

## **On Para-Mongolic vs. Pre-Proto-Mongolic loanwords in Jurchen-Manchu**

The Tungusic languages incorporate a large number of Mongolic loanwords. Most of these were reviewed by G. Doerfer [1985], who showed that their distribution indicates a gradual infiltration of Mongolic lexicon into Tungusic, with the smallest number of Mongolisms being present in geographically marginal idioms such as Western Ewenki and Ewen. The majority of the loanwords are Post-Proto-Mongolic borrowings into Post-Proto-Tungusic, that is, into the various individual Tungusic languages and dialects. There is also a small corpus of items shared by Proto-Mongolic and Proto-Tungusic, for which the direction of borrowing is more difficult to establish. Ultimately we cannot rule out that there are a few items shared on a genetic basis, though evidence for a binary genetic connection between Tungusic and Mongolic in the context of a distinct language family (“Khinganic”) is still very scarce [Janhunen 1996].

Many Mongolic loanwords are present in only a single Tungusic language. In most of such cases, it is not difficult to point out the Mongolic source. It is, for instance, natural that Barguzin Ewenki has borrowed many words from Buryat, but also from Khamnigan Mongol and/or Dagur [Khabtagaeva 2010]. The only really problematic cases are offered by the Jurchen-Manchu lineage, which has a considerable number of Mongolic elements not present in the other Tungusic languages. Although many of the Mongolisms in later Manchu can be directly related to Post-Proto-Mongolic sources, there are also items that are conspicuously “different” from their Mongolic counterparts. Interestingly, many of these items were not included in Doerfer’s corpus. They are discussed by W. Rozycki [1994], but his conclusions are rather laconic.

Manchu, or Jurchen-Manchu, is notoriously the most “aberrant” Tungusic language, in some respects looking even “non-Tungusic” [Vovin 2006]. Many of the idiosyncracies of Manchu can be explained by assuming interference from Mongolic and Chinese, and the general impression is that most of the specific features of Manchu are innovations — typically, losses of morphological com-

plexity, though it has also been maintained that the morphological “simplicity” of Manchu may in some cases be an archaic retention [Alonso de la Fuente 2011]. However this may be, there has historically been one additional neighbouring language whose influence on Jurchen-Manchu has not been studied in detail — for the reason that the language is extinct. This language is, of course, Khitan, but when speaking of Khitan we also have to consider the possibility that it was only one of several “Khitanic” languages once spoken in the western neighbourhood of Jurchen.

Recent progress in the decipherment of the Khitan Small Script, as summarized by D. Kane [2009], has confirmed that Khitan was a distinct language, related to Mongolic, but clearly separate from the Proto-Mongolic lineage, from which all the other historical and modern Mongolic languages have evolved. Khitan is therefore best classified as “Para-Mongolic”, meaning that it represented a branch collateral to Proto-Mongolic. Since Khitan was the language of a powerful ethnic group, or tribal union, which established the Liao dynasty of Manchuria (907–1125), it must have exerted considerable influence on Jurchen, whose speakers followed the Khitan as rulers of Manchuria under the subsequent Jin dynasty (1115–1234).

We do not know when the Proto-Mongolic and Para-Mongolic lineages were separated from each other, but judging by the differences between Khitan and “regular” Mongolic, the separation must have taken place at least several centuries before the founding of the Liao dynasty, possibly even earlier. We do know, however, when, approximately, the Khitan language became extinct. It was still widely used and even written during the Jin dynasty, and there were Khitan individuals serving under the historical Mongols during the Yuan dynasty (1279–1368). However, there does not seem to be any unambiguous information on Khitan speakers during the Ming dynasty of China (1368–1644), suggesting that, very probably, the language died out already before the new rise of the Jurchen under the name Manchu (1616).

This means that Jurchen-Manchu is likely to have undergone three types of linguistic influence from Khitan, corresponding to the different historical constellations. At the first stage, when the Khitan and the Jurchen coexisted in Southern Manchuria as two distinct ethnic groups, geographically separated by the Liao river [Janhunen 2008],

the influence must have been mainly of the adstratal type. At the second stage, when the Jurchen were subjects of the Liao empire, Khitan is likely to have left traces of superstratal influence on Jurchen. At the third stage, when the political roles were reversed, part of the remaining Khitan speakers were gradually absorbed into the Jurchen speech community leaving, very probably, some traces of substratal influence. Of course, Khitan speakers abandoned their language also in favour of Chinese, as well as, after the rise of the historical Mongols, in favour of "regular" Mongolic.

The Proto-Mongolic lineage seems to have differentiated from Para-Mongolic by way of gradual diffusion towards the north. While the Khitan speech community remained in the original Mongolic homeland in Southwestern Manchuria, the new Proto-Mongolic homeland, from where the historical Mongols started their expansion, was located in Northwestern Manchuria. In the intermediate zone there may have been transitional idioms: we do not know, for instance, what type of Mongolic was spoken by the Tatar confederation, which occupied the territory between the Khitan and the Mongols. Even so, in view of the considerable difference between Khitan and Proto-Mongolic, the linguistic boundary between the two branches is likely to have been sharp, and the two types of Mongolic are unlikely to have been mutually intelligible.

The Jurchen homeland seems to have been located in South-eastern Manchuria (probably extending to Northern Korea), from where the language expanded also to Central Manchuria. It is, therefore, likely that direct contacts between Jurchen-Manchu and the Proto-Mongolic lineage were initiated only after the rise of the historical Mongols. Prior to this period, the Mongolic contacts of Jurchen were limited to Khitan, as well as, possibly, to other Para-Mongolic languages. However, the contacts between Tungusic and Mongolic date back to even earlier times, and irrespective of whether the two language families are ultimately mutually related or not, they contacted with each other already at the level of pre-protolanguages.

We must, consequently, assume that Jurchen-Manchu incorporates three chronological layers of Mongolic influences, deriving from Pre-Proto-Mongolic, Para-Mongolic, and Post-Proto-Mongolic, respectively. In the absence of unambiguous diagnostic features it is not always easy to distinguish between these layers. Even so, items

belonging to the Post-Proto-Mongolic layer can often be identified on the basis of formal or semantic criteria, while items belonging to the Pre-Proto-Mongolic layer are at least potentially revealed by their distribution, which can extend from Jurchen-Manchu also to the other Tungusic languages. The best candidates for Para-Mongolic loanwords are those that are attested only in Jurchen-Manchu, and that, at the same time, show features deviating from the Proto-Mongolic lineage. Para-Mongolic loans in other Tungusic languages are likely to have been transmitted by Jurchen-Manchu.

The linguistic interaction between Para-Mongolic and Jurchen concerned, of course, not only the lexicon, but also structural features, including, perhaps most importantly, phonological developments. Unfortunately, although we know relatively well how Jurchen-Manchu developed from Proto-Tungusic, our understanding of the history of Khitan is still very imperfect, and, in particular, we have no information on how substantial the difference between Khitan and the possible other Para-Mongolic languages may have been. In this situation, it is not always clear whether the special features, especially phonological ones, exhibited by a Mongolism in Jurchen-Manchu are due to internal developments in Jurchen-Manchu, or to developments that had taken place already in the Para-Mongolic donor language.

In many cases, the most difficult distinction to make is that between a Para-Mongolic and a Pre-Proto-Mongolic source language. In this respect, the recent growth of information on Khitan has turned out to yield unexpected results, in that certain formally aberrant items that otherwise would look like good candidates for Para-Mongolic borrowings in Jurchen-Manchu seem to have been absent in the language of the Khitan inscriptions. There are three possible explanations: either (a) the items were lost in Khitan only after they had been transmitted to Jurchen, or (b) they were borrowed from a Para-Mongolic language other than Khitan, or (c) they were borrowed from Pre-Proto-Mongolic before the separation of the Para-Mongolic and Proto-Mongolic lineages. In this paper we shall examine three groups of etymologies:

- (1) Colour terms: Manchu *fulgiyan* [ful-gʷan] 'red', *shanyan* < *shanggiyan* [ʃaŋ-gʷan] 'white' and *niowanggiyan* [nʷaŋ-gʷan] 'green' correspond systematically to Mongolic *\*xulaxan*, *\*cagaxan* and *\*nogaxan*, modern (\*)*ulaan*, (\*)*cagaan*,

(\*)*nogoon*, respectively. The Manchu shapes exhibit both archaic and innovative features [Okada 1962], which might well point to a Para-Mongolic origin. However, the colour terms attested in Khitan are completely different [Kane 2009: 176]. Also, the etymological status of the feminine forms *shahūn*, *niohon*, *fulahūn* is unclear. The same pattern is repeated in Manchu *genggiyen* : *gehun* vs. Mongolic \**gegexen* ‘bright’.

(2) Numerals for the teens: Jurchen-Manchu 11 *omshon*, 12 *jorgon*, 13 †*gorhon*, 14 †*durhon*, 15 *tofohon*, 16 *niolhun*, 17 †*dalhon*, 18 †*niohun*, 19 †*oniohon* are based on Mongolic synthetic forms not attested in the Proto-Mongolic lineage [Janhunen 1993]. Certain phonetic details also point to an origin different from Proto-Mongolic. These might, then, be borrowings from Para-Mongolic. Unfortunately, although the basic numerals of Khitan correspond to Mongolic [Janhunen 2012: 118–119], the phonetic shapes of the Khitan items for the teens are unknown, and the way they are written with logograms suggests that were expressed analytically (10 + 1 etc.).

(3) Random items: Many other “irregular” parallels between Jurchen-Manchu and Mongolic must be Para-Mongolic loanwords. However, in most cases they cannot be verified against the extant Khitan corpus. We may distinguish three types of cases: (a) items which, like Manchu *fomo-ci* ‘stockings’ vs. Mongolic \**xoima-su/n*, are simply not attested in Khitan, (b) items which, like Manchu *aisin* ‘gold’ vs. Mongolic \**altan* (< \**alton*) vs. Khitan †*nigu*, exhibit a totally different etymon in Khitan, and (c) items which, like Manchu *fon* < \**pon* ‘time’ vs. Mongolic \**xon* ‘year’ vs. Khitan †*po*, correspond to Mongolic in form and to Khitan in meaning.

## References

- Alonso de la Fuente 2011 – *Alonso de la Fuente J.A.* Tense, Voice and Aktionsart in Tungusic: Another Case of »Analysis to Synthesis«? Wiesbaden, 2011. (Tunguso-Sibirica; Bd. 32.)
- Doerfer 1985 – *Doerfer G.* Mongolo-Tungusica. Wiesbaden, 1985. (Tungusica; Bd. 3.)

- Janhunen 1993 – *Janhunen J.* The teens in Jurchen and Manchu revisited // Festschrift für Raija Bartens. Helsinki, 1993. P. 169–184. (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne; Vol. 215.)
- Janhunen 1996 – *Janhunen J.* Prolegomena to a comparative analysis of Mongolic and Tungusic // Proceedings of the 38th Permanent International Altaistic Conference (PIAC), Kawasaki, Japan: August 7–12, 1995 / Ed. by G. Sary. Wiesbaden, 1996. P. 209–218.
- Janhunen 2008 – *Janhunen J.* Liao: A Manchurian hydronym and its ethno-historical context // *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia*. 2008. Vol. 13. P. 89–102.
- Janhunen 2012 – *Janhunen J.* Khitan: Understanding the language behind the scripts // *Scripta*. 2012. Vol. 4. P. 107–132.
- Kane 2009 – *Kane D.* The Kitan Language and Script. Leiden, 2009. (Handbuch der Orientalistik. Sect. 8; Vol. 19.)
- Khabtagaeva 2010 – *Khabtagaeva B.* Mongolic elements in Barguzin Evenki // *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*. 2010. Vol. 63, № 1. P. 9–25.
- Okada 1962 – *Okada H.* Color-names in Manchu // *American Studies in Altaic Linguistics*. Bloomington, Indiana, 1962. P. 225–227. (Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series; Vol. 13.)
- Rozycki 1994 – *Rozycki W.* Mongol Elements in Manchu. Bloomington, Indiana, 1994. (Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series; Vol. 157.)
- Vovin 2006 – *Vovin A.* Why Manchu and Jurchen look so non-Tungusic? // *Tumen jalafun jecen aku: Manchu Studies in Honor of Giovanni Sary* / Ed. by A. Pozzi, J.A. Janhunen, and M. Weiers. Wiesbaden, 2006. P. 255–266. (Tunguso-Sibirica; 20.)