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The borrowing channels of three words can be relatively easily established:

*ajna* (Arin.) ‘devil’ (VWJ I 21) < Turkic, e.g. Shor, Khak., Oir. ajna id. << Old Pers. hajnâ+ id. (Stachowski 1996: 102). – Unfortunately, the Old Persian etymon, first established by B. Munkácsi (1900) as the source of Ostyak xeına ‘Führer der unterirdischen bösen Heerscharen’ (ibid.) cannot be used as an argument in the discussion of the chronology of the borrowing process as it only signals the ultimate source (not the direct one) of the Turkic words. – The direct borrowing of the Arinian word from Old Persian cannot be excluded on a purely phonetic basis; however, it requires an historical scenario which makes a more or less direct contact possible.3 On the other

1 Cf. Joki 1952: “Einige frühere Forscher hatten die Koibalen und Kotten für eine und dieselbe ethnisch-linguistische Einheit gehalten [...]”

2 Cf. VWJ I 9: “imb. = imbazisch [ketsch 18.Jh.]”.

3 This aspect of our Yeniseiological knowledge still may not be viewed as perfectly understood, nevertheless, newer research points to a possible necessity of restructuring our historical conception of the role and geographical range of the Yeniseic languages, see e.g. the introductory parts in Vovin 2000, 2003. It seems also very tempting to examine once again E. G. Pulleyblank’s concept, who tried to connect the name Čač, being an old name of Tashkent, with Kott šš (not šis, against Aalto 1987) = Ket tyšš and other Yeniseic names for ‘stone’ (cf. Turkic taš-kent, lit. ‘stone-city’). Penti
hand, no phonetic or morphological feature of the word suggests another channel than the Turkic one.

*molat* (Arin. ~ molo\[
\]
t (Koib.) ~ balat (Ass.) ~ bolat (Ket: Castrén) 'steel' (VWJ I 139) = Shor (SS), Khak. molat, Tof. bolat, Oir. bolot ~ polot id. = Mo. bolot ~ bolod ~ bolud id. (Joki 1952: 96) = Mator bolat id. (Helimski 1997, Nr. 136) < Pers. pula\[
\]
t id. (Stachowski 1993: 251; 2002: 8). – The m- variants point unequivocally to the Turkic mediation, whereas Ass. balat and Kott bolat may reflect Turkic and Mator bolat or Mo. bolad.

*nān ~ nān ~ nān* (Imb.) 'bread' [= modern Ket na`n ~ nay`n, Yug ne`n id.] (VWJ II 26) < Uralic na\[
\]

***

Some more questions arise when discussing the Yeniseic word for 'beer':

*syrā* (Arin.) ~ si\[
\]
rā (Ass.) ~ sera || šera (Kott: Castrén) ~ šira (Kott: Klaproth) ~ si-

hirā (Kott: Mueller) id. = Ottom. šire 'juice' ~ Čuv. sîra 'beer' ~ Koib. (-Turkic) šere id. ~ Oir., Kirgh. syra id. < Pers. šira 'juice; syrup, treacle' (ultimately related to English sour, Aalto 1971: 30; 198: 7). – Since Pers. š always reverts to Old Pers. *ś* (Pisowicz 1985: 174), no older Persian variant like *śiva* has to be assumed. On the other hand, there is no necessity for Turkic to change the initial *ś*- > *s-. Consequently, the existence of *ś*- and *ś*- variants in Yeniseic cannot be explained as a trace of a diachronic difference in Persian or Turkic. Neither does it look like a regular inner-Yeniseic development which would rather yield *ś*- in Ass. and Kott, as in Arin. sat ~ Ass., Kott šet 'river' (Toporov 1967: 313), Arin. sâj ~ Ass., Kott šig 'night' (VWJ II 206 s.v. ši). It points rather to two different channels of borrowing, instead, even if they cannot be established and explained at the moment. – The varying vowel of the first syllable of the Yeniseic words might suggest the Chuvash language as their direct source. On the other hand, Čuv. sâra reflects an older form like *śere, so that the Yeniseic words should in this case be relatively young loans (but see also below). – G. F. Mueller’s spelling <-ihi-> in the Kott record certainly is but an orthographical device to render long -i-, so that <-sihirâ> is to be read *śira, with the accent on the ultima. – The situation of the final vowel also deserves attention. It is especially conspicuous that none of the Yeniseic words has an -e which is typical of almost all Turkic records. It would not be easy to connect this observation with the Persian fluctuation of *a* and *ā* since the word *śira* has no phonetic surrounding in which the alternation can usually be observed. It might be very interesting to suggest that the Yeniseic forms are older than the Turkic ones because they have retained the original Persian pronunciation (-a), whereas the Turkic reflexes point to a secondary -a in Persian, but this explanation would not in reality hold its ground. Rather, we have to accept the general Persian pronunciation with -a that has, in the Turkic languages, been changed into -e according

Aalto’s (1987: 104) reservation about this idea is based exactly on the too early attestation (3rd century AD) of the word Çâc. However, it is not so much philology as rather etymology that makes Pulleyblank’s suggestion unacceptable – if, originally, the ‘Yeniseic word really was a nominal compound (Werner 1997) with -ś as a relict element of the second noun of the syntagma it cannot be used as a one-syllable etymon of Çâc. Interestingly enough, H. Werner does not repeat this explanation in VWJ II 312.

4 Uralic languages should at any rate be excluded as a medium because they display reflexes shortened to one syllable only, like Ostyak sar ‘beer’ and so forth (Aalto 1971: 30).

5 For the enumeration of these cases see Pisowicz 1985: 15.
to the vowel harmony rules (but cf. also Kirgh. syra, in which the first vowel -r. > -y-). In short: the (almost regular) distribution of -a and -e in Yeniseic and Turkic cannot provide substantial evidence for chronological or geographical (= time or dialects?) features of the Persian etymon of this word or for establishing the borrowing routes.

Conclusions: The Yeniseic data form three groups with regard to their initial segment: [a] sV-, as in Arin. syră, Ass. siră, Kott sēra; [b] sV-, as in Kott sirā <sihirā>; [c] šV-, as in Kott šīra ~ šēra. Incidentally, no Yeniseic word has a segment šV-, as in the Persian etymon. – The s variants possibly penetrated through the Turkic medium whereas the borrowing channel of š variants remains unknown since neither a direct borrowing from Pers. šīra is certain nor does the Ottoman medium appear realistic.

***

The word kōs which possibly suggests a relatively early date of the borrowing process seems to be an especially interesting item:

kōs (Koib.) ‘beautiful, pretty’ ~ kos, in: Kos-ul (Ass.), name of a river, lit. ‘beautiful water’ (VWJ I 458) [= Yug ku-š ‘picture’, in: ejš-ku-š ‘icon’ (with ejš ‘God’) ~ kūš ‘1. Gottheit, Geist; 2. anthropomorpher Anhänger an einem Schamanenanzug’ (ibid.); in compounds also: Yug -ku-š ~ -kus, Southern Ket -kūš (ibid.)] < *kōs (> Khk. xos ‘picture’, Čul. kōs ~ kuas, see below) ‘beautiful’ < Early New Persian *xʷuš ~ *xʷoš ~ *xʷaš ‘beautiful; nice’ (Stachowski 1996: 98). – For the xʷ- > x-development in the 13th-14th century Persian see Pisowicz 1985: 122. – The Proto-Yeniseic etymon is reconstructed as *koś as or *kugas in VWJ I 458. This seems, however, to be due to a misunderstanding. H. Werner (ibid.) tries to find a common etymon for forms like Koib. kōs and e.g. Kamassian kuwas ‘beautiful’; Čul. (-Turkic) kuas id., and he cites my article (Stachowski 1996: 98) by giving the following etymology: «pers. kāgad ‘Papier’», whereas I had in reality suggested a contamination of Pers. kāgad ‘paper’ with Pers. xōš ‘beautiful; nice’ which has yielded a twofold result in Siberia: [a] the form of xōš and the meaning of kāgad → Yug ku-š ‘picture’; [b] the form of kāgad and the meaning of xōš → Tuvinian kōš ‘beautiful’. What should be added now is that Koib. kōs and Ass. kos (which were unknown to me before) are direct (= non-contaminated) reflexes of the Early New Persian word *xʷoš. Although we have no 18th century record of Yug ku-š, its form points to an etymon with a long vowel, i.e. an archaic variant *kōs which means that it can be viewed as equally old a loan as Koib. kōs and Ass. kos. They all go back to a period between the 13th and 18th century.

***

Persian sources of the two words below are less certain:

bespān (Ket) ‘spring-balance’ is etymologized from Russ. bezmén id. in VWJ I 122. However, this leaves the change of the palatalness of Russ. -ě- > Ket -ē- unexplained. I would rather suggest an etymon like *besmān (> Old Ćuv. *besmen (> modern Ćuv. pasman, a measure of weight of cereals] > Russ. bezmén ‘spring-balance’) < Pers. Pl. vaznān id. < Sg. *vazn < Arab. wazn ‘weight (a piece of metal)’; semantically cf. Russ. vec ‘weight’ vs. vecč ‘balance’. – For the time being, I cannot establish the language with which the etymon *besmān should be connected. – Besides, there is no hint about the chronology of the borrowing of this word into Ket.

ezná (imb.) «leicht» (fehlerhaft anstatt ‘lebendig’?)» (VWJ I 253) might be somehow connected with Pers. āsān ‘light’ > Oir. āzān ‘healthy’, Barab. esen ~ izen id., Khak. izen id., Kirgh. esen ‘1. happy; 2. healthy’ (Stachowski 1993: 249). – The
change of Pers. -s- > Imb. -t- could have actually been caused by a folk-etymological association of the loan word with Ket et ‘alive, living’ but one question still remains unanswered: why did Pers. -ān change into Imb. -na?

2.

The approximate geographical distribution of the languages important to us in this context was in the 18th century as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ostyak</td>
<td>Selkup</td>
<td>Ket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump.</td>
<td>Arin.</td>
<td>Kott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamassian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shor</td>
<td>Mator</td>
<td>Tof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khak.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, let us try to establish the main channels of borrowing of the Persian words presented above (apart from bešpān and ēmā which are uncertain).

The word naḥ ‘bread’ is unknown to the Turkic languages of Siberia, so that it should be seen as a Uralic loan into Yeniseic. Ostyak and Selkup seem to be the only Uralic languages that should be taken into account for that purpose. At the same time, naḥ is the only Persian word that can be assumed to have come from the North, here-with exemplifying the ties between the languages of an areal grouping called by E. Helimski (2003: 160) an “Ostyak (Ob-Yeniseic) Sprachbund”.

It seems especially alluring to see whether other conceivable borrowing routes of the Persian words can also be correlated with some areal groupings presented in the study by Helimski. The Persian loans are attested, besides Yeniseic, in the following languages of the region:

- ajna – Shor, Khakas, Oiro
dolat – Khakas; bolat – Mator, Tofalar, Mongolian
- syra – Oiro
dos – Khakas.

The first thing to be observed here is that dolat and bolat can be interpreted as two phonetic variants which penetrated via two different routes into Yeniseic. The routes can, on the geographical basis, be called a Western (Khakas) and an Eastern (Tofalar) one. Moreover, what is even more important is that there probably exists not a single Persian word which was transmitted through the Eastern (Tuvinian, Tofalar) channel only. Both dolat and the three remaining words (ajna, syra, dos) point to the Western route (Oiro, Khakas, Shor) as the main channel of borrowing (even if Khak. xos ‘picture’ cannot be accepted as a direct source of Yen. dos ‘beautiful’ [see the discussion above], not a vaguest hint about the Eastern borrowing route of this word exists).

---

6 The Mongolian mediation can, as it seems, be ignored here because there exists no other Persian loan word transmitted through Mongolian into Yeniseic, and no peculiar feature of this word compels us to abandon the prospect of the Turkic mediation.
The limited number of Persian words in the Yeniseic languages of the 18th century does not permit far-reaching inferences. We may, however, glean from what has been said above that this lexical material points to the participation of Kott and Arinian in the “Upper Yenisei Sprachbund” (Helimski 2003: 158) whose core languages are Khakas, Shor, Kamassian and Mator, whereas the cautious conjecture that Tuvinian and Tofalar, too, may belong to this Sprachbund has not found any support in my material. This fact makes the real existence of a grouping, supplied by Helimski with a question mark, viz. the “[? ] Yeniseic Sprachbund” (ibid. 161) which, besides Yeniseic, comprises also Tuvinian and Tofalar even more uncertain. The glottal articulation of some vowels is most apparently not sufficient to suggest a discrete linguistic area so that I willingly agree with E. Helimski’s suggestion concerning this phonetic phenomenon: “[…] it could be safer to assume instead a chain of contact-induced developments, with their starting point presumably in Samoyedic” (ibid.) and I am even inclined to go a step further and to assume a mere transmission of this articulatory habit by Yeniseic-speakers in the course of their Turkicization which in fact is a contact-induced development, but one reduced to a stretch between two nodes only instead of a chain of developments.
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