

On Some Problems of Transliteration of the Jurchen Language by Chinese Characters

Masato YAMAZAKI

キーワード 女真語 満州・ツングース語 鼻母音 漢字音訳 『華夷訳語』

要旨 『女真館訳語』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。これは音訳者の漢語方言で[n]と[ŋ]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られる。また、満州語と比較して、子音の素性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 auther 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:¹⁾

头	(4-638)	(以藍 <i>lan</i>)	ilan	: Ma. ilan
先米	(4-780)	(的勒岸 <i>an</i>)	dilgan	: Ma. jilgan
尔册	(4-248)	(阿羊 <i>yang</i>)	ayan	: Ma. ayan
金册	(4-346)	(伯羊)	bayan	: Ma. bayan

The Jurchen characters for loan words from Chinese are 片 (3-114) and 又 (3-193). The 片 (3-114), for example, is used for 带片 (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 安 *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 序 (3-114) is used for 蘭 *lan*, a Chinese word having a dental nasal [n]. 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:

角 旁	(4-356)	(脱興 <i>xing</i>)	tolgin	: Ma. tolgin
长 友 旁	(4-734)	(只刺興)	jilagin	: Ma. jilan
能 旁	(4-002)	(塔里江 <i>jiang</i>)	talgiyan	: Ma. talkiyan
瓜 旁	(4-616)	(嫩江)	niyongiyan	: Ma. niowanggiyan
金 旁	(4-617)	(弗刺江)	fulagiyan	: Ma. fulgiyan
片 旁	(4-618)	(瓊江)	sogiyan	: Ma. suwayan
兄 旁	(4-619)	(上江)	šangiyan	: Ma. šanggiyan
萌 旁	(4-620)	(撒哈良 <i>liang</i>)	sahaliyan	: Ma. sahaliyan
拿 并 旁	(4-022)	(晚都洪 <i>hong</i>)	wenduhun	: Ma. untuhun
吞 角 旁	(4-098)	(言的洪)	yamdihun	: Ma. yamjishūn
吴 老 旁	(4-183)	(失别洪)	šibihun	: Ma. sibirgan, cibirgan
函 皮 旁	(4-406)	(巴奴洪)	banuhun	: Ma. banuhūn
辟 页 旁	(4-450)	(厄克洪)	ekehun	: Ma. ekiyehun
虫 旁	(4-529)	(都速洪)	dushun	: Ma. jušun
旱 角 旁	(4-549)	(一兒的洪)	irdihun	: Ma. ijifun
孛 旁	(4-557)	(卜的洪)	dibohun	: Ma. jibehun
存 旁	(4-672)	(納兒洪)	narhun	: Ma. narhūn
屯 在 旁	(4-673)	(兀魯忽洪)	ulhuhun	: Ma. uhukun

𠵹 𠵹 𠵹	(4-693)	(南克洪)	nankehun	: Ma. nekeliyen
𠵹 𠵹 𠵹	(4-694)	(一兒哈洪)	irhahun	
𠵹 𠵹	(4-720)	(都塔洪)	dutahun	: Ma. tutambi
𠵹 𠵹	(4-721)	(厄木洪)	emuhun	: Ma. emhun
𠵹 𠵹	(4-736)	(革洪)	gehun	: Ma. gehun
𠵹 𠵹 𠵹	(4-764)	(斡洪昧)	wehunmei	: Ma. uhumbi
𠵹 𠵹	(4-846)	(厄秃洪)	etuhun	: Ma. etumbi

Meanwhile, there are three versions of 華夷訳語 *Hua-yi Yi-yu*,²⁾ two of which are available: 四訳館 *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 四訳館 *Si-yi-guan* text, while examples from the 会同館 *Hui-tong-guan* text are as follows³⁾:

雪厚	亦忙吉郎 <i>lang</i> 的刺迷 p.24	
麒麟	阿撒郎 ⁴⁾ p.33 其休丸 (4-167) (其里因 <i>yin</i>) kilin : Ma. kilin	
蜜蜂	歳郎 p.35	: Ma. suilan ⁵⁾
橙 ^[sic]	木郎 p.36 罕米 (4-239) (木刺 <i>la</i>) mulan : Ma. mulan	
犁鏵	兀浦哈郎 p.37	
三	亦郎 p.52 斗 (4-638) (以藍 <i>lan</i>) ilan : Ma. ilan	
煙燭	忽朗 <i>lang</i> p.36	
糖	麻湯 <i>tang</i> p.49	
山林	阿力不章 <i>zhang</i> p.27 𠵹 𠵹 (4-047) (扎 <i>zha</i> 卜) j'abu? : Ma. bujan	
莧菜	非冷 <i>leng</i> 素吉 p.31	
一更	額木經 <i>jing</i> 佛 p.29 A loan word from Chinese?	
壺	湯平 <i>ping</i> p.36	: Ma. tampin
瓶	化平 p.37	
放火	他興 <i>xing</i> 答必 p.50	

- 晚 樣的哈 p.28 𠵹 𠵹 (4-098) (言的洪 *hong*) yamdihun : Ma.
yamjishūn
- 黄 素羊 *yang* p.51 𠵹 𠵹 (4-618) (瓊江 *jiang*) sogiyan : Ma.
suwayan
- 幾間房 木姜 *jiang* 博 p.36
- 黑 撒哈良 *liang* p.51 𠵹 𠵹 (4-620) (撒哈良 *liang*) sahaliyan : Ma.
sahaliyan
- 紅 伏良 p.51 𠵹 𠵹 (4-617) (弗刺江) fulagiyan : Ma. fulgiyan
- 柝房 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
- 兔 姑麻洪 p.32 𠵹 𠵹 (4-150) (古魯麻孩 *hai*) gulmahai : Ma.
gulmahūn, gūlmahūn
- 鴛鴦 谷牙洪 p.35 𠵹 𠵹 (4-180) (古牙忽 *hu*) guyahu
- 兄 阿洪 p.39 𠵹 𠵹 (4-286) (阿渾温 *wen*) ahun : Ma. ahūn
- 窮 牙荅洪 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
- 被褥 的伯洪失塞 p.48 𠵹 𠵹 (4-557) (卜的洪) dibohun : Ma. jibehun
- 臭 襪洪 p.49
- 紫 霍洪 p.51
- 秋涼 博羅里塞兒空 *kong* p.30 𠵹 𠵹 (4-093) (塞魯温) sergun : Ma.
serguwen
- 八 筭空 p.52 𠵹 (4-643) (扎困 *kun*) ĵakun : Ma. jakūn
- 九 兀容 *rong* p.52 𠵹 (4-644) (兀也温) uyun : Ma. uyun
- 撞鐘 中 *zhong* 東 *dong* 必 p.29
- 梯子 汪 *wang* p.38 : Ma. wan

夏	莊 <i>zhuang</i> 里 p.28	夏屯 (4-074) (朱阿厄林 <i>lin</i>)	juwa erin : Ma. juwari
十	莊 p.52	十 (4-645) (撻)	juwa : Ma. juwan
賣	翁 <i>weng</i> 察 p.42		: Ma. uncambi
瘦馬	因荅忽翁必 ⁶⁾ p.35		

It is difficult to assume that 洪 *hung* is used for -*hun*, because 夙 (4-541) was transliterated as 忽渾 *hu-hun*.

There will be two possible explanations for this phenomenon. First, since [n] and [ŋ] were not distinctive in the dialect of the Chinese person who transliterated the Jurchen characters, both Chinese characters with [n] 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.⁷⁾ It will be overhasty to conclude, judging from the fact that modern 吳 Wu dialect does not distinguish [n] 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 [n] 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 <i>kong</i> (45a)	saiyūn	字念薩衣切雍 <i>yong</i> (45a)
yargiyūn	字念呀尔駒雍切 (45b)	kacilan	字念喀吃拉英 <i>ying</i> 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:

岸舍 (4-042) (哈沙)	gaša : Ma. gašan
嵐屯 (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 忒 *te*, *tei*, *tui* in the 四訳館 *Si-yi-guan* text, as in the following:

			the 会同館 <i>Hui-tong-guan</i> text
主 忒 (4-491) (忒厄)	tee	: Ma. dere	面 得勒
Cf. 使 (4-216) (必忒黑)	bitehe	: Ma. bithe	字 必忒

夙屯 (4-046) (脉忒厄林) meterin : Ma. mederi 海 墨得
 Cf. 文夏文 (4-740) (木忒卜魯) muteburu : Ma. mutembi 成 墨忒黑

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.¹⁴⁾ 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, 个 "forty" is transliterated as 忒希, but according to Written Manchu *dehi*, the Jurchen form should not be *tehi* but *dehi*.¹⁵⁾ However, it will be hardly easy, when there is no corresponding form in sister languages and original words in case of borrowing.¹⁶⁾ Therefore, judging from this, the author thinks that some conventional reconstructed forms may have to be reconsidered.

Since 纛 (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 德. Jin (1984: 218) gives 更委伐烏利 *o-gu-dei usu-in* (斡古德兀速因) as an example, and compares it with Written Manchu *urgedembi*. He lists other examples (loan words from Chinese proper names with 德), but the author does not think that this will give a persuasive reason for the reconstruction of 纛 (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 訳館 *Si-yi-guan* text.

In addition, there are still a few examples of this kind:

				the 会同館 <i>Hui-tong-guan</i> text
付 貪	(4-462)	(哈貪 <i>tan</i>)	hatan	: Ma. akdun
夬 奈	(4-674)	(忽屯 <i>tun</i> 只)	hutunji	: Ma. hūdun
攷 夷	(4-556)	(弗赤 <i>chi</i>)	foci	: Ma. foji 襪子 伏莫尺 ¹⁷⁾

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 <i>Hui-tong-guan</i> text
申	(4-168)	(阿荅 <i>da</i>)	akda	: Ma. akta 扇馬 阿塔木力
希 育	(4-229)	(塔荅)	tada	:? Ma. tatambi 轡頭 哈荅刺 ¹⁸⁾
忒 育 足	(4-330)	(岸荅孩)	andahai	: Ma. antaha ¹⁹⁾
未 雷 友 夷	一十·荅·刺·列		iʃɪ-da-la-bie ²⁰⁾	: Ma. isitala
走 夷	(4-505)	(卜的 <i>di, de</i> 黑)	budihe	: Ma. bethe 脚 伯帖
乃 乍	(4-720)	(都 <i>du, dou</i> 塔洪)	dutahun	:? Ma. tutambi
夬 并 乍	(4-022)	(晚都洪)	wenduhun	: Ma. untuhun

Moreover, there are the following examples:

				the 会同館 <i>Hui-tong-guan</i> text
能 乍	(4-002)	(塔里江 <i>jiang</i>)	talgiyan	: Ma. talkiyan 電 塔兒恰
看 夷	(4-514)	(素古 <i>gu</i>)	sugu	: Ma. sukū 皮 速吉
杰 夷 休	(4-214)	(扎 <i>zha, za</i> 赤里)	jacili	: Ma. cacari

Though Written Manchu *t* is theoretically an aspirated consonant [t']²¹⁾, it often changes to an unaspirated consonant [t] in practical utterance, especially in intervocalic positions. Therefore, it is natural that 荅 having an unaspirated consonant corresponds to *ta* in *akta*,

because Sibö has [ʔ aqt]²²⁾. However, because Jurchen voiced consonants correspond to Written Manchu unaspirated consonants, these examples are opposed to the general rule.²³⁾ 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.²⁴⁾ 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 会同館 *Hui-tong-guan* text, but in the 四訳館 *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 四訳館 *Si-yi-guan* text consists of transliteration, while the 会同館 *Hui-tong-guan* text consists of transcription. For example, 卜 corresponds not only to the Jurchen *bu* but to *bo* in the 四訳館 *Si-yi-guan* text.²⁵⁾ 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*, *dʒ*, *dʒi* appear at the end of a word, they could be pronounced as their corresponding aspirated sounds *t*, *tʂ*, *tʂ* respectively, as in the following:

tond	[thonth]	"straight"
udz _w	[uʃhw]	"a head"
xaχədzi	[χarvəhi]	"a boy"

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

bodχui	[bothχui]	"to have thought"
budz _w χui	[butʃhχui]	"to have boiled"
fəendz _w χəi	[fəentʃhχvi]	"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 Sibö 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).
- 2) See Kiyose (1977: 26-32).
- 3) See Ishida (1931). The page numbers used in this paper correspond to those in Ishida (1931). Jurchen words in the 四訳館 *Si-yi-guan* text and their Written Manchu equivalents are added by the author.
- 4) Written Manchu has the word *arsalan* which means "lion".
- 5) Written Manchu has the word *hibsū ejen* which means "honeybee", while *suilan* means "hornet". Sibö has a word *çylia* "honeybee". See Li & Zhong (1986: 146).
- 6) Written Manchu has the word *indahūn* which means "dog".
- 7) See Ōta (1987: 195, 196, 200, 204).
- 8) There are some Northern 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 𠬞, which is transliterated as the Chinese character 你 having a nasal [n], is used for loan words of the following Chinese proper names(N. B. Both share the Jurchen race): i. e. 𠬞𠬞𠬞 (你卜赤)「李 li 卜赤」, 𠬞𠬞 (你哥)「李 li 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 吳 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 『清文啓蒙』 *Qing-wen Qi-meng*, Manchu syllables are transliterated as follows:

kūn 坤(16b)	yūn 淤因切(17a)
lan 拉因切(16b)	lin 哩因切(16b)
Cf. kūng 空(18b)	yong, yung, yūng 雍(19a)
ing 英(18b)	

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

11)See Li et al. (1984: 8-9), Hayata(1985: 31), Li & Zhong(1986: 6) and Kubo (1988: 80, 81, 87, 90).

12)Jin(1984: 9) compares 𠬞𠬞 (扎安) *dʒa-(g)an* in 華夷訳語 *Hua-yi Yi-yu* with 𠬞𠬞 *dʒa-ga* in an inscription.

13)Meanwhile, the Jurchen 金冊 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

dialect. According to Sun(1990: 138), the change of [n] to [ŋ] occurred in such Mongolian dialects as 正藍旗 Zheng lan qi, 陳巴尔虎 Chen ba er hu, 布利亜特 Bu li ya te, 東蘇尼特 Dong su ni tu, 都蘭 Dou lan, 和静 Huo jing and 保安語 Bao an yu. Similar examples are as follows:

瓦 亨	(4-616) (嫩江)	niyongiyan	: Мо. ногоон	(nogugan)
金 亨	(4-617) (弗刺江)	fulagiyan	: Мо. улаан	(ulagan)
兄 亨	(4-619) (上江)	sangiyan	: Мо. цагаан	(caga(cā)n)
存 亨	(4-672) (納兒洪)	narhun	: Мо. нарийн	(narin)
化 亨	(4-736) (革洪)	gehun	: Мо. гэгээн	(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. *hodun* (火敦, 火墩), *hūsūn* (許孫, 忽速, 五素), *harban* (哈兒班, 哈兒八, 哈兒霸). 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 ЦИНИУС (1975: 215), the corresponding words in Tungus dialects also have *d*. All of them share their origin with the Mongolian *дочун*.

16) There is more difficulty in case of 笨 並 (4-083) (厄魯忒) *erte*, because this word obviously derives from Mongolian word *эрт(эн)* whose literary form is *erte-n*, while its corresponding form is *erde* in Manchu and [ʔɛrdɛ] in Sibo. See Yamamoto(1969: 131). It is not easy to decide whether Jurchen had *d* or *t* in this case.

17) There is *fomoci* 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 一十塔利 *iʃɪ-ta-la* id.

21) See Hattori & Yamamoto(1956: 3-4), Kouno(1979: 547-548), Li et al. (1984) and Li & Zhong(1986).

22) See Yamamoto(1969: 107).

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.)

25) See Jin & Jin(1980: 113).

REFERENCES

- Benzing, J. (1956) *Die tungusischen Sprachen. Versuch einer vergleichenden Grammatik.* Wiesbaden.
- Grube, W. (1896) *Die Sprache und Schrift der Jücen.* Leipzig.
- Hattori, S. & Yamamoto, K. (1956) "The Phonological Structure of Spoken Manchu". *Gengo Kenkyu (Linguistic Research)*. No. 30. pp.1-29. (服部四郎・山本謙吾「満洲語口語の音韻の体系と構造」『言語研究』)
- Hayata, T. (1985) "A Note of the Fieldwork of the Sibo Language". *Kyushu University Annual Report of Linguistics*. No.6. pp.23-36. (早田輝洋「錫伯語調査ノートより」『九大言語学研究室報告』)
- Ikegami, J. (1986, 1987a,b) "An Inquiry into the Phonology of Manchu in the *Man-han-tzu Ch'ing-wên-ch'i-mêng*". (1)-(3). *Sapporo University Women's Junior College Journal*. No.28. pp.1-26., No. 29. pp.1-24., No.30. pp.1-26. (池上二良「満漢字清文啓蒙に於ける満洲語音韻の考察」『札幌大学女子短期大学部紀要』)
- Ishida, M. (1931) "The New Material for the Study of Jurchen". *Collection of Articles on the Oriental history: Festschrift for Dr. Kuwabara on the Occasion of his 60's Birthday*. pp.1271-1323. (石田幹之助「女真語研究の新資料」『桑原博士還暦記念東洋史論叢』)
- Jia, J. & Zhu, F. (1990) *A Corpus of Meng-gu Yi-yu Nü-zhen Yi-yu.* (賈敬顔・朱風『蒙古訳語女真訳語匯編』)
- Jin, Q. (1984) *The Jurchen Dictionary.* Beijing. (金啓葆『女真文辞典』)
- Jin, G. & Jin, Q. (1980) *A Study of the Jurchen Language and Script.* Beijing. (金光平・金啓葆『女真語言文字研究』)
- Kane, D. (1989) *The Sino-Jurchen Vocabulary of the Bureau of Interpreters.* Bloomington.
- Kiyose, N. G. (1977) *A Study of the Jurchen Language and Script. Reconstruction and Decipherment.* Kyoto.
- Kouno, R. (1979) "On the Specific Character of Manchu in Hei-he District of Manchu.

- The Memoirs of the Comparative Study of Korean and Manchu ". *Collection of Articles of Kouno Rokuro* 1. Tokyo. (河野六郎「滿洲國黒河地方に於ける滿洲語の一特色—朝鮮語及び滿洲語の比較研究の一報告—」『河野六郎著作集』)
- Kubo, T. (1988) "The Memoirs of Some Basic Vocabulary of Sibo(Spoken Manchu)". *Kyushu University Annual Report of Linguistics No.9.pp.79-94.* (久保智之「錫伯語(滿洲語口語)の若干の基礎語彙についての報告」『九大言語学研究室報告』)
- Li, Sh. & Zhong, Q. (1986) *A Sibo Grammer*. Beijing. (李樹蘭・仲謙『錫伯語簡志』)
- Li, Sh. et al. (1984) *The Study of Spoken Sibo*. Beijing. (李樹蘭他『錫伯語口語研究』)
- Matsumura, J. (1971) "The Early Manchu Tablets". *Studies in Humanities and Sciences*. No.13. pp.125-140. (松村潤「崇徳三年の満文本牌について」『日本大学人文科学研究所研究紀要』)
- Ōta, I. (1987) "The *Xi-fan-guan-yi-yu* 西番館譯語 a Part of the *Hua-yi-yi-yu* 華夷譯語 of the type C: Corrected Text and Critical Apparatus". *Annals of Foreign Studies*. Vol.17. pp.157-217. (太田斎「〔資料〕丙種本西番館訳語校本(稿)」『外国学研究』)
- Ozawa, S. (1979) *The Study of Middle Mongolian Morphology*. Tokyo. (小沢重男『中世蒙古語諸形態の研究』)
- Sun, Zh. ed. (1990) *A Dictionary of Mongolian Linguistic Family*. Xining. (孫竹主編『蒙古族語言詞典』)
- Цинциус, В. И. ed. (1975, 1977) *Сравнительный словарь тунгусо-маньчжурских языков*. Ленинград.
- Yamamoto, K. (1969) *A Classified Dictionary of Spoken Manchu*. Tokyo. (山本謙吾『滿洲語口語基礎語彙集』)

I would like to thank Dr. Gisaburo N. Kiyose very much for his invaluable comments upon earlier drafts of this paper. I am also grateful to Mr. Nobuo Yuzawa, who kindly corrected errors in this paper. All errors and inadequacies are my own.