José Andrés Alonso de la Fuente (Madrid/Vitoria)

Venjukov's [1858] 1862/1868 Nanai materials 1

The goal of this paper is to offer a philological analysis of the so-called "Nanai word-list" by M. I. Venjukov, published in the mid-19th century in two language versions, in French and Russian. Most descriptions (usually based on Kotwicz's pioneering studies) agree that both lists are identical. I aim to demonstrate that (a) the two versions differ on some crucial points and, more importantly, (b) Venjukov's lists hide the materials of both the Kilen and Kili languages (formerly the Sungari-Bikin and Kur-Urmi sub-dialects of the Upper Amur Nanai dialect), as happens to be the case with sources gathered in the Ussuri region.

I. Introduction

The goal of this paper is to offer a linguistic analysis of the Nanai word-list by M. I. Venjukov, published in the mid-19th century in two language versions (French and Russian). Most descriptions of this word-list — which are usually based on Kotwicz's brief report — agree that both language versions are identical. I aim (a) to demonstrate that the two versions differ on some crucial points and, more importantly, (b) to establish the languages or dialects represented in Venjukov's word-list and to integrate the results with the general picture of Nanai dialectology and Tungusic historical and comparative linguistics.

Most old sources containing valuable material for the description of Common Tungusic languages² remain insufficiently studied. There are a few notable exceptions to this general statement. We have at our disposal several critical editions of all the pre-professional linguistic descriptions known to us of Solon (Northern Tungusic): Ligeti (1959), Kałużyński (1971a, 1971b), Aalto (1976, 1977) and Lie (1978). These sources assist us in improving our knowledge of both Solon and Tungusic historical and comparative linguistics.

As far as Nanai is concerned, there are numerous sources of the 19th century and earlier which await linguistic scrutiny, some of which were analysed by Gerhard Doerfer. However, Doerfer gave attention only to those which could shed some light on the question of the independent language status of the Kur-Urmi Nanai dialect. Since Doerfer never aimed to carry out an exhaustive analysis of all the available old sources, he chose to ignore some of them, among others Venjukov's word-list. Although Venjukov's materials may seem to have little appeal (for example, as we shall see both language versions contain more or less the same 150 words), it is my

¹ I would like to express my deep gratitude to the anonymous reviewers and the editor of the journal. Their remarks have improved the overall quality of this paper contributing many valuable suggestions and corrections. Any remaining errors are, of course, my own responsibility.

² I use the label "Common Tungusic" to refer to those Tungusic languages which do not belong to the Jurchenic branch, i.e. Jurchen, Manchu and Sibe.

understanding that they deserve the same amount of attention, especially if we take into account that (a) Venjukov is the oldest source after Maak's 1855 glossary (published in 1859) and (b) later authors seemingly did not bother to consult it. In fact, the word-lists of Venjukov and Maak complement each other very well; Maak's materials grosso modo cover the Central and Lower Amur dialectal zones, while Venjukov's materials cover the Upper Amur zone. As is well known, the Upper Amur dialectal zone, the one with which Doerfer was more concerned, is defined by those Nanai varieties mainly spoken in the basins of the Kur, Urmi and Sungari rivers (here, Lower Amur and Sungari should be understood according to Smoljak 1975, pace Ikegami 1989: 123). Doerfer concluded that these varieties are not dialects of Nanai, but rather full-fledged languages. In that context, Kili and Kilen are the names traditionally used to designate the Kur-Urmi and Sungari dialects, respectively (however, Kilen is commonly referred as "Hezhe(n)" in Chinese and Japanese works, see for example An 1986). We must bear in mind, however, that Doerfer's proposal is not commonly accepted, and many authors still prefer to regard all these varieties as dialects of Nanai.

In §2 I shall briefly sketch Venjukov's life and main occupations. In §3 the description of both word-lists will be presented from a formal viewpoint. I will briefly mention the most distinctive features of the Nanai dialects in §4 so that they can be later compared with those detected in Venjukov's materials. The contents of both word-lists are integrally reproduced in §5 and a commentary is provided in §6. I shall identify the precedence and dialectal nature of Venjukov's materials in the discussion and conclusions offered in §7–8, respectively.

2. Venjukov's word lists: background

Mixail Ivanovič Venjukov (Михаил Иванович Венюков; Nikitinski (Никитинский), 1832–Paris, 1901) was a Russian traveller and geographer who retired from a military career with the rank of Major General, conferred upon him in 1876. Venjukov belonged to highly prestigious geographic societies, among others Paris, Geneva and London, and many of his travelogues and other descriptions of the places which he visited and studied were published and very often even translated into English (see inter alia Venjukov 1872 and Michell & Michell 1865: 239–291). He travelled extensively in Asia, Africa and America, and spent the last part of his life in Switzerland and France, though he never lost contact with his native Russia (for further details, see his extensive memoirs in Venjukov 1895–1901).

During an expedition to the region of the Ussuri basin in 1858, Venjukov managed to collect a brief vocabulary of the Nanai language which he would publish twice. The first version (French version or "F") was published in 1862 in *Petermann's Geographische Mittheilungen*, a journal devoted mainly to geographic as well as cartographic issues. Venjukov's contribution occupies only one page (109). The Nanai materials are presented in two columns (half left column, full right column). The paper is signed by "Stabskapitän *Venukoff*" (German *Stabskapitän* corresponds to Russian *штабс-капитан* or English *staff captain*, a middle rank within the military

hierarchy). There is a six-line German prologue, obviously not written by Venjukov but rather by the editor of the journal. The second version (Russian version or "R") appeared as the second appendix to the first chapter of Venjukov's expedition diaries published in 1868, the word-list occupying three pages (from 103 to 105, full right and left columns). This version has a four-line Russian prologue, this time undoubtedly from Venjukov's own pen.

Venjukov informs the reader that the contents of his word-list differ from Brylkin's. Brylkin's materials, gathered in 1859 and published two years later in Maak's second monograph, offered at the time the most extensive information on the Nanai language because the author not only gathered a vocabulary of more than 800 terms, but he also produced a brief grammatical description. The work of Brylkin gained much attention and it was widely used by other travellers, anthropologists and linguists until the publication of P. Protodjakonov's dictionary in 1901. Therefore, Venjukov's disclaimer is somewhat justified. Venjukov could have benefited only from Maak's 1855 word-list (published in 1859: i–xix), but as we shall see later, that is not the case. This fact naturally increases the value of Venjukov's word-list and the origin of its contents.

3. Formal characteristics

The differences between F and R are few in number. For starters, F contains four words which do not appear in R, namely <Gassan> 'village', <Guissouri> 'to speak', <Nouvou> 'sister', <oumoun> 'one'. There are cases of "lexical pairs", i.e. two different Nanai forms with the same meaning, in both versions. Since one of these lexical pairs in F involves < Nouvou>, R only has two of these lexical pairs ('water', 'sea'), instead of the three to be identified in F ('sister', 'water', 'sea'). It is hard to tell why those words are absent from R. Two of them are Tungusic in origin, while the other two are of unknown origin, at least to me. Secondly, Venjukov indicates the stressed syllable by means of the sign < '> only in R, e.g. F <aïa> vs. RV <aя>, cf. LN <aя> ava [a va] 'good' (if necessary, I provide an impressionistic transliteration, following Janhunen 1996: xiii-xiv, and the IPA transcription). The position of the stress sign in Venjukov's materials seems to agree with the general rule that in Nanai the last syllable is always stressed, even when occupied by an enclitic (see Avrorin 1959: 62-63 for LN or Sem 1976: 34 for the Upper Nanai dialects). However, there are numerous instances showing that other syllables may be the locus of stress, e.g. F <Drabra> vs. <Дза́бза>, cf. LN <дябдян> jabjan [заb'зã] 'snake'. Most old sources of Nanai do not provide information on the placement of the stress, with the notable exception of Brylkin (1961: 4 §2) and Skurlatov (1899). Unfortunately, stress is not indicated for many words in Venjukov's R word-list, even when they contain more than two syllables. Table 1 summarizes the number of accented and unaccented instances (I have counted Janhunen's diphthongoids [1985] as disyllables since Venjukov's practice is to accent those too; syllabification is based on F, since in R some orthographical devices, e.g. the use of $\leq n \geq 1$ for the diphthongoid [ya], might make the count difficult).

14

Number of syllables	Accented	Unaccented
1	0	7
2	73	36
3 or more	25	12
Total: 153	98	55

Table 1. Accented vs. unaccented instances according to number of syllables.

Thirdly, F has 145 lexical items arranged in orthographical order according to French spelling conventions. In fact, French spelling conventions are systematically applied to the Nanai materials throughout the word-list. Thus, we have mute final unaccented <e> after consonants (as expected, has an identical function in R), <é> for /e/, <ou> for /u/, <i> for the glide /y/, <-ss-> for /-s-/, <gu> for /g/, etc. Every word is capitalized. Numerals, not capitalized and arranged in increasing order from one to ten as well as 50 and 100, follow the vocabulary in a separate section. R has 153 lexical items and although it seems that they are arranged in orthographical order according to Russian spelling, in reality the position of many words has been altered so that it is not easy to find them at first sight.

There is some confusion about the exact number of words contained in both versions. The first recount surely belongs to Kotwicz (1909: 211-212) who says that R contains 153 words. He does not mention, however, that there are two lexical pairs ('water', 'sea') and one question, namely Анда, Думань-бира горо́? '(My) friend, where is the Duman' river?', which actually does not contain any new words (anda 'friend', bira 'river' and goro 'far (away)' are already glossed in the word-list) except for the name of the river Duman'. In a footnote, Kotwicz does mention that there is a previous version which had been published several years earlier in French (1909: 212 footnote 1). Avrorin (1959: 8–14) repeats Kotwicz's statement. Sem (1976: 14), who relies on Kotwicz, claims that the number of words is 143. Since he does not specify what version he consulted, one must assume that Sem had in mind F after subsuming the lexical pairs for 'water' and 'sister' (this could be so because each member of these lexical pairs are presented in contiguous order, but the two members of the lexical pair for 'sea' are distributed in orthographic, and therefore non-contiguous, order) and ignoring numerals altogether. We could also speculate that actually Sem was referring to R, but in this case we must assume a typo in 143 instead of 153. Regardless of these counts, it is obvious that neither Kotwicz nor Sem (or any other later researchers) took the time to compare both lists in detail.

The distribution of the features noted above are presented in the following table:

F	R
157 words (11 numerals,	153 words (11 numerals, two pairs)
three pairs)	Disrupted orthographical order (numerals occupy
Orthographical order (numerals aside)	no special place)
	One question (= extra material)
	Comments on the location where a given word was recorded or on semantics

Table 2. Comparison of formal features in F and R.

4. Brief survey of Nanai dialectology

Sources containing materials gathered in the Ussuri region arguably reflect a mixture of different known Nanai dialects. The status of some of these dialects has been challenged in recent decades by Gerhard Doerfer, Juha Janhunen and also by tungusologists from China and Japan. These authors consider that the Sungari and Kur-Urmi dialects should be treated as full-fledged languages, thus referred to by the terms Kilen and Kili, respectively. Janhunen even speaks of a Nanaic group within the Southern Tungusic branch which would encompass Nanai, Kili, Kilen and also Ulcha and Orok (see for example Janhunen 1996: 59–64, 2005). The use of labels such as "dialect" and "language" are commonly associated with non-linguistic issues. However, it is my understanding that those authors who endorse the language status of the Sungari and Kur-Urmi dialects are actually seeking a way to underline the differences between the variants strictly from a linguistic (historical and comparative) viewpoint: just as Solon, Negidal and Ewenki are languages, so too are Kili, Kilen and Nanai.

Be that as it may, in the following table I summarize the main correspondences between these two schools of thinking:

Nanai dialectology		Nanaic dialectology	
Upper Amur	(= Sungari, Bikin)	Kilen (≈ Hezhen) language	
	(= Kur-Urmi)	Kili language	
Central Amur (= Najxin, Sikači-Aljan)		Nanai proper (or Najxin < Найхин> Nanai = Literary Nanai)	
Lower Amur (= Gorin, Bolon)			

Table 3. Nanai vs. Nanaic dialectology.

I have tabulated the main phonological features of Literary Nanai, Sungari Nanai and Kur-Urmi Nanai in the following chart (based on Sem 1976: 26–34, Sunik 1958: 52–54 and Doerfer 1973, especially 572–578; 1977: 56; 1978: 8–18; 1984):

	Literary Nanai	Sungari Nanai	Kur-Urmi Nanai
	(= Central Amur)	(= Kilen)	(= Kili)
I	/-W-/	Ø	Ø
	cowo 'thief'	c00	<i>coo</i>
II	/aCi/	/aCa/	/aCi/
	aysi(n) 'gold'	aysa(n)	aysi ⁿ
III	PT */u/ > /u/	$PT */\ddot{u} / > /u/$	PT */ü/ > /i/
	tugdä 'rain'	tugdä	tigdä
IV	/-V ₁ r#/	/-V ₁ rV ₁ #/ kamürü	/-V ₁ r#/
	kamor 'together'	kamürü	kamür
V	NO	apocope	NO
	ama 'father'	ama ~ am	ата
VI	NO	syncope	syncope
	nämdäkän 'thin'	nämtkääkä	nämku ⁿ
VII	NO	monophthongization	monophthongization
	boa 'place'	baa	baa
VIII	PT */p(-)/ >/p(-)/	PT */p(-)/ > /f(-)/	PT */p(-)/ > /f(-)/
	palan 'floor'	fala	fala ⁿ
	mapa 'old man'	mafa	mafa
IX	/ŋ-/	/n-/	/ŋ-/
~~	nala 'hand'	nana	ŋala
X	/wä-/	/(w)u-/	/wä-/
XXX	wäcän 'dog (female)'	(w)ucä	wäcä
XI	/-ŋm-/, /-gb-/, /-kp-/	/-mŋ-/, /-bg-/, /-fk-/	/-mŋ-/, /-bg-/, /-pk-/
	anma 'mouth'	amna	amna
	sogbo 'fish skin' tukpä 'nail'	sobgo tufkä	sobgo tipkä
XII	PT */p-/ > /p-/	PT */p-/ > /x-/	PT */p-/ > /x-/
AII	paa 'liver'	xakï	$xaki^n$
XIII	/n'/	$/j/\sim/n'/$	/n'/
7111	<i>n'oani</i> 'he'	$jan'\ddot{i} \sim n'an\ddot{i}$	n'aanï
XIV	Ø	/-k-/	/-k-/
211 (muä 'water'	mukä	mukä
XV	PT */-ti-/, /-di-/>	PT */-ti-/, /-di-/>	PT */-ti-/, /-di-/>
	/-ci-/, /-ji-/	/-ci-/, /-d'i-/	/-ti-/, /-d ^(*) i-/
	gocisii 'bitter'	gocïsï	gotisi
	agji 'thunderbolt'	agd'ï	agdi
XVI	PT */rC/ > /yC/	PT */rC/ > /yC/	PT */-rC-/ > /-d'C-/
	xuygu 'tail'	xuygu	id'gi
XVII	/-ar#/	/-aa#/	/-a#/
	saŋar 'hole'	saŋaa	saŋa

Table 4. Main dialectal features of the Nanai dialects.

In Kazama's contribution on the genealogical position of Hezhen (\approx Kilen), Features III (> /i/), VIII (> /x-/), XIV (> Ø) and XVI (> /-rC-/) are also highlighted with additional instances (1996: 120–125; English translation in Kazama 1998). They show that the variety described by Kazama seems to occupy an intermediate position between Sunik's Kur-Urmi Nanai (= Kili) and Sem's Sungari (Bikin) Nanai.

I have selected those features which will be of some relevance for the later discussion. Among other things, this means that only phonological features shall be taken into account, since we cannot directly observe any morphological particularities in Venjukov's word-list (see Tsumagari 1997: 179–180 for some morphosyntactic differences between Literary Nanai and Sungari Nanai with further bibliography). Needless to say, Lower Amur Nanai dialects (Gorin, Bolon, etc.) do not play any role in this discussion.

5. Venjukov's word-list

The content of both R and F word-lists are reproduced in Table 5 with the corresponding comparative materials from Najxin Nanai or Literary Nanai (after Onenko 1980), Sungari Nanai or Kilen (after Sem 1976) and Kur-Urmi Nanai or Kili (after Sunik 1958). Phonological transcriptions of the Cyrillic-based orthographies are merely impressionistic (again, see Janhunen 1996: xiii–xiv). The French and Russian original translations will be mentioned only if necessary, otherwise I provide only the English translation. In case a word in R does not occupy the place that it apparently would have to according to the Russian alphabetical order, I indicate the page and column (lower case, square brackets) so that it can be easily found.

*Table 5.*Venjukov's materials from F and R, with Najxin, Kilen, Kili and Brylkin's corresponding forms:

Venju	ıkov		English meaning	Literary Nanai
Nr	F	R		(= Najxin Nanai)
1	Aba	Абá	not	aba _[22b]
2	Adime	Ади́мъ	big sturgeon	$ajin_{[29b]}^{[220]}$
3	Agaï	Агай	brother	$aga_{[25a]}^{[290]}$
4	Aïa	Ая́	good	$\begin{array}{c} aya_{[52b]} \end{array}$
5	Aïssa	Айса́	golden	$aysin_{[31a]}$
6	Ama	Ама́	father	amaa _[35b]
7	Amira	Амиро	grandfather	_
8	Anda	Анда́	friend	anda _[42b]
9	Apou	Апу́	hat	$\mid aanon_{-} \mid$
10	Balana	Балана	long time ago	balana _{rsobi}
11	Balapti	Балапти	ancient	balapci _[58b]
12	Baran	Бара́нъ	much	—
13	Bi	Би	to be (locative,	bi- _[64b]
			copulative)	
14	Bia	Бя	moon	bia _[65a]
15	Bira	Бира́	river	biraan _[67b]
16	Bitza	Бица́	branch of a river	l —
17	Botzin	Боце́нъ	island	boacaan _[69b]
18	Bouda	Буда	millet	
19	Bougdy	Быгды	leg, foot	bägji _[84a]
20	Bouié	Быэ́	man	bägji _[84a] bäyä _[84b]
21	Boussou	Бусу́	a k. of fabric	UUSUU _{FO21-1}
22	Boutcha	Быча	roe	$ UUCun_{[77b]} $
23	Chia	Шя _[105b]	ear	Stan _[357b]
24	Chiro	широ _[105h]	sand	$ Siyuun_{[270o]} $
25	Daé	Дае́	big	$ uuuv_{[122a]} $
26	Daï .	Дай	pipe	$day_{[133a]}$
27	Daouri	Да́ури	to cross	day _[133a]
28	Dérin	Дэре́нь	river's source	
29	diguine	Дигинъ	four	<i>auin</i> _[162a]
30 31	Dilé	Дилэ	head	duin _[162a] jili _[154a] joan
32	dja	Джа	ten	joan _[146a] jiakpon _[177b]
33	djapcou	Джабку	eight	<i>Jtакроп</i> _[177b]
34	Diangué	Чжангэ _[105b]	pole	
35	Djanguine Djantchi	IMani nn b _[105k]	master sheet	iansa
36	Djikda	Чжанчи _[105b]	bread (flour)	jansa _[542b]
37	djour	Джикда _[103b] Джуръ	two	caagjan _[496b]
38	Dolbo	Джурь Долбо	night	$ju\ddot{a}r_{[175a]}$ $dolbo_{[158b]}$
39	Drabra	Дза́бза	snake	iahian
40	Dyré	Дырэ	face	jabjan _[176a] däräl _[172a]
41	Eleki	Элэкѝ	to drink	
42	Epyn	Эпынъ	bread	älä- _[527b] äpän _[283b]
43	Er-inin	Эръ-иненъ	today	äyniä _[524b]
44	Esso	Эсо	eyes	nasal _[284a]
45	Foulgué	Фульгэ́	sheet	[284a]
46	Foulou	Фулу́	aspen	polo _[334b]
47	Fouro	Фуро́ _[1,04b]	mountain	xurään _[483b]
48	Foutatcha	Футача	bag	pootacaan _[338a]
49	Gakhara	Гахара́	shirt	[3388]
50	Gao	Γáο	pole	_
51	Gassan	_	village	_
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		I

Sungari Nanai (= Kilen)	Kur-Urmi Nanai (= Kili)	Brylkin
$\begin{array}{c} aab(a)_{[135a]} \\ ad'i(n)_{[136b]} \\ aaga_{[136a]} \\ ay(aa)_{[136b]} \\ ays'an \sim ays'in_{[136b]} \\ ama_{[137b]} \\ \end{array}$	aba _[163a] ajin _[163b] aga _[163a] aya _[164b] aysin _[163b] ama _[164a]	$[a]$ б a $_{[11a]}$ a дзин ' b \sim a дз u $_{[11a]}$ a a a $_{[11a]}$ a
$anda_{[138b]}$ $aafo(n) \sim aafu(n)_{[139b]}$ $baalan(a)_{[141a]}$ $balafcee \sim balafci_{[141a]}$	afun _[165b] balana _[166a] balapti _[166a]	анда̀ _[11b] афон ъ _[11a] — — —
bi- _[142a]	_	би-мэ _[12a]
b'ëë _[142a] b'ira _[142a]	bia _[166b] bira _[166b]	$\begin{array}{c} \delta j \grave{a}_{[12a]} \\ \delta u p \acute{a}_{[12a]} \\$
booca(n) _[143b]		бачà ~ бацà _[11b]
bägd'i _[144a] bäyä _[144b] busu _[144a] boca(n) _[143b] s'ëë(n) _[181a] s'iro(n) _[182b] daay _[150a] dao- _[151b] därä(n) _[155b] duy(n) _[153b]	$\begin{array}{c}$	$\stackrel{-}{\bigcirc}$ бэкдыль $_{[11b]}$ $\stackrel{-}{\bigcirc}$ босо $_{[12a]}$ $\stackrel{-}{\bigcirc}$ с $_{[17a]}$ $\stackrel{-}{\bigcirc}$ дай \sim даје $_{[12b]}$ даји $_{[13a]}$ $\stackrel{-}{\bigcirc}$ дырэ-ни $_{[13b]}$ дуинь $_{[13b]}$
$d'il'i_{[152b]}$ $joan_{[174b]}$ $jafko(n) \sim jafku(n)_{[156b]}$	duin _[24] d'ili _[171b] juan _[24] jakun _[173b]	$\begin{array}{c} \partial y u \mu {\bf b}_{[13b]} \\ \partial j e n u \sim \partial n u_{[13a]} \\ \partial n u \sim \partial n u_{[13a]} \\ \partial n u \wedge u \sim \partial n u_{[13b]} \\ \partial n u \wedge u \sim u \sim u \sim u \\ \partial n u \sim u$
$\begin{array}{l} jan\ddot{e}\ddot{e}(n)_{[156a]} \\ jansa_{[156a]} \\ caagjaa(n)_{[206a]} \\ juu \sim juu\ddot{a}\ddot{a}_{[157a]} \\ dolbo_{[153a]} \\ jabja(n)_{[155a]} \\ d\ddot{a}\ddot{a}_{[155a]} \\ d\ddot{a}\ddot{a}_{[210a]} \\ \ddot{a}fu(n)_{[211b]} \\ \ddot{a}yn'a \sim \ddot{a}yin'i_{[210a]} \\ (n')isala_{[159b]} \\ \hline \end{array}$	$jang'an_{[173b]}$ $janci_{[173b]}$ $cagjan_{[202b]}$ $juu(r) \sim juru_{[175a]}$ $dolbo_{[171b]}$ $jabjan_{[173a]}$ $\ddot{a}l\ddot{a}-u-ri_{[205b]}$ $\ddot{a}f\ddot{a}n_{[205a]}$ $\ddot{a}sal \sim esal_{[184b]}$	∂жан'гинъ[13a] — чакджан'ь [20b] джуръ[13b] дольбо [13b] — дыри[13b] — эйни[13b] —

20

Sungari Nanai (= Kilen)	Kur-Urmi Nanai (= Kili)	Brylkin
gärb'i _[146a] goro _[148b] gus'i(n) _[149b]		герби ~ гербу _[12a] горд _[12b] —
	_ _ _	гуйса̀ _[12b] — гисурэ-мэ _[12b]
g'iu _[1476] g'iu _[1476] kadaa _[161a] xay _[200a] koyla(n)		zjyh b _[12b]
$kay(a(a))_{[161b]}$ $kalta_{[162a]}$ $xam'ila_{[200b]}$ $garmatka \sim$	kayla ⁿ _[177a] kalta _[177a]	кана _[14b] кальта _[14b]
garmaxka [146b]	garmatka _[168b] xaja _[199a]	гармакта̀ _[12a] хадза̀ _[19a]
$x\ddot{a}du(n)_{[205a]}$ $xon(\dot{i})_{[203b]}$ $koco(a)_{[166a]}$ $xoto(n)_{[203a]}$	$\ddot{a}din_{[205a]}^{[199a]}$ $oon \sim ooni_{[186b]}$ $koceka_{[179b]}$ $xoton_{[201b]}$	$x \omega \partial y_{[19b]}$ $x \omega \partial y_{[19b]}$
	$ \begin{array}{c} - \\ - \\ (x)uyun_{[24, 82]} \end{array} $	
$ ixa(n) \sim jaxa(n)_{[159b]}$ $ila(n)_{[158a]}$ $im(a)xa_{[159a]}$	exan _[173b] elan _[173a]	x ын ' $\kappa a_{[19b]}^{[20a]}$ $9xa_{[14a]}^{[14a]}$ $ulàhb_{[14a]}^{[14a]}$ $9maxa_{[14a]}^{[14a]}$
	än'ä _[206a] inäŋi _[175b] 	энэ _[14a] ини _[14a] јатарко _[13a]
'кресало', [1010] jafo _[156b] jay _[155a]		— дэжаи _[13a]
jolo _[156b] kalci _[162a]	jolo _[174b] kalci _[177b]	$\partial \mathcal{H}$ оло $_{[13a]}$ кальчи $_{[14b]}$ хартхо $_{[19a]}$
$k'ira \sim k'ara_{[164a]}$ $kirfo \sim kirfu_{[164b]}$ $koxto_{[166a]}$	$\begin{array}{c} \\ kirfu_{[178b]} \\ kokton_{[178bh]} \end{array}$	кира _[14b] кирфу _[14b] кохтон ът
xulu _[204b] xurmä _[5041]	kokton _[178bb] koldo ⁿ _[178b]	xyly _[20a] xypma _[20a]
xurm ikta ~ xurm ixta _[204b]	xurmäktä _[201b] —	хурмикта [20a]
$\begin{array}{c} la_{[168a]} \\ lamo \sim lamu_{[169a]} \\ \end{array}$	$ \begin{array}{c} la_{[180a]}\\ lamu_{[180b]}\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\$	
$egin{array}{ll} \it{ma}_{[171a]} \it{mafa}_{[172a]} \it{maanga}_{[171a]} = 98 \end{array}$		
$m'\ddot{o}\ddot{o}caa(n)_{[173a]}$ $moo \sim muu_{[172a]}$	meocan _[182a]	мјаоча̀ _[15a] — мо _[15b]

Venju	Venjukov		English meaning	Literary Nanai
Nr	F	R		(= Najxin Nanai)
104	Mou	My	water	muä _[274a]
105	Mouca	му́ка	= 104	
106	Moudou	Муду́	otter	_
107	Moungou	Мынгу́	silver	mäŋgun _[277b]
108	Mouni	Му́ни	our	
109	Mouré	Мурэ	horse	morin _[269a]
110	Mourin-pocto	Мурень-покто	horse-path	
111	Nadan	Наданъ	seven	nadaan _[279b]
112	Nakchi	Накшѝ	to beat	
113	Nala	На́ла	hand	naala _[284b]
114	N'amou	Наму	sea	$\mid namo_{rao_1k_1}$
115	ningou	Нингу́	six	n'uŋun _[296a] nuktä _[296a]
116	Noucté	Нукте	hair	nuktä _[296a]
117	Noutchi	Ню́чи	small	nuuci _[296b]
118	Nouvou	_	sister	[2900]
119	Nyvou	Ныву	= 118	_
120	Orké	Оркэ́	horrible, lame	orki _[314a]
121	Ouchicta	Ушикта	star	orki _[314a] xosikta ~
				xosakta _[474a]
122	Oufourou	Уфуру	nose	oporo[313b]
123	Oukda	Укда	boat	oporo _[313b] ogda _[306a] okto _[308b] ulää _[429a] uliksä _[429a]
124	Ouktou	Укту́	powder	okto[300a]
125	Oulé	Улэ́	good	ulää _{[4200}]
126	Oulicsé	Уликсэ	meat	uliksä _[429a]
127	oumoun		one	ämun _[529b]
128	Ouni	Уни	cup, dish	
129	Pocto	Покто́	track, path	pokto _[334b] pulsi- _[342a]
130	Pouli	Пулѝ	to walk	pulsi-[342]
131	Salia	Саля	smoke	[342a]
132	Séfa	Сэ́фа	sable	sääpä _[385b]
133	Si	Си	thou	sii _[356b]
134	Singui	Синги	he	[3300]
135	Siou	Ciy	sun	siun _[369a]
136	Sou	Cy	you	Suä _[2011-]
137	Soukda	Сукда	a k. of fish	suä _[381b] sogdata _[371b]
138	Sounta	Сунта	deep	sonta _[374b]
139	soussaï	Сусай	fifty	sosii _[377b]
140	tangou	Тангу́	hundred	tano[392b]
141	Taoussou	Taycý	salt	daoson _[139a]
142	Tava	Та́во	fire	tawa _[388b]
143	Tchektchuri	Чекчюри	(it's) cold	
144	Tchicou	Чику́ 1	chicken	ciko _[503b]
145	Tchikymé	Чикыма	velvet	[5036]
146	Tchoulou	Чулу	glass	_
147	Timana	Тимана	tomorrow	cimana _[505b]
148	Toudosa	Тудо́за	potato	duduusäria
149	Tougdé	Тугда	rain	tugdä _[408a]
150	Tougoulgou	Тугулгу	lead	tuugu- _[408b]
151	tounga	Тунга	five	$toy\eta a_{[401a]}$
152	Tourgué	Тургэ	quickly	turgän _[412a]
153	Tourguendji	Тургенъчжи	very fast	turgändi _[412a]
154	Tzahara	Цахара́ _[105b]	pebble	$ \begin{array}{c c} in garren [412a] \\ jaxar_{[182b]} \end{array} $
155	Vaksa	Bakcá _[102]	nose	waaksa _[89b]
156	Vassou	Вакса́ _[103a] Васу́ _[103a]	stockings	[89b]
157	Zoulouli	Зулули	in front of	julilä _[173b]
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	[1/30]

Sungari Nanai (= Kilen)	Kur-Urmi Nanai (= Kili)	Brylkin
 mukä _[173b]	 mukä _[183a]	— мука̀ _[15b]
$m\ddot{a}nu(n)_{[174a]}$		
$\frac{-}{mor'i(n)_{[173a]}}$		— морѝнъ _[15a]
$\frac{-}{nada(n)_{[174a]}}$		— нада̀нъ _[15b]
	$ \frac{-}{\eta a l a_{[185a]}} = 95^{[185a]} $	— нана̀ _[15b]
n'ingu _[176b] niktä ~ nixtä _[175a] nuuci _[175b]	n'uŋgun _[185a] niruktä _[184b]	— нин'гунъ _[16b] нукта _[16a] нучи _[16a]
$ orki(n)_{[178b]}$ $os'ikta \sim os'ixta_{[179a]}$	osiakta _[187b]	орки _[16b]
$oforo_{[179b]}$ $ogda_{[177a]}$ $okto \sim oxto_{[177a]}$ $ul\ddot{a}(n)_{[193b]}$ $ul\ddot{a}ks\ddot{a}_{[193b]}$ $\ddot{a}m \sim \ddot{a}mu(n)_{[210a]}$ $un'i_{[193b]}$ $fokto \sim foxto_{[196b]}$	$oforo_{[187b]} \\ ogda_{[186a]} \\ okto_{[186a]} \\ ul\ddot{a}_{[196a]} \\$	$o\phi op \hat{o}_{[16b]}$ $o[z] \partial \hat{a}_{[16a]}$ $oк m \hat{o}_{[16b]}$ $yn \hat{e}_{18a]}$ $yn u k c \hat{a}_{[18a]}$ $oм y h b \sim om y h b_{[16b]}$ —
$ful'i$ - $_{[198a]}$ $ s\ddot{a}\ddot{a}f\ddot{a}_{[187b]}$ $s'i_{[182b]}$	$ \begin{array}{c c} fuli-u-ri_{[198b]} \\ \hline \\ si_{[189a]} \end{array} $	$egin{array}{l} \phi \!$
$s'iu(n)_{[183b]}$ $suu_{[185b]}$ $sonta_{[185a]}$ $soosay_{[185a]}$ $tangu \sim tango_{[192b]}$ $daosu(n) \sim daoso(n)_{[152b]}$	siun _[189b] suu _[191b] sogjana _[189b] sonta _[190a] sosay _[190b] tangu _[192b] daosun _[171a]	сјун'ь _[17a] су _[17b] сугдата̀ _[17b] сункта̀ _[17b] сюса̀й _[17b] стоса̀й _[17b] тан'гу _[17b] даусун'ь _[13a] тава̀ _[17b]
tao _[188b]	too _[194b]	
	temaki _[193a]	— тсимакса̀ _[18a] тудуза _[18a] тугда̀ _[18a]
toynga _[189b] turgä(n) _[191a]	$toyya \sim ton'ya_{[189b]}$ $turg\ddot{a}n_{[194b]}$ \vdots	— <i>mён 'га̀</i> _[17b] <i>mурга̀нъ</i> _[18a] —
jaxara _[156b]	jaxar _[174a]	

6. Comments

Since the main goal of the etymological comments below is to establish the degree of closeness or remoteness between Venjukov's materials and the other Nanai dialects (as we shall see later, this sometimes requires quoting additional forms for example from Ewenki or Udihe), they will not be exhaustive. The interested reader is referred to auxiliary tools such as SSTMJa, Benzing 1956, Rozycki 1994 or Doerfer 1985, 2004 for full quotations and deeper insights on etymology. For the sake of abbreviation, LN refers to both Literary Nanai (i.e. the Najxin dialect) and Central Amur Nanai by extension.

- [2] Brylkin adds '(Acipenser orientalis)' (from Maak 1859: ii-a, s.v. <aʒѣ>, Central Amur). The notation <m> for /-m#/ instead of /-n#/ is well known in older and more recent sources. The alternation is due to the ambiguous realization of certain phonemes in absolute *Auslaut* position, the so-called "archiphonemes". Since Venjukov devised other spelling conventions to represent /j/ (see discussion in [93]), I assume that by writing F <di> vs. R <ди> he intended to render a different phoneme. Sem (1976: 31) discusses the opposition between LN /ji/ <ди> and SN /d'i/ (= Brylkin's <дз>; note that Brylkin's grapheme <ù> is his personal typographical solution for <ѝ>, i.e. stressed /i/). Here Feature XV does not apply because both forms go back to PT */ajïn/ id., cf. SSTMJa I: 16b.
- [3] LN, SN, KUN, and Brylkin's vocabulary have 'older brother'. Venjukov's form reads *aga-i* with the final <-i> corresponding to the 1SG.POSS marker (Avrorin 1959: 131–133). This form literally means 'my/the (older) brother'.
- [5] A typical SN form, reflecting Feature II (vowel assimilation). Brylkin's form is closer to SN (diagnostic feature: <-3->, see Feature II).
- [7] F <-a> vs. R <-ó> is a very suspicious correspondence. Venjukov may have pronounced this word with "Russian accent", i.e. not stressing the last syllable, despite the fact that the Nanai accent falls on the last syllable as a rule of thumb. If this is the case, then one should assume *akanye* (/a/ for unstressed /o/ in Russian pronunciation), cf. [142] and Brylkin's form in [17]. This hypothesis implies that the original form could be †*amiro*, but this cannot be demonstrated since the word is attested nowhere else. Of course, we can also assume a typo originally in F which Venjukov noticed and corrected later in R.
- [9] Lack of the class marker /-n/ is a diagnostic feature of SN, but the presence of /p/ instead of /f/ is characteristic only of LN. It has been claimed that KUN shows a heavy influence from Ewenic (the group formed by Ewenki, Ewen, Negidal, Arman, Oroqen and Solon according to Janhunen's terminology). In this context, it may be pertinent to bring into the discussion forms like Ewenki (Ayan = Eastern dialect) *apsa* 'hunter's bag', (Ilimpi, Erbogachen = Northern dialects & Upper Lena = Southern dialects) *aptu*ⁿ 'cotton (жильная) thread' (Vasilevič 1958: 33b), cf. Maak's Central Amur <awsa, auwsa> 'birch-box' and Lower Amur <afun> 'birch-hat' (1859: ii-a). This is an excellent instance illustrating the differences between Venjukov and Brylkin's materials in the sense that Venjukov definitely

- did not copy from Brylkin. Cf. Skurlatov's Sungari $\langle a\dot{y}hb\rangle$ id. (1899: 253b), where the chain $f/\langle w/w\rangle = 0$ seems to result from the combination of Features I and VIII.
- [11] No accent in R. A typical KUN form.
- [12] Cf. SSTMJa I: 73, see inter alia Literary Ewen *baran* 'capacious', Literary Manchu *baran* 'many', Orok *bara* 'many'.
- [13] Brylkin's form contains the infinitive marker (<-M₉>), cf. [57].
- [14] Unless we are open to accepting the presence of Central Amur forms in Venjukov's word-list, something which is highly unlikely, we have no choice but to assume that this is a KUN form.
- [17] A typical SN form. Brylkin's form may reflect *akanye* (/a/ for unstressed /o/ in Russian pronunciation) or a sort of "Ulchism", for only in Ulcha do we find /a/, i.e. *baaca(n)* id., see SSTMJa I: 104a.
- [18] Cf. Yakut region Ewenki *budan* 'measles, rubella' (Romanova & Myreeva 1968: 29a). Cross-linguistically, 'grain' and 'spot, pimple' are sometimes expressed by the same word, e.g. Spanish *grano* 'grain; spot, pimple'.
- [19] On phonological grounds (vocalism and preservation of */-di/), this form should be considered KUN. See Northern Tungusic words such as Literary Ewenki *bägdi* id. etc., cf. SSTMJa I: 118b–119a.
- [22] Venjukov renders /ä/ by <u> when surrounded by vowels other than /a/ & /ä/ (otherwise they commonly use <u>), see inter alia [36?, 40, 73, 107], as some other authors did, cf. Brylkin's forms in [28, 66], although they are not always consistent.
- [23] Cf. [14].
- [24] No accent in R.
- [25] Also in KUN according to SSMTJa I: 190a.
- [26] No accent in R. Since we already have instances like [25, 60, 81], the lack of accent here may be due to a clerical error.
- [27] A typical KUN form, this must be analysed as *dao-u-ri*, with the passive/causative marker *-u-* and the aorist tense marker *-ri* (Sunik 1958: 91–92). It is impossible to decide to which Venjukov's form corresponds, since the suffix *-u-* is also used in SN.
- [28] Brylkin's form contains most likely the 3SG.POSS ending -ni (otherwise we would have to assume a misprint of $\langle H'b \rangle = /-n\#/$).
- [29] No accent in R. This is a pure Northern Tungusic form, cf. Literary Ewenki, Ewen, Negidal *digin* id. (SSTMJa I: 204a–205a), cf. [12].
- [30] No accent in R. It is worth noting Brylkin's use of the digraph <дj> vs. <дз> as happens in [2] among others.
- [31] Behind Venjukov's form may be hiding [aa], that is, a long vowel resulting from the monophthongization of an original [oa]. Monophthongization is a very typical feature of SN (see under VII), e.g. *baa* vs. LN *boa* 'land' (Sem 1976: 27). However, the existence of Northern Tungusic forms like Literary Ewenki *jaan* id. (cf. SSTMJa I: 248a–b) leaves some room to claim KUN pedigree.

- [32] This is a typical Northern Tungusic form, cf. Literary Ewenki *japkun* id. etc., see SSTMJa I: 251a–252a, so it can be tentatively ascribed to KUN.
- [33] No accent in R. Cf. Yakut region Ewenki *cääŋgääy* 'a k. of stick attached to the reindeer's neck to avoid that he moves far away' (Romanova & Myreeve 1968: 205a).
- [34] No accent in R. In all languages 'leader, manager, head'.
- [35] No accent in R. In all languages 'cloth'.
- [36] No accent in R. In F 'wheat, flour', in R 'bread (flour)'. In LN *caagjan* is used in the expression *saxarin / caagjan xleb (äpän)* 'black / white bread' (Onenko 1986: 283b). Venjukov mistakenly interpreted the word *caagjan* as 'flour' instead of 'white', cf. *caagjan opa* 'white flour' (Onenko 1980: 496a). Could this word be a Para-Mongolism (cf. Monguor & Dagur *cigaan* < **cagagan* 'white')? See also [79] on *ikanye*.
- [38] No accent in R.
- [39] No accent in R.
- [40] SN 'front side, outward (of materials, clothes)'.
- [41] SN 'to be thirsty'. The element -ki might correspond to the past participle marker of the III class verb stems (for verb stems ending in consonant, e.g. LN un- & SN uN- 'to say' $\rightarrow un$ - ki^n & $u\eta$ -k'i 'said, saying', see Avrorin 1961: 13–15, 67–70, Sem 1976: 63, 78–79), though $\ddot{a}l\ddot{a}$ 'to drink' does not belong to this class.
- [42] No accent in R. In R Venjukov added 'baked bread'.
- [43] It seems that Venjukov is the only researcher who has recorded the pre-contraction form of the word for 'today' in the Tungusic languages, only self-evident in Kilen *äyin'i*. I wonder whether Venjukov did not work it out after Russian *cezoдня* 'today', in origin the fusion of the genitive forms of the ancient demonstrative */sь/ 'this' and the word for 'day' (cf. Polish *tego roku* 'in this year' etc.). Be that as it may, LN, SN and KUN *äy* is the expected outcome of PT */är/ 'this' (SSTMJa II: 460a–462a s.v. *är*). Thus, in theory Venjukov's form cannot belong to any Nanai dialect. Cf. Literary Ewenki *ärääw inäŋu* 'today', lit. 'this day', already in Maak (1859: i-a) s.v. <ar inäŋi> 'today' (Manegir). Cf. [24] (= Feature XVI) for another instance with /y/ instead of /r/. This sound change is common, especially when /r/ is surrounded by palatal vowels, e.g. PT */xürgü/ 'tail' > LN *xuygu* id., SN *xuygu* (204a), KUN *id'gi* id. (175a), but Literary Ewenki *irgi* id. (SSTMJa I: 325a s.v. *irgi*) and it has been extensively used in the discussion about the language status of KUN and SN, see inter alia Doerfer (1973: 591).
- [44] No accent in R. Venjukov's form is curious because it has no plural marker /-l/ (see the extensive cognate list quoted in SSTMJa I: 291–292, from which one can deduce that PL /-l/ is almost fossilized). Venjukov's /o/ instead of /a/ may be due to some kind of *okanye* (/o/ for unstressed /o/ in Russian pronunciation), perhaps due to hypercorrection? See Doerfer (1973: 573) for a discussion of this item taking into account other forms mentioned in old sources.

- [47] KUN 'taiga, thick forest'. This interesting instance reflects the sound change /p-/>/x-/>/f-/ (realization [β -]), the latter stage especially frequent after back vowels. Doerfer (1973: 573–574) devotes a few lines to this important diagnostic feature, see under XII above.
- [48] KUN 'bag made of fish skin', after metathesis.
- [50] Cf. Poniatowski (1923: 5a) ss.vv. <gao> and <geoĺ> 'paddle', see also Brylkin's <геоль> id. [12b].
- [51] Not in R, which would have had something like *<\GacaH> (with or without accent). Folkloric term in KUN. Cf. SSTMJa I: 143a-b, e.g. Negidal gasin, Oroch gasa, Ulcha gasa(n), Orok gas(s)a, Manchu gašan id.
- [52] Venjukov's *gorbi-ni* contains †*gorbi* 'name' and the 3SG.POSS ending *-ni*, hence 'his/the name'. SSTMJa I: 180b–181b mixes two different words under 'name': on one side, LN *gärbu* id., on the other LN *gäbu* 'authority' (123b), SN *gäbää* id. (150a) and KUN *gäbu* id. (170b), doubtlessly a Manchu loanword.
- [54] Cf. KUN guskä id. (149b).
- [55] Cf. SN g'ëësa 'hedge' (147a).
- [56] Cf. SN giwan id. (169a), but the preservation of /-w-/ is irregular.
- [57] Not in R, which would have had something like *<Гисури> (with or without accent).
- [58] LN 'roe deer', see KUN *giakso* 'skin of seal' (169b), plus SSTMJa I: 148b, vid. i.a. Negidal *giwu* '(skin of) seal', Orok *geoksa* id. The correspondence F /i/ vs. R /u/ is unique, but it may hide a real isogloss (see under III).
- [59] Preservation of final /-r#/ is a typical feature of Northern Tungusic, hence Literary Ewenki *kadar*, Ewen *kadaar* id. However, Negidal as well as SN and sometimes KUN lose it, producing Negidal and SN *kadaa* id. (see SSTMja I: 360a–b, Benzing 1956: 49 §59[d]). The use of <x-> instead of <κ-> for Nanai /k-/ is a common device in old sources (not restricted to the Tungusic domain!) in order to try to grasp the particularities of the uvular(ized) allophone [q-] of /k-/ after the back vowels /a o ï/, see among others Avrorin (1959: 36). Cf. inter alia [61–62, 68]
- [62] No accent in R. Cf. additionally [61] for /x-/.
- [64] Could it be that Venjukov corrected the F version (/g-/ instead of /h-/) after having had access to Brylkin's materials?
- [66] Cf. Skurlatov's Sungari <едунь> id. (252а).
- [67] Brylkin 'how many'.
- [68] No accent in R.
- [69] KUN is most likely a loanword, since /x-/ should be Ø. Given the meaning of the word, it is easy to assume here a *Kulturwort*.
- [70] R adds 'about the current of the river'. The first segment is most likely related to onomatopoeic forms like LN *kuäx-kuäx* (236b), SN *kuil-kuil* ~ *kujäl-kujäl* (166b), KUN *kuän-kuän* (179b), it is usually uttered to express quick, repetitive actions or about the bigness, deepness or toughness of an object or situation. As for the second, see LN *manga* 'high, hard, strong' (256b; also KUN 182a, SN 171b).

- [72] No accent in R.
- [73] No accent in R. Clearly a Chinese loanword, cf. 黄瓜 *huángguā* id. Monophthongization points to a SN source.
- [74] Brylkin's form contrasts notably with [75]. Number 'five' is closer to SN, while number 'four' is closer to KUN.
- [76] Venjukov mentions it originally as an instance of the lexical pairs one may notice while researching in the Amur and Upper Ussuri regions (1868: 87). In this case, Venjukov labelled it "Upper Ussuri". It can be safely identified as a typical SN form. See also Doerfer (1973: 572) or Sem (1976: 16). Curiously enough, Venjukov's word-list includes also the "pair" *sukda* (cf. [137]) and it is labelled "Lower Ussuri".
- [78] No accent in R.
- [79] No accent in R. Cf. LN *yaxarako* 'stove-lid' (544b). It is likely that reduction of /ia/ (= Russian Cyrillic orthography <\$\pi\$>) to /i/ is a typical case of *ikanye* (/i/ for unstressed /je/, /jo/ and /ja/, i.e. <e>, <ë> and <\$\pi\$>, respectively, in Russian pronunciation).
- [80] SN only in the expression *jafo afu(n)*, cf. *jaf(a) säftäxu(n)* 'mattress' (156a). Cf. Brylkin's <джафагди> 'glove' [13a].
- [86] Cf. Literary Manchu kirfu id. (Norman 1978: 176b), plus SSTMJa I: 399a.
- [87] KUN 'pipe (to smoke)'.
- [88] Confusion of /o/ with /u/ is a typical feature of SN. See [9] or the example under Feature IV.
- [90] No accent in R.
- [91] There is a typo in R, with <-n-> instead of F <-k->.
- [92] Cf. SSTMJa I: 439b, s.v. kuta 'clay'.
- [93] No accent in R. R \leq 11 vs. F \leq 12, pace [65] where R \leq 12 vs. F \leq 17.
- [94] A Chinese loanword, cf. SSTMJa I: 485a.
- [95] No accent in R.
- [96] LN *namokaan* 'the Udihe' (281b), SN *lamka nayn'i* id. (169a), KUN *lamukan* id. (180b), Brylkin's <ламука̀, намука̀> 'the Oroch' (15a, 16a). Note that the element -*kA* is segmentable (see -*ka(n)* in Avrorin 1959: 108–109). In the case of the lexical pair *mu* ~ *mukä*, the segment /kä/ belongs to the root (Venjukov had to gather *mu* and *mukä* from two speakers of different dialects).
- [98] Onenko (1986: 256a) contains both meanings: *mapa* 'bear; old man'. This is a well-known instance of religious usage. It is my understanding that Brylkin's translation 'медвѣдь старый' actually contains a misprint for †'медвѣдь; старый', i.e. with a semicolon between one and another meaning, so he also provides both meanings, otherwise we would have to assume a case of anomalous syntax. Cf. Brylkin's <мафа̀-най> 'старикъ' (15a), lit. 'old man'.
- [99] LN, SN, and KUN 'difficulty, hard, tough'.
- [102] F 'bon jour' and R 'здравствуй'. Cf. SSTMJa I: 568a, s.v. *mändu* id. (Ewenki).
- [104] As happened in [14], it is highly dubious that we have here a LN word. Rather, we can assume a KUN form which has been heavily influenced by the Northern

- Tungusic languages, e.g. Literary Ewenki *muu* id. (cf. SSTMJa I: 548a–549a). See the discussion in §7 for the assessment of this influence by some scholars.
- [105] Not capitalized in R (contrary to the case of "Lamu, Namu").
- [106] Cf. SSTMJa II: 550b, s.v. *mudur* 'dragon' < PT */mudu.ri/ (from a root meaning 'to bite', perhaps created after a Chinese model).
- [108] This is the common form for the possessive of the inclusive 1PL: LN $bu.\ddot{a}$ 'we' $\rightarrow bu.n-i$ 'our(s)', SN $buu \rightarrow muu.n-i$, (54, 56), KUN $muu \rightarrow mu.n-i$ (84), cf. Brylkin's <муни> id. (15b).
- [109] No accent in R. The difference between this word and [110] may be better understood as one between dialectological forms, since the lack of the noun class /-n/ is typical of SN, but not of LN or KUN.
- [111] No accent in R.
- [112] Most likely unrelated to forms like Literary Ewenki *n'ācuu* 'to hit', Orok *nātu* id. or Literary Manchu *neci* 'to annoy' (Norman 1978: 210a, cf. SSTMJa I: 655b).
- [114] No accent in R. No corresponding form in Brylkin's materials. The origin of this word can be only ascribed to SN, cf. Udihe *namu* vs. Pan-Ewenki *laamu* id.
- [116] R and F translations seem to try to reflect the collective marker -ktä. The existence of such forms as Udihe n'uuktä id. (Kormušin 1998: 270b) leaves this form closer to SN.
- [118] Not in R, which would have had something like *[HyBY] (with or without accent). There is a strange resemblance between Venjukov's form and a pair of well-known kinship terms attested in almost every Nanai dialect, on one side LN *näku* 'youngest brother or sister' (298a), KUN *näkun* (185b) or SN *näku* (175b) 'younger brother or sister', on the other LN *näu* 'youngest brother or sister' (510b), KUN *näu-fangu* 'the youngest child' (185b) or SN *näu* 'son of brothers and sisters and their younger children' (176a), cf. Brylkin's <H3Y> 'youngest brother' (16a). Note that */-k-/ and */-w-/ are phonemes which tend to disappear in the history of LN and KUN. However, it is not easy to formulate a scenario without falling into the trap of endless speculation.
- [119] No accent in R.
- [121] No accent in R. This is a good parallel of $/x-/>\emptyset$ for [67].
- [122] No accent in R.
- [123] Brylkin's form <одда> must be amended to <огда>. Brylkin also includes in his vocabulary <огда чоони> 'днище лодки'.
- [124] LN, SN, and KUN 'medicine'. We can assume that Venjukov's translation derives from the fact that he observed a sort of medicament in powder form. As happened in [36], Venjukov just assigned an incorrect meaning.
- [126] KUN has no trace of the suffix -ksä.
- [127] Not in R, which would have had something like *[Умун] (with or without accent). This form seems to reflect a sort of vowel assimilation, very similar to the one attested in SN, e.g. SN *buyu* vs. LN *bäyun* 'wild animal'. However, SN has *äm* ~ *ämu* id. This form may tentatively be identified as KUN, since

- Northern Tungusic languages present very similar, if not identical shapes, e.g. Literary Ewenki *umuun* id., see SSTMJa II: 270a–272a.
- [128] No accent in R. SN 'big cast-iron container'. Cf. Maak's Central Amur <una> 'big container' (1859: v-a).
- [129] From LN? The result /p-/ for PT */p-/ is restricted to LN (see Feature VIII), Ulcha and Orok (see further in Benzing 1956: 33 §66), cf. [17].
- [130] From LN? See [129].
- [131] No accent in R. LN saŋn 'an 'smoke' [354a], SN saŋn 'a(n) (180b), KUN saŋn 'an (188a), Brylkin <coмнгја> (17a). All of these words are probably unrelated to Venjukov's form, for it is very hard to understand how someone could have misheard /-lya-/ (vel sim.) instead of /-ŋn'-/.
- [132] KUN sefan 'catfish' (189a).
- [134] No accent in R. Venjukov translates 'he' in both R and F, but this is obviously wrong, see for instance SN *n'aani* ~ *jaan'i* 'he', *n'aaci* ~ *jaaci* 'they' (54), or KUN *n'oani* 'he', *n'oati* 'they' (64). Venjukov's form suspiciously resembles LN *siingi* (365a), SN *s'iingi'* (56), KUN *sini* 'your(s)' (64), etc., where -*ni* corresponds to the alienable possession marker. This must be Venjukov's personal interpretation, for Brylkin clearly stated in his grammatical sketch that there is no third person pronoun (6 §7), and therefore Venjukov could not have taken it from Brylkin's materials.
- [135] No accent in R.
- [137] This form is neither KUN nor SN. Venjukov notes that it was gathered in the Lower Ussuri area. Haplology may explain Venjukov's testimony. As is well known, one of the most salient features of SN is the syncope of medial vowels in three-syllable words, e.g. SN gätku 'instrument to rumpling skin (Russian кожемялка)' vs. LN gäjiku < */gädiku/ (vid. i.a. Sem 1976: 28), thus one can assume */sugdăta/ > */sugd(t)a/. See a very extensive quotation of materials in SSTMJa II: 118, vid. i.a. Ewenki sugjanna, Negidal sogjana, Ulcha sugdata id.
- [138] No accent in R.
- [139] No accent in R.
- [142] With *akanye* (/a/ for unstressed /o/ in Russian pronunciation). From LN or perhaps a Manchurism (see Norman 1978: 287a s.v. *tuwa* id.)? Northern Tungusic forms reflect /-g-/ as expected, e.g. Literary Ewenki *togo* id., cf. SSTMJa II: 190a-b.
- [143] Cf. LN *cäktäri-* 'to throw vodka around'. This word also refers to other actions belonging to the folkloric sphere, especially those related to the fire (517b). Could Venjukov have misunderstood this tradition and consequently provided a misguided translation?
- [144] Cf. KUN *tikimä* 'swift (a k. of bird; Russian стриж)' (193a). It cannot be ruled out that these words are of onomatopoetic (and then not necessarily common) origin.
- [145] F and R do not match, for the last vowel is different, cf. [137].
- [146] No accent in R.

- [147] KUN 'morning, tomorrow' (193a).
- [148] Already Brylkin notes the Chinese origin of this word, cf. Chinese 土豆 tǔdòu 'potato'.
- [150] No accent in R. LN and SN 'to go away; to set (the sun)'.
- [152] No accent in R.
- [153] No accent in R.
- [155] Onenko (1980) mentions two different words, namely *woaksa* (92a) and *ŋaaksa* (285a), seemingly dialectal variants. Unfortunately, Onenko does not elaborate further.
- [157] No accent in R. Cf. KUN juläski (175a).

7. Discussion

Venjukov's materials seem to agree with what we know about linguistic sources coming from the Ussuri region. They are complicated, if not confusing, but they basically bear witness to the Upper Amur Nanai dialects. The most telling instances are:

- (I) Kur-Urmi Nanai = Kili pedigree: [14, 23] (see under VII), [47] (see under VIII), [11, 147] (see under XV);
- (II) Sungari Nanai = Kilen pedigree: [5] (see under II), [17] (see under VII), [46, 48] (see under VIII), [59] (see under XVII), [154] (see under IV). A very characteristic feature of Venjukov's materials is the absence of final /-n/ (see Vietze 1969 for a general description of this element in the Tungusic and other surrounding languages), with some possible exceptions, e.g. [12, 17, 28, 43, 51?]. This element is very unstable, especially in Kilen, where it appears only in flexional, derivational processes (that's why in Table 5 it always appears between brackets). It is almost certain that the speaker from which Venjukov elicited the numerals is not the one who helped him with the rest of the vocabulary.

I summarize the results of my analysis in the following table (all forms which speculatively might be assigned to LN have been listed in the "Ambiguous and/or unclear" column):

Sungari Nanai (= Kilen)	Kur-Urmi Nanai (= Kili)	Ewenic (≈ Kili)	Ambiguous and/ or unclear	Unidentified
5, 15, 17, 24, 34, 42, 46, 48, 50, 52?, 54, 59, 67, 71, 72, 73, 74–76, 78–79, 80?, 91, 115, 116?, 128, 132, 135?, 137?, 157?	11, 14, 19, 23, 30, 35, 37, 44, 47–48, 51, 87, 101, 107, 113?, 126?, 140, 147	9?, 12, 18?, 29, 31, 32?, 33, 43, 58?, 102, 104, 110?, 114, 127	1–4, 6, 8, 10, 15, 17, 20–21, 22?, 24–28, 30, 36, 38–39, 40?, 41, 49, 53, 55, 56?, 57, 60–66, 68–70, 77, 81–86, 88–90, 93–99, 100?, 105, 108–109, 111, 117–125, 129, 130, 133, 136, 138–139, 141– 142, 144, 148?, 149–155	7, 16, 45, 56?, 61, 84, 92?, 106?, 112, 131, 134, 143, 145– 146, 156

Table 6. Statistical report of Venjukov's materials according to their dialectal origin.

Instances like [12, 29, 33, 102] point out that Venjukov may had interviewed non-Nanai speakers or that latter researchers working with Nanai failed to record those words. The latter option seems to me highly unlikely. The former, however, actually does not require the presence of other "extra" ethnic groups, since, as many authors have already remarked, the Kur-Urmi and Sungari Nanai dialects present many features in common with the Ewenic (= Ewenki, Ewen, Negidal, Solon, Oroqen, Arman) and Udihe phonologies, on one hand, and with the Nanaic grammar, on the other (vid. i.a. Janhunen 1996: 61-62, 2005: 42, Nikolaeva & Tolskaya 2001: 24, or Doerfer 1975: 57, 60 §2, and his groups "A = Manchu, Ulcha, Nanai" and "B = Udihe, Ewenki, Kili"). For those like Janhunen or Doerfer, who prefer to talk about languages instead of dialects, Kili and Kilen are mixed languages, a very reasonable conclusion from a historical and comparative viewpoint. According to this hypothesis, the existence of "lexical anomalies", e.g. [114], seems to make sense, since parallels for those cases above can easily be found in the Ewenic and Udihe languages. In some cases it must be admitted that the degree of intrusion is very surprising, e.g. [12] */dügiⁿ/ 'four' (vid. i.a. Janhunen 1993: 174, Doerfer 2004: 29[2592], pace Benzing 1956: 101 §114). In this context, it is important to underline the presence of the sound changes */\(\vec{u}\)/ > /i/ and */-g-/ $> \emptyset$, because they are diagnostic of the Southern vs. Northern Tungusic pedigree of a given item (for the relevancy of these sound changes, see Georg 2007).

8. Conclusion

In summary, taking into account the linguistic criteria presented in §4, we can conclude that the language in Venjukov's materials can be identified with the Sungari and Kur-Urmi Nanai dialects (or the Kilen and Kili languages, respectively). Many of the unclear and ambiguous instances detected in Venjukov's word-list seem to reflect typical Ewenic features, which in the context of Nanai dialectology means that they are closer to the Kur-Urmi varieties (= Kili).

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 = 1st, 2nd, 3rd person PT = Proto-Tungusic

F = French version of Venjukov's R = Russian version of Venjukov's

word-list word-list

KUN = Kur-Urmi Nanai SG = singular LT = Literary Nanai (Najxin) SN = Sungari Nanai

POSS = possessive

References

Aalto, Pentti 1976: G. J. Ramstedts Onkor-solonisches Wörterverzeichnis (I). – *Rocznik orientalistyczny* 38: 31–41.

Aalto, Pentti 1977: G. J. Ramstedts Onkor-solonisches Wörterverzeichnis (II). – *Rocznik orientalistyczny* 39: 55–84.

An = 安俊 [Ān Jùn] 1986: 赫哲语简志 [Hèzhéyǔ jiǎnzhì]. 北京: 民族出版社 [Běijīng: Mínzú chūbǎnshè].

Avrorin = Аврорин, В. А. 1959: *Грамматика нанайского языка*, т. 1. Москва – Ленинград: Издательство Академии наук СССР.

Avrorin = Аврорин, В. А. 1961: *Грамматика нанайского языка*, т. 2. Москва – Ленинград: Издательство Академии наук СССР.

Benzing, Johannes 1956: *Die tungusischen Sprachen. Versuch einer vergleichenden Grammatik*, Wiesbaden: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der literatur in Mainz.

Brylkin = Брылкин А. 1861: Зам'ьчанія о свойствахъ языка хозденовъ и ходзенскій словарь. – Р. К. Маак, *Путешествіе по долиню ртьки Уссури*, vol. 1, 204–225. Санкт-петербургъ: тип. В. Безобразова и комп.

Doerfer, Gerhard 1973: Das Kur-urmiische und seine verwandten. – *Zentralasiatische Studien* 7: 567–599.

Doerfer, Gerhard 1977: Ist Kur-Urmiisch ein nanaischer Dialekt? – Gyula Décsy & Christo D. Dimov-Bogoev (eds), *Eurasia nostratica. Festschrift für Karl Heinrich Menges*, vol. 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 51–63.

Doerfer, Gerhard 1978: Classification Problems of Tungus. – Michael Weiers (ed.), *Tungusica. Beiträge zur nordasiatischen Kulturgeschichte*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 1–26.

Doerfer, Gerhard 1984: Die Körperteilbezeichnungen des Kili. Ein Beitrag zur Frage der dialektologischen Klassifikation. – *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 86: 238–246.

Doerfer, Gerhard 1985: Mongolo-Tungusica. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- Doerfer, Gerhard 2004: Etymologisch-ethnologisches Wörterbuch tungusischer Dialekte (vornehmlich der Mandschurei), Unter Mitwirkung von Michael Knüppel. Hildesheim Zürich New York: Georg Olms.
- Georg, Stefan 2004: Unreclassifying Tungusic. Carsten Naeher (ed.), *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manchu-Tungus Studies*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. Vol. 2, 45–57
- Ikegami, Jirō 1989: The Lower Amur and Sungari Basins–From the Viewpoint of Toponymy and Ethnonymy. – Giovanni Stary (ed.), *Proceedings of the XXVIII Permanent International Altaistic Conference (Venice, 8–14 July 1985)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 123–129.
- Janhunen, Juha 1985: On the diphthongs in Nanai. Hoppo Bunka Kenkyu 17: 103–116.
- Janhunen, Juha 1993: The teens in Jurchen and Manchu revisited. Ulla-Maija Kulonen (ed.), *Festschrift für Raija Bartens zum 25.10.1993*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 215. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. 169–183.
- Janhunen, Juha 1996: *Manchuria. An Ethnic History*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 222. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.
- Janhunen, Juha 2005: Tungusic: an endangered language family in Northeast Asia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 173: 37–54.
- Kałużyński, Stanisław 1971a: Solonisches Wörterverzeichnis nach F. V. Muromskis handschriftlichen Sprachaufzeichnungen (I). *Rocznik orientalistyczny* 34.1: 39–77.
- Kałużyński, Stanisław 1971b: Solonisches Wörterverzeichnis nach F. V. Muromskis handschriftlichen Sprachaufzeichnungen (II). *Rocznik orientalistyczny* 34.2: 15–56.
- Kazama = 風間伸次郎 [Kazama Shinjirō] 1996: 「ヘジェン護の系統的位置について」 [Hezyen go no keitōteki ichi ni tsuite]. 『言語研究』 [Gengo Kenkyū] 109: 117–139.
- Kazama, Shinjiro 1998: Genetical position of Hezhen. Osahito Miyaoka & Minoru Oshima (eds), *Languages of the North Pacific Rim* 4. Suita: ELPR. 115–131.
- Kormušin = Кормушин, И. В. 1998: Удыхейский (удэгейский) язык. Москва: Наука.
- Kotwicz = Котвичъ, Вл. 1909: Матеріалы для изученіа тунгусскихъ нарѣчій. І. Образцы языка сунгарійскиъ гольдовъ. *Живая Старина* 18.2–3: 206–218.
- Lie, Hiu (1978): Solonisches Material aus dem Huin-gol. Nach [S. Kamimakise] Sprachmaterial umgearbeitet, annotiert und herausgegeben. Michael Weiers (ed.), *Tungusica. Beiträge zur nordasiatischen Kulturgeschichte*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 120–178.
- Ligeti, Louis 1959: Les mots solons dans un ouvrage chinois des Ts'ing. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 8: 201–239.
- Маак = Маак, Р. К. 1859: Путешествіе на Амуръ, совершенное по распоряжению Сибирскаго отдъла Императорскаго Русскаго географическаго общества. Санктпетербургъ: В тип. К. Вульфа.
- Menges, Karl 1964: Bemerkungen zum Bikin-Dialekt des Nanaj. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 35: 198–203.
- Menges, Karl 1980: Die nānaj-tungusischen Materialen von Lipskij-Val'rond in Leningrad. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 52: 87–100.
- Michell, John & Robert Michell 1865: *The Russians in Central Asia*. London: Edward Stanford & Charing Cross.
- Nikolaeva, Irina & Maria Tolskaya 2001: A Grammar of Udihe. Berlin: Mouton.
- Norman, Jerry 1978: *A Concise Manchu-English Lexicon*. Seattle London: University of Washington Press.
- Onenko = Оненко, С. Н. 1980: *Нанайско-русский словарь*. Москва: Русский Язык.

- Onenko = Оненко, С. Н. 1986: Русско-нанайский словарь. Москва: Русский **Я**зык.
- Poniatowski, Stanisław 1923: Materials to the Vocabulary of the Amur River Gold. *Bibliotheca Universitatis Liberae Polonae* 10: 1–11.
- Romanova & Myreeva = Романова, А. В. & Мыреева, А. Н. 1968: Диалектологический словарь эвенкийского языка. Материалы говоров эвенков Якутии. Ленинград: Наука.
- Rozycki, William 1994: *Mongol Elements in Manchu*. Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series 157. Bloomington: Research Institute of Inner Asian Studies.
- Sem = Сем, Л. И. 1976: Очерк диалектов нанайского языка. Бикинский (уссурийский) диалект. Ленинград: Наука.
- Skurlatov = Скурлатовъ, И. 1899: Матерьялы для словаря тунгузскихъ нарѣчій. *Жива Старина* 9.1: 251–262.
- Smoljak = Смоляк, А. В. 1975: Этнические процессы у народов нижнего Амура и Сахалина. Середина XIX начало XX в. Москва: Наука.
- SSTMJa I & II = Цинциус, В. И. (ed.) 1975–1977: Сравнительный словарь тунгусо-маньчжурских языков, 2 т. Ленинград: Наука.
- Sunik = Суник, О. П. 1958: *Кур-Урмийский диалект*. Исследования и материалы по нанайскому языку. Ленинград: Успедгиз.
- Tsumagari, Toshir[ō] 1997: Linguistic Diversity and National Borders of Tungusic. Shoji Hiroshi & Juha Janhunen (eds), *Northern Minority Languages: Problems and Survival*. Senri Ethnological Studies, 44. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology. 175–186.
- Vasilevič = Василевич, Г. М. 1958: Эвенкийско-русский словарь. Москва: Государственное издательство иностранных и национальных словарей.
- Venjukov = Venukoff[, M.] 1862: Vokabular der Golde-Sprache. Petermann's Geographische Mittheilungen [= Mittheilungen aus Justus Perthes' geographischer Anstalt über Wichtige neue Erforschungen auf dem gesammtgebiete der Geographie von D^r. A. Petermann] 1862. 109.
- Venjukov = Венюковъ, М. И. 1868: *Путешествія по окраинамъ русской Азіи и записки о нихъ*. Санктпетербургъ: Тип. Имп. Акад. наук.
- Venjukov = Veniukof[, M.] 1872: On the Island of Saghalin (translated by Captain Spalding). *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London* 42: 373–388.
- Venjukov = Венюков, М. И. 1895–1901: *Из воспоминаний*. 3 т. Амстердам: тип. А. Рейфа в Париже.
- Vietze, Hans-Peter 1969: Plural, Dual und Nominalklassen in altaischen Sprachen. Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin 18.3: 481–512.
- José Andrés Alonso de la Fuente <jose.andres25@gmail.com>