter, reins, belt’ (Robbek-Robbek 2005: 191), which should be a hitherto non-discovered independent Yakut borrowing having undergone apocope. Further, the Yakut word also appears borrowed as Uchamsky Ewen *һови* ‘повод = halter’, and related words (Vasilevič 1958:612); here diphthong has been shortened and the word undergone the irregular change of *ү > v*, but there is no doubt about this, or the Ewenki form both (not being found in the TMS series) having originated in the Yakut word, whatever its etymological origin may be. Furthermore, there is TD *nogije-* ‘belt made of reindeer skin’, an isolated Yukaghir word, which appears to be a nominally

suffixed form of this root, and therefore another independent borrowing; the semantic idea appears to be ‘reindeer reins’ > ‘belt (rope) made of reindeer’.

New borrowing

Written Mongolian *čöjγur* ‘hole, uneven ground’ (Lessing 1960: 198), borrowed as: Yakut *čöjörö* ‘глубокий = deep’ (JRS: 262), borrowed as: KY *čö*: ‘little pit’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 134).

The Yakut word has, to the best of my knowledge, remained non-etymologized, but a tentative connection can be made to Proto-Turkic **cöŋ*- ‘кожаное ведро для дойки; погружаться; полый, глубокий; пруд, водоем = leather bucket for milking; to submerge; hollow, deep; pool, pond’ (EDT: 426). This Turkic root is attested in Karakhalpak, Turkish, Kyrgyz, Oyrat, and here the EDT also includes Shor *šünür* ‘hollow, deep’, a fellow Northeastern Turkic language, which has a phonological, morphological and semantic form parallel to the Yakut form. Because there are also phonologically and semantically similar Ewenki *čururē*, Manchu *čunguru* ‘navel, cavity’, etc. which are claimed (Doerfer 1985 :38) Mongolic borrowings (cf. Proto-Mongolic **cong*-~**cöŋk*- ‘ямы в земле, неровная Земля; глубокий (о воде); лужа, водоем; полый, вогнутый; мешочек = hole, uneven ground; deep (of water); pool; hollow, cave; bag, pouch; small bag’ (EDAL: 1343), this suggests to me, along the root-final *-r-*, a typical Mongolic feature, that the Shor and Yakut forms may actually instead both be Mongolic borrowings. It would therewith appear as if there are distinct roots in Mongolic and Turkic for all the related forms (summarized in EDAL: 1343), some of which have been confused in the literature, and that the Shor form should be re-etymologized as a Mongolic borrowing, along the wholly non-discussed Yakut form. In any case, the Yakut word has been borrowed isolated only into Kolyma Yukaghir in heavily assimilated form (actually more resembling Oyrat *čöŋ~čün* ‘deep’), where the meaning of ‘deep’ has taken on the meaning of ‘little pit’, albeit the original Mongolic meaning of ‘hole, uneven ground’ could still have remained in Yakut at the time of borrowing into Yukaghir, which is a clearer hypothesis (i.e. Mongolic and Pre-Yakut ‘hole, uneven ground’ > Yukaghir ‘little pit’).

New borrowing

Yakut *any* ‘ныне, теперь = now’ (JRS: 42), borrowed as: TY *ana-moli, ana-mod’ej* ‘употр. для передачи неожиданности совершаемого: и вдруг = suddenly’ (Kurilov 2001: 44; Nikolaeva 2006: 105).

This represents another grammatical discourse borrowing. The Yakut word is used compounded as numerous different adverbs, expressions and conjunctions. It is therefore not a great surprise that this particle word was also borrowed into Yukaghir and therein used as part of an adverb. The Yukaghir compounds, both meaning ‘suddenly’, are created by attaching two different, but related, very common Yukaghir modal markers to the Yakut word. The word *moli* is in itself a modal marker meaning ‘it seems that; for a short time’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 272), while *mod’ej* is another modal marker meaning ‘я сказал; модальн. частица, выражает подтверждение высказываемой мысли: ведь... же. = I have said that...; modal marker expressing agreement with an expressed idea’ (Kurilov 2001: 245). This latter is also found with *numune-mod’ej* ‘modal marker: I have said that...’ (Kurilov 2001: 293; Nikolaeva 2006: 313), and *oqo-mod’ej* ‘выражает удивление говорящего чем-л. неожиданным = mirative modal marker’ (Kurilov 2001: 350; Nikolaeva 2006: 335), these grammatical elements being semantically described by the first part of the respective compound (*numunej* ‘nothing’ & *okuo* ‘interjection of fear’, *oqodek* ‘выражает опасение, сомнение: боюсь, что не...; такое ощущение, что не...; чувствую, что не... = modal marker of doubt or fear’ (Kurilov 2001: 349). So, in Yukaghir, the compound *ana-moli* has the literal meaning of ‘now for a short time = suddenly’, while *ana-mod’ej* is more difficult to describe.

4. New Tungusic borrowings into Yukaghir

Below a total of *seven* new Tungusic borrowings into Yukaghir are given. In order to better be able to trace specific historical contacts I have also included dialectal data on the Ewenki forms.

New borrowing

и Ewenki *atygyt* ‘торговец, купец = dealer, trader, merchant’ (Vasilevic 1958: 40) OR Yakut *atyhyt* ‘купец = merchant’ (JRS: 53), borrowed as: KY *ateyit* ‘merchant’ (Maslova 2001: 163).

This constitutes another quite expected cultural borrowing into Yukaghir. The short vowel length of the Yukaghir form suggests that the borrowing was made from Ewenki, not from Yakut.

New borrowing

П-Т, ТНГ, э, алд, урм Ewenki *капка* ‘горло = throat’ (Vasilevic 1958: 192), borrowed as: KY *каппуи* ‘Adam’s apple, larynx, throat’ (Maslova 2001: 171; Nikolaeva 2006: 379).

This isolated KY word for *throat* is a borrowing, and it is hardly justifiable to reconstruct it on the Late Proto-Yukaghir level. The donor language is Ewenki (as the word is not attested in Ewen), and we can here posit assimilation and suffixation (using the nominal derivational suffix *-uu*; Nikolaeva 2006: 83) on the Yukaghir end, i.e. Ewenki *капка* > **капк-uu* > KY *каппуи*. Assimilation is strongly suggested by the facts that Yukaghir generally dislikes geminates which are phonetically of secondary origin, all earlier geminates (as evident through comparisons with Uralic lexicon) were degeminized and the cluster *-pk-* is prone to assimilation in many languages. The Ewenki word for *throat* is etymologically derived from the verb *капкal-* ‘to press, to squeeze together’, which is of Tungusic origin, cf. Proto-Tungusic **kap-* ‘вместе; давить, прижимать; пара; тиски, зажим; Капкан = together; to press, to squeeze together; couple; gripe; trap’ (EDAL: 647; TMS 1: 376, 378-379).

New borrowing

урм, чмк Ewenki *tur* ‘земля = earth’ (Vasilevič 1958: 402) OR Ewen *tōr* ‘земля; месность; край, сторона = earth; terrain; region’ (Robbek-Robbek 2005: 254), borrowed as: SD *tior* ‘земля = earth’ (Spiridonov 2003).

The Ewenki and Ewen words are of Tungusic origin which proves the direction of borrowing. It is unclear if the word also denotes ‘planet Earth’, and not only ‘earth, ground, soil’, but if it did it would likely have been specified within brackets, i.e. as: (планета). The SD form suggests that the vowel used to be long directly after borrowing (i.e. likely **tōr*), which points at Ewen being the donor language. Another rare Yukaghir form, MO *tainang* ‘earth’ (derived from *tannang* according to Nikolaeva 2006: 424), which should be considered non-etymologized thus far, could be borrowed from Ewenki *dünne* ‘earth’.

None of these words are in any way connected to synonymous Yakut concepts, cf. Yakut *sir* ‘earth, planet Earth’ (JRS: 325, 295), *буор* ‘земля = earth, clay’ (JRS: 84), *dojdu* ‘страна, край; родина = country, region; homeland’ (JRS: 115), *kün* ‘мир, земля = world, earth’ (JRS: 197).

New borrowing

Proto-Tungusic ***tap-** ‘пачкаться = to become dirty’ (TMS 2: 164; EDAL: 1404) > учр Ewenki *taparā-* ‘пачкаться = to get dirty’ (Vasilevič 1958: 387) (& Oroqen *tapti* ‘clay’) > ТУ *tepičeri-* ‘dirty’, *tepil’es-* ‘to soil’, *tepičerej* ‘to soil oneself’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 429).

Given the Tungusic forms, there are good reason to believe that the Tundra Yukaghir words are borrowings despite the fact that local suffixation patterns may vary. The donor language is no doubt dialectal Ewenki. The phonological is a good match and the semantics are identical. It seems fairly likely that the seemingly limited Tungusic form could also be found in additional Tungusic languages.

New borrowing

Proto-Tungusic ***sür-** ‘трещать (от мороза); кричать, орать = to creak, scream; to shout, cry’ (TMS 2: 95, 131; EDAL: 1297) > алд, учр Ewenki *sirgi-* ‘шипеть (о кипящем масле на сковороде или о мясе на вертеле); поскрипывать; шуршать = to hiss (of boiling oil in a pan, or about meat on a spit); to creak, scream; to rustle’, учр, урм, сх Ewenki *sirgideri* ‘трескучий = crackling’ (Vasilevič 1958: 357), borrowed as: ТУ *seruge-* ‘to make noise; to jingle’, *serugijej*, *serugej* ‘noise’, etc. (Nikolaeva 2006: 402).

As both the phonology and semantics make clear, the Yukaghir form and derivatives have arisen through borrowing from Ewenki. The Tungusic form is not attested in Ewen, so this is a secure Ewenki borrowing.

New borrowing

Proto-Tungusic ***pukču-** ‘(нападать = to attack’ (TMS 2: 341-342; EDAL: 1179) > з, алд, урм, сх Ewenki *hukču-mi* ‘напасть (на кого-либо); наброситься (о звере) = to attack (anyone); to pounce (about a beast)’ (Vasilevič 1958: 492) > RS *puž’uboi* ‘rogue, lit. attacker’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 370).

The Omolon materials, presented by Rajsikij/Stubendorff and documented by Schiefner in 1871, have an old, isolated word for ‘rogue’ with RS *puž’uboi*. Omolon Yukaghir is fairly close to Kolyma Yukaghir (Nikolaeva 2006: 27-28). This word etymologically originated in a borrowing from Pre-Ewenki ***pukču-** ‘to attack’ (before the general change of ***p-** > Ewenki *h-*). While the cluster ***-kč-** is possible in Yukaghir, there are no documented RS words containing such. In-

stead, it appears to here have found the (irregular?) correspondence of *-žʹ*- (possibly via an irregular alternation **-kč-* > **-nč-* > *-žʹ-*?), and the word was then semi-productively suffixed with what appears to be a rare nominal derivational suffix *-boi*, also found in some other old Yukaghir nouns (i.e. **pukču-boi* > *pužʹuboi*). Semantically, a ‘(wandering) rogue’ in the Yukaghir lands likely described a ‘miscreant thief and robber’. The rendered meaning is ‘attacker’, which is a quite fitting epitaph for a ‘rogue’ who is also generally considered a ‘dishonest and bad man not behaving in an acceptable way’. Furthermore, the Ewenki form has a cognate in Nanai *xukču-* ‘бросаться = to rush up’, which is also typical behavior of a *forest rogue*.

New borrowing

Proto-Tungusic **purka* ‘петля, силок, аркан = lasso’ (TMS 2: 352-353; EDAL: 1189) > Ewenki *hurka* ‘lasso’ (& Ewen *hurqə*), etc. > SD *porogion* ‘towing rope of a seine net’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 362).

This isolated, dialectal Yukaghir word appears to be an early Pre-Ewenki word (before the change **p-* > *h-*). The cluster *-rk-* was epenthetically broken up in Yukaghir and then voiced in an intervocalic position (i.e. *-rk-* > *-rog-*, this choice of vowel clearly being affected by the first syllable vowel, *-o-*). Again, the SD vocabulary displays some phonetically unusual features. Semantically, a ‘towing rope’ is quite often created as a ‘lasso’, and towing with a ‘seine net’ is actually done exactly as if it were a huge ‘lasso’. Indeed, this is how *seine net fishing* is carried out, as it has been for thousands of years, and it is therefore also called *seine-haul fishing*. We thus have ‘lasso’ (Ewenki) > ‘rope formed like a lasso’ > ‘towing rope of a seine net’ (Yukaghir).

5. New Russian borrowings into Yukaghir

Below follows *seven* newly discovered Russian borrowings into Yukaghir. All of these follow the phonological principles of Russian borrowings outlined in Piispanen 2018c. While the below borrowings are new, additional parallel borrowings into other languages from dialectal Russian (as per Anikin 2003) are sometimes included with the description for a comparison.

New borrowing

Russian палатка (pe'latkə) 'modern tent; booth, stall', borrowed as: Yakut *balaakka* 'палатка = modern tent' (JRS: 60), borrowed as: KY *pōloq-poloq* 'tent' (Maslova 2001: 170).

The same Russian word is already earlier known independently borrowed as Yakut *balaakka*, *balaakky*, *balaarka*, *palaatka* 'modern tent' (Pekarsky 1959: 349, 1991); Ewenki *palatke* 'ловушка на соболя; горностая = trap for sable or ermine' (Vasilevič 1954:616), and more (Anikin 2003:430). The word is even found borrowed in different phonologic forms into other forms of Yukaghir: TY *palaatka* 'tent', KY *pálatka* 'tent', but the KY form discussed in this entry has a noteworthy aberrant phonology.

This KY word for 'tent' is, based in the phonology, another Yakut-intermediated Russian cultural borrowing. The Yakut word has clearly been prosodically and phonologically adjusted into the Yakut language. These phonological features are then also found in the KY form where they would otherwise never have occurred had the word been a direct Russian borrowing. Even so, the KY form is somewhat unusual with regard to the phonology, having been palatalized, but nevertheless this seems a fairly safe borrowing suggestion. We can thus posit a direct Russian borrowing with KY *pálatka* and a Yakut-intermediated Russian borrowing with KY *poloq*.

New borrowing

Rus. спирт (sp'irt) 'alcohol, spirit', borrowed as: Yakut *ispīr* 'спирт = alcohol, spirit' (JRS: 155), borrowed as: KY *ispīr* 'alcohol, spirits' (Maslova 2001: 165).

This is another clear Yakut-intermediated borrowing of Russian cultural vocabulary into Yukaghir, based on the phonological correspondence. Also independently borrowed from Russian are Ewen *ispir* 'спирт' (Robbek-Robbek 2005: 130) & Ewenki *ispirte* 'спирт' (Vasilevič 1958: 603), as well as the forms of Komi *špirt*, Nenets *pirt* and others in various Turkic languages (Anikin 2003: 564).

New borrowing

Rus. платье ('platje) 'dress', borrowed as: KY *patie* 'dress' (Maslova 2001: 170).

The KY word has not yet been declared a Russian borrowing, but it is clearly so. The in Yukaghir invalid root-initial cluster has expectedly been simplified with the borrowing. The Russian word is also previously known to have been borrowed as Taz Selkup *plat'o*, Dolgan *plat'e*, Yakut *bylāččyja*, Ewen *pùlātjā*, Buryat *palaati*, Koryak *platte* and Mongolian *palaacchi* (Anikin 2003: 454), but due to phonological reasons neither Yakut nor Ewen can be the donor language in this case, and this is therefore a direct Russian cultural borrowing into Yukaghir.

New borrowing

Russian заряд (*zɛ'rʲat*) 'charge, load', borrowed as: KY *sar'at* 'charge (of a gun)' (Maslova 2001: 172).

The technological term for a 'gun charge' is naturally borrowed into KY from Russian with expected, minor phonological changes. The word as such does not appear to be borrowed into any of the neighboring languages and so this is to be considered another direct Russian borrowing. It is also borrowed independently into some forms of Khanty, Mansi, and Komi in different shape (Anikin 2003: 212).

New borrowing

Rus. ущелье (*uˈɕ:elʲjə*) 'gorge', borrowed as: TY *ussuu(ŋ)* 'gorge' (Kurilov 2001: 488-489; Nikolaeva 2006: 445).

This isolated TY word is the direct result of a Russian borrowing. The regular outcome of Rus. -šč- (*щ*) is TY -s- (Piispanen 2018: 226), and the gemination (-s- > -ss-) appears to be the result of a stressed position. With this Russian borrowing we can posit *ushchel'e* > *ussel'(e)* > *usse-uu* > *ussuu*. The ending is clearly the nominal derivational suffix -u: (Nikolaeva 2006: 83). An example sentence is given by KURILOV where the borrowed Yukaghir form looks practically identical to the original, non-truncated Russian form: *Тингип өнҗие җылҗи ме хонҗеҗ, маранме ussuuleҗ* 'берега реки, вытекающей из озера тингип, высокие, просто как ущелье = The banks of the river flowing from Lake Tingiep are tall, just like a gorge'.

New borrowing

Rus. картошка (*kɛr'toʂkə*) 'potato', borrowed as: Yakut *xortuoska* 'картошка = potato' (JRS 490), borrowed as: TY *xortuoska* 'potato' (Kurilov 2001: 495).

This is another Yakut-intermediated Russian borrowing in Yukaghir. This essential Russian word is naturally also borrowed elsewhere, including into forms of Tundra Nenets, Ewenki, Ewen, Solon, Orok, *etc.* (Anikin: 250).

New borrowing

Rus. свадьба ('svadʲbə) 'wedding', borrowed as: TY *sybad'be* 'wedding' (Maslova 2001: 107).

This constitutes another cultural Russian borrowing directly into Tundra Yukaghir; the phonetic form of the Yukaghir form³ is quite expected, and the semantics is identical. The Russian word was also independently borrowed as Yakut *sybaajba* 'свадьба = wedding' (JRS: 355), which is clear because the word has entirely accustomed to Yakut phonology, and it is different from that found in the Yukaghir word. The Russian word is also borrowed as Ket *bad'bä*, P-T Ewenki *suwājbe*, Ewen *čiwāžba*, *etc.* (Anikin 2003: 533). The Ewenki and Yakut forms, I will suggest, are similar enough to assume that the Ewenki word is a Yakut borrowing.

6. Further assumed borrowed vocabulary

There are no doubt further hitherto non-discussed Russian borrowings into Yukaghir to be found, some obvious, some less obvious; for example, cultural vocabulary such as KY *juoraq* 'seminary', and *l'et'uon* 'deacon', introduced through Christianity, are probable borrowings, but I have not been able to find the source of them, although they likely entered through Yakut, Ewenki or Russian. In a similar vein, we find TY *arkirej* 'bishop' borrowed from Russian (Maslova 2001: 92); Maslova does not give the original Russian word, but it must obviously have been архиерей (ərɣ'ɪ(j)ɪ'r'ej) 'bishop'. Another Yukaghir word that is a likely borrowing is KY *debies* 'entirely' (Maslova 2001: 164) as it contains voiced plosives and the prosody appears to be Yakutic, but the donor remains unidentified.

³ Maslova appears to use transcription similar to that of Krejnovič (for example *t'*- instead of *č*-) so perhaps the Yukaghir form should be called TK instead of TY.

7. A few etymological, lexical and spelling corrections

An etymological correction: SD *myl'a* ‘resin’ has previously been hesitantly connected to KY *mull'a* ‘saliva’ (Nikolaeva 2006: 279). This is, however, a false assumption because the SD word is instead evidently from Rus. *smola* (смола) ‘resin’ with a regular apheresis of complex root-initial clusters! This should be kept separate from Rus. *mylo* ‘soap’, borrowed as: Yakut *myyla*, Ewen *miile~myyle*, Ewenki *myle* (summarized in Piispanen 2018c: 228).

Another etymological correction: KY *pen~ped* ‘thing, condition, world’ (Maslova, E. 2001:170) is etymologically related to the Late Proto-Yukaghir root ***pon~*pont** (Nikolaeva 2006: 359) from where have arisen the nominalizing marker of KY *pön*, *-bən~-bəd-*, SD *pon*, etc., as well as TY *pan-*, *-ban-* ‘to be’, etc. The connection with the KY word treated here, however, is made most clear through a comparison with BO *pon* ‘land’, also belonging here.

Another etymological correction: TY *ile* ‘domesticated reindeer’, and related forms, has previously been compared (Nikolaeva 2006: 171) to Proto-Altaic ***ēlv(-kv)** ‘deer’ (EDAL: 501), but far more accurate comparisons can be made. The so-called Altaic root is supposedly composed of Proto-Tungusic ***(x)elken** ‘wild reindeer; domesticated deer’ (TMS 2:448), Proto-Mongolic ***ili** ‘(новорожденный олененок = new-born deer’, and Proto-Turkic ***elik** ‘косуля (общее назв. и самка) = roebuck, wild goat’ (EDT: 142, VEWT: 40, ЭСТЯ/І: 265-266, Лексика: 153). Of these, due to phonologic and semantic considerations, only the Mongolic form is a possible donating source for this lexical borrowing into Yukaghir, cf. Written Mongolic *ili* ‘a young deer, fawn’ (Lessing 1960: 407). Thus, we can posit this more specifically as another Mongolic borrowing into Yukaghir.

Another etymological correction: KK *buot'ka~buot'ke* ‘barrel’ has previously been suggested (Nikolaeva 2006: 118) a Russian borrowing, cf. Rus. бочка ‘barrel’. However, it is instead to be considered another Yakut-intermediated Russian borrowing because the Yukaghir form exhibits Yakut phonological traces with the diphthong whereas the change of *č > t'* is fairly regular and documented in older vocabulary (and which may actually be only a transcription artifact), cf. Yakut *buočuka* ‘бочка = barrel’ (JRS: 85). This adds another member to the group

of Yakut-intermediated Russian cultural borrowings detailed elsewhere (Piispanen 2018c). The same Yakut word is also found independently borrowed elsewhere in Yukaghir as KY *ana-buska*: ‘small boat hollowed out of a poplar trunk, lit. half-barrel’ noted in earlier literature (Piispanen 2013b).

A lexical correction: according to Nikolaeva 2006: 349, SD *pieze* means ‘bone’, but it actually means ‘elk’ (Spiridonov 2003). SD *pejzi*, in the same entry, indeed means ‘bone’, but these words have been documented separately with the clear semantic connection of ‘bone’ > ‘elk’ like with KY *pe:d’ə* ‘shoulder-blade; knot; elk’. Despite the documentation, I conjecture that the two SD words should only be one word, *pejzi* ‘bone; elk’, with no metathesis, like in all the other Yukaghir words of that entry. As has been noted elsewhere (such as in Nikolaeva 2006:349 and in her earlier thesis, 1988:242), the Yukaghir words appear to be cognate with PU ***puńća** ‘kneecap of a reindeer’ (UEW: 403), attested only in Saamic and Nenets.

A lexical addition: KY *puru*: ‘cellar’ has been reconstructed on a Late Proto-Yukaghir level (Nikolaeva 2006: 372), probably needlessly, and it remains wholly non-etymologized. However, there is also KY *puruk* ‘vault’ (Maslova 2001: 171), which tells us that the word originally ended in a consonant, and was in some dialectal forms assimilated into becoming a long final vowel. The final *-k* may suggest a Yakut origin for this word, although this donor has not been identified (because Yakut *buruuk* ‘whirlpool, rapids’ (JRS: 86) must be unrelated).

A spelling correction: Nikolaeva (2006:180) presents SD *jaglagol* ‘body, torso’, but this is a typing error and should instead actually read SD *jaglogal* ‘туловище = body, torso’ (Spiridonov 2003).

8. Structured semantic fields

Dividing the found borrowings into various cultural and technological spheres of semantics (as per Rédei 1999), produces the following groups:

- a. body parts of humans and animals: throat (Ewenki)
- b. animal kingdom (i.e. fauna): burbot (Yakut)
- c. plant kingdom (i.e. fauna): potato (Russian)

d. nature, natural phenomena and natural places: gorge (Russian), pit (Mongolic *via* Yakut), stream (Yakut), lawn (Yakut), earth (Ewen)

e. types of work and tools: reins (Yakut), towing rope (Ewenki), tent (Russian *via* Yakut), charge (Russian)

f. trade: merchant (Ewenki), alcohol (Russian *via* Yakut), rogue (Ewenki)

g. habitation: fireplace (Yakut)

h. clothing: dress (Russian)

i. social life and kinship terms: wedding (Russian)

m. elementary phenomena, actions and perceptions: to stick (Yakut), to sweep (Yakut), dirty (Ewen), noise (Ewenki)

n. other: suddenly (Yakut), far (Turkic)

The following categories had no representatives among the borrowings: j. tribal or population names, k. health, illness and death, l. religion. A few conclusions can be drawn from the now fairly extensive database of known borrowings into the Yukaghir dialects and languages. Ewenki borrowings are generally found in Kolyma Yukaghir, while most Mongolic and Yakut borrowings are found in Tundra Yukaghir.

Abbreviations

алд = Upper Aldan-Zeyan (Верхне-алданско-зейский диалект).

брг = Barguzin (баргузинский диалект).

B = Materials of Billings 1787.

BO = Materials of Boensing 1781.

чмк = Chumikan (чумиканский диалект).

ЭСТЯ = Sevortjan 1974-2000.

EDAL = Starostin et al. 2003.

EDT = Clauson 1972.

Федотов = Fedotov 1996.



и = Iimri (олимпийский диалект).

Лексика = Tenišev 1997.

JRS = Slepcev 1972.

KD = Kolyma Yukaghir from Jochelson's manuscript dictionary.

KJ = Kolyma Yukaghir materials of Jochelson (1898) and (1900).

KK = Kolyma Yukaghir materials of Krejnovič (1982).

KL = Materials of Klitschka (1781).

KY = Modern Kolyma Yukaghir.

M = Materials by Maydell presented by Schiefner (1871a) and (1871b).

MC = Chuvan materials of Matjuškin in Wrangel (1841).

ME = Materials of Merk 1787.

MGCD = Zhu 1990.

MK = Kolyma Yukaghir materials of Mueller and Lindenau in 1741.

MO = Omok materials of Matjuškin in Wrangel (1841).

MU = Ust'-Janskoe materials of Mueller/Lindenau 1741.

м = Mai (майский говор).

н = Nera (непский диалект).

орч = Orochon (говор ороchonский эвенков).

П-Т = Podkamen (подкаменно-тунгусский диалект и его говори);

с = Sumu (сумский диалект).

с-б = Northern Baikal (северобайкальский диалект).

сх = Sakhalin (сахалинский диалект).

тк = Tokko (толкинский говор).

тмт = Tommot (томмотский говор).



ТНГ = Tungir form of the Vitim-Olekminsky dialect (Тунгирский говор витимо-олекминского диалекта).

ТТ = Totti (Тоттинский говор).

RS = Materials of Rajskej and Stubendorf presented by Schiefner (1871a).

SD = Kolyma Yukaghir materials of Spiridonov (2003).

SU = Materials by Suvorov presented by Schiefner (1871a).

TD = Tundra Yukaghir materials of Jochelson (1926).

TK = Tundra Yukaghir materials of Krejnovič (1958) and Krejnovič (1982).

TMN = Doerfer 1985.

TMS 1 = Cincius 1975.

TMS 2 = Cincius 1977.

ТУ = Modern Tundra Yukaghir.

урм = Urmī (урмийский говор буреинско-урмийско-амгунского диалекта).

учр = Uchur-Zeya (учурско-зейский диалект).

VEWT = Räsänen 1969.

W = Early materials of Witsen in 1692. All the older materials are exhaustively described and referenced in Nikolaeva (2006).

з = Upper Aldan-Zeyan (зейский говор верхнеалданско-зейского диалекта).

References

ANIKIN, A. E. (2003). *Etimologičeskij slovar russkix dialektov sibiri, zaimstvovaniya iz ural'skix, altajskix i paleoaziatskix jazykov*, Moscow-Novosibirsk: Nauka.

ATLASOV, J. I. & G. N. KURILOV (1992). *Russko-jukagirskij razgovornik*, Jakutsk: <Rozovaja cajka>.

ATLASOVA, E. S. (2007). *Slovar' jukagirsko-russkij i russko-jukagirskij (tundrenyj dialekti) - okolo 3500 slov*, St. Peterburg: Filial izdatel'stva <prosveshchenije>.

BOLDYREV, B. V. (1994). Russko-Evenkijskij slovar', Rossiskaja Akademija Nauk. Sibirskoje otdelenije, Institut filologij, Novosibirsk: VO <Nauka>.

CINCIUS, V. I. (1975). Sravnitel'nyj Slovar' Tunguso-Man'žurskix Jazykov I, Leningrad: Akademia Nauka.

CINCIUS, V. I. (1977). Sravnitel'nyj Slovar' Tunguso-Man'žurskix Jazykov II, Leningrad: Akademia Nauka.

CLAUSON, Sir G. (1972). Etymological dictionary of Prethirteenth Century Turkish, Oxford: Clarendon.

DOERFER, G. (1985). Mongolo-Tungusica, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

DOERFER, G. (2004). Etymologisch-Ethnologisches Wörterbuch tungusischer Dialekte (vornehmlich der Mandschurei), Hildesheim-Zürich-New York: Georg Olms Verlag.

DYBO, A. V. (1997). Nazvanija podarkov v praaltajskom, Honour of the 90th Anniversary of N. A. BASKAKOV, Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture.

FEDOTOV, M. R. (1995). Étimologičeskij slovar' čuvaškogo jazyka I-II, Čeboksary: Čuvaškij gosudarstvennyj institut gumanitarnyx nauk.

KNÜPPEL, M. (2013). "Noch einmal zum historischen Wörterbuch des Jukagirischen", Rocznik Orientalistyczny, 66/2: 109-116.

KURILOV, G. N. (2001). Jukagirsko-russkij slovar', Novosibirsk: Rossiskaja Akademija Nauk.

KURILOV, N. N. (1999). Jukagirsckaja toponimika nižekol'ymskogo ulusa respublika Saxa (Jakutia), [Ed. by] L. S. SLEPTSOVA, Yakutsk.

LESSING, F. D. (1960). Mongolian-English Dictionary, Los Angeles & Berkeley: University of California Press.

MARTIN, S. E. (1987). The Japanese Language through Time, New Haven-London: Yale University Press.

MASLOVA, E. (2001). Yukaghir texts, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

MASLOVA, E. (2003). A Grammar of Kolyma Yukaghir, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

MIDDENDORFF, A. Th.v. (1851). Über die Sprache der Jakuten, von Otto Böntlingk, Theil 2. Jakutisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch. Reise in den äussersten Norden und Osten Sibiriens Band III, St. Petersburg: Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

NIKOLAEV, S. L. (2015). "Toward the reconstruction of Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan. Part 1: Proof of the Algonquian-Wakashan relationship", *Journal of Language Relationship*, 13/1: 23-61.

NIKOLAEVA A. & V. G. SHALUGIN (2002). *Slovar' Jukagirsko-Russkij i Russkij-Jukagirskij (Verxnekol'mskij Dialekt)*, St. Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo "Drofa".

NIKOLAEVA, I. (1988). *Problema uralo-jukagirskix genetičeskix svjazej*, Moscow: Institute of Linguistics. (Unpublished Ph.D. Diss.)

NIKOLAEVA, I. (2006). *A Historical Dictionary of Yukaghir*, Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

NUGTEREN, H. (2011). *Mongolic phonology and the Qinghai-Gansu Languages*, Utrecht: LOT.

ÖZTOPÇU, K. et al. (1999). *A Dictionary of the Turkic Languages-English: Azerbaijani, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Tatar, Turkish, Turkmen, Uighur, Uzbek*, London-New York: Routledge.

PEKARSKY, E. K. (1959). *Slovar jakutskogo jazyka I-III*, Yakutsk: Akademija Nauk SSSR.

PIISPANEN, P. S. (2013a). "The Uralic-Yukaghiric connection revisited: Sound Correspondences of Geminate Clusters", *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, 93: 165-197.

PIISPANEN, P. S. (2013b). "Further lexical borrowings from (Pre-)Yakut into the Yukaghiric languages", *Turkic Languages*, 17/2: 115-139.

PIISPANEN, P. S. (2015a). "Evaluating the Uralic-Yukaghiric word-initial, proto-sibilant correspondence rules", *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, 95: 237-273.

PIISPANEN, P. S. (2015b). "Extensive borrowing of reindeer terminology in north-eastern Siberia", *Turkic Languages*, 19: 240-258.

PIISPANEN, P. S. (2016a). "Folklore borrowings in north-eastern Siberia", *Turkic Languages*, 20: 257-272.

PIISPANEN, P. S. (2016b). “A prosody-controlled semi-vowel alternation in Yukaghir”, *Journal of Historical Linguistics*, 6/2: 247-296.

PIISPANEN, P. S. (2018a). “Additional Turkic and Tungusic borrowings into Yukaghir”, *Turkic Languages*, 22: 108-138.

PIISPANEN, P. S. (2018b). “Turkic lexical borrowings in Samoyed”, *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana*, 14/3: 357-383.

PIISPANEN, P. S. (2018c). “Re-etymologizing Russian cultural vocabulary in Yukaghir as mediated by the Yakut”, *Turkic Languages*, 23: 222-249.

PIISPANEN, P. S. (2019a). “Additional Turkic and Tungusic borrowings into Yukaghir II”, *Journal of Old Turkic Studies*, 3/1: 54-82.

PIISPANEN, P. S. (2019b). “Additional Turkic and Tungusic borrowings into Yukaghir III”, *Journal of Old Turkic Studies*, 3/2: 321-371.

PIISPANEN, P. S. (2020). “Additional Turkic and Tungusic borrowings into Yukaghir IV”, *Journal of Old Turkic Studies*, 4/1: 152-187.

POPPE, N. (1972). “On some Mongolic Loan Words in Evenki”, *Central Asiatic Journal* 16/2: 95-103.

RÄSÄNEN, M. (1969). *Versuch eines etymologisches Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen*, Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

RÉDEI, K. (1999). “Zu den uralisch-jukagirischen Sprachkontakten”, *Finnisch-Ugrischen Forschungen*, 55: 1-58.

ROBBEK, V. A. & M. E. ROBBEK (2005). *Evensko-Russkij slovar'*, Novosibirsk: <Nauka>. Sibirskaja izdatel'skaja firma RAN.

ROMANOVA, A. V. & A. N. MYREEVA (1968). *Dialektologičeskij slovar' Evenkijskogo jazyka*, Materialy govorov Evenkov jakutii, Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo <Nauka>.

SCHMIDT, P. (1923). “The language of the Negidals”, *Acta Universita Latviensis*, 5: 3-38.

SEVORTJAN, E. V. (1974–2000). *Étimologičeskij slovar' tjurskix jazykov I-VII*, Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Nauka.

SLEPCOV, P. (1972). *Jakutsko-russkij slovar'*, Moscow: Sovetskaja Ekciklopedija.

SPIRIDONOV, N. I. (2003). Jukagirsko-russkij slovar' i évensko-russkij slovar', Jakutsk: Yakut State University Publishing House.

STACHOWSKI, M. (1993). Dolganischer Wortschatz, Kraków: Nakładem Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

STACHOWSKI, M. (2005). "Chronology of some Yakut phonetic changes in the context of 18th century Mongolian loanwords into Yakut", Rocznik Orientalistyczny, 58/1: 194-203.

STAROSTIN, S. et al. (2003). An Etymological Dictionary of Altaic Languages I-III, Leiden: Brill.

TENIŠEV, E. R. (1997). Sravnitel'noistoričeskaja grammatika tjurskix jazykov: Leksika, Moscow: Akademia Nauk.

TUMURDEJ, G. & B. D. TSYBENOV (2014). Kratkij Dagursko-Russkij Slovar', Ulan-Ude: Izdalel'stvo Bnts So Ran.

VASILEVIČ, G. M. (1958). Evenkijsko-Russkij Slovar', Moskva: Gosudarstvennoje izdatel'stvo inostrannyx i natsional'nyx slovarej.

VASILEVIČ, G. M. (2005). Russko-Evenkijskij slovar' I, Sankt-Peterburg: Filial izdatel'stva <Prosveshchenije>.

ZHU, S. (1990). Měnggǔ yǔzú yǔyán cìdián [Dictionary of the Language(s) of the Mongolian Nationality], Xining: Qinghai renmin chubanshe [Qinghai People's Press].