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TURCO — SAMOIEDICA


O. Introduction

The Turkic-Samoyedic comparisons presented below result from independent etymological research by each of the two authors, followed by mutual cross-checking of the material (the opportunity of the team work has been provided by the Free University Berlin and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft). Our purpose was to enlarge the collection of etymologies which can be found in the monumental work by A. J. Joki (Joki LSS) and in later contributions to the topic (e.g. Márik NéNy 19-20: 243-252; Janhunen MSFOu 158: 123-129; Tenišev MSFOu 158: 235-239; Róna-Tas CIFU-5 III: 377-385; Terent’ev PÈÈISN; Helimski JSFOu 81: 54-103; Róna-Tas UL 742-748; Filippova Diss.; Filippova JSFOu 85: 41-70).

In the treatment of the historical and cultural circumstances of the language contacts between Proto-Turkic (and its descendants) and Proto-Samoyedic (and its descendants) the authors follow the conception outlined e.g. in Joki LSS 33ff. and Helimski JSFOu
83: 257-267. The approach advocated e.g. in the works by A. Ró-
na-Tas (see above) or in Janhunen JSFOu 82: 287-297 differs pri-
marily in the postulation of a strong Bulgar-Turkic impact upon
the peoples of Southern Siberia.

A significant part of the etymologies below is restricted, on the
Samoyedic side, to the data of a single language – Selkup. The
special position of this language in regard to Turkic influences
(various from the viewpoint of chronology and sources) is well-
known; see the detailed discussion in Filippova Diss. (a shortened
version is Filippova JSFOu 85: 41-70).

1. ‘to strive, to aspire’

Selk. Taz (OSYa 2: 100) antalpj-, antalimpj- ‘to strive, to as-
pire to; стремиться’, antaljl- ‘to compete; соревноваться, со-
перничать’, antaljt- ‘to argue; спорить’.

Etym.: < Turk., cf. esp. Kzk. antala- ‘иметь сильное же-
ление’, Kiqn. antala- ‘стремиться’.

The forms in other Turk. languages (see ESTYa I: 653 ff.) re-
flect (I) intltl-, umtll-, umtltl-, intltl-; (II) intlt-, intltl-, intltk-, intltl-;
(III) amatl-, antala-; the meanings are ‘to strive, to aspire, to rush
forward, to attack’ etc.

The Selk. forms can be best accounted for from a non-attested
reflex in one of the Siberian Tatar dialects (e.g. in Baraba), which
could be phonetically especially similar to the Kzk. and Kirg. re-
flexes – antala- or antal-. The direct borrowing from Kzk. into
Selk. hardly seems likely. The geographic considerations prevent
us from looking for the source of Selk. forms in Chuv. antal- ‘to
strive’, and the phonetic ones make the borrowing from Alt. amat-
id. equally improbable. The phonetic relationship between the
Turk. forms cited above is not completely clear; one may think of
the primary verbal root *umt-, with the following developments:
> *int- > *int- > *mt- > *amtl- > *amt- > *ant-. The suffixes -pj-, -mpj-
(durative) and -tj- (transitive) are typical of Selkup and often occur with borrowed verbal stems. The verb antaljl- (with suffixal -tj-) may be derived from Turk. *anta

(non-attested, but cf. Kzk. Kirg. inta ‘стремление, инициатива,
yerdet’) or result from analogical derivational processes in Selk.
(antalpj-, antalimpj- vs. antaijt-, like kekkalpj-, kekkalimpj- ‘to be
tortured, to undergo sufferings’ vs. kekkiljt- ‘to suffer’).

The verbs in question occur in Taz Selkup relatively rarely,
therefore the absence of data from other Selk. dialects (the lexical
stock of which has not been sufficiently studied) does not prove
that the Turk. word has been actually borrowed only into one dia-
lect. Anyhow, the borrowing could have occurred only before the
17th century (when the ancestors of Taz Selkups lost contacts with
their Turkic neighbours and with speakers of Southern Selkup).

2. ‘to lie (down)’

Selk. Taz (Mat.) č’atiį-mpj-, č’atiį-mpj- ‘to lie’. Unlike Selk.
Taz ippj- id., this word is used only when speaking of persons,
and is not applied to inanimate objects. Parallels from other Selk.
dialects or other Sam. languages remain unknown, but in principle
the word may go back to Selk. *t’ato- (or even to Sam. *jat-).

Etym.: < Turk. *jat- ‘to lie (down)’ (VEWT 192; Clauson 884;
Bbr. jat- id.

Nothing definite can be said about the chronology of borrow-
ing. As long as the Turk. word is genuine, it is possible to think of
*jat- > Sam. *jat- (cf. Turk. *tar+ [e.g. Ott. tara-, Tuv. tira- ‘to
comb’, Yak. taran = Dolg. tarban- (~ *targan- ‘to comb one’s
hair’, Old Turk. tarag = Yak. tarax ‘comb’] > Sam. *tar ‘hair’;
see Róna-Tas UL 744, Stachowski GJV 55, § 5.10(e) or > Selk.
*t’at- (where t’ < *j). The restricted dialectal occurrence of the
Selk. word may be, however, treated as an indication of a later
borrowing from one of the adjacent Turk. dialects (e.g. from Chul.
čat- ~ jat-). The addition of -j- before the durative suffix -mpj-
typical formative of stative verbs), as well as the positional
lengthening of a, are probably Selk. developments.
3. ‘fat’


Etym.: < Turk. *Tür (*Tür) > *üz (*üz) ‘fat’: Old Turk. öz ~ üz (DTS 395, 629) ~ üz (Clauson 278f.), Alt. Tel. Tuv. Sag. Koyb. (Radl.) üs ‘geschmolzenes Fett, Talg, Butter’. We are faced with certain problems in distinguishing the Old Turk. attestations of this word from those of *üz (Clauson 278) ‘center, middle; valley; the interior, pith, pulp, marrow; spirit; self; life’ (< *őr > Chuv. var ‘1.center; 2.pith, heartwood’) = MKAšg. őz ‘heartwood’, Yak. üős ‘1.center; 2.pith, heartwood’, Dolg. üös ‘Mitte’ (Stachowski DW 252), Trkm. őős ‘self’, Kha. ăz id. ; cf. also Old Yak. *őzāg > Modern Yak. őhüüs ‘ein Balken im Holzgerüst der Jure’ (Stachowski GJV 65, 8 8.5); *jösök (< *őzák) > Brb. jüssök ‘heartwood’ (Tekin 183). Cf. also Gombocz (KZS 13: 4) Khas. Tat. üzök ‘das innere, […] der bauchteil des felles […]’ ~ Mong. үүр ‘l’intérieur; das innere oder inwendige einer sache’. — From the semantic viewpoint the connection between *üz (*üz) and *őz is very likely. Cf. the semantic duality ‘pulp, insides’ ~ ‘fat’ in Lat. pinguis ‘1.fat; 2.flesh (soft parts of body, as distinct from bones and gristles)’ and the wide-spread derivational pattern ‘to live; life’ → ‘fat’, as in Slav. *žiti ‘to live’ vs. *ži-r ‘fat’.

*) It seems that an almost exact analogy – with the same phonetic problem – is provided by the word pair: Turk. *őr vs. *üz ‘oberer Teil’ (cf. *őrüt > Yak. ürüüt ‘Oberfläche’, *üzük > Brb. üük ‘Dach’, see Stachowski FO 30: 198f.). In view of Mo. uglify ‘tente; zelt’ which Z. Gombocz (KZS 13: 5, No. 7) connected with Brb. Kig. üzük, it seems to be possible to trace the stem back to *ür or even *ür, and this could then be for its part a phonetic variant of *őr < *őr. If one day a proof for the original identity of *őr and *üz is found, a reinterpretation of Yak. ürüüt ‘Oberfläche’, őüük ‘hoch’, őrdü ‘sich erheben; hoch werden’ (Stachowski FO 30: 198) according to E. Helimski’s (ST 1986/2: 40-50) rules will probably be practicable (in this case, the likely proto-form for ürüüt should be *őrüt [< *őr ‘i’ rather than *őrüt).

The suggested etymology raises doubts mainly from the “Wörter und Sachen” viewpoint: the borrowing of the word for ‘fat’ seems pointless, inasmuch as this substance was obviously well known and widely used long before the contacts between Samoyeds and Turks started. Phonetically, however, the comparison creates little or no problems:

(a) For Sam. *r ~ Turk. *r (> z) see e.g. Helimski JSFOu 83: 262-263 (where the etymology under consideration is cursorily mentioned).

(b) There are two possibilities to account for the presence of *j- in Sam.:

— In a recently published paper, T. Tekin demonstrated the sporadic appearance of a pre-vocalic prothetic *j- in Turk. (Tekin TDA 4: 51-66). One of his examples is of direct relevance, because the j-prothesis appears in a possibly distantly related word: Brb. jüssök ‘heartwood (ağaç özü)’ < *őzük (ibid. 63, No. 23); the latter is attested with the meanings ‘pulp; insides’, see ESTYA 1: 509, and is derived from *őz. Thus, the borrowing from a Turk. source with a prothetic *j- (*jör) may be assumed, too.

— There are only very few stems with an initial *ű- or *ő- reconstructable for Proto-Sam., and these vowels occur in an open syllable only (*ű- ‘to drag’, *uköl- id., *ûcä ‘small’, *ö or *őš ‘door’; see Janhunen SW 29-31; for the prothetic j- in Sam. see also Joki LSS 387). We may therefore assume a phonetic rule:

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ & 0 \\
\{ & ő \\
\end{align*} \rightarrow jü / # __ \begin{cases} 
C# \\
CC \end{cases}
\]


4. ‘as, like’

Selk. Taz (Mat.) kępi, kępi ‘as big as, like (Postp.),’ ukkjr kępi ‘equal in size’ (ukkjr ‘one’).
Both Selk. and Yak. words may be qualified as descriptive. For Yakut cf. Kalużyński RO 42/1: 33 (‘от звукоопределяющего орнамента подарок’; ‘sound from the surface of the water’). Further Yakut forms are reported in Popova (J.R. 1967). Related onomatopoetic forms are found in many neighbouring languages. E.g. Nen. T (L) O xɒŋk – звук от удара (стука) по предмету, имеющему рисунок; xɔŋkur – глухой звук от падения пустого внутри металлического предмета’.

5. ‘sagging ice’

Selk. Taz (Mat.) qoqa ‘sagging ice on river or lake (separated with a hollow from the water surface)’, qoqaqra ‘sagging ice-crust (with snow melted under it)’. The earlier forms of these words may be reconstructed as Selk. *qoqa, qoqara (cf. Sam. *ponqa ‘fishing net’ > Selk. *ponqa > Taz poqq etc.).

Selk. *kěpi ‘its form’ (Ott. gibi ‘as, like’) < *kāpi < *kāp > Yak. kāp ‘Form, Gestalt’ = Trkm. gāp ‘Puppe in Form eines Kalbes oder Kamelfohlens, die – falls das Kalb oder das Kamelfohlen verendet ist – beim Melken an die Kuh bzw. die Kame- lin gestellt wird’ (Stachowski GJV 70, § 10.3).

While kēpi, kēpi is presently used only as a postposition, the construction ukkir kēpi (where the word is supplied with an adjectival suffix and preceded by a numeral) permits to view it historically as a noun (‘size, form’), cf. similar constructions ukkir mōnti ‘equal in quantity, simultaneous’ (← mōnti ‘measure’, ukkir č’aril ‘equally thick’ (← č’aril ‘thickness’).

Selk. ē may reflect the long vowel in the Turk, source or be the result of internal development (lengthening of short vowels in open syllables before a voiceless consonant, cf. No. 11, ʔjīl < Turk. ewi). The borrowing most certainly occurred during the separate existence of the Selk. language (as long as Sam. *k- > Selk. *k- before a front vowel), but a more exact dating of it hardly seems possible.

It is worth mentioning that Turk. *kēp > Hung. kép ‘picture, portrait, appearance’, with its derivative képpen (← képp) being used as a postposition (‘like, as, in the way of’) and then as a case formative of the ‘formalis’ case: csodaképpen ‘in a wonderful way’, példáképp ‘for example’, etc. (EWUng. 730-733).

The similarity between Pūr. *kii(t) ‘shadow; form’ (Helmiski DVSYAP 95-97) and Turk. *kāp ‘form’ (Stachowski GJV 70, § 10.3) deserves being mentioned; the possibility of the two forms being connected requires, however, further research.

6. ‘thigh’

mod'uki ～ mod'ugi 'thigh, croup', (KP 122) mod'ug'i 'Lende des Wildrentiers' / Ngan. (Mat.) munsu̱də 'thigh'. It is very probable that Ngan. (Mikola NyK 72: 83) mund'uka, (Mat.) mund'ukə 'lame' also belongs here and goes back directly to *monsokkiye- (the innate dislocation of thigh-bone being the typical cause of lameness among the Arctic peoples).

Etym.: < (or ~) Turk. *mončak (possibly from original *mončok), preserved only (?) as Tat. munčak 'thigh'.

The reconstruction of *mončak 'thigh' finds an exact phonetic analogy in Tat. dial. munčak 'necklace' < Volga-Kipch. *mončak (Berta LTD 181). Pay attention also to Ott. (Radl.) minčik 'Pfote', which may go back to *mončik ~ *mončuk, a formation parallel to *mončak or an alternative outcome of *mončok (> *mončak ~ *mončuk ~ *mončik). The origin and morphological structure of *mončolak remain unclear; while either *-olak or *čolak may be suffixal, the initial segment cannot be identified with any Common Turk. stem. In particular, the derivation from *manj 'step', *manj- 'to walk' (ATG 346b; Clauson 767a) is not likely, because:

(a) The original *a is expected to result in Tat. o rather than in ə;

(b) It would then be necessary to reconstruct the proto-form with *-ajč-, and this cluster could hardly develop into Tat. -nc-. Cf. *ajči > Tat. (Lit.) auči 'hunter' ~ (Sib.) apči (Tumaševa 25); cf. also Tat. (Lit.) ışjaš 'shoulder' < *ajšaš (see *ajšil id., Stachowski GJV 108, § 30.3).

The comparison of Tat. munčak with Ott. pača (< Pers. pājča) 'der untere Teil des Beines oder der Pfote' (VEWT 377a, with a question mark) is phonetically unacceptable.

The vocalism of the Northern Sam. forms supports the reconstruction of Turk. *o in the first, eventually also in the second syllable. The phonetic shape of the medial clusters favours the idea of borrowing from Turk. into Sam.: while the substitution of Sam. *ns- for Turk. *nc- looks quite normal (cf. Ural. *nc- > Sam. *ns-), Sam. *ns- could be expected to be preserved in Turk. (if the direction of borrowing were the opposite). Still, it cannot be excluded that the historical relationships between Sam. and Turk. forms were more complicated.

In Ngan. munsu̱də the original *-k(kj) has been replaced by the suffix -də- exactly as in sūšu̱də 'finger joint' < Old Yak. sūšu̱ə, see No. 8.

7. 'snow-storm'

Selk. Taz (Irikov) pusqa 'snow-storm; буран, вьюга, метель, пуруга', (Mat.) pusqatimpa 'the wind is driving the snow', pusqatı̱pa 'a snow-storm arose'.

Etym.: < Turk. *buskak or *buskan, cf. Alt. buskan 'пуруга' (OyrRS 36), Tuv. bı̱skan 'межкий снег' (TuvRS 131), Tel. pı̱skak 'Reif; Schneeblöcke' (Radl.), Shor pı̱skak 'Reif' (Radl.). These forms are probably derived from *bus 'mist, fog, vapour' (EstYa II: 277f.; occasionally also with the meanings 'haze', 'gloom', 'overcast weather', 'dew', 'hoar-frost') and possibly from *biši (dimin. suffix -kan); for the latter stem (a variant of *bus ?) cf. also Tofa bi's (Rassadin 167) 'fresh-fallen snow; снег-пороша' (as distinct from Tofa bus 'mist above open water in winter; туман над полынью в зимнее время'), Tat. bas 'hoar-frost'. Additionally, one must take into consideration the possibilities of semantic (and partly phonetic) contamination < *bir (~ *bur) 'dust, smoke, vapour' (EstYa II: 306f.; Stachowski GJV 123), *bur- 'to whirl' (EstYa II: 264-267), and possibly also < Mong. *borowan 'snow-storm' (borrowed into many Turk. languages) and from Russ. (< Finn.) nypa id. An example of such contamination may be Kirg. (Radl.) burkak 'ein kleines Schneewehen'.

8. 'joint'

En. T (Mat.) šušu̱do 'finger joint, knuckle', soborego šušu̱odo 'fist knuckle' (sobrege 'five') / Ngan. (Ks.) šušu̱odɔy 'Finger, Zehengelenk', šušu̱da 'Finger', (Katzschmann No. 24384) šušu̱da-gata-tu 'finger (El.Sg., 3.Sg.)', (Mat.) sūšu̱dwə 'finger joint, (figuratively) finger'.

Etym.: < Old Yak. *sūšu̱ək (Modern Yak. sūšu̱əx, Dolg. hūhu̱ək 'Gelenk') < Turk. *južgæk or (?) *južgæk (Stachowski
GJV 66, § 8.6c; Stachowsk i DW 115). Another possible source is a non-attested Old Yak. *süsüd (< 3.Sg. *süsüyě < *süsüök, on -VYk vs. -VY in Yak. see also Stachowski JSFOu 85: 186, § 14e).

The Yak. word must have been originally borrowed into Ngan., with a substitution of the nominal stem-formative suffix -đa in place of -k (as in several other Ngan. words; cf. Ngan. munsuđo ‘thigh’ ~ Turk. *moniciğ, No. 6) and with semantic specialization (‘joint’ → ‘finger joint’). The En. word (attested only in the Tundra dialect, closely affiliated to Ngan., but not in En. F) is probably a Ngan. loan. The reconstruction of a common NSam. source for En. sušuđo and Ngan. süsüđa is hardly possible.

9. ‘power, craft’

Selk. Taz (OSYa a 2: 175-176) šaŋ ‘strength, power; craft (of a shaman)’, cf. also šaŋkijil’ ‘powerless’, šaŋṣišjil’ ‘powerful, mighty’.


Concerning Selk. -ŋ in place of Turk. -k (<ŋ, -ŋ) see No. 10.

The borrowing must have occurred after the introduction of š into the phonological system of Selkup (Selk. š usually from Sam. *k before a front vowel) and the transition *č > š in a number of NE Turk. idioms (Turk. *č would have been reflected as Selk. *č or *ř, resp. as Selk. Taz t or ḍ), but certainly before the ancestors of Taz Selkups lost contact with their former Turkic neighbours (that is, before their northward migration in the 17th century). The borrowing of the same word into Kamassian must have occurred independently (see in this connection Joki LSS 36-37).

The semantic evolution of the word was as follows: ‘time’ > ‘the right/convenient time or moment’ > ‘maturity’ > ‘strength, power’ (all the meanings are known from the Ott. lexicology).

10. ‘mountain (wooded)’

The following important comparison, suggested by T. Máár in 1975-1976 (Máár NéNy 19-20: 252), is not mentioned in later works, including the most comprehensive list of Turk. loans in Selk. (Filippova JSFOu 85: 41-70).


Eym.: < Turk. *tāŋ ‘mountain, esp. wooded mountain’.

The word seems to be unknown to other Sam. languages. Selk. *-ŋ (~ -k ~ -‰) may go back to a velar stop, as in Vx1Sg. subj. conj. -ŋ ~ -k < *-k (Helimski DVSYaP 80), in keŋ ~ kak ‘as’ < Russ. kak id. (Castrén Gr. 605) or in KeM kūnny ‘kurzer Pelz aus Rentierfell’, KeO kūnny id. from Turk. kūnny, kūnny (= Ott. gömlük), etc. ‘shirt’ (Joki LSS 215). The semantic development in Northern Selkup (‘wooded mountain’ > ‘taiga on a high place’) is related to the natural conditions of the lowlands in the Taz river basin.

11. ‘single, unmarried’


Eym.: < Turk., cf. esp. Brb. (Dm. 192) uvil ‘son; fellow, unmarried young man’ < *ogil ‘son; fellow’ (with Turk. *o > Brb. u, Turk. *-g- > *-ŋ > Brb. -v~).

The substitutions u > ů (in an open syllable before a non-resonant), v > p are characteristic of (relatively recent) loanwords in Selkup, cf. e.g. Selk. Taz rūšjı ‘Russian (adj.)’, ruş ‘Russian (n.)’ < Ostyak rūš, ruš; Selk. Taz sjipjıč’a ‘pig, swine’ < Russ. свинья (OSYa 1: 13; DEWOS 1288-1289).
The Siberian (Baraba) Tatar word must have been borrowed into Selkup in its special meaning ‘fellow, unmarried young man’ (> ‘bachelor’). This assumption is supported by the fact that the Turk. word has the meaning ‘son’ only if it has a possessive suffix, i.e. for instance үүли (3.Sg.), while Selk. *үүрл obviously reflects the non-possessive form of the word. The further semantic development in Selkup (> ‘riding’) may look bewildering, but it has an absolutely exact parallel in the neighbouring Ostyk language: Ostyak ыдыр ‘ledig, unverheiratet’ ~ ыдыр ‘reitend, rittlings, верхом’, cf. also DN вело ‘ledig, unverheiratet’ ~ вело-тав ‘Reitpferd’ (тав ‘Pferd’), see DEWOS 1587-1588. The likely semantic development was the following one: ‘single, free’ > ‘travelling/running freely (i.e. without a sledge)’ > [1] ‘riding’, [2] ‘saddle horse’.
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