The article analyzes an areal polysemy ‘earth/year’ in the languages of North America. The distribution of the trait largely coincides with the cultural region of California. Within this area, the polysemy ‘earth/year’ is attested from Mo-lala in the north to Seri in the south. The trait in question is apparently old in Yuman, Chumashan and Yuki-Wappo, whereas Uto-Aztecan languages acquired it as a result of contact with other families. However, a number of outliers are attested outside California: languages of the Northern Plains and adjoining regions of Great Lakes (Winnebago, Lakota-Dakota, Skiri Pawnee, Menominee), Southeastern Tepehuan and Oaxaca Chontal. These may result from prehistoric migrations. Presence of this polysemy in Northern Plains languages can be connected to the eastward migration of Algonquian speakers from the Proto-Algic homeland possibly located in the Fraser River basin. The case of Southeastern Tepehuan is possibly due to prehistoric contacts between Proto-Tepiman and Yuman languages, with the subsequent southward migration of Southeastern Tepehuan speakers. Oaxaca Chontal belongs to a hypothetical Hokan family, whose other branches are located in California. Moreover, Oaxaca Chontal word for ‘earth/year’ is cognate to words with the same meaning in Yuman and Seri.
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INTRODUCTION

Recurrent patterns of polysemy can be either universal, reflecting common properties of human cognition, or areal, spreading between languages due to historical contacts (Urban 2009; Hendery et al. in print). Distribution of polysemy patterns can indicate prehistoric contacts, in the same way as the distribution of folklore motifs. In the present paper, I will discuss areal distribution of the polysemy ‘earth/year’ in North America.

The most widespread polysemy involving ‘year’ in the languages of the world is the pattern ‘year/season’: ‘year/winter’, ‘year/summer’, ‘year/dry season’, ‘year/rainy season’, etc. It is universal in the sense that it is attested in languages from all major regions of the world. To the best of my knowledge, the pattern ‘earth/year’ is attested only in North America. Alfred Kroeber was the first to notice the pattern in his “Handbook of California Indians” (Kroeber 1925: 498): “Like some other Californians, the Yokuts call the years “worlds.” P’a’an tanzhi, “world went,” denotes the lapse of a year.” The pattern ‘earth/year’ was also observed in Oaxaca Chontal (O’Connor, Kroefges 2008: 311) and in Seri (O’Meara, Bohnemeyer 2008: 322). As far as I know, no study have been dedicated to this pattern of polysemy. I will summarize the data from each language showing this polysemy, discuss its geographical distribution and possible migrations responsible for its spread. Here, the polysemy ‘earth/year’ is understood in the broad sense, including cases like ‘world/year’, ‘earth/season’, etc. Data from different languages are cited exactly as they are given in the sources, without any attempt to unify the transcription. The languages are grouped by language families. After the name of each language, I indicate its code according to Glottolog (https://glottolog.org/) and the family it belongs to.

LANGUAGE DATA

Molala (mola1238, isolate)
laŋs ‘earth; land; year’ (Pharris 2006: 332, 366), läŋs ‘land, country, year’ (Berman 1996: 12).

It is a derivation from the verb laŋi- ‘sprout’ with the nominalizer suffix -s (Berman 1996: 12).

Wintu (nucl1651, Wintuan)
po·m ‘earth, land, ground, weather’, pom-, pomisim ‘winter, year, in the winter’ (Schlichter 1981: 171).

These words go back to Proto-Wintuan *po·m ‘ground’ and *pomisim ‘winter’, with reflexes attested in Nomlaki and Patwin (Shepherd 2006: 140). The connection between po·m and pomisim is accepted in the literature.

1 I am sincerely grateful to Albert Davletshin and Yoram Meroz for numerous corrections and suggestions that helped me to improve this paper. Any remaining errors are mine alone.
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(Schlichter 1981: 171, Shepherd 2006: 140). The semantic change ‘earth > year > season’ has been also attested in Menominee (see below).

**Wikchamni** (wikc1234, Yokutsan)

\(pʰaʔan\) ‘year, earth, world; land, country’ (Espinoza n.d.: 38, 102), \(p'aʔan\) ‘earth’ (Espinoza n.d.: 18).

The form with initial \(pʰ\) is likely to be a mistranscription, because the Wikchamni form with the initial glottalized stop \(pʰaʔaŋ\) ‘world’ is found in another source (Gamble 1978: 132).

The word goes back to Proto-Nim-Yokuts \(\ast pʰaʔaŋ\), cf. Choynimni \(pʰa’aŋ\) ‘world’ and Yawelmani \(pʰa’aŋ\) ‘world’ (Kroeber 1963: 197).

**Palewwymi** (pale1254, Yokutsan)

\(Hah-pahs’\) ‘land, earth, or ground’, \(Wē-kā-hah’-pel\) ‘the whole world’, \(Hah’-pil-le\) ‘a year’ (Merriam); \(happas, happil\) ‘earth’ (Harrington); \(hapil\) ‘earth’, \(nema ha’pil\) ‘world’ (Kroeber) (Berman 2002: 437).

This root is unattested outside Paleowwymi (Kroeber 1963: 197).

**Lake Miwok** (lake1258, Miwok-Costanoan)

\(wáli\) ‘(1) season, (2) year, (3) area space, (4) world’ (Callaghan 1965: 153).

**Bodega Miwok** (bode1246, Miwok-Costanoan)

\(wálli\) ‘season’ (Callaghan 1970: 79).

These words go back to Proto-Miwok-Costanoan \(\ast wál-i(p)\) ‘earth, world’ (Callaghan 2013: 433). Lake Miwok and Bodega Miwok belong to Western Miwok branch. Reflexes of this root in Eastern Miwok and Costanoan do not mean ‘year’ or ‘season’. The words for ‘year’ in Eastern Miwok languages go back to Proto-Eastern-Miwok \(\ast \text{ʔomu·č-a-} \sim \ast \text{ʔumu·č-a-}\) ‘winter, year’ (Callaghan 2013: 481). I have not been able to find out if there is any polysemy involving ‘year’ in Costanoan.

**Maidu** (nort2952, Maiduan)

\(k̓ódo \sim k̓ódoj\) ‘(1) district, country, area, place. (2) time, year (of time)’ (Shipley 1963: 140, 261).

**Central Hill Nisenan** (nise1244, Maiduan)

\(k’aw\) ‘earth, ground, place, year’ (Eatough 1999: 43, 44, 47, 50).

Maidu \(kódo\) goes back to Proto-Maiduan \(\ast k’o’do\), whose Nisenan reflex means ‘whole earth’, while the Konkow reflex of this word means ‘world’ (Tatsch 2006: 220). Central Hill Nisenan \(k’aw\) reflects Proto-Maiduan \(\ast k’aw\) ‘earth, ground, dirt’ (Tatsch 2006: 181). The third Maiduan language, Konkow, shows another type of polysemy: \(kímmeni\) ‘winter, year’ (Ultan 1961: 7). Thus, it is not clear whether the polysemy ‘earth/year’ was present in Proto-Maiduan. Apparently, the homeland of Proto-Maiduan lay outside California, perhaps in the Great Basin (Golla 2011: 128–129). It is possible that the polysemy ‘earth/year’ was independently acquired by Maidu and Nisenan upon their arrival in California.

**Ineseño** (ines1240, Chumashan)

\(šup\) ‘earth, world; year, soil, dirt; place’ (Applegate 2007: 347).
Barbareño (barb1263, Chumashan)  
*šup* ‘1. world, earth; 2. ground, soil, dirt, land; 3. year; 4. god; name of a particular god’ (Whistler 1980: 30).

Ventureño (vent1242, Chumashan)  
*šup* ‘Gott; Jahr; Land, Erde, Berg’ (Mamet 2005: 225).

The Ineseño, Barbareño and Ventureño words go back to Proto-Southern Chumash *šup* ‘earth’ (Klar 1977: 83). I have no data on the word for ‘year’ in other Chumash languages. Klar does not give the gloss ‘year’ for Ineseño, Barbareño and Ventureño, so the absence of this gloss for other Chumash languages in her work is not informative. Perhaps, the polysemy ‘earth/year’ is quite old in Chumash family.

Yuki (yuki1243, Yuki-Wappo)  
ʔon ‘world, ground, land, year’ (Sawyer, Schlichter 1984: 241).

This word goes back to Proto-Yukian *ʔon* ‘earth; ground; land; dirt’ (Schlichter 1985: 149), with reflexes in Yuki, Coast Yuki, and Huchnom. Schlichter also reconstructs Proto-Yukian *powi/a ʔonəʔ* ‘one year’ (Schlichter 1985: 262), reflected in Yuki and Huchnom, cf. Proto-Yukian *powi(k)* ‘one’ (Schlichter 1985: 261).

Wappo (wapp1239, Yuki-Wappo)  
ɔʹma ‘earth’, ɔmɔ ‘world’, omaʹwɔn ‘year’ (Radin 1929: 181–182), cf. -wen, suffix for seasons (Radin 1929: 124); ʔóma ‘around, all around, unspecified location in the general environment’ (Sawyer 1965: 5), ʔóma·wen ‘year’ (Sawyer 1965: 123).

It is not clear whether Wappo ʔóma is related to Proto-Yukian *ʔon*. Anyway, it seems that the polysemy ‘earth/year’ is old in Yuki-Wappo family.

Tübatulabal (tuba1278, Uto-Aztecan)  
šuwa·-l ‘(1) the earth, (2) his years’ (Voegelin 1958: 226).

This word might be a cognate with Nahuatl šiwi-tl ‘year’ (Manaster Ramer 1996: 109). This comparison is plausible from the phonological point of view, but it is somewhat doubtful because no cognates in other Uto-Aztecan languages have been found so far. Moreover, in all the other cases ‘earth’ does not develop from ‘year’, but the other way round. Alternatively, the Tübatulabal word might be a borrowing from Southern Chumash *šup* ‘earth’ (see above). The development *p > w* could not have happened in Tübatulabal, so we must assume that it occurred in some unattested Chumash variety.

Kawaiisu (kawa1283, Uto-Aztecan)  
tii-pɨ ‘dirt; earth; world; year’ (Zigmond et al. 1991: 277).

The word must be an irregular reflex of Proto-Uto-Aztecan *tɪpV- ‘earth’ (see below). Kawaiisu belongs to the Numic branch of Uto-Aztecan. No other Numic language has this type of polysemy.

Kitanemuk (serr1255, Uto-Aztecan)  
tɪva-č ‘land, earth, ground, year, world’ (Anderton 1988: 532).

The word goes back to Proto-Uto-Aztecan *tɪpV- ‘earth’. Remarkably, a cognate word in Kitanemuk’s closest relative, Serrano, does not mean ‘year’:
It can hardly be a coincidence that Kawaiisu, Tübatulabal, and Kitanemuk—three of the four Uto-Aztecan languages having the polysemy ‘earth/year’—occupy a small continuous area in Southern California. This area borders with Yokuts and Chumash languages. We can suppose that the polysemy in question was not inherited from Proto-Uto-Aztecan, but spread as an areal trait, perhaps from Yokuts or Chumash.

Southeastern Tepehuan (sout 2976, Uto-Aztecan)
odha’ ‘cerro; año’ (de Willett, Willett 2015: 139).

This is a borderline case, since the Southeastern Tepehuan word has a polysemy ‘mountain/year’ rather than ‘earth/year’ or ‘world/year’. However, Southeastern Tepehuan oídha’ goes back to Proto-Tepiman *ʔoi’daga ‘world, mountain’ (Bascom 1965: 156), so we can assume that the polysemy ‘world/year’ existed at a certain stage. Geographically, Southeastern Tepehuan lies far to the south from the main region where this polysemy is common. According to Shaul and Hill (1998: 392), “[e]vidence from historical linguistics suggests that the Tepiman subgroup of the Uto-Aztecan languages originated in the northern end of its current range. Speakers of Proto-Tepiman and speakers of Proto-River Yuman were probably in a sufficiently intense contact with one another for a substantial population of bilinguals to exist… The most likely context for that development was during the emergence of the Hohokam system, in the drainage of the middle and lower Gila River”. Tepiman and River Yuman share a nontrivial sound change—“hardening” of glides *y and *w. Proto-Yuman *y yields Proto-River Yuman *ð root-initially, while Proto-Yuman *w yields Proto-River Yuman *v in the same position. Correspondingly, Proto-Uto-Aztecan *y and *w yield Proto-Tepiman *d and *g respectively (Shaul, Hill 1998: 379–381). The River Yuman languages Quechan and Maricopa have the polysemy ‘earth/year’ (see below), so the intense contact implied by the shared sound change may have also resulted in a transfer of this type of polysemy from River Yuman to (some varieties of) Tepiman. This scenario is in accord with the hypothesis that the Uto-Aztecan languages acquired this type of polysemy under areal influence.

Maricopa (mari1440, Cochimi-Yuman)
ʔmat ~ mat ‘land, field, earth’ (Miller 2018: A51), mat a:m-k ‘be a (complete, full) year’ (Miller 2018: A98).

Quechan (quec1382, Cochimi-Yuman)
ʔomaj ‘land, dirt, clay, territory, place, country, continent’ (Miller 2018: A51), ʔomatə:m-k ~ mata:m-k ‘it is a year; a year passes’ (Miller 2018: A98).

Paipai (paip1241, Cochimi-Yuman)
mat ‘land, earth’ (Joel 1966: 57), matʔamk ‘year’ (Joel 1966: 15).

Cocopa (coco1261, Cochimi-Yuman)
maṭ ‘land, ground, floor, country, dirt, earth, (city) lot’, màṭká·m ‘year’ (Crawford 1989: 124–125).

Ko’alh (kwat1246, Cochimi-Yuman)
maṭ ‘land, earth’ (Miller 2018: A51), maṭwam ‘year’ (cf. w- ‘third person subject’) (Miller 2018: A98).

Ja’a (kumi1248, Cochimi-Yuman)
maṭ ‘land, place, country’ (Miller 2018: A51), maṭwam ‘year’ (Miller 2018: A98).

Jamul Tiipay (kumi1248, Cochimi-Yuman)
maṭ ‘land, place, country’ (Miller 2018: A51), maṭwam, maṭʔa:m ~ maṭa:m ‘year’ (Miller 2018: A98).

San José de la Zorra (kumi1248, Cochimi-Yuman)
maṭ ‘tierra [land, earth]’ (Miller 2018: A51), maṭwam ‘año [year]’ (Miller 2018: A98).

Los Conejos (ipai1240, Cochimi-Yuman)
ʔəmat ~ mat ~ ʔəmat ‘land, earth, ground, dirt, clay’ (Miller 2018: A51), məta:(ʔ)am(p) ‘year’ (Miller 2018: A98).

Barona ’Ipay (ipai1240, Cochimi-Yuman)
ʔomat ‘dirt’ (Miller 2018: A51), matwam ~ maṭwa:m ‘year’ (cf. w- ‘third person subject’) (Miller 2018: A98).

Kiliwa (kili1268, Cochimi-Yuman)
ʔ+mat ‘earth, land, place’, ʔ+mat=kw+haa ‘current year’ (Mixco 1985: 74-75).

The word for ‘year’ in most Yuman languages goes back to Proto-Yuman *ʔmat a(:)m- a compound of *ʔmat ‘land, earth’ and *a(:)m ‘to pass by’ (Miller 2018: A98). A different compound is attested in Kiliwa: ʔ+mat=kw+haa literally means ‘earth that goes’. Upland Pai languages – Havasupai, Walapai, and Yavapai – show the polysemy ‘winter/year’, while Mojave has hode, huude ‘year, age’ without any connections to either ‘earth’ or ‘winter’ (Munro et al. 1992: 78).

Cochimi (coch1272, Cochimi-Yuman)
ʔ-met ~ ʔ-mat ‘earth, place; year’ (Mixco 1978: 84, 100).

Cochimi is a poorly documented distant relative of Yuman languages. The Cochimi word is a cognate of Proto-Yuman *ʔmat ‘land, earth’.

Seri (seri1257, isolate)
hant ‘1 earth, dirt, land. 2 world, earth. 3 place. 4 year’ (Moser, Marlett 2010: 324).

This word is used with different definite articles. Combined with the article com ‘horizontal’, it means ‘earth, dirt, land’; with gui ‘compact’ — ‘world, earth’; with hac ‘location’ — ‘place’, with cop/cap ‘vertical; abstract’ — ‘year’. There is a remarkable parallelism between the use of articles with the words for ‘earth’, ‘moon’, and ‘sun’:
Serí is an isolate, so no reconstructed protoform for *hant* is available. However, an earlier form of this word *hamt* [ʔamt] can be found in nineteenth century word lists (Marlett 2010: 21). This form also exists in the modern language, but it means only ‘soil’ (Marlett 2010: 18). An even earlier form *hamat* ~ *hamati* [ʔamat ~ ʔamati] is preserved in an old Serí chant about the creation of the world (Marlett et al. 2018: 173–174)².

**Highland Oaxaca Chontal** (high1242, Tequistlatecan)

*łamats’* ‘the land, earth, year’ (Turner, Turner 1971: 213).

**Lowland Oaxaca Chontal** (lowl1260, Tequistlatecan)

*amats’* ‘earth, ground, land, soil; year’ (O’Connor 2013: 89).

**Proto-Tequistlatecan** form can be reconstructed tentatively as *amats’* (– in the Highland Chontal word is an article).

**Winnebago** (hoch1243, Siouan)

mq ‘earth’, mądjuregą ‘as the years go by, year-by-year’ (cf. djire ‘to go by’), mŋ nybóhanąga ‘to elapse (of years)’, mokahi ‘a number of years’ (mo is an allomorph of mŋ) (Marino 1968: 314–317).

**Lakota** (lako1247, Siouan)

makȟá ‘1. earth, ground; dirt, soil, dust. 2. land, estate. 3. the earth, the world; nature’ (Ullrich 2008: 328–329), ómakȟa ‘a season, a year’ (? + makȟá) (Ullrich 2008: 398), makȟúŋčhaǧe ~ makȟúŋčhaǧe ‘a season’ (makȟá + oúŋčhaǧe ‘form, likeness, shape, appearance, image, look, resemblance; growth’)(Ullrich 2008: 331).

**Yankton-Yanktonai** (nako1239, Siouan)

makȟá ‘1. earth, ground; dirt, soil, dust. 2. land, estate. 3. the earth, the world; nature’ (Ullrich 2008: 328–329), ómakȟa ‘a season, a year’ (? + makȟá) (Ullrich 2008: 398), makȟúŋčhaǧe ~ makȟúŋčhaǧe ‘a season’ (makȟá + oúŋčhaǧe ‘form, likeness, shape, appearance, image, look, resemblance; growth’)(Ullrich 2008: 331).

**Santee-Sisseton** (dako1259, Siouan)

makȟá ‘1. earth, ground; dirt, soil, dust. 2. land, estate. 3. the earth, the world; nature’ (Ullrich 2008: 328–329), ómakȟa ‘a season, a year’ (? + makȟá) (Ullrich 2008: 398).

Both the Winnebago and the Lakota-Dakota forms go back to Proto-Siouan *awá’- ‘earth, ground, land’ (Rankin et al. 2015)³.

**Skiri Pawnee** (skir1238, Caddoan)
² “Hay casos en que la forma cantada de una palabra muy probablemente es una forma antigua de tal palabra...” (Marlett et al. 2018: 172).
³ Yankton-Yanktonai and Santee-Sisseton are Dakota varieties.
*huraaru* ‘1. land, ground; earth. 2. season. 3. mile’ (Parks, Pratt 2008: 395). This word goes back to Proto-North-Caddoan *huna-nuʔ* ‘ground’ (Taylor 1963: 121). This is a marginal case, since the Skiri Pawnee word means ‘season’ rather than ‘year’. Nevertheless, this case must be connected with the polysemy ‘earth/year’ in other languages of this region.

Menominee (meno1252, Algic)  
*ahke-w* ‘earth, land’; archaically also ‘summer, year’ (Bloomfield 1975: 8). The word is a reflex of Proto-Algonquian *axkyi* ‘land’ (Hewson 1993: 31). While the primary meaning of *axkyi*, retained in all reflexes in daughter languages, was ‘land’, traces of the meanings ‘year’ and ‘summer’ are preserved in the Cree derived verbs *aski-wan* ‘it is earth, summer, year’ and *aski-wiw* ‘it is earth, summer, year’ (Hewson 1993: 31).

**DISCUSSION**

Summing up, we can see that the main area of distribution of the polysemy ‘earth/year’ lies in the Western North America. It stretches from Molala in the north to Seri and Cochimi in the south. This area largely coincides with the cultural area of California.

Map 1: Distribution of the polysemy ‘earth/year’ in North America

There can hardly be any doubt that all cases of the polysemy ‘earth/year’ in this region are historically connected. There are also several outliers: Skiri Pawnee, Lakota-Dakota, Winnebago and Menominee in the northern Plains
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The easiest case is that of Southeastern Tepehuan. This language belongs to the Tepehuan branch of Uto-Aztecan. As shown above, Proto-Tepiman was in direct contact with River Yuman languages. The southward migration of Southeastern Tepehuan speakers after the breakup of Proto-Tepiman brought the pattern ‘earth/year’ to Durango.

The case of Tequistlatecan (Oaxaca Chontal) languages is more complex. Their relationship with other language families is not widely accepted. The authors who accept the Hokan hypothesis consider Tequistlatecan to be a part of Hokan family (Kaufman 1989; Zhivlov 2018). Interestingly, Kaufman (1989: 142, 167) reconstructs Proto-Hokan *#aHma(ṭ') ‘earth’ and *#amaṭ’ ‘year’. These reconstructions are based, inter alia, on Proto-Yuman *ʔmat ‘land, earth, year’, Cochimi ʔ-met ~ ʔ-mat ‘earth, place; year’, Seri ʔant < ʔamat ‘land, earth, place, year’, and Proto-Tequistlatecan *amats’ ‘land, earth, year’. The fact that in all these languages roots for ‘earth’ and ‘year’ completely coincide shows that there are no reasons to reconstruct two different protoforms for these two meanings. If Hokan relationship is accepted, the polysemy ‘earth/year’ should be reconstructed for Proto-Hokan or, at least, for the last common ancestor of Yuman, Cochimi, Seri, and Tequistlatecan. This scenario implies migration of Tequistlatecan speakers into Oaxaca from their original homeland somewhere nearby Seri and Proto-Yuman.

The remaining outliers are Skiri Pawnee, Lakota-Dakota, Winnebago and Menominee. These languages are located on the Northern Plains and in the adjoining region of Great Lakes. The only known migration that could have brought the polysemy ‘earth/year’ from the Western North America to this area is the eastward migration of Algonquian speakers from the Proto-Algic homeland possibly located in the Fraser River basin (Berezkin 2010: 27–49). The polysemy ‘earth/year’ is attested in Menominee and its traces are found in Cree, so it can be tentatively reconstructed for Proto-Algonquian. Its loss in other Algonquian languages could result from contacts with languages of other families. Winnebago, Lakota-Dakota and Pawnee must have acquired the polysemy from Menominee.

The origin of the polysemy ‘earth/year’ is an intriguing question. According to Urban (2015: 378), “there is a common diachronic pathway from coded meanings via initially context-bound pragmatic inferences to new coded meanings”. That is, initially a word gets a new meaning in a specific context, where this new meaning can arise ‘on the fly’ based on “general world knowledge or the particular circumstances of the conversational setting”. Therefore, in order to understand how a word for ‘earth’ could have acquired the meaning ‘year’, we must find a context where both ‘earth’ and ‘year’ can be used interchangeably. The example for such a context comes from a Sahaptian language Umatilla (umat1237). This language uses different words for ‘earth’ and adjoining regions of Northeast, Southeastern Tepehuan in the Mexican state of Durango, and Tequistlatecan languages in the Mexican state of Oaxaca.

The authors who accept the Hokan hypothesis consider Tequistlatecan to be a part of Hokan family (Kaufman 1989; Zhivlov 2018). Interestingly, Kaufman (1989: 142, 167) reconstructs Proto-Hokan *#aHma(ṭ') ‘earth’ and *#amaṭ’ ‘year’. These reconstructions are based, inter alia, on Proto-Yuman *ʔmat ‘land, earth, year’, Cochimi ʔ-met ~ ʔ-mat ‘earth, place; year’, Seri ʔant < ʔamat ‘land, earth, place, year’, and Proto-Tequistlatecan *amats’ ‘land, earth, year’. The fact that in all these languages roots for ‘earth’ and ‘year’ completely coincide shows that there are no reasons to reconstruct two different protoforms for these two meanings. If Hokan relationship is accepted, the polysemy ‘earth/year’ should be reconstructed for Proto-Hokan or, at least, for the last common ancestor of Yuman, Cochimi, Seri, and Tequistlatecan. This scenario implies migration of Tequistlatecan speakers into Oaxaca from their original homeland somewhere nearby Seri and Proto-Yuman.

The remaining outliers are Skiri Pawnee, Lakota-Dakota, Winnebago and Menominee. These languages are located on the Northern Plains and in the adjoining region of Great Lakes. The only known migration that could have brought the polysemy ‘earth/year’ from the Western North America to this area is the eastward migration of Algonquian speakers from the Proto-Algic homeland possibly located in the Fraser River basin (Berezkin 2010: 27–49). The polysemy ‘earth/year’ is attested in Menominee and its traces are found in Cree, so it can be tentatively reconstructed for Proto-Algonquian. Its loss in other Algonquian languages could result from contacts with languages of other families. Winnebago, Lakota-Dakota and Pawnee must have acquired the polysemy from Menominee.

The origin of the polysemy ‘earth/year’ is an intriguing question. According to Urban (2015: 378), “there is a common diachronic pathway from coded meanings via initially context-bound pragmatic inferences to new coded meanings”. That is, initially a word gets a new meaning in a specific context, where this new meaning can arise ‘on the fly’ based on “general world knowledge or the particular circumstances of the conversational setting”. Therefore, in order to understand how a word for ‘earth’ could have acquired the meaning ‘year’, we must find a context where both ‘earth’ and ‘year’ can be used interchangeably. The example for such a context comes from a Sahaptian language Umatilla (umat1237). This language uses different words for ‘earth’
and ‘year’: tiičám ‘land, earth, ground, place’ (Rude 2014: 330) and anwičt ‘year’ (Rude 2014: 63). Both these words can be used in identical context, as subjects of the verb tamásklik ‘turn over. Often said of the earth passing through the seasons and of a body at a funeral’ (Rude 2014: 311). The Umatilla dictionary (Rude 2014: 311) gives the following examples (the subject is underlined):

pinátamasklıkša tiičám ‘the earth is turning itself over (as at the change of the seasons, or at an eclipse of the sun or moon); ana kú tiičám pinátamasklıkinxā wawáximyayaw ‘when the land turns itself to spring’; ana kú pinátamasklıkinxā anwičt ‘when the year turns itself around’; pinátamasklıkinxā tiičám wawáximyayaw ānimkni ‘the earth turns itself from winter to spring’; áw pinátamasklıkin anmiwit wawaxmiwityaw ‘now the winter has turned itself to spring’, see also anmiwit ‘beginning of winter, year’ (Rude 2014: 63).

The short text “Anwíčt” (“The Year”) shows how the change of seasons is described in Umatilla: “Now I am speaking [about] when the earth turns itself over — it turns itself over to spring when it will be winter — mid winter — the 21st of the moon’s camping (i.e., March 21) and then the earth turns itself over to spring from winter, from winter it turns itself over to spring, and then indeed our food grows when the earth turns itself over (in) spring... Then at that time its leaves become nothing — it waits for spring, and then again it gets itself ready when the earth turns itself around” (Rude 2014: 45).

The word for ‘earth’ used in such a context can be interpreted by speakers as having the meaning ‘year’.
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АРЕАЛЬНАЯ ПОЛИСЕМИЯ ‘ЗЕМЛЯ/ГОД’ В СЕВЕРНОЙ АМЕРИКЕ: ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЕ ИМПЛИКАЦИИ

А Н Н О Т А Ц И Я. В статье анализируется ареальное явление в языках индейцев Северной Америки: полисемия ‘земля/год’. Основной регион, где распространена такая полисемия, совпадает с культурно-исторической областью Калифорния. Внутри этого ареала полисемия ‘земля/год’ засвидетельствована от молала на севере до сэри на юге. Этот тип полисемии, по всей видимости, ис-конный для юманской, чумашской и юки-ваппо языковых семей. В юто-астекских языках, напротив, он появился в результате языковых контактов. В то же время полисемия ‘земля/год’ имеется также в ряде ареалов вне Калифорнии и сопре-дельных территорий: Северные Равнины и сопредельные области Великих Озёр (виннебаго, лакота-дакота, скри пауни, меномини), штаты Дуранго (юго-вос- точный тепеуанский) и Оахака (текистлатекские языки) в Мексике. Эти случаи могут отражать следы доисторических миграций. Так, наличие этой полисемии в языках Северных Равнин может быть результатом миграции алгонкинов с алгонкино-ритванской прародины, которая предположительно локализуется в бассейне реки Фрейзер. В случае юго-восточного тепеуанского можно предполагать контакты между пратепиманским языком и языками юманской семьи, с последу-ющей миграцией носителей юго-восточного тепеуанского на юг. Текистлатекские языки входят в гипотетическую семью хока, остальные ветви которой находятся в Калифорнии. Более того, текистлатексское обозначение ‘земли’ и ‘года’ род-ственно словам с тем же значением в юманских языках и сери.

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА: индейские языки, полисемия, языковой контакт, сравнительно-историческое языкознание

ЖИВЛОВ Михаил Александрович — к.ф.н., доцент Института восточных культур и античности Российского государственного гуманитарного университета; старший научный сотрудник Института классического Востока и антично-сти Национального исследовательского университета «Высшая школа экономики» (Россия, Москва)
E-mail: zhivlov@yandex.ru