

MONGOLIC ELEMENTS IN BARGUZIN EVENKI*

BAYARMA KHABTAGAEVA

Department of Altaic Studies, University of Szeged
H-6722 Szeged, Egyetem u. 2, Hungary
e-mail: baiarma@hotmail.com

During their long history Tungusic and Mongolic peoples have had intensive contacts extending to all fields of human existence. These contacts left their traces also in the respective languages. The aim of this paper is to present and characterise the Mongolic elements traceable in the Barguzin dialect of the Evenki language which is one of the dialects subjected to a considerable Mongolic influence. My work to be published later will comprise some 300 words and I will examine these words from the etymological, phonetical, and morphological points of view, and attempt to determine the time of borrowing. In the following I will try to present a few categories which may help resolve the problems concerning the different layers of the loanwords.

Key words: Barguzin Evenki, Mongolic elements, bilingualism.

During their long history Tungusic and Mongolic peoples have had intensive contacts extending to all fields of human existence. These contacts left their traces also in the respective languages. The aim of this paper is to present and characterise the Mongolic elements traceable in the Barguzin dialect of the Evenki language, namely Barguzin Evenki is one of those dialects in which the most considerable Mongolic influence is expected. Such a powerful influence is mainly due to the fact that speakers of this dialect have been living in Buryat neighbourhoods for quite a long period, and they are bilingual, usually trilingual.

In my work comprising some 300 words I will examine the words from the etymological, phonetical, and morphological points of view, and attempt to determine when the loanword was taken over. In the following I will try to present a few categories, which may help resolve the problems concerning the different layers of the

* I would like to express my thanks to Professors András Róna-Tas, Katalin Köhalmi and Juha Janhunen for their helpful pieces of advice. This paper was supported by the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

loanwords. Before presenting these categories a brief sketch will be given about the Evenki people and the Evenki language.

The Tungusic Languages

The Evenki language belongs to the Tungusic language family, traditionally believed to form the Altaic language family together with the Turkic and Mongolic languages. Although the classification of the Tungusic languages is not definitive, according to Ligeti (1948) and Cincius (1949, p. 35), the Tungusic languages may be divided into two big branches:

1. The northern branch: Evenki, Even (or Lamut) and Negidal;
2. The southern branch: the Manchuric group: Jurchen (Old Manchu), Manchu and its sole living remnant Sibe ~ Sibö; the Amuric group: Nanai, Ulcha, Oroch, Oroch and Udehe.

Other researchers such as Benzing (1955, pp. 9–10), Avrorin (1960, p. 3) and Atkine (1997, p. 111) think that the Amuric group forms a separate branch. The most detailed classification was proposed by Doerfer (1978, pp. 4–5). Vovin (1993, pp. 102–103) suggested that the Tungusic languages can be divided into two big branches: Manchu and Tungusic. The Tungusic branch can be divided into three groups: Even, West Tungusic (Evenki, Negidal, Solon) and East Tungusic (Oroch, Ulcha, Nanai, Udehe and Oroch). Traditionally, the Evenki language belongs to the northern Tungusic branch.

The first Tungusic comparative phonology is that of Cincius (1949), on which the work of Benzing (1955) was based. It should be observed, however, that in many respects these researches could not give a reliable result in the field of Proto-Tungusic reconstructions.

Even the earliest Tungusic linguistic sources are quite late. Practically they date from the time of the Ming dynasty and they are monuments of the Jurchen language. (For details see Ligeti 1948.) This material, however, only provides some data about the southern Tungusic languages.

There is no material on the northern languages from the early period. The first short lists of the Evenki and Even words and phrases were written down at the 18th century by European travellers and scholars, including Witsen, Messerschmidt and Strahlenberg. In the same century, the Russian Academy of Sciences at the behest of the Russian Empress Catherine II, initiated an extensive programme to explore the ethnology and languages of the Siberian people. One of the results of this programme was the Comparative Dictionary of Pallas, which contains 285 Russian words translated into a large number of Asiatic languages, including seven Evenki and Even dialects (Kotwicz 1909; Atkine 1997, pp. 111–112).

The lack of the early sources of the northern Tungusic group makes us understand the important role played by the Gilyak, Ketic, Yakut and Mongolic loanwords of the Evenki language in the reconstruction of the Proto-Tungusic language.

The Evenki People

Geographical Position

The Evenki people live in Russia, China and Mongolia, scattered over a vast territory. In Russia they number approximately 10,000. They live in small groups of some thousand people, very far from each other (Bulatova 2002, p. 268):

the Autonomous District of Evenki – 2706;
 the Autonomous District of Taimyr – 246;
 the Republic of Buryatia – 815;
 the Republic of Yakutia – 1327;
 the Province of Irkutsk – 670;
 the Province of Chita – 528;
 the Province of Amur – 1224;
 the Province of Khabarovsk – 1408;
 the other Provinces – 609.

Best investigated is one of their largest communities, which can be found in Yakutia (see Romanova–Myreeva 1962, 1964, 1968; Romanova–Myreeva–Baraškova 1975). Its members solidly preserve their language.

In North-East China, along to the rivers Mergel and Khailar, in the Khulun Buir Province, in the Evenki Autonomous District there live mixed Solon Evenki and Khamnigan Evenki populations. While they differentiate themselves from each other, both groups are called erroneously *Ewenke* by the administration. Here they number about 10,000 people, however, we do not know the exact distribution of these two groups (Janhunen 1997, pp. 130–131).

A group of Evenkis of unknown number also lives near Lake Buir in North-East Mongolia.

Lifestyle

According to their lifestyle, Evenkis can be classified in three groups. We can distinguish unmounted or hunter Evenkis, reindeer breeders and nomadic breeders or horse breeders (Vasilevič 1969, pp. 11–12). This third group is present in Buryatia (Barguzin), Mongolia, and China as well. They adopted the Mongolic lifestyle and copied a large number of lexical elements from the Mongols. Even their self-designation *mur-čen* is of Mongolic origin. It originates from the noun *morin* ‘horse’.

The Khamnigan People

The Mongolic influence on the Evenki is well characterised by the fact that the Evenki did not only adopt a Mongolic lifestyle, but some of them even changed their language to a Mongolic one. Their Mongolic language, called Khamnigan, preserves many ar-

chaic features (Janhunen 2003, pp. 83–101). They also live scattered across the Trans-Baikalian territory in the Aga National District of Chita Province, numbering approximately 5000 (Damdinov 1962, 1968), in the northeastern part of China, in the Khulun Buir Province, numbering approximately 2000 (Janhunen 1990, pp. 11–12), while in the northeastern part of Mongolia, in Khentei Province their number is unknown (Köhalmi 1959, p. 163).

Interestingly enough, a group of Khamnigans living close to the Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol area preserved their original Evenki variety as well (Janhunen 1991).

Evenki Dialects

The first steps in Evenki studies were done by the Finnish scholar Matthias Alexander Castrén, who lived among the Urulga and Mankovo Evenki people and collected linguistic material. His work was not only the first descriptive grammar of Evenki, but also one of the pioneer treatises in the field of comparative Altaic linguistics. Castrén translated 1500 Evenki items into German, and added Manchu, Mongolian, Buryat, Tatar, and Yakut parallels (Castrén 1856).

From 1919 to 1926, Titov made several expeditions to the Evenkis of the Upper Lena, Northern Baikal and Vitim-Nerchinsk regions. His lexical collections were published in 1926 as a dictionary, to which the Russian translation of Castrén's grammar was added as an appendix (Titov 1926).

Systematic research, however, was started only in the 1930s. It is not possible, of course, to present a complete sketch of the research (for details see Gorcevskaja 1959; Atkine 1997, pp. 111–113), but one must mention the name of the Tungusist professor of the University of Leningrad, G. M. Vasilevič. Her work covered practically every aspect of the research on the Evenkis. Without aiming at completeness I just mention the Evenki dictionary (1958) which lists even dialectal forms, the comparative grammar of the Evenki dialects (1948), the historical ethnography of the Evenkis (1969), and the Evenki comparative folklore (1966).

The Evenki language in Russia has 51 dialects and sub-dialects, which can be grouped into northern, southern and eastern branches (Atkine 1997, p. 115; Bulatova 2002, pp. 270–271):

1. The northern group: Yerbogochén, Ilimpeya;
2. The southern group: the hissing type: Stony Tunguska (Standard language), Nepa, Vitim-Nercha; the hushing type: Sym, Northern Baikal;
3. The eastern group: Vitim-Olyokma, Barguzin, Aldan, Ayan, Uchur-Zeya, Selemdzha-Urmi, Ayan-Mai, Tugur-Chumikan, Sakhalin.

Literary or standard Evenki is based on the Stony Tunguska dialect, which belongs to the southern branch. The scattered nature of their territorial distribution explains why there is no possibility for developing a real literary language. In everyday life each speaker uses his/her own dialect (Bulatova 2002, p. 271).

The main criterion used during the classification of the dialects is the fate of the Common-Tungusic consonant *s in initial and intervocalic position. In the three branches there appear the representations *h*, *s* and *š*.

In the table below I present four examples to show the differences between the dialects:

Common-Tungusic	northern (spirant: <i>h-</i> , <i>VhV</i>)	southern (sibilant)		eastern (sibilant- spirant: <i>s-</i> , <i>VhV</i>)
		<i>s-</i> , <i>VsV</i>	<i>š-</i> , <i>VšV</i>	
‘ear’	<i>hēn</i>	<i>sēn</i>	<i>šēn</i>	<i>sēn</i>
‘very’	<i>hō</i>	<i>sō</i>	<i>šō</i>	<i>sō</i>
‘woman’	<i>ahī</i>	<i>asī</i>	<i>ašī</i>	<i>ahī</i>
‘eye’	<i>ēha</i>	<i>ēsa</i>	<i>ēša</i>	<i>ēha</i>

Barguzin Evenki

On the territory of Buryatia Evenki people live in a number of places, such as the regions of Barguzin, Kurumkan, North-Baikal and Baunt. Their total number in Buryatia is approximately 800, but their exact distribution is unknown.

The first researcher of the Barguzin Evenki dialect was Nicholas Poppe. In 1927 he published a short grammatical description and five tales. His material was collected in Leningrad, from a native Barguzin Evenki student, Panteleimon Baranov (Poppe 1927).

Nine years later, based on the material of Poppe, Gorcevskaja (1936) compiled a larger grammar. Although her work is more detailed, one of its shortcomings is that it was based on a material collected only from one speaker.

In 1953 the collection of Rinčino was published by Kotwicz. Like earlier materials, this was also based on one informant (Kotwicz 1953).

Mongolic Elements in Barguzin Evenki

The Mongolic loanwords of Evenki were dealt with by Nicholas Poppe in two short papers. In the first one, he discussed the Mongolic loanwords of Tungusic in general (1966), while in the second article he wrote specially about the Mongolic elements in the Evenki dialects (1972). Since his first paper mainly discussed Evenki, these two papers mostly cover the same problems.

In 1985 there appeared the *Mongolo-Tungusica* of Doerfer, who examined the Tungusic–Mongolic linguistic contacts with statistical methods. The method used in his investigation makes the material difficult to handle.

*

In the subsequent part of my paper, I will present the linguistic criteria peculiar to the Mongolic elements of Barguzin Evenki that enable us a clear periodisation of the elements. I compare the Barguzin Evenki loanwords with Modern archaic (Khamnigan Mongol and Dagur) and non-archaic (Buryat and Khalkha) Mongolic languages. From the archaic languages I chose Khamnigan Mongol and Dagur because they definitely had linguistic contacts with Tungusic languages. It is generally accepted that Khamnigan Mongols originally spoke a Tungusic language, but later its speakers changed it to a Mongolic language (for details see Kõhalmi 1959, 1964; Damdinov 1962, pp. 171–172; 1968, pp. 75–76), while Dagur was erroneously listed as a Tungusic language for a long time (for details see Ivanovskij 1894, p. 9; Poppe 1930, p. 2; Todaeva 1986, pp. 3–5).

Phonetic Criteria

1. Mongolic *s-*

(a) Preservation

As previously mentioned Barguzin Evenki belongs to the southern branch of dialects, where the original initial *s-* is still preserved. This reflects an earlier layer of loanwords.

Common-Tungusic *saŋnyan* ‘smoke’ ~ BE *saŋnyan*;

Common-Tungusic *sele* ‘iron’ ~ BE *sele*;

Common-Tungusic *sī* ‘bile’ ~ BE *sī*;

BE *sukay* ‘Tamarisk’ ← Mongolic **sukai*: LM *suqai*; cf. Buryat *huxai*; Khalkha *suxai*;

BE *sura-* ‘to ask’ ← Mongolic **sura-*: LM *sura-*; cf. Buryat *hura-*; Khalkha *sura-* ← Turkic **sora-*: cf. Old Turkic *sōr-* ‘to ask; to inquire about sg’;

BE *sunehun* ‘soul’ ← Mongolic **sünesün*: LM *sünesün*; cf. Buryat *hünehe(n)*; Khalkha *süns(en)*.

(b) Pharyngealisation

On the other hand, a pharyngealisation of the initial *s-* is also observable, which shows that the loanword was taken over in a period when the Buryat change *s- > h-* had already taken place. This criterion points to the later (Old Buryat) layer. I have to mention that a Buryat type of laryngealisation is also characteristic for Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol¹ (Janhunen 1997, p. 42), but it is not typical for other variants of Khamnigan Mongol.

¹ For example, Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol *xara* ‘moon’ ~ LM *sara* (cf. Buryat *hara*; Khalkha *sar*); Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol *kixu* ‘birch’ ~ LM *qusa* (cf. Buryat *xuhan*; Khalkha

BE *haki-* ‘to graze, pasture’ ← Mongolic **haki-*: Middle Mongolic *saki-* ~ *saqi-*; LM *saki-*; cf. Buryat *haxi-*; Khalkha *saxi-* ← Turkic **saqi-*: cf. Old Turkic *saqī-* ‘to wait for, watch’ < *saq-* ‘awake, alert’.

2. Pharyngealisation of *VsV*

Mongolic intervocalic *VsV* in Barguzin Evenki is regularly pharyngealised, like in original Tungusic words:

Common-Tungusic *ēsa* ‘eye’ ~ BE *ēha*;

Common-Tungusic *usī* ‘halter, tether’ ~ BE *uhī*;

Common-Tungusic *osin* ‘spark’ ~ BE *ohin*.

In the following elements, although the quality of the consonant does not display any clue as to the layer of the loanword, the vowel in the last syllable clearly shows that the word belongs to the earlier layer. At the same time it informs us that the loanword was not taken from Modern Buryat.

BE *balgahun* ‘summer house’ ← Mongolic **balgasun*: LM *balyasun* ‘ancient city, ruined city’; cf. Buryat *balgāha(n)*; Khalkha *balgas(an)* ← Turkic: Old Turkic *balīq* ‘town’;

BE *baitahun* ‘barren mare’ ← Mongolic **bayidasun*: LM *bayidasun*; cf. Buryat *baitaha(n)*; Khalkha *baidas(an)*;

BE *gatahun* ‘peg, pile’ ← Mongolic **gadasun*: LM *γadasun*; cf. Buryat *gadaha(n)*; Khalkha *gadas*;

BE *nahun* ‘age’ ← Mongolic **nasun*: LM *nasun* ‘age, years, life, lifetime’; cf. Buryat *nahan*; Khalkha *nas(an)*; Dagur *nas*.

3. Preservation of Mongolic *ǰ-*

The loanwords that belong here pertain to a quite early date of copying. The early period of borrowing in words like *ǰalagan* and *ǰalaw* is not only demonstrated by the initial consonant *ǰ*, but by the pattern *Vowel–Consonant–Vowel* as well, which had not yet developed into a long vowel:

BE *ǰalagan* ‘tassel on a hat; thick silk thread’ ← Mongolic **ǰalagan* < **ǰala*+*GA*n: Middle Mongolic *ǰala’an*; LM *ǰalaya(n)*; cf. Dagur *dǰilā*; Khamnigan Mongol *dzalā*; Buryat *zalā*; Khalkha *jalā* ← Turkic **ǰalā*: cf. Old Turkic *yāl* ‘a horse’s mane’;

BE *ǰalaw* ‘young’ ← Mongolic **ǰalagu* < **ǰal*+*A-GU*: LM *ǰalayu*; cf. Dagur *dǰalō*; Khamnigan Mongol *dǰalalagan* ‘boy’; Buryat *zalū*; Khalkha *zalū* ← Turkic **ǰāl*: cf. Old Turkic *yāš* ‘fresh’;

xus); Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol *naraxu* ‘pine’ ~ LM *narasun* (cf. Buryat *narha(n)*; Khalkha *nars*) etc.

BE *ǰargu* ‘court of law’ ← Mongolic **ǰargu*: LM *ǰarγu*; cf. Buryat *zarga*; Khalkha *jarga*.

The phrase “quite early” mentioned above refers to the loanword *ǰōri* ‘property’, which still preserves the initial Mongolic affricate, however, the long vowel had already developed. In the word *ǰun* first a long vowel evolved which later shortened:

BE *ǰōri* ‘property’ ← Mongolic **ǰōri*: LM *ǰōgeri*; cf. Buryat *zōri*; Khalkha *zōr*;

BE *ǰun* ‘east’ ← Mongolic **ǰūn*: Middle Mongolic *ǰe’ūn*; LM *ǰegūn*; cf. Dagur *džun*; Khamnigan Mongol *dzū(n)*; Buryat *zūn*; Khalkha *jūn*.

4. Labialisation

This phonetic criterion is a strong labialisation of vowels, which is a distinctive peculiarity of Barguzin Evenki. It is typical particularly of long vowels:

Common-Tungusic *sēkse* ‘blood’ ~ BE *sōkse*;

Common-Tungusic *sēn* ‘eye of a needle’ ~ BE *sōn*;

Common-Tungusic *gudyei* ‘beautiful, nice’ ~ BE *gudyoï*;

Consequently, the Mongolic loanwords are also labialised:

BE *ǰōrde* ‘chestnut (horse)’ ← Mongolic **ǰērde*: LM *ǰegerde*; cf. Dagur *džērde*; Khamnigan Mongol *dzērd*; Buryat *zērde*; Khalkha *jērd*;

BE *dōǰi* ‘the first or choicest part of food or drink’ ← Mongolic **dēǰi*: LM *degeǰi*; cf. Buryat *dēže*; Khalkha *dēǰ* ← Turkic **degē*: cf. Old Turkic *yeg* ‘better’;

BE *ōro-* ‘to spin, to twist’ ← Mongolic **ēre-* < *egere-*: LM *egere-*; cf. Dagur; Buryat; Khalkha *ēre-* ← Turkic **āgir-*: cf. Old Turkic *āgir-* ‘to surround, encircle; to twist, spin’;

BE *mendō* ‘hello!’ ← Mongolic **mendē*: LM *mendü*; cf. Buryat *mende*; Khalkha *mend*.

5. The Fate of Mongolic *i

(a) The preservation of Mongolic *i in different positions

The phenomenon called breaking of *i, which is the regressive assimilation of this vowel and is peculiar to Mongolic languages, does not apply in the Mongolic loanwords of Barguzin Evenki. This fact points to an early date of copying:

BE *imagan* ‘goat’ ← Mongolic **imagan*: Middle Mongolic: MNT *ima’an*; LM *imayan*; cf. Dagur *imā*; Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol *imān*; Buryat; Khalkha *yamā(n)*;

BE **jiluga** ‘rein’ ← Mongolic **jiluga*: Middle Mongolic: MNT *jilo’ a* ~ *jilu’ a*; LM *jiloya*; cf. Dagur *džilō*; Buryat *žolō*; Khalkha *žolō*;
 BE **aǰirga** ‘stallion’ ← Mongolic **aǰirga*: LM *aǰirγa*; cf. Dagur *adirga*; Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol *aǰirga*; Buryat *azarga*; Khalkha *ajar-ga(n)*;
 BE **ewečün** ‘illness, ache’ ← Mongolic **ebečün*: LM *ebe(d)čün*; cf. Dagur *euči*; Buryat *übšen*; Khalkha *övčün*.

(b) Mongolic **si-*

We should keep apart those words which in Mongolic originally had an initial sequence **si-*. It is relevant also for Mongolic linguistic history that these sequences appearing in most Modern Mongolic languages as *šV-*, were preserved in Barguzin Evenki. According to Damdinoy (1968, p. 77) and Janhunen (1990, p. 43), this archaic feature is typical for Onon² and Manchurian³ Khamnigan Mongol:

BE **sirga** ‘bay (horse)’ ← Mongolic **sirga*: LM *sirγa* ‘whitish-yellow (horse)’ < *sir-a* ‘yellow’; cf. Dagur; Buryat; Khalkha *šarga* ← Turkic **sārī*: cf. Old Turkic *sārīg* ‘yellow’;
 BE **sile** ‘soup’ ← Mongolic **silü*: LM *silü*; cf. Dagur *šil*; Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol *šilü*; Buryat *šülen*; Khalkha *šöl*;
 BE **sipke** ‘dung’ ← Mongolic **sibke*: LM *sibke*; cf. Buryat *šebxe*; Khalkha *šivx*.

However, a large number of examples occur in which the original Mongolic **si-* is opposed to Barguzin Evenki *či-*. This is explained by the change **si-* > *ši-* in Mongolic, which was taken over by Barguzin Evenki with sound-correspondence as *či-*, which shows the criterion of the early layer:

BE **činehun** ‘Larch’ ← Mongolic **šinesün*: LM *sinesün*; cf. Buryat *šenehen*; Khalkha *šines(en)*;
 BE **čiwuke** ‘awl, spike’ ← Mongolic **šibüge*: LM *sibüge*; cf. Dagur *šeugu*; Buryat *šübge*; Khalkha *šövög*;
 BE **čike-** ‘to urinate’ ← Mongolic **šige-*: LM *sige-*; cf. Buryat; Khalkha *šē-*.

² For example, LM *sibar* ‘mud; clay’ ~ Onon Khamnigan Mongol *s’ibar* (cf. Buryat *šabar*; Khalkha *šawar*); LM *sinaya* ‘ladle, scoop, dipper’ ~ Onon Khamnigan Mongol *s’inaga* (cf. Buryat *šanaga*; Khalkha *šanag*); LM *sita-* ‘to burn, to be burned’ ~ Onon Khamnigan Mongol *s’ita-* (cf. Buryat; Khalkha *šata-*) etc.

³ For example, LM *siregen* ‘table’ ~ Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol *sirē* (cf. Buryat *šerē(n)*; Khalkha *širē*); LM *sine* ‘new’ ~ Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol *sin-e* (cf. Buryat *šene*; Khalkha *šine*); LM *sidün* ‘tooth’ ~ Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol *sidü* (cf. Buryat *šüden*; Khalkha *šüd*) etc.

(c) The ‘breaking’ of Mongolic **i* (regressive assimilation)

Several times, Mongolic *i* in the initial syllable displays an assimilated form, which clearly points to a late period of borrowing. In such cases the assimilation had already taken place in Mongolic, and the assimilated form was copied by Barguzin Evenki:

BE *ǰuru-* ‘to draw’ ← Mongolic **ǰiru-*: LM *ǰiru-*; cf. Dagur *džurī-*; Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol *ǰuru-*; Buryat *zura-*; Khalkha *ǰura-* ← Turkic **ǰürü-*: cf. Old Turkic *yaz-* ‘to write’;
BE *čulē* ‘free time’ ← Mongolic **čülō-*: LM *čilüge*; cf. Dagur *čulē*; Buryat *sülō*; Khalkha *čölō*.

6. Preservation of Middle Mongolic Initial *h-*

The next criterion refers to an early (Old Mongolic) layer since in these words an initial *h-* is present, which has practically disappeared in Mongolic by the end of the Middle Mongolic period:

BE *hirugē-* ‘to bless’ ← Mongolic **hirüge-*: Middle Mongolic: MNT *hirü’er* ‘a prayer for a long life’; LM *irüge-* ‘to wish well, bless, pray; to felicitate; to propose a toast’; cf. Dagur *šurē-*; Buryat *yürō-*; Khalkha *yerō-*;

BE *him* ‘earmark of cow’ ← Mongolic **him*: Middle Mongolic *him*; LM *im(-e)* ‘mark, sign, token, earmark (as of cattle, sheep; testicle)’; cf. Khalkha *im* ← ? Turkic **im*: cf. Old Turkic *im* ‘sign, wink, password’;

BE *hukur* ‘cow’ ← Mongolic **hüker*: Middle Mongolic *hüker*; LM *üker* ‘horned cattle, ox, cow’; cf. Dagur *hukure*; Khamnigan Mongol *ükür*; Buryat; Khalkha *üxer* ← Turkic **hökür*: cf. Old Turkic *öküz* ‘ox’.

Of special interest are some Evenki words, which are not yet proved to be from Middle Mongolic sources:

BE *hěče-* ‘to become tired’ ← Mongolic **heče-*: LM *eče-*; cf. Dagur *hečē-*; Buryat *ese-*; Khalkha *ece-*;

BE *hulō* ‘touchwood’ ← Mongolic **hula*: LM *ula*; cf. Buryat *ula* ~ *ūla*; Khalkha *ul*.

7. Mongolic *VgV*

The intervocalic *VgV*, which in Mongolic usually results in a long vowel, shows quite different representations. In contrast to the Mongolic secondary long vowels, the quality of the Barguzin Evenki representations can refer to the period of copying. The following few subgroups can be distinguished.

(a) Preservation

According to the examples the Mongolic long vowel has not yet evolved at the time of borrowing. The Evenki words preserved the pattern *Vowel–Consonant–Vowel*, while in Modern Mongolic a long vowel evolved. This points to an early (Old Mongolic) date of copying:

BE **emegen** ‘saddle’ ← Mongolic **emegel*: LM *emegel*; cf. Dagur; Khamnigan Mongol; Buryat; Khalkha *emēl*;

BE **imagan** ‘goat’ ← Mongolic **imagan*: Middle Mongolic: MNT *ima’an*; LM *imayan*; cf. Dagur *imān*; Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol; Buryat; Khalkha *yamā(n)*;

BE **temegen** ‘camel’ ← Mongolic **temegen* < **teme+GAN*: Middle Mongolic *teme’en*; LM *temegen*; cf. Dagur; Khamnigan Mongol; Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol *temē*; Buryat; Khalkha *temēn* ← Turkic **täβä*: cf. Old Turkic *tävay* ‘camel’.

(b) The development of a long vowel

The words in the second subgroup show the same long vowel as the Mongolic languages, consequently they are from the later layer of loanwords:

BE **atān** ‘avidity; jealousy’ ← Mongolic **atān*: LM *ataγ-a* ‘envy, jealousy; emulation, rivalry’; cf. Buryat; Khalkha *atā(n)*;

BE **nogōn** ‘green’ ← Mongolic **nogōn*: LM *noγoyan*; cf. Dagur *nugā*; Khamnigan Mongol *nogō*; Buryat; Khalkha *nogōn*;

BE **tār** ‘bag, sack’ ← Mongolic **tār*: LM *tayar*; Buryat; Khalkha *tār* ← Turkic **tağar*: cf. Old Turkic *tağar* ‘a large container; a sack’.

(c) The shortening of the long vowel

The third subgroup includes those elements in which the secondary Mongolic loanword was shortened in Barguzin Evenki after the copying, which also points to the later layer:

BE **urak** ‘colostrum, the first milk after delivery’ ← Mongolic **ūrak*: LM *uyuray*; cf. Buryat; Khalkha *ūrag* ← Turkic **oğuraq* < **oğur+AK*⁴: cf. Old Turkic *ağuz* ~ *ağuy* ~ *oğuz* ‘biestings, colostrum, the first milk produced after parturition’;

BE **todok** ‘great bustard’ ← Mongolic **tōdok*: LM *toyoday*; cf. Buryat; Khalkha *tōdog*;

BE **goli** ‘brass’ ← Mongolic **gūli*: LM *γuuli*; cf. Dagur *gauli* ~ *gaul*’; Buryat *gūli*; Khalkha *gūl*’.

⁴ Turkic diminutive (Erdal 1991, p. 40).

(d) Mongolic *VgV* → Barguzin Evenki *VwV*

The Mongolic sequence *Vowel–Consonant g–Vowel* can show up in Barguzin Evenki as showing a bilabial spirant, which points to the early layer.⁵

- BE **üwey** ‘no, absent’ ← Mongolic **ügei*: LM *ügei*; cf. Dagur *uwei*; Buryat *ügī*; Khalkha *ügüi*;
 BE **gowohun** ‘wild garlic’ ← Mongolic **γoγosun*: LM *γoγod* ‘the kind of onion, *Allium odarum*’; cf. Dagur *gogos*; Khalkha *gogod*;
 BE **kewer** ‘meadow, tundra’ ← Mongolic **keger*: LM *kegere* ‘steppe, open country’, cf. Dagur *kēr* ~ *xēr*; Buryat *xēre*; Khalkha *xēr*;

(e) Unvoicing

In the last subgroup, the intervocalic *-g-* is represented by *-k-*, the corresponding unvoiced plosive. It is striking to observe that such examples belong here in which not even their Mongolic counterparts evolve a long vowel. This criterion points to the early (Old Mongolic) layer:

- BE **dorokon** ‘hedgehog’ ← Mongolic **dorogon*: LM *doroγon* ‘badger’; cf. Buryat; Khalkha *dorgo(n)*;
 BE **unukān** ‘foal on his first year’ ← Mongolic **unugan*: LM *unayan*; cf. Buryat; Khalkha *unaga(n)*;
 BE **idokon** ‘shamaness’ ← Mongolic **idugan*: LM *iduyan* ~ *uduyan*; cf. Buryat *udagan*; Khalkha *udgan*.

8. Mongolic Initial *č-*

(a) Preservation

Regularly Common-Tungusic words with this consonant are preserved in Barguzin Evenki, as in most cases of Mongolic loanwords. This points to the early (Old Mongolic) layer:

- Common-Tungusic *čirikte* ‘copper’ ~ BE *čirikte*;
 Common-Tungusic *čalban* ‘birch tree’ ~ BE *čalban*;
 Common-Tungusic *čopko* ‘hole’ ~ BE *čopko*;

- BE **čagāŋ-kān** ‘tsar’ ← Mongolic **čagān kān*: LM *čayan qayan* ‘Russian tsar’; cf. Dagur *čigān*; Khamnigan Mongol *tsagān*; Buryat *sagān xān*; Khalkha *cagān xān*;

⁵ For details see Janhunen (1997, pp. 36–37), e.g. Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol *awu* ‘father’ ~ LM *abu*.

BE *čuglān* ‘meeting, assembly’ ← Mongolic **čuglān* < *čuyula-GAn*: LM *čuyula-a(n)* ‘assembly, gathering, meeting; wrapper’ < *čuyula-* ‘to gather, assemble; to wrap’; cf. Buryat *suglān*; Khalkha *cuglān* ← Turkic **čugla-*: cf. Old Turkic *čugla-* ‘to wrap, pack up’ < *čūg* ‘bundle’.

There appear, however, three Mongolic words with twofold phonetical variants with initial *č-* ~ *s-* or *č-* ~ *š-*. The question as to which consonant is the original one cannot be definitively answered, although the presence of an initial *č-* in the Barguzin Evenki borrowings speaks rather for the originality of *č-*:

BE *čaču-* ‘to scatter, to sprinkle a sacrifice’ ← Mongolic **čaču-*: LM *čaču-* ~ *saču-* ‘to scatter; to spray, to sprinkle’; cf. Dagur *čači-*; Buryat *sasa-*; Khalkha *caca-* ← Turkic **saču-*: cf. Old Turkic *sač-* ‘to scatter, sprinkle’;

BE *čečen* ‘wise’ ← Mongolic **čečen*: LM *čečen* ~ *sečen*; cf. Buryat *sesen*; Khalkha *cecen*;

BE *čar* ‘bull’ ← Mongolic **čar*: LM *čar* ~ *šar*; cf. Buryat *sar*; Khalkha *šar*.

(b) Mongolic *č-* → Barguzin Evenki *s-*

This criterion points to the Buryat layer. In following examples, the Buryat origin of the Barguzin Evenki word *sarsun*, is not only proved by the initial *s-*, but by the middle consonant *-r-* as well, which is absent in other Mongolic languages. Presumably, the Buryat word was borrowed into Evenki when the pharyngealisation had not yet happened in Buryat. Similarly, in the other Evenki word *sapča-*, the changing to *-š-* had not yet happened in Buryat. These words give a possibility to differentiate or presuppose a separate Old Buryat layer:

BE *sarsun* ‘paper’ ← Mongolic **sārsun*: LM *čayalsun* ~ *čayarsun* ~ *čayasun*; cf. Dagur *čās*; Buryat *sārha(n)*; Khalkha *cās(an)*; Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol *cārxun*;

BE *sapča-* ‘to flit (bird)’ ← Mongolic **sabča-*: LM *čabči-* ‘to chop; to blink; to trample (with the front hooves)’; cf. Buryat *sabša-*; Khalkha *cavči-*.

9. Mongolic *q-* and *k-*

(c) Preservation

The last phonetic criterion is represented by the fate of the Mongolic initial *k-*. Regularly this consonant was preserved in Common-Tungusic words and Mongolic elements. This feature is typical for all varieties of Khamnigan Mongol as well, while Buryat and Khalkha show a spirantised correspondence. So this criterion points to an early (Old Mongolic or Khamnigan Mongolic) layer:

Common-Tungusic *kačikān* ‘puppy, pup’ ~ BE *kačikān*;

Common-Tungusic *kete* ‘majority’ ~ BE *kete*;

Common-Tungusic *kēnye-* ‘to praise’ ~ BE *kenyo-*;

BE *kadum* ‘mother-in-law; father-in-law’ ← Mongolic **kadum*: LM *qadum*; cf. Dagur *xadam*; Khamnigan Mongol *xadom*; Buryat; Khalkha *xadam* ← ? Turkic **qađin*: cf. Old Turkic *qađin* ‘related by marriage’; BE *kōhun* ‘foam’ ← Mongolic **kōsün*: LM *kōgesün*; cf. Dagur *xuēs* ~ *kuēs*; Buryat *xōhen*; Khalkha *xōs*;

BE *kalbaka* ‘spoon’ ← Mongolic **kalbaga*: LM *qalbay-a* ~ *qalbuy-a*; cf. Khamnigan Mongol *kalbaga*; Buryat; Khalkha *xalbaga* ← Turkic **qalbā-*: cf. Old Turkic *qašūq* ‘spoon’ < *qaši-* ‘to scratch’;

BE *key* ‘air’ ← Mongolic *kei*: LM *kei*; cf. Dagur *kein* ~ *xein* ~ *kīn*; Buryat; Khalkha *xī*.

(d) Pharyngealisation through spirantisation

The following Mongolic words behave ambiguously in Evenki. On the one hand, their guttural initial consonants firstly were spirantised and later pharyngealised, which points to the later layer. On the other hand, in the Evenki word *huruwun* the intervocalic bilabial spirant *VwV* is presumed to be a copy belonging to the early layer:

BE *huruwun* ‘thumb’ ← Mongolic **xurugun* < *quruγun*: LM *quruγu(n)* ‘finger’; cf. Dagur *xorō*; Khamnigan Mongol *xurū*; Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol *kurūn*; Buryat *xurgan*; Khalkha *xurū*;

BE *hilekēn* ‘open woodless place’ (+ *kēn* Evenki Diminutive) ← Mongolic **xile* < *kile*: LM *kile* ~ *kili* ‘furrow between two fields, border, boundary; frontier; limitation’; cf. Buryat *xile*; Khalkha *xil*.

Compound Words

The next group of Mongolic elements in Barguzin Evenki consists of three compound words. All of them represent criteria of the early layer:

1. BE *čikidōr* ‘temple (*body part*)’ ← Mongolic **čikin* ‘ear’ + *degere* (cf. Buryat *dēre*) ‘on top of, on, at, above’.

This Evenki word consists of two Mongolic words *čikin* ‘ear’ and *degere* ‘on top of’. Both of these components belong to the early layer. In the first Mongolic component the sequence *či-* was regularly preserved, while in the second component the long vowel was labialised. All these criteria point to an early borrowing.

2. BE *hokorsōl* ‘sacrum’ ← Mongolic **hoqor* (cf. LM *oqor*; Dagur *huakare*) ‘short’ + *segül* (cf. Buryat *hūl*) ‘tail’.

The other compound word *hokorsōl* ‘sacrum’ consists of Mongolic *hoqor* ‘short’ and *segül* ‘tail’. The first component, as shown by the initial *h-*, was borrowed

in the Middle-Mongolic period. The second component implies that the loanword was taken over when the long vowel had already evolved in Mongolic.

3. BE *kördāwūn* ‘fiddle’ ← Mongolic **quur* ‘fiddle’ + *dayun* ‘sound, song’.

In this compound word the preservation of the initial consonant *k-* points to the early layer, as does the bilabial spirant *w* as well.

Change in Semantics

In a few Evenki loanwords evident semantic changes took place, e.g.:

BE *bohogo* ‘the northern side of a mountain, not reached by the sun’ ← Mongolic **bosogo*: LM *bosoy-a* ‘threshold’ < *bos-* ‘to get up, to stand up’; cf. Dagur *basarga*⁶; Buryat *bogoho*; Khalkha *bosgo(n)*;
 BE *būmal* ‘arrows of thunder’ ← Mongolic **bū-mAl* [Dev.N./Adj.]: LM *bayu-* ‘to come down, to descend’; cf. Buryat; Khalkha *bū-*;
 BE *yendōr* ‘ceiling’ ← Mongolic **yender*: LM *inder* ‘platform, rostrum’; cf. Buryat *yender*; Khalkha *inder*.

Original Evenki Words with Mongolic Suffixes

From a morphological point of view, some original Evenki words took Mongolic suffixes. According to Vasilevič (1958, pp. 759, 767, 791) and Nedjalkov (1997, pp. 298, 303), they are productive in all Evenki dialects.

Such examples could be the Evenki sociative or attributive suffix *+tei*, the diminutive suffix *+kĀn*, *+kōn* and the cooperative suffix *-ldi-*:

1. NN *+tey* ← Mongolic Sociative and attributive *+tAi*: BE *atirkāčatey* ‘with old woman’ < *atirkān* ‘old woman’;

BE *niṅtetey* ‘with root’ < *niṅte* ‘root’;

BE *nekūtey* ‘with younger brother’ < *nekūn* ‘younger brother’.

2. Diminutive *+kĀn*, *+kōn* ← Mongolic *+KĀn*:

Evenki *birakān* ‘brook, stream’ < *bira* ‘river’;

Evenki *ēhakān* ‘small eye’ < *ēha* ‘eye’;

Evenki *kūmīrkōn* ‘small insect’ < *kūmīr* ‘beetle’;

Evenki *ayakān* ‘nice, beautiful’ < *aya* ‘good’;

Evenki *dagakān* ‘very close’ < *daga* ‘near’.

3. Cooperative *-ldi-* ← Mongolic *-ldU-*:

BE *ṅeneldi-* ‘to go together’ < *ṅene-* ‘to go’;

BE *havalildi-* ‘to work together’ < *haval-* ‘to work’;

BE *dyawaldi-* ‘to wrestle’ < *dyawa-* ‘to grasp, to hold, to catch’.

⁶ Dagur → Solon *basarga* ~ *basagga*.

In this paper I presented *nine* phonological, morphological, and semantical criteria which characterise the Mongolic elements of Barguzin Evenki. Based on these criteria it is possible to establish an earlier and a later layer of loanwords. It is clear that most of the elements pertain to the earlier layer. In turn, the elements pertaining to the later layer show the peculiarities of an earlier stage of the Buryat language, and in many instances traces of archaic Mongolic languages appear. It is reasonable to think that the Barguzin Evenkis had linguistic contacts not only with the Buryats, but with speakers of different archaic Mongolic languages as well. I hope that the presented material clearly demonstrates that these elements not only contribute to Tungusic reconstructions, but are important for the Mongolic linguistic history as well.

Bibliography

- Atkine, V. (1997): The Evenki Language from the Yenisei to Sakhalin. In: Shoji, H. – Janhunen, J. (eds): *Northern Minority Languages: Problems of Survival*. Osaka (Senri Ethnological Studies 44), pp. 109–121.
- Avrorin, V. A. (1960): O klassifikacii tunguso-man'čžurskix jazykov. In: *XXV International Congress of Orientalists*. Moskva.
- Bawden, Ch. (1997): *Mongolian – English Dictionary*. London – New York.
- Benzing, J. (1955): *Die tungusischen Sprachen. Versuch einer vergleichenden Grammatik*. Wiesbaden.
- Bulatova, N. Ja. (2002): Ėvenkijskij jazyk. In: Neroznak, V. P. (ed.): *Jazyki narodov Rossii. Krasnaja kniga. Ėnciklopedičeskij slovar'-spravočnik*. Moskva, pp. 267–272.
- Castrén, A. (1856): *Grundzüge einer tungusischen Sprachlehre nebst kurzem Wörterverzeichnis*. St.-Petersburg.
- Cincius, V. I. (1949): *Sravnitel'naja fonetika tunguso-man'čžurskix jazykov*. Leningrad.
- Cincius, V. I. (ed.) (1975): *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' tunguso-man'čžurskix jazykov*. 1–2. Leningrad.
- Clauson, G. (1972): *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*. Oxford.
- Čeremisov, K. M. (1973): *Burjatsko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva.
- Damdinov, D. G. (1962): K voprosu o proisxoždenii ononskix xamnigan. In: Cydendambaev, C. B. (ed.): *Trudy Burjatskogo kompleksnogo naučno-issledovatel'skogo Instituta Sibirskogo otdelenija Akademii nauk SSSR*. Ulan-Ude. Vypusk 10, pp. 169–179.
- Damdinov, D. G. (1968): Ėtno-lingvističeskij očerk xamniganskogo govora. In: Cydendambaev, C. B. – Budaev, I. D. (eds): *Issledovanija burjatskix govorov*. 2. Ulan-Ude, pp. 74–116.
- Doerfer, G. (1978): Classification Problems of Tungus. In: *Tungusica* 1. Wiesbaden, pp. 1–26.
- Doerfer, G. (1985): *Mongolo-Tungusica*. Wiesbaden.
- Erdal, M. (1991): *Old Turkic Word Formation*. Wiesbaden.
- Gorcevskaja, V. A. (1936): *Xarakteristika govora barguzinskix ėvenkov (po materialam N. N. Poppe)*. Moskva–Leningrad.
- Gorcevskaja, V. A. (1959): *Očerk istorii izučenija tunguso-man'čžurskix jazykov*. Leningrad.
- Haenisch, E. (1939): *Wörterbuch zu Manghol un niuca tobca'an (Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi). Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*. Leipzig.
- Ivanovskij, A. O. (1894): *Mandjurica 1. Obrazcy solonskogo i daxurskogo jazykov*. St.-Peterburg.
- Janhunen, J. (1990): *Material on Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol*. Helsinki.
- Janhunen, J. (1991): *Material on Manchurian Khamnigan Evenki*. Helsinki.

- Janhunen, J. (1997): The Languages of Manchuria in Today's China. In: Shoji, H. – Janhunen, J. (eds): *Northern Minority Languages: Problems of Survival*. Osaka (Senri Ethnological Studies 44), pp. 123–146.
- Janhunen, J. (2003): Khamnigan Mongol. In: Janhunen, J. (ed.): *The Mongolic Languages*. London–New York, pp. 83–101.
- Kotwicz, W. (1909): Materialy dlja izučenija tungusskix narečij. *Živaja starina* 2–3, pp. 206–218.
- Kotwicz, W. (1953): Le dialecte tongous de Bargouzine. Matériaux recueillis par D. Rinčino. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 16, pp. 315–326.
- Köhalmi, K. (1959): Der Mongolisch-kamniganische Dialekt von Dadal Sum und die Frage der Mongolisierung der Tungusen in der Nordmongolei und Transbaikalien. *AOH* 9, pp. 163–204.
- Köhalmi, K. (1964): Ešče raz k voprosu o proisxoždenii xamnigan. *Kratkie soobščeniya Instituta narodov Azii* 83, pp. 156–164.
- Lessing, F. D. (1996): *Mongolian–English Dictionary*. Bloomington.
- Ligeti, L. (1948): Egy XII századi mandzsu-tunguz írás. A „kis” dzsürcsi írás értelmezése. *Értekezések a nyelv- és széptudományi osztály köréből* 36/9, pp. 3–41.
- Nedjalkov, I. (1997): *Evenki*. London–New York.
- Poppe, N. (1927): *Materialy dlja issledovanija tungusskogo jazyka. Narečie barguzinskix évenkov*. Leningrad.
- Poppe, N. (1930): *Dagurskoe narečie*. Leningrad.
- Poppe, N. (1966): On some Ancient Mongolian Loanwords in Tungus. *CAJ* 11, pp. 187–198.
- Poppe, N. (1972): On some Mongolian Loanwords in Evenki. *CAJ* 16, pp. 95–103.
- Romanova, A. V. – Myreeva, A. N. (1962): *Očerki tokkinskogo i tommotskogo dialektov*. Moskva – Leningrad.
- Romanova, A. V. – Myreeva, A. N. (1964): *Očerki učurskogo, majszkogo i tottinskogo govorov*. Moskva – Leningrad.
- Romanova, A. V. – Myreeva, A. N. (1968): *Dialektologičeskij slovar' évenkijskogo jazyka. Materialy govorov évenkov Jakutii*. Leningrad.
- Romanova, A. V. – Myreeva, A. N. – Baraškova, P. P. (1975): *Vzaimovlijanie évenkijskogo i jakutskogo jazykov*. Leningrad.
- Titov, Je. I. (1926): *Tungussko-russkij slovar' s priloženijem knigi M. A. Kastrena "Osnovy izučeniya tungusskogo jazyka"*. Irkutsk.
- Todaeva B. X. (1986): *Dagurskij jazyk*. Moskva.
- Vasilevič, G. M. (1948): *Očerki dialektov évenkijskogo (tungusskogo jazyka)*. Leningrad.
- Vasilevič, G. M. (1958): *Évenkijsko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva.
- Vasilevič, G. M. (1966): *Istoričeskij fol'klor évenkov. Skazaniya i predaniya*. Moskva – Leningrad.
- Vasilevič, G. M. (1969): *Évenki. Istoriko-étnografičeskie očerki (XVIII–načalo XX v.)*. Leningrad.
- Vovin, A. (1993): Towards a New Classification of Tungusic Languages. *UJb* 65, pp. 99–113.