ISSN 1226-6582

알 타 이 학 보

제 11 호 2001년 6월

목 차

大興安嶺地区における満洲文化 ..... 加藤直人 ... 1
사역원 청학서의 원문과 대역의 대응 관계에 대하여 ..... 菅野裕臣 ... 15
Long Vowels Transcribed into the Jurchen Script ..... Gisaburo N. KIYOSE ... 27
稲葉岩吉博士と《百二老人語録》 ..... 中見立夫 ... 41
清太祖実録考 ..... 松村潤 ... 63
허저어 지역사회 상황 고찰 ..... 박련옥 ... 85
The Manchu First Person Plural Pronouns ..... Toshiro TSUMAGARI ... 99
中国满学研究五十年(1950－2000年) ..... 阎崇年 ... 111
论清末八旗学堂的满文教育 ..... 屈六生 ... 127
关于"汉蒙机器辅助翻译系统" ..... 那顺乌日图・刘群・巴达玛敖德斯尔 ... 135
The Survey Report of Buriat Language and Society in Mongolia and Russia ..... Bayarmend BORJIGIN ... 143
탈 사회주의 몽골의 친족용어 ..... 박환영 ... 149
モンゴル語の直接目的語の格選択にみられる名詞句階層 ..... 山越康裕 ... 165
黑龙江柯尔克孜语与蒙古语辅音比较研究 ..... 武·呼格吉勒图 ... 181
휘 보 207

한 국 알 타 이 학 회

ALTAI HAKPO

JOURNAL OF THE ALTAIC SOCIETY OF KOREA

No. 11 June 2001

CONTENTS

Manchu Culture in the Great Xing-an-ling Region ..... Naoto KATO ... 1
On the Parallelism between Original Text and Korean Translation of Manchu Language Text in the Korean Translation Bureau *Sayogwon* ..... Hiroömi KANNO ... 15
Long Vowels Transcribed into the Jurchen Script ..... Gisaburo N. KIYOSE ... 27
Dr. INABA Iwakichi and His Manuscript of *Emu tanggū orin sakda I gisun sarkiyan* ..... Tatsuo NAKAMI ... 41
On the Veritable Records of Qing Taizu ..... Jun MATSUMURA ... 63
On the Hezhe Linguistic Community ..... PIAO Lianyu ... 85
The Manchu First Person Plural Pronouns ..... Toshiro TSUMAGARI ... 99
Manchu Studies in China from 1950 to 2000 ..... YAN Chongnian ... 111
On the Teaching of Manchu Language in BAQI in the End of Qing Dynasty ..... QU Liusheng ... 127
On "The Chinese-Mongolian machine-aided translation system" ..... Nasun-urt, Liuqun, Badmaodsar ... 135
The Survey Report of Buriat Language and Society in Mongolia and Russia ..... Bayarmend BORJIGIN ... 143
Mongolian Kinship Terminology in the Post-Socialist Era ..... PARK Hwan-Young ... 149
On the Relation between the Hierarchy of Noun Phrase and Choice of the case that Direct-object takes ..... Yasuhiro YAMAKOSHI ... 165
A Comparative Study of the Consonants in Mongolian and Khirkiz in Heilongjiang Province ..... Hugjiltu WU ... 181
Miscellanea 207

Published by

THE ALTAIC SOCIETY OF KOREA

Address: c/o Department of Linguistics
Seoul National University
SEOUL 151-745, KOREA

Long Vowels Transcribed into the Jurchen Script: A Criticism on Aisin Gioro Ulhicun's "Jurchenistics"*

Gisaburo N. KIYOSE**

1. Secondary Long Vowels in Jurchen in the Ming Time

From the viewpoint of the Altaic hypothesis Nicholas Poppe gives the following sound changes:[1]

Ma. *šan* 'ear' < **sɨyan* id.; Neg. *sen* id. < **sian* < **sɨyan*; Gol. *seā* id. < **sɨyan*

Manchu does not retain a secondary long vowel as is shown in the reflex *šan*, the *-n* being a nominal ending, wheras Jurchen still preserved it as seen in 497  **šaa* id.,[2] having the second character (68) [3] which is transcribed into the chinese 阿 **a* in the Jurchen section of the Sino-Barbarian Glossaries known as *Hua-i i-yü* 華夷訳語, with-script series, complied at Ssu-i-kuan 四夷館, the Bureau of Translators of the Ming dynasty (founded in 1407). After the present author thus reconstructed, all the Jurchen works done by scholars such as Dorji and Hesig[4] have

---

* This article is a revised and enlarged version of the paper presented at the 43rd Permanent International Altaistic Conference held at Château Pietersheim, Belgium on September 3-8, 2000.

** Professor Emeritus, University of Hawaii at Manoa

1) Nikolaus Poppe, *Vergleichende Grammatik der altaischen Sprachen, Teil I: Vergleichende Lautlehre*, Wiesbaden 1960, p. 31.

2) The numeral before a Jurchen word indicates the entry number in the Jurchen section of the *Hua-i i-yü* with-script series, given in Gisaburo N. Kiyose, *A Study of the Jurchen Language and Script*, Kyoto 1977, pp. 96-149.

3) The numeral in parentheses before a Jurchen character indicates the charater number as explained *ibidem*, pp. 61-94.

followed this interpretation as regards secondary long vowels in Jurchen thus far.

On the other hand, as in Manchu, no primary long vowels are preserved in Jurchen.[5] Therefore, only problems related to secondary long vowels will be dealt with in this paper.

Ulhicun Aisingioro (Aisin Gioro Ulhicun 愛新覚羅 烏拉熙春) wholly denies the existence of secondary long vowels, though supposedly misunderstanding the meaning of the term "secondary," in her recent article under the title of "On Absence of Secondary Long Vowels in Jurchen" (in Chinese with a title in English, "女真語無二次長元音考"),[6] claiming that all the fourteen words found in *Hua-i i-yü*, in which long vowels are reconstructed by Gisaburo N. Kiyose, actually did not hold such vowels since a final consonant such as *k* in the preceding syllable can be inferred in continual two syllables in some cases and, moreover, the Jurchens originally adopted complicated ways in the use of Jurchen characters, (1) adhesion use, (2) repetition use, (3) duplication use, and (4) phonetic similarity use (pp. 29-30). However, none of this sort of arbitrary "uses" may be accepted as an orthographical rule in any script whatsoever.

The Jurchen script was created in 1119 at the outset of the Chin dynasty period (1115-1234), but the present author reconstructed the Jurchen sounds of the Ming period (1368-1644) as he wrote so in the "Preface" of his book of 1977: "the reconstruction of Ming-Jurchen phonology makes possible the reconstruction of Chin-Jurchen phonology through historico-linguistic methods."[7] Daniel Kane also comments on the same book: "Kiyose has not attempted the task of reconstructing the original readings of the characters, those in use during the Jin Dynasty when the script was created, but this Ming Dynasty reconstruction will form an essential basis for this important task."[8]

4) Dorji 道爾吉 and Hesig 和希格, *Nü-chen i-yü yen-chiu* 女真訳語研究, Huhehot 1993.
5) Vid. Kiyose, op. cit., p. 51.
6) *Altai Hakpo* 알타이학보: *Journal of the Altaic Society of Korea* 8, 1998, pp. 21-33.
7) Kiyose, op. cit., p. 15.
8) Daniel Kane, *The Sino-Jurchen Vocabulary of the Bureau of Interpreters*, Bloomington 1989, p. 94.
9) Vera I. Cincius ed., *Sravnitel'naja slovar' tunguso-mančžurskih yazykov*, 2 vols., Leningrad 1975-77.

2. Aisingioro's Reading of Jurchen Characters

The above-mentioned Jurchen word 𑿪𑿰𑿣 **šaa* 'year' is reconstructed by Aisingioro as **ŝaka* [sic] (*ŝ* should be *š*, henceforth the same), by reading the second character (68) 𑿣 as **ka*, while enumerating Tunguz cognates, Evk. *se:n*, Sol. *ŝ'ē:*, Ev. (Lam.) *kæ:qan*, Neg. *se:n*, Orč. *sæ:~sæ:a*, Udh. *saŋka*, Ulč., Orok. *se:*, Nan. (Gol.) *siã*, based obviously on the gloss of an entry listed in Vera I. Cincius' dictionary.[9] Aisingioro, then, gives the following "sound changes" (p. 24):

> **sijakan* 'ear' > **sjakan*; hence on one hand, > **se:kan* > Udh. *saŋka* id., Evk. *se:n* id.: similarly, **sijakan* > **sjakan*; hence on the other hand, > **ŝakã* > Jur. *ŝaka* id.

If the character (68) 𑿣 had been *ka* as she claims, the Jurchen words, shown below in her phonetic signs, might have existed (in the Chin time?). To bring out the contrast, the present author's readings of Ming-Jurchen along with a probable Manchu cognate of each is also given in the parentheses below and hereafter.

209 𑿖𑿣 *faka* (!) 'window' (**faa* id.; Ma. *fa* id.)
119 𑿡𑿤 *kabuha* (!) 'leaf' (**abuχa* id.; Ma. *abdaha* id., cf. *abuha* 'buckwheat')
349 𑿯𑿣𑿥 *ʤakagi* (!) 'light (not heavy)' (**ǰaagi* id.; Ma. *ǰa* id.)

The first character (562) 𑿖 **fa* of the first example above is, according to her, read as *fak*, and the two characters together there *fak-ka* should be, according to her again, read as **faka*, undoubtedly applying one of the aforementioned "uses." Taking up Tunguz cognates easily from the gloss of an entry of Cincius' dictionary, Aisingioro presents the following "tree" of sound changes (p. 25):

pa:ka 'window' > { *pa:ga* > Neg. *pa:ɣa* id. > Orč. *pa:wa* id. > Udh. *pa:* id.; Jur. **faka* id.; **faka* > Evk. *haga* id.

Despite the fact that all the Tunguz languages cited above (except Jurchen) are modern, spoken at present, she claims that Udehe has developed from Orochi, which has again developed from Negidal. Supposing that one may see the following "development" regarding the first person singular pronoun in Germanic languages:

Latin *ego* > Danish *jeg* > Icelandic *ég* > Dutch *ik* > German *ich* > English *I*

in a certain article, he / she will certainly deny it. Yet, she shows the following "tree," without stating the condition of the sound change or changes in each dialect (p. 26):

ʤabas'agi > { **ʤabagi* > Jur. **ʤaɣagi* 'light (not heavy)'; **ʤabaŝag* > Ma. **ʤabŝan* id.; **ʤawas'aʤi* > Udh. *ʤa:s'aʤi* > Ulč. and Nan. *ʤa:ʤi* id.

This time, she says Udehe has changed to Ulcha and Nanai. This seems to reveal that she is not very famaliar with historical and comparative linguistics, and even the linguistic relationship between the northern and southern stocks of Tunguz.

The word 088  'now' (**tee*; Ma. *te* id.) is interpreted by Aisingioro as (328)  *tek* plus (59)  *er*, i.e. **teker* id. If so,

491  *terer* (!) 'face' (**tee* id.; Ma. *dere* id.)
238  *terer* (!) 'table' (**tere* id.; Ma. *dere* id.)

have to be her reading, but she reads both the words above as **derel* by way of reading (59) as *el* this time and the initial *t-* as *d-*, probably applying what she calls "phonetic similarity use" to the given characters. The character (328) is *tek*, according to her, as above-mentioned. If so,

437 *tektun* (!) 'usually' (**tetun* id.; cf. Ma. *ente-* 'to eternize')

must be her reading, but it is unknown since this word is not taken up in her article.

3. Interpretation of Some -φ- in Ming-Jurchen

A secondary long vowel occurred as a result of contraction of syllables in the language history. Accordingly, it should be regarded rather as hiatus than as long vowel since the zero phoneme, -φ-, is presumed to be between the two same vowels from the historical point of view.

The Jurchen section of the *Hua-i i-yü* without-script series compiled at Hui-t'ung-kuan 会同館, the Bureau of Interpreters, of the Ming dynasty has a word in two entries, **ǰulege* (住勒革 **ʦu-le-kə* in Chinese transcription)[10] 'south, front' which corresponds to 598 and 613 **ǰulee* 'front, before'; Ma. *ǰulergi / ǰuleri* 'south, front.' The three forms cited above are, though cognates, a little different in form from each other, because those developed from the proto-form separatedly as Kiyose proposed in earlier publication: "it is extremely doubtful that the Jurchen represented in the 'Chin kuo-yü chieh 金国語解' and inscriptions, that in the *Hua-i i-yü* with-script texts, that in the *Hua-i i-yü* without-script texts, and Manchu are, in historical sequence, the same dialect."[11] As a result, the consonant cluster *-rg-* is assumed to have been between the two vowels *e*'s of **ǰulee*, i.e. as **ǰülerge*, in the earlier form inasmuch as *r* and *g* are still preserved in the reflexes in Manchu and in the Hui-t'ung-kuan texts, respectively. Although no Chinese transliteration to indicate the existence of *g* was written in the with-script series texts, it is only natural since that consonant had already changed to -φ- prior to the Ming period.

10) Kane gives **ǰule[r]ge*; Kane, op. cit., p. 368.
11) Gisaburo N. Kiyose (清瀬義三郎則府), "Remarks on the Reconstruction of Jurchen Phonology," (in Japanese with a summary in English, "女真音再構成考") *Gengo kenkyū* 言語研究: *Journal of the Linguistic Society of Japan* 64, 1973, p. 26.

Consequently, the character 代[12] *e in the Ming time can be referred to have represented the sound *rge in the Chin period when the script was created, and the -rge (代) must have been a nominal ending denoting "direction" then, as seen in the following reconstructed words:

595 舟余代 *fǔǰirge 'benieth'; Ma. *feǰergi / feǰile* id.
598 衆代 *ǰülerge 'before'; Ma. *ǰulergi / ǰuleri* 'before, south'
601 吾代 *tülirge 'outside'; Ma. *tulergi / tuleri* id.

The intervocalic consonant cluster *-rg- developed to -ǰ- in Manchu, according to Johannes Benzing,[13] but this sound change occurred just after the stage of proto-Tunguz, not after the Chin time in Jurchen. Incidentally, Aisingioro reads 598衆代, just mentioned above, as *ʤulle (!) 'front,' insisting that this word was written down in texts by the "adhesion use" of the Jurchen script (p. 32).

A probable Manchu cognate of 397 亦赤支 *ǰuute- 'to respect' is ǰukte- 'to pray.' The second character (431) 赤 *u (in the Ming time) appears only in this word in the *Hua-i i-yü* texts. According to Benzing, the intervocalic *-gt- in proto-Tunguz came to be collapsed to -kt- in all Tunguz languages. Thus, from the Manchu form ǰukte, the sound represented by the character (431) 赤 can be inferred to have been *k* in the Chin period, as the word shown above would have been *ǰükte- 'to respect' then. Incidentally, Aisingioro, citing several cognates in Tunguz from Cincius' dictionary, reconstructs *ʤuγute-, arbitrarily saying γ <*g. She writes γ there despite the fact that the word is of front vocalism, not a word of back vocalism where γ occurs as an allophone of /g/, and says that Kiyose reconstructs *ʤu:te-* [sic] (Kiyose gives *ǰuute-*) and, without recognizing that his reconstruction shows Ming-Juchen, still states that he

12) This character is similar in shape to a deverbal nominalizer, *-le-, and so the two are mixed as scribal error in the text, as some other characters are in the same text.
13) Johannes Benzing, *Die tungusischen Sprachen: Versuch einer vergleichenden Grammtik*, Wiesbaden 1955, pp. 47-48.

erred as he followed the Chinese transcription 兀 (wu) in its Modern pronunciation, in spite of the fact that he depends it entirely upon the reconstructed Ming-Chinese phonetic system that is explained by him in detail in five pages in his Jurchen work[14].

4. Aisin Gioro Ulhicun's "Jurchenistics"

As has partially been pointed out above, her article entitled "On Absence of Secondary Long Vowels in Jurchen" (in Chinese) reveals that she is not well acquainted with historical and comparative linguistics. She cites Tunguz dialects' probable cognates in relation to the Jurchen words in question, all of which are cited in the glosses of entries of Cincius' dictionary, as aforementioned, but giving no consideration to phonetic correspondences of which the laws have been founded thanks to previous scholarship. She also cites the locations of Jurchen words, where the character in question appears, as if she had investigated rubbings of several inscriptions, but all she enumerates are from the gloss of an entry under the heading of the character in question listed in Chin Ch'i-tsung's Jurchen character dictionary[15] that gives all the Jurchen words appearing in the extant materials, even giving the locations such as line numbers and the names of inscriptions, where the words appear, entry numbers with the names of *Hua-i i-yü* texts, and probable readings of each character, done by previous scholars including the present author. She seems not to struggles for Jurchen studies with primary materials in the same manner as Roy Andrew Miller, who has done research in Altaic languages and Old Japanese so far depending exclusively upon secondary materials, does. In fact, the "References" appended to the end of her article in question lists only five books: a book on the Manchu phonology by herself, 1992,[16] a book on the Jurchen language and script by Chin

14) Kiyose, *Jurchen Language and Script*, pp. 34-38.
15) Chin Ch'i-tsung 金啓孮, *Nü-chen-wen ts'u tien* 女真文辞典, Peking 1984.
16) Aisin Gioro Ulhicun 愛新覚羅 烏拉熙春, *Man-chou-yü yü-yin yen-chiu* 満洲語語音研究, Kyoto 1992.

Kuang-p'ing 金光平, her grandfather, and Chin Ch'i-tsung 金啓孮, her father, 1981, and an anthology of Manchu studies of these three people just cited above, 1996, in addition to the aforementioned two dictionaries, one by Cincius and the other by Chin Ch'i-tsung.

Her book on Manchu phonology, mentioned immediately above as a reference, discloses that she deals with phonology without considering even the difference between phonetics and phonemics and, consequently, makes no mention of the allophones in Manchu. Accordingly, in her article, which the present author comments upon, she tries to transcribe Tunguz phonemes including those of Jurchen throughout in phonetic signs. Since she does not bear an idea of "distinctive feature" in mind, it would be hard to expect her to transcribe the Jurchen phonemes on the phonemic level.

The fact that she tries in her article to deny the existence of secondary long vowels reconstructed by the author of these lines followed by some other scholars and, without realizing that the reconstructed long vowels by him and others are in the sounds of Jurchen in the Ming period, presents her own reconstruction of Jurchen forms (of the Chin period?) goes to show that she is ignorant of the meaning of the term "secondary."

5. The Jurchen Big Script and the Jurchen Small Script

As mentioned earlier, Miller has never read primary materials in Altaic languages and, therefore, is so ignorant of things about linguistic sources, even of the locations of them, that he erroneously states that the Orkhon inscriptions of Old Turkic (in Outer Mongolia) are in Turkey in Anatolia. Since his numerous incorrect statements were pointed out in Kiyose's articles,[17] Miller retaliatorily remarked badly on Kiyose's Jurchen work of

17) E.g., Gisaburo N. Kiyose, "Uralic Languages and Japanese: Kazár's Comparison and Miller's Criticism of It," (in Japanese with a summary in English, "ウラル諸言語と日本語 —カザール氏の比較とミラー氏の反論—") *Nippongo no keitō : kihon ronbunshū* 日本語の系統・基本論文集 I, Osaka 1982, pp. 140-165, 274-275 (reprinted in Kiyose, *Japanese Linguistics and Altaic Linguistics*, Tokyo 1991, pp. 233-256).

1977.[18] Aisingioro, who is not familiar with this background, purposely quotes an intentional slander by Miller, though she also introduces Tong-so Kim's positive review[19] on the Kiyose's same work.

She does not know the fact that Nicholas Poppe published an important paper entitled "Jurchen and Mongolian,"[20] in which all the reconstructed Jurchen forms were based on those in Kiyose's work. Györgu Kara says in his review of Kiyose's book in question, "With this book, presenting the decipherment of the two main sources of Ming Jurchen in Jurchen script, G. N. Kiyose provides a handy and very useful tool to researchers of the Manchu and Tungus languages. In spite of the fact that a great deal of work has yet to be done in the fields and around Jurchen, Kiyose's study deserves to be a long term guide especially for those for whom the Chinese side remains inaccessible."[21] As regards the primary long vowels, Lajos Kazár says in his review article of Kiyose's book,

> I find it to be a significant feature of Jurchen that, in contrast with Evenki, Solon, Negidal, Orochi, Udehe, Oroki, Ulcha, Goldi, Lamut, and Manchu, that is, the rest of Tungs languages, as well as Dagur and Monguor in the Monglian group, Jurchen, the Tungus language with the oldest language monument, has no primary long vowels. For example, No. 353 of the deciphered Sino-Jurchen Glossary [by Kiyose] has the root **sa-* 'to know' versus Manchu *sa-*, Evenki *sā-* 'to learn', Lamut *hā-* 'to discover'; Mongol *sana-* 'to think'. While this could be interpreted as nonconformness on the part of Jurchen, the opposite argument, that the lack of primary long vowels in Jurchen is an archaic feature, has just as much validity.[22]

18) Roy A. Miller, "Proto Altaic **x-*," *Central Asiatic Journal* 31:1-2, 1987, p. 59.

19) Not the original review in Korean, but its Chinese translation, Kim Tong-so 金東昭, *Nü-chen-yü Man-yü yen-chiu* 女真語・滿語研究, Peking 1992, pp. 124-141.

20) Henry G. Schwarz ed., *Studies on Mongolia : Proceedings of the First North American Conference on Mongolian Studies*, Bellingham 1979, pp. 30-37.

21) *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientarum Hungaricae* XXXVIII: 1-2, 1984, p. 245.

22) L. Kazár, "A New Book about the Jurchen Language and Script," *Ural-Altaishe Jahrbücher / Ural-Altaic Yearbook* 55, 1983, p. 149.

and concludes:

> "No doubt that even if numerous corrections will have to be made in the future concerning the details of Dr. Kiyose's book, his courageous effort to plow the whole field of Ming Jurchen and to further his adherence to sound scientific principles, and his consistent attention to detail — the pointing out of many errors in copying and/or interpretation by Grube and several other researchers — have secured for this work the epithet: Excellent."[23]

Ulhicun Aisingioro's article entitled "A New Study on the Jurchen Scripts in the Inscriptions and the Sino-Jurchen Vocabulary of the Bureau of Translation [sic] are not a Mixture of the Large and Small Script — in Commemoration of the 880th Anniversary of the Invention of the Large Jurchen Script —" (in Chinese with a title in English, "碑文 ≪訳語≫ 女真字非大小字混合考—紀念女真大字創制八百八十周年—")[24] betrays her ignorance about previous scholarship. She triumphantly says, at this late date as if her own new discovery, after having discussed the nature of Jurchen characters appearing in some extant materials, "Thus, the final conclusion can be drawn: the extant Jurchen characters are [those of] the 'Large' Jurchen script" (p. 10). She, nonetheless, does not mention what the "Small" script is.

Jurchen had two kinds of script, Big and Small. The Big Script was, according to the official *Chin-shih* 金史 (1344), created by Wan-yen Hsi-yin in 1119.[25] The third emperor, Hsi-tung 熙宗, subsequently created another type of script, the Small Script, in 1138 and promulgated it in 1145.

A Japanese chronicle, *Azuma Kagami* 吾妻鏡 (1266) quotes, in its 1223 section, four Jurchen characters which are identical with those carved on a silver tablet discovered in the old citadel of Šaigin on the Siberian coast

23) Ibid., p. 150.
24) *Altai Hakpo* 9, 1999, pp. 1-10.
25) In contrast, the Wan-yen Hsi-yin shen-tao pei 完顔希尹神道碑 inscription (ca. 1181-86) gives the date, 1121, and *Ta-chin kuo chih* 大金国志 (after 1234) the date, 1122.

in 1976. The first "character" is actually a cipher of an emperor, and the third is a genitive case marker, *-ni* listed in the *Hua-i i-yü* with-script texts. The second and fourth characters are compound characters (read as *gürü-n* 'country' and *γada-γun* 'sincerity', respectively), consisting of two "component" characters each. Kiyose's article entitled "The Significance of the New Kitan and Jurchen Materials"[26] reads:

> ... it is quite certain, as was formerly pointed out by the present author, that "compound" characters such as those appearing in *Azuma Kagami*, which are identical to those carved on the recently discovered silver tablet, and those listed in *Fang-shih mo-p'u* [方氏墨譜 (1588)], must be the Jurchen Small characters created in 1138.
>
> The characters which are seen in most of the extant Jurchen materials, such as the inscriptions on stelae erected in the Chin and Ming periods and in the Sino-Jurchen Glossary of the Ming dynasty, are used as the components of "compound" characters, viz. Jurchen Small characters; these are the Jurchen Big characters created in 1199. (p. 85)

As quoted immediately above, he had already pointed this out, in Japanese in 1973 and in English in 1977.[27]

The author of this article personally believes that much remains to be learned by her before Aisin Gioro Ulhicun interferes in Jurchenistics.

26) *Papers in East Asian Languages* 2, 1984, pp. 75-87 (reprinted in Kiyose, *Japanese Linguistics and Altaic Linguistics*, pp. 359-377).
27) Kiyose, "Remarks on the Reconstruction of Jurchen Phonology," pp. 15-16 and Kiyose, *A Study of the Jurchen Language and Script*, pp. 27-28, respectively.

Abbreviations

Ev. = Even (Lamut)
Evk. = Evenki
Gol. = Goldi (Nanai)
Jur. = Jurchen
Lam. = Lamut (Even)
Ma. = Manchu
Nan = Nanai (Goldi)
Neg. = Negidal
Orč. = Orochi
Orok. = Oroki
Sol. = Solon
Udh. = Udehe
Ulč. = Ulchi

References

Aisin Gioro Ulhicun 愛新覚羅 烏拉熙春 (1992), *Man-chou-yü yü-yin yen-chiu* 満洲語語音研究, Kyoto.

Aisingioro Ulhicun (1998), "On Absence of Secondary Long Vowels in Jurchen," (in Chinese with a title in English, "女真語無二次長元音考") *Altai Hakpo* 알타이학보 : *Journal of the Altaic Society of Korea* 8, pp. 21-33.

Aisingioro Ulhicun (1999), "A New Study on the Jurchen Scripts : Jurchen Scripts in the Inscriptions and the *Sino-Jurchen Vocabulary of the Bureau of Translation* are not a Mixture of the Large and Small Script —in Commemoration of the 880th Anniversary of the Invention of the Large Jurchen Script—"(in Chinese with a title in English, "碑文≪訳語≫女真字非大小字混合考—紀念女真大字創制八百八十周年—") *Altai Hakpo* 알타이학보 : *Journal of the Altaic Society of Korea* 9, pp. 1-10.

Benzing, Johannes (1955), *Die tungusischen Sprachen: Versuch einer vergleichenden Grammtik*, Wiesbaden.

Chin Ch'i-tsung 金啓孮 (1984), *Nü-chen-wen ts'u tien* 女真文辞典, Peking.

Cincius, Vera I. ed. (1975-77), *Sravnitel'naja slovar' tunguso-mančžurskih yazykov*, 2 vols., Leningrad.

Dorji 道爾吉 and Hesig 和希格 (1993), *Nü-chen i-yü yen-chiu* 女真訳語研究, Huhehot.

Kane, Daniel (1989), *The Sino-Jurchen Vocabulary of the Bureau of Interpreters*, Bloomington 1989.

Kara, Györgu (1984), Review of Gisaburo N. Kiyose, *A Study of the Jurchen Language and Script*, Kyoto: Hōritsubunka-sha, 1977, *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientarum Hungaricae* XXXⅧ: 1-2, pp. 244-246.

Kazár, Lajos (1983), "A New Book about the Jurchen Language and Script," *Ural-Altaishe Jahrbücher/Ural-Altaic Yearbook* 55, pp. 147-150.

Kim Tong-so 金東昭 (1992), *Nü-chen-yü Man-yü yen-chiu* 女真語・満語研究, Peking.

Kiyose, Gisaburo N. 清瀬義三郎則府 (1973), "Remarks on the Reconstruction of Jurchen Phonology," (in Japanese with a summary in English, "女真音再構成考") *Gengo kenkyū* 言語研究 : *Journal of the Linguistic Society of Japan* 64, pp. 12-43.

Kiyose, Gisaburo N. (1977), *A Study of the Jurchen Language and Script*, Kyoto.

Kiyose, Gisaburo N. (1982), "Uralic Languages and Japanese: Kazár's Comparison and Miller's Criticism of It," (in Japanese with a summary in English, "ウラル諸言語と日本語—カザール氏の比較とミラー氏の反論—") *Nippongo no keitō : kihon ronbunshū* 日本語の系統・基本論文集 I, Osaka, pp. 140-165, 274-275.

Kiyose, Gisaburo N. (1984), "The Significance of the New Kitan and Jurchen Materials," *Papers in East Asian Languages* 2, pp.75-87.

Kiyose, Gisaburo N. (1991), *Japanese Linguistics and Altaic Linguistics*, Tokyo.

Miller, Roy A. (1987), "Proto Altaic **x-*," *Central Asiatic Journal* 31, pp. 19-63.

Poppe, Nikolaus (1960),*Vergleichende Grammatik der altaischen Sprachen, Teil I: Vergleichende Lautlehre*, Wiesbaden.

Poppe, Nicholas (1979), "Jurchen and Mongolian," Henry G. Schwarz, ed., *Studies on Mongolia : Proceedings of the First North American Conference on Mongolian Studies*, Bellingham, pp. 30-37.

<Abstract>

Long Vowels Transcribed into the Jurchen Script: A Criticism on Aisin Gioro Ulhicun's "Jurchenistics"

Gisaburo N. KIYOSE

Manchu does not retain secondary long vowels, which occurred as a result of contraction of syllables in the language history, whereas in Jurchen they are still preserved as clearly transcribed in Jurchen characters for the fourteen words listed in the Jurchen section of the Sino-Babarian Glossaries with-script series of the Ming dynasty (1368-1644). Ulhicun Aisingioro, nevertheless, wholly denies the existence of the secondary long vowels in her article (in Chinese), published in *Altai Hakpo* 8, 1998, pp. 21-33.

Attempting unpersuasively to criticize the methods of reconstruction claimed by the author of this paper, she insists that the Jurchens originally adopted complicated ways in the use of Jurchen characters, (1) adhesion use, (2) repetition use and so forth, and gives her own reconstructed forms of the fourteen words, holding no long vowels, by applying the "uses" just mentioned above. Since she argues without comprehending the meaning of the term "secondary," it is not clear whether she reconstructs the Jurchen sounds of the Chin time (1115-1234), when the script was created, or those of the Ming time. Her arguments are vitiated by ignorance of fundamental linguistic and phonemic premises, e.g. such concepts as diachrony, allophone, and distinctive feature. She also published another article (in Chinese) in *Altai Hakpo* 9, 1999, pp. 1-10, in which she claims that all the extant Jurchen inscriptions and the aforementioned Glossaries are written in the Jurchen Big Script, not in the mixture of the Big and Small Scripts. She states so as if it is her own new discovery, but the present author already pointed it out a long time ago, in Japanese in 1973 and in English in 1977.