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Abstract

Krasheninnikov’s and Dybowski’s recording on Kamchatka – Northern Kuril Ainu dialect are actually word lists. However, since they contain not just lexis, but also phrases it is possible to reconstruct grammar of the idiom. Krasheninnikov’s and Dybowski’s recordings represent different stages of the same dialect, but not different as it probably can be supposed. Grammar of the dialect actually doesn’t differ much from that of other Ainu dialects, but it has some local features: negation is expressed by preposition of eyn while other Ainu dialects use somo as negative preposition; also there seem to be two desiderative forms while other Ainu dialects have one desiderative form only.
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1. Introduction: general notes on the sources

Krasheninnikov word list and Dybowski dictionary are the most important sources on Ainu dialect that was spoken in southern Kamchatka and Northern Kuril Islands (pic. 1). Word list compiled by Krasheninnikov is the earliest data on the idiom and material collected by Dybowski is the latest\(^1\) recording of the idiom before it went out of actual use.

Both of these sources mainly represent lexical level of the idiom. However, these two sources are not just plain dictionaries as far as beside lexical items they provide some information about grammar. Information provided in these dictionaries evidently isn’t sufficient for compiling a complete description of grammar, but it is sufficient for making conclusions about idiom history and about its proximity to a certain group of Ainu dialects.

2. Whether Krasheninnikov’s and Dybowski’s materials describe different idioms?

Sometimes can be met opinion that dictionary of Krasheninnikov and dictionary of Dybowski describe different idioms of Ainu, however, it is just a perfunctory view since both dictionaries evidently describe the same idiom.

Little facts of grammar are represented in both descriptions and especially few are common facts: suffix -pa as marker of plural number of verb and phrasal ending particle wa (these facts of grammar as well as others are considered in 3). These facts are evidences of belonging of both idioms to Ainu language, but they are insufficient for identifying described idioms as different temporal stages of the same dialect.

---

\(^1\) Krasheninnikov managed his field work in Kamchatka in 1737 – 1741 and Dybowski in 1877 – 1883.
Pic. 1 Map representing geographic location of idioms and ethnicities mentioned in text; border of Ainu area in Kamchatka in the time of Krasheninnikov is marked by orange and Itemen area in the same time is marked by green (map has been made after Google map screenshot).

Since there is lack of grammatical evidences in available descriptions so it is reasonable to pay due attention to lexical items; i.e.: to those lexical items that are not common Ainu, but to certain local specific expressions which can be seen only in corresponding idioms.

Below are considered some facts proving that both descriptions represent the same dialect:
(1) амуспе́ (amuspe) “seal” (Krasheninnikov 1994: 188) correlates with амоспи (amospí) [amospi] (Radlński 1891: 68); амуспе́3 literary means “a being with claws”; in Hokkaido dialects амуспе́ means “crab” (Kayano 2005: 35; Ōta 2005: 3).

(2) мичи [mitʃi] “father” (Krasheninnikov 1994: 185) correlates with мичи, мичи, (мици, мичи) [mitsi], [mitʃi] “father” (Radlński 1891: 95); in Hokkaido dialects also can be seen form мичи, but form она is more widely spread.

(3) пойна [poina] “water” (Krasheninnikov 1994: 185) corresponds with p’e (ne) [pe] “water” (Radlński 1891: 103); in Hokkaido dialects form pe also can be seen, but word for water is mainly вакка;

(4) ку́амуспе [amuspe] “stone” (Krasheninnikov 1994: 185) correlates with по́нена (пойна) [поjна] “stone” (Radlński 1891: 104); this word is completely unknown in Hokkaido where word for “stone” is сума (Kayano 2005: 282; Ōta 2005: 207).

(5) рика [rika] “whale” (Krasheninnikov 1994: 188) correlates with рик (рик) (Radlński 1891: 107); in Hokkaido dialects word for “whale” is mainly хумпе while form rica/rik means “subcutaneous fat”, “whale white meat” (Ōta 2005: 178) or “whale meat” (Kayano 2005: 467), and from the other hand form хумпе is unknown in Kamchatka-Kuril idiom.

(6) си́чип [sitʃip] “fish” (Krasheninnikov 1994: 186) correlates with си́чип (сичип) [sitʃip] “salmon” (Radlński 1891: 109); in Hokkaido dialects it would probably be *sicep lit.: “true fish” but such form is unknown.

(7) це [tʃe] “house” (Krasheninnikov 1994: 186) corresponds with це (цө) [tʃe] “house” (Radlński 1891: 73); in Hokkaido word for “house” is цис (Kayano 2005: 305; Ōta 2005: 23).

Some clearly seen differences are superficial, variants of recordings ([amuspe]/[amospi]) can also be seen in some other early descriptions of Ainu language. Also should be taken into account that neither Krasheninnikov nor Dybowski had appropriate linguistic background and they made their recording basing mostly on their own impressions and on the material of the languages they knew.

Thus, both of described idioms use certain expressions that are not seen in other dialects, or that are marginalia in other dialects. I suppose that above shown examples are evidences of sameness of described idioms.

Also there are some examples of backlash and shift of some meanings, for instance:

(8) aany [aapu] “mother” (Krasheninnikov 1994: 185) and aapu, аапу (aany, any) [aapu], [апу] “elder sister” (Radlński 1891: 67); while word for “elder sister” in Krasheninnikov’s dictionary is кса [ksa] (Krasheninnikov 1994: 185), actually it means “my elder sister”, and word for “mother” in Dybowski list is нонно (нонно) [nonno]4 (Radlński 1891: 98); this case is obviously just an issue of natural changes that take place in any living language.

However, it can be noted that Kamchatka – Northern Kuril Ainu dialect didn’t change seriously during about 150 years.

---

2 All examples from Krasheninnikov and Dybowski dictionaries are given in their original forms and accompanied by transcription.
3 Examples of modern Ainu dialects are written in Ainu orthography.
4 In some Hokkaido dialects нонно means “flower”, and in baby speech it means “be good” (Tamura 2000: 265).
3. Main data on Kamchatka – Northern Kuril Ainu dialect grammar extracted from Dybowski’s and Krasheninnikov’s descriptions

Krasheninnikov’s description contains more data on grammar than that of Dybowski. However, in Dybowski’s description also there are some important facts.

3.1. Suffix -ра

As it has been mentioned above in both descriptions are represented plural forms of verbs formed by suffix -ра:

(9) ティパシエンクун фравантаг ткеани тифоррпа. (Krasheninnikov 1994: 112)
[tipsainku fravantag tkeani tifrorpa];

It seems to be distorted recording of the following phrase (written in contemporary practical Ainu orthography):

Cip(1) san-ke(2) ya-[w]-an-ta-ke(3) ani(4) cip-ror-ра(5).

Boat(1) to down(2) near the shore/near the land(3) instrumental particle(4) to sit in a boat much⁶ (5).

Examples with the same suffix -ра can also be seen in Dybowski dictionary:

(10) nojba (нойба) [nojba] (Radlniski 1891: 98); “to turn”, “to twist”; in contemporary orthography: noy-ра;

(11) okonospa (оконоспа) [okonospa] “to hold” (Radlniski 1891: 100); in contemporary orthography: okonos-ра

This feature is common Ainu feature and isn’t specific for any dialect group.

3.2. Phrase ending particle wa

Another feature that is common Ainu is phrase ending particle wa:

(12) кинкаруа [kinkarua] (Krasheninnikov 1994: 187); in practical contemporary Ainu orthography it is k=inkar wa “I look”;

(13) rikanva (риканва) [rikanva] (Radlniski 1891: 107), рикауа [rikanua] (Krasheninnikov 1994: 187) that means “wet”; in contemporary orthography it is rikan wa.

---

⁵ This phrase was text of song sung during a ritual dance performed by Itelmen people; the song and the ritual evidently were borrowed from Ainu; the song and the ritual were about sea hunting.

⁶ Cip-ror-ра literary means “to sit in a boat much”; in Ainu plurality expresses not just with number of subject/agent/patient, but also can express frequency and intensity (Tamura 2000: 39). Also should be noted that this verb is an example of hunters’ euphemism or hunters’ taboo to speak openly about issues related to hunting.
3.3. Unidentified agent prefix an-

Unidentified agent prefix is common Ainu grammatical feature; however, in different dialects different forms of the prefix are used. Particular form of the prefix in Kamchatka – Northern Kuril Ainu is an-:

(14) anep (anen) [anep] (Radlinski 1891: 69) “something eaten”; in contemporary orthography it is: an-e-p.

(15) ankarkar (анкаρκар) [ankarkar] (Ibid.) “prepared”; in contemporary orthography it is: an-ka-r-kar.

This affix shows that Kamchatka – Northern Kuril dialect is rather close to the dialects of Northern and Eastern Hokkaido since the same prefix is represented, for instance, in Asahikawa dialect, but is absent in Southern Hokkaido and Sakhalin dialects.

3.4. Nominalizer

In (3.3) is shown an example with nominalizer -p (example 14) that literary means “thing”; this nominalizer is a common Ainu feature; usually two variants of the nominalizer are represented: -pe/-p (-pe is used after consonant ending of verbal stem and -p after vowel endings); however, in Kamchatka – Northern Kuril dialect only -p form can be seen:

(16) ajkarp (айкарп) [ajkarp] (Radlinski 1891: 67) that means “tool [for] casting bullets”; in contemporary orthography it is: ay-kar-p.

3.5. Negation

As well as in other Ainu dialects negation is expressed by a prepositional particle, but the particle used in Kamchatka – Northern Kuril dialect is much unlike negative particle used in other Ainu dialects:

(17) кмукураа [kmukuruara] “I sleep” (Krasheninnikov 1994: 187); k=mokor wa in practical orthography;

(18) ейн-кмукураа [ejnkukurara] “I don’t sleep” (Ibid.); eyn k=mokor wa in modern practical orthography.

And an example of Saru dialect for contrast:

(19) somo ku=mokor “I don’t sleep”.

This particle eyn seems to be result of influence of some other language: Itelmen or probably Russian.

3.6. Conjugation

As well as in all other Ainu dialects there is conjugation and verbs express grammatical category of number.

---

7 Pic.1  
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9 Pic.1
“You stand”: ea siana (Krasheninnikov 1994: 186); it seems to be a distorted recording of the following form: e=as an wa “you are standing” where an wa is probably an aspectual form.

“They stand”: okaja roski lua (Ibid.); this example obviously was the following phrase initially:

\( \text{okay(1) roski(2) wa(3)} \)

does(1) stand pl.(2) sentence final particle(3).

It seems that [wa]/[ua] became [tua] due to positional assimilation.

At first sight conjugation seems not differ seriously from that of other Ainu dialects, but as far as forms of conjugation were written in a very impressionistic manner and were not separated from aspectual auxiliaries the reconstruction of conjugation will probably be a quite complicated task.

3.7. Desiderative forms

It seems that there are at least two different desiderative in the dialect:

(22) ipekrejke “I want to eat” (Krasheninnikov 1994: 186); in contemporary orthography it is ipe k=rey-ke; rey-ke can probably be interpreted as “to tend to do something”;

(23) kmokonrosiva (Ibid.) is translated as “to sleep” by Krasheninnikov, but this form evidently looks much alike the following:

\( k=mokor(1) rusuy(2) wa(3) \)

I sleep(1) want(2) sentence final particle(3)

Desiderative rey-ke seems to be softer than that of rusuy.

3.8. Possessive forms of nouns

Possessive forms of nouns are formed by adding personal affixes:

(24) “my elder brother” kiyuni (Krasheninnikov 1994: 185); in contemporary orthography: k=yupi

(25) “my younger brother” kaku (Ibid.); in contemporary orthography it is: k=aki.

Also an example of possessive form can be seen in (8).
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