

Hans Adalbert DETTMER (ed.): *Acta Sieboldiana VIII. Ein nachgelassenes Manuskript Ph. F. von Siebolds zu "Nippon" Abteilung VII: Das Mogami Tokunai zugeschriebene Ainu-Wörterbuch*, 2 vols., Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag 2002 (Veröffentlichungen des Ostasien-Instituts der Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Band 33); 1185 pp.

Roy Andrew Miller, Honolulu

This publication of Professor Dettmer's magisterial edition of the Siebold-Mogami Ainu glossary MS in Bochum University's *Acta Sieboldiana* is an important event for Far Eastern philology, in and of itself. Rarely if ever have manuscript materials concerning early linguistic evidence for any of the languages of the Far East been edited and published with as great care, as much attention to detail, and as useful indices and references to all relevant secondary literature as Dettmer has lavished on these rare pages from the recent past. The history of this MS, especially the almost miraculous survival of its content in the form of a microfilm in the Tôyô bunko, is in itself a tale that would do credit to any modern novelist; Dettmer here reconstructs its vicissitudes with exemplary attention to detail at every turn. But of course the great interest and value of these materials are not in their history of troubled transmission but in what they can tell us about the recent history of the Ainu language. On that score especially these two new volumes of the *Acta* will not only be welcomed by linguists, historians, and anthropologists concerned with the Ainu and their culture; they may well also serve as a model for anyone brave enough to attempt an equally precise and useful edition of parallel or similar documentary materials.

Nor is the import of this impressive edition limited to those who may claim competence in Ainu linguistic materials – an admittedly small sphere of scholars to which this reviewer, to his great regret, can lay no claim to be admitted. That small hand of investigators will surely find here new materials sufficient to sustain Ainu studies for at least the coming generation. But that is by no means the only important contribution of these two volumes; and even given the reviewer's handicap in this regard, perhaps he may nevertheless make some small contribution – and in the process may pay due respect to Dettmer's achievement – by elaborating slightly upon certain aspects of a general problem in Far Eastern philology which this publication brings to light, albeit inadvertently.

This is, most briefly put, the question of the underlying assumptions and characteristically uncategorized intellectual mechanisms that in one way or another undergird any and all “Sino-Xenic” linguistic, and especially lexical, evidence from the greater Far Eastern cultural sphere. In the case of many, even hundreds, of languages (too many of which have since disappeared from the earth) such Sino-Xenic evidence is all that we have now or will probably ever have; in the case of many others, as for example Mongolian, that evidence provides a major part of the documentation for historically significant earlier stages of the language without which we would be even harder put than we are to account for relationships and developments among the later attested, and in many cases still living, languages.

The most important lexical resources that immediately come to mind in this connection are of course those of Middle Mongolian, where in the case of the *Secret History* and ancillary lexical compilations we have Sino-Xenic records of extraordinary scope and, by and large, reliability. But having pointed this out, it would at the same time not do to overlook the multiplicity of smaller but in many ways equally valuable Sino-Xenic documents for other non-Chinese languages, including in this latter category both texts arranged in the glossary format, and discrete glosses only found in, and necessarily gleaned from other, principally historical, texts.

In studying all these historical-lexical resources, linguists both East and West have almost always relied upon printed texts; the early discovery and almost universal employment of printing in China have virtually removed the problems of a manuscript-tradition from the purview of those concerned with exploiting the lexical information of the Sino-Xenic materials. To this general dictum there exists, of course, what is very nearly an “exception that proves the rule,” in the form of the *Hua-yi yi-yu* genre of Sino-Xenic vocabularies, some of which have reached us in manuscript as well as (or, instead of) print versions. Printed texts, of course, have their textual-transmission problems just as do manuscripts. But in general, it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that none of the Sino-Xenic documents, valuable though they be, and unique witness though they provide to early stages of a given language (as e.g. in the case of the *Secret History*) have been the subjects of the same meticulous variety of text-critical editing that Dettmer has here lavished upon the Mogami glossary of Ainu. In this his work stands alone, and will remain that way for some time, or at least until a scholar of commensurate gifts of patience and precision turns to other Sino-Xenic resources.

Problems of text-transmission and text-criticism are not the only questions that must be considered if and when other Sino-Xenic exemplars are reinves-

tigated, as many of them deserve to be, along the same lines as Dettmer's edition; there is also the problem of the nature of semantic manipulation within the traditional Chinese lexicographic tradition, and of detecting its impact upon the data handed down to us in the Sino-Xenic bilingual (or, multilingual) sources. Most existing studies of Sino-Xenic texts have been approached with the somewhat simplistic working-assumption that when a Chinese text says, in effect, that "[Chinese] $X =$ [foreign] Y ," it is to be understood as meaning just that, no more and no less, i.e., " $X = Y$ ". But to operate with that unsupported assumption is in effect to ignore much of what is otherwise understood today about the rationale of the Chinese lexicographic tradition, and by the same token, about the manner in which that rationale has frequently, or perhaps even always, affected, directed, and more often than not probably deflected the ostensibly neat " $X = Y$ " equations of our texts. In a word, with most, perhaps all of our Sino-Xenic bilinguals, no matter how simplistic their word-to-word confrontations may at first glance appear, we must more often than not be prepared to reckon with the parameters of the vast and antique Chinese lexicographical tradition, and its exegetical lore, out of which in one way or another these texts evolved.

The textual-transmission problems inherent in these documents are thus not their only facet that scholarship has largely neglected; the same is by and large true of the complex nature of their apparently straight-forward semantic equations, which frequently are rather more than — or at least somewhat different from — what they may at first glance appear to be. This aspect of the texts has to date received but little notice in scholarly circles; the only important exception to this general statement familiar to this reviewer is that provided by Ch. Harbsmeier in his chapter on "Dictionaries in Traditional China," in Joseph NEEDHAM, *Science and Civilisation in China*, Vol. 7. Part I: *Language and Logic* (Cambridge UP, 1998), pp. 65–84. There, after correctly emphasizing that "lexicography proper in China is historically and essentially linked to the tradition of writing commentaries or glosses on old texts", he examines, if only briefly (pp. 82–84), the structure and nature of China's "glossaries of foreign words," concluding that "[a]ll these vocabularies [...] show little semantic perceptiveness on [*sic!*] the words that they do treat" (p. 83).

Far more must eventually be said about the cause-and-effect relationship between the Chinese lexicographical tradition's "essential link" to the exegetical annotation of "old texts" on the one hand and the "lack of semantic perceptiveness" of the Sino-Xenic glossaries on the other; but for the moment Harbsmeier has here quite deftly identified the major dimensions of the

problem, and has provided us with a more than useful clue toward its eventual codification, if not actually its solution.

We need not look far in Dettmer's meticulous and impressive edition for an instance of the point being made here. Thanks to the wholesale *Wechsel der Lemmata* that reordered the original Japanese-Ainu *Ezo hôgen moshiogusa* so that it became the Ainu-Japanese of the *Ezogashima gengo* and in turn the similarly Ainu-Japanese-ordered Mogami Tokunai *Wörterbuch der Aino Sprache* that is the subject of Dettmer's edition (pp. 767, 778), we now find as his second entry (edition p. [3], fasc. p. 7[a], col. 1) Ainu *iutani* glossing Chin. 參宿 *shēn xiù*, and this glossed in turn as "Ein Gestirn".

Ainu *iutani* 'a pestle, pounder' of course appears elsewhere in its own proper place (p. 608, no. 2256: 'Stämpfel', Jap. *kine*), but this only opens the fascinating question of the ultimate connection of these glosses with Chin. *shēn xiù*, which is of course far more than 'ein Gestirn'; indeed it has reference to the triad of prominent stars most visible in our constellation Orion, namely Betelgeuse, Rigel, and Bellatrix.

As these star-names immediately remind us, our own astronomical tradition here embodies an inordinately complicated history of inheritances and borrowings from a wide variety of lexical resources for denominating these stars; we are all familiar with the figures-of-imagination that found here the girdle or belt of Orion, not to mention Orion himself. In the Far East too we have no lack of compelling and innovative linguistic metaphors that in one way or another echo the visual-structural spectacle of the major stars of the constellation Orion. The Manchu pentaglot (ed. TAMURA Jitsuzô et al., Kyoto, 1966, p. 6a, no. 102 = ed. Peking, 1957, p. 27) gives a selection that ranges from the artificially coined Manchu *sebnio* (< Chin. *shēn* + Man. *bonio* 'monkey') through the purely if routinely descriptive Tibetan *lag* 'hand' and eventually the more interesting 'Uighur' *balda* [rd: *balta*] *ulus* 'axe star' (cf. the somewhat complementary if mostly similar inventories in the *Mahāvvyut-patti* [ed. SÁRKÖZI & SZERB, Asiatische Forschungen Bd. 130, Wiesbaden, 1995, p. 235. Ch. 159, no. 3140]).

Within this lexical repertory only the Turkic *balta* forms are deserving of more than routine notice, in part because of the obvious east-west parallels inherent in the visual metaphor involved with this designation, in part also because the Altaic original that must certainly lie behind Turkic *balta* may possibly have an early echo in one of the easily over-looked Chinese designations for the three most prominent stars of Orion, Chin. 伐 *fá* < **bal* < ***bat*.

That term is attested in this sense in the often neglected Kung-yang commentary to the *Chunqiu* (Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Index Series,

Supplement No. 11, Vol. I, rpt. 1965, p. 393, to Duke Zhao year 17). In rendering passages from the *Zhou li* that recast and build upon the same sense of this same word *fá*, E. БИОР (*Le Tcheou-Li ...*, Paris 1851, t. 2, p. 489) was exploring a somewhat later (and already scholastically conflated?) tradition (text in *A Concordance to the Zhou Li, ICS Ancient Chinese Texts Concordance Series, Classics No. 4*, Hongkong, 1993, p. 80, 6.3, line 6). But in that tradition too the *baudrier* ‘sword-belt’ or ‘baldric’ of Orion was never far away (*loc. cit.*, note 6), reminding us once more that behind *baudrier* there eventually lies Lat. *balteus*.

Varro is reported (*apud Charisium*, 1. 28) to have believed this term to be *vocabulum tuscum* ‘an Etruscan word’ — at any rate the Latin apparently has no convincing cognates elsewhere in Indo-European. And so perhaps one day, even if not at the moment, the prototype(s) of Chin. *fá* as documented in connection with Orion may ultimately here lead us lexically back again from east to west.

Much has been written about Assyrian-Babylonian terms for a variety of weapons and weapon-like tools possibly having been borrowed into Indo-European on the one hand, and either independently or perhaps from there, at second-hand as it were, borrowed in turn into various Altaic languages. Most of the relevant literature is assembled in *Konferenser 12, Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien* (Stockholm, 1985), pp. 93–121. The sources examined there still deserve serious consideration, even though most recently S. A. Starostin and his colleagues have dismissed the question of linguistic relationships between Altaic and the ancient Middle East in this particular area of the vocabulary out of hand (*Etymological Dictionary of the Altaic Languages* [Leiden, 2003], p. 898, where the references to important publications by Poppe and Menges are also incorrect).

What Dettmer’s meticulous edition of the Mogami materials has here documented for us is extremely valuable. In contrast to the almost universal visual metaphors hinging upon weapons and other warrior gear that were invoked in the naming of these three most prominent stars in the constellation Orion throughout the Indo-European linguistic realm, it appears that the Ainu saw in their sky a stellar representation of a thoroughly mundane household object — the pestle or pounding-stick. And it was from this peaceful perception that they derived their designation for the most visually striking feature of the Orion asterism, using not only an interesting but certainly also an important term that until now (to judge from Dettmer’s citations of the literature) appears to have escaped the Ainu lexicographers. Fortunately,

however, it has survived in these Sino-Xenic materials now made available by Dettmer.

As usual in the case of stellar designations, the Japanese lexical resources are here disappointing in the extreme, but for all that not without interest if only because, like this Ainu term, the oldest such Japanese lexical item on record also has reference to an entirely useful, non-aggressive tool. This is Jap. *karasukiboshi* ‘the Chinese [or, continental? Korean?] plow star’, first attested “after the 15th century”, then in 1597 and 1775 (²*Nihon kokugo daijiten*, 2000, 3.1076a); considerably later is the even more mundane *mitsu-boshi* ‘three stars’, first recorded in 1775 (*loc. cit.*, 12.760d).

Further, but still in this same connection, we should also note that Dettmer’s edition provides important documentation for Ainu *mukkari* ‘Grosses Beil’ (transcription, p. 391; facs., p. 41b), which the Mogami materials translate with Jap. *masakari* ‘a large axe-like tool’; again, both are lexemes that can only bring us back to the ancient Middle and Near East (see *Konferenser 12*, pp. 113–15 and *passim*). In this same sense of ‘ax’ the Uilta (‘Orok’) Tungus has *masaari* (IKEGAMI Jirô, *Uruiita-go kiso goi* [Sapporo, 1980], p. 26). This may be, as Ikegami believes, a loan from Japanese; but other possibilities surely exist, and this in turn makes Dettmer’s documentation of the Ainu member of the *mukkari* / *masakari* complex all the more important.

This otherwise undocumented Ainu term for the most conspicuous triple asterism in Orion must, as we have attempted to demonstrate, be somewhat laboriously extrapolated from the Sino-Xenic matrix of the Mogami materials. But in many other instances one is struck with the manner in which Siebold’s glosses accurately capture the sense of his Chinese *lemmata*, and / or the sense of the Japanese equivalents with which Mogami worked — more than once. it must be noted, rather more accurately than do many modern sources and studies.

A significant case-in-point is to be found in Dettmer’s number 1332 (transcription p. 362, facs. p. 38a), glossing Ainu *tubiratsuka* with Jap. *kawara* and this in turn with ‘Flussufer’. Quite apart from the equally important question of the sense of the Ainu term, Dettmer’s complete citations here of the earlier notices for this word demonstrate how the understanding of Jap. *kawara* by Western Japanologists (and not a few Japanese as well) has gradually shifted over the past century and a half, and shifted not for the better: Siebold’s ‘Flussufer’ was exactly on target, and goes precisely with Pfizmaier’s 1854 gloss ‘eine von einem Flusse bewässerte Ebene’. But we also learn here how, from that point on, Jap. *kawara* has been routinely misunderstood and mistranslated as, ‘a stony (or, dry) river bed’, and most recently even more

misleadingly glossed by S. E. Martin (*The Japanese Language through Time* [New Haven, 1987], p. 446) simply as ‘riverbed’.

The matter, though more relevant to the history of Japanese than to that of Ainu, is an important one. NJap. *kawara* < OJ *kaFara* is, just as Siebold glossed it, ‘Flussufer’. For centuries in Kyoto (and until modern river-conservancy operations changed this feature of the landscape) it had reference to the flat, plain-like areas on the right bank of the Kamo River, a legal no-man’s-land because of their periodic flooding. Both Siebold and Pfizmaier were right; the word does not, nor did it ever, have reference to the ‘riverbed’. And the precise sense of the word is important, not only for understanding Kyoto placenames, e.g., *kawaramachi*, a commercial area on the bank of (but not in!) the Kamo river, but also for recovering some of the remote history of the language itself, since it is ultimately cognate with Evk. *kewer*, WMo. *keger* ‘steppe’ < Altaic **kebér* (N. N. POPPE, *Vergl. Gr.*, p. 48). Most recently the Japanese etymology has been fully explored in *AOH* 56: 2–4 (2003), pp. 228–29 note 25; STAROSTIN *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 655 have citations of the Altaic reflexes but an erroneous Japanese cognate.

In respect to several other important words as well, Dettmer’s edition painstakingly documents important lexical evidence that should not be overlooked. That some historical connection must once have existed between Ainu *kamui* ‘god’ and Jap. *kami* ‘id.’ has long been obvious to all concerned. With the discovery of documentary evidence for an earlier eight-vowel phonological system for the language recorded in the phonogram orthography of Old Japanese, it became clear that modern *kami* reverted to OJap. *kami* where the final vowel conventionally (and conveniently) transcribed *-i* is historically the result of crasis of a still earlier *-u-* (as preserved, *inter alia*, in such compounding forms as OJap. *kamukaze* ‘divine wind’) and a following *-i*; one way of analysing the *-i* of OJap. *kami* is to see in it a phoneme / *ĩ* /, whose principal allophone was the crasis-diphthong [ü] < [u + i]. In other words, OJap. *kami* was phonetically something along the lines of [kamüj], and this in turn once more put historical linguists in mind of Ainu *kamui*.

Indeed, the similarity of the forms in the two different languages is more than striking. It might even be presented as one of those rare cases in historical linguistics in which a form arrived at by internal reconstruction (involving, to be sure, early written records), *i.e.*, OJap. *kami*, turns out to be supported in detail by data totally unrelated to that same reconstruction, *i.e.*, Ainu *kamui*. In this way especially, the early documentation of Ainu *kamui*, *kamoi* ‘Geist, Gott; Göttliches Wesen’ in the Mogami materials (Dettmer’s number 1103, transcription, p. 299; facs. p. 33a) is of more than routine interest. Most

unfortunately, in recent years it has become the fashion to use a transcription of the Old Japanese phonogram orthography that flies directly in the face of what we know about the facts of the language, and in turn to use this totally misleading transcription as the basis for further even more misleading historical suggestions. Thus Martin (*op. cit.*, p. 435) writes OJap. *kamiy*, which not only contradicts the facts of internal reconstruction within Japanese itself, but also cannot be reconciled with the Ainu form in question. Starostin (*op. cit.*, p. 687) ignores the Old Japanese phonogram orthography and simply writes “OJpn. *kami*”; but at least his reconstructed Proto-Japanese form **kamu-i* shows that he is not unacquainted with the linguistic facts of this problem, and indeed points, as it should, back in the direction of Ainu *kamui*. The precise phonetic testimony of this Ainu form and the support it extends for the methodological assumptions inherent in the received interpretation of the Old Japanese phonogram orthography are both far too valuable to be obscured by capricious miswritings such as “OJ *kamiy*” or “OJ *kami*”.

Discussions of this variety illustrating the value and importance of many of the Ainu forms preserved in the Mogami materials, not to mention explorations of the semantic dimensions and depths of the Sino-Xenic *lemmata* involved on almost every page of this large and handsome edition of the same, might well be extended at great length; but to do so here would surely exceed the competence of the reviewer, not to mention the patience of the reader. Suffice it to say that Orion’s baldric, the Altaic steppes, and the nomenclature of the early Japanese gods are by no means alone in this respect; much more in these pages awaits the discovery and commentary of specialists in many fields. Dettmer initiates a particularly significant portion of his documentation of his materials with the epigram *habent sua fata libelli* (p. 765 note 1). But in consideration of the riches that await the reader of these two volumes, and also because it would not be fitting to conclude a review such as this without a single suggestion for emendation, we will propose that it might have been better to have cited this catchword in its full form: *pro captu lectoris habent sua fata libelli*.