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Abstract: Scholars studying early distribution of Native groups and languages in Chukotka have been for long discussing the value of several early-contact records left by the Russian explorers and other visitors to the region during the 1700s and early 1800s. This paper offers the first detailed analysis of one of such early scholarly records produced by Carl Heinrich Merck, a German doctor and natural scientist, who visited Chukotka in 1791. Specifically, the author reviews a word-list of several dozen Native terms in Merck’s manuscript belonging to the so-called “Uelenski language.” Based upon comparative analysis, he argues that the “Uelenski language” was, actually, a dialect of the Central Siberian Yup’ik that once used to be spread widely along the eastern and northern shores of Chukotka. Later population replacements, language and cultural shifts have changed the linguistic map of the region, leaving Merck’s manuscript as the only indisputable evidence of the early Siberian Yup’ik presence at Bering Strait and along the Arctic coast of Chukotka.
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Introduction

For the first and the only time the words that reportedly belonged to the so-called “Uelenski (Uelen) language” were written down by a German naturalist named Carl Merck in summer 1791, on his visit to the Chukchi Peninsula. Merck was traveling across the Bering Sea and Bering Strait region as a member of the Russian North-East Geographical Expedition (1785–1795), under the leadership of Joseph Billings and Gavriil Sarychev (Sarycheff). Being German by origin, Merck drafted his field notes and sketches for his final report in his native German, writing it down in fluent Gothic cursive. The original copy of his manuscript entitled “Die Beschreibung der Tschuktschi, von ihren Gebraeuchen und Lebensart” (Description of the Chukchi in their Lore and Way of Life) is preserved at the Russian National Public Library in St. Petersburg, in its Manuscript and Rare Books Division (German), Fond No.173. For the first time, and almost 200 years after it had been compiled, a more or less complete Russian translation of Merck’s manuscript was published by Zinaida D. Titova (1978), in her edited collection of various ethnographic reports generated by the Billings Expedition. However, shorter fragments of Merck’s report, both in German and in Russian translation, were published earlier (Bronshtein and Shnakenburg 1941; Merck 1814; Vdovin 1954:76-77); his data had been used and cited many times prior to Titova’s publication (cf. Bronshtein and Shnakenburg 1941; Dolgikh 1960; Vdovin 1954, 1961, 1965).

Linguists, anthropologists, and ethnohistorians have repeatedly turned to Merck’s manuscript, both before and after its Russian publication by Titova, treating it as a unique source on Native history and ethnography of the Chukchi Peninsula (Chukotka). Merck’s report indeed is the earliest scholarly essay on this topic; it remained for many years unsurpassed because of its details, clarity, and scholarly conscientiousness. Merck’s manuscript contains what may be called the earliest basic ethnography of the “Tchuktschi”: i.e., the Native inhabitants of the Chukchi Peninsula, both the Chukchi proper and the Yup’ik Eskimo. It is also renown for its extensive use of glosses from many Native languages of the area, including the one he labeled “Uelenski” (Russian “of Uelen”) that had been reportedly spoken in the community of Uelen, a few miles northwest of today’s Cape Dezhnev (East Cape).

The most famous (and the most widely cited) section of Merck’s manuscript treats the linguistic situation in the Bering Strait area at the end of the 18th century; it also mentions for the first and the only time the very existence of a special “Uelenski language.” The original German
version and the full English translation of that section of Merck’s manuscript were first published by Michael Krauss (2005:165). In his original German text Merck used two sets of Native glosses. The one that he labeled “Rennhier-
habende Tschuktschi” (‘Reindeer Chukchi’) obviously belonged to the Chukchi language proper. That language was not only the main vernacular in the area during the time of Merck’s visit but also the language via which the expedition members, be they Russian (Sarycheff), German (Merck), or British (Billings), communicated with the local people using a series of interpreters: from Chukchi to Russian, and vice versa. The second language used in Merck’s manuscript he called “stillsitzende Tschuktschi” (‘of the Sedentary Chukchi’); that term, obviously, covered various Yup’ik Eskimo languages that were present on the Siberian side of the Bering Strait in Merck’s time. Various attempts by several scholars, both Russian and Western, to identify the four different versions of that “sedentary Chukchi” language(s) came to very similar conclusions. Three of Merck’s “sedentary Chukchi” languages were almost unanimously identified with the three known Siberian Yup’ik languages in Chukotka, namely the Sirenëski, Chaplinski, and Naukanski (Arutyunov et al. 1982:88-89; Chlenov 1988:67-68; Chlenov and Krupnik 1983; Dolgikh 1960; Krauss 2005; Vdovin 1954). As for the last one, the “Uelenski,” it was identified as a separate (fourth?) Eskimo language more than fifty years ago by Vdovin (1954:76-77); but neither Vdovin nor many other researchers who dealt with the excerpts from Merck’s text could reasonably specify what kind of “Eskimo” language it was and what was its position among other Native languages of the area (see most recent discussion in Krauss 2005:167–170).

During the late 1980s, both Krauss and I had studied Merck’s data, looking for clues to the origins of the Uelenski language. The proceedings of our extensive communication remained unpublished (Krauss and Chlenov 1987). Independently of each other and quite simultaneously we came to the same conclusion that the Uelenski language was but a dialect of the Yup’ik Eskimo language known in the U.S. as “Central-Siberian Yup’ik” (further CSY) and in Russia as “Asiatic Eskimo language,” or in the vernacular, the Chaplinski Eskimo language.1 I have published a preliminary short result of this analysis elsewhere (Chlenov 1988:67-68) but postponed the full publication until more data would become available. Krauss and Steven Jacobson (both at the Alaska Native Language Center, ANLC) analyzed the names of the months in Uelenski language as reported by Merck, as a proof for its being close to, or originated from Central Siberian Yup’ik (CSY); their study also remained unpublished. With Krauss’ brief analysis of Merck’s materials on the position of the Uelenski language among the Eskimo languages in Asia now published (Krauss 2005; see also Fortescue 2004), I believe the time has come to present my arguments as well.

This paper deals with the following issues based upon an extensive textual and linguistic analysis of Merck’s original German manuscript:

1. Identification of the languages listed by Merck as well as of the place-names that he cited in his manuscript to define the areas where they had been spoken in his time;

2. Sources of different linguistic glosses in Merck’s manuscript;

3. Identification and interpretation of words marked by the letter “U” in his manuscript;

4. Identification of Uelenski language as a dialect of CSY.

The Language(s) of the “Sedentary Chukchi” and their Geographic Boundaries

The interpretation of Merck’s data depends in many respects on the way(s) one reads, or more properly, deciphers Merck’s transliteration of Native words, particularly, of Native place-names, in his manuscript. The complexity of the task is determined by two considerations.

First, one has to comprehend how exactly Merck and/or his local interpreters from Chukchi to Russian pronounced and transliterated Native words and names. In Merck’s manuscript, all, or almost all of the local place-names were written according to their Chukchi, or even Russian phonation, not the Eskimo one. Not surprisingly, all Native place-names were inevitably phonetically distorted, since Merck himself did not know either the Chukchi or the Koryak languages that were used by his interpreters; and he certainly did not master any of the Yup’ik Eskimo language(s) to which the words in his manuscript originally belonged. Also, we may assume that his knowledge of Russian was not perfect, bearing in mind that he preferred to write down his

---

1The Russian understanding of the term “Siberia” contradicts the term “Central Siberian.” For the Russians the Bering Strait area is a part of the “Far East,” whereas Siberia proper starts (or ends) at the Kolyma River. For the Americans, “Siberia” starts at the Russian-American border. Still, I believe that CSY is a good enough term, bearing in mind that its Russian analog, “language of the Asiatic Eskimos” is similarly misleading, since it creates an impression that there is only one language among the Asiatic Eskimo. As for Chaplinski, it is rather a vernacular term, which has hardly any Eskimo connotation (Ungazighmiistun, “language of the Ungaziq people”). In this paper, the Eskimo language of the southeastern part of the Chukchi Peninsula, St. Lawrence Island, and formerly, along the western shore of Bering Strait is labeled CSY.
field notes and final report in his native German. One of the early publishers of his diaries mentioned that even his German was quite turbid and archaic, and often difficult to be understood by modern German speakers (Jacobi 1938, cit. after Titova 1978:17).

The second consideration is purely paleographic and it deals with the deciphering of Merck’s original writing done, as noticed above, in fluent Gothic cursive. I checked the original handwritten text and, in many cases, I came to different interpretations than some of my predecessors, like Titova (1978), or Bronshtein and Shnakenburg (1941), who made the first Russian publication of Merck’s famous passage on four languages of the “Sedentary Chukchis.” My conclusions are based upon some training in reading Gothic cursive texts that comes from my childhood years spent in Germany; but also upon observations of Merck’s handwriting and of his potential knowledge of local place-names in Chukotka. These conclusions can be summarized as follows.

Gulf of Anadyr, Northern Shore

The “first language of the Sedentary Chukchis” as identified by Merck was distributed from the site named “Serdts-Kamen” to the village (camp – Russian stoibsche) Ugin or Aigan, as originally read by Bronshtein and Shnakenburg. Nowadays, the only place-name, Cape Serdts Kamen, known in Chukotka is the rocky cape on its arctic shore, next to the town of Enumino. Clearly enough, it is not the one referred to by Merck; otherwise, the orderly geographical, southwest to northeast, orientation of languages in his description would be distorted. If Merck’s “Serdts-Kamen” were indeed located on the northern shore of the Chukchi Peninsula, then all four languages he referred to would be squeezed in a bottleneck along a small section of the Chukchi Sea coast, between Enumino and Cape Dezhnev (East Cape). That means that Merck had another “Serdts-Kamen” in mind, the one identified almost fifty years ago by Vdvin (1954) and Dolgikh (1960 – see also Krauss 2005:165).

The name is clearly of Russian origin (literally ‘Heart-Rock’). There is indeed a visible mountain or, rather, high cliff at the entrance to Cross Bay (Zaliv Kresta), in the northernmost section of the Gulf of Anadyr, just off today’s town of Konergino. The rock’s name can be seen on some of the navigational charts; but it is unknown to the local Chukchi residents. The name was given by Vitus Bering on his first voyage of 1728, and it was widely used on many Russian maps of the 1700s (cf. Efimov et al. 1964:89, 114).

Identification of Merck’s “Serdts Kamen” with the Cross Bay area enables us to recognize another place-name in the same passage, which is interpreted by Titova as “Mantschchen” (Titova 1978:99). I read it, instead, as Maetschchen because the spelling of the cursive Gotish e resembles very much the spelling of cursive n. Such a spelling (independently of whether the ae should be pronounced as an Umlaut or the two distinct vowels) leaves no doubt that it refers to the bar island of Meechkyn that starts right at the eastern entrance to Cross Bay, immediately below the Serdts Kamen cliff.2 The bar still has two walrus howling grounds on its west and east ends; historically, it marked the westernmost sites populated by Native sea-mammal hunters along the northern shore of the Gulf of Anadyr. This had been repeatedly documented since the early voyages of the 1700s and up to the 1950s. In the 1920s, a group of a dozen Yup’ik families from the village of Ungaziq (see below) moved to the Meechkyn spit and established a small settlement that existed until the 1940s. Therefore, the northwestern border of the first of Merck’s “sedentary Chukchi” languages corresponded nicely to the historical boundary of the sea-mammal hunting coastal population along the Gulf of Anadyr shore.

Merck put the eastern limit of that language “up to the village of Uigin.” My reading of this place-name agrees with that of Titova and disagrees with Bronshtein and Shankenburg’s (1941). Ugin can solidly be identified with the Yup’ik community of Ungaziq or Chaplino (Indian Point) at Cape Chaplin. The Chukchi name for this site is Ugin. Most certainly, Merck received the information on areas far away from the places he personally visited from the expedition’s interpreter, the Cossack sotnik Ivan K obelev (see below). The latter had traveled extensively across the Bering Strait region between the 1750s and early 1800s (Fedorova 1971). On his map published in German in 1783, Ungaziq is marked as Ugin (in a Russian version of the same map published in 1784 – as Ugyn or Uginayakh). There is good reason to believe that –ge- in both of these names indicates the nasal –ng-; so, a simple pen error could have turned K obelev’s Ugin into Merck’s Ugin. If so, Merck’s first language can be located on the northern shore of the Gulf of Anadyr, from the island of Meekchyn and up to the main Yup’ik Eskimo village of Ungaziq. Krauss (2005:165) arrived at the same conclusion regarding the boundaries of that first language.

All of the authors who tried to interpret Merck’s language distribution in the 1700s based upon that passage (i.e., Vdvin, Dolgikh, Menovshchikov, Krauss, Fortescue,

---

1Darwin’s map of 1765 transliterates this place-name as Meechkbyn (Efimov 1964:89), whereas K obelev’s report calls it Maechkbin (Fedorova 1971:ill.1), almost exactly as did Merck in his notes of 1791 and very close to the Russianized modern pronunciation, Maechkbin.
as well as my colleagues and I [Arutyunov et al. 1982; Chlenov and Krupnik 1983], commonly associated that first area with the Sirenikski language. As such, everyone had to account for a certain discrepancy between Merck’s boundaries in the 1700s and what has been known from the later period. By the mid-1800s there were no traces of any Sirenikski speakers on the coast between Provideniya Bay and Cape Chaplin, and even for some distance to the west of Provideniya Bay. Of course, some earlier presence of the Sirenikski language could not be excluded. One hint of this may be the place-name Paghileq on the southwestern shore of Arakamchechen Island, to the north of Cape Chaplin. This is probably a derivation from Sirenikski pągłe (‘cormorant’); but that is the only example of a Sirenikski-based place-name that is known to me in the Cape Chaplin area.

Thus the word vorn (‘slightly before’) used by Merck in his manuscript might not be accidental. It means that the eastern limit of the Sirenikski language was indeed more in agreement with what we know of the Siberian Yup’ik language and tribal distribution during the mid- and late-19th century. ‘Slightly before’ then could literally mean that the coast around Provideniya Bay was not a part of the first “language” area (see the same conclusion in Krauss 2005:165). During the mid-late 1800s, the area to the west and around Provideniya Bay was occupied by small Yup’ik groups called Atqallghhaghmiit, Nangupagaghmiit, and Intugmiit, with three other communities, Qiwaaghmiit, Taqevaq and Nangupagaghmiit, living further eastward, from Cape Chukotsky to Tkachen Bay (Arutyunov et al. 1982; Chlenov and Krupnik 1983; Krupnik and Chlenov 1976). All of them spoke various (sub)dialects of CSY; two latter groups were primarily Chukchi-speaking. In the 1970s some of the elderly Atqallghhaghmiit still remembered that their distant forefathers once came from St. Lawrence Island:

Our elders repeatedly told us that our people, Atqallghhaghmiit came once from Sivuuaq [St. Lawrence Island – M.C.]. Father’s great-grandfathers were from there probably, so I heard. But as I remember people always called us Atqallghhaghmiit, never Sivuuaqghaghmiit. It is only due to the old stories that we know that our forefathers are from over there. We never heard of any relatives over there (Krupnik 2001:451).

A similar oral tradition has been recorded among a mixed Chukchi-Yup’ik group called the Nangupagaghmiit (‘people from Nangupagaq’):

So I heard it. People spoke that somewhere in the nineteen tens or in eighteen hundreds those from Nangupagan [sic! with a Chukchi suffix] came from Lavrentiya [St. Lawrence Island–M.C.], from over there. We are the last remains, and the name was Nangupagaghmiit, a kind of nationality. Nangupagaq is a location over there, their place. Lavrentiya island is huge! Many people lived there. But that was very long time ago, long before us (Krupnik 2001:452).

This tradition is fully corroborated by the place-name Nangupagaq near Gambell on St. Lawrence Island. The Qiwaaghmiit have no oral tradition of this kind; but significantly enough, the largest part of that group had resettled to St. Lawrence Island during the late 1800s (Krupnik 1994); their modern descendants on the island still retain the name Qiwaaghmiit and a clear memory of their origins in Siberia. Some Atatmiit families also moved to St. Lawrence Island in the early 1900s (Krupnik 1994). It seems that between the mid-1800s and the early 1900s, the area around and to the east of Provideniya Bay experienced several migrations from St. Lawrence Island and vice versa. All of those migrant groups had spoken different versions of CSY. That means that either the boundary between Sirenikski and CSY was already located somewhat westward of Provideniya Bay, or that it had been moved westward after Merck’s time, due to those later migrations. In any case, Merck’s Uigin (CSY Ungaziq) was far to the east.

Even more problematic is the western position of the Sirenikski language boundary, following Merck’s statement that the “first language” was spoken all along up to the Meechkyn spit. Kobelev put on his 1779 map of that area a village named “Eymelan” (Efimov 1964, map 174), which is obviously the same as the modern Chukchi town of Enmelen near Cape Bering. Its Yup’ik name Taqevaq is widely known, including on St. Lawrence Island (Oovi and Womkon Badten 1975:17). The very fact that Kobelev used the Chukchi name in the 1700s indicates that the village could already have had a Chukchi-speaking population. Most probably, Merck’s informants meant that Meechkyn spit was the westernmost boundary of the “sedentary Chukchi,” that is, of the coastal people, in general, and not just of their language. But this is my guess only. It may well be that in Merck’s time Sirenikski was indeed spoken more widely along the northern shore of the Gulf of Anadyr; but that area could have been already punctured by several Chukchi-speaking enclaves, or, rather, the Sirenikski speakers themselves were already living in the chain of coastal enclaves among predominately Chukchi-speaking people. Such was the situation along the coast of the Bering Strait proper (see below), and it would be reasonable to expect that a similar language transition was already in place along the shore of the Gulf of Anadyr.
Southeastern and Eastern Shore of the Chukchi Peninsula

The second of Merck’s “sedentary Chukchi” languages is undoubtedly the CSY, then distributed along the eastern shore of the Chukchi Peninsula, from Ungaq at Cape Chaplin (or Ugin in Merck’s notation) to the site Pauchtta halfway between Lavrentiya Bay and Cape Dezhnev (East Cape). Pauchtta is still a fairly well known name for an old village and a small bay, though the site itself has been abandoned for more than 100 years. The modern Russianized form is “Pouten”; the Chukchi name is P’uuten; in Naukanski it is Piighetq and in CSY, Puughhtaq (Leontyev and Novikova 1989:313). The versions reported by Daurkin in the mid-1700s were Pukhtyn, or Puug’tyn,’ and by Kobylev – Puchan, Pukhtan or Pukhtan (Leontyev 1969:103). Merck’s spelling, Pauchtta, mostly resembles the CSY form, which would be quite natural if we assume that this “second language” was indeed CSY. According to oral stories recorded by Krupnik and myself back in the 1970s (Krupnik 2001:447–448), some clans of the Ungazzhimit still retained vague memories that their ancestors once lived to the north of Lavrentiya Bay. The Armaranket clan, for example, had a tradition that some of its members originated from the now abandoned village of Qasuyqag that was reportedly located to the south from Pouten Bay.

The former tracks of the CSY speakers via their old place-names can still be traced in the area, particularly between Pouten Bay and the former village of Qengissiq (Russian: Dezhnev, or Dezhnevo) on the southern shore of the promontory topped by Cape Dezhnev. Not far from today’s Cape Verbluyuzhiy (“Camel Point”), near the ancient Ekven burial ground, there once used to be a village named Nengluwaq. The name is clearly a derivation from CSY nengu ‘underground dwelling,’ not from Naukanski enlu, where the initial n- is omitted and the intervocal –n- is not nasalized, despite its proximity to the Naukanski-speaking area. An old clan name, Nengluvaget, was known among the Ungazzhimit during the 1900s, although the clan is now almost extinct. Quite possibly, it owed its name to that old site to the south of Cape Dezhnev, and not just to the fact that its members once lived—much like everybody else—in underground houses. There might have been some other pockets of CSY speakers along the eastern shore of the Chukchi Peninsula (cf. Chlenov and Krupnik 1984); but their area was certainly interrupted by numerous Chukchi-speaking enclaves, including those around Lavrentiya and Mechigmen Bays, where Billings, Merck, and their party communicated with the Natives in August-September 1791.

Cape Dezhnev

The third language in Merck’s manuscript has been deciphered elsewhere as Pankniskoi or Pankuiskoi (Titova 1978:99). I read it as Pekeiskoi bearing in mind the resemblance between Gothic n and e (see also Krauss 2005:165). Read so, this word is almost identical to the Russian name for the Naukanski language (“Peeksiy” or “Peekskoy”), common in the late 1800s, among others in Gondatti (1897), Miller (1897), and Bogoras (1904). Most probably, Merck’s term indicates that this name was already in use for the Naukanski and their language during the 1700s.

The origins of the term “Peeky” has been a subject of special analysis by Leontyev (1969). Three other place names cited by Merck, Nuchin, Preky (deciphered by me as Paeky), and Mengibenitkin, corroborate the identification of the third language as Naukanski. Nuchin resembles very much the name “Naukan” itself. The Chukchi pronunciation of this place name is Nuukan, in Naukanski it is as Nunuvaq, in CSY – Nevuqaq. As for Paeky, it seems to be just another spelling of Pekeiskoi, only without the Russian suffix –skoy. The root “Paéck” is still preserved in the official name on the Russian navigational charts for the southeastern edge of Cape Dezhnev (Cape Paek, Mys Paek), but it is unknown to today’s residents of the area, both Chukchi and Yup’ik. An old village named Nunak was located there until the early 1900s, when its residents moved to Naukan. The Chukchi name for that site, Nuneqgin, was already known to Daurkin and Kobylev in the 1700s and was featured on their maps (see Efimov 1964); it is still in use by today’s inhabitants of the nearby Chukchi towns of Uelen and Inchoun. Quite possibly, the village of Nunak might have had an alternative name after the cape, at which it was located, namely Paek. If Merck’s Paeky was then a local name for Nunak it strongly supports the assumption that, in describing the third language of the “Sedentary Chukchis,” Merck referred to the two major villages of the Naukanski Yup’ik, known from the oral histories and the records of the 1800s (Chlenov and Krupnik 1983).

The third place-name, Mengibenitkin, is also unknown to today’s Chukchi and Naukanski Yup’ik residents of the area. Comparing it to the Chukchi name for the easternmost extremity of Arakamchechen Island south of the Bering Strait, Kygyninitkin (Cape Kygynin, Mys Kiginnin), one may interpret Mengibenikin as ‘big extremity,’ that is, as the general name for the rocky massif of Cape Dezhnev, the easternmost point of the Eurasian continent. Such an interpretation is another argument to support our conclusion that Merck’s “third language” was indeed the Naukanski Yup’ik then attached to a small area around Cape Dezhnev.
The fourth language that Merck labeled “Uelenskij,” with a Russian suffix –skij (obviously an indication that the source of his information was a Russian – see below) was clearly named after a big village “Uelen” located on the Chukchi Sea shore, just a few miles northwest from Naukan and Cape Dezhnev. There is no doubt about its geographical location. Merck stated that it was used in the area from the “above mentioned cape,” that is Cape Dezhnev, and then northwestward along the Arctic coast, up to Cape Shelagskij (Cape Shelag sky on the coast of the East Siberian Sea, near the modern town of Pevek – see also Krauss 2005). Today’s residents of Uelen, as well as of all other indigenous communities in Chukotka along the shores of the Chukchi and East-Siberian Seas, speak the Chukchi language only (and, of course, Russian). Despite repeated efforts to identify any historical Eskimo-speakers in that area via old place-names and other sources (Lenteyev and Novikova 1989; Menovschikov 1963, 1971, 1972; Vdovin 1961; and particularly Krauss 2005), there are neither direct records nor any memories of the late Eskimo presence on Chukotka’s Arctic Coast, except for some Naukanski or Diomedie expatriates who used to settle in Uelen and, to a lesser extent, in other nearby communities in the late 1800s and during the 1900s.

This lack of late historic evidence complicates the search for a prospective western boundaries of the Uelenski language. Merck’s information on the issue is also confusing. Although the “Uelenskij” is mentioned as a language of the “Sedentary Chukchi,” up to their “last settlement at Cape Shelag skij” (Krauss 2005:165), another passage of the same manuscript has a slightly different statement. “Camps of the Sedentary Chukchi (are) spread from Cape Serdtse Kamen and almost to Cape Shelagskij. Behind the Kolyuchin Bay, there are only two camps and the farthest among them is located at the estuary of the Ekcheta River not far from the Kchwat-Wi tam River; its name is Rirkai-Pija (Titova 1978:98–99 [translation mine, M.C.]). Similar references can be found in Billings’ diary: “The Chukchis told us that the last settlement of the Sedentary Chukchi called Reer-Karpee is located between the mouth of Karpee River and the mouth of Ekichtuma River. There are no other dwellings belonging to the nation of Sedentary Chukchi behind that settlement and up to the Chuvanskij inlet in the Icy Sea” (Arctic Ocean –Titova 1978:57 [translation mine, M.C.]). With this in mind, we may assume that the “Uelenskij” language was indeed spread from Uelen westward, though not to Cape Shelagsky but up to Cape Schmidt (North Cape), or about 300 miles eastward from Cape Shelagsky. Cape Schmidt is indeed called Ryrkaypiya in Chukchi; the same name applies to the village of Ryrkaypiy, which historically was the westernmost community of coastal hunters on the Arctic shore of Chukotka.

As for the second possible village (“camp”) referred by Merck between Ryrkaypiya and Kolyuchin Bay, that might have been either Cape Vankarem, or Cape Onmyn. According to my aerial survey of the coast in 1984, these are the only other coastal sites with known historical settlements. Thus, following Merck’s and Billings’ information, we are to place the boundaries of the Uelenski language area in the 1700s from Uelen and up to Kolyuchin Bay on the Arctic coast, with probably two more settlements further northwest up to Cape Schmidt.

The Sources of Native Glosses in Billings’ Expedition Notes

The published and archival records of the Billings expedition of 1785-1795 contain not only several independent narratives of the voyage written in Russian, German, and English by the expedition’s participants, but also different vocabularies (“word lists”) of Native languages spoken in the Bering Strait area. One of those word lists is known as “the Rohbeck vocabulary” (Sarychev 1811, Attachment), after Dr. M. von Rohbeck, a physician and naturalist who, along with Merck, was a member of the same expedition. It contains a few hundred words of the Naukanski Yup’ik (NY) language, thus presenting its earliest known documentation (cf. Fortescue 2004; Krauss 2005:167). The original manuscript of the “Rohbeck vocabulary” is kept at the Manuscript Collection of the National Russian Library in St. Petersburg, Russia (NRL, Division of Manuscripts and Antiquities, Adelung Collection F.7 No.131). The original Russian publication of this dictionary (Sarychev 1811) is very inaccurate, as it contains numerous typos and wrong transcriptions from the original Latin notation to Cyrillic.

The name given to that vocabulary is very peculiar and vague: “Aiwasinskaia, eines Tschuktschisches Stammes, an der Kueste, wo der Anadyr in das Meer faellt - aus Woerterbuchern, welche Herr Doktor Rohbek verfertigt hat. Herr Etatsrath von Rohbeck.” It is known that Rohbeck did not participate in the land travel with Merck and Billings from St. Lawrence Bay to Nizhne-Kolymsk, but rather stayed with Sarychev and returned to St. Petersburg by sea on the expedition’s ship, Slava Rossii (The Glory of Russia). Neither Rohbeck nor Sarychev had ever visited the mouth of the Anadyr River. Rohbeck’s stay in Chukotka and his possible communication with local residents lasted for several days only. It took place on the northern shore of St. Lawrence Bay, where the expedition’s party, including Billings, Rohbeck, and Merck, landed on August 4, 1791. The exact place of their landing...
Merck made a note in his diary: “They boarded the ship again the next day, August 5, and Merck and Billings visited Nuniamo and spent a night there. (Sarychev 1811:182 [translation mine, M.C.]). This name can be easily associated with the historical coastal village known later as Nuniamo (Nunyamo). During the 1800s, various sources referred to that village as “Nuniagmo,” which sounds very similar to Sarychev’s “Uniagma.” It was a maritime Chukchi community, probably from time immemorial.\footnote{In 1958, after the closure of Naukan, most of the Naukan Yup’ik Eskimo were resettled to Nunyamo, but not for a long time, since Nunyamo was itself abandoned in 1975 (Chichlo 1983).}

Entering the St. Lawrence Bay and “…passing about 4.5 miles into the bay we anchored at the right shore close to a flat point where 4 tents or summer yurts (huts – M.C.) of the sedentary Chukchis stood. This settlements consists of 4 tents build of wooden rifts and whale bones closed from above by walrus skins” (Sarychev 1811:182). This second site was another coastal Chukchi settlement on the northern shore of St. Lawrence Bay, later known by its Russianized name Pinakul. These two Chukchi camps, Nuniamo and Pinakul, served as common landing places for almost all of the ships that visited St. Lawrence Bay, from Captain Cook’s voyage of 1777 and until the 1920s. During the Soviet era, the administrative and cultural center of the area was moved further inland, to a former small camp named Katrytkino (in CSY Kesbi, in Merck’s notation – Gartschocher – Titova 1978:145), where the modern town of Lavrentiya, an administrative center of the Chukotskiy district, is now located.

The expedition stayed at St. Lawrence Bay for 10 days, and after that two leaders of the expedition, Billings and Sarychev, took different routes. On August 14, 1791 Sarychev, with the bulk of the expedition’s party, including Rohbeck, left Chukotka on board the Glory of Russia, went to the Aleutians, and proceeded from there to St. Petersburg. As for Billings, Merck, and a few other expedition members, they went by a small boat to Mechigmen Bay on August 13, 1791. After a short stay in that area, they arranged for a group of reindeer Chukchi to take them by land to Nizhnekolymsk on the Kolyma River, which they eventually accomplished via an arduous sled-journey of several months (Sarychev 1811; Titova 1978:4).

On August 4, 1791, their very first day in Chukotka, Merck and Billings visited Nuniamo and spent a night there. They boarded the ship again the next day, August 5, and Merck made a note in his diary: The Chukchis started to visit the ship. Some of them were sedentary, other possessed reindeers (Tschautschu), they were nomads who constantly change their camping places. This time they arranged their camps in two places on the southern shore of the bay. Interpreter Daurkin also arrived, accompanied by the Chukchis, who live further from here. On many skin-boats (baidaras) they came for trading to the first settlement [Pinakul – M.C.]. Here they stranded their boats and used them as shelters. Mr. Rohbeck sat with them to make notes on everything he could learn by asking them. Later during our slow travel I had much free time to develop and check these notes (Siberia 1980:195).

The analysis of the expedition’s itinerary helps identify the time and the circumstances under which Rohbeck could have compiled his Naukanski vocabulary. That might have happened in Pinakul only sometime between August 4-12, 1791. It turned out that among the traders “who arrived with Daurkin and who lived further from there” there was a boat-crew from Naukan. Rohbeck, obviously, took his vocabulary with him on the return trip to St. Petersburg, since his original handwritten word list was later put together with other of Sarychev’s papers and published in his book as a separate attachment. As for Merck’s notes, they were transferred after the end of the expedition to another Russian-German naturalist, Academician P.S. Pallas; thus, they did not become a part of Sarychev’s collection, which was mentioned by the latter with regret (Sarychev 1952:233). That means that when Merck referred to his “development and checking” of Rohbeck’s materials, he had in mind not Rohbeck’s vocabulary proper but rather some ethnographic notes, which they quite probably had initially taken together. As for the strange title of Rohbeck’s vocabulary and its reference to the mouth of the Anadyr River, the only explanation I have is that such a title has been added by some of the later editors of the manuscript in Pallas’ team. The latter was obviously not a reliable expert in local geography and his misnomer was a cause of confusion for many a later scholar (see Fortescue 2004; Krauss 2005:167).

Another unsolved mystery is the sources of Merck’s own information on the Uelenski language, bearing in mind that he himself never visited the village of Uelen. Of course, upon his landing in Pinakul, with Billings and Rohbeck, he might have met there, besides the Naukan boats, also some visitors from Uelen. But that is a guess only that may be but vaguely confirmed by Merck’s allegation that at a later time...
on his sled journey he was “developing” what had been done by Rohbeck, rather than taking his own notes.

The chronicle of the expedition offers indications to some other prospective sources on Uelen's language that might have been available to Merck. As mentioned above, on August 13, 1791, two parties of the expedition, one headed by Billings accompanied by Merck, another headed by Sarychev, split and took different routes. Billings and Merck joined the reindeer camp of a rich Chukchi herder named Imlerat, who was invited by the expedition's Chukchi interpreter Nikolay Daurkin to meet the expedition in Lavrentiya Bay. There, Imlerat and Daurkin persuaded Billings to abandon his initial plan to take a sea route across the Bering Strait and along the arctic coast of Chukotka to the mouth of the Kolyma River, arguing that the route would be impassable because of heavy sea ice. Sarychev was very unhappy with Billings' decision and opposed it. In the anticipation of the original Billings' trip to the Kolyma by sea, the second interpreter of the expedition, Cossack officer Ivan Kobelev, was sent to the Uelen area to prepare local residents for the forthcoming arrival of the expedition. While in Uelen, Kobelev made a short trip to the Diomede and King Islands in mid-August 1791 (Titova 1978). At that time, he did not know anything about the change of Billings' itinerary and was probably waiting for the arrival of the expedition's boat somewhere around Uelen. To inform him on the change of plans, Billings sent a boat under Sergeant Gilev, who spent two days (August 21–23) in Uelen looking for Kobelev. Not finding him there, Gilev continued his travel northwest by a local skin-boat. That means Gilev was by sea, the second interpreter of the expedition, Cossack officer Ivan Kobelev, was sent to the Uelen area to prepare local residents for the forthcoming arrival of the expedition. While in Uelen, Kobelev made a short trip to the Diomede and King Islands in mid-August 1791 (Titova 1978). At that time, he did not know anything about the change of Billings' itinerary and was probably waiting for the arrival of the expedition's boat somewhere around Uelen. To inform him on the change of plans, Billings sent a boat under Sergeant Gilev, who spent two days (August 21–23) in Uelen looking for Kobelev. Not finding him there, Gilev continued his travel northwest by a local skin-boat. That means Gilev was probably in close contact with at least some Uelen people for at least a month. In his report, Gilev referred to a captured “American” (i.e., Alaskan Eskimo) woman, also to some Chukchi who brought them fish from the Puchta River (Titova 1978:106; the place name is recorded in its CSY version, like in Merck's report). However, Gilev could not find Kobelev (and eventually returned to St. Lawrence Bay); whereas the latter learned from some Chukchi reindeer herders that Billings was indeed traveling by land. The herders brought Kobelev to Kolyuchin Bay where, on October 5th, he finally joined Billings and Merck’s party. Upon his arrival, Kobelev was accompanied by “20 Chukchi from Kolyuchin Bay”; among them, there were probably some of his fellow travelers to Alaska across the Bering Strait, that is, people from Uelen (Titova 1978:146).

We know from Merck’s and Billings’ diaries that, after meeting Kobelev, they both parted with Imlerat’s group and continued with Kobelev and his party for the rest of their journey to Kolyma. That means that for the following several months Merck was traveling together with Kobelev and his Native companions from Kolyuchin Bay and/or from the northern shore of the Chukchi Peninsula adjacent to Uelen. Kobelev undoubtedly was Merck’s and Billings’ main, if not the only, interpreter during their long trip with a caravan of reindeer sleds (and sled-drivers) to Nizhne-Kolymsk. It is probably due to Kobelev’s translation and explanations that Merck eventually added Russian suffixes to a number of Native place and language names. All that gives us some hints concerning the prospective sources of Merck’s information on the Uelen language.

**What Are the Words Marked by “U” in Merck’s Manuscript**

Vdovin (1954), who was the first to approach Merck’s manuscript as a valuable reference to the former language areas in Chukotka in the 1700s, was also the first to claim that the words marked with a sign “u” in the manuscript relate to some Eskimo language spoken in the village of Uelen. After citing four words from Merck’s text (one of them uluan ‘spear,’ evidently a Chukchi loan), he wrote: “Merck’s data undoubtedly indicate the presence of Eskimo speakers in the village of Uelen now inhabited by the Chukchi” (Vdovin 1954:77). Having come to that reasonable conclusion, Vdovin nevertheless skipped the next question: What kind of Eskimo language was spoken in Uelen? As stated above, both Krauss and I analyzed the full text of Merck’s manuscript during the 1970s and 1980s, and we both arrived at the same conclusion that that language was in fact a dialect of CSY. My position was presented in short and without any linguistic argumentation about twenty years ago (Chlenov 1988:67-68); Krauss’ analysis was published recently (Krauss 2005).

Titova, the editor and translator of Merck’s manuscript, made a footnote to Merck’s reference in passim on “the Uelenski dialect (speech? Germ. Mundart) for which a vocabulary is compiled” stating that “...Merck refers here to the dictionary of 12 languages published in G.A. Sarychev’s book of 1811 (Titova 1978:100), thus obviously referring to the Naukanski vocabulary by Rohbeck. But the words in Merck’s manuscript are absolutely different from those listed by Rohbeck. That means that Titova’s reference is incorrect and we still have to explain what is the meaning of the letter “a” put by Merck in his text after most of the words of the “Sedentary Chukchi” language, and also why he did it.

I fully agree with Vdovin and other later students who believe that this letter should be interpreted as an abbreviation for “Uelenski.” In the beginning of his notes Merck gives the name of the Big Diomede Island first in Chukchi as Imaglin, and then in Uelenski as Imaeklin (Titova 1978:100). The widespread local Eskimo name of this island is Imaaqil.ig, with a back velar –q- evidently reflected in Merck’s Imaeklin.
Even more, after writing this name, Merck put a letter U, and added "in the Uelenski dialect in which the vocabulary [was compiled]" (Titova 1978:100). That is a clear indication that "U" should be understood as "Uelenski" and not as something else. As for the vocabulary, mentioned above, it might refer to either a vocabulary that was compiled by Merck himself during his voyage and that was somehow lost afterwards, or simply to the limited number of words in his manuscript, which were marked by the letter "u." The very fact that the letter "u" stands after the very first Eskimo word where it was needed to differentiate the languages of reindeer and sedentary Chukchis is just another proof that it should be understood as "Uelenski."

In her publication of Merck's manuscript, Titova (1978:151–154) attached two word-lists, one named “Chukchi words found in Merck’s manuscript about the Chukchi,” and the other titled “Words from the Eskimo language found in Merck’s manuscript about the Chukchi (marked with a letter “u”)” (Titova 1978:153). Titova compiled both of those lists herself from the manuscript, obviously to help the future students of Merck’s materials. For that, she is to be praised by every Eskimo linguist to use her publication. However, not all of the 74 words she put into her “Eskimo list” are actually marked with the "u" sign in the manuscript. For an unknown reason, she omitted in her translation a part of the manuscript on leaf 32 recto and verso; the text remained unpublished, but the following words were nevertheless included into the Eskimo word-list: gamyjik ‘sledge,’ gatypagyt ‘eider-duck,’ kokawa ‘covered sledge,’ khouren ‘reindeer,’ kuungit ‘reindeer,’ nachschak ‘seal,’ nachtschalueta ‘wooden box for fire-stone,’ nelcyl ‘reindeer herd,’ nilkhat ‘cormorant,’ pariak ‘beluga,’ sikiit ‘ground-squirrel,’ tshukak ‘baleen,’ tungtu ‘caribou,’ uliaakov ‘polar fox,’ waliannak ‘grindstone.’

Some of these words, namely khouren, kokawa, and nelcyl are obviously of Chukchi origin. All three relate to the nomadic way of life and were probably used by the Eskimos as loan-words. The remaining words are undoubtedly of Eskimo origin; so we analyze them here as part of the Uelenski language corpus. Another portion of Titova’s Eskimo word-list consists of some words that were not marked by “u” in the manuscript but were indicated as words used by the “sedentary Chukchi” without specific relation to Uelenski. The first “unmarked” word is kachlibagy, ‘clothes.’ Merck writes: “Their clothes are called Kerker, and the sedentary – Kachlybagyt” (Titova 1978:124). This is without doubt an Eskimo word, which sounds very similar both in CSY and in NY: CSY qalleva’g ‘female fur coat, kerker (pl.),’ qalleva’gek ‘female fur coat (sing.),’ NY qallivik ‘female fur coat, qallivaget ‘female clothes.’

The second unmarked word was machak, ‘broad outer fur clothes (parka).’ Merck writes: “the Russians call it Kuklaencke, the reindeer-Chukchi Utitschgin, the sedentary – Mackak (Titova 1978:111). There is a clear correspondence with CSY maqak ‘a double outer parka done of thin reindeer skins dressed over a usual parka.’ I have not found an exact NY equivalent, although the root is present in NY in maqaghe ‘muffle up.’

The third word of the “unmarked origin” is ulit or ‘warm fur curtain.’ In Merck’s manuscript the meaning is literally ‘Iniri, and the sedentary call it Ulit, again without the letter ‘u’ (Titova 1978:105). It is not quite clear what Merck meant here. The inner sleeping chamber in the coastal Eskimo dwelling is called aagra in both CSY and NY. In CSY ulik means ‘fur blanket (dual),’ uliget ‘fur blankets (pl.),’ in NY ulik ‘fur coverlet (dual);’ ulikutaq ‘fur blanket.’ Interestingly enough the plural in Uelenski, ulit is formed not according to the CSY model, i.e., not from the stem type 4 (cf. aghneg (sing.) – aghneghet (pl.), uliget (dual) – uliget (pl.), as is the case in modern CSY, but from stem type 3 (cf. aghnaq (sing.) – aghnaq (pl.), ulit (dual) – ulit (pl.). It is not the only example of this type of derivation in Uelenski that differs from modern CSY. It seems that this type of plural formation is more characteristic of NY, than of CSY.

The fourth word is kjaigit translated as ‘winter dwelling.’ Merck: “The sedentary Chukchi call their winter dwellings Kjaigit, the reindeer Chukchi – Gliirat” (Titova 1978:106; again without a “u” mark). This word has a clear analog in NY qaygi ‘small underground dwelling, cave.’ The CSY uses the word nenglu for old underground houses. No doubt both NY qaygi and sedentary Chukchi kjaigit are etymologically related to the widespread Eskimo root *qadgi that normally designates a communal winter (men’s) house in various Eskimo languages. As far as I know this root does not exist (is not recorded?) in CSY and Sirenenski NY does have it. Interestingly enough, the Chukchi word qlegran, which is the correspondence to Merck’s gleirat, also means ‘big subterranean house.’ This is a cultural term easily loaned. If this word in Merck’s manuscript were accompanied by a “u” mark I could have speculated that this Uelenski word was either a loan from NY or from Iñupiaq, or, more probably, that the Uelenski retained it as a reflex of a widespread root

---

4Here and below all the Yùıp’ik Eskimo words are given in their standard CSY orthography.

5Here and below Mark’s words marked with “U” and otherwise indicated as used by the sedentary Chukchi are compared with words from modern CSY and Naukinski. The abbreviations used below: U – Uelenski; CSY – Central-Siberian Yùıp’ik, or Chaplinski; NY – Naukinski.
lost in other Siberian/Asiatic Eskimo languages. Since we lack a non-controversial reference that this word belonged to the Uelenski language, it cannot be used, together with three other clearly Eskimo words, to analyze its position among other Eskimo languages in Asia.

More controversial is the affiliation of a few other words that also lack the “U” mark in the published text but were nevertheless included by Titova into her “Uelenski” word-list.

The first word is the term used for the Russians, Leleuronmy. Merck writes: “The reindeer Chukchi call the Russians Milgitanggitan and by the way also Leleuronkmkit…that means ‘bearded people’…the sedentary call the Russians Leleuronmy” (again without a “U” – Titova 1978:100). No doubt this word is of Chukchi origin and Merck’s translation is absolutely correct; it means ‘bearded or mustachioed people.’ Significantly, this Chukchi word is used as a denomination for Russians in CSY only (laluramka, laluramke ‘a Russian (sing.),’ laluramket ‘Russians (pl.).’ The NY form is anguyak (‘enemy, stranger, also a Russian’). NY anguyak initially meant ‘enemy, stranger,’ and its use for ‘Russian’ is a calque from Chukchi tanngetan (‘enemy, stranger, a Russian’).

The second word is the self-denomination of the sedentary Chukhchis, Nimillaen. Merck writes: “The sedentary Chukchis call themselves Nimillaen (those who live on one place, sedentary)– again without a “U” mark (Titova 1978:98).” There is no such word in any of the present-day Eskimo languages in Asia. As far as I know the Chukchi also do not have such a word and do not use it for either Eskimo or maritime Chukchi people. One can, nevertheless, find it in various forms in some Russian travel accounts from Chukotka of the early 1800s (i.e., Lutke’s Namollo). Etymologically it seems to be related to Chukchi nem ‘dwelling.’ It closely resembles the self-denomination of the sedentary Koryak known in its Russianized form as Nymylan, from which it may be taken by some Kamchatka interpreters accompanying early Russian expeditions. Other indications that this name was once used in Chukotka are modern Siberian Eskimo personal names, such as Numelin (CSY) and Nomelian (NY).

Two more words found their place in Titova’s “Uelenski” vocabulary presumably by mistake. The first word is okamak, or ‘small figurines of gods’ (Merck writes: “the Chukchis have small figurines of gods – Gamangau or Okamak, they carry them attached to the belt” – Titova 1978:101). There is neither a “U” sign nor other indication that the second word relates to the language of “sedentary Chukchis.” Perhaps the two words are simply synonyms. No comparable word is to be found in the nearest Siberian Eskimo languages; in CSY ukamag means ‘hauling a boat along the shore,’ in NY ukamaghbte means ‘the one who hauls a boat.’ The second problematic word is pokajomrot or ‘moose-willow.’ The exact quotation from Merck reads as follows: “The reindeer Chukchis name the willow Jomrot or Jomrat; the sedentary – Okjuet,a; another type of willow they name Pokata or Poka-Jomrot because it looks fluffy” (Titova 1978:127). Clearly enough, that second term is a version of some Chukchi word, not an Eskimo one, since I could not find any Eskimo word with a similar meaning.

Position of Uelenski Language: Lexical Analysis of Merck’s Word List

Thus the corpus of the specifically Uelenski words consists of 63 and not of 74 words, as listed by Titova. Below I provide a lexical analysis of Merck’s Uelenski word list, by comparing it to similar forms known in CSY and NY that have common or close meaning. Comparison with the Central Alaskan Yup’ik, Alaskan Iñupiaq, or Sireniki language might be illuminating as well; but my knowledge of those languages is too limited for such a study.

Twelve Uelenski words in Merck’s list are the names of the months (Titova 1978:136); some of these could hardly be associated with any familiar month names known in the present-day Yup’ik languages across the area. It should be noted that the names for the months are highly variable in Eskimo languages, as they are often derived from independently different roots; also, there may be many different month names even within one language area. For example, numerous and quite distinctive names for the same months in CSY have been recorded by many scholars, including myself, in different CSY-speaking communities, even from different informants (see month names or name lists in Krupnik 2001; Rubtsova 1971; Shinen 1976; Sivuqam 1985; Vakhtin and Emel’ianova 1988).

For this and other reasons, identification of Merck’s Uelenski names for months is quite insightful but also very complicated. My colleagues, Michael Krauss and Steven Jacobson, at the ANLC, have done some preliminary comparison of Merck’s list of month names with those from other Yup’ik languages. The results of their study of almost twenty years ago have never been published; I cite it here with their kind permission, using the manuscript version of their original text of 1987 (Krauss and Chlenov 1987).

---

I have not specifically analyzed the Chukchi portion of Merck’s vocabulary; but a cursory inspection gives an impression that some Eskimo words might have been added to it by mistake. See, for instance, Chukchi angerengil ‘shaman,’ which reminds its CSY counterpart alginalghi ‘shaman’ (Titova 1978:103).
Edscheachtsch 'January.' Krauss and Jacobson view it a distorted CSY word *nazziqhaghbsiq* or NY *naayuugbghbsiq* 'moon of newly born ringed seal cubs.' It roughly corresponds to January-February; the word derives from *nazziqhag* 'ringed seal cub.' Merck’s transcription is too distorted to be identified with either CSY or NY. But here, as in most other Uelen'ski glosses, as well as in other Eskimo words transcribed in the 18th to the early 19th centuries, the old *Q* is retained and not being replaced by $S$, as in all modern Yup’ik languages on the Asiatic mainland.

Tailuechtschuch 'February.' Krauss and Jacobson associate it with CSY *tqghihlgguxiq*, or *tqghiigluggagbhevik* 'moon (month) of newly born bearded seal cubs'; roughly corresponds to March. The name is derived from CSY *tqghigluk* 'newborn bearded seal cub.' This identification looks phonetically much more plausible than the previous one. In NY the equivalent form for this month is *inlavlak*, derived from *inlaa* 'white skin of seal cub.'

Tliqghwit 'March.' This name can be easily identified with CSY *lluaghvik* 'moon of the bird-sling.' The name is derived from CSY *lluk* 'slng'; it roughly corresponds to April. The NY correspondence to this month is *kpeginbheghbsiq* 'moon the ice breaks'; another interpretation is the 'end of winter,' from CSY *kepney* 'portion' (Krupnik 2001:394).

Nedsbeachtsh 'April.' The normative CSY form for this month in Chukotka Yup’ik is *ellngagbhevik* - 'moon when the water stands out from below the ice.' It is derived from CSY *ellngaghaq* 'to flow and from' *llnga* - 'flow, leak.' St. Lawrence Island residents interpret it as ‘moon of the draining tundra’ and identify it not with April-May, as do Siberian Yup’ik, but with July (Sivuqam 1985:126). The NY analogue for this month cannot be found; therefore, this word in Merck’s list remains unidentified. Krauss and Jacobson relate it to the first month of the year (in Merck’s notation *edsbeachtshchu*); but that hardly clarifies what was actually meant by Merck or his informants. One should also bear in mind that Merck coped with the complicated Yup’ik phonetics with great difficulty, using Chukchi informants and Chukchi translations.

Kiutagbnaeit 'May.' The first analog that comes to mind is the NY *kiiget aaniit*, 'mother of rivers.' However, in CSY this part of the year is *kiigem agbnna* 'summer woman.' The plural form -*aqhnaat* 'women' with its distinctive voiced uvular -*gh* (in the modern CSY transliteration, this sound is written exactly like Merck did it in 1791) points to such an identification with CSY plural *aghnaat* and correspondingly *kiiget*.

Angutagbheit 'June.' An analogue to this word exists in CSY dialect of St. Lawrence Island only. Krauss and Jacobson note that the name *angutagbheit* appears in a St. Lawrence annual calendar first compiled by Shinen (1976). The islanders themselves use the word *angutagbheit*, 'moon of plant gathering' as an alternative name to *ellngagbhevik* and identify it with July (Sivuqam 1985:126). In N this part of the year is called *kiguyghvehq* 'moon of sorrel gathering.'

Pelerwit 'July.' Can be easily compared to CSY *palsiigbhevik* 'moon of withering plants,’ or ‘moon to gather berries,’ it is derived from *palsiq* 'wither'; roughly corresponds to July and August. In NY this part of the year is, again, designated by a different word *siklagbhevik* 'moon to gather roots,' or by *quaquinbhevik* 'moon to gather young willow sprouts' which corresponds more or less to the same season.

Komulaewwit 'August.' An analogue to this name, as first identified by Krauss and Jacobson, exists in St. Lawrence version of CSY only. Shinen (1976) spells it as "komlaviq," the islanders use the form *kumlaviq*, with the meaning ‘moon of freeze-up.’ It is derived from CSY and NY *kumla*- 'light frost'; on today’s St. Lawrence Island it coincides with September, not with August (Sivuqam 1985:126–27).

Naiwagwit 'September.' Like the previous name, it exists only in St. Lawrence Island version of CSY. Shinen (1976) gives the spelling "*naayuqhbhevik;" the islanders use the form *naayuqhbhevik* 'moon of the freezing lakes.' On St. Lawrence Island, it corresponds to October (Sivuqam 1985:126–27). Derived from CSY *naayuq* 'lake,' and *naayvaghbhevik* 'freeze (of lakes).'

Akumuk 'October.' Can be soundly identified with CSY *aqum* 'moon of the sun standing still,' derived from CSY and NY *aqum*- 'to sit,' locally interpreted as the moon (month) when people sit inside their dwellings. Roughly corresponds to November. In NY this month is designated by a word *aqumtuq* derived from the same Yup’ik stem.

Kangatingytshchik 'November.' Krauss and Jacobson compare it to CSY *kanegbheyngesiq* 'moon of the frozen dew,' derived from CSY and NY *kangiiq* 'hoar frost.' Roughly corresponds to December. In NY this month is called *kanayyasiq* derived from the same Yup’ik stem.

Galluebchick 'December.' Can be compared to CSY *gaktuwik* 'moon of netting tomcod'; roughly corresponds to the period from November to January. Derived from CSY and NY *gala* - 'netting fish.' In NY this month is called *perugbhiigbhevik* 'moon of first snow hunting.'
Notwithstanding the inconsistency of some identifications, Krauss and Jacobson’s analysis of the Uelenski names for months clearly illustrates that Merck’s list consists of primarily CSY terms and not of the Naukanski, or any other known (or unknown) Yup’ik or other language. Moreover, it brings us to a conclusion that within CSY dialectal realm, the Uelenski language was closer to the St. Lawrence CSY version than to any other variety of that language (see references to that also in Krauss 2004:170).

This overall conclusion that Merck’s Uelenski language was very close if not almost identical to CSY can be corroborated by several other words from Merck’s list. Among the remaining 54 words, eleven match very closely to both their CSY and NY analogs:

- **Aiwok** – walrus. Both CSY and NY have *ayveq* ‘walrus.’
- **Algakpach** – placenta. Both CSY and NY have *alghaghhpak* ‘placenta.’
- **Awtuk** – menses. CSY *aawk* ‘blood’; *aawggtuq* ‘menses (past tense)’; NY *awk* ‘blood.’
- **Kamgyt** – ‘woman’s boots.’ CSY *kaamget* ‘boots (pl.)’ *kamgek* ‘boots, fur-boots (dual)’; cf. NY *kamgek* (dual), *kamget* (pl.) ‘fur-boots.’
- **Kuingit** – reindeer. Both CSY and NY have *quyngiq* ‘reindeer’; CSY *quyngiit* (pl.).
- **Mytschegan** – blubber. Both CSY and NY have *mesiq* ‘melted blubber.’
- **Nachschak** – ringed seal. Both CSY and NY have *negbhsaq* ‘ringed seal.’
- **Naenuk** – ‘polar bear.’ CSY *nanuq*; NY *naniuq.*
- **Natschahat** – hood. Equivalent form in CSY is *nasaghak* ‘a hood not sewn to the parka (dual),’ or *nasagbat* the same in plural, or just *nasag* ‘hood.’ NY has both words *nasagbag* and *nasag* for ‘hood.’
- **Sikuk** – needle. Both CSY and NY have *sikuq* ‘needle.’
- **Tsckukak** – baleen. Both CSY and NY have *suuqaq* ‘baleen.’

In ten other words on Merck’s list, both CSY and NY analogs to Uelenski forms are derived from the same roots; but morphologically and phonetically the Uelenski forms are closer to the CSY than to the NY versions:

- **Aningwab** – abscess. CSY *aningwaq* ‘abscess, boil, furuncle’; NY *aningoq* ‘abscess.’
- **Atkughat** – fur coat. CSY *atuk* ‘fur coat, parka (dual);’ *atkuget* ‘fur coats sewn from reindeer skin dressed over one’s head (pl.)’; NY *atekuk* ‘fur coat, parka (dual).’
- **Gamyjik** – sledge. CSY *qamiyk* ‘sledge;’ NY *qamawak* ‘sledge.’
- **Kammach** – oil-lamp. CSY *keneq* ‘fire,’ *keneqetaaghek* ‘lamp, oil-lamp;’ NY *ekneq* ‘fire,’ *eknitaq* ‘lamp, oil-lamp.’
- **Kochlinit** – trousers. CSY *qulliget* ‘trousers,’ *qulligek* ‘breeches, trousers (dual);’ NY *qulliik* ‘trousers, breeches.’
- **Nikschik** – ivory fishhook. CSY *nakshek* ‘fishhook;’ NY *neggsiq* ‘stick for hauling in the catch from the water, fishhook.’
- **Packak** – moss. CSY *pepaq* ‘moss used as wick in oil-lamps;’ NY *epaqaq* ‘moss.’
- **Tainagli** – graphite. CSY *tagneghli* ‘black inking stone for dying thread,’ *tagnelghi* ‘black graphite, black inking stone.’ The respective NY forms are *tangeq* ‘black,’ *talngaghrik* ‘inking graphite stone,’ and *tangelghi* ‘blackened.’
- **Tungtu** – caribou. CSY *tungtu*; NY *tuntu* ‘caribou.’

Worth mentioning is that the consonant sequence –gl- and –ghl- appears in CSY and Uelenski but not in NY.

The nasalized –ng- in this word is characteristic for CSY and Uelenski, not for NY.
Seventeen more Uelenski words in Merck’s list have semantic and phonetic analogues in CSY only, since the corresponding meanings in NY are produced from etymologically different roots: *achwaimutue* -- holiday running (cf. CSY *aqutaq* ‘to run (after someone), to call, invite (someone)’; NY *aghgpalieg* ‘aghbapassel’ ‘running (after someone)’; *qhbeelak* – mitten (CSY *ahollak; NY *ayggqat* ‘mitten, hand, ayepgghqaat *mitten’); *nakutschagt* – short boots made from seal’s skin sewn with fur inside (cf. CSY *akughviiqasagat* ‘beautifully ornamented boots sewn from fur from reindeer’s legs to knee length,’ *ivghusiaghruk* ‘short boots made of fur from reindeer’s legs to knee length, ’ *ivghusiik* – summer boots to knee length sewn from scraped hairless seal skin; NY *ivgusiihvak* – ‘beautifully ornamented boots sewn from scraped hairless seal skin,’ *ivgusiihvakru* ‘short boots made of scraped hairless seal skin’; *akubjachpuk* – boots made of seal skin to hip length (CSY *akughvihaput* ‘long fur boots’ (pl.) *akughviiqappegat* ‘fur boots to knee length made of scraped hairless seal skin; cf. NY *ivgusiihvak* ‘long fur boots’; *amaghullug* – eider duck (CSY *qatepak* (sing.); *qatepegat* (pl.); NY *amaghullek, tegniapik, gengallek* ‘eider-duck drake’; *kalik* – woman’s raincoat (CSY *qaliq* ‘raincoat done of manufactured walrus or bearded seal intestines’; NY *silqogqig* ‘woman’s raincoat’); *kapagq* – earrings (CSY *qapagq* (dual); *qapagq* (pl.) *earrings or beads plait into one’s hair (pl.)’; *nachtshaltlu* – wooden box for fire-stone (cf. CSY *naaghsalqagq* ‘box of matches; NY *eketj* ‘box of matches’); *nelqiy* reindeer herd (1) (CSY *qigviil* ‘reindeer herd; cf. NY *pnyagtemke* ‘herd (of any animals); *qyingit* ‘reindeer herd’); *nigachpq* – net made of sinew or leather threads (CSY *negaghpikq* ‘fishing net’); *nikpat* – cormorant (CSY *nxelqap* (sing.); *nxelqap* (pl.); cf. NY *gqatjig*); *pariak* – beluga, white whale (CSY *papqegq*; NY *sitqu*); *siki* – polar ground squirrel (CSY *sikik* (sing.); *sikik* (pl.); NY *qittaq*; *talamchikbi* – chin tattoo (CSY *talamkhun* ‘chin tattoo’ from *tama* ‘chin’); *nuu* – holidays (CSY *vuwalla* ‘holiday’; cf. NY *krissma* ‘holiday’ (most certainly, from English “Christmas”); 13 *waliamnak* – whetstone (cf. CSY *walamnaak* 14 file; NY *penagun* ‘file’). Thus 45 Uelen words out of 66 can be associated with the modern CSY words. Only four other words on Merck’s list (not counting the word *kjaigit* analyzed above) can be matched to their quite distinctive Naukanski analogues: *echtykynagak* – cremation (CSY *egtegqhuq, agtegqhuq* ‘the one who lost or threw out his children’; NY *egtekgengaq* ‘cremation, literally – to throw out’); *kolummitschit* – kettle (CSY *qulmesiin* ‘pot (sing.); *qulmesiitet* ‘pot (pl.)’; NY *qulasmsin* ‘pot’ *qulasmsi* ‘kettle’); *okjuet* – ‘willow foddered by reindeer’ (CSY (?!) – cf. NY *equ* ‘willow foddered by reindeer’ 15; *uiahak* – Arctic fox (CSY *gatelghiq*” cf. NY *uлагаq*). This extremely limited number of words in Merck’s list that are closer to NY than to CSY certainly cannot be taken as a proof of specific relation between U and NY. These are either clear Chukchi loanwords or items related to the lifeways of reindeer breeders, or are products (reflexes) of the general Yup’ik stems widely distributed in the area and not specific to NY.

Finally there are several words in “Uelenski list” for which I was unable to come to any conclusion regarding their origins. Some do not resemble Eskimo words, either Yupik or Inupiaq; others probably belong to the Chukchi language. A few seem to be clear typos, like *runmuckel*, woman's pronunciation *wanmuckel* ‘arm tattooing’ (origins unknown?), or *witschelkalin* ‘polar ground squirrel 5.5 inch long,’ which seems to be a Chukchi word. A few of Merck’s glosses clearly resemble Eskimo (Yupik) words; but their identification with potential analogues in modern CSY or NY is not as firm as for the words listed above. Even in those cases, however, most such words resemble CSY more than NY.

---

9By ‘holiday running’ Merck possibly meant the invitation to participate in a holiday delivered by special running heralds. This might be indicated by the semantics of CSY *apitaq* ‘to run after someone, to invite guests.’
10The final –tsch in Merck’s gloss can be interpreted as designating the plural suffix –get. The combination –tsch-reflects the old *č now replaced in all Asiatic Eskimo languages by k.
11This word is also not significant, not only because CSY *nqila* is a loanword from Chukchi *nqil* with the same meaning. Generally speaking reindeer breeding is alien to the Eskimos; so the Eskimo languages do not possess developed terminology for this type of economy. Cf. NY where the word for ‘reindeer herd’ is simply *qyingit*, which means ‘many reindeer.’
12The word given by Merck *siki* (pl.) is certainly identical to (CSY *sikik* (sing.) but interestingly enough the plural formation is different from the standard CSY *sikik*.
13Strictly speaking this word is meaningless for comparison: the CSY *wuwalla* is a Chukchi loanword, in NY it is replaced by an English loanword *krissma*, which did not exist in the late 1700s.
14This is a Chukchi loanword.
15Cremation is practiced in Chukotka by the Reindeer Chukchi only. The Eskimo and the Coastal Chukchi usually bury the corpses or leave them in coffins on the ground. That is why we find a strange semantics here, because a person who was burned after his death cannot ‘reincarnate’ in his descendants. The semantic of this word, again, does not come from the realities of the Eskimo way of life and the word itself is hardly suitable for any comparison between U and NY.
16I could not find any lexical equivalent for this item in CSY. It seems that the NY word is also a Chukchi loanword thus not belonging to the genuine Naukanski ‘Sprachgut.’
17The CSY *gatelghiq* looks like a lexical tabooing and is derived etymologically from CSY *gatelghiq* ‘white.’ As for the U *uaiaq* most probably it is not a Naukanski word, but rather a retention in U of a widely distributed Eskimo root for Arctic fox.
The majority of the Uelenski language glosses recorded by Merck in 1791 can be clearly matched with their modern CSY analogs or differ from them but slightly. Few if any words in Merck’s list can be treated as lexically specific or characteristic to Naukanski Yup’ik, to say nothing about other Iñupiaq or Yup’ik languages adjacent to the Bering Strait area. Therefore, there is hardly any doubt that the so-called “Uelenski” language as documented by Merck in the late 1700s was nothing else but one of the dialects of Central Siberian Yup’ik (CSY), or Chaplinski Asiatic Eskimo language, according to the Russian terminology.

Atkahutschiksci ‘girls tattooing: two lines along the nose and along the forehead.’ Resembles somehow CSY atngagaghsiq (or atngaghuta) ‘tattooing of two lines along the nose;’ NY atggagbute ‘tattooing.’

Juguljachtsci ‘tattooing in a form of a lying little person.’ That should be a derivation from CSY, NY yuuk ‘man,’ cf. for instance CSY *yagulaghsiq.

Kugugut ‘annual remembrance of dead ancestors’; traditional ritual commemoration of the dead is called in CSY agqesagq, but cf. CSY qungughsagq, qungughat ‘cemetery,’ NY yunguq ‘dead person.’

Publiangok ‘dead person.’ It can be compared to NY puuqlangghalghii ‘swollen, inflated by gas or compressed air.’ Cf. also CSY paangb, panqghataaq ‘to starve,’ puuqilgeq ‘tumor, swell,’ puuqlegh ‘to swell, swell up.’

Tawatawate ‘a cry during sacrificial ceremonies;’ cf. NY tawatawaten ‘enough,’ CSY tawatawattitat ‘that’s how they are!’ tawatateaqq ‘so it is.’ The semantics of interjection are normally very vague so it remains unclear what should be the right comparison to the form as written down by Merck. Possibly it is a Russian loanword from davay-davay ‘do it!’

Tun chlutuk ‘let us wrestle.’ Slightly resembles the imperative mood from CSY verb tughumghaqa ‘to wrestle’- tughumghalluta, NY akulluta ‘let us wrestle.’

Ukhutschichtsci ‘tattooing on cheeks.’ May be a derivation from CSY uullunak ‘cheeks.’

Conclusions

The specific dialectal position of Uelenski within CSY is, however, not at all clear. The Uelenski CSY language probably had a slightly unusual form of plural formation for a number of nouns, when formed from different stem-type, than in modern CSY. It also had a significant number of Chukchi loanwords indicating extensive Chukchi influence on its speakers. If the “Uelenski” language is to be indeed associated with the residents of the village of Uelen and of some other communities along the Arctic coast of Chukotka, northwest of Cape Dezhnev, one may assume that by the time of Merck’s visit to the Bering Strait (1791), that area was probably already populated by the mix of the Yup’ik and Chukchi speakers. Vdovin (1965), Leont’iev (1976) and I in 1985 have independently reported the names of two historical segments of the Uelen community: the Tapkarallit and the Enmerallit. Quite probably, those names might have reflected the former Yup’ik and Chukchi sections of the village, respectively, where the Tapkarallit (from CSY and NY tapqghaq ‘sand spit’) could have been a traditional name of the Yup’ik-speaking people who lived on the long Uelen sand bar.

On the other hand, there are certain words that are characteristic to both the Uelen and the CSY dialect of St. Lawrence Island. Additional arguments for this unexpected closeness reported by Krauss (2005:170) are extremely intriguing. If proven, they can shed some new light to the many unresolved mysteries of ethnic history of the Bering Strait region during the last three centuries.

At the same time, the Uelenski language clearly differed from other CSY dialects distributed to the west of Chaplinski CSY, along the northern shore of the Gulf of Anadyr. I can see an additional proof to this in the fact that Merck’s informants in 1791 clearly singled out Uelenski as a separate language, not just a version of what Merck called the “second language of the Sedentary Chukchi,” i.e., Chaplinski or CSY. The southern boundary of the Uelenski language was also clearly marked in his report and was positioned at or very close to the village of Uelen, that is hardly a few dozen miles from the Pouten Bay that Merck marked as the northernmost extension of CSY. There could have been some local realities that forced Merck’s informants to make such clear definitions for distinct language areas, although, the latter were, probably, defined more by cultural, or societal (tribal) boundaries than by the distribution of the languages themselves.

Another conclusion one comes to from the data presented above is that the former Yup’ik language(s) that once existed more than 200 years ago along the eastern shore of the Chukchi Peninsula, particularly around St. Lawrence and Mechigmen Bays, was in no way an element
of a dialectal continuum from Naukanski to CSY. Although
this area was geographically a bridge between the Naukanski
and the Ungaziq (Chaplinski) Yup’ik, the language spoken
here was most probably another dialect of the same CSY and
one rather close to Uelenski. This is just another argument
in favor of the hypothesis first postulated by Krauss (1984;
see also Fortescue 2004:168) and later explored by me
elsewhere (Chlenov 1988) that the Naukanski Yup’ik
represented the most westerly and the latest extension of the
dialect continuum belonging to the Central Alaskan Yup’ik.
Its distribution on the Asiatic shore was always limited to
a narrow rocky ledge of Cape Dezhnev. Ecologically and
geographically that latter area was like the “third” of the
Diomede Island being removed from its position in the
middle of Bering Strait and accidentally attached to the
Asian shore.
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