1. Introduction: The past and present of Ainu studies

Ainu is a critically endangered language of unknown genetic affiliation, which shows considerable dialectal variation. The three primary divisions are geographically based, and distinguish between the dialects once spoken on Hokkaido, Sakhalin, and the Kuril Islands. Originally, Ainu was not a written language, i.e. there are no early written records made by the Ainu themselves. The earliest records of Ainu were made by the Japanese in kana and Europeans in the Roman alphabet in the early 17th century but they are scarce.

Extensive documentation of Ainu and its linguistic research started a century ago and has produced a number of comprehensive dictionaries and grammars. Despite this proliferation of descriptive works on Ainu, no grammar of Ainu is historical. There were separate attempts to relate Ainu to Indo-European (Batchelor 1889, Naert 1958, Lindquist 1960), Austronesian (Gjerdmam 1926, Murayama 1992), Koreo-Japonic within Altaic (Patrie 1982), Japonic (Hattori 1959), and Nivkh (Austerlitz 1976) or reconstruct Proto-Ainu of 1000 CE (Vovin 1993, Alonso de la Fuente 2012). However, due to the scarcity of written records or methodological problems no comparative work on Ainu has been fully verified. As a result, there is a general lack of historical perspective on Ainu, which is a major impediment to the further progress of Ainu research.

This paper suggests that the study of unpublished old written records made by foreigners in the Roman/Cyrillic alphabets can compensate for the lack of documentation of some under-described Ainu dialects, provide telling clues about earlier stages of Ainu, advance understanding of the history of Ainu and possibly contribute to our understanding of the prehistory of Northeast Asia.

Focusing on the cross-dialectal comparison is important for its role in clarifying transitions between different synchronic states of a language, and for the insights it provides for reconstructing earlier phases of the language, particularly important in the case of isolate languages like Ainu which lack outside comparisons.

Unfortunately, the Kuril dialect of Ainu, which is absolutely indispensable for the reconstruction, disappeared in the late 19th century and all we are left with now is just a
limited amount of data, i.e. 700 items in R. Torii (1903), 1900 items in Dybowski (1892), 372 items in Klaproth (1823)\(^1\), and about items 297 in Krashennikov (1755) (§3). However, there are several other unpublished documents on Kuril Ainu of the 18th (§4) and 19th centuries (§5), particularly the one called Kuril'skie Slova [Kuril Words] (1844?) which is a list of 1609 words/phrases recorded in Cyrillic in the archive of I.G. Voznesensky stored in the St. Petersburg Branch of the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences (SPbF-ARAN, f.53, op.1, #43). Only one third of this document’s material is used in Vovin (1993), and the rest has never been published. Based on these new data we are going to revise and complement Murayama’s (1971) overview of Kuril Ainu and pursue historical research on a number of issues.

Though Murayama (1971) notes that Kuril Ainu is extremely important for Ainu dialectology and history of Ainu, he does not give any concrete examples of how it can actually be used for this purpose. This paper suggests that Kuril Ainu old documents (§4, §5) can reveal a lot only when compared with old documents of other dialects, i.e. Hokkaido (§2) and Sakhalin Ainu (§3), as shown in §6 and §7.

2. Old Ainu documents in kana
The first Ainu documents by the Japanese in kana go back to early 17th century, which is the time when the Japanese warrior clan Matsumae received Hokkaido as a fief (1604) from the newly established Edo Shogunate and monopolized trade with the Ainu; the 17th – early 18th century Ainu documents are few. By contrast, the late 18th – 19th century Ainu documents are numerous because the weakened Edo Shogunate feared colonization of Japan by Western powers and engaged in active exploration of the border territories (Hamaguchi et al. 2016: 98), which resulted in the establishment of the Japan government’s direct control over Hokkaido in 1799.

A word on the Japanese kana syllabaries, i.e. hiragana and katakana, is in place. It was not until 1900 that the Ministry of Education of Japan established the standard set of 48 hiragana (and katakana) characters. Before the Meiji era (1868-1912), it was common to use a number of different kana characters to notate one and the same sound in Japanese documents. For example, while as a hiragana for た, only た is now used, 多, 當, 堂, and others were freely used as hiragana before the Meiji era. Non-standard hiragana characters that were not chosen for that set came to be called hentaigana (‘variant kana’).

Both hiragana (including hentaigana) and katakana are used for the notation of Ainu in old documents by the Japanese. In the 17-18th century documents, Ainu tends to be written with hiragana (including hentaigana), while in the late 18th and 19th

---

\(^1\) According to Murayama (1971), Klaproth (1823) is based on the missing materials which were collected around 1743 by a German scholar G.W. Steller, see §4.
century documents, Ainu tends to be written with katakana (Satō, to appear in A. Bugaeva (ed.) *Handbook of the Ainu Language*).

*Matsumae no kotoba* (松前ノ言) ‘The words of Matsumae’ (n.d., Narita (ed.) 1972) from the Library of Tenri University, Nara Prefecture (deciphered in Kondaichi (1924)) is presumably the oldest Ainu document in kana. The exact date of this document is not clear but it probably dates back to the period of Kan’ei (1624-1644) (Sasaki 1925). It was included in a series of books called *Kokuseki-ruisho* (国籍類書) ‘a series of Japanese books’, which once belonged to the Ishikawas in Ise (now Mie prefecture). The total number of entries in this vocabulary is 117 (Satō 1998). For example, “ゆ王んふ (yuwanfu) 六川の事” corresponds to the present form *iwanpe* ‘six’ but this notation may imply that this word once had a form like *iwanp* or *iwanpə* (Satō 2008: 174).

The oldest attested Ainu vocabulary of considerable size that is clearly dated is *Ezo kotoba* (狄言葉) ‘The words of Ezo’ (Kūnen 2010/1704) with 456 entries; it belongs to Fukui City History Museum (Satō 2014, 2015a, 2016c).


And finally the most famous 18th century kana document is *Moshiogusa* (もしほ草) ‘Seaweeds for making salt’ (1792) by Kumajirō Uehara (Kondaichi 1972) which is the first published Ainu dictionary in the world compiled by Kumajirō Uehara and Chōzaburō Abe; 2000 entries and several sample texts. Its influence on the succeeding old documents was enormous.

One of the most important 19th century Ainu documents are *Ezogoshū* (蝦夷語集) ‘Collection of Ainu words’ (Uehara 1824). The author is Yūji Uehara, probably the same person as Kumajirō Uehara, the author of *Moshiogusa* (1792). The number of entries is 6000 (Tanaka and Sasaki 1985) so it is probably the largest Ainu dictionary in the Edo era. Another important one is *Ezo kotoba irohabiki* (蝦夷言いろは引) ‘Ainu words arranged in kana order’ (Itoya 1848). It includes 1724 entries and Ainu versions of ordinances at the end (Satō 1995).

Clearly dated old Ainu documents provide telling clues for dating documents with no specified date. For instance, in *Matsumae no kotoba* (early 17th century) and *Ezo kotoba* (1704), which are written in hiragana, a number of characters, see a list below, are used more often for the notation of Ainu than for Japanese translation (Satō 2018).

---

2 Although they look like characters, they are used here as a kind of hiragana (i.e. hentaigana).
which allows us to date the former (undated) document in accordance with the latter (dated) document\(^3\), see also Ezosaezuri in §6.

\[
\text{「可」} (ka) \quad \text{(Ainu: Jap: 23:12 (Matsumae) / 57:29 (Ezo))}; \\
\text{「志」} (shi) \quad (23:5/87:4); \\
\text{「川」} (tsu) \quad (33:11/30:6); \\
\text{「遍」} (he) \quad (10:1/9:1); \\
\text{「本」} (ho) \quad (11:3/37:8); \\
\text{「連」} (re) \quad (5:1/24:3)
\]

3. **Old Ainu documents in Roman and Cyrillic characters**

The oldest existing dated document of Ainu is *Relatione del Regno di Iezo ‘An account of the land of Iezo’* (the original is in Portuguese) (1624) by an Italian Jesuit, Girolamo de Angelis who was the first known European to come to Hokkaido and record 54 Ainu words in Roman characters during the ten years which he spent there since 1618 (Cieslik 1962). According to Satô (to appear in A. Bugaeva (ed.) *Handbook of the Ainu Language*), it is likely that at least parts of this document were copied from a document in kana.

In 1597, Hideyoshi proclaimed a banning edict on Christianity\(^4\). Japan has been closed for foreigners until 1853 but the ban on Christianity was abolished only in 1871. Thus, it is quite natural that in this period documents on Hokkaido Ainu in Roman characters are very scarce; they started reappearing only the 19th century; for a detailed account see Majewicz (to appear in *Handbook of the Ainu Language*).

However, there are early documents in Roman/Cyrillic characters of Ainu spoken in Sakhalin and Kurils, which were more easily accessible to foreigners. For example, 160 Sakhalin Ainu words are recorded in Lapérouse (1798) *Voyage de La Pérouse autour du monde, pendant les années 1785, 1786, 1787 et 1788* [A voyage of Lapérouse around the world performed in the years 1785, 1786, 1787, and 1788] published in Louis-Antoine Milet-Mureau (éditeur), reproduced in Pfizmaier 1850. Another early source on Sakhalin Ainu containing 1,987 entries is Davydov (1812) *Slovar’ narodov obitayushchikh na yuzhnoy okonechnosti poluostrova Sakhalina, sobranniy na meste pokojnym leytenantom Gavriloym Davydovym* [A dictionary of ethnolects of peoples inhabiting the southern recesses of the Sakhalin Peninsula collected on location by the late lieutenant Gavrila Davydov] published as part of I. F. Kruzenshtern’s

\[^{3}\text{For example, the tokens of relevant letters in Ezosaezuri are as follows:「可」 (ka) (Ainu: Jap: 91:22 (Ezosaezuri)) ; 「志」 (shi) (Ainu: Jap: 173:6 (Ezosaezuri)) ; 「川」 (tsu) (Ainu: Jap: 80:7 (Ezosaezuri)).}\]

\[^{4}\text{In fact, Angelis too was captured on a Kamakura beach where he was hiding and sentenced by the shogun to death by fire in public in 1623 (Majewicz, to appear in A. Bugaeva (ed.) *Handbook of the Ainu Language*).}\]
Puteshestviye vokrug sveta v 1803, 4, 5 i 1806 godakh na korablyakh Nadezhda i Neva [Circumnavigation in 1803-1806 on ships Nadezhda and Neva], the German edition is Pfizmaier (1851). Importantly, Davydov (1812) came to the conclusion that the same or almost the same language is spoken by denizens of Matmay [=Matsumae] or Esso [=Ezo] and Southern Kurils; in other words, by all people who the Japanese call Ainu, which is also their self-designation.

As was already mentioned in §1, the Kuril dialect, which was disappearing in the late 19th century, is the least documented variety of Ainu. The first serious attempt to document it is Krasheninnikov (1755), which contains 297 entries recorded in 1738 during the Second Kamchatkan Expedition (1733–1743). The Second Kamchatkan Expedition (1733–1743) was initiated by Russian Emperor Peter I the Great, implemented by Russian Empresses Anna and Elizabeth and led by Vitas Bering who was a Danish cartographer and explorer in Russian service. Stepan Petrovich Krasheninnikov (1711–1755) belongs to the first-generation Russian born scientists. He was assigned to the Second Kamchatkan Expedition as an assistant to German professors Gmelin and Müller. Another outstanding member of the expedition was Georg Wilhelm Steller (1709–1746), a German botanist, zoologist, physician and explorer. The Kuril Ainu vocabulary was presumably collected by one of Karasheninnikov’s assistants, Semjon Plishkin, in Bol’sheretsk (Kamchatka) from two speakers from the Paramushir Island (Kurils) (Murayama 1971). It is published in Cyrillic with the Russian translation (1755) but a slightly different romanized version Vocabularium: Latine-Curilice-Chuhachtscha-Kamtschtice-Ukinice ‘A Glossary: Latin-Ainu-Chukchi-Koryak-Itelmen’ stored in SPbF-ARAN (r.1, op.13, ed.10, l. 209-214ob, 222-223ob) was published in Murayama (1971: 11-20) (only the Latin-Ainu part with the Japanese translation), see Photo A.

4. Unpublished 18th Kuril Ainu documents in Cyrillic
Osip Argunov is another member of the Second Kamchatkan Expedition who worked as an assistant for S. Krasheninnikov and G. Steller. In April 1741, he was sent to the Kuril Islands by G. Steller to describe the local customs while Steller himself was planning to sail from Petropavlovsk harbor (Kamchatka) to North America with Vitus Bering. On completion of the task Osip Argunov submitted a report to G. Steller (October 10, 1742) (SPbF-ARAN, f.3, op.1, #800a, l.3-4ob) and attached two of his works namely Описание на первом острову живущих курилов, о их обычаих и поведении [A description of the Kuriles living on the first island [Paramushir], their customs and behavior] (Opisanie I: SPbF-ARAN: f.3, op.1, #800a, ll.17-26) and Описание пути от устья Большой реки до Курильской Лопатки и оттуда до первого, вокруг Второго и возвратно вокруг же Первоого островов Курильских подле морской берег водным путем, впадающим рекам и речкам
Photo A. Vocabulium: Latine-Curilice-Chuhachtscha-Kamtschitce-Ukinice
by S. Krasheninnikov (recorded in 1738) (SPbF-ARAN; r.1, op.13, ed.10, l. 209-214ob, 222-223ob)
[A description of the way from the estuary of the Bolshaya River to the Kuril Lopatka, then to the first island [Shumshu], around the second island [Paramushir] and then back around the first island along the sea shore by sea, rivers and small rivers] (Opisanie 2: SPbF-ARAN; f.3, op.1, #800a, ll.5-16ob) with numerous place names of Ainu origin. Both documents by Argunov are referred to in an article by the Soviet historian B.P. Polevoj (1988) Neopublikovannoe sochinenie O. Argunova o severnykh aijnakh [An unpublished essay on the Northern Ainu by Osip Argunov] but their full text has never been published.

The first manuscript (Opisanie 1) is particularly valuable for our research. It clearly states that indigenous people living on the Paramushir Island are the Ainu (both culturally and linguistically) though Itelmen (Kamchadal) cultural influence is very strong. It contains a detailed description of Ainu customs, traditions, social organization, religious beliefs, upbringing, traditional medicine and contacts with the Itelmens and Russians. It also includes about 30 Ainu words of the following groups: (1) names of months, (2) names of winds (=points of the compass), (3) names of seasons, (4) names of stars, and (5) abusive language, obscenities.

Names of months are usually encoded by nominalizations denoting traditional activities carried out in each month and/or expressions related to names of local animals and plants (e.g. seri-kar-cup ‘November: a fish.fillet-making-month’ in Table 1). Names of winds depend on land features of a particular region. It is not surprising that Ainu names of month and winds vary considerably depending on the dialect and can even differ within the same dialect; this is possibly because several expressions to refer to the same entity co-existed.5

In this section (Photos & Tables 1-4), we present copies of the original manuscripts and suggest tentative morphological interpretations in Roman italics (see column 2 in Tables) for our deciphered Ainu words of groups 1-4 in Cyrillic (column 1, cf. Roman transliteration in column 2), while completely undocumented words of group 5 (Photo 5) will be discussed separately in §6 since they deserve special attention.

---

5 For example, names of month in Argunov’s Opisanie (1742) are completely different from those documented in Kuril’skie Slova (1844?) discussed in §5.
### Table 1. Имена месяцымь [Names of months] *(Opisanie1 SPbF-ARAN; f.3, op.1, #800a,18)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Transcription (Cyrillic)</th>
<th>Roman Transliteration and Interpretation</th>
<th>Original Translation (Russian)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>мусикаръ-чю’пъ</td>
<td>mushikar-chup</td>
<td>октябрь</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>muse</em>-kar-cup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nettles?-mowing-month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>сизикáчю</td>
<td>sezikáchu</td>
<td>ноябрь</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>seri</em>-kar-cup?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fish.fillet-making-month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>но́хто</td>
<td>nóhto</td>
<td>декабрь</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>noh</em>-to?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>egg-day?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кйть-ча</td>
<td>kit'cha</td>
<td>генварь</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>kite</em>-cup?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trough?-month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>áтьту</td>
<td>áthu</td>
<td>февраль</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>at</em>-cup?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elm.tree.bark?-month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ý’йнь-ни</td>
<td>ünni</td>
<td>мартъ</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>unew</em>-ni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>seal?-tree?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Госахочю</td>
<td>gósahochu</td>
<td>апрель</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>kôsa</em>-o-cup?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hops?-holding-month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


8 Cf. *Kuril: nôhk* ‘egg’ *(Klaproth 1823: 42, 57)*.


10 Cf. *un’ew* ‘seal!’ *(Yakumo)* *(Hattori 1964: 186)*.

11 Cf. *kôsa* ‘Hops. …used by the Ainu as an article of diet.’ *(Batchelor 1938: 270)*.
### Photo & Table 2. Звание ветров/румбов [Names of winds/points of the compass] (Opisanie 1 SPbF-ARAN; f.3, op.1, #800a, 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Transcription (Cyrillic)</th>
<th>Roman Transliteration and Interpretation</th>
<th>Original Translation (Russian)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>уяумпи</td>
<td>uyaumpi oyak?-un-pe another.place-attach-thing</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>окатанъ-туумпи</td>
<td>okatan-tuumpi14 okotan15-tum-pe adjoining.island?-middle?-thing</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Сианьрюкъ</td>
<td>Shanruk16 senruk16</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>очипъ-кауморопи</td>
<td>ochip-kaumoropi o-chip-ka-un-oro-pe bottom.PF-boat-top-attach-place -thing?</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 In some words, syllable-initial /t/ and /r/ can alternate but the nature of this phenomenon is not fully understood yet. Cf. rawraw ‘Arisaema peninsulae’ (Chiri 1953: 203) (western species are often called ‘jack-in-the-pulpit’), used by the Ainu as stomach medicine.


15 Cf. okotan ‘adjoining villages’ (Batchelor 1938: 352); Kuril: kotan ‘island, country’ (Dybowski 1892: 180).

| оатucharомъ пи | oatucharom pi  
o?-atuy?-car-un-pe  
bottom.PF-sea-mouth-attach-thing | N | North |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---|-------|
| ромату         | romatu  
romatu? | NO | Northeast |
| усироймъ-пи    | usirojmpi  
o?-siruru?17-un-pe  
bottom.PF-ocean-attach-thing | O | East |
| урипуасъ-пукуму | uripuas18-pukumi  
uripuas-puk-un-i?  
?-under-attach-thing/place? | SO | Southeast |

**Photo & Table 3.** Звание четырех времен года [Names of seasons] (*Opisanie I* SPbF-ARAN; f.3, op.1, #800a, 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Transcription (Cyrillic)</th>
<th>Roman Transliteration and Interpretation</th>
<th>Original Translation (Russian)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| чюканъ                          | chukan  
cuk an  
autumn be(come) | осень                          | autumn              |
| мати                            | mati  
mata                            | зима                           | winter              |
| пайкаранъ                       | paykaran  
paykar an  
autumn be(come) | вѣсна                          | spring              |
| сахъканъ                        | sakkan  
sak an  
summer be(come) | лѣто                           | summer              |

**Photo & Table 4.** Звание нькоторых звёздъ [Names of stars] (*Opisanie 1 SPb-ARAN;* f.3, op.1, #800a, 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Transcription (Cyrillic)</th>
<th>Roman Transliteration and Interpretation</th>
<th>Original Translation (Russian)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Чинукерь</td>
<td>chinuker* ci-nukar 19 1PL.A-see NMLZ</td>
<td>лось</td>
<td>North Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Исат-саватпи</td>
<td>isat-sawatpi nisat-sawot-pe20 dawn-escape-thing</td>
<td>зорница утренняя и вечерняя</td>
<td>the morning and evening star, Venus at dawn and dusk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>паусеньнить</td>
<td>pausey nit 21-nit chop-stick</td>
<td>Кичиги22 stars of Orion’s Belt and Orion’s Sword</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>унунучинукерь</td>
<td>ununuchinuker unume23 ci-nukar mother? 1PL.A-see</td>
<td>6 звездъ, которые близъ Кичигъ вз’ сходить наизкось потри врядъ</td>
<td>6 stars which rise near Orion in a diagonal direction three-in-a-row</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

22 “Кичига...выгнутая, срученная палка, с плосковатым концом...; Кичига, кичиги ...созвездие Орион, или пятизвезденное, образующее пояс и меч его.” [*Kichiga is a curved stick with a flat end; Kichiga, kichigi refers to the Orion constellation consisting of the Orion’s Belt and Sword*] (Dahl 1880).
5. Unpublished 19th Kuril Ainu documents in Cyrillic

Kuril’skie Slova [Kuril words] (henceforth KS) is a list of 1609 words/phrases in Cyrillic from the archive of Ilya G. Voznesensky (1816–1871) (SPbF-ARAN; f.53, op.1, #43) who was a Russian naturalist and explorer of Russian America and Far East. There is no indication of the author’s name and the date of compilation. As already mentioned in §1, only one third of this document’s material is reflected in Vovin (1993) but the rest has never been published. The document is mentioned in Vdovin (1954: 103) and Miyaoka (1985: 154) and is known through the manuscript of A. Pinart.

As noted in Vovin (1993) the handwriting in KS is different from the handwriting in other manuscripts for which Voznesensky’s authorship is certain. Our research has revealed that the document was compiled or, at least, copied by a man called Filat Druzhinin who was a “creole” (mixed-blood) graduate of the school in Novo-Arkhangelsk (now Sitka, Alaska), which used to be an important settlement for the Russian-American Company, later designated the capital of Russian America. We were able to find a letter of I. G. Voznesensky called Наставление, данное Филату Дружинину при оставлении его на острове Урупе [Instructions to Filat Druzhinin on leaving him on the Urup Island] (June 9, 1844) in which he assigns Druzhinin to work on botanical, zoological and mineralogical descriptions of the island for one year (SPbF-ARAN; f.53, op.1, #12). We also found Filat Druzhinin’s completion report Сведения о XIII курильском острове Урупе/инча именующийся Александр [Information about 18th Kuril Island Urup, also called Alexander] (1845) (SPbF-ARAN; f.53, op.1, #14). The handwriting in both documents (‘Instructions’ were dictated to F. Druzhinin) and also in Kuril’skie slova are the same.

It is quite clear that the glossary was not compiled on the Urup Island. As F. Druzhinin states in his report, when he stayed in Urup in the period from June 12, 1844 to June 26, 1845, there were no indigenous people left, and he found only nine
abandoned indigenous dwellings. According to the previous survey of 1829, there still lived seven people but all of them have died an unnatural death. So it is likely that the glossary was compiled in the end of June 1844 after Voznesensky had dropped Druzhinin at Urup and his ship “Promysel” sailed to the Northern Kurils (Alekseev 1977: 40) spending 1 day on Shimushir and 13 days on Paramushir and Shumshu (SPbF-ARAN; f.53, op.1, #13). Another compilation possibility is one year later, i.e. when Voznesensky came back to Paramushir from Novo-Arkhangelsk on the ship “Naslednik Alexander” to pick up F. Druzhinin who was supposed to arrive there himself from Urup by a small boat. After picking up F. Druzhinin, the ship went to Island Makanrushi24 (磨勘留島) inhabited by the Ainu and then directly to Ayan, a Northern Russian port on the shore of the Okhotsk Sea. In the former case, the glossary would have been compiled by one of Voznesensky’s assistants or even obtained from some Russian compiler living on Shumshyu, Paramushir or Shimushir in 1844, while F. Druzhinin has only copied the material. In the latter case (less likely), the glossary could have been compiled by F. Druzhinin himself on Makanrushi in 1845 after he joined the trip.

The manuscript has a structure of a Russian-Ainu glossary organized in the order of Cyrillic alphabet (Photo B). The handwriting is clear and gives an impression of an elaborate copy made later rather than fieldnotes. There is also an appendix to the dictionary with Russian phrases translated into Ainu, given in random order, then numerals, names of months, a list of islands and a map consisting of another nine small islands (mosir; kotan) and sea rocks (watara) with the original Ainu toponyms. Only a handwriting in the map is identical with that in Voznesensky’s works (e.g. Путь на Курильские острова [A way to the Kurils], SPbF-ARAN; f.53, op.1, #13, ll.1ob-2ob).

Overall a Kuril variety of the Ainu language in the glossary is very close to Hokkaido Ainu and particularly to that of Southern Hokkaido (Saru). For example, first person singular and plural markers ku- and ci- alternates with k-25 (1) and c- (2) before vowels and the independent first person singular and plural pronouns are kani (1) and cokay (#1280) as in Saru/Chitose while in all other Hokkaido and Sakhalin Ainu dialects the vowel does not drop out (1SG: ku-, kuani; 1PL: ci-, cioka(y)). Also, all Ainu dialects avoid encoding first person subject and second person object by concatenation of the 1SG/PL.A and 2SG/PL.O morphemes (*ku-e-) and employ other strategies. For example, in Saru, the combination of 1SG/PL.A+2SG/PL.O is encoded with eci- as in (3), which is originally a marker of 2PL.A/S/O, and the same form is

24 From Ainu makan-ru-sir (go.to.the.inner.side-path-appearance) ‘a path to the north’.
25 Unlike Saru/Chitose, the vowel dropping in ku- occurs even before /i/, e.g. k-i-ukawkaw (1SG.S-ANTIP-sew) ‘I sew’ (#1473), instead of the glide formation phenomena as in Saru: ku-y-ukawkaw.
### Kuril'skie Slova (1844?) [Kuril Words]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Photo B. Kuril'skie Slova (1844?) [Kuril Words] (SPbF-ARAN, f.53, op.1, #43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the other hand, some grammatical particles are cognate with those of Sakhalin, e.g. the negation particle *hein* (4), which is also reported in Murayama as *ein* (1971: 52) based on Steller (included in Klaproth 1823), cf. *ham* in Sakhalin (Murayama 1971: 52) and Eastern Hokkaido dialects (*henne* in Okuda 1999). While Murayama (1971: 52) points out that the form *ein* collected by Steller in Krasheninnikov’s materials may have derived from the miscopy of *hem*, the form *hein* (4) found in Voznesensky’s material suggests that Murayama’s assumption should be reconsidered and that *ein* in Krasheninnikov’s materials does not necessarily derive from a miscopy of the original form like *hem* contrary to Murayama’s suggestion. If so, we can assume that *hein* here may phonetically correspond to a form like [he:n], which can then be interpreted phonologically as /hen/, where its long vowel is supposed to be caused by intonation.

(1) ‘Я ходилъ’ Кани-команатъ (#1397)

\begin{verbatim}
kan - k-oman a tek
\end{verbatim}

1SG 1SG.S-go PRF aspect?

‘I went.’

(2) ‘Получили’ Чуга (#844)

\begin{verbatim}
c-uk a
\end{verbatim}

1PL.A-take PRF

‘We got it.’

(3) ‘Покажу’ Ечъ-нугари (#919)

\begin{verbatim}
eci-nukar-e
\end{verbatim}

1SG.A+2SG.O-see-CAUS

‘I will show it to you.’

(4) ‘Не боимся’ Гейн-орибакась (#654)

\begin{verbatim}
hein oripak-as
\end{verbatim}

NEG be.afraid-1PL.S

‘We are not afraid.’

Finally, some grammatical particles seem to be peculiar to Kuril Ainu and/or to its variety documented in *KS*. For example, the intentional mood particle is *kunsu* (#34, 906, 912), while it is *kusu* elsewhere.
The lexicon of the KS variety of Kuril Ainu is mixed: some items cluster with Southern Hokkaido (Saru/Chitose) and others with Eastern Hokkaido and Sakhalin Ainu, which among other features show a *pa: ca* [tʃa] correspondence in a limited number of words\(^\text{26}\), e.g. *pa* ‘head’, *patoy* ‘lips’, *parunpe* ‘tongue’, *pas* ‘run’ vs. *ca* ‘head’, *catoy* ‘lips’, *carunpe* ‘tongue’, *cas* ‘run’, see details on the distribution in Fukazawa (2014, 2016). KS is inconsistent with regard to the *pa: ca* correspondence; for instance, it has *pa* for ‘head’ (#199) but *car* for ‘mouth’ (#980), *catoy* for ‘lips’ (#160-162) and *cas* for ‘run’ (#25).

Also, Ainu dialects show variation with respect to interrogatives, i.e. Saru/Chitose use *hemanta* ‘what/why’ and *makanak* ‘how’ while other Hokkaido Ainu dialects use *nep* ‘what’ and *nekon* ‘how’ (Fukazawa, to appear in A. Bugaeva (ed.) *Handbook of the Ainu Language*). Kuril Ainu in KS behaves as Saru/Chitose, i.e. *hemat* ‘what’ (#1342) and *makanta* ‘how’ (#461, 1338, 1339).

\(^{26}\) Since phonologically the *ca-*: *pa-* correspondence is crosslinguistically unusual and occurs only in several lexemes, all of which are likely to be cognate, Kirikae (1994) argues that it is not due to a historical sound change. Rather these are forms that can be traced back to two different roots with similar meanings.
'mother' (557), komta ‘elbow’ (499), sunta ‘fish face’ (602), rutu ‘hair’ (70), cacoo ‘fox’ (510). Some common Ainu words developed additional meanings in Kuril Ainu, e.g. kotan means not only ‘village’ but also ‘island’ (687).

A more detailed analysis of KS and existing Kuril Ainu documents is required. We hope that extended Kuril Ainu data combined with the data of Hattori and Chiri (1960) for other Ainu dialects and application of new computational phylogenetics methods will allow us to arrive at a finer classification of Ainu dialects in the future.

6. Comparison between Kuril and Hokkaido Ainu old documents: Newly discovered words

The 18th century Ainu documents by O. Argunov present many challenges for transcription and interpretation. It must be noted that the abusive language of Opisanie I (SPbF-ARAN; f.3, op.1, #800a, ll.17-26) has hardly ever been documented for any Ainu variety (see Photo 5), so the significance of this finding can hardly be overestimated. Comparison of Kuril and Hokkaido Ainu old documents can reveal forms unattested in other sources.

(8) Унатаратитста матерень тайной уды
unataratitsta ‘female genitals’
unatara-cit-sta
?-vagina-dog

cf. sta ‘dog’ (Kuril Ainu: Krasheninnikov, Dybowski, Voznesensky);
čit ‘vagina’ (Kuril Ainu: Dybowski)

(9) Уиманатаръ мужеской тайной уды
uimunatara ‘male genitals’
u-oma-unatara
REC?-enter?-?

(10) Унатаранипъ неодинъ де отецъ изъ матери добыль, и оное слово завеликое бесчестие в’меняютъ
unataranipj ‘it is not only father who had sex with mother, which is a very shameful characterization’

unatara ne re COP NMLZ

27 Cf. nonno ‘flower’ elsewhere in Ainu.
28 Cf. kamuy cacoa ‘an old bear, a king of bears’ (Hokkaido, Asahikawa) (Hattori 1964: 185).
As we can see, there is a recurring mysterious word unatara, which is not attested in any published Ainu dictionary. Nevertheless, quite unexpectedly unatara and its cognates onatara and onabaha are found in Ezosaezuri (狄さえ紫) ‘Ezo twittering’ (see (12)-(16)) for which neither the author/place nor the date are known but, as argued in Satō (2017), it is probably as old as Matsumae no kotoba (松前ノ言) (17th cent.) or Ezo kotoba (稚言葉) (1704), since it is characterized by the same tendency in the use of hentaigana, see end of §2.

Although the Japanese translations of the words below do not show any apparent connection to human/animal genitals or sexual relations and the Russian translations do not show any connection to ‘father/mother killing’, all of them are obscenities (dirty words) without doubt. In fact, Russian and Japanese translations do not render the actual Ainu meanings of these words, but rather they can be regarded as contextual equivalents in the respective languages. In fact, most obscenities in Russian deal with genitals or unconventional sexual relations while in Japanese they often refer to killing close relatives. Thus the unatara enigma is not fully solved and we can only speculate as to what the actual meanings of these Ainu words were.

(12) おなたら (おなたら) ‘父殺’ onatara ‘father-killing’
(13) おなば者 (おなば者は) ‘母殺’ onabaha ‘mother-killing’
(14) 於奈たら「おなたら」 onatara (悪敷言事母ト言事) ‘bad things about mother’
(15) おなば「同断 父ト言事」 onaba ‘bad things about father’
(16) うなたら「散々なる事」 unatara ‘terrible things’.

7. Comparison between Hokkaido, Sakhalin and Kuril Ainu old documents: A suggestion for the reconstruction of Ainu

This section focuses on words for ‘good’ and ‘dark’ in Ainu dialects because they reveal a lot about the history of Ainu. In modern Ainu dialects, phonetically they are [pirjka] and [sirjkuunne], i.e. the preceding vowel is copied after /r/, which is a general rule on the formation of all r-final syllables in Ainu. However, phonologically these words are /pirka/ and /sirkuunne/. The phenomenon in question has been referred to as “re-sounding” (Kindaichi 1931: 11), “parasitic” (Peng 1970), or “echoing” (Tamura 1988: 13) the preceding vowel. There are minimal pairs like kér ‘shoes’ (pronounced as [kere] or [keral]) and kéré ‘to touch’. As to the former, the “re-sounding” vowel disappears when followed by another vowel or when a final /r/ undergoes assimilation/dissimilation processes, while the latter always stays as /-rV/, for details.
see Shiraishi (to appear in A. Bugaeva (ed.) *Handbook of the Ainu Language*).

Next, we examine words for ‘good’ and ‘dark’ in old Ainu documents in kana for Hokkaido Ainu and Cyrillic for Sakhalin and Kuril Ainu. As we know, kana is syllabic so there is no way to transcribe /r/ without any vowel. However, contrary to our expectations the accompanying vowels in words for ‘good’ and ‘dark’ are not the same, i.e. there is [u] after /r/ in ‘good’: *piruka* but [i] in ‘dark’: *shirikunne*.

(17) ‘good’: びる可 (biruka) (*Matsumae no kotoba*) (Satō 1999);

飛類可 (hiruka), 飛り可 (biruka); 走る可 (hiruka)29 (*Ezo kotoba* 1704), same in (*Ezoki* 1795);
cf. きゝ里 (kikiri) kikir ‘bug’ (*Ezoki* 1795);

ピルカ (biruka) (*Hokkai zuihitsu* 1739)

(18) ‘dark’: 志りく川ね (shirikunne) (*Matsumae no kotoba*) (Satō 1999);

志りくん祢 (shirikunne) (*Ezodan hikki* 1710) (Satō 2009);
志りくん祢 (shirikunne) (*Ezoki* 1795);
cf. ‘land, atmosphere’: シリ (shiri) (*Hokkai zuihitsu* 1739)

Importantly, old Ainu documents in Cyrillic show the same tendency, i.e. *py* (ru) (19) or *p* (r) (20) in ‘good’ but *pu* (ri) (21) or *p* (r) (22) in ‘dark’.

(19) ‘good’: ‘Хорошо’ Пирука (*piruka*)30 (Davydov 1812: 376),

‘kind’: ‘Добро’ Пирукава (*pirukawa*), ‘Добрый’ Пирука гуру (*piruka guru*), ‘kind heart’: ‘Доброе сердце’ Кеутомо пирука (*keutomo piruka*) (p. 349, see also p. 344, 374)

(20) ‘good’: ‘Доброй’ Пиргапъ нисьпа (*pirgap nishpa*),

пирга-кур (*pirga kur*) (KS #247)

(21) ‘dark’: ‘Темно’ Ширикунни (*shirikunni*) (Davydov 1812: 373),

Cf. ‘bad weather’: ‘Погода дурная’ Ширин увень (*shiri uwen*) (p. 365)

(22) ‘dark’: ‘Темно’ Сиргурукъ (*shirkuruk*) (KS #1187, #1194)

---

29 In this period, both characters 飛 and 飛‘ indicated /pi/.  
30 Cf. a different word *piriba* ‘rub’ (тереть).
The question is why \text{ร} (ru) /ル (ru) or Cyrillic ル (ru) are used in \textit{pirka} ‘good’, whereas 里(ri) /り (ri) or Cyrillic り (ri) are used in \textit{sirkunne} ‘dark’? Satō (2015b, 2016a, 2016b) suggests reconstructing a superheavy syllable structure *CVHC for Proto-Ainu where *H is an unidentified hypothetical consonant. In proto-Ainu, \textit{pirka} ‘good’ may have been *РHrka with an *H sound intervening between \textit{i} and \textit{r}. Since \textit{r} was separated from \textit{i} by an *H sound, it was not directly influenced by this \textit{i}, therefore it was written with ร (ru), which means there was no re-sounding. In contrast, in forms like สิร ‘land’ the *H consonant was absent historically and so \textit{r} was adjacent to \textit{i} and became palatalized, which is reflected in the notation り (ri) expressing re-sounding.

8. Concluding remarks
This paper provides a brief overview of old documents of Ainu in \textit{kana} and Roman/Cyrillic alphabets, which are indispensable for the study of history of Ainu. The focus is on unpublished Kuril Ainu documents in Cyrillic. We have shown that, despite many difficulties in accessing and deciphering, the study of old Kuril Ainu documents and their comparison with Hokkaido and Sakhalin Ainu documents is very promising because it is quite possible to find some new vocabulary items (e.g. obscenities including the word unatara which appeared in both unpublished Kuril Ainu materials in Cyrillic and \textit{kana} materials but are not attested in any published Ainu dictionary), identify new meanings of words (e.g. in Kuril Ainu, \textit{kotan} means not only ‘village’ but also ‘island’ (KS #687)), and even attempt to recover Proto-Ainu through the reconstruction in phonology (e.g. *CVHC syllable structure in PA based on words for ‘good’ and ‘dark’ in Hokkaido, Sakhalin and Kuril Ainu old records) and grammar (person marking and negation).

* Parts of this paper were presented at the NINJAL International Symposium 2018 Approaches to Endangered Languages in Japan and Northeast Asia, August 6-8. We are very grateful to the symposium organizer Prof. Nobuko Kibe (NINJAL), our co-organizer of the session Ainu and Northeast Asia Prof. Megumi Kurebito and also to participants of these meetings for their questions and comments as well as to two anonymous referees. We would like to express our heartfelt thanks to the reading room staff of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences, especially E. N. Gruzdeva, E. A. Annenkova and N. S. Prokhorenko, for their kind cooperation, and to a PhD student Anastasiya Gorlova (Institute for Linguistic Studies, RAS) for helping us to type and interpretate Cyrillic materials. The present study was supported by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, International Scientific Grant-in-Aid Research Program, project “Towards understanding dynamics of language change in Ainu” (2017-2021) (Kiban C, Principal Investigator: Anna Bugaeva, Tokyo University of Science; Co-investigator: Tomomi Satō).
Abbreviations
1/2/3/4 = 1st/2nd/3rd person, A = transitive subject, ANTIP = antipassive, AUX = auxiliary, CAUS = causative, COP = copula, DESID = desiderative, NEG = negation, NMLZ = nominalizer, O = object, PL = plural, PRF = perfect, PSD = possessed, Q = question marker, REC = reciprocal, S = intransitive subject, SG = singular.
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