HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

| | |
|---|---|
| Title | On Some Archaic Features of the Jurchen Language |
| Author(s) | Alexander M., PEVNOV |
| Description | Special Contribution |
| Citation | 北方人文研究, 5, 57-69 |
| Issue Date | 2012-03-31 |
| Doc URL | https://hdl.handle.net/2115/49279 |
| Type | departmental bulletin paper |
| File Information | 05journal05-pevnov.pdf |

Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers : HUSCAP

〈Special Contribution〉

# On Some Archaic Features of the Jurchen Language

Alexander M. PEVNOV
Institute for Linguistic Studies, Saint-Petersburg

The Jurchens were a medieval people that appeared in north-eastern China, also known as Manchuria. The Jurchen language is a member of the Manchu-Tungusic language family and is the closest in origin to the Manchu language. The Jurchens, after defeating the Khitans, created their own state with all appropriate characteristics, including the original script. As a result of their military success, the Jurchens conquered a great part of China and ruled the occupied territory for over a century, from 1115 to 1234, till the Jurchens in their turn were overcome by the hordes of Genghis Khan. History of the Jurchens after that cannot be called social and cultural decline as it were some Jurchen tribes, led by Nurhaci, that went to the top again and gained revenge for the defeat. This time the descendants of the Jurchens (Manchus) had under their rule the whole of the Chinese Empire, and they ruled it from 1644 to 1911.

The Jurchen script, or rather the so called Jurchen small script, is known from the epigraphy of the 12th-15th centuries from the north-eastern China, southern part of the Primorye Territory (Russia) as well as the lower reaches of the Amur River (the Tyr trilingual stele, now in the city of Vladivostok). Scholars first got interested in the Jurchen small script after the medieval Chinese-Jurchen vocabulary "*Nüzhen yiyu*" was published by Grube (1896). The vocabulary "*Nüzhen yiyu*" was part of the series known as "*Huayi yiyu*". The shape of Jurchen graphemes in some sense resembles the appearance of Chinese characters but typologically it is closer to the Egyptian, Sumerian, Mayan, and Japanese writing systems. Almost all research in the sphere of the Jurchen script (Kiyose 1977, Jin Guangping and Jin Qizong 1980, Jin Qizong 1984, Kane 1989, and others) is based on interpreting the Chinese medieval transcription, which represents the reading of Jurchen characters and words in rough approximation. The real path breaker in the task of phonetic deciphering of the Jurchen script was L. Ligeti who, in his two papers (Ligeti 1953, 1961), was the first to prove that it was possible to determine and verify the pronunciation of Jurchen graphemes.

I suggest using the term signogram (from Latin *signum* “sign”) to denote the grapheme that is a sign of a sign (i.e. a graphic sign representing a language sign). For the graphemes that do not possess this quality and only designate the sound, I will use the common term phonogram. If any of the writing systems has both phonograms and signograms, then phonograms are mostly used to write down grammatical elements. Signograms usually represent the language signs that have lexical meaning.

The Jurchen script is a typical example of a mixed writing system, i.e., a "signophonographic" script, which emerged as a compromise between the purely "signographic" Chinese script and the non-syllabomorphemic structure of the Jurchen

language. In other words, Jurchen signophonography is a way to adopt a writing system of the Chinese type (one grapheme = one morpheme = one syllable) to the Altaic language system (root + affixes, while a morpheme does not necessarily coincide with the syllable).

An attempt to decipher the mixed systems of writing, naturally, leads to "mixed reading" by which I mean the coexistence of readings of different phonetic reliability within a word and within a text. The "mixed-read" word or text combines what is verified with what can only be reconstructed; the two types of "mixed reading" should not be confused and should always be marked. Deciphering of the Jurchen script is special in the case when verification or reconstruction of the reading for a certain grapheme is impossible, the mediaeval Chinese transcription (despite its imperfections) of Jurchen words, i. e., the "Chinese reading", can be used then. Correspondingly, the mixed reading of the Jurchen script is graded into three categories: phonoverified reading, reconstructed reading, and the "Chinese reading" (listed in the order from more reliable to less reliable).

The mixed reading of Jurchen graphemes is represented in this paper by means of uppercase and lowercase Latin characters and lowercase Cyrillic characters. Latin uppercase italics represent the reconstructed reading (used when verification is impossible); Latin lowercase italics represent the phonoverified reading; lowercase Cyrillic characters (not italicised) represent the Chinese reading, used when neither verification nor reconstruction is possible (the Chinese reading is represented here by means of traditional Russian transcription of Chinese characters used for transcribing Jurchen words in "*Nüzhen yiyu* with script").

This paper focuses on some features of the Jurchen morphology. Among the representatives of the Manchu-Tungusic language family these features are preserved mainly in Jurchen or both in Jurchen and Manchu.

1. One of the most intriguing forms of the Jurchen language is the verbal form in *-r*. It was identified by me as a result of phonoverification that produced the reading of the Jurchen character 丈 considerably different from the Chinese transcription (*lu* (*лу*)) (Певнов 2004: 181). Jin Guangping and Jin Qizong (and also G. Kiyose) read the Jurchen character 丈 as *ru*, H. Yamaji reads it as *lu* (Jin Qizong 1984: 20-21).

The reading *r* (not *ru* or *lu*) can also be proved in the following way: in the Jurchen text of the Tyr stele a medieval place-name 夫丈宂 is used[1]. According to the Chinese transcription in *Huayi yiyu* this word should be transcribed as *nu-lu-e* (modern reading of Chinese characters). But in reality the Chinese transcription *nu-lu-e* resembles to only a small extent the genuine reading of the corresponding Jurchen word. The place-name 夫丈宂 is used in the Tyr inscription six times (lines 1, 3, 6, 9, 10, 15); in the Mongol text of the Tyr stele this place-name is written as *nurgel* (Головачев *et al*. 2011: 126), in the Chinese text of the Tyr stele (1413) it is read as *nurgan* (奴兒干 *nu er gan* (Головачев *et al*. 2011: 60)). If we take into consideration the Mongol and the Chinese forms of that

[1] Roughly speaking, it denotes at least the Lower Amur region (Головачев *et al*. 2011: 55, footnote 13; 276, footnote 15).

place-name (*nurgel* and *nu-er-gan* = *nurgan* respectively), we inevitably come to a conclusion that the corresponding Jurchen word should be read as *nurγe*, and grapheme for grapheme reading is like that: 𘗀 *nu* – 𘡈 *r* – 𘡈 *γe*. Thus the Jurchen grapheme 𘡈 undoubtedly reads *r*; by the way, no other Jurchen grapheme reads as a separate consonant: all readings with consonants have vowels either in preposition or in postposition, e.g. *ru*, *ur*, *ti*, *xan*, *xun*, *sur*, *sol*, *ara*, *ira*, *ura*.

The form in *-r* (𘡈) can be regarded as a participle, since it can function not only as a finite predicate but also as an attribute and an object, while preserving the verbal government. Here are some examples of the Tyr stele Jurchen text which in many respects resembles the Mongol text of that trilingual stele erected in 1413 not so far from the mouth of the Amur river. The substantial similarity of the both texts (Jurchen and Mongol) enables us to analyse the Jurchen text more correctly. The following examples are accompanied by "coglossing" (parallel glossing of semantically analogous texts or their fragments):

Ju.[2] *DONDI-či ABUKA deγe b'e-mei GEŋg'en* □[3]*DOR-ba DAŠI-mei* дянь*de-**r***
Mo. *sonos-basu tngri ün*(*dü*)*r bö*(*ge-tele*) *gegegen γ*(*aǰa*)*r oron-i bürkü-*(*n*) *čid*(*a-**qu***)
listen-CVB[4] sky high be-CVB light land-ACC cover-CVB can-PTCP
'If (one) listens, the sky is high (nevertheless) (its) light can cover the land'

Ju. *gilemi UDIγen ABUKA-i PEǯile taipiŋ-be DONDI-b'e KEŋkele-mei ŋeDU-**r***
Mo. *gilemi üdigen tnngri-yin doura taibing-i sonos-ču m(ü)rgü-n od-**ču***
Nivkhs Udigens sky-GEN under peace-ACC hear-CVB kowtow-CVB leave-PTCP(CVB)
'Nivkhs and Udigens after having heard of peace under the skies left (went?) to kowtow'

Ju. … *XUsun bu-**r**-be* …
… strength give-PTCP-ACC …
Mo. … *kučün ög-**kü**-i-ben* …
… strength give-PTCP-SBVZ-REF (Головачев *et al*. 2011: 178, 180-181, 191).
'… to do everything in one's power'[5]

As one can see, in two cases the Jurchen form in *-r* corresponds to the Mongolian participle in *-qu*/*-kü*, in one case it corresponds to the Mongolian converb in *-ču*/*-čü*.

The temporal meaning of the participial form in *-r* can be demonstrated by the contrast of the following forms of the Jurchen verb *ǯalu-* 'to fill': *ǯaluxa* (*ǯal-lu-xa* =

[2] Ju. = Jurchen, Mo. = Mongol.
[3] The sign □ indicates that the grapheme cannot be read.
[4] CVB = converb, ACC = accusative, PTCP = participle, SBVZ = substantivizer, REF = reflexive-possessive.
[5] The Jurchen clause *XUsun burbe* and the Mongol clause *kučün ögküiben* are represented as direct object.

*ǯaluxa*) ("*Nüzhen yiyu* with script") and *ǯalur* (*ǯal-lu-ur* = *ǯalur*) (the stele "*Nüzhen jinshi timing bei*"). The former word is obviously past participle (*ǯalu-xa*), the latter one is present-future participle (*ǯalu-r*).

The Jurchen affix *-r* does not have direct correspondences in modern Manchu-Tungusic languages. Nevertheless it seems to me that the Jurchen affix *-r* is very interesting from the etymological point of view: maybe it gives an opportunity to explain the origin of several affixes in the Manchu-Tungusic languages. These affixes are:

1) the present (present-future) participle marker **-rii* which has correspondences in all Manchu-Tungusic languages; in Jurchen and in Manchu the participle marker *-ra/-re/-ro* < **-rii* (in Solon the participle in *-ri* is original but the synonymous participle in *-ra/-re/-ro* is evidently borrowed from Manchu), cf. analogous sound change in the Manchu converb marker *-me* < **-mii* and in the Manchu affix *-ŋge* (as in *miniŋge* 'mine') < **-ŋgii* (Цинциус 1949: 104)
2) the present tense marker **-ra/-re/-ro* which has correspondences in many Manchu-Tungusic languages; this affix coincides with the connegative marker *-ra/-re/-ro* represented in all Manchu-Tungusic languages
3) the affix **-ru* for the 2nd person (SG) imperative (Nanai, Ulch, Orok (Uilta))
4) the affix **-raa/-ree* of the converb which is represented in Nanai, Ulch, Orok; cf. also the Negidal affix *-jaan/-jeen/-joon* (< **-raa+-n/-ree+-n/-roo+-n*)

Coincidence of the consonants and diversity of the vowels in these affixes are mentioned in (Аврорин 1961: 123).

On the other hand, one can observe diversity of the consonants and coincidence of the vowels in the following affixes:

1) Evenki: *-rii* (*ŋene-**rii*** 'going'), *-dii* (*oo-**dii*** 'becoming, getting', *bu-**dii*** 'dying'), *-sii* (*bi-**sii*** 'being', *e-**sii*** participial form of the auxiliary negative verb)
2) Evenki: *-ra/-re/-ro* (*baka-**ra**-n* 'he/she found'), *-da/-de* (*oo-**da**-n* 'he/she became', *nee-**de**-n* 'he/she put')
3) Nanai, Ulch, Orok *-ru* (*waa-**ru*** 'kill!'); Manchu *-su* ~ *-so* (*bi-**su*** 'be! live!', *gai-**su*** 'take!', *bai-**su*** 'seek!', *o-**so*** 'become!'), **-u* (*ǯu* 'come!' < **ǯi-**u***[6]; *ǯefu* 'eat!' < **ǯefu-**u***)
4) Nanai *-raa/-ree* (*ana-**raa*** 'having pushed'); Negid. *-jaan/-jeen/-joon* < **-raa-n/-ree-n/-roo-n* (*ŋene-**jeen*** 'having gone'), *-daan* < **-daa-n* (*oo-**daan*** 'having become')

All these facts indicate that the element **-r* can be regarded as a separate verbal affix of the reconstructed Manchu-Tungusic parent language. Interestingly, the participle marker *-r* survived only in the Jurchen language, in the rest of that language family are represented only derivatives (*-rii*, *-ra/-re/-ro*, *-ru*, *-raa/-ree*). Apparently one can find that affix in the Evenki word-formation: *iče-* 'to see' – *ičer* 'look, glance', *dawda-* 'to be

[6] Cf. Ju. *diu* 'come!' in the "*Nüzhen yiyu* without script" (Kane 1989: 121).

defeated' – *dawdan* ~ *dawda**r*** 'defeat; failure', *moodan* ~ *mooda**r*** 'bend, curve (of a river)'; *on'o-* 'to draw' – *on'o**r*** (Nepa dialect) 'ornamental pattern' (cf. *on'o**čoo*** (Chumikan dialect) 'chipmunk' where *-čoo* is identical to the participle marker (past tense)). Cf. Nanai *balži**r***, *balži**ča*** '1) appearance; 2) face, features' (*balži-*'to be born; to grow; to live; …')[7].

In Bikin (Ussuri) Nanai a very interesting verb form in *-r* is used, e.g.:

*Mafa tok'idu teexeni*, *solaki-tana ana**r** taxan'i* 'The bear sat down on a sledge and the fox pushed (the sledge down)';

*Dolbo s'inger'iwe keske žefte**r** taxan'i* 'At night the cat ate the mouse';

*S'ææxo žɵfk'iči*, *mamakawa omgo**r** taxači* '(They) ate up everything and (they) forgot about the old woman' (Сем 1976: 106).

Maybe the Bikin (Ussuri) Nanai verbal form in *-r* can be compared with the Jurchen participle marker *-r*.

Thus in Jurchen there were two semantically close (if not identical) participles which were probably of common origin: the participle in *-r* and the participle in *-ra*/*-re*/*-ro* (< **-rii*).

Adherents of the genetic affinity of the Altaic languages could compare the Jurchen affix *-r* with the Old Turkic participial affix *-r* (one of allomorphes) and with the Mongolian presumably participial affix **-r* which later developed into the written Mongolian converb of purpose in *-ra*/*-re* (*-r* + ancient Dative affix *-a*/*-e*).

2. In all Manchu-Tungusic languages (except Jurchen, Manchu, and Hezhe[8]) the verb stem cannot be used as a word without affixes attached to it (markers of tense, mood, and person).

In Manchu and in Hezhe (Hezhe materials of J. Ling, see (Ikegami 1999a: 278-279) the verb stem can be used with the zero affix, in this case the verb stem expresses imperative (the 2nd person Singular and Plural). Here are some Manchu examples:

*ala* 'say (SG, PL)!'
*bu* 'give (SG, PL)!'

[7] In principle word-formation affixes preserve remnants of former morphological state, this assertion can be illustrated by the fact that the Evenki language has a derivational affix *-kaa*/*-kee*/*-koo* and the Even language possesses a marker *-ka*/*-ke*/*-ko* (e.g. Evenki *sukča-* 'destroy' – *sukča**kaa*** 'destruction, collapse', Even *iru-* 'to transport, convey' – *iru**ka*** 'poles of the framework of a yurt which are transported when wandering (nomad's term)'); both affixes can be compared with the Nanai past participle marker *-xan*[*-xã*]/*-xen*[*-xẽ*]/*-xon*[*-xõ*] and with the Manchu past participle marker *-xa*/*-xe*/*-xo*, *-ka*/*-ke*/*-ko*).

[8] A dialect of Nanai or a language closely related to Nanai; this dialect (language) is probably still spoken in Heilongjiang Province (China) near the border with Russia.

*tua* ‘look (SG, PL)!’
*tuabu* ‘show (SG, PL)!’ (Аврорин 2000: 213).

At the same time there is a group of irregular verbs in Manchu – irregular in the sense that they have special imperative forms. In this connection it is reasonable to quote from Prof. Ikegami’s work:

"*baisu* von *baimbi* ‘suchen’,
*bisu* von *bimbi* ‘sein’,
*dosinu* neben der regelmäβigen Form *dosi*
von *dosimbi* ‘hineingehen, hereinkommen’
oder *dosinambi* ‘eintreten’,
*gaisu* von *gaimbi* ‘nehmen’,
*jefu* neben der regelmäβigen Form *je* (nach *Ta-ch‘ing ch‘üan-shu*)
von *jembi* ‘essen’,
*jio* neben der regelmäβigen Form *ji* (nach *Ta-ch‘ing ch‘üan-shu*)
von *jimbi* ‘kommen’,
*-(n)ju* von *-(n)jimbi* ‘kommen um zu …’,
*juranu* neben der regelmäβigen Form *jura*
von *jurambi* ‘aufbrechen’,
*oso* von *ombi* ‘werden’,
*tucinu* neben der regelmäβigen Form *tuci*
von *tucimbi* ‘hinausgehen, herauskommen’, oder *tucinembi* ‘hinausgehen’,
*wasinu* von *wasimbi* ‘von oben nach unten gehen’ oder *wasinambi* ‘hinabgehen’,
*wesinu* von *wesimbi* ‘steigen’ oder *wesinembi* ‘hinaufgehen’.

Ich glaube annehmen zu können, daβ das Mandschurische früher ein Flexionssystem der Imperativformen besaβ, das mit den gold. und orok. Flexionssystemen der Imperativformen grundsätzlich übereinstimmt und daβ wenigstens manche der obenerwähnten unregelmäβigen Imperativformen daraus stammen" (Ikegami 1999a: 272-273)[9].

So according to Prof. Ikegami the Manchu imperative form (2 SG,PL) equal to verbal stem is an innovation, previously that language used imperative affixes like Nanai, Evenki and other Manchu-Tungusic languages.

In Manchu the verbal stem with zero affix is used only as imperative form. Strangely enough, in Jurchen which genetically was the closest language to Manchu the bare verbal stem could be used in different syntactic positions, it functioned as:

1) finite predicate:

[9] I express profound gratitude to Prof. Tsumagari from Hokkaido University for recommending me this work (and many other works) of Prof. Ikegami and also for copying them for me.

*bugu gašando BANDIru* '(He?) lives (lived?) in Bugu village' (the stele "*Chaoxian Qingyuan jun nüzhen guoshu bei*")

2) replacement for converbs (?):

*uxedu Po□šu tairan ILI*бума *muteBUxei da* …'The leader who succeeded in erecting a buddhistic temple and in engraving on stone … (Having engraved on stone… (?)' (the stele "*Chaoxian Qingyuan jun nüzhen guoshu bei*")

3) connegative form:

*Ešin* дяньде 'to be incapable of doing something, not to understand' ("*Nüzhen yiyu* with script")

In the "*Nüzhen yiyu* without script" (Kane 1989) the verb stem can be used as an attribute:

*hasha hudasha bo*[10] [**gaša xudaša boo*[11]] 'village shop (literally: village + to trade + house)'

*hudasha niema* [**xudaša n'a*(*l*)*ma*] 'trader(s) (literally: to trade + person (people))', cf. Manchu *xudašara n'alma* 'traders' (Захаров 1875: 439)

*huoni feita aligu* [**xoni faita aliku*] 'dish for cutting mutton (literally: sheep + to cut + dish)'

*yiche fashi* [**iče fakši*] 'dyer (literally: to dye + master)'

*maxila ala fashi* [**maxila ara fakši*] 'hatter (literally: hat + to make + master)'

Nevertheless in the "*Nüzhen yi-yu* without script" participle is used in some cases instead of the verb stem with zero affix:

*wumusu dule fashi* [**umusu du-re fakši*] 'master who makes belts (literally: belt(s) + beating (hammering) + master)', cf. Manchu *du-re* 'beating, hammering'

*adu aole fashi* [**adu au-re fakši*] literally: 'clothes + washing + master'

As to the function 1 (finite predicate), an identical use of the verb stem is mentioned in Kim *et al*. (2008).

"Interestingly, our consultant used an imperative form even in a sentence other than an imperative one.

*sind bo*

I give it to you.

*ǰixa sind bo*

I give you money" (Kim *et al*. 2008: 40).

(It was pointed out above that in Manchu the imperative form coincides with the verb stem).

[10] Jurchen words from the "*Nüzhen yiyu* without script" (Kane 1989) are transcribed here by means of the Chinese phonetic alphabet; in the "*Nüzhen yiyu* without script" there were no gaps separating Jurchen words.

[11] The reconstruction is made by me – A. M. Pevnov.

The problem is whether the syntactic use of the verb stem without any affixes attached to it is an innovation in Jurchen and in Manchu or it is an ancient feature, i.e. a feature of the Manchu-Tungusic parent language.

On the one hand, the functioning of the verb stem as imperative form in Manchu seems to be an innovation. Prof. Ikegami wrote about that in his papers and his argumentation is convincing. Moreover the use of the bare verb stem (the imperative form) as a finite predicate in the Manchu dialect spoken in Sanjiazi village looks like imitation of Chinese pattern (*ǰixa sind bo* 'I give you money' (literally 'money to you (I) give') resembles the Chinese 我給你錢 *wǒ gěi nǐ qián* 'I give you money' – note, however, the different word order, which seems to be rather suspicious).

On the other hand, the use of the verb stem with the zero affixation in the Jurchen language does not seem to be an innovation of the Chinese origin. The Chinese influence on the Jurchen language was limited, and evidently there was no Chinese influence on the Jurchen morphology. Thus the syntactic use of the bare verb stem may be original in the Jurchen language, and this fact may indicate the existence of a corresponding feature of the Manchu-Tungusic parent language.

3. Jurchen and Manchu differ from most of the other Manchu-Tungusic languages in that they have the Genitive case. It is the Genitive that compensates for the absence of personal and possessive-reflexive affixes in the Jurchen and Manchu languages, which are present in the rest of Manchu-Tungusic languages[12].

To my mind the Jurchen-Manchu Genitive marker *-i* goes back to the Manchu-Tungusic parent language ("Ursprache"), cf. the following pronominal attributive forms (in my view the former Genitive forms): *min* ~ *mini* 'my', *sin* ~ *sini* 'your' etc. in Negidal and Orok, as well as *min* (< **mini*) 'my', *sin* (< **sini*) 'your' etc. in Ulch[13] and Even (cf. Jurchen and Manchu *mini* 'my').

To the suppletive Genitive forms like **min-i* 'my' (**bii* 'I') and **sin-i* 'your' (**sii* 'you') in the reconstructed Manchu-Tungusic parent language the marker **-ŋii* (**-ŋgii*) could be attached: **mini-ŋii* (**mini-ŋgii*) 'mine', **sini-ŋii* (**sini-ŋgii*) 'yours'. Reflexes of such forms are present in all Manchu-Tungusic languages, e.g. in Manchu (*Ere ǯaka miniŋge* 'This thing is mine' (Аврорин 2000: 143); *miniŋge* < **mini-ŋgii*), in Nanai (*Ej daŋsa miŋgi* 'This book is mine'; *miŋgi* < **mini-ŋgii*), in Evenki (*Er oron minŋi* 'This reindeer is mine', *minŋi oronmi* 'my reindeer'; *minŋi* < **mini-ŋii*).

[12] Nevertheless we have etymological evidence that possessive (at least for 3SG) affixation did exist at the previous stage of the Jurchen and Manchu language history: in the Jurchen text of the Tyr stele an imperative form with the historically compound affix *-xi*(*-*)ni* (cf. *sa-xini* know,govern-IMP.3SG,PL 'let him/them know/govern') was used, in which *-xi* was an optative marker and *-ni* was a marker of the 3rd person singular (Головачев *et al*. 2011: 201) (cf. Nanai, Ulch, Orok, Udege, Oroch *-ni* (3 SG), Evenki, Even, Negidal *-n* (3SG) < **-ni*); in Manchu the corresponding marker is *-kini* (IMP.3SG,PL). Interestingly, the 3rd person singular imperative form is also used for the plural not only in Jurchen and Manchu (Головачев *et al*. 2011: 201; Аврорин 2000: 214) but in Solon (Поппе 1931: 125) and in Mongolian languages, cf. Written Mongolian (Орловская 1997: 24).

[13] In Ulch materials collected by A. N. Lipskiy two forms are registered: *min*, *mini* 'my' (Липский, дело 71, лист 91 (reverse)).

4. New affixes in Manchu-Tungusic languages often emerged as a result of compound affixation. There are many compound affixes in Manchu-Tungusic languages, and in languages of the group B there are many more compound affixes than in languages of the group A[14].

Here are some examples of the Evenki compound affixes[15]:

*-wkaan-/-wkeen-/-wkoon-* < **-bu-kaan-/-bu-keen-/-bu-koon-* (Causative)
*-wkii* < **-bu-kii* (Habitual participle)
*-rak-/-rek-/-rok-* < **-ra-ki-/-re-ki-/-ro-ki-* (Conditional converb)
*-sal/-sel/-sol* < **-sa-l/-se-l/-so-l* (Plural)
*-duk* < **-du-ki* (Ablative)
*-tki/-tiki* < **-ti-kii* (Allative (Directive))
*-tmar/-tmer/-tmor* ~ *-dimar/-dimer* < **-di-ma-r/-di-me-r/-di-mo-r* (Superlative degree, e.g. *aja-tmar* 'the best'), cf. *-tmakaan/-tmekeen/-tmokoon* < **-di-ma-kaan/-di-me -keen/-di-mo-koon* (e.g. *aja-tmakaan* 'a little better'), cf. *-tmama/-tmeme/-tmomo* < **di-ma-ma/di-me-me/di-mo-mo* (e.g. *aja-tmama* 'very good, the best', the affix *-ma* is reduplicated like in *aja-ma-ma* 'very good'[16])
*-ksa/-kse/-kso* < **-ka-sa/-ke-se/-ko-so* (affix denoting skin of animals, e.g. *sulakii* 'fox' – *sulakii-ksa* 'fox skin')
*-magda/-megde/-mogdo* < **-ma-gda/-me-gde/-mo-gdo* (affix attached to words denoting fishing net, e.g. *niru-magda* 'fishing net for catching grayling')
*-maaγin/-meeγin/-mooγin* < **-maa-γin/-mee-γin/-moo-γin* (affix attached to words denoting names of diseases, e.g. *ije-meeγin* 'horn disease')
*-mkuraa/-mkuree* < **-mku*(*-m-ku-*?)*-raa/-mku*(*-m-ku-*?)*-ree* (affix attached to words denoting bushes on which berries grow)

The list of Manchu compound affixes is much shorter. Manchu examples are more preferable than the Jurchen ones because the data on the Jurchen morphology is rather limited. Compound affixation in Manchu is presented mostly within the derivational system.

Here is the list of some Manchu derivational affixes which are historically compound from my point of view (all the examples are quoted from (Аврорин 2000), page numbers are indicated parenthetically):

*-sxun* (*daxa**sxun*** 'obedient', 126)

[14] Taking into acount primarily grammatical features, Manchu-Tungusic languages can be divided into two groups: group B consists of Evenki, Solon, Even, Negidal, Oroch, Udege, Ulch, Nanai, Orok, and group A consists of Jurchen and Manchu only.
[15] I quote the examples from (Василевич 1958); the affixes were reconstructed by myself.
[16] Reduplication of affixes is rather unusual from typological point of view. Cf. reduplication of Inchoative affix in the Orok verb *xold'i-**lu-lu**-xa-pu* '(we) began to dry', reduplication of the Plural affix in the Orok verb *suŋum-bokki-**li-l** bi-tt'i-t'i* '(they) froze (fish)' (both words were used in texts recorded by me from I. Ja. Fedjajeva in Val (Sakhalin) in 2010), reduplication of the converb marker in Ulch: *waa-**ra-ra*** 'having killed', *baa-**ra-ra*** 'having found', *buu-**re-re*** 'having given' (Суник 1985: 47).

*-čuka*/*-čuke* (*olxo**čuka*** ‘cautious; cautiously’, 126)
*-rgi* (*do**rgi*** ‘inside’, 134)
*-sita*/*-site* (*koima**sita***- ‘to deceive constantly’, 166)
*-nǯa*/*-nǯe*/*-nǯo* (*guni**nǯa***- ‘to think constantly, consider, think over’, 167-168)
*-lǯa*/*-lǯe*/*-lǯo* (*mida**lǯa***- ‘to wag a tail’, 168)
*-rǯa*/*-rǯe*/*-rǯo* (*mele**rǯe***- ‘to be shy’, 168-169)
*-rala*/*-rela* (*uka**rala***- ‘to be on the run, to be in hiding’, 171)

Inflexional compound affixes in Manchu are not numerous:

1) Prolative marker *-deri*, of which J. Ikegami wrote: "There seems to be a probability that in Manchu the older form -**deli*, which is not attested in records, was replaced by *deri*, which was formed on the analogy of *deleri* ‘on the surface’, *dolori* ‘inside’, *juleri* ‘in front’, *oilori* ‘over’ and *tuleri* ‘outside’. It is possible that -**deli* may have been a post-consonantal variant of the prolative case-ending -**li*, which was derived from the combination of the dative ending -**de* and and the prolative ending -**li* or this ending with a transitional syllable inserted between a stem-final consonant (such as *-n*) and the ending-initial *l*-" (Ikegami 1999b: 288).

It is noteworthy that the case marker *-de* may be an innovation in Manchu, because according to Jurchen materials (except the "*Nüzhen yiyu* without script" (Kane 1989)) the affix for the Dative-Locative is *-do*/*-du*, not *-de*. Accordingly, the Jurchen compound Ablative marker *-doxi*/*-duxi* (Головачев *et al*. 2011: 197), which is represented only in the text of the latest monument of the Jurchen script (the Tyr stele 1413), contains *-do*/*-du*, not *-de*.

As to the Manchu Dative affix *-de*, in my opinion it may have been derived from the word **dee*[17] < **deɣe* ‘top’ of Mongolian origin (cf. Written Mongolian *deger-e* ‘top, at the top, atop’, Jurchen *deger* ~ *deɣe* ‘high, upper, top’). Presumably, the process of grammaticalization took place in the early Manchu and apparently in the late Jurchen (reflected in the "*Nüzhen yiyu* without script"). As a result of that process the element **dee* > *de* ‘top’ (semantically it corresponds to the Chinese 上 *shàng*) replaced the ancient Manchu-Tungusic Dative-Locative case marker **-duu*.

2) Present participle markers ("classes" III and IV) *-ndara*/*-ndere*/*-ndoro*, *-nere*/*-noro*, *-dere*, *-ǯara*/*-ǯoro*, *-dere*, *-tere*, *-sire* (all of them include affix *-ra*/*-re*, V. A. Avrorin pointed out that the compound affix *-ndara*/*-ndere*/*-ndoro* consisted of three components: *-na* + *-da* + *-ra* (Аврорин 2000: 189-190)).

3) Past participle marker ("classes" II and III) *-ŋka*, which according to V. A. Avrorin was derived from *-na* + *-ka* (Аврорин 2000: 190).

4) Marker of the present tense *-mbi* < *-me bi*.

5) Markers of the past tense *-xabi*/*-xebi*/*-xobi*, *-kabi*/*-kebi*/*-kobi*, *-ŋkabi*/*-ŋkebi*/*-ŋkobi* (Аврорин 2000: 211-212) < *-xa*/*-xe*/*-xo bi*, *-ka*/*-ke*/*-ko bi*, *-ŋka*/*-ŋke*/*-ŋko bi*.

6) Polite imperative form in *-čina* (Аврорин 2000: 214) < ?

[17] Cf. Manchu ***de**n* ‘high, height’, ***de**le* ‘top, at the top’, ***de**rgi* ‘height, upper (part); east’ (*de*(*le*?) + *ergi* ‘side’, cf. *wala* ‘lower part; below, beneath’, *wargi* ‘west’ (*wa*(*la*?) + *ergi* ‘side’)).

7) Imperative form in *-kini* (3 SG,PL) (Аврорин 2000: 214) < *-*ki* + *-ni*.

The data on Jurchen morphology is obscure in many respects; nevertheless, two Jurchen compound inflectional affixes have to be mentioned: *-xi*(-)*ni* (IMP.3SG,PL) and *-do*(-)*xi*/*-du*(-)*xi* (ABL). Both affixes have correspondences in modern Manchu-Tungusic languages: cf. Manchu *-ki*(-)*ni* (IMP.3SG,PL), Evenki *-du*(-)*k* (ABL). For the time being the affixes *-xini* and *-doxi*/*-duxi* are found only in the Jurchen text of the Tyr stele (Головачев *et al*. 2011: 201, 197) – they lack in other Jurchen materials.

It is likely that the Manchu-Tungusic parent language developed compound affixation only to a small extent and predominantly in the verbal system. I mean the following affixes: *-*ra*/*-re*/*-ro* (finite verb and connegative, too), *-*rii* (present participle), *-*mii* (SG) ~ *-*mari*/*-meri* (PL) (converb), *-*duki* (Ablative).

The Manchu-Tungusic parent language as a rule avoided compound affixation in the noun system. It is impossible to imagine that the compound affixes existed in the Manchu-Tungusic parent language and then, in course of time, were selectively eliminated from its descendants, which created their own compound affixation instead of the old one. Unlike linguists, the language is incapable of differentiating between compound affixes and non-compound affixes.

All Manchu-Tungusic languages have special affixes which were used for "classification" of nouns. In contrast to noun classes (as for example in Bantu) or to classifiers (like in Chinese or Korean) "classifying affixes" of the Manchu-Tungusic languages were applied not to all nouns but just to some of them. For instance some words denoting aggregate of small homogeneous things (or only one object representing such an aggregate) have a special suffix attached to them (e.g. Jurchen *OŠI**xa*** ‘star(s)’, *ui**xe*** ‘tooth, teeth’ and Evenki words with genetically corresponding roots: *oosi**kta*** ‘star’, *ii**kte*** ‘tooth’). The Evenki affix *-kta*/*-kte*/*-kto* is a typical compound morpheme; we have a chance to demonstrate that at least this compound affix appeared later than the non-compound *-xa*/*-xe*/*-xo* (<*-*kaa*/*-kee*/*-koo*): cf. *oosi**kaa**kta* (*oosi-kaa* + *-kta*) ‘star’ in Podkamennaya Tunguska River dialect (Василевич 1958: 328), Even *oosikat* ‘star’ (< **oosikaakta*).

In general we can draw the following conclusion**:** only a few compound affixes in Manchu-Tungusic languages of the group B (Evenki, Solon, Even, Negidal, Oroch, Udege, Ulch, Nanai, Orok) have total correspondences (i.e. affix by affix correspondences) in the languages of the group A (Jurchen and Manchu). For example, the Evenki derivational affix *-ksa*/*-kse* (as in the word *tamna-ksa* ‘mist, fog’) does not, as a single whole, have a correspondence either in Jurchen or in Manchu; however, the affixes *-*ŋi*[18] and *-*sa*/*-se*[19]

[18] Cf. Jurchen *se**ŋi*** ‘blood’, *PULE**ŋi*** ‘ashes’, *iME**ŋi*** ‘vegetable oil; fat’, *IMA**ŋi*** ‘snow’, *TU**ŋi*** ‘cloud’, *ta*(*r*?)*ma**ŋi*** ‘mist, fog’.
[19] Cf. Jurchen *BEI**se*** ‘princes’, *MUDu**se*** ‘dragons’ (*MUDur* ‘dragon’).

that, in my opinion, had merged and led to the formation of the affix *-ksa*/*-kse*[20], are present separately in both languages. This evidence proves that for the most part the development of compound affixation took place in the group A (Jurchen and Manchu) and in the group B (the rest of the Manchu-Tungusic language family) independently, i.e. after the first division of the parent language.

Thus, the comparison of the Jurchen data to the data on other Manchu-Tungusic languages reveals some archaic features, which allow to speculate on the morphological type of the Manchu-Tungusic parent language.

## REFERENCES


Аврорин, В. А.

1961 *Грамматика нанайского языка*. Том 2. Москва, Ленинград.

2000 *Грамматика маньчжурского письменного языка*. Санкт-Петербург.

Василевич, Г. М.

1958 *Эвенкийско-русский словарь*. Москва.

Головачев, В. Ц., Ивлиев, А. Л., Певнов, А. М., Рыкин, П. О.

2011 *Тырские стелы XV в.: перевод, комментарии, исследование китайских, монгольского и чжурчжэньского текстов*. Санкт-Петербург.

Захаров, И.

1875 *Полный маньчжурско-русский словарь*. Санкт-Петербург.

Липский, А. Н.

unpublished *Ульчский словарь*. Архив Музея антропологии и этнографии им. Петра Великого (МАЭ РАН), фонд 5, опись 1, дело 71.

Орловская, М. Н.

1997 Старописьменный монгольский язык. *Языки мира: Монгольские языки, Тунгусо-маньчжурские языки, Японский язык, Корейский язык*. Москва.

Певнов, А. М.

2004 *Чтение чжурчжэньских письмен*. Санкт-Петербург.

Поппе, Н. Н.

1931 *Материалы по солонскому языку*. Ленинград.

Сем, Л. И.

1976 *Очерки диалектов нанайского языка: Бикинский (уссурийский) диалект*. Ленинград.

Суник, О. П.

1985 *Ульчский язык*. Ленинград.

Цинциус, В. И.

1949 *Сравнительная фонетика тунгусо-маньчжурских языков*. Ленинград.


[20] The historical transformations seem to be like that: **-ŋi + *-sa/-se > -ŋsa/-ŋse* (cf. Oroch *sile**ŋse*** ‘dew’) > *-ksa*/*-kse* (cf. Evenki, Negidal *sile**kse*** ‘dew’) > *-s* (cf. Even *hilə**s*** ‘dew; drizzle’).

Grube, W.
1896 *Die Sprache und Schrift der Jučen*. Leipzig.
Ikegami, Jirô
1997 *A Dictionary of the Uilta Language*. Sapporo.
1999a Über die Herkunft einiger unregelmäβiger Imperativformen der mandschurischen Verben. *Researches on the Manchu Language*. Tokyo.
1999b The Manchu Prolative *deri*. *Researches on the Manchu Language*. Tokyo.
Jin Guangping and Jin Qizong
1980 *Nüzhen yuyan wenzi yanjiu*. Beijing.
Jin Qizong
1984 *Nüzhenwen cidian*. Beijing.
D. Kane
1989 *The Sino-Jurchen Vocabulary of the Bureau of Interpreters*. Bloomington.
Kim Juwon, Ko Dongho, D. O. Chaoke, Han Youfeng, Piao Lianyu, B. V. Boldyrev
2008 *Materials of Spoken Manchu*. Altaic Languages Series 1. Seoul.
Kiyose, G. N.
1977 *A Study of the Jurchen Language and Script*. Kyoto.
Ligeti, L.
1953 Note préliminaire sur le déchiffrement des "petits caractères" jou-tchen. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*. T. III, fasc. 2.
1961 Les inscriptions djurtchen de Tyr. La formule *om mani padme hūm*. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*. T. XII, fasc. 1-3.