

Studies in Yukaghir etymology II

This paper offers a number of additions and corrections to the corpus of etymologies published in Irina Nikolaeva's *A Historical Dictionary of Yukaghir* (De Gruyter, 2006). The focus of the paper is on internal Yukaghir etymology rather than on search for loanwords or long-range cognates.

Keywords: Yukaghir languages; etymology; historical linguistics; protolanguage reconstruction.

Introduction

This is the second paper in the series opened with Zhivlov 2022b, whose aim is to propose new etymologies for words that were erroneously etymologized or not etymologized at all in Irina Nikolaeva's *A Historical Dictionary of Yukaghir* (HDY). Proto-Yukaghir and pre-Proto-Yukaghir forms in this paper are reconstructed following my own revised version of Nikolaeva's Yukaghir reconstruction (Zhivlov 2022a). Unless noted otherwise, Kolyma Yukaghir forms are cited after Prokop'eva & Prokop'eva 2021 and Tundra Yukaghir forms are cited after Kurilov 2001.

1. K *aranpaaj* 'mushroom (growing on earth)'

This word is analyzed in HDY (155–156) as *a-ra:n-paj* 'mushroom (growing on earth)' (lit. 'naked woman'). This etymology implies that the word is a compound, whose second component is K *paaj* 'woman'. The first component is supposed to be the attributive form in *-n* of the Kolyma stem *aruo-*, attested in K *aruo-ńe-* 'to be naked; to be bald' (*-ńe-* is a proprietive suffix, deriving verbs with the meaning 'have X' from nouns, see Maslova 2003: 122–124). This stem, together with its Tundra cognate *araw* 'naked', is derived from Proto-Yukaghir **cawa* 'skin' (> T *sawa(η)* 'hide, skin') with the negative prefix **e-*, here regressively assimilated to the vowel of the root (Zhivlov 2022b: 73). The change of word-initial **c-* to *-r-* in compounding is regular. The etymology proposed in HDY faces both phonetic and semantic difficulties. From the phonetic point of view, *-a-* or *-aa-* instead of *-uo-* remains unexplained. Semantically, 'naked woman' looks quite arbitrary.

The clue to the correct understanding of this word lies in the fact that it designates specifically mushrooms growing on earth. As such, it is opposed to K *šaan paaj* 'mushroom, fungus (growing on trees)' (Nikolaeva & Šalugin 2002: 85, 113). The latter form is transparently 'tree woman', cf. already Jochelson (1926: 419): "The Yukaghir call mushrooms *can-pai*, i. e. tree-girl". K *aranpaaj* is thus to be understood as 'not-tree-woman'. The change of initial K *š-*, T *s-* (< PY **c-*) to intervocalic *-r-* in compounds is regular, see above on *araw* 'naked'.

This etymology provides us with one more example of the negative prefix **e-* (Zhivlov 2022b: 73–74), here harmonized to *a-*.

2. T *asle* ‘sibling born immediately after the speaker’¹, T *asl’ii-* ‘to have somebody as a sibling born immediately after the speaker’

The sibilant T *-s-* ~ K *-š-* (< PY **-c-*) is quite rare word-internally in Yukaghir words, apart from some verbal suffixes (HDY: 83). In the preconsonantal position we find variation *-s/šL-* ~ *-rTL-* (where T is a voiceless stop and L is a lateral) in the following items: T *kösl’e(η)* ‘burbot’, S <kortle> ‘Quappe’ (Schiefner 1871: 379); K *marql’uo* ~ *martl’uo* ~ *mašl’uo* ‘daughter’ from K *marqil’* ‘girl’ and K *uo* ‘child’. Knowing this, we can propose that T *asle* goes back to an earlier form **arqle* and is related to K *arqaa* ‘near, at’ (postposition) (Maslova 2003: 268–269), T *arqaa lalime* ‘sledge immediately following the first in a caravan of reindeer sledges’ (see other cognate forms in HDY: 113). The semantic motivation here is obvious: both T *arqaa lalime* and T *asle* refer to something/someone immediately following another.

3. T <arugi-mer-ignu-> ‘stammer’

This phrase is attested only in Jochelson’s manuscript of the Tundra Yukaghir dictionary, entries from which are included in HDY (170). It is to be interpreted as *aruu-gi mer-ig-nu-* ‘his/her voice is tied’, where *aruu-gi* is T *aruu* ‘language; word; voice’ with the 3 person possessive suffix *-gi*, and *mer-ig-nu-* is a form of an otherwise unattested verb with the verbal focus prefix/proclitic *mer-*. This verb is derived from T *ige-* ‘to be tied; to stammer’² with the durative suffix *-nu-* (Schmalz 2013: 125–127). Thus, there is no need to reconstruct a separate root **iγn-*, supplied in HDY with a question mark. Altogether, the following four entries in HDY can now be united under a single Proto-Yukaghir root **ige-* ‘to tie’ (Zhivlov 2022a: 52): **iγ-* ‘to sew’ (HDY: 170), **iye-* ‘to catch’ (HDY: 170), **iγn-* ‘to stammer’, and **iγč’ə-* ‘to sew; sinew’ (HDY: 174–175).

4. T *čuoire-* ‘to catch fire; to appear (of burning embers)’

This verb is clearly related to T *čuoتهj-* ‘to let the fire flare up more strongly; to light (a cigarette, a pipe)’, although HDY: 143 lists the latter under a separate reconstruction **čö:tə-* and connects the former with K *čorqə* ‘glade, clearing; tundra’, K *čorqə-* ‘firm, hard’ (K forms cited after HDY: 141). Despite the Russian gloss ‘загореться; появиться горящему углю’ (‘to catch fire; to appear (of burning embers)’), the example sentence in Kurilov’s dictionary (2001: 570) shows that the subject of this verb is *lačil* ‘bonfire’: *Eld’e mit lačil el čuoتهj?* ‘Ну как, появился уголь [горящий] в костре?’ (‘Well, didn’t burning embers appear in our bonfire?’, literally ‘Well, didn’t our bonfire acquire burning embers?’). Thus, this verb behaves exactly like other verbs with the denominal suffix *-re-* ‘to acquire X’ (Schmalz 2013: 113). The verb T *čuoتهj-* ‘to let the fire flare up more strongly; to light (a cigarette, a pipe)’ apparently contains the denominal suffix *-te-* ‘to provide with X’ (ibid.) and the semelfactive suffix *-j-* (Schmalz 2013: 128–129). Cf. for the same combination of suffixes T *od’etej-* ‘to moisturize; to wet’ from T *od’e* ‘dew; wet

¹ The original Russian gloss in Kurilov (2001) is ‘единоутробный брат (или сестра), родившийся в семье непосредственно за говорящим’. Nikolaeva (HDY: 113) translates this as ‘half-sibling born immediately after the speaker’. While Russian *единоутробный* ‘born by the same mother’ is normally applied to half-siblings, a look at how this word is actually applied by Kurilov (2001: 58, 59, 239, 329, 335, 579, 604) shows that he uses it as a synonym of *родной* in the sense ‘natural sibling’, as opposed to cousins.

² In the latter meaning with *aruu* ‘voice’ as a subject.

place; drop; juice (of meat)'. The deriving noun *čuo 'burning ember' is not attested as such, but is preserved as a second part of compound in T *lači-n+d'uo* 'burning ember' and perhaps in T *jerpeje+d'uo* 'disk of the sun'. Now, it seems quite possible that T *čuo(η)* 'iron', also attested in Omok as *če* <Тче> 'copper; iron' (Matjuškin 1841: 121), is etymologically the same word, whose meaning 'iron' developed from 'burning ember'.

5. T *elem* 'nothing'

This form functions as a preverbal particle in such expressions as T *elem-gurilijen* 'I don't know anything' (Krejnovič 1982: 213), T *elem-wietejen* 'I won't do anything' (ibid.), T *elemjuol* 'to see nothing', T *elemkuril'iil* 'to know nothing'. It is quite transparently derived from T *leme ~ neme* 'what', K *leme ~ neme* 'what' with the negative prefix *e-* (Zhivlov 2022b: 73–74). This derivation is not recognized by Nikolaeva, who reconstructs a separate etymon *ölem (HDY: 324). The rest of the material adduced by Nikolaeva under *ölem is also undoubtedly cognate. Note that K *ulum* 'mad', cited in HDY, is not found as an independent word in other sources, only as a part of the expression *ulum kude-* 'to go mad'³, literally 'to become nothing' (Prokop'eva & Prokop'eva 2021: 300; Nikolaeva & Šalugin 2002: 72; Maslova 2003: 342, 399). The verb K *ulum-l'ə* 'mad; stupid' (attested only in HDY: 324) is derived from K *ulum* with the inchoative suffix *-l'e-* 'become X' (Maslova 2003: 205). Note that variants such as K <elu'lum-ku'de> 'to run mad; to go mad' (Jochelson 1926: 321), K <oļu'lum-k'ude> 'to become mad, insane' (Jochelson 1926: 325), K <o'ļlum-k'ude> 'to run, to go, become mad' (Jochelson 1926: 336) contain a pleonastic negative prefix. The derivation of K *ulum-l'ə* 'mad; stupid' from 'nothing' allows us to explain previously unetymologized verb T *leml'e-* 'to be tolerable, normal in terms of quality, in terms of the intensity of the manifestation of smth.; to feel healthy; to be not the timid type' as a parallel derivative from T *leme* 'what', literally 'to be/become something'. This verb also has a nominal correlate T *leml'e* 'chief, superior; the authorities'.

6. T *eluojerke* 'dry female reindeer'

This word is given in HDY (154) under the reconstructed root **el-* 2 together with T *elmelije* 'a bare (without vegetation) area on a hill; a flat terrain without holes or willows', T *elmeliñe-* 'to be even, smooth (about a terrain overgrown only with grass)'. The sequence *el-* that these words have in common is actually the negative prefix *el-*. The obvious components of T *eluojerke* are the negative prefix and the word T *uo* 'child'. The suffix *-rke* looks like T *-rqal-rke* — a suffix deriving names of quality from qualitative verbs (Kurilov 1994: 43–49), although here its function is clearly different. Note the same suffix in a semantically close word T *ličuoerke* 'female reindeer'. The element *-je-* looks mysterious, since normally the suffix *-je* is deverbal (Kurilov 1994: 10–18). However, there are other similar examples with the suffix *-je*, whose approximate meaning can be described as 'having X', where X is a noun denoting living beings. The first is T *ńorquoje* 'female of a wild reindeer with a newborn calf; reindeer herd where there are only calving females', whose first two components are T *ńorqo-* 'newborn reindeer' (see below) and T *uo* 'child'. Another case is K <o'yē> 'father' (Jochelson 1926: 326), probably derived from K *uo* 'child', a cognate of T *uo* 'id.'. One more example is T *elñiimije* 'orphan'.

³ Prokop'eva & Prokop'eva (2021: 300) also give a meaning 'to turn sour (of milk)', which developed directly from 'to become nothing'.

Here *el-* is the same negative prefix we see in T *eluojerke*. The remaining part *-ñiimi-* is not attested as a word for ‘mother’ or ‘parent’, but may be tentatively etymologized as consisting of the reciprocal prefix *ñi-*, sometimes used in kinship terms (Maslova 2007: 1854), and the otherwise unattested Tundra cognate of K *emej* ‘mother’. Summing up, *eluoje-* would have meant ‘having no child’ and *-rke* was possibly added under the influence of T *ličuorke* ‘female reindeer’. Finally, K *olujorko*, given in HDY: 326 under the reconstruction **olujərqa*, is a hapax, attested as <олýjopko> in but one text (Jochelson 1900: 70). Although the Kolyma word is translated by Jochelson as ‘(wild reindeer) male’, it is almost certainly cognate to T *eluojerke*, and the meaning ‘male’ is most likely an error.

7. K *kenkeraa* ‘bucket’

This word is listed in HDY: 206 as *kenkə-ra*: ‘amber’ (sic!)⁴ with the following commentary “[t]he cluster *-nk-* is atypical and indicates that the word may be a recent borrowing”. Indeed, a similar form is attested in Ewen (Kolyma-Omolon dialect) *kéŋka* ‘a big cauldron’ (TMS I: 450), but given the absence of Tungusic cognates, it is certainly itself borrowed from Yukaghir. The “suffix” *-ra*: derives names of various household utensils, such as ‘trough’, ‘rack’ or ‘pitch fork’ (Maslova 2003: 132–133). In fact, it is a postpound going back to K *šaa-l* ‘tree; stick; firewood’, with the regular change *š > r* between vowels. The atypical cluster *-nk-* points to a morphological boundary. It seems probable that the word contains the suffix **-rkə*, which is attached to qualitative verbs to form names of objects or concepts possessing the quality in question (see Zhivlov 2022a: 49–51). The deriving root is K *kenbe-*, attested in K *kenbune-* ‘wide’, K *kenbuben* ‘width’, K *kenbegedej-* ~ *kenmegedej-* ‘to open, unfold’ (tr.), K *kenbel’eš-* ‘to spread out, to lay out, to unfold; to flatten’. Thus, ‘bucket’ is a ‘wide/flattened thing’. The simplification of the cluster on the morphological boundary follows the general rule: only the first and the last consonants (in this case, *-n-* and *-k-*) are preserved.

8. T *kise-* ~ *kiise-*, K *kiše-* ~ *kišše-* ‘to show’

Comparison of T *kise-* ‘to show’ with K *kiše-* ‘id.’ leads to a straightforward reconstruction of PY **kice-*. This reconstruction, however, does not account for the variants T *kiise-* ‘to show’ and K *kišše-* ‘id.’. The geminate variant in Kolyma results from a recent syncope: Jochelson’s records show both the simple variant *kiše-* <кíшä-> and ‘long’ variants *kičše-* <кíчäшä-> (Jochelson 1900: 104) and *kiššē-* <кíшäшш-> (Jochelson 1900: 142). Nikolaeva explains this in the following way: “[s]ome forms demonstrate the following phonetic changes: **kičəse-* > *kičə-* > *kiššə-* > *kiše-/kise-*” (HDY: 213). This scenario runs into chronological problems, since ‘simple’ variants *kiše-/kise-*, supposed to result from syncope, actually predate this syncope in Kolyma. Moreover, one of the variants (<кíчäшä-> and <кíшäшш->) must be secondary, and the variant with *-č-* can be tentatively explained by the influence of K *kiš-* ‘to teach’ (*š* is an allophone of *č* in Kolyma Yukaghir). The variant <кíшäшш-> can be derived from <кíшä-> with the pleonastically added causative suffix *-še-*.

It seems probable, however, that the PY form **kice-* itself contains the same causative suffix: words for ‘to show’ are typically causative formations in languages of Northern Eurasia (Uralic, Mongolic, Tungusic, Itelmen, Nivkh). Since the root shape CV- with a short vowel is impossible in Yukaghir, we must assume the loss of some consonant before the causative suf-

⁴ The erroneous gloss possibly resulted from a confusion between English *amber* and Estonian *ämbەر* ‘bucket’.

fix already in Proto-Yukaghir. Fortunately, we are able to identify this consonant thanks to the unique forms K *kigie-m* ‘he showed’ and K *kigie-č-u-m* ‘he was showing’, cited by Krejnovič (1982: 129). Since there are no other attestations of this verb, and it is suspiciously similar to the well-attested K *kigie-* ‘to prick; to butt’, one would be tempted to doubt the authenticity of these forms. Support comes from T *kiise-*, which can owe its vowel length to a loss of pre-consonantal *-g-*, cf. T *iire-* ‘to tie’, derived from T *ige-* ‘to be tied up’.

Summing up, the Proto-Yukaghir verb **kice-* ‘to show’ was derived from a root **kig-* with the causative suffix **-ce-*. The velar stop was lost in this form already in the proto-language⁵. Later, in Tundra Yukaghir a renewed causative form was created by adding the suffix *-se-* to the root **kig-*. This latter form gave T *kiise-*, which coexists with T *kise-* — a direct reflex of PY **kice-*.

9. T *liidej-* (intr.) ‘to scatter; to disperse (of reindeer)’

This verb is adduced in HDY under the reconstructed form **lintə-*. The reconstruction with a short vowel here, as in some other words⁶, is apparently based on an assumption that the simplification of clusters “homorganic nasal + obstruent” caused compensatory lengthening of a preceding vowel. However, many counterexamples can be cited, e.g., **joŋq-* > K *joyul* ‘nose’, T *joyul* ‘nose’ (HDY: 196); **montə-* > K *modo-* ‘to sit’ (HDY: 276); **noŋqə-* > K *noyo* ‘sand’, T *noyo* ‘ash’ (HDY: 309); **nontə-* > K *nodo* ‘bird’, T *nada* ‘wolf’ (HDY: 309), etc. Thus, the long vowel must be original here. Still, Proto-Yukaghir does not have roots of the shape (C)VVCC(V)-, i.e. roots with a long vowel before a consonant cluster; thus, we can conclude that the verb *liidej-* has a morphological boundary before *-d-* (< **-nd-* < **-nt-*). This is confirmed by the stem T *liid’i-*, the iterative counterpart of *liidej-*, which can be analyzed as consisting of the root *lii-* and the iterative suffix *-d’i-* (Schmalz 2013: 129–133). The stem *liidej-*, then, is composed of the root *lii-*, the non-iterative suffix *-de-* (Maslova 2003: 192–193) and the semelfactive suffix *-j-* (Schmalz 2013: 128–129). The same root *lii-* with the causative suffix *-te-* (Schmalz 2013: 152–156) is also found in T *liite-* (tr.) ‘to share smth. with smb.; distribute, divide’. Another derivative from the root *lii-* is T *liitterej-* (tr.) ‘to separate (reindeer from the herd)’, which contains the augmentative suffix *-tte-* (Schmalz 2013: 164–165), non-iterative suffix *-re-* and semelfactive *-j-* (Schmalz 2013: 128–129). An iterative counterpart of T *liitterej-* is T *liittes-*, where *-s-* is a causative suffix (Schmalz 2013: 152–156). T *liite-* and T *liitterej-* are given in HDY: 245 under a separate reconstruction **li:tə-*.

Summing up, instead of two reconstructions proposed in HDY — **lintə-* and **li:tə-* — we can reconstruct the verbal root **lii-*. Note that this is not a proper Proto-Yukaghir reconstruction, since no cognates are found in Kolyma Yukaghir, Chuvan or Omok. Still, it is possible that this root was present in Proto-Yukaghir and was simply lost outside of TY.

10. K *lomd’e* ‘dew’

This word cannot be separated from K *löude-* ‘to take off; to drop’, semelfactive K *löudij-*⁷ ‘to fall; to go down; to descend (of fog)’, cf. a *figura etymologica* in K *lomd’e löudiš* ‘dew has

⁵ Loss of the velar stop before **-c-* becomes more understandable once we recognize the secondary nature of intervocalic **-c-* itself. Word-initial **c* regularly alternates with intervocalic **r*, which means that intervocalic **c* must have been a cluster or geminate on the pre-Proto-Yukaghir level.

⁶ E.g., **ončə-* > K *o:žə-* ‘to drink’ (HDY: 330).

⁷ Given as *löudiš-* in Prokop’eva & Prokop’eva 2021: 151. The same source gives inflected forms like 1 sg. *löudiše* (< **löudij-je*) and 3 sg. *löudiš* (< **löudij-j*), which show that the underlying stem is *löudij-*.

fallen’ (Prokop’eva & Prokop’eva 2021: 147). Nikolaeva reconstructs two roots, **l’omč’ə/*lomjə* (HDY: 248) and **löw-* (HDY: 250). The first is supported by the following data from her own fieldwork: K *l’omd’ə* ‘moisture, humidity’, K *l’omd’ə-* ‘to shed hair, feathers’, K *lomd’u-* ‘humid, damp’ (HDY: 248). The palatal *l’-* is confirmed by K *l’omd’oj* ‘to shed hair, feathers’ in Nikolaeva & Šalugin 2002: 39 and by *l’omd’e-j* ‘fade, lose color’⁸ in Maslova 2003: 548. On the other hand, Krejnovič (1982: 63) gives K *lōmd’e* ‘moisture’ with non-palatal *l-*, and examples in Maslova’s grammar also have *l-* (Maslova 2003: 187, 509, 511). The variant with the palatal lateral *l’-* is possibly due to assimilation to the following *-d’-*. Anyway, it should be secondary, since Proto-Yukaghir word-initial **l’-* regularly gives *j-* in Kolyma Yukaghir. Nikolaeva’s **löw-* is supported by the following reflexes from her fieldwork: K *löudu-* ‘to fall down’, K *löudə-* ‘to drop; to take off’, K *lōmdijə ~ jōmdijə* ‘precipice’ (HDY: 250). Nikolaeva notes that “[t]he alternation *-w-* ~ *-m-* is irregular” (ibid.). In fact, the alternation is governed by the rule described in Zhivlov 2022a: 51–53: pre-Proto-Yukaghir clusters of the type “obstruent + nasal + obstruent” yield Proto-Yukaghir clusters “nasal + obstruent”, where the nasal has the same place of articulation as the first obstruent in the pre-Proto-Yukaghir cluster. Thus, we can reconstruct a pre-Proto-Yukaghir root **lop- ~ *löp-* ‘to fall, to drop’: K *lomd’e* ‘dew’ goes back to pre-PY **löp-ńčə* with the participle suffix **-ńčə*, while K *löude-* can be derived from pre-PY **löp-te-* with the non-iterative suffix pre-PY **-te-* > PY **-de-*, which did not contain a nasal. The original **p* is preserved before *-č-* in K *löpsii- ~ löpčii-* ‘to drop; to shed (leaves); to take off, remove’.

11. T *ńaal’uol-* ‘to enter into a sexual relationship’

This verb is tentatively (under a question sign) derived in HDY: 283 from T *ńaajl* ‘son-in-law, daughter-in-law’. Apart from formal problems (*-l’-* vs. *-j-*), such a derivation looks utterly improbable in the Yukaghir cultural context, where certain relatives, including in-laws, were required to perform mutual avoidance: “Persons who are mutually “bashful” should not address themselves directly to each other, or look into each other’s faces, or call each other by name or by their term of relationship. ... A daughter-in-law should not look into the face of her father-in-law or her husband’s elder brother, neither is a son-in-law allowed to look into the face of his father-in-law or his mother-in-law” (Jochelson 1926: 76). Cf. the Tundra Yukaghir verb *ńaajči-* ‘behave like a son-in-law or daughter-in-law; behave modestly, shyly, like a son-in-law or daughter-in-law; perform mutual avoidance norms towards smb.’.

Another etymology can be suggested for T *ńaal’uol-* ‘to enter into a sexual relationship’. If we suppose that this verb contains a fossilized reciprocal prefix *ńi-*, we can derive it from T *al’uol-* ‘to be melted’, cf. T *al’aa-* ‘to melt (of snow, ice); to warm oneself; to heat up (of a house); to dissolve’. In this case, the literal meaning of T *ńaal’uol-* would be ‘to melt reciprocally’ or simply ‘to warm each other’.

12. T *ńaarčuu-* ‘to be bad’, attributive form *ńaarčə*

This Tundra verb and its various derivatives are compared in HDY to K *ńerčəd-anil’* ‘buttocks’ (HDY: 290), K *ńerčəd-anil’* <нәрчәд-әңил> ‘vagina’ (Jochelson 1900: 158), as well as to T *ńerče(η)* ‘buttocks’, which HDY erroneously glosses as ‘nasty’. The forms meaning ‘buttocks’ and ‘va-

⁸ This gloss is apparently a mistranslation of Russian *линять*, which means both ‘shed hair or feathers’ and ‘fade, lose color (of textile etc.)’.

gina' go back to a separate Proto-Yukaghir form **ńerčə*, which, in view of a different vocalism and different semantics, has nothing to do with T *ńaarče*.

According to HDY, T *ńaarče* has “[a]n irregular long vowel in a closed syllable”. The irregularity in question is morphophonological rather than simply phonological — long vowels in closed syllables are perfectly possible both in Tundra and in Kolyma Yukaghir, but underlying roots cannot have long vowels in closed syllables. Therefore, T *ńaarče* should be morphologically segmentable. It is tempting to compare T *ńaarče* with K *erče* in K *erče ńińieńe-* ‘to be unkind, bad (of a person)’, *erče šoromo* ‘bad person, villain’, *erčed önmeń-* ‘bad (of a person), rude, quick-tempered’. The only way these words can be related is if the Tundra word includes a fossilized reciprocal prefix *ńi-*, the original meaning being ‘bad with respect to each other’. The modern Tundra Yukaghir reciprocal prefix has an allomorph *ńiń-* in prevocalic position, but this must be an innovation, cf. the cognate Kolyma Yukaghir reciprocal prefix *ńe-*, used both before vowels and consonants.

K *erče* is related to K *eruu-* ‘to be bad’, K *eríš-* ‘to be bad, unsatisfactory, ugly’, K *erulbe-* ‘to get worse (of mood, temper); to deteriorate, to become unusable’, and K *erie-* ‘to hate; to disdain’. The latter word has a Tundra cognate *erie-* ‘to disdain; to be disgusted by smth.; to reject’. Thus, we have a Proto-Yukaghir root **er-* ‘bad’ with a lot of derivatives, at least two of which go back to Proto-Yukaghir: PY **er-čə* (K *erče* ~ T *ńaarče*) and PY **er-ie-* (K *erie-* ~ T *erie-*). Now, Nikolaeva (HDY: 163) compares this root with Tungusic **er(e)-*. This reconstruction refers to the following forms: Ewenki *erū* ‘bad’, Solon *erū* ‘bad’, Ulcha *erule-* ‘to torment; to scold; to oppress’, Nanai *erū*, *erulē* ‘torment’, *erule-* ‘to torment’, Manchu *eru-*, *erula-*, *erule-* ‘to torment, to torture’, *erun* ‘torment, torture; execution’ (TMS II: 465–466). Doerfer (1985: 39) considers all these words to be borrowed from Mongolic, cf. Written Mongolian *eregüü* ‘torture, torment, chastisement; capital punishment’ (Lessing et al. 1960: 321–322). There is no doubt that Ulcha, Nanai and Manchu forms are Mongolic loans, since their semantics is the same as that of the Mongolic original. Things are less clear with Ewenki and Solon forms. If these are also borrowed from Mongolic, we have to assume that 1) the meaning shift ‘torment, torture’ > ‘bad’ occurred in Proto-Ewenic and that 2a) either this word was borrowed at an early stage into Yukaghir languages, where the final *-ū* was reinterpreted as a Yukaghir suffix, after which other derivatives were formed from the bare root **er-*, or 2b) the resemblance with Yukaghir is due to chance. Both options do not look very probable. The most simple solution in my view is to separate the Ewenic forms from the Ulcha, Nanai and Manchu ones, and to consider the former borrowed from Yukaghir and the latter borrowed from Mongolic.

13. T *ńamne-* ‘to be wide (of a distance between the horns of a reindeer)’

This verb, given in HDY: 287 under the separate protoform **ńamnə-*, contains the suffix of qualitative verbs *-ne-/na-* (Schmalz 2013: 112). Verbs with this suffix typically have active intransitive counterparts with the suffix *-gej-/γaj-*: T *ńori-ne-* ‘to be yellow’ ~ T *ńoro-γoj-* ‘to turn yellow’, T *sil-na-* ‘to be dry’ ~ T *silγa-γaj-* ‘to dry up quickly’, T *wen-ne-* ‘to be stretched’ ~ T *wede-gej-* ‘to stretch out, to expand’, etc. The active counterpart of T *ńam-ne-* ‘to be wide (of a distance between the horns of a reindeer)’ is T *ńaba-γaj-* ‘to open (of door, etc.), to widen (of an opening)’ (intr.), for which HDY: 287 reconstructs **ńampə-*. Other words from the same root are T *ńabal’es-* ‘to open (of door, etc.)’ (tr.), T *ńabačėń-* ‘to be excessively open (about the smoke hole of the yaranga); be wide open; be wide (about horns sticking out in different directions)’. Moreover, Kolyma cognates can be proposed: K *ńabol’e-* ‘to be unbuttoned, to have unbuttoned clothes’, K *ńabol’uot* ‘being in a position with the head thrown back’. The Proto-Yukaghir root can be reconstructed as **ńambə-*.

14. T *ńarqajewlid'e* ‘newborn reindeer’, T *ńorqomayil* ‘coat made of newborn reindeer skin’

These words are compounds with the second components T *jewlid'e* ‘reindeer calf’ and T *mayil* ‘coat’ respectively. One more related item is T *ńorqoje* ‘female of a wild reindeer with a newborn calf; reindeer herd where there are only calving females’ (see above on the morphological analysis of this word). The variable vocalism of *ńarqa-* ~ *ńorqo-* results from a relatively recent change **o* > *a* in Tundra Yukaghir, whose exact conditions so far remain unclear (HDY: 58–59). Thus, the original form must have been *ńorqo-*. Nikolaeva compares this word with Tungusic **ńar-gu-* ‘new, fresh’, noting that “[t]he element -qə in Yukaghir may be a derivational suffix”. A native Yukaghir etymology can be proposed for T *ńarqa-* ~ *ńorqo-*. We can start with the similarity of this stem with T *ńorqo* ‘copper’. Of course, the name for ‘newborn reindeer’ cannot go back to ‘copper’; instead, both are semantic specializations of a more general meaning. T *ńorqo* ‘copper’ goes back to pre-PY **ńor-rkə* from the root of T *ńori-ne-* ‘to be yellow’ and T *ńoro-γoj-* ‘to turn yellow’ (Zhivlov 2022a: 50). The suffix **-rkə* is attached to qualitative verbs to form names of objects or concepts possessing the quality in question (Kurilov 1994: 43–49; Schmalz 2013: 106). Thus, the original meaning of T *ńorqo* was ‘yellow thing’. The shift from ‘yellow thing’ to ‘copper’ is trivial. The connection of ‘newborn reindeer’ to ‘yellow’ is found in Tundra Nenets, where the word *tas^oko* <таско> ‘newborn reindeer’ is apparently related to *tasyey^o* <тасей> ‘yellow’ and *tasyexey^o* <тасахэй> ‘id.’ (Tereščenko 1965: 639–640). Moreover, the same semantic connection is found in English, where *fawn* has a secondary meaning ‘pale brown colour tinted with yellow’.

15. T *ńimojie-* ‘to mix blood (though marriage)’

HDY: 301 lists this verb under a reconstructed form **ni:mə* together with T *elńiimije* ‘orphan’ (on which see above) and K <ni’mdietek> ‘mother’s younger sister, her younger female cousins’ (Jochelson 1900: 239; Jochelson 1926: 71). In fact, T *ńimojie-* is derived from T *mojie-* ‘to touch; to stroke; to smear; to mix; to stir up; to rub oneself’ with the reciprocal prefix *ńi-*. Cf. Russian glosses: *mojie-* ‘смешать’ and *ńimojie-* ‘смешать(ся) (по крови)’, where Russian *-ся* is equivalent to Yukaghir *ńi-*.

16. T *ńiruon* ‘separately; apart’, T *ńiruose-* ‘to part (with someone); to get divorced’

These words are given in HDY: 317–318 under the reconstruction **ńyr-*, with a comment that “[t]he stem shows back vowel harmony”. It seems reasonable to assume that *ńi-* is a reciprocal prefix here. Intervocalic *-r-* can regularly go back to *s-*. If this assumption is correct, the words in question are related to T *suose-* ‘to miss the target’, iterative T *suorič-*. Thus, ‘to part with someone’ is ‘to reciprocally miss the aim’. The postposition T *suode* ‘except, apart from’ can also be related.

17. T *ńiwien* ‘different’

This form (Krejnovič 1958: 276) is given in HDY: 304 as *niwie-* ‘different’ (with erroneous *n-*) under a reconstruction **niw-* together with unglossed forms *niwol*, *niuol* from Jochelson’s unpublished Tundra Yukaghir dictionary. The etymology of T *ńiwien* could not be more evident:

it is simply T *wien* ‘another, other’ with the reciprocal prefix *ńi-*. As for T *niwol* and *niuol*, I would tentatively suggest that these forms are the same as T *ńiwal* ‘next to each other’ from T *wal* ‘near’ with the same reciprocal prefix. Of course, the absence of a gloss next to a form in HDY means, in theory, that its gloss must be the same as that of the preceding word, but in practice this is not always the case (Zhivlov 2022b: 71–72).

18. T <niuoletile-, niwoletile-> ‘to change’

These forms from the unpublished dictionary of Jochelson are given in HDY: 318 under the reconstruction **nywolə-*, supplied with a question mark. In fact, this word is attested in Kurilov’s 2001 dictionary as T *ńiwal’itiil’e-* ‘to do in exchange for something’. This verb is derived from T *ńiwal’itii-* ‘to exchange’, which in its turn is derived from T *ńiwal* ‘next to each other’, on which see above.

19. K *ńuoduope* ‘descendants’

This word, attested only in Jochelson’s materials (Jochelson 1900: 112, 114), is treated in HDY: 305 as etymologically isolated under a reconstructed form **ńo:δ-/ńo:nt-*. The final *-pe* is a plural suffix. The stem K *ńuoduo-* is hard to separate from T *uoduo* ‘grandchild’. The latter form can be easily analyzed as *uo-d+uo* ‘child’s child’, from T *uo(η)* ‘child’ with the attributive suffix *-d*. The initial *ń-* in the Kolyma form needs an explanation. The only formally possible hypothesis is that *ń-* here is the reciprocal prefix. While its semantic function here is not entirely clear, it is attested in other kinship terms, although only in terms denoting relations within a generation (Maslova 2007: 1854).

20. K *poyožil* ‘knee’

The comparison to K *poyoŋin* ‘knee-long’ (HDY: 354), where *-ŋin* is a dative case ending, implies that the root here is *poyo-*. While *-l* can be a suffix⁹, there is no nominal suffix *-ž* in Kolyma Yukaghir. Therefore, the most probable hypothesis is that we are dealing here with a compound. The second part of this compound can be identified as K *qožile* ‘cavity’ (Nikolaeva & Šalugin 2002: 76). The semantics make sense if we assume that the original meaning of the compound was ‘knee pit’, cf. also K *qoži-d+elbe* ‘armpit’ (Nikolaeva & Šalugin 2002: 76). In order to get the attested form, we need to assume a haplology: **poyo+yožil > poyožil*.

21. T *qaadale* ‘armpit’

This word is reconstructed in HDY: 379 as **qantala*. The reconstruction with a short vowel cannot be correct (see above on T *liidej-*). The word can be analyzed as a compound *qaa-d+ale*, where *-d* is the attributive suffix and *-ale* is related to the postposition T *al*, K *aal* ‘below’. The preposition *qaa-* is most likely related to K *qaar* ‘hide; bark (of a tree); skin’. Note that the *-r* in K *qaar* must be a suffix. Krejnovič (1982: 87) lists the following examples when *-r* in this word gets

⁹ Cf. K *poyožaaq* ‘on one’s knees’ (Nikolaeva & Šalugin 2002: 60).

ousted by the attributive suffix: K *qa-n+punbur* ‘bed’ (K *ponbur* ‘sleeping mat’), K *qa-n+murudu* ‘fur stockings’ (K *murudu* ‘stockings’), K *qa-d+ejmunde* ‘half of a skin’ (K *ejmunde* ‘half’). The same prepound *qaa-* can be found in two more words. One is K *qa-d+uo* ‘trousers with fur inside’, listed in HDY: 373 as *qa:d-o*: ‘leather trousers with fur inside’, with vowel length in the first syllable. The second part of the compound here is K *oo* ‘trousers’. Another example is K *qa-n+šogi* <xancogi> ‘leather bag’ from the manuscript dictionary of Jochelson (HDY: 378). This word literally means ‘leather bag’ and has K *šögi* ‘bag, sack’ as its second part. The reconstruction **qansə-*, provided with a question sign in HDY, can be safely discarded.

K *qaar* is given in HDY: 379 under a reconstruction **qa:r/*qajr*, where the second variant is based on T *qajr* ‘skin from the head of an animal’ and MK *-cháär-*, *-hér-*¹⁰ (unglossed in HDY). In fact, Kurilov’s dictionary (Kurilov 2001), which is supposed to be the source of all material marked as T in HDY, does not have the word *qajr* ‘skin from the head of an animal’. It only has T *ńaačayajr* ‘skin from the muzzle of an animal; facial skin’ — a compound with T *ńaače(η)* ‘face’ as the first member. It is not yet clear how the variants with *aa* and *aj* are to be explained.

22. T *saayare* ‘side (the space located on the sides, edges of something; not the middle); the left side of yaranga; South side’, T *saayar* ‘South’

HDY lists T *saayare* with an erroneous gloss ‘left side of a yurt; West’ under a separate reconstruction **sa:γər/*sanqər*. T *-yar* is a suffix of spatial adverbs (Schmalz 2013: 203). Thus, the root here is *saa-*. It can be easily identified as the root of T *saa-l* ‘tree; forest, taiga’. For the Tundra Yukaghirs the south side is obviously the side of taiga. Cf. T *čawlaayar* ‘north’, literally ‘sea side’, from T *čawul* ‘sea, ocean’.

23. T *sebul* ‘tray for food (made from reindeer skins sewn to each other)’

This word is compared in HDY: 401 to K *šepid-i-čə* ‘top of a mountain’ and K *šibil’, šebil’* ‘window; door’. The comparison is both semantically and phonetically implausible. Krejnovič (1982: 89) glosses T *sebul* as ‘mat for things’. The Tundra word is also found as the second part of the compound T *lugu+rubul* ‘tray; mat for meat (reindeer skins sewn to each other)’, whose first part is T *legu-l* ‘food’. Note the sound change **e-u > u-u* in both parts of the compound (Zhivlov 2022b: 78). HDY lists this word under a separate protoform **luyur-/*luŋkur*¹¹ (HDY: 252). Another compound with the same second component is T *juödu+rubul* ‘a board for cutting fish or meat’. Its first part is T *juödu-* ‘to chop’.

T *sebul* has a rather transparent Kolyma cognate: K *šobul* ‘bedding (from plant material, often from larch branches or grass)’. The Proto-Yukaghir form can be tentatively reconstructed as **cembul*. Nikolaeva (HDY: 404) gives the Kolyma form as K *šöbul, šubul* ‘branch of the larch tree; bedding made of larch branches’ and compares it with T *sebul* from Krejnovič’s work, but

¹⁰ This is one more Old Tundra form in the MK wordlist. In Zhivlov 2022b: 72 I suggested that the presence of both Tundra and Kolyma forms in the MK and MU wordlists results from borrowing. Now I think that these lists simply are a mix of words from two Old Yukaghir languages – either because of code-switching by bilingual informants, or because each list has words from more than one informant. Unfortunately, we do not have a “pure” Old Tundra wordlist.

¹¹ Apart from T *lugurubul*, this entry also includes T *lugumul* from Jochelson’s unpublished dictionary. Since this word is not glossed, it must presumably have the same meaning. This is doubtful, since it is phonologically identical to T *lugumul* ‘aging, old age’.

not with T *sebul* from Kurilov's dictionary, although these are two attestations of the same word. She further compares these words to Northern Tungusic **seg-/sew-* 'to lay branches in a yurt'. This comparison, although semantically attractive, is made impossible by the Tundra Yukaghir forms, which require the reconstruction of word-internal cluster **-mb-*.

24. T *unumed'uo* ~ *unemed'uo* 'earrings'

This word is explained in HDY: 444 as "T *unemed'-uo* ear-ring [lit. ear's child]" — a compound of T *unume(η)* 'ear' and *uo(η)* 'child'. Kurilov (2001: 486) gives only the variant *unumed'uo* with the second syllable *-u-* in the main entry, but the variant *unemed'uo* with the second syllable *-e-* is attested in example sentences (Kurilov 2001: 108, 174, 226), as well as in the compound T *moηo-d+unemed'uo* 'pendants of a fur cap' (T *moηo(η)* 'headdress'). The variation in the second syllable vowel is the same as in the word for 'ear': T *unume(η)* ~ *uneme(η)* (Krejnovič 1958: 279). The morphological segmentation proposed in HDY implies that *-d'* must somehow be a variant of the attributive suffix *-d*. There are no other instances where the attributive suffix takes the form *-d'*, and no known morphophonological process which could have caused such a change. Note, however, that the Kolyma Yukaghir word for 'earrings' is *unume ludul*, literally 'ear iron' (K *ludul* 'iron'). The Tundra Yukaghir word has the same semantic structure: T *unume+d'uo*, literally 'ear iron', cf. T *čuo(η)* 'iron'. The voicing *č > d'* is regular in compounds, cf. T *čuul* 'meat', but T *al'γα+d'uul* 'boiled fish meat as a dish' (T *al'γα(η)* 'fish'). There was also a parallel form without voicing, attested as T <u'nemečō> 'earring' (Jochelson 1926: 327) and preserved in two verbal derivatives in modern Tundra Yukaghir: T *unumečuóne-* 'to have pendants, earrings', T *unumečuore-* 'to acquire earrings'.

Language Abbreviations

- K Kolyma Yukaghir (Prokop'eva & Prokop'eva 2021)
- MK Old Kolyma Yukaghir materials of Mueller/Lindenau (HDY)
- MU Old Ust'-Jansk Yukaghir materials of Mueller/Lindenau (HDY)
- S Old Kolyma Yukaghir materials of Suworov (Schiefner 1871)
- T Tundra Yukaghir (Kurilov 2001)

References

- Doerfer, Gerhard. 1985. *Mongolo-Tungusica*. (*Tungusica* 3.) Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- HDY = Nikolaeva, Irina. 2006. *A Historical Dictionary of Yukaghir*. (*Trends in Linguistics, Documentation* 25.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jochelson, Waldemar. 1900. *Materialy po izučeniju jukagirskago jazyka i fol'klora*. I. (*Trudy jakutskoj èkspedicii, snar'ažennoj na sredstva I. M. Sibir'akova. Otděl III. Tom IX. Čast' III.*) Sankt-Peterburg: Imperatorskaja Akademija nauk.
- Jochelson, Waldemar. 1926. *The Yukaghir and the Yukaghirized Tungus*. (*Memoir of the American Museum of Natural History* IX). New York: G. E. Stechert.
- Krejnovič, Eruxim A. 1958. *Jukagirskij jazyk*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.
- Krejnovič, Eruxim A. 1982. *Issledovanija i materialy po jukagirskomu jazyku*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Kurilov, Gavril N. 1994. *Obrazovanie imennyx slov v jukagirskom jazyke*. Yakutsk: Yakutskij naučnyj centr SO RAN.
- Kurilov, Gavril N. 2001. *Jukagirsko-russkij slovar'*. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Lessing, Ferdinand D. et al. 1960. *Mongolian-English dictionary*. Berkeley / Los Angeles: University of California Press.

- Maslova, Elena. 2003. *A Grammar of Kolyma Yukaghir*. (Mouton Grammar Library 27.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Maslova, Elena. 2007. Reciprocals in Yukaghir languages. In: Vladimir P. Nedjalkov (ed.). *Reciprocal Constructions (Typological Studies in Language 71): 1835–1863*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Matjuškin, Fedor F. 1841. Sобрание слов Чуванского и Омокского языков, составленное Мишманом Матюшкиным. In: *Pribavlenija k Putešestvoju po severnym beregam Sibiri i po Ledovitomu morju, soveršenomu v 1820, 1821, 1822, 1823 i 1824 g. èkspedicieju, sostojavšeju pod načal'stvom flota lejtenanta Ferdinanda fon-Vrangelja*: 115–125. Sankt-Peterburg: Imperatorskaja Akademiya nauk.
- Nikolaeva, Irina A., Vasilij G. Šalugin. *Slovar' jukagirsko-russkij i russko-jukagirskij (Verxnekolymskij dialekt)*. Sankt-Peterburg: Drofa.
- Prokop'eva, Praskov'ja. E., Aleksandra E. Prokop'eva. 2021. *Jukagirsko-russkij slovar' (jazyk lesnyx jukagirov)*. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Schiefner, Anton. 1871. Beiträge zur Kenntniss der jukagirischen Sprache. *Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de Saint-Petersbourg* XVI: 373–399.
- Schmalz, Mark. 2013. *Aspects of the Grammar of Tundra Yukaghir*. PhD dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- Tereščenko, Natalija M. 1965. *Nenecko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva: Sovetskaja ènciklopedija.
- TMS I = Cincius, Vera I. (ed.). 1975. *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' tunguso-man'čžurskix jazykov. Tom I*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- TMS II = Cincius, Vera I. (ed.). 1977. *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' tunguso-man'čžurskix jazykov. Tom II*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Zhivlov, Mikhail. 2022a. Pre-Proto-Yukaghir Consonant Clusters. *International Journal of Eurasian Linguistics* 4: 41–59.
- Zhivlov, Mikhail. 2022b. Studies in Yukaghir etymology I. *Journal of Language Relationship* 20(1): 71–80.

М. А. Живлов. Исследования в области юкагирской этимологии II

В настоящей статье предлагается ряд дополнений и уточнений к корпусу этимологий, опубликованному И. А. Николаевой в *A Historical Dictionary of Yukaghir* (De Gruyter, 2006). Основной упор сделан не столько на поиске заимствований или когнатов в рамках дальнего сравнения, сколько на собственно внутриякагирских этимологиях.

Ключевые слова: юкагирские языки; этимология; сравнительно-историческое языкознание; праязыковая реконструкция.