Ante Aikio

New and Old Samoyed Etymologies
(Part 2)¹

This paper is a sequel to New and Old Samoyed Etymologies published in FUF 56, offering etymological equations between Samoyed and Finno-Ugric languages, including both new etymologies and arguments supporting previous comparisons that have not been accepted in the strictest modern treatments of the Proto-Uralic lexicon. A total of fourteen Samoyed word families are analyzed as inherited from Proto-Uralic.

0. Introduction

This paper is a follow-up to New and Old Samoyed Etymologies, published in FUF 56 (Aikio 2002). As in the earlier paper, the purpose is to present previously undiscovered Uralic etymologies for Samoyed words as well as to rehabilitate word comparisons presented in earlier literature but ignored or rejected in the strictest modern comparative treatments (Janhunen 1981; Sammallahti 1988). First, some recent developments in Samoyed historical phonology are briefly summarized below. Both new and old etymological equations between Samoyed and various other Uralic languages are argued for in Section 1, and Section 2 includes addenda and corrigenda to the etymologies published in the previous paper.

The reconstruction of Proto-Samoyed vocalism applied in this paper differs in certain respects from that in earlier studies. Helimski (2005) has recently offered new findings in Nganasan historical phonology that require the revision of the reconstructed Proto-Samoyed vowel system. It was previously assumed that Proto-Uralic (PU) *e, *i and *ü had merged into *i in Proto-Samoyed (Janhunen 1981: 247; Sammallahti 1988: 484), but the data presented by Helimski shows that the reflexes of PU *e have remained distinct from those of PU *i and *ü in Nganasan. PU *i and *ü yield Nganasan i (u), whereas PU *e is reflected as i (e). The high value of i is apparently due to a very recent sound change, as Castrén’s notations from the nineteenth century have e, ê in its place. Compare the following examples in Helimski:

¹
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PU *nimi ‘name’ > Ngan *nim id. (Castrén *nim)
PU *pidi ‘high, long’ > Ngan *pira ‘high’ (Castrén *pira)
PU *nūdi ‘shaft’ > Ngan *iri id. (Castrén *iri)
PU *meni ‘to go’ > Ngan *mendem id. (Castrén *mendem)
PU *wet ‘water’ > Ngan *bē’ id. (Castrén *bē’)
PU *pesä ‘nest’ > Ngan *nres id. (not attested by Castrén)

Since the representations of PU *i and *e are identical in the rest of the Samoyed languages, Nganasan is the only Samoyed language that has preserved this distinction. On the basis of the Nganasan representation, Helimski proposes the following modified Proto-Samoyed vowel system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helimski 2005:</th>
<th>cf. Janhunen 1977:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ü i</td>
<td>ü i i ü u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ö e ı ə e o</td>
<td>ö e ı ə e o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>á a å å å</td>
<td>å å å å</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The changes to the reconstructed vowel system are greater than the mere paradigms reveal. Janhunen’s *i has two correspondents in Helimski’s revised system, *i and *e, the first of which yielded Nganasan *i and the latter *ı. Janhunen’s *e corresponds to Helimski’s *ä, and Janhunen’s *ä to Helimski’s illabial back vowel *a. Hence, the relationships between the system can be described by the following rewriting rules:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Janhunen 1977</th>
<th>Helimski 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*i (&gt; Ngan ı), *e (&gt; Ngan ı)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*ä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ä</td>
<td>*a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further thing to note is that in several references PS *a has been applied instead of *ā in Janhunen 1977, as was also the case with the previous part of this paper (Aikio 2002). In the renewed reconstruction, however, *a corresponds to Janhunen’s *ä.

No changes have been made to the reconstructed values of the vowels in non-initial syllables: *ä and *ā behave as a vowel harmonic pair as already appears in Janhunen’s reconstruction. Hence, the modified reconstruction explains the peculiar phonotactic status that PS *ā had in Janhunen’s reconstruction, in which *ā behaved harmonically as a back
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vowel in stressed syllables but as a front vowel in unstressed syllables (Janhunen 1998: 466). Since these are no longer identified as the same phoneme in the new reconstruction, there is no need to postulate a dual harmonic status for this vowel.\(^3\)

For the sake of readers better acquainted with the traditional reconstruction by Janhunen, that form is also given in parentheses where it differs from the new one. The reconstructions according to the older system are indicated by the abbreviation “JJ” (e.g., Proto-Samoyed *ket ‘shape, figure’ = JJ *kit). The data from the various Samoyed languages is cited according to the same principles as in Aikio (2002), except that the recently published Nganasansko-russkij i russko-nganasanskij slovar’ (NgSlov) by Kosterkin, Momde & Zhdanova and Sölkupisches Wörterbuch (SlkWb) by Alatalo have been used as the sources of Nganasan and Selkup data respectively. A phonologization key for the Nganasan forms written in Cyrillic can be found in Wagner-Nagy (2002: 29–31). As for Selkup, only the abstract ‘common Selkup’ form which appears as the headword in the word articles in SlkWb is cited. Even though the headwords cannot always be equated with Proto-Selkup reconstructions (ibid.: xv), they can be interpreted as such in the case of old vocabulary discussed in this paper.

1. The etymologies

1.1. PS *äjä ‘meat, body’ [> NenT ngaya ‘body’, EnF aja id., Slk uščora ‘meat’, Kam aja ‘meat; body’], der. *äjä-på(-j)q ‘raw, uncooked’ [> NenT ngayabey id., EnF ajbi id., Ngan (Castrén) ~ òdba id., Slk uščorø id.] (SW: 17; JurWb: 15; MWbEnz no. 25, 27; SlkWb no. 162; KamWb: 80)

< PU *ođa ‘wet, raw; (raw) meat’

Paasonen (1917: 46–47) has compared the Samoyed forms reflecting PS *äjä-på(-j)q ‘raw’ to Komi ul ‘moist; raw, uncooked’ and Udm if ‘moist; fresh; weak’ (< PPerm *uľ). He also included Mari ile ‘moist, raw’ and MsW il, il’, MsS ul ‘sap’ in this cognate set. Mari ile is clearly a borrowing from Udmurt on account of its phonological shape, however. UEW (73–74) accepts the comparison between Permic and Mansi and reconstructs a proto-form *elä ‘moist’, but makes no mention of Paasonen’s comparison with Samoyed. However, the comparison between Permic and Mansi is not phonologically regular, because the Permic vocalism presupposes an origi-
nal *u or *ū in the first syllable. Moreover, UEW actually presents the same Mansi word as a member of a different cognate set as well: on p. 23 MsW il’ is compared to KhN āl, KhE āl, KhS ēl ( ← PKh *āl), SenF nyilī and Slk ēlu, all meaning ‘sap’, as well as SaaN ǎlus ‘the sap layer in a tree’. The proto-form of these words is reconstructed as *āl2. As the Mansi word cannot simultaneously belong to two separate cognate sets, and its semantics agrees rather with the ‘sap’ word family, there is no reason to assume any connection with PPerm ǔl ‘moist; raw’.4

Paasonen’s comparison did not take into account that the Samoyed items can be analyzed as derivatives of the PS noun *ājā ‘meat, (> body’ but, even when this is acknowledged, the comparison with Permic remains quite regular since one can posit the Proto-Uralic form *oša, which regularly gives both PS *ājā ‘meat’ and PPerm *ǔl ‘raw; moist’. The Udmurt cognate shows sporadic illabialization *u > i, for which many parallels are known (see E. Itkonen 1954: 317; Lytkin 1964: 21–22).

The etymology is semantically quite straightforward, as the ‘raw’ sense is attested both in Permic and the Samoyed derivative *ajā-pā(-jö). The Permic cognates also show the sense ‘moist’, but the connection between ‘wet, moist’ and ‘raw’ is attested in numerous parallels; cf., e.g., SaaN njuoska biergu ‘raw meat’, literally “wet meat”. A parallel for the connection between ‘raw’ and ‘meat’ occurs in Greek kréos ‘meat, flesh’ ~ Sanskrit kravīs ‘raw meat’ ~ English raw, German roh ‘raw’ (and Russian krowx, Lithuanian kraužas ‘blood’) (Buck 1965: 202).

There is also another word in Permic that can be explained as a derivative of the same root: Komi uši ‘fat, stout, thick’ and Udm il´s ‘stout, thick’ ( ← PPerm *ūlšs). The meaning ‘fat, stout’ is noteworthy, as it could not have developed directly from ‘wet, raw’. Instead, this word confirms that the meaning ‘meat’, or the like, has occurred earlier in Permic as well (cf. Finn. lihava ‘fat, stout’ ← liha ‘meat’). The ‘fat’ sense is also attested in Samoyed derivatives, e.g., NenT ngayом- ‘to become fat’.

1-2. PS *juņa ‘lichen (on trees?)’ [ > NenT yuy ‘lichen on trees’, Ngan dwa ‘lichen’] (JurWb: 140; NgSlov: 44)
< PU *jëwji (*janji?) ‘lichen on trees’

The Nenets and Nganasan words cited above have traditionally been considered cognate with Saa elvjam ‘lichen on trees’ and KhE jej ~ jej, KhS jëj id. (Sammallahti 1979: 28; UEW: 96). Janhunen (1981) did not accept
the etymology in his Proto-Uralic corpus, however, and Sammallahti has also left the etymology out of his revised Uralic word list (1988). However, the comparison appears to be quite satisfactory.

SaaMI provides the best basis for phonological reconstruction. SaaI jievjäm goes back to PSaa *jievjemë, and from this reconstruct one can also derive SaaN jievjun ‘lichen on trees’ (GenSg jievjuma); the second-syllable labial vowel in SaaN is probably secondary because of the influence of the following *m. There is also a cognate in South SaaMI, which shows irregular vocalism: joevjeme ~ jovjeme ‘lichen on trees’ (< PSaa *ju(o)jvjemë). The labial vowel has perhaps developed because of the influence of the following v; however, folk-etymological contamination with the word joevje – jovje ‘light grey reindeer’ also seems possible. The latter word seems to be of different origin (see below).

Assuming that the North and Inari SaaMI forms with -ie- are regular, their Uralic predecessor can be reconstructed as *jäwji-, and the final *-më in SaaMI analyzed as a suffix. A less likely possibility is the reconstruct *jewji-, as Uralic *e-i should regularly give PSaa *e–ë instead of *ie–ë. However, the sporadic *e >> *ie development has a possible parallel in PU *lewë ‘breath, spirit’ > PSaa *lievë > SaaN lievla ‘vapor, steam’. Saal lievlâ id. (unless this is a Finnic loanword, cf. Finn löyly ‘steam in a sauna bath’).

The Khanty cognates show unclear dialectal oscillation between PKh *ě and *e, cf. KhE jej ~ jëj, KhS jëj (DEWOS: 317). Regardless of which one of these forms is interpreted as primary, the comparison with SaaMI poses no problem. PKh *e is the regular reflex of PU *ä in all positions except next to velars. PKh short *ě, on the other hand, could be explained by the alternative reconstruction *jewji. The development of PU *e(–i) > PKh *ě is regular before single consonants (cf. Sammallahti 1988: 504), cf. PKh *meni- ‘to sell, give’ > PKh *më(j)j-, PKh *meni- ‘to go’ > PKh *mën-, PKh *peli- ‘to be afraid’ > PKh *pëli-, PKh *teki- ‘to do, make’ > PKh *tëj- ‘to weave’, PKh *werë ‘blood’ > PKh *wër. The word *jewji / *jäwji could also be counted in this group, as the *w glide was probably lost at an early stage.

Thus, there are solid grounds for reconstructing the Uralic word *jäwji (or less likely, *jewji) ‘lichen on trees’ on the basis of SaaMI and Khanty. Samoyed *jüjö id. can also be included in this cognate set. A preconsonantal *w was regularly dropped in Samoyed: cf. PU *tawöö ‘full’ > PS *tärö (= JJ *terö) (Aikio 2002: 31–34). PU *swöö ‘finger’ > PS *tajö (Sammallahti 1988: 540). PU *kawöö (~ *këwöö?) ‘rope’ > PS *kärsa (see 1.6.). Notably, the lost *w has occasionally left a trace of itself behind since it is likely that
the labial vowel *ü in PS *jüja developed via assimilation to the following *
which was later lost. Even though this labialization does not seem to be a
regular change (cf. PU *täwö ‘full’ > PS *tärö = JJ *terö), there is a parallel: PU *
? ~ *kewöi ‘rope’ > PS *kürö (see 1.6.).

Finally, we can return to Saami. As noted above, there is also another
PSaa word family the stem of which is homonymous with that of the word
for ‘lichen on trees’, namely, PSaa *jievj ‘(very) white, snow-white; snow-
white reindeer’ (> SaaN jievja etc.). This seems to be a distinct word on
semantic grounds, as lichen on trees is characteristically grey rather than
white. Indeed, a Scandinavian loan etymology can be pointed out since the
word is a borrowing from Germanic *heuja- (> later *hiuja-) ‘appearance,
color, etc.’ > Gothic hiwi ‘form, appearance’, English hue. This etymology
is treated in more detail in Aikio (forthcoming). This color adjective also
shows the irregular vowel *uo in SaaS: juovje ~ jovje ‘greyish white rein-
der’. However, in this case the vowel can be explained on the analogy of
other color terms ending in -ovevje: cf. SaaS moevje-miesie ‘a reindeer calf
with a whitish brown color’ (miesie ‘reindeer calf’), SaaS boevje ‘moss-
colored, greyish black reindeer’, as well as *teovje (this has word has not
been attested in SaaS, but it would be the predictable reflex of PSaa *cuovje
‘grey; blue’, which has cognates in all the other Saami languages; see YSS
no. 215).

PS *korä ‘bent, crooked; bend’ (> NenT čora ‘bent, crooked; river
bend; debt’, Ngan ḫəpy ‘manner, habit’, (der.) ḫəpyşyca ‘to get accustomed
to, into the habit of something’, Slk (der.) kar ‘bend’, karukka ‘bent,
crooked (of trees)’, Kam kărål ‘åm ‘to wind itself’) (SW: 55; JurWb: 151;
NgSlov: 83–84; SlkWb no. 2225; KamWb: 26)
< PU *kura ‘bent, crooked; bend’

Janhunen (SW: 55) reconstructs PS *korä ‘bent, crooked’ on the basis of
Nenets, Selkup and Kamas forms. One can also add Ngar ḫəpy ‘manner,
habit’ to this cognate set; we may assume the semantic development ‘bend’
> ‘inclination (“bending”) towards something’ > ‘manner, habit’. A parallel
occurs e.g. in Finnish taipuvainen ‘inclined to’, literally “bending” (a
derivative of taipu- ‘to bend’).

PS *korä is the regular correspondent of Komi (der.) kirijšen ‘askew;
unfriendly (of look, eyes)’, Udm (der.) kirž ~ kirž ‘bent, crooked’, and
KhE kōr, KhS, N čör ‘reach, stretch of a river (usually straight, sometimes
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curving)’ (< PKh *kōr). The PU root can be reconstructed as *kura. UEW accepts the comparison (220), but the Proto-Uralic corpora of Sammallahti (1979; 1988) and Janhunen (1981) do not include it.

Finn. (dial.) kura ‘left’ and Est. kura id. can also be added to the cognate set; cf. also SaaN gurut ‘left’, which is a Finnic loanword. The sense ‘left’ frequently derives from senses such as ‘bad’, ‘weak’, ‘crooked’, etc. Latin laevus ‘left’ (< ‘bent’) serves as an exact parallel; Russian levyat ‘left’ also is of the same etymology (Walde 1965 s.v. laevus). Another parallel is provided by Norwegian keive ‘left hand’, which is a derivative of keiv ‘crooked, bent’ (Bjorvand & Lindeman 2000 s.v.).

1.4. PS *käntə- ‘to hunt; to kill; sacrificial animal’ [> NenT čan ‘sacrificial animal’, (der.) čanos- ‘to murder’, EnT (der.) kadu‘i ‘murderer, assassin’, Ngun kontə ‘sacrificial animal’, konty ‘skilled, lucky hunter’, kontə ‘catch’, kondis- ‘to murder, assassinate’, kondi’mə ‘murderer, assassin; band leader; rascal’; Mat (der.) kandəgat ‘pugnacious, eager to fight’] (JurWb: 170; NgSlov: 69; MatSpr: 265–266)

< PU *konta- ~ *kunta- ‘hunting party; to hunt, to catch, to kill’

The Finno-Ugric reconstruct *kunta ‘group of people, etc.’ is well-known in etymological literature. This proto-form is posited on the basis of Finn. kunta ‘municipality’ (in compounds ‘a particular group of people’: perhekunta ‘household’, sukukunta ‘(extended) family; tribe’, kyläkunta ‘village community’, kansakunta ‘nation’), MsW kõnt, MsS känt ‘troop; war’ and Hung had ‘troop, band; war’ (UEW: 206; SSA s.v. kunta; Sammallahti 1988: 544). The endogenous ethnonym of the Khanty (KhE kantja ‘the Khanty’, KhS čantə ‘Khanty’, KhN čänti ‘man, person; Khanty’ < PKh *kantja) likely also belongs to this group, even though the vowel (PKh *ä) is not regular. MdM koindä ~ kuindä ‘friend, companion’ has also been cautiously compared to these forms, but this is somewhat uncertain because of the unexplained palatalization. SaaN -goddi in compounds such as beara-goddi ‘household’ and sohka-goddi ‘(extended) family, tribe’ has also been considered cognate, but because this word is only attested in compounds with identical correspondents in Finnish, it is probably a loan from Finnic. On the other hand, SaaN goddi ‘wild reindeer’ seems to be the inherited cognate of Finn. kunta, as pointed out by Koivulehto (1988: 26).

The meaning of the word may have developed via a taboo-motivated circumlocution (‘hunters, hunting party’ > ‘the catch of the hunters’), wild
reindeer being a very important game animal for the ancient Saami. In etymological references (e.g., UEW: 206–207) SaaN goddi has been compared to MsW kunna, MsE çonya, MsS konkä ‘reindeer’ and EnF keede’ ‘wild reindeer’, but this equation may be rejected owing to the irregular consonant correspondences.

The Finno-Ugric word is an old nomenverbum: a verbal form *kunta- is reflected in Finn (dialect) kunta ‘to grab, etc.’ (-i- is a frequentative suffix), SaaN goddit ‘to kill; to catch (fish)’, MdE kundams ‘to grab, take hold of; to catch’, and MsN çont-, MsE çont-, MsW kont-, MsS kant- ‘to find; to see’. NenT xanye- ~ xanye- ‘to hunt, pursue game’ and EnF kadaš ‘to hunt, catch’ (? < *kånjå-) have also been considered uncertain cognates (UEW: 207; SSA s.v. kunne), but the unusual cluster -nÿ- (= [nj]) in Nenets makes this suggestion problematic. The word could only belong in this connection if an irregular syncope has taken place (*kånjå-? < *kânjå- < *kåntjå-, or the like). Even though the semantics of the attested nominal and verbal forms are quite distant, they are related through the concept of hunting, as suggested by Sammallahti (1988: 544): the noun *kunta may originally have designated a ‘hunting party’. The semantic development would then have been approximately ‘hunters’ > ‘the catch of the hunters’ > ‘wild reindeer’ in Saami, ‘hunting party’ > ‘tribe’ > ‘(a particular) group of people’ in Finnic, and ‘hunting party’ > ‘raiding party’ > ‘troop’ in Ugric.

A frequentative derivative, *kunta-li-, can also be reconstructed, which shows the innovative sense ‘to listen’: cf. Finn. kuunnella ~ dial. kunnella ‘to listen’ (the long vowel is secondary, probably the result of the influence of kuulla ‘to hear’), KhE kunyol-, KhS çuntt- ‘to hear’ (< PKh *kuntyl-), MsW kontl-, MsS k’antl- ‘to listen’ (< PMs *k’antl-). Hung hall ‘to hear’ (< Old Hung hadl) (UEW: 207–208; Sammallahti 1988: 544). This semantic development has probably taken place along the lines ‘to hunt, catch’ > ‘to try to catch’ > ‘to try to find, locate, perceive game’ > ‘to listen’.

As regards the sound correspondences, it is noteworthy that only Saami and Northern Finnic unambiguously seem to support the traditional reconstruction *kunta, whereas some forms seem rather to suggest PU *konta instead. In Estonian one encounters -o- (-kond in perekond ‘household’, hõimkond ‘(extended) family, tribe’, etc.), and there is also a possible trace of -o- in Northern Finnic. Finn. kontu ‘farm, dwelling, homestead’ which might be a derivative of *konta (this suggestion derives from Janne Saarikivi, pers. comm.). In this case the semantic development could have been ‘tribe, group of people inhabiting a certain area’ > ‘homestead, area in the usu-
fruct of a particular group’, which can be compared to Finn. kunta in its modern sense of ‘municipality’; cf. also the compounds maakunta ‘province’, valtakunta ‘kingdom, realm, empire’. A similar semantic development apparently took place in Mari kundem ‘area, territory, district’, which has been compared to the kunta word family by Saarikivi (2005). The reconstruction *konta also accords better with MdE kundams as well as Hung had and hall (<_had>.

Two variants, *kunta and *konta, can thus be posited. The irregular oscillation between o and u is apparently quite old in this word-stem, and its background remains unclear. It can be noted, however, that there are also a couple of other Uralic items showing inconsistency between *u and *o in their reflexes. Compare the following examples: 1) PS *kämpä ‘wave’, Hung hab ‘wave, foam’, MdM kumboldo- (< PU *kompa) ~ Finn. kummata ‘to well forth’, kumpu ‘hill’ (< ‘wave’), SaaL kábbä ‘hill’ (< PU *kumpi); 2) Est mõske ‘to wash’, PS *mäso- id. (< PU *moški-) ~ Komi mįški-, Hung mos (< PU *muški-); 3) SaaN goika ‘to dry’ (< PU *kaški-) ~ Mari koške-, Komi koš-mį-, PS *käso- id. (< PU *kaški-).

The reconstruction of the *konta variant is supported by a previously unnoticed Samoyed cognate. One can add a Samoyed word family to this etymological set, the underived root of which is attested in NenT xan ‘sacrificial animal’ and Ngan kontø id. (< PS *käntø). Senses connected with ‘killing’ and ‘hunting’ are also attested in derivatives: NenT xanos- ‘to murder’, EnT kod’i ‘murderer’, Ngan kondás- ‘to murder’ (< PS *käntos-), Ngan kont’g ‘skilled, lucky hunter’, kontø ‘catch’. The semantic scope of the Samoyed word family corresponds very well to the established Finno-Ugric cognate set, and the PS form *konta also matches the reconstructed PU variant *konta phonologically. The PU *o > PS *â shift is regular before consonant clusters, and the stem vowel reduction *a > *o is also frequent in Samoyed (Janhunen 1981: 226–230).

1.5. PS *ket (= JJ *kit) ‘shape, appearance, figure’ [= NenT syiq ‘shape, figure’, EnT ší ‘resemblance, similarity, likeness; omen, sign’, Ngan ciit’ ‘shape, figure, appearance; picture; shadow’; also grammaticalized as a personal pronoun stem: Ngan čiit’ ‘he, she’, čiitk ‘they’; NenT syiq-, EnT ší ‘(personal pronoun stem used in the accusative case, in Nen and En in the genitive as well)’] (SW: 70–71; JurWb: 442; MWbEnz no. 2406, 2407; NgSlov: 161; SlkWb no. 2428) < PU *keti ‘skin, hide’
PS *ket ‘shape, appearance, figure’ is attested as an independent noun in Nenets, Enets and Nganasan. In addition, the word-stem combined with possessive suffixes occurs as a grammaticalized element in certain case forms of personal pronouns. Irregular loss of the root-final *-t accompanied this grammaticalization in Selkup. Note that the Nganasan personal pronouns syty ‘he, she’, sytyú ‘they’ (< old Nganasan sete, seten), which are based on this word-stem, have been incorrectly compared to Finn. *se ‘it’ and MdE *se ‘it, that over there’ in etymological references (SSA s.v. se; UEW: 33–34). Helimski (1982: 88–97) has argued that the pronominal element *ket(-) attested in Samoyed also occurs in the accusative forms of certain Hungarian personal pronouns: cf., engem ‘me’, téged ‘you (acc.)’ (? < *űnêkem, *töngentí); this may be the case, even though it has also been suggested that the Hungarian -g- in these forms derives from an earlier *-η- (cf. Kulonen 1993: 78). However, no lexical cognates from other Uralic languages have been suggested for PS *ket ‘shape, figure’.

As PS *ket would regularly reflect either PU *keti or *kesi, it can be compared to the word *keti ‘skin, hide’ which has reflexes in the westernmost branches of Uralic: MdE, M keder ‘skin, hide’, Finn kesi (kete- ‘thin skin’ (cf. also the derivative ket-tä- ‘to skin’), SaaK -kedd – -kedd ‘skin, hide’ (only in compounds), e.g., a'id-kedd ‘hide of a reindeer cow’, vü'ss-kedd ‘hide of a reindeer calf’ (< PSaa *ketë). In North and Inari Saami, the word has become grammaticalized as a derivational suffix which forms the names of hides, its suffixal status being determined by the presence of morphophonological alterations which are regular in derivatives but do not occur in compounds: cf. SaaN sarvvåskat ‘hide of a reindeer bull’ < sarvvis ‘reindeer bull’, which shows the vowel change i > â before PSaa *e in a suffixal syllable (PSaa *s ervës-k ete >> *s ervåsket).

In Samoyed one can postulate the semantic development ‘skin’ > ‘body’ > ‘form, appearance, figure’. Wilkins (1996) has examined natural tendencies of semantic shifts in body-part vocabulary, and found the closely related chain ‘skin’ > ‘body’ > ‘person’ to be one such natural shift. There are indeed numerous parallels for this: cf., e.g., SaaN gärvi ‘appearance, form’ < Finn. karva ‘hair; (dial. also) color of hair, color; nature, character’; Finn. iho ‘(human) skin’ ~ Carelian iho ‘form, appearance; face, cheek; skin’; Finn. naama ‘face (pejorative)’, attested in 1745 meaning ‘human skin; appearance’ (the word is possibly a loan from PSaa *nämë ‘furry skin on antlers’, cf. SSA s.v.); English hue (previously ‘form, appearance’), Gothic hiwi id. ~ Swedish hy ‘(human) skin’ (cf. also Finn. hiipä ‘(human)
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skin’ and *hius ~ *hivus ‘hair (on the head)’, which are borrowings from this Germanic word family); Norwegian *ham ‘(outer) skin; appearance, form, shape; ghost’; KhN *estì ‘appearance, figure’ ← *e ‘skin; body’; SaaT *koyye ‘hair, color (of reindeer); figure, shape’.

Moreover, the grammaticalization of PS *ket- into a supplementary stem of various personal pronouns also corroborates this assumed semantic shift. It is likely that this development took place when the intermediate ‘body’ sense still occurred in Samoyed. It is more natural to assume the development ‘(my/your/his/etc.) body’ > ‘me/you/him’, than to derive the pronominal forms from the ‘shape, figure’ sense (‘his shape’ > ‘him’, etc.). There are numerous examples in the world’s languages of a lexeme meaning ‘body’ developing into a (reflexive) pronoun (Heine & Kuteva 2002: 58–60).

Another etymology has previously been suggested for western Uralic *keti ‘skin, hide’. Koivulehto (1983: 119) has suggested that Finn kesi derives from Pre-Finnic *kenti < Pre-Germanic *skento- (> Germanic *skinba- ‘skin’). The loss of the nasal *-n- would result from analogical generalization based on the predictable regular nominative and partitive forms: NomSg kesi < *keni < *kenti, PartSg ket-tä < *kent-tä (cf., e.g., Finn. kusi ‘urine’ < PU *kusī and Finn. tuta (1sg tunnen) ‘to feel’ < *tunt-ta-k : *tunte-n).

Such a development is in itself possible, and Koivulehto’s etymology for the word susi ‘wolf’ (< *śunsī < *śanti < Indo-European *kynto- > Germanic *hunda- ‘dog’) could serve as a parallel; but the suggestion is complicated by the Mordvin and Saami forms, which do not show the expected *n either. Koivulehto thus suggests that they were borrowed from Finnic after the loss of *n. This interpretation seems problematic because the sound substitution Finn. e > PSaa ē is not reliably attested in loanwords. Instead, PSaa *ēa or (rarely) *ēi has been substituted for Finn. e in borrowings of all ages. It is true there is one case that appears to show the substitution of PS *ē for Finnic *e, namely, SaaN *darvi ‘tar’ < PSaa *terve < Finn. terva id. (unless the Saami item is rather a separate Indo-European borrowing), but this word forms an isolated exception. In light of the Samoyed cognate *ket, the loan etymology of Finn kesi can no longer be maintained.

1.6. PS *kürv- ‘band (for tightening something)’ [> NenT (der.) syur‘q ‘waist band of trousers, etc.’, Ngan (der.) кирику ‘band (for closing a sack, etc.)’, кирмаксы ‘to tighten’] (JurWb: 454; NgSlov: 65)
< PU *kōwTī (? ~ *kewTī) ‘strap, rope’
The word-stem *kür- has unambiguous reflexes in Nenets and Nganasan. There is also a rather similar word in Mator, körü ‘rope, cord’ but, since the vowel -ö- is not a regular reflex of PS *-ü-, it is likely that this word is a borrowing from Tungusic *görä ‘rope, cord’ (Helimski 1997: 288) and is unrelated to the northern Samoyed items. A less likely possibility is that Mator körü derives from PS *kür- but was phonologically influenced by the Tungusic form. In any case, the uncertain status of the Mator item does not pose a problem for the Uralic etymology of the Nenets and Nganasan items.

PS *kür- can be compared to the following well-established cognate set: SaaI kievdä ‘rope of a drift-net’, Finn. köysi ‘rope’, Komi käl ‘string, band’, Udm kal ‘string, band, cord, strap; handle’, KhN ke, kol ‘(leather) strip’ (< PKh *köljy), MsN kraligi, MsW k’alayi, MsE k’aloj, MsS k’alow ‘cord, rope’ (< PMs *k’alayi) (SSA s.v. köysi; Sammallahti 1988: 545; cf. UEW: 135, where the Finnic and Saami cognates are considered uncertain). Mari käl ‘handle’ has also been considered an uncertain cognate, but on phonological grounds it must be a Permic loanword, as argued by Bereczki (1992: 98–99). There are slight vowel irregularities in Finno-Ugric in that Finnic presupposes a PU form *kewTi, whereas all the other cognates indicate PU *käwøi.

The comparison of PU *këwøi ~ *kewøi to PS *kür- is quite straightforward. The loss of preconsonantal *w and the *ö > *r change are regular in Samoyed; see 1.2. for parallels and discussion on the former change. The development of PU *ü (or *e?) into PS *ü is not regular, however – cf. PU tøwøi ‘full’ > PS *türo (= JJ *tøro) (Aikio 2002: 31–34), but a parallel occurs in PU *jëwjëi (?) ~ *jëwjë ‘lichen on trees’ > PS *jëjë (see 1.2.). The labialization of the vowel was apparently caused by the following *w before its regular disappearance in Samoyed.

1.7. PS *ñër ‘wet and sticky substance’ [> NenT nyër ‘sap; white (of an egg)’; Slk ñir ‘sperm’] (SW: 109–110; JurWb: 315; NenSlov: 304; SlkWb no. 1708)

< PU *ñëri ‘wetness, dampness; wet place, bog; wet and sticky substance’

The Samoyed word *ñër has not been etymologized. However, it regularly matches PU *ñëri, which is reflected in the following forms: Komi ñyr ‘bog’, Udm ñur ‘moist, wet; moisture, wetness; bog’, MsN, E ñër, MsW, S ñër ‘bog’, Hung nyirok ‘moisture, wetness; lymph; (dial.) moist, clayey
earth’. The Finno-Ugric comparison is well established (UEW: 324; Sammallahti 1988: 546). To this cognate set one can also add Mari nöre- ‘to become moist, wet’ and MdE, M nar ‘grass, lawn; turf’. The PU *nį- > Mari nō- development appears to be regular; cf. PU *nįxli ‘arrow’ > Mari nölo, PU *nįrkį ‘cartilage’ > Mari nörgö. The Mordvin form is phonologically regular as well.

There is also a possible cognate in Saami, cf. SaaN njuoras ‘soft, not woody yet (of young plants); weak (of an infant, calf, parts of the body, etc.)’, njuorat ‘newborn reindeer calf (which cannot properly stand yet)’, njuorat-màmà ‘newborn baby’ (màmà ‘child’), which are derivatives of a PSaa stem *nuore-. This is the regular reflex of PU *nįri, but it is also possible that the Saami words are cognate with Finn. nuori ‘young’, which requires a proto-form *nőri; SaaN nuorra ‘young’ would then be a Finnic loanword (cf. SSA s.v. nuori). In fact, as suggested by an anonymous reviewer, one could imagine including Finnish nuori in this Uralic etymology as well, in which case one would have to reconstruct PU *nįxri (and PS *ńg(ə)r) to account for the Finnic long vowel: PU *ńıx > *ń > Finnic *d is a regular change. However, this idea is complicated by the Permic cognate nūr which does not support the reconstruction of *x. Pre-Permic *į developed into Proto-Permic *u, the reflexes of Pre-Permic *į (< PU *ńıx) being different; cf. PU *ńįxmi ‘bird-cherry’, *ńįxmi ‘vein, sinew’, *ńįxmi ‘scale’ > Komi and Udm lem, sen, šem. Hence, it remains uncertain whether the Finnic item can be considered a member of the Uralic cognate set.

UEW (324) also cites NenF nyurka ‘aspen’ and Slk nāro ‘bog’ as uncertain cognates of the Finno-Ugric word family. This comparison can be rejected, because the Nenet and Selkup words cannot even belong together on phonological grounds, and neither of them corresponds regularly to the form *nįri. According to SlkWb (no. 1690), Slk nāro is an Evenki loanword; however, it seems to go back to Proto-Samoyed *ńāra, which is also reflected in En noro and Ngan nepya ‘boggy terrain, bog; pudding’ (these cognates were pointed out by E. Helimski, pers. comm.). In contrast, the comparison of PS *ńēr with PU *ńįri is regular. The PU *i > PS *ę shift took place in PS closed syllables; cf., e.g., PU *ńįrkį ‘cartilage’ > PS *ńēr, PU *pįni- ‘put’ > PS *pęni-, PU *įptį ‘hair on the head’ > PS *ęptį. Semantically the comparison between PS *ńēr and PU *ńįri is straightforward, as all branches show the basic sense of ‘wetness’ or ‘wet, sticky substance’ (from which > ‘wet soil, wet terrain’, as well as ‘bog’ in Komi and ‘grass, lawn; turf’ in Mordvin).
The verb root *pojä- ‘to hit, chop wood’ or its derivatives are attested in most Samoyed languages. In Nganasan the reflexes of this word-stem have become contaminated by another semantically and phonetically close item: PS *pojor- > Ngan *xopoča ‘to fetch firewood’, (der.) *xoppy ‘one who gathers or chops firewood’. This contamination took place because both PS *po- and *po- merged into Ngan xo-. However, on account of their Nenets cognates, these words seem to be originally distinct; cf. NenT *pæøq- ‘to chop firewood’ (< PS *pøjä-) vs. *poyor- ‘to fetch firewood’ (< PS *pojor-). The latter item however shows markedly irregular variation within Nenets, the NenF form pyeyolh- (JurWb: 356) pointing to PS *pejor-. The background of this irregularity is obscure, but in any case neither of the Nenets forms corresponds regularly to PS *pojä-.

The Samoyed word family has not been etymologized, but PS *pojä- can be quite regularly matched with a Finno-Ugric word family with widespread cognates. It derives from PU *puoš-, which is also reflected in SaaN bodu- ‘loose, separated’, boddet ‘to cut (a carcass) to pieces’, SaaS bárras ~ barras ‘scattered (of reindeer, people); patchy (of pasture)’, burreddh ‘to scatter, to spread all about’, Finnish pudota ‘to fall’, pudistaa ‘to shake, shake off’, Mari puššita- ‘to break, split (intr.), go asunder’, puššorte- ‘to break (tr.), chop up, cut into pieces’, Udm pilži- ~ pilži- ~ pil- ‘to split; to hoe’, and MsE pal, MsW, Spol ‘chip, shaving’. The j > i change in certain Udmurt dialects is due to the influence of the following palatalized consonant, the same development being attested in a number of other words as well; e.g., vil ~ vil ‘fresh, new’ < PU *wudj (cf. Kel’makov & Saarinen 1994: 44–45). The ‘to fall’ meaning in Finnish (and Karelian) is apparently secondary; elsewhere in Finnic, senses closer to the Uralic word family are attested; e.g., Est pudeneda ‘to crumble; to fall off’, poetada ‘to crumble (tr.); to scatter, strew, drop’ (SSA s.v. pudota). As for the semantic relation between ‘falling’ and ‘scattering’, ‘crumbling’, compare Hawaiian helele‘i i ‘to be falling; to be scattered (like rain, tears, grain); to be crumbling (like the earth)’ (Pukui & Elbert 1986 s.v.). The comparison is phonologically quite satisfying since PU *ŋ > PS *j and PU *u > PS *e (in PU *a-stems) are regular sound laws. The Nganasan
cognate *hōi*di and probably also Mator *hājāl-* suggest PS *-āi-* in the second syllable, which has arisen from the palatalization of preceding *-d (> *j)*, as in PS *kājā-* ‘to leave (tr.)’ < PU *kaśa-* (Janhunen 1981: 274). This palatalization does not seem to be an entirely regular development, however; cf. PS *ājā ‘meat, body’ < PU *ośa-* ‘wet, raw; raw meat’ (see 1.1.), PS *mojā ‘earth’ < PU *muśa-* (Aikio 2002: 22–23) and PS *tjājā ‘finger’ < PU *suumša-* (Sammallahi 1988: 540; cf. Janhunen 1981: 224, Aikio 2002: 34). Nevertheless, the word *kājā-* < *kaśa-* serves as a perfect parallel for the development of the stem vowel.

The wide distribution of this Uralic word family has not been recognized in etymological references. SSA (s.v. *pudota*) tentatively compares the Finnic items to SaaN *bo*du-, but provides no further etymology. On the other hand, UEW (389–390) equates the Mansi and Udmurt forms with SaaN *bœd*t (with no mention of SaaN *bodu-*), but reconstructs the proto-form as *pośša-*. The posited *o* vowel does not actually match any of the cognates suggested. The Mari forms cited above have been equated with Finn. *pudota*, *pudistaa* and Saami *bod*u- ‘loose, separated’ by Saarikivi (2005).

1.9. PS *pāncā* ‘hem, lower edge (e.g., of a parka or tent cloth)’ [‡ NenT *pän* ‘hem (of a piece of clothing, a tent cloth, the tent door)’, EnF (der.) *pādte* ‘seam (in a skin)’, Ṇgan (der.) *xonrōa* ‘hem; skirt’, Slk (der.) *pōncar* ‘hem (e.g., of a parka), edge, border’, Kam (der.) *p’āndār* ‘front of a parka’, ? Mat *handa* ‘lower edge, hem’ (the attestation is uncertain)] (SW: 116; JurWb: 346; MWbEnz no. 729; NgSlov: 197; SlkWb no. 486; MatSpr: 240)

< PU *ponči* ‘tail’

No etymology has so far been suggested for PS *pāncā* ‘hem’. As the word would regularly go back to PU *ponči*, it can be compared to the established reconstruct *ponči* ‘tail’, with the following reflexes: Mari *pač* ‘tail; rear part; lower edge’, Komi *bèž* ‘tail; hem (of a skirt), train (in a woman’s clothing); end, rear part’, Udm *bž* ‘tail’, KhE *poč* ‘heel; neck; back’, MsE, W *ponš* ‘bird’s tail’ (UEW: 535; the meaning of the Komi word is cited here (according?) to Fokos-Fuchs 1959 s.v.). It is also possible that Finnish *potka* ‘knuckle, shin’ and North Saami *boaski* ‘the small of the leg with a shoelace laced up around it’ (< *počka*) reflect an obscured derivative of this word (*po(n)č-ka*), as suggested by Saarikivi (2005).
As regards the Samoyed word, the semantic development ‘tail’ > ‘hem’ (= ‘hanging lower part of a piece of clothing or a tent cloth’) can be easily understood via metaphorical usage, and the same secondary sense has developed in Komi as well; note also the abstract sense ‘lower edge’ attested in Mari.

1.10. PS *sänka- ‘to stick (into)’ [> Slk suŋk -, *sänka ‘penis’ [> NenT sangk’, EnT saqo] (SlkWb no. 2625; JurWb: 406; MWbEnz no. 2116) < PU *šaŋka- ‘to sting, stick’

Slk suŋk- ‘to stick (into)’ (< *sänka-) has no verbal cognates elsewhere in Samoyed, even though the Nenets-Enets noun *sänka ‘penis’ is evidently of the same etymology. The Samoyed words can be compared to PSaa *čuŋkē- ‘to sting, stick’, reflected in such SaaN derivatives as čuŋget ‘to sting, stick’, čuoggut id. (frequentative), and čuokkis ‘dot’. This word family has cognates in all Saami languages except for Ter Saami (YSS no. 201). No etymology has previously been proposed for the Saami word.

The sound correspondence between Saami and Samoyed is regular: one can posit the PU form *šaŋka-, which regularly gives both PSaa *čuŋkē- and PS *sänka-. The PS second-syllable vowel cannot be reliably reconstructed on the basis of Selkup, and the reduced vowel in the noun *sänka ‘penis’ may be secondary. The presumably original *a-stem (> PSaa *ē) is preserved in the Saami derivative čuokkis ‘dot’ (< *čuŋkē-s). One can assume that the Selkup form also goes back to a PU *a-stem, because the regular outcome of the PU form *šaŋki- would be PS *šaŋka- (= JJ *šaŋka-) instead of *sänka-; on the PU *a > PS *a (= JJ *ä) development see Aikio (2002: 50).

The only members of this cognate set appear to be found in Saami and Samoyed. However, this restricted distribution does not impede an otherwise straightforward etymology. Among already established etymologies there are words reconstructed solely on the basis of two branches, e.g., PU *koska ‘aunt, grandmother’ (> PS *kātå, PSaa *koaskē) and PU *wasa ‘left’ (> PS *wāri, PFinn *vasa-).

1.11. PS *sālā ‘sharpness’, *sālā- (? *sāli-) ‘to sharpen, grind’ (= JJ *selē-) [> NenT (irreg.) syil- ‘to sharpen, grind’, Ngan šelj ‘sharpness’, ce.wūd ‘to sharpen’, Slk sel- id., Kam sē’lēm ‘to grind, to rub’], der. *sālū- ‘to rub the antlers against a tree (in order to get the skin off; of reindeer)’ [> NenT
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< PU *sälä- ‘to cut’

The PS verb *sälä- ‘to sharpen, grind’ (= JJ *selä-) is attested in most Samoyed languages. In Nenets the verb appears in the unexplained irregular form syíl- (? < *säjl- = JJ *sejl-), but the expected form is attested in the derivative NenT syelø-, NenF syelhyø- ‘to rub the antlers (of reindeer)’ (< *sälü- = JJ *selü-). PS *sälä- is a regular reflex of PU *sälä- ‘to cut’, which has widespread cognates elsewhere in Uralic: SaaN vcállit ‘to write; to cut’, Finn (der.) säle ‘slat’, Mari v sela- ‘to split’, Komi cselal- ‘to cut, cut up’, KhE sül-, KhN sil- ‘to cut open (a fish, an animal that is butchered)’, MsN sil- ‘to cut’, Hung sel ‘to cut’ (UEW: 470–471). Comparison with Slk selq- ‘to sharpen’ to PU *sälä- has been cautiously suggested by Helimski (1976: 119). Phonologically the comparison is regular, the depalatalization PU *s > PS *s being a well-known sound law. The Permic affricate č- is probably secondary, as in PU *şünkı- ‘to break, to cut’ > Komi čeg-, Udm čigi- (UEW: 31–32; Sammallahti 1988: 549).

The semantics of the Samoyed cognates differ from the sense of ‘to cut’ attested in the other branches. However, there is a close connection between ‘cutting’ and ‘sharpness’. Parallels include Greek κοφτερόζ ‘sharp’, Italian tagliente, French tranchant, Spanish cortante and Romanian tăios ‘sharpness’, all of which literally mean ‘cutting’; note also English sharp, which is ultimately based on Indo-European *sker- ‘to cut’ (Buck 1965: 1070).

The NenT derivative syelø- ‘to rub the antlers’ has often been cited as the cognate of SaaN čallat id. < PSaa *čełe- (SSA s.v. keloa, cf. s.v. sileä; UEW: 35). This comparison is not acceptable on phonological grounds since PSaa *e ~ PS *ã (= JJ *e) is not a regular vowel correspondence, and the preservation of the lateral *l in Samoyed also contradicts the known sound laws. The Saami word presupposes a Uralic *i-stem, but before a high vowel the *l > *j shift takes place in Samoyed; hence, the predictable cognate of PSaa *čełe- is PS *svj- or *sej- (= JJ *sij-). The derivational relationship between NenT syelø- ‘to rub the antlers’ and PS *sälä- ‘to sharpen’ was, with some hesitation, suggested by Helimski (1996: 65), who nevertheless still advocated the equation of this word family with PSaa *čełe-.
Ante Aikio

1.12. PS *titt-, ‘to open’ [> Slk tit-, ‘to open wide (the mouth), to gape’, Kam ŝi’d-, ‘to open’] (SlkWb no. 1096; KamWb: 64)
< PU *tūtki-, ‘to open, spread out’

The PS verb *titt-, ‘to open’ is attested only in Selkup and Kamas. The word can be derived from PU *tūtki- ‘to open, spread out’, which is also reflected in MdE tērkems ‘to open (e.g., one’s mouth, a sack, a coat), to spread out’, Mari tūţka- ‘to spread out (e.g., a curtain, a tent cloth, a net)’. KhS tēwats- ‘to spread to dry (a hide)’, KhE (Salym) sâm tōwattetq ‘to open one’s eyes wide’ (sâm ‘eye(s)’) (< PKh *tōq-). The Mordvin, Mari and Khanty words are considered cognate in UEW (525), but the Samoyed forms have not been previously etymologized. The equation is both semantically and phonologically straightforward. The PU *ū > PS *i and PU *tk > PS *t developments are regular sound laws.

1.13. PS *wålä ? ~ *wälæ ‘song; legend’ [> Ngan bələ̀ ‘song’, EnF bari ‘song’, (?) NenT (der.?) wäl ‘waql ‘legend’] (NgSlov: 30; MWbEnz no. 106; NenSlov: 38, 53)
< PU *wala ‘song’?

Finn. vala ‘oath’, SaaS vuelie ‘yoik (traditional Saami song)’ and MdE, M val ‘word’ are considered cognate in standard references (SSA s.v. vala; UEW: 812), and their proto-form can be reconstructed as *wala.? These words have a previously unremarked Samoyed cognate, Ngan bələ̀ ‘song’, which regularly reflects PS *wålä and PU *wala. The PU *a > PS *ä palatalization is regular after the liquid *; cf., e.g., PU *kala ‘fish’ > PS *kålä, PU *salä ‘to steal’ > PS *tälä-. The etymology is also semantically straightforward, as the ‘song’ sense is attested in Saami as well.

The word has phonologically slightly deviant cognates elsewhere in Samoyed. EnF bari ‘song’ shows a final -i, which would presuppose a proto-form *wälî or *wålî. Ngan bələ̀ cannot reflect such a form; -a alternates morphophonologically with -a- in this word (cf. GenPl bəla”), which demonstrates that it reflects PS *ā. It is thus likely that EnF bari reflects an obscured derivative. There is also a very similar word meaning ‘legend’ in Tundra Nenets, which shows puzzling irregular variation. Tereshchenko (NenSlov) presents the form wa” ă̇ l (phonologically waql ‘? < *waCla) and the variant aal (phonologically wal’) in the Yamal dialect. The background to this variation is unclear, but it seems likely that the word belongs in this
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context. Since the form val would regularly reflect PS *wålq, *wålq, *wålq or *wålq, it could be the cognate of EnF bar ‘song’. However, the waql variant with its -ql- cluster remains obscure. One should also note that there is another similar word family, NenT waxel- ‘to begin to speak’ (a derivative of wa- ‘to speak’ < PS *wålq), and there may be some contamination. However, the Nganasan cognates suggest that the two word families are originally distinct: Ngan buodä ‘to speak’ (< PS *wålq) vs. bql ‘song’ (< PS *wålq).

PS *wårå (? ~ *wårå) ‘mountain, ridge’ (> Ngan ṭop ‘mountain; cliff’, Silk kür ‘grove with fir trees; mountain ridge’, (der.) kūra ‘wooded ridge’, Kam bør ‘mountain, ridge’) (NgSlov: 33; SlkWb no. 2288, 2292; KamWb: 10)
< PU *wara ‘mountain, hill, ridge’

Sammallahti (1988: 551) reconstructs the Finno-Ugric word *wara ‘hill; forest’ on the basis of Saami and Ob-Ugric: cf. SaaS vaerje, SaaN várrj ‘hill, mountain’, SaaK ṿrr ‘forest; wooded hill’ (< PSaa *värē), KhE ur, KhS úr, KhN wur, wūr ‘(wooded) ridge’ (< PKh *wur), MsN ur, MsE wör, MsW wur ‘mountain, peak, top’, MsS or ‘forest’ (< PMs *wūr). Sammallahti also cites Finn. vaara ‘hill, mountain’ as an uncertain cognate. However, this word is only attested in the eastern dialects of Finnish (as well as in Karelian and Vepsian), and is best explained as a Saami loanword, as argued by T. Itkonen (1993). Sammallahti considers the equation between SaaS várrj and the Ob-Ugric items certain, whereas SSA (s.v. vaara) presents it with two question marks. Saarikivi (2004: 204) has also regarded the comparison as highly uncertain.

Indeed, the assumed Saami cognate presupposes an exceptional vowel development. PU *a regularly developed into PSaa *uo, and one would thus expect PU *wara to be reflected as PSaa *vuore. This irregularity does not however pose a great problem for the etymology, as there are also a few other cases where PU *a has irregularly developed into PSaa *ā: cf., e.g., SaaS vāzžit ‘to walk’ < PSaa *vāncē- < PU *wanē- ‘to walk, sneak, move cautiously’ (Aikio 2002: 36–38) and gāskit ‘to bite’ < PSaa *kācke-< PU *kācka- ‘to bite, eat’ (> Finn. (der.) katkera ‘bitter’, Mari kočka- ‘to eat’; UEW: 641). The reconstruction of PU *wara ‘hill’ is supported by a cognate in Samoyed not previously noticed. Ngan ṭop ‘mountain; cliff’ goes regularly back to PS *wårå and further to PU *wara; the word has
further cognates in Selkup and Kamas as well, but the vowel of the second syllable is not reconstructable on the basis of these forms. As a PU word, *wara can in any case be reconstructed on the basis of Ob-Ugric and Samoyed, there being no obstacle to the inclusion of the Saami words in this set as well.

It is also worth noting that PS *wårå ‘mountain, ridge’ closely resembles another PS word, *wår ‘edge’ (> NenT war’, En baro, Ngan dára; SW: 172). It is possible that the two words are ultimately related, as the semantic development ‘edge’ > ‘ridge’, or the like, is not rare; compare English edge, which also means ‘sharp crest of a ridge’, and its Old Norse cognate egr ‘edge, blade; mountain ridge’ (< Proto-Germanic *ägrō). Furthermore, there are also related words meaning ‘edge’ in Ob-Ugric, which are in at least most dialects homonymous with the cognates of PU *wårå discussed above: KhN wur, S år, MsN ur, S or ‘edge’ (see Honti 1982: 196). However, if there is an etymological connection, it remains unclear how the phonological distinction between *wårå ‘mountain, ridge’ and *wår ‘edge’ has arisen in Proto-Samoyed.

Moreover, there is also another phonologically and semantically close but distinct cognate set, *wör ‘hill; forest’ (? < earlier *waxri or *waxri) > Finn. vuori ‘mountain’. Komi vgr ‘forest’, Udm vgr ‘hill, hillock’. KhE wör, KhN or ‘range of hills, wooded ridge, etc.’ (< PKh *wor),” MsN wör, MsE wör, MsS wår ‘evergreen forest’ (< PMs *wår) (UEW: 571; Sammallahti 1988: 551). The relationship between the words *wara and *wör is obscure, as they are not linked via any known derivational process. SSA (s.v. vaara) suggests that the former set might be an old phonological variant of the word *wör, but the background of the assumed variation is left unexplained.

2. Addenda and corrigenda to earlier etymologies

This section includes additional remarks and corrections to the etymologies suggested in the previous New and Old Samoyed Etymologies paper (Aikio 2002). The reconstructions have been updated according to the re-interpreted Proto-Samoyed vowel system. I am obliged to Eugen Helimski, who provided some of the additional Enets and Nganasan cognates from his own field notes.
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2.1. PS *câŋə- ‘to rub, wear out (tr.)’, *câŋ-o- ‘to wear out (intr.)’ < PU *čaŋə- ‘to beat; to rub’ (Aikio 2002: 11–12). To this cognate set one can add EnT taa- ‘to wear out (tr.)’, tau- ‘to wear out (intr.)’ (Helimski, pers. comm.)

2.2. PS *jəcə ‘block of wood’ (Aikio 2002: 12–13). Further Samoyed cognates include EnT doño ‘a plank on which leather is curried and cut’, (der.) došio ‘to strike, hit’, došə ‘club, cudgel’. Ngan dətə ‘a stone for breaking bones on’ (Helimski, pers. comm.), Slk čačə ‘club, cudgel’ (SlkWb no. 1474). The medial affricate in Selkup shows that the PS form was *jɔcə instead of *jɔtə as reconstructed in the earlier paper, and hence the reconstruction of a Uralic word *luτa ‘block of wood, wooden tool’ is incorrect. Still, there is a slim chance that the Samoyed items are of Uralic origin after all: PS *jɔcə might derive from PU *luča, which would also be reflected in Finn. luta ‘a tool for removing birch-bark’; in this case the Saami forms (SaaN lohti ‘wedge’, etc.) would be borrowings from Proto-Finnic and not inherited items. However, this idea remains speculative.

2.3. PS *kərpə ‘northern lights; large fire’ < PU *korpi- ‘to blaze, scorch’ (Aikio 2002: 15–16). This comparison is not certain despite the phonological regularity, because the alternative etymology for the Samoyed words is that the word-stem may be a borrowing from Proto-Tungusic *ɡarpa- ‘to radiate light, to shine’, *ɡarpa ‘ray, beam’ (Helimski 1985).

2.4. PS *kär(ə)- (= JJ *ker(ə)-) ‘to dress, put on (clothes, a piece of clothing)’ < PU *käri- ‘to thread, slip’ (Aikio 2002: 18–20). The Uralic origin of the Samoyed word had already been tentatively suggested by Helimski (1976: 118), but this reference was overlooked by me at the time of writing the earlier paper. One can add Komi kər- ‘to fold’ to the Permic cognates listed in Aikio (2002), which reflects the underived stem.

2.5. PS *kätsə- (= JJ *ketsə-) ‘to wrap up, tuck up’ < PU *käki- id. (Aikio 2002: 20). One can add Ngan sætəh ‘to load’, (der.) sætəxə ‘to load (things in a sledge)’ (NgSlov: 150) to the Samoyed cognates. As regards the semantics of this cognate set, it is noteworthy that NenT syédə- also means ‘to give birth’ (NenSlov: 541), which is found in western Saami as well: cf. SaaU geädhkat ‘to give birth (to a child)’, SaaL gierhkat id.; also ‘to tuck up (a child in the cradle)’.
2.6. PS *kısäs- ‘to cool down, get cold’ < PU *kansä- ‘to freeze, get cold’ (Aikio 2002: 21). Additional cognate: EnT kőde- ‘to cool down, get cold’ (Helimski, pers. comm.). There is also another somewhat similar word in northern Samoyed, NenT syincye- ‘to freeze, get cold’ ~ Ngan cuncuđa ‘to get cold’, whose relation to PS *kısäs- is unclear. The Nenets and Nganasan words could reflect the earlier form *kinsä-, but *kinkä-, *sinkä-, *sinäs- are also possible.

2.7. PS *pur ‘smoke’ < PU *purki ‘smoke; blizzard’ (Aikio 2002: 25–27). Slk purka ‘smoke’ may also be a borrowing from P Kh *pőrkaj ‘smoke’ (> KhE pőrkj, KhN pőrga, pőrga) (SlkWb no. 661). However, this would still leave NenT purq (< PS *puṛ-q) as a Samoyed cognate, so that the Uralic comparison remains valid.

2.8. PS *sāj- ‘war; to wage war’ < *sođa- ‘war; to wage war’ (Aikio 2002: 27). An additional derived cognate: Ngan souru ‘warrior’ (NgSlov: 156).


2.10. PS *wānc- ‘to sneak up on’ < PU *wanča- ‘to go slowly and cautiously’ (Aikio 2002: 36–38). An additional cognate: Kam mān’t- ‘to creep’ (KamWb: 38; SlkWb no. 2012).


Notes

1 I would like to thank Eugen Helimski and an anonymous scholar who reviewed this paper, as well as Jorma Koivulehto for comments on an earlier manuscript, and Tapani Salminen for comments on a preliminary draft. All the suggestions have helped to improve the paper.

2 Note that the second reduced vowel *š is unrelated to this issue; this vowel is reconstructed by Helimski in those cases where the schwa behaves as a front vowel in respect to vowel harmony. From the point of view of Proto-Samoyed, the distinction between *š and *s can be interpreted as morphophonological rather than phonemic (Janhunen 1998: 466).
New and Old Samoyed Etymologies

3. Note that in Aikio 2002 I followed the notation applied by Helimski (e.g., 1997), who reconstructed the vowel *e instead of *u in unstressed syllables. This solution avoided postulating dual harmonic status for PS *ä, as well as reserving the unstressed *ä for those cognate sets which show the NenT -ya ~ Ngan -a correspondence in unstressed positions (e.g., NenT xidya ‘cup’ ~ Ngan xara id., NenT ngodya ‘berry’ ~ Ngan yuyla id., NenT yesya ‘iron’ ~ Ngan ada id.). In the renewed reconstruction these can be explained by postulating the illabial back vowel *a (PS *kija ‘cup’, *wota ‘berry’, *wasa ‘iron’) which is distinct from both PS *ä and its harmonic pair *å (T. Salminen, pers. comm.).

4. Admittedly, the vowel correspondences are quite irregular in the alleged ‘sap’ cognate set as well (not to mention PKh *l ~ PMs *l!), and thus borrowing between Samoyed, Khanty and Mansi seems more likely than Uralic inheritance. The Saami word may be of entirely different origin. In any case, there is no reason to connect any of these words with Permic *3ul.

5. A further example of the loss of a preconsonantal *w might be EnF tüdi ‘bait’, Slk tütü id. (MWBEnz: 48; SlkWb no. 1089) < PS *tütü ~ *tütü. This might be an obscured consonant-stem derivative based on PU *swi- ‘to eat’, cf. Finn. syötti ‘bait’ ← syöttä- ‘to feed’ ← syö- ‘to eat’ (< *swi-).

6. The use of the term ‘grammaticalization’ is not meant to imply support for the popular but weakly argued ‘grammaticalization theory’ (see Campbell 2001 for critical discussion).

7. It has been suggested that Finnish vala and its Saami and Mordvin cognates might be onomatopoetic in origin (SSA s.v.). This suggestion is most unlikely, since the reconstructed form *wala cannot be ascribed to any known onomatopoetic convention, and it is even unclear what sound the word is supposed to imitate.

8. I am obliged to T. Salminen for pointing out the Nenets forms.

9. Finn. katkeru has previously been compared to SaaN guoха (guoхca-) ‘rotten’, Mari koč ‘bitter’, KhE kio ‘mold’, MsE ьяръа, MsW kašša, MsS kešk id. (UEW: 113). This comparison is not phonologically acceptable, as the words presuppose a PU form *kičč-, which does not match the -tk- in Finnic. The semantic connection between ‘bitter’ and ‘biting’ has a parallel in Proto-Germanic *bitra- ‘bitter’, which is a derivative of *bita- ‘bite’ (Kluge 1995 s.v. bitter).

10. Note that Honti (1982: 192) and SSA (s.v. vaara, vuori) suggest KhE wor (< PKh *wor) as the reflex of both PKh *wur and *war, whereas KhE ur (< PKh *war) is left unmentioned; cf. DEWOS: 158, 1620.

Abbreviations

EnF Forest (Baj) Enets
EnT Tundra (Maddu) Enets
Est (North) Estonian
EstS South Estonian
Finn. Finnish
Hung Hungarian
Ante Aikio

Kam  Kamas
KhE  Eastern Khanty (Vakh, Vasjugan)
KhN  Northern Khanty (Obdorsk, Kazym)
KhS  Southern Khanty (Demyanka, Konda)
Kam  Kamas
Mat  Mator
MdE  Erzya Mordvin
MdM  Moksha Mordvin
MsE  Eastern Mansi (Konda)
MsN  Northern Mansi (Sosva)
MsS  Southern Mansi (Tavda)
MsW  Western Mansi (Pelymka)
NenF  Forest Nenets
NenT  Tundra Nenets
Ngan  Nganasan
PFinn  Proto-Finnic
PKh  Proto-Khanty
PPerm  Proto-Permic
PMs  Proto-Mansi
PS  Proto-Samoyed
PSaa  Proto-Sami
PU  Proto-Uralic
SaaI  Inari Saami
SaaK  Kildin Saami
SaaL  Lule Saami
SaaN  North Saami
SaaS  South Saami
SaaT  Ter Saami
SaaU  Ume Saami
Slk  Selkup
Udm  Udmurt
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