## The origin of the Na-Dene

MERRITT RUHLEN<sup>†</sup>

Program in Human Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305

Communicated by Joseph H. Greenberg, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, September 9, 1998 (received for review January 28, 1998)

ABSTRACT Linguistic evidence indicates that the Yeniseian family of languages, spoken in central Siberia, is most closely related to the Na-Dene family of languages spoken, for the most part, in northwestern North America. This hypothesis locates the source of one of the three migrations responsible for the peopling of the Americas.

The Yeniseian family of languages today consists of a single language, Ket, spoken by around 550 people (out of a total population of 1,100) along the Yenisei River in central Siberia. Five other related languages are known from historical sources, but all became extinct in the nineteenth century (1). The Na-Dene family has four branches, three of which are single languages spoken along the coastline of western Canada and southern Alaska (Haida, Tlingit, Eyak). The fourth branch is the Athabaskan family, spread over interior Alaska and western Canada, with outliers along the Pacific coast of Oregon and California and in the American Southwest (Navajo, Apache). Both the Yeniseian and the Na-Dene families have traditionally been considered isolates, that is, families with no known relatives (2, 3), and many linguists maintain that "there is no trace of genetic connections between New World and Old World stocks" (4). The present paper presents evidence that the Yeniseian and Na-Dene families are most closely related to one another within the world's languages. If this hypothesis is correct, it would locate the source of one of the three migrations to the Americas posited by Greenberg, Turner, and Zegura (5).

To my knowledge, no one has ever directly compared the Yeniseian and Na-Dene families, and the reason is not hard to find. Because both have traditionally been considered isolates, that is, language families with no known relatives, the Yeniseian family has been compared with other Eurasian languages and families (6), while Na-Dene has been compared, for the most part, with other New World families (7), in both cases because related languages are more likely to be found in the same geographical area rather than on different continents. Moreover, very few linguists have concerned themselves with both Old World and New World languages. Na-Dene has previously been compared with two Old World families, Sino-Tibetan and Caucasian. Around 1920 Sapir became convinced that Na-Dene was more closely related to Sino-Tibetan than to other American families. Although he wrote about this hypothesis in personal letters, and kept comparative notebooks on the two families, he never published any evidence on this connection. Recently Bengtson (8) has reviewed Sapir's evidence, adding additional evidence of his own. Nikolaev (9) compared Na-Dene with Caucasian. Although I do not question that Na-Dene is related to both Sino-Tibetan and Caucasian (within the larger Dene-Caucasian family), as posited by Sapir and Nikolaev, the evidence presented below indicates that Na-Dene is more closely related to Yeniseian than to either of these other two families.

The publication costs of this article were defrayed in part by page charge payment. This article must therefore be hereby marked "advertisement" in accordance with 18 U.S.C. §1734 solely to indicate this fact.

© 1998 by The National Academy of Sciences 0027-8424/98/9513994-3\$0.00/0 PNAS is available online at www.pnas.org.

The linguistic evidence presented at the end of this paper consists of 36 etymologies, that is, 36 sets of cognate words that appear to be shared by Yeniseian and Na-Dene, but not (for the most part) by other language families. It is significant that these shared words include basic vocabulary (boil/burn, children, dry, he, hunger, name, night, nit/louse, old, summer, word/speak), body parts (breast, cheek, elbow, foot, guts/stomach, head, shoulder), flora and natural phenomena (birch bark, cedar, clay, fir, lake, river, snow [on ground], snow [falling], stone), fauna (deer, owl, rabbit, skin [animal], squirrel), and cultural artifacts (boat, bow/arrow, dish/plate/basket, rope). It is difficult to imagine that similarities of this nature could exist between language families that do not share a common origin. The other possible explanations for linguistic similarities can, in this case, easily be ruled out. Borrowing is excluded because there is no evidence that people speaking the Yeniseian and Na-Dene languages have ever been in contact; onomatopoeia is ruled out because the terms are clearly not sound symbolic; and chance is ruled out by simple probability. Two language families might share one or two accidental resemblances, but they would not share 36, so the only plausible explanation for these resemblances is common origin. These 36 etymologies represent what seem to me the most secure evidence for the genetic connection of these two families. Other etymologies, of a more problematical nature, also exist.

One of the most compelling pieces of evidence for the Yeniseian–Na-Dene connection is the word for "birch bark." The Ket word for "birch bark" is *qi?y*, and this is distinct from the Ket word for "birch tree" ( $\bar{u}$ \$\sigma\$0). The Ket word for "birch bark" is almost identical to the word reconstructed for "birch tree" in Proto-Athabaskan: \*q'\sigma\$y. These two forms differ in only two respects. First, the glottalization in the Proto-Athabaskan form (symbolized as ') has shifted after the vowel in Ket, where it is symbolized as the glottal stop ?. Second, the Yeniseian form means exclusively "birch bark," while the Proto-Athabaskan form has been reconstructed as meaning "birch tree." Both of these apparent differences can, however, be reconciled.

With regard to the difference in meaning, we need note only that the meaning of this word in the two most conservative Athabaskan languages (Ahtna and Tanaina) is "birch bark." Elsewhere in Athabaskan, the meaning has apparently shifted to "birch tree" in general, leading Athabaskanists to reconstruct "birch tree" as the original meaning. However, the presence of the meaning "birch bark" in the two most conservative Athabaskan languages, and in the nearest outgroup (Yeniseian), indicates that the meaning of the Proto-Athabaskan term was originally "birch bark," and it was only after the fission of these two languages from the rest of Athabaskan that the meaning was generalized to "birch tree."

The difference in phonetic form also has a simple explanation because the different location of the glottal stop in Yeniseian and Na-Dene is not an idiosyncratic feature of the particular word "birch bark," but is rather a recurrent sound correspondence connecting these two families. It affects not just the word for "birch bark," but also the words for "stone," "utensil," "bow," and "foot."

<sup>†</sup>To whom reprint requests should be addressed. e-mail: ancar@leland. stanford.edu.

On the basis of the evidence presented in this paper, it would seem that Na-Dene and Yeniseian must have once formed a single population in Eurasia. Part of this population migrated to the New World, giving rise to the Na-Dene languages, while the portion of the population that remained in Asia gave rise to the Yeniseian languages. The implication of this proposal for prehistory is that the Na-Dene represent a distinct migration from Asia to the Americas, in all likelihood intermediate between the first migration of Amerinds around 11,000 years ago and the third migration of the Eskimo-Aleut around 3,000 years ago. The origin of the Yeniseian–Na-Dene population can plausibly be traced to West Asia, where the more distantly related Caucasian and Burushaski languages are found. Genetics and archaeology may shed further light on these relationships, as will no doubt a more extensive study of the linguistic evidence.

## Linguistic Evidence Connecting Yeniseian and Na-Dene

Each of the following etymologies consists of a semantic gloss, indicating the general meaning in both families, followed by the relevant Yeniseian and Na-Dene evidence separated by an equals sign (=). The meaning of each form is identical with the general gloss unless specified otherwise. For Yeniseian, Starostin's reconstructions (1) and a few representative examples are given. These reconstructions require a comment. Starostin reconstructs affricates and fricatives that develop into stops in some words in some languages, but remain as affricates and fricatives in others. For example, Starostin reconstructs Proto-Yeniseian \*xi?w "birch bark" to account for Ket qi?y and Yug xi?y. This analysis is suspect on two grounds. First, on internal grounds it is highly unusual for affricates and fricatives to develop into stops, while the reverse development-from stops to affricates and fricatives-is common in linguistic evolution. Second, the external evidence provided by Na-Dene indicates that the stops were the primitive state. It is also difficult to understand why Starostin has reconstructed word-final -w for this word, when all the Yeniseian and Athabaskan forms show word-final -y.

For Na-Dene, forms from individual languages are given because there is at present no Na-Dene—or even Athabaskan—comparative dictionary. Where they are known, Proto-Athabaskan reconstructions are cited, followed by a few examples from individual languages. For the most part, however, the Na-Dene evidence has been taken directly from Haida, Tlingit, Eyak, or one of the Athabaskan languages. Several of the etymologies connecting Na-Dene with Yeniseian were first proposed by Bengtson (10) in the context of the larger Dene-Caucasian family (though not exactly in the form given here): dry, foot, guts, head, name, old, (animal) skin, snow (falling), squirrel. Although tone appears in both Yeniseian and Na-Dene, it has not been taken into account here because Starostin did not reconstruct tones for Proto-Yeniseian. Tone is generally thought to have developed independently within both Yeniseian and Na-Dene, but this aspect of the relationship warrants further investigation. The following abbreviations are used: PY, Proto-Yeniseian; PND, Proto-Na-Dene; PEA, Proto-Eyak-Athabaskan; PA, Proto-Athabaskan; PPA, Pre-Proto-Athabaskan.

BIRCH BARK PY \*xi?w-, Ket qi?y, Yug xi?y = PA \*q'əy "birch," Ahtna q'ey "birch bark," Tanaina q'əy "birch bark," Koyukon q'əx "birch tree," Chipewyan k'i "birch."

BOAT PY \* $q\ddot{a}(?)p$ , Yug xa(?)p, Kott xep = Eyak -qe "go by boat," PA \*-qe- "go by boat."

BOIL (v.) PY \*?əqan, Ket  $\bar{\lambda}n$ , Yug  $\lambda xan$  = Tlingit  $\chi'\bar{a}n$  "dry meat, fish," Eyak -q'a "burn," PA \*- $q'\bar{a}n$  "burn," Ahtna  $q'\bar{a}n$  "burn," Koyukon -q'un? "burn," Kato k'an "burn," Navajo - $k'\tilde{a}\tilde{a}h$  "burn."

 $\overrightarrow{BOW}$  (n.) PY \*qi?j, Ket qi?t, Yug qi?t' = PA (Krauss/Leer) \*q'\vec{a}'-z\vec{o}'s "quiver" (lit. "arrow-skin"), Tanaina

*q'ada-t''es* "blunt arrow" (*t''es* "blunt arrow"), *q'aditin* "spear," *q'adiluy* "bone spearhead," PA \*-*q'a?* "arrow," Koyukon *q'o?* "arrow," Chipewyan *k'a* "arrow," Hupa -*q'a?* "arrow," Mattole *k'a?* "arrow," Navajo *k'ā?* "arrow."

BREAST PY \*t aga, Ket t aga, Yug t aga = Tlingit t aga? "heart," PA \*-t aga' "suckle," Ahtna t aga', Koyukon -t aga', Kutchin t aga, Slave -t aga'.

CEDAR PY \*pä?y, Ket ha?y, Yug fa?y, Kott fei, Assan pey = Tlingit  $\chi$ áy "yellow cedar."

CHEEK PY \* $\chi ol$ -, Ket  $qo \Lambda et$ , Yug xolat, Kott hol = Haida qul "forehead," Eyak -quhl "cheek."

CHILDREN PY \*gə?t, Ket kʌ?t, kitey "young" = Haida gyīt' "child," Tlingit git'a "child," Eyak qēt's "child."

CLAY PY \*t again q-, Ket t a gar, t u y i t "smear with clay," Yug t again x = Tlingit  $s' \acute{e} \sim s' \acute{a}$  "clay," Eyak  $t^s' a$ ? "mud," Ahtna  $t^s' \bar{x} q$ ? "clay, glacial mud."

DEER PY \* $s\bar{e}r_1e$ , Ket  $s'\in S$ 0, Yug  $s\in r$ 0, Kott  $s'eli \sim s'ele =$ ? Haida  $sal\bar{i}$  "tracks, trace, imprint," Galice  $silii \sim selii$  "doe."

DRY PY \* $q\sigma r_1$ -, Ket qol-ins, Kott š $\bar{i}$ -gal = Haida  $k'a \sim G'a$ , PA \*- $G\alpha\eta$ , Ahtna -Gan, Ingalik - $G\sigma\eta$ , Navajo -gan. ELBOW PY \*gid, Ket uA-git = Eyak Guhd "knee," PA \*-Got" "knee," Ahtna -Got" "knee," Tanaina -Got" "knee, joint," Koyukon -Gut "knee," Sarsi - $g\bar{u}d$  "knee, elbow," Car-

joint," Koyukon -*gut* "knee," Sarsi -*gūd* "knee, elbow," Carrier -*gwət* "knee," Hupa -*got*' "knee," Kato -*qōt*' "knee," Navajo -*god* "knee."

FIR PY \*dɨñe, Ket dɨñ, Yug dɨn, Kott tīni, Arin tin, Pumpokol dɨñe = Eyak t³' īt³ih "fir," PA \*čən-čəŋ "Douglas fir," Chilcotin t³int³ən "fir."

FOOT PY \*ki?s, Ket ki?s, Yug ki?s = Tlingit k'os  $\sim q$ 'os "foot, leg," Eyak -k'ahs-.

GUTS PY \* $pi?i\Lambda$ , Ket  $pi\Lambda$ , Yug  $fi\Lambda$  = Eyak wut' "belly," PA (Krauss/Leer) \*-wat' "belly," Ahtna -bet' "belly," Tanaina -vet' "belly," Slave -be? "belly," Carrier -but "stomach," Sarsi -mi? "belly," Mattole -bi?4 "belly," Kato -but' "belly," Navajo -bid "stomach."

HE PY \* $d\Lambda$ , Ket  $da \sim di$ - = Haida dei "just that way," Tlingit de "now," Ahtna  $d\bar{i}$ , Slave ti "this," Navajo  $d\bar{i}$  "this."

HEAD PY \* $t^si$ ?g-, Ket ti?, Yug  $\check{c}i$ ? = Eyak - $t^si$ ? "neck," PA \*- $t^si$ ? "head," Ahtna - $t^se$ ?, Tanaina  $t^si$ , Koyukon - $t^ti$ ?, Beaver  $t^sii$ ?, Sarsi  $t^si$ ?, Galice -sii?, Mattole - $t^si$ ?, Navajo - $t^sii$ ?.

HUNGER PY \*qoqante, Ket q $\delta t$ , Yug x $\delta x$ at = Haida q'ut "hungry."

LAKE PY \*de?g, Ket  $d\varepsilon$ ?, Yug  $d\varepsilon$ ? = Slave deh "river," Chipewyan de "river flowing out of lake."

NAME PY \*?ig, Ket  $\overline{i}$ , Yug i, Kott ix = ?Haida  $ki?\overline{i}$ , Tlingit ?ix' "call out, announce, invite," Eyak ?e "call, name," Chipewyan -ye?  $\sim$  -yi? "to be named."

NIGHT (SPEND THE -) PY \*sagar<sub>1</sub>, Ket sāl, Yug sā<sup>h</sup>r, Kott šagal "spending the night" = Haida gālga "dark," gālqwā "last night," Eyak  $\chi \partial t^{i}$  "night," PEA \*- $\gamma \partial t^{i}$  "get dark," Ahtna  $\gamma \partial t^{i}$  "dark, quiet," Sarsi - $\gamma \partial t^{i}$  "dark," Kato  $\lambda \partial t^{i}$  "night passes."

NIT PY  $\overline{y}ok$ , Ket  $(xyin-) \supset k$ , Yug  $(etin-) \supset k$ , Kott d'oga = PA (Krauss/Leer)  $\overline{y}a$ ? "louse," Tanaina eyu "human lice," Koyukon yo? "lice," Galice ya? "louse," Navajo  $y\bar{a}$ ? "louse."

OLD PY \*siń, Ket śiń, Yug sin = Tlingit šān "old age," šàn "old person," ?Ahtna sen "last year," Tlatskanai sen "old man," Navajo sání "old (person or thing)."

OWL PY \*kAg-, Kott hikei-še, Arin kak "hawk," Pumpo-kol xagam-kolka = Haida k'akw, Tlingit q'ukw.

RABBIT PY \*?ax, Yug ak "jumping hare" = PND (Pinnow) \* $Ga\chi$ , Tlingit  $Ga\chi$ , Eyak  $Ga\chi$ , PA (Krauss/Leer) \* $Ga\chi$ , Ahtna  $Ga\chi$ , Tanaina  $Ga\chi$ , Tsetsaut  $Ga\chi$ , Slave  $Ga\chi$ , Navajo  $Ga\chi$ .

RIVER PY \*ses, Ket  $\dot{ses}$ , Yug ses = Haida  $s\bar{s}skw$  "ocean, salt water," Tlingit  $i\dot{s}$  "still deep water," Eyak  $\dot{s}\bar{i}$  "creek, stream."

ROPE PY \*ti?, Ket ti? = Tlingit t'ix' "rope," PA \*t's'e'  $\chi$  "sinew," Ahtna  $t^{s}'\bar{x}\chi$  "sinew, thread, string," ?Tanaina  $t^{s}'ik'$ -t''il "bowstring" (-t''il "string").

SHOULDER PY \*ken-, Ket ken-tə-bu\(\alpha\) "shoulder joint,"

SHOULDER PY \*ken-, Ket ken-tə-buλ "shoulder joint," Arin qinaŋ "shoulder, arm" = PA \*-gānə? "arm," Ahtna -gān? "arm," Tanana -gàn- "arm," Slave -gon "arm," Kato -kwane "shoulder, arm," Navajo -gaan "arm."

(ANIMAL) SKIN PY \*sās, Ket śāśi, Yug sāhs = Tlingit s'isa' "cloth," Eyak -sits' "skin (of fish)," PA (Krauss/Leer) \*-zə's "skin" [< PPA (Krauss/Leer) \*-səts'], Hupa sits' "bark, skin," Tututni səs "skin," Galice -saas "skin."

SNOW (ON GROUND) PY \* $ti\chi$ , Ket  $t\bar{\imath}k$ , Yug tik, Pumpokol tig = Tlingit  $t'i'\chi'$  "snow, ice." SNOW (FALLING) PY \* $be?\check{c}$  "snow," Ket be?t,

SNOW (FALLING) PY \*be?t "snow," Ket bɛ?t, Yug bɛ?t', Pumpokol bet = Eyak wehs "soft snow," PA (Krauss/Leer) \*yəҳs, Tanaina yes "falling snow," Slave yah, Carrier yus, Galice yas, Hupa yahs "white frost (on trees)," Navajo yas.

SQUIRREL PY \*sa?qa, Ket sa?q, Yug sa?x = Haida  $ga^{\dagger}t^{s'}aak^{w}$ , Tlingit  $t^{s}A^{\dagger}k$ , Eyak  $t^{s}\partial^{\dagger}k'$ , PA \* $t^{s}\partial^{\dagger}ax$ , Ahtna  $t^{s}eles$  "arctic ground squirrel," Tanaina  $t^{s'}\partial^{\dagger}ga$  "red squirrel, flying squirrel" (different dialects), Koyukon  $t^{\dagger}ilix$  "ground squirrel," Carrier  $t^{s}al\partial k$ .

STONE PY \*či?s, Ket ti?ś, Yug či?s, Kott šīš = Haida t'īs "piece of rock sticking out of water or sand," PA \*t's'es "rock," Ahtna t's'es "rock, stone," Tanaina t's'es "rock."

SUMMER PY \* $sir_1$ -, Ket ś $\bar{s}i$ i, Yug  $s\bar{i}r$ , Arin  $\check{s}il$  = PA \* $\check{s}\bar{e}n$ , Ahtna  $s\bar{e}n$ , Tanaina  $\check{s}an$ , Carrier  $\check{s}in$ , Navajo  $\check{s}\bar{i}$ .

UTENSIL PY \*si?k "trough for dough," Ket  $\dot{s}i?k$ , Yug si?k = PND (Nikolaev) \* $t^{s}\dot{a}g(w)$  "basket, bowl, dish," Tlin-

git *s'ix'* "dish," Eyak *t\*'āg* "dipper," PA (Krauss and Leer) \**t\*'a'k'* "plate, dish," Ahtna *t\*'āk'* "plate, dish, bowl," Tanaina *t\*'uk'* "dish, plate," Beaver *t\*'a?* "dish," Navajo -*t\*'ā?* "shallow basket."

WORD PY \* $q\ddot{a}$ ? $_{G}$ , Ket qa?, Yug  $x\bar{a}$ , Kott  $x\bar{e}g \sim k^{h}\bar{e}g =$  Haida  $q\bar{a}gw\bar{a}$  "to talk," Tlingit qa "say," Eyak - $\chi a$  "say," PA \*qa-no- $(h)\bar{e}$ -x "speak."

I would like to thank John Bengtson, Victor Golla, Michael Krauss, Sergei Starostin, Edward Vayda, and William S.-Y. Wang for criticism of an earlier version of this paper. Part of this article was written at the Santa Fe Institute, whose support is gratefully acknowledged.

- Starostin, S. A. (1982) Ketskij Sbornik (Nauka, Leningrad), pp. 144–237.
- Comrie, B. (1981) The Languages of the Soviet Union (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, U.K.), p. 261.
- 3. Campbell, L. (1997) *American İndian Languages* (Oxford Univ. Press, New York), p. 286.
- 4. Nichols, J. (1990) Language 47, 495.
- Greenberg, J. H., Turner, C. G. & Zegura, S. L. (1986) Curr. Anthropol. 27, 477–497.
- Starostin, S. A. (1984) in Lingvisticheskaja Rekonstruktsija i Drevnejshaja Istorija Vostoka (Akademija Nauk, Moscow), Vol. 4, pp. 19–38.
- 7. Haas, M. R. (1964) Int. Cong. Amerincanists 35, 495–500.
- 8. Bengtson, J. B. (1994) Anthropol. Sci. 102, 207–230.
- 9. Nikolaev, S. L. (1991) in *Dene-Sino-Caucasian Languages*, ed. Shevoroshkin, V. (Brockmeyer, Bochum), pp. 67–129.
- Bengtson, J. D. (1991) in *Dene-Sino-Caucasian Languages*, ed. Shevoroshkin, V. (Brockmeyer, Bochum), pp. 42–66.