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キーワード 女真語 滿州・ツングース語 鼻母音 漢字音訳 『華夷詮語』

要旨 『女真館詮語』では、語末に-nを持つ女真語に軟口蓋鼻音の漢字をあてている例が見られる。これは音読者の漢語方言で[n]と[g]を区別しなかったためか、あるいは女真語の語末に現れた鼻母音を表記しようとしたものと考える。また、満州語と比較して、子音の素さが逆に表記されている例があるが、これはまた錫伯語でも観察される現象と考える。

0. Introduction
1. Transliteration by using Chinese characters having a velar nasal
2. Disagreement of Consonant Transliteration

0. Introduction
The Jurchen language is the oldest Manchu-Tungus language described sufficiently to research its linguistic structure. It was in the twelfth century that the language was written by proper and unique characters. In those times, national independence began to arise in northeastern Asia and languages around China obtained their own characters. The Jurchen language was also unable to free itself from the enchantment of Chinese characters, because morphologically its characters are obviously made with Chinese characters as their model. A student familiar with Chinese characters would be interested in their morphological uniqueness. In addition, though the Jurchen language was described in the earliest times among the Manchu-Tungus languages, some of its words are morphologically remote, compared with
Written Manchu, from the Proto-Manchu-Tungus or the Mongolian language in case of borrowing.

There are comparatively few students studying the Manchu-Tungus languages, especially the Jurchen language, because it is a completely dead language. After Grube (1896), however, slow but steady study has obtained dependable results in the last decades: e.g. Kiyose (1977) in Japan, Jin & Jin (1980) in China, Jin (1984) in China and Kane (1989) in the Occident. It is no exaggeration to say that the study of the Jurchen language is already established at the fundamental stage.

In the present paper, the author will consider some problems of transliteration of the Jurchen language using Chinese characters based on the comprehensive studies mentioned above.

1. Transliteration by using Chinese characters having a velar nasal

There are examples of the Jurchen characters transliterated by not only Chinese characters having a dental nasal [n] but also those having velar nasal [ŋ]. The following lists shows some of examples with Written Manchu equivalents on the right:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ㄢ} & \quad (4-638) \quad \text{（以囉 lan）} \quad \text{ilang} \quad : \quad \text{Ma. ilan} \\
\text{ㄆ耰} & \quad (4-780) \quad \text{（的勒岸 an）} \quad \text{dilgan} \quad : \quad \text{Ma. jilgan} \\
\text{ㄤJoinColumn} & \quad (4-248) \quad \text{（阿羊 yang）} \quad \text{ayan} \quad : \quad \text{Ma. ayan} \\
\text{ㄍJoinColumn} & \quad (4-346) \quad \text{（伯羊）} \quad \text{bayan} \quad : \quad \text{Ma. bayan}
\end{align*}
\]

The Jurchen characters for loan words from Chinese are 片 (3-114) and 歹 (3-193). The 片 (3-114), for example, is used for 片片 (4-198), which is borrowed from a Chinese word 堂 tang. The 片 (3-114) might have been pronounced as [aŋ] by Jurchen speakers who knew its original sound. However, it is reasonable to consider that the 片 (3-114) was generally pronounced as [an], because it is transliterated in a Chinese character 全 an. In other
words, the author thinks that the most crucial purpose of these characters is to show that words in question are borrowed from foreign languages, and that their pronunciation is based upon the Jurchen phonology, unlike Manchu letters for foreign sounds. This view will be supported by the fact that the 矢 (3-114) is used for 蕃 lan, a Chinese word having a dental nasal [ŋ]. This phenomenon can be seen in Chinese words having [ŋ] which were described in -n in early Manchu, and the author thinks that it is natural that foreign unfamiliar sounds in loan words be assimilated to the phonology of borrowing language.

Besides 羊, there are the following Chinese characters having [ŋ] which have been used in transliteration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>4-356</th>
<th>(脱興 xing)</th>
<th>tolgin</th>
<th>: Ma. tolgin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>夫文</td>
<td>4-734</td>
<td>(只刺興)</td>
<td>jilagin</td>
<td>: Ma. jilan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>件</td>
<td>4-002</td>
<td>(塔里江 jiang)</td>
<td>talgiyan</td>
<td>: Ma. talkiyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>及</td>
<td>4-616</td>
<td>(嫩江)</td>
<td>niyongiyian</td>
<td>: Ma. niowanggiyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>革</td>
<td>4-617</td>
<td>(弗剌江)</td>
<td>fulagiyan</td>
<td>: Ma. fulgiyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>呈</td>
<td>4-618</td>
<td>(琉江)</td>
<td>sogiyan</td>
<td>: Ma. suwayan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>子</td>
<td>4-619</td>
<td>(上江)</td>
<td>sangiyian</td>
<td>: Ma. sanggiyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>京</td>
<td>4-620</td>
<td>(撒哈良 liang)</td>
<td>sahaliyan</td>
<td>: Ma. sahaliyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>今</td>
<td>4-022</td>
<td>(懇都洪 hong)</td>
<td>wenduhun</td>
<td>: Ma. untuhun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>合</td>
<td>4-098</td>
<td>(言的洪)</td>
<td>yamdihun</td>
<td>: Ma. yamjishūn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>吴</td>
<td>4-183</td>
<td>(失別洪)</td>
<td>sibihun</td>
<td>: Ma. sibirgan, cibirgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>斯</td>
<td>4-406</td>
<td>(巴奴洪)</td>
<td>banuhun</td>
<td>: Ma. banuhun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>平</td>
<td>4-450</td>
<td>(厄克洪)</td>
<td>ekehun</td>
<td>: Ma. ekiyehun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>上平</td>
<td>4-529</td>
<td>(都速洪)</td>
<td>dushun</td>
<td>: Ma. įšun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>荒</td>
<td>4-549</td>
<td>(一入的洪)</td>
<td>irdihun</td>
<td>: Ma. iijifun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>畔</td>
<td>4-557</td>
<td>(卜的洪)</td>
<td>dibohnun</td>
<td>: Ma. jibehun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>蛯</td>
<td>4-672</td>
<td>(納入洪)</td>
<td>narhun</td>
<td>: Ma. narhūn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>穿</td>
<td>4-673</td>
<td>(兀鲁忽洪)</td>
<td>uluhun</td>
<td>: Ma. uhukken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meanwhile, there are three versions of 華夷詴語 Hua-yi Yi-yu, two of which are available: 訳館 Si-yi-guan text and 会同館 Hui-tong-guan text. As Dr. Kiyose wrote, the former consists of transliteration, while the latter of transcription. Therefore, there is a great difference between them in the expression of Jurchen vocabulary. All the examples above were quoted from the 訳館 Si-yi-guan text, while examples from the 会同館 Hui-tong-guan text are as follows:

雪厚 阿忙吉郎 lang 的刺速 p.24
麒麟 阿撤郎 p.33 基休人 (4-167) (其里因 yīn) kilin: Ma. kilin
蜜蜂 歲郎 p.35 
梨 (sic) 木郎 p.36 木米 (4-239) (木刺 la) mulan: Ma. mulan
黎銈 兀浦哈郎 p.37
三 亦郎 p.52 釉 (4-638) (以藍 lan) ilan: Ma. ilan
煙甥 忽郎 lang p.36
糖 麻湯 tang p.49
山林 阿力不章 zhang p.27 卓 美 (4-047) (扎 zha 卜) jabo?: Ma. bujan
蔓莱 非冷 leng 素吉 p.31
一更 額木經 jing 佛 p.29 A loan word from Chinese?
壺 湯平 ping p.36 
瓶 化平 p.37
放火 他興 xīng 答必 p.50
晩 樣的哈 p.28 今卦 中 (4-098) (言的洪 hong) yamdihun : Ma. yamjishū

黄 素羊 yang p.51 伏 (4-618) (殅江 jiang) sogiyan : Ma. suwayan

幾間房 木姜 jiang 博 p.36

黒 撒哈良 liang p.51 芎 (4-620) (撒哈良 liang) sahaliyan : Ma. sahaliyan

紅 伏良 p.51 金 (4-617) (弗刺江) fulagiyan : Ma. fulgiyan

栢房 博額峰 feng 必 p.35

鋸 伏風 feng p.37

昏 發兒洪 hong p.21 : Ma. farhūn

河窄 必刺亦塞洪 p.25

細沙 納兒洪灼兒 p.26 : Ma. narhūn

兎 姑麻洪 p.32 兎 (4-150) (古魯麻孩 hai) gulmahai : Ma. gulmahan, ĝulmahūn

鵝 鹅牙洪 p.35 灰 (4-180) (古牙忽 hu) guyahu

兄 阿洪 p.39 兎 (4-286) (阿渾 wen) ahun : Ma. ahūn

窮 牙苔洪 p.39 : Ma. yadahūn

手指 哈刺深木洪 p.46 : Ma. simhun

指甲 希塔洪 p.46 : Ma. hitahūn

肝 發洪 p.46 : Ma. farhūn

被癢 的伯洪失塞 p.48 存 (4-557) (卜的洪) dibohun : Ma. jibehun

臭 襪洪 p.49

紫 里洪 p.51

秋凉 博羅里塞兒空 kong p.30 多是 (4-093) (塞魯溫) sergun : Ma. serguwen

八 箭空 p.52 弓 (4-643) (札困 kun) jakun : Ma. jakūn

九 兇容 rong p.52 弓 (4-644) (兀也溫) uyun : Ma. uyun

撞鐘 中 zhong 東 dong 必 p.29

梯子 汪 wang p.38 : Ma. wan
It is difficult to assume that 洪 hung is used for - hun, because 天 (4-541) was transliterated as 忽訶 hu-hun.

There will be two possible explanations for this phenomenon. First, since [ŋ] and [ŋ] were not distinctive in the dialect of the Chinese person who transliterated the Jurchen characters, both Chinese characters with [ŋ] and those with [ŋ] were used. Ōta(1987) also argues that some examples of transliteration in 「丙種本西番館訳語」 Xi-fan-guan Yi-yu the type C may have been based upon such a Chinese dialect as Jiang-nan literary pronunciation.71 It will be overhasty to conclude, judging from the fact that modern 吳 Wu dialect does not distinguish [ŋ] and [ŋ] in some regions, that it was a speaker of 吳 Wu dialect who transliterated the Jurchen characters. In this respect, however, it is necessary to consider a possibility that the transliteration might have been partly based upon other Chinese dialects, besides the literary pronunciation of Chinese characters which were conventionally used for the reconstruction of the Jurchen phonology.8

Meanwhile, though in general [ŋ] and [ŋ] are clearly distinctive in Written Manchu9, there are four examples in 「異施清字」 Yi-shi Qing -zi’ Chapter in 『清文啓蒙』Qing-wen Qi-meng (1730), as follows:10

akūn 字念阿空 kong (45a) saiyūn 字念薩衣切雍 yong (45a)
yargiyūn 字念呾爾駒雍切 (45b) kacilan 字念喀吃拉英 ying 切 (47b)

Moreover, the Written Manchu word hangsi derives from a Chinese word 寒食, which does not have a velar nasal. It is obviously difficult
to think that Chinese did not distinguish [n] and [ŋ] in these examples, because transliteration of Written Manchu is clearly based upon Mandarin.

The author's second explanation, which is more likely one, is that Chinese characters having [ŋ] may have been used to show nasal vowels in Jurchen and Written Manchu. Benzing (1956:27) explains that final vowels with -n can be changed to nasal vowels in Tungus dialects, and there are many descriptions of nasal vowels in Sibo.11) Needless to say, nasal vowels are simply phonetic variants of oral vowels at the end of a word, and they are not distinctive in the phonology of both languages. Kiyose (1977: 57) gives some examples where the presence of a final nasal does not coincide between Jurchen and Written Manchu as in the following:

岸合 (4-042) (哈沙)  

| gasa : Ma. gasan |

騒屯 (4-046) (脉忒厄林)  

| meterin : Ma. mederi |

The author thinks that these examples reflect nasal vowels. It is well-known that Written Manchu has plenty of variants with or without the final -n.12) here the same view will be taken for this explanation.13)

2. Disagreement of Consonant Transliteration

There are some exceptional cases of transliteration. First, although Jurchen d is usually transliterated as a Chinese character with an unaspirated consonant [t], only de is transliterated as 訑 te, tei, tui in the 四譯館 Si-yi-guan text, as in the following:

the 会同館 Hui-tong-guan text

主今 (4-491) (忒厄)  

| tee : Ma. dere | 面 得勒 |

Cf. 使 (4-216) (必忒黑)  

| bitche : Ma. bithe | 字 必忒 |
As seen above, the same Chinese character is used to transliterate a voiceless dental consonant [t]. The author thinks that there must have been an inevitable reason why the transliterator chose this Chinese character for de, because the idea of a phonetic change in [d] to [t] in Jurchen is inadequate. However, there is no clear evidence for this explanation yet. When Tungus dialects as well as Manchu have corresponding forms, it is possible to decide whether a particular Jurchen word had d or t. For example, 十 “forty” is transliterated as 十, but according to Written Manchu dehi, the Jurchen form should not be tehì but dehi. However, it will be hardly easy, when there is no corresponding form in sister languages and original words in case of borrowing. Therefore, judging from this, the author thinks that some conventional reconstructed forms may have to be reconsidered.

Since 德 (3-297) is principally used to transliterate a Chinese character 德, its reconstructed form should be de. Thus, it is impossible to assume that Jurchen did not have the syllable. On the other hand, Jin & Jin (1980:113) and Jin (1984: 218-219) reconstruct this as dei, which is another pronunciation of 徳. Jin (1984: 218) gives 犬尾曳曳利 o-gu-dei usu-in (斡古德曳速因) as an example, and compares it with Written Manchu urgedembi. He lists other examples (loan words from Chinese proper names with 徳), but the author does not think that this will give a persuasive reason for the reconstruction of 徳 (3-297) as dei.

Besides, there is a such Chinese character as 得 having the sound de. There might have been an unavoidable reason why both Chinese characters were excluded in transliterating de in compilation of the 四詮館 Si-yì-guan text.
In addition, there are still a few examples of this kind:

the 会同館 Hui-tong-guan text

付 会 (4-462) (哈貳 tan) hatan : Ma. akdu
支 会 (4-674) (忽屯 tun 只) hutunji : Ma. hūdun
玫 会 (4-556) (弗赤 chi) foci : Ma. foji 襪子 伏莫尺

On the other hand, there is a case that Jurchen characters corresponding to Written Manchu t is transliterated as Chinese characters having an unaspirated consonant.

the 会同館 Hui-tong-guan text

卯 (4-168) (阿答 da) akda : Ma. akta 斧馬 阿塔木力
辛 (4-229) (塔答) tada : Ma. tatambi 彭頭 哈昔剌
辛 (4-330) (岸答德) andahai : Ma. antaha
末 (4-331) (奇答剌) jī-da-la-bie : Ma. isitala
走 (4-505) (卜的 di, de 黑) budihe : Ma. bethe 脚 伯帖
木 (4-720) (都 du, dou 塔洪) dutun : Ma. tutambi
今 (4-022) (晚都洪) wenduhun : Ma. untuhun

Moreover, there are the following examples:

the 会同館 Hui-tong-guan text

薔 (4-002) (塔里江 jiang) talgiyan : Ma. talkiyuan 電 塔兒猞
看 (4-514) (素古 gu) sugu : Ma. suku 皮 速吉
点 (4-214) (札 zha, za 赤里) jācili : Ma. cacari

Though Written Manchu t is theoretically an aspirated consonant [tʰ], it often changes to an unaspirated consonant [t] in practical utterance, especially in intervocalic positions. Therefore, it is natural that 曰 having an unaspirated consonant corresponds to ta in akta,
because Sibo has [ʔ aqt]. However, because Jurchen voiced consonants correspond to Written Manchu unaspirated consonants, these examples are opposed to the general rule. Of course, it might be possible to assume the phonetic change between a voiced consonant [d] and a voiceless consonant [t] in each example.

One hypothesis is that some Written Manchu words above were written in old orthography. Written Manchu has plenty of variants, especially between unaspirated consonants and aspirated consonants: d and t, j and c, g and k. This is because the old orthographic spelling held good to some degree in those days. However, it is difficult to explain all examples through this hypothesis if they are compared with Tungus and Mongolian.

As seen already, most of the disagreement in transliteration above is not contained in the 合同館 Hui-tong-guan text, but in the 四詣館 Si-yi-guan text: in the respect, the former text is true to the general rule of phonetic correspondence between Jurchen words and Chinese characters, because as Dr. Kiyose mentioned, the 四詣館 Si-yi-guan text consists of transliteration, while the 合同館 Hui-tong-guan text consists of transcription. For example, 卜 corresponds not only to the Jurchen bu but to bo in the 四詣館 Si-yi-guan text. However, it is doubtful whether the disagreement of transliteration above was caused for the same reason.

If we suppose that this was due to the Jurchen phonetic change in those days, it would be restricted to its dialectal phenomena. Theoretically the opposition between consonant phonemes is strictly distinguished in each language, but it is not necessarily unnatural that there be occasional cases where distinctive features alternate in several words.

Li & Zhong (1986: 11-12) state that when d, dz, dzì appear at the end of a word, they could be pronounced as their corresponding aspirated sounds t, ts, tc respectively, as in the following:
tond  [thonth]  "straight"

ulōw  [uʃhw]  "a head"

χaχək'i  [χaʃək'i]  "a boy"

They also state that when d, dz, dž stand in front of x, χ, again they are pronounced as their corresponding aspirated sounds t, ts, tc respectively, as in the following:

bodχui  [bothχui]  "to have thought"

budχui  [buʃχui]  "to have boiled"

fændχəi  [fændχəi]  "to have asked"

Either of the above conditions will be applied to some examples cited in this paper. In other words, the author thinks that the phonetic changes in Sibo are also observed in the correspondence between Jurchen and Written Manchu.

NOTES

1) Jurchen characters are identified by means of the number used in Kiyose (1977). For example, (4-638) means a Jurchen word listed in the entry number 638 in Chapter 4. Jurchen reconstructed forms are also quoted from Kiyose (1977).


3) See Ishida (1931). The page numbers used in this paper correspond to those in Ishida (1931). Jurchen words in the 四詮館 Si-yi-guan text and their Written Manchu equivalents are added by the author.

4) Written Manchu has the word ursalan which means "lion".

5) Written Manchu has the word kibsu ejen which means "honeybee", while suilan means "hornet". Sibo has a word ʒištia "honeybee". See Li & Zhong (1986: 146).

6) Written Manchu has the word indubihun which means "dog".


8) There are some Northen Chinese dialects where [en], [in] and [eŋ], [iŋ] are not dis-
tinctive: e. g. 西北官話 Xi-bei Mandarin and 江淮官話 Jiang-huai Mandarin.

Jin & Jin (1980: 287) give two examples where the Jurchen character 羊, which is transliterated as the Chinese character 有 having a nasal [n], is used for loan words of the following Chinese proper names (N. B. Both share the Jurchen race): i. e. 羊曳曳 (你曳曳) ‘李 ily 哥’, 羊曳曳 (你曳曳) ‘李 ili 哥’. This is either because [n] and [l] were occasionally confounded in Jurchen or because these proper names entered Jurchen vocabulary via a Chinese speaker who did not distinguish [n] from [l]. The two sounds are distinctive in the 蒙 Wu dialect, while both sounds are confused in some dialects in 西北官話 Xi-bei Mandarin and 江淮官話 Jiang-huai Mandarin.

9) Manchu does not have [ŋ] in its proper phonological system, except onomatopoeia, mimesis words and loan words.

10) According to the first volume of 清文學蒙 Qing-wen Qi-meng, Manchu syllables are transliterated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manchu</th>
<th>Pinyin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kūn 坤 (16b)</td>
<td>yūn 淫 (17a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lān 拉 (16b)</td>
<td>lì 嘀 (16b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cf. kūng 空 (18b)</td>
<td>yōng, yōng, yōng 缶 (19a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ǐng 英 (18b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ikegami (1986: 11) supposes, concerning these examples, that Manchu had either [ŋ] or [n]. However, Hattori & Yamamoto (1956: 11) explain that the phoneme /ŋ/ corresponds to an apical-laminal [n] at the ending of a syllable. Ikegami (1986: 11) quoted the following example in 清文學蒙 Qing-wen Yi-yan (1766) where an ending -n changed to -ŋ: yar-giyun > yar giong (14b).


12) Jin (1984: 9) compares 元describe (扎安)dʒa-(g) an in 華夷語 Hua-ya Yi-yu with 元 describe dʒa-qa in an inscription.

13) Meanwhile, the Jurchen 金 derives from Mongolian bayan. Its corresponding form in the modern Khalkha dialect is баян, which has a velar nasal [ŋ]. In some Mongolian dialects, [n] has changed to [ŋ]. The existence of this phonetic change might have been one of the reason why the transliterator used 羊 in borrowing this word from Mongolian. However, there is no clear evidence that Jurchen borrowed words from the Khalkha
According to Sun (1990: 138), the change of [n] to [ŋ] occurred in such Mongolian dialects as 正蓝旗 Zheng lan qi, 陈巴尔虎 Chen ba er hu, 布里亚特 Bu li ya te, 杜尔尼特 Dong su ni tu, 都兰 Dou lan, 和静 Huo jing and 保安语 Bao an yu. Similar examples are as follows:

瓦 丁 (4-616) (嫩江) niiyougian : Мэнөөн (nogucan)

金 丁 (4-617) (弗利江) fulagian : Мэн. улазан (ulagcan)

克 丁 (4-619) (上江) шаагийан : Мэн. цагаан (caaga(can))

存 丁 (4-672) (纳尔汗) narhun : Мэн. нарын (narin)

必 丁 (4-736) (革洪) gehun : Мэн. гегээн (gegegen)

However, in the transliteration of Mongolian by using Chinese characters in Ming Dynasty, Chinese characters having [n] are principally used as follows: e. g. kodun (火敦, 火墩), hüsün (許孫, 忽速, 五索), harban (哈兒班, 哈儿八, 哈業). See Ozawa (1979: 20).

14) Generally speaking, the selection of Chinese characters is based upon phonetic reason, but the semantic aspects sometimes affect the creation of exceptional usage.

15) According to Ивлий (1975: 215), the corresponding words in Tungus dialects also have d. All of them share their origin with the Mongolian дочин.

16) There is more difficulty in case of 尕鱼 (4-083) (厄魯忒) ерт, because this word obviously derives from Mongolian word oр (эр) whose literary form is ер-т, while its corresponding form is erde in Manchu and 23rd's in Sibo. See Yamamoto (1969: 131).

It is not easy to decide whether Jurchen had d or t in this case.

17) There is famoci in Written Manchu as Kiyose (1977: 128) states in his note.

18) There is hadala in Written Manchu as Kiyose (1977: 110) states in his note.

19) Written Manchu has the word anda which means "a sworn brother".

20) Jin (1984: 195). But there is also the following example: 朱帝友 -+·+д・м iy - ta - la id.


23) As Jin & Jin (1980: 108-117) explains, there are many problems in the transliteration of Jurchen characters due to the occasional existence of exceptions.

24) Written Manchu has two types of orthography. The use of the new one started in
632. As Matsumura (1971: 58) points out, however, the Manchu people sometimes used the old orthography even after 1632, where the \( d - t \ g - k \) distinctions were not necessarily made, when it was obviously understood. (This type of distinction is made by using a point in the new orthography.)
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