

José Andrés ALONSO DE LA FUENTE¹
ORCID: 0000-0002-4926-7385

“Just for the Sake of Comparison”. Some Thoughts on Batchelor’s Linguistic Skills and the Validity of His Ainu Language Data²

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14746/sijp.2022.68.1>

ABSTRACT

When describing John Batchelor’s Ainu language data, it is a trope in the field to dismiss them out of hand due to Batchelor’s lack of linguistic training. Some specialists, however, consider such a statement an exaggeration. Whereas it is undeniable that the Ainu texts composed by Batchelor for indoctrination purposes are less than satisfactory, excerpts of oral tradition recorded by him (or under his supervision) are as good as those which have been gathered in more recent times in full agreement with contemporary linguistic conventions. In order to show that this is indeed the case, the author compares the text of an oral composition which has come down to us in two versions: one by Batchelor, the other by Bronisław Piłsudski. It turns out that both versions are virtually the same. Since Piłsudski’s linguistic skills have been universally praised (and rightly so), it naturally follows that there exist instances like the present one when Batchelor’s Ainu language data must be approached with more respect than it is usually done.

KEYWORDS: Ainu language, language documentation, oral tradition, dialectology, philology

¹ José Andrés Alonso de la Fuente (Ph.D. in Linguistics, 2012, University of the Basque Country) is an associate professor at the Institute of Linguistics, Translation Studies and Hungarian Studies of Jagiellonian University. His main research interests focus on the typology and history of Northeast Asian languages. Contact: jose.delafuente@uj.edu.pl.

² The author gratefully acknowledges the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and corrections, and the editors for their advice. Responsibility for any errors is, of course, mine alone.

Introduction

It has become a generalized practice that whenever the Ainu language data gathered by John Batchelor (1854–1944)³, the Anglican English missionary who lived among the Ainu for more than 60 years, is mentioned, there must be a remark to the effect that this language data is faulty, to put it mildly. The most common explanation behind the cautionary statement amounts to Batchelor’s lack of linguistic training. While not denying that one needs to approach Batchelor’s Ainu language data critically, many specialists seem to agree that such a negative judgement is an exaggeration (see, e.g., Cortazzi 1997: 121–122 or CWBP-3: 795 fn. 387).

This contribution does not seek to restore Batchelor’s credentials as a linguist, nor to offer the interested reader a full assessment of Batchelor’s contributions to Ainu linguistics. The main goal of this brief contribution is to show that some of the language data published by Batchelor deserve as much consideration as the data gathered by other specialists whose linguistic talents are beyond any doubt. To do so, below the author compares two versions of a text, in origin an oral narration: one by Batchelor, and the other by Bronisław Piłsudski (1866–1918), a famous Polish scholar⁴. To all appearances, the versions were published independently. Those who had a chance to witness the linguistic abilities of both gentlemen unanimously agree that Piłsudski’s abilities were superior (see, e.g., Dudarec and Latyšev 2002: 163, 165, where they echo Waław Sieroszewski’s testimony)⁵. Be as it may, both versions turn out to be virtually the same.

The structure of the paper is as follows: first, both versions of the text are introduced as well as the circumstances in which they were recorded and published (§§1–2). Then the author proceeds to the linguistic analysis of the text from a comparative perspective (§3). The fact that Batchelor and Piłsudski worked on two different cultural areas of the Ainu world which, in terms of language, are (were) markedly different, i.e., Hokkaido (Batchelor) vs. Sakhalin (Piłsudski), occupies a significant place in the discussion

³ Three birth dates can be found in the literature: 1853 (e.g., CWBP-3: 794 fn. 387), 1854 (e.g., AG-II.A: 551), and 1855 (e.g., Cortazzi 1997: 113). Here the author provides 1854 because this is the year that Batchelor himself gives in his autobiographical accounts (see, e.g., 2000: 13 §3).

⁴ To the best of my knowledge, this has never been reported, much less discussed, in the existing literature.

⁵ Needless to say, it is not the intention of this brief contribution to offer a psychological profile of Piłsudski or Batchelor, or what could have been the relationship between the men (it seems they were on good terms and respectful to each other, see, e.g., CWBP-3: 793 fn. 375).

section (§4). The paper ends with conclusions.

1. Version 1: Bronislaw Piłsudski

Piłsudski informs the reader (1912: 96 / 126) that he wrote down the text in January 1903. He took dictation from a 28-years old male called Sisiratoka from Taraika, a small settlement in East Coast Sakhalin. It seems that Sisiratoka spoke in a way to make things easier for a foreigner (see remarks in 1912: 53/83). Unfortunately, it is no easy task to identify what passages might have been “smoothed” by Sisiratoka (but, as argued below, this may be irrelevant to the text under scrutiny).

The original Ainu text and Piłsudski’s English translation (verbatim) are reproduced below, neither of which was given a title. Note that all diacritic marks in Piłsudski’s original semi-phonetic notation have been removed in Figure 1, for they are irrelevant for present purposes.

<p>Kotankes kotan an. Kunne ajnu utara asipaxci, Kotankes arapexcakeva unzi nen-an tononampe nupuri kata an. Utara mokoro, simma utara pajki, suj sirukunne, suj Kotankes-un nispa asin, suj inkara, suj unzi nen ampe an.</p>	<p>(There) was the village of Kotankes. In the night the people went out (of the house and) from the other side of the river Kotankes (there) was (seen) upon the mountain a luminous thing like a fire. The people slept, the next day the people rose, again the darkness (came), again the rich man of Kotankes went out, again he looked (forth), again a thing like a fire was (seen).</p>
<p>Tani cise oxt ahun, macihi caxcanki kokana. Nea maxneku caxcankihe asinkejke, hokohokore, sikaxka ne ejajkara. Naxte asin. Neja Kotankes arapexcakene pecika, nupuri kaskene rikin, samaketa rikin.</p>	<p>Now (he) entered (his) house (and) asked (his) wife for a woman’s loin-cloth. The woman took out a loin-cloth and gave (it) to (her) husband; (he) made himself an eye-shade (of it). Afterwards (he) went away. (He) crossed the Kotankes river, (came) to the other side (of it), ascended the mountain and ascended near (the luminous thing).</p>

<p>Mavehe jufke, nukarajke, cuf nen an. Nani u, tura san. Kunne neva kajki tonon nen an. Cise oxta tura ahun. Nani pirikahno ama, amate suj asinke. Nukarajke, nin cuf na, tonocux na, suj asiri cux na oxta an.</p>	<p>The spirit (thereof was) mighty; when he saw, (it had) the form of a luminary. (He) took (it) quickly (and) brought (it) home. (It was) night, nevertheless (it) was like the day. (He) bore (it) into the house. At that moment (he) put (it) carefully (into a box); having put (it in after some time he) took (it) out. When (he) looked upon (it there), were within (it): one (luminary) like the moon in the last quarter; another, like the sun, another like the new moon.</p>
<p>Taha rehe ne ampe cux-noka-un kani, kamui ranke tane. Tani paxno anike, tani emujke kamui canka hemaka. Tani Kotankes-ta Sitorikajnu oxta an. Tan kamui ranke nax-kane utara eucaskoma.</p>	<p>(People) name these: ‘the metal images of the luminaries’; behold the things sent down by the gods. At present, all these talismans have definitively lost (their) might. Now they are in the village of Kotankes in (the house of) Sitorikajnu. The people relate thus the tradition about those things, sent down by the gods.</p>

Figure 1. Piłsudski’s transcript and translation of Sisiratoka’s text (Piłsudski 1912: 96–97 / 126–127).

2. Version 2: John Batchelor

Batchelor’s version was published as part of his 1924 collection of *uwepeker* (generally, ‘edifying stories’), an anthology of texts intended for those who wish to learn the Ainu language. Batchelor explains that “[t]he following lore was written down for me by an Ainu whom I myself had taught to write with the Roman alphabet nearly forty years ago” (1924: [1])⁶. The identity of this collaborator, however, remains unknown.

Batchelor introduces the text (1924: 71) with the following remark: “I was

⁶ In this passage Batchelor indirectly refers to his work at the Hakodate school, where he instructed many Ainu how to write their language in the Roman alphabet (see, e.g., Siddle 1996: 127).

some years ago in an Ainu village where a meeting was being held. One of the speakers, a young Ainu woman, gave the following illustration speaking in Ainu and Japanese mixed. The story comes from Saghalién and I give it here as it fell from the lips of a real Saghalién Ainu”. Based on this description, it is difficult to assert whether Batchelor wrote it down himself, or, as he claimed in the prologue (see above), one of his collaborators did it for him. The original 1924 publication bears the subtitle “As told by one of themselves”, therefore, perhaps it would be best to assume that the text was retold by his no less mysterious collaborator.

Be that as it may, there is no information that could help us to be more specific about the year when the meeting took place, where it happened, or who is the woman that served as a consultant for Batchelor’s collaborator. Even worse, it is unclear whether the woman was a speaker of Sakhalin Ainu (SA) or Hokkaido Ainu (HA). Batchelor remains silent on this issue. Likewise, it is unclear what exactly Batchelor meant by “Ainu and Japanese mixed”, as the Ainu text provided by Batchelor shows no traces of Japanese whatsoever. As for the true value of Batchelor’s remark “fell from the lips of a real Saghalién Ainu”, see the linguistic analysis in §3.

Batchelor provides titles for both the original in Ainu and the English translation. Figure 2 shows Batchelor’s paragraph numeration and the typo(s) (see §3 for details).

Chup-noka-un-kani.	The Metal with Luminary Forms.
1. Kotankes kotan an. Kunne ainu ashippa-atchi. Kotankes ara pet chake wa unchi nen an to no ambe nupuri kata an.	1. There is the village of Kotankes. At night the people went out. On the top of a mountain across the stream a fiery object shone like the day.
2. Utara mokoro; shimma utara paiki. Shui shirikunne; shui Kotankes un nishpa ashin. Shui ingara; shui unchi nen ambe an.	2. The people slept; the next day they got up. Once more it became dark; again a certain gentleman of Kotankes went out. He looked again; and once more there was the thing like fire.
3. Tane chisei otta ahun. Machihi chakchanke kokana.	3. He now went into the house and asked his wife to lend him an apron.

<p>4. Neia matneku chakchangehe ashinge ike hokuhu kore. Shik-atka ne eyaikara. Naktek ashin. Neia Kotankes ara pet chake ne peichika. Nupuri kashke e-ne rikin. Samaketa rikin.</p>	<p>4. The woman took one out and handed it to her husband. He made for himself an eyeshade with it and went out. He waded to the other side of the village stream. He ascended to the top of the mountain. He came close up to the place where it was.</p>
<p>5. Mawehe yupke. Nukar'ike, chup nen an. Nani uk. Tura san. Kunne ne wa ka iki, to no nen an.</p>	<p>5. The effect was great. On looking at it, it was like a luminary. He took it at once. He descended. Though it was then night it shone like day.</p>
<p>6. Chisei otta tura ahun. Nani pirika no ama. Amatek shui ashinge. Nukar'aige, nin chup na, to no chup na, shui ashiri chup na otta an.</p>	<p>6. He entered the house with it. He put it away carefully. Having put it away he took it out again. On looking at it, he saw in it a waning moon, a sun, and a new moon.</p>
<p>7. Taha reihe ne ambe CHUP-NOKA-UN-KANI. Kanui range ta ne. Tani pak no an ike; tani emuige kamui chanka hemaka. Tani Kotankes ta Shitorek ainu otta an. Tani kamui range nak na ne utara euchashkuma.</p>	<p>7. The name of this object is THE METAL WITH LUMINARY FORMS. It was sent down by the gods. It is in existence now; but its glory has completely waned. It is now in the possession of Shitorek ainu at Kotankes. The people teach us that this object was sent down by the gods.</p>

Figure 2. Batchelor's transcript and translation (verbatim) of the text (Batchelor 1924: 71–73, text nr 38).

3. Linguistic Analysis⁷

In terms of linguistic features, the language of Piłsudski's text (PT) and Batchelor's text (BT) belongs to the Sakhalin group of dialects. This may be

⁷ Explanations and references will be kept to a minimum so that the discussion does not deviate from the primary aim of the paper, that is, to show that (part of) Batchelor's Ainu language data deserves (sometimes) serious consideration.

self-evident from the fact that (a) the overwhelming majority of Bronisław Piłsudski's Ainu language data comes from Sakhalin, and (b) Batchelor, in the introductory remark to his text, says that the narration comes from Sakhalin. However, Batchelor showed little concern for dialectal distinctions along his career and his version of the text, as reproduced in the 1924 booklet, looks atypical, to say the least, for a Sakhalin composition. In Table 1, Piłsudski's and Batchelor's Ainu texts are again reproduced, this time with the tabulation of sentence-like units to make the comparison more explicit.

PT	#	BT
Kotankes kotan an.	1	Kotankes kotan an.
Kunne ajnu utara asipaxci,	2	Kunne ainu ashippa-atchi.
Kotankes arapexcakeva unʒi nen-an tonon ampe nupuri kata an.	3	Kotankes ara pet chake wa unchi nen an to no ambe nupuri kata an.
Utara mokoro, simma utara paiki,	4	Utara mokoro; shimma utara paiki.
suʒ sirukunne,	5	Shui shirikunne;
suʒ Kotankes-un nispa asin,	6	shui Kotankes un nishpa ashin.
suʒ inkara,	7	Shui ingara;
suʒ unʒi nen ampe an.	8	shui unchi nen ambe an.
Tani cise oxt ahun,	9	Tane chisei otta ahun.
macihi caxcanki kokana.	10	Machihi chakchanke kokana.
Nea maxneku caxcankihe asinkejke, hokoho kore,	11	Neia matneku chakchangehe ashinge ike hokuhu kore.
sikaxka ne ejaikara.	12	Shik-atka ne eyaikara.
Naxte asin.	13	Naktek ashin.
Neja Kotankes arapexcakene pecika,	14	Neia Kotankes ara pet chake ne peichika.
nupuri kaskene rikin, samaketa rikin.	15	Nupuri kashke e-ne rikin. Samaketa rikin.
Mavehe jufke, nukarajke, cuf nen an.	16	Mawehe yupke. Nukar'ike, chup nen an.
Nani u,	17	Nani uk.
tura san.	18	Tura san.
Kunne neva kajki tonon nen an.	19	Kunne ne wa ka iki, tonon nen an.
Cise oxta tura ahun.	20	Chisei otta tura ahun.
Nani pirikahno ama,	21	Nani pirika no ama.
amate suʒ asinke.	22	Amatek shui ashinge.
Nukarajke, nin cuf na, tonon cux na, suʒ asiri cux na oxta an	23	Nukar'aige, nin chup na, tonon chup na, shui ashiri chup na otta an.
Taha rehe ne ampe cux-noka-un kani,	24	Taha reihe ne ambe chup-noka-un-kani.
kamui ranke tane	25	Kanui range ta ne.
Tani paxno anike,	26	Tani pak no an ike;

tani emujke kamui canka hemaka.	27	tani emuige kamui chanka hemaka.
Tani Kotankes-ta Sitorik-ajnu oxta an.	28	Tani Kotankes ta Shitorek ainu otta an.
Tan kamui ranke nax-kane utara eucaskoma.	29	Tani kamui range nak na ne utara euchashkuma.

Table 1. Line-by-line comparison of PT and BT.

BT contains one obvious typo: #25 ⟨kanui⟩ for †kamui. Two other instances, however, could be seen as either typos or inconsistencies by Batchelor (or his collaborator?): #16 ⟨Nukar'ike⟩, in spite of having the correct form later, cf. #23 ⟨nukar'aige⟩, and #29 ⟨nak na ne⟩, perhaps for †nak kane (Batchelor himself gives this form in his dictionary, see 1938: 311 s.v. Nakkane).

In regards to the discrepancy in #29 *tan kamuy ranke* (PT) vs. *tani kamuy ranke* (BT) (translation is the same: ‘sent down by the gods’), it is unlikely that this is the case of a typo like in the above instances. There is enough evidence to assume that Piłsudski’s notation in #29 faithfully records the (optional, rare) elision of /i/ when this vowel is unstressed and appears between consonants (even across word boundaries)⁸, that is, /tanĩ.kamuy/ > [tan.kamuy]⁹. Whether Batchelor was aware of this phenomenon, one cannot tell. Had he found such a syncopated form, it is entirely possible that he would have rewritten it in analogy to the other instances of sentence-initial *tani* ‘now’ (~ HA *tané* < tan-(h)i {DEICTIC-time}), see Hattori 1964: 246 [1], which here should not be confused with the regular *tan* DEICTIC [‘here; this’]).

Before addressing the most substantial points, a few words are in order regarding the English translations and some other less relevant aspects of the published texts (idiosyncratic spellings, phonetic free-variation), but which are nevertheless of some interest from a comparative viewpoint.

Discrepancies in the translation are minimal, and the primary reason behind the differences is mainly stylistic/idiomatic. Batchelor always strides for texts with literary flavor, whereas Piłsudski follows the original Ainu very close at the expense of elegant prose. See, for example, #3 *unci nen* ‘like a fire’ (PT) vs. ‘like the day’ (BT). The word *unci* refers only to fire. Accordingly, this is the only meaning provided even by Batchelor himself in his dictionary (1938: 532b s.v. Unchi). However, Batchelor goes for

⁸ The loss of (unstressed) /i/, sometimes /e/, can be observed in a variety of situations, e.g., Vj(♯)C > VC, unvoicing between unvoiced consonants under Japanese influence, etc. (for a summary with examples and references, see AG-I.A: 55–56, 73–74 sub §§10c, d, 13g, etc.).

⁹ The author would like express my gratitude to one of the anonymous reviewers for his remarks on the first version of this account which was formulated in an unclear manner.

‘day’, perhaps in an attempt to create a more apt metaphor in English (although in #8 he favors the literal translation: ‘like fire’; both PT and BT agree that #19 *to-no nen* means ‘like (the) day’, which contains a derivate of *to* ‘day’). The same logic applies to, among others, #6 *nispa* ‘rich man’ (PT) vs. ‘gentleman’ (BT), #10 *caxcanki* ‘(woman’s) loin-cloth’ (PT) vs. ‘apron’ (BT), or #23 *nin cux na* ‘the moon in the last quarter’ (PT) vs. ‘a waning moon’ (BT)¹⁰. While admittedly fascinating, this issue falls beyond the scope of this paper.

The interpretation of Batchelor’s ⟨ei⟩ remains elusive (see, e.g., Tamura 2013: 232 = [1981]: 12). The sound – or a group of sounds – indicated by this spelling convention corresponds to regular ⟨e⟩ in other sources, Piłsudski’s included (Table 2). Whatever the explanation might be, it seems unrelated to the SA vs. HA opposition, and therefore, it will not be pursued here. The same is valid in the case of the /o ~ u/ alternation in #29, this time not the doing of Batchelor’s spelling but a well-known variation across Ainu dialects (see, e.g., AG-I.A: 83 sub §15i).

BT	#	PT	(TEXT) GLOSS
cise	9, 20	chisei	house
pecika	14	peichika	to cross over a river
rehe	24	reihe	name
eucaskoma	29	euchaskuma	teach

Table 2. Vowel discrepancies.

Coming back to the more relevant features, these can be divided according to their nature: phonological, morphological, and lexical.

Two phonological traits clearly set SA apart from HA: (a) debuccalization of certain consonants (/p t k r/) in final position or as first members of a sequence of two (that be either in natural clusters or across word boundaries), and (b) vowel length¹¹.

¹⁰ As for the translations of #16 *mawehe yupke* ‘the spirit (is) mighty’ (PT) vs. ‘the effect (is) great’ (BT), which contains *maw* ‘breath, wind, air’ (affiliative forms *maw-e* and *maw-ehe*, cf. SA *mawe isam* ‘to perish, die out’, with *isam* ‘not exist’, etc.), this reflects Batchelor’s reticence to reveal a facet of Ainu beliefs (see, e.g., Ölschleger 1993: 145–148), rather than an effort on his behalf to achieve any degree of literacy. The same is valid for #27 *tani emuyke kamuy canka hemaka* ‘all these talismans have definitively lost (their) might’ (PT) vs. ‘but its glory has completely waned’ (BT).

¹¹ These have been extensively discussed in the literature. The reader is referred to AG-I.A: 19–21 sub §4[.3] and 67–69 sub §13b for a basic presentation of the facts and a summary of the most relevant literature.

Vowel length in Piłsudski’s East Coast Sakhalin is a thorny issue which cannot be addressed in detail here.

Debuccalization, however, is clearly noted by Piłsudski with ⟨x⟩ (or ⟨f⟩) when the segment in question is preceded by /u/) or Ø, the latter especially in final position¹². BT, on the other hand, shows no examples of debuccalization. Table 3 shows a few instances extracted from the two versions of the text.

PT	#	BT	(TEXT) GLOSS
asipaxci	2	ashippa-atchi	(people) went out
arapexcakeva	3	ara pet chake wa	across the stream
oxt ¹³	9	otta	in
caxcanki	10	chakchanke	loin-cloth, apron
naxte	13	naktek	thereupon
nani u	17	nani uk	(he) took (it) immediately
amate	22	amatek	to put, place
cuf na ~ cux na	23	chup na	both the moon and...

Table 3. Sakhalin Ainu debuccalization.

From a morphological viewpoint, one of the most salient features of SA is the existence of various strategies to express plurality (see, e.g., AG-I.B: 425–428 sub §101.1, cf. noun plurality on pp. 164–167, esp. 165–166 sub §37, and Nakagawa 2022). For plural argument marking, SA makes use of the suffix V^o-*xci* (sometimes *-xsi*), like in #2 *asipaxci* ‘(they) went out’ (here C^o-*axci*). This form is based on *asin* SG vs. *asip* PL ‘go out’ (cf. #13 *asin* or #22 *asin-ke* CAU.SG; see, e.g., Hattori 1964: 243[58], 244[59]) which, as can be easily inferred, already codify action plurality via suffixation of *-n* vs. *-p*. The most notable difference between PT and BT is the lack of *utara* ‘group, people, etc.; NOUN.PL’ in the same line #2.

As far as vocabulary is concerned, a diagnostic item for the positive identification of SA against HA is *unci* ‘fire’ (see §3). The word is attested only in SA and the Hokkaido dialect of Sōya (Hattori 1964: 105 [51]), where many speakers of SA were historically relocated in recent times. The most interesting item, however, is #10 *caxcanki* ‘(woman’s) loin-cloth’ (or ‘apron’ in Batchelor’s translation)¹⁴. Although it is traditionally described as

¹² In today’s convention all instances are indicated with either ⟨x⟩ or ⟨h⟩ (= [x h uϕ], etc.). The former is here adopted to harmonize with Piłsudski’s materials.

¹³ PT ⟨oxt⟩ ‘in, at’ (< otta < or=ta {place=LOC}) undergoes vowel crasis when followed by *ahun* ‘enter’.

¹⁴ The etymology of this word is unknown, although there might be a tenuous connection to *cak* ‘to (burst) open’, since the use of this sort of garment, which serves as a talisman

a lexeme documented only in Piłsudski's materials (see, e.g., Ōtsuka et al. 2008: 17a), Batchelor included it in his dictionary, where, curiously enough, one finds final *-i*, with a spelling partly resembling that of Piłsudski's, rather than *-e*, like Batchelor gave in the text (1938: 68a s.v. Chakchanki).

4. Discussion

The conclusion that PT and BT are virtually the same text is unescapable even after the most cursory examination. It should not necessarily come as a surprise, for oral narrations that, having been recorded on different occasions from different narrators, show striking similarities are not unheard of. Similarities, however, are usually accounted for by invoking geographical proximity. This explanation does not seem to be available in the present case: Piłsudski worked on (East Coast) Sakhalin, whereas Batchelor's main concern was the various Ainu traditions scattered through southern Hokkaido. There are no additional examples of a narration across La Pérouse Strait (which is only 42 km long) with variants whose degree of similarity would be of a comparable magnitude to the one observed here has been reported so far¹⁵.

No evidence supports the assumption that Piłsudski and Batchelor worked with the same consultant or a group of related consultants (e.g., members of the same family, etc.). It is known that Piłsudski managed to gather some linguistic data during his visit to the Hidaka region in the summer (June 20th – September 24th) of 1903 as part of the so-called “Sieroszewski-Piłsudski

too, is a sign of maidenhood (see definition by Batchelor [1938: 68a s.v. Chakchanki] ‘a female's apron. These were formerly made of bark thread’, cf. Piłsudski's ethnographic remarks in 1912: 97–98 note 5).

¹⁵ In the 1880s, Batchelor gathered a series of narratives which were published as instalments in the famous *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* between 1889 and 1893. One of these narratives, traditionally known as “Song of a Swordfish”, exists in many variants. All of them seem to come from the same region (Hidaka and Horobetsu). Kanturuka, an Ainu from Biratori, recited one version for Batchelor in 1880 (see Batchelor 1889: 123–127, text nr IV). Another version was dictated by Nitani Kunimatsu to Itsuhiko Kubodera in 1935 (see Kubodera 1977: 316–318, text nr 68). When these two versions are compared, only the first four lines turn identical: ⟨Okikurumi / Samai un guru / Utura ine / Repa gusu ariki⟩... (BT) vs. ⟨Okikurmi / Samai-un-kur / u-tura hine / repa kusu arki⟩... (Kubodera's text). The remaining lines of the song show significant differences in wording and they do not lend themselves to direct comparison, though it is undeniable that both versions stem from the same tradition (cf. Kindaichi 1967-1: 389–397, where BT is compared with another two versions, and the discrepancies start appearing already within the fourth line). Incidentally, this is another of a few examples where Batchelor's Ainu data can be set in contrast with the data supplied by contemporary specialists.

Hokkaido Expedition” (for Waław Sieroszewki’s account of the event, see CWBP-3: 661–699)¹⁶. As for Batchelor, he visited Sakhalin in 1907 after the Japanese government granted him permission (see, e.g., Batchelor 2000: 145–146). Some of his collaborators, like, for example, his Ainu teacher Penri (Hiramura Penriuku), visited Sakhalin as well (see, e.g., Batchelor 2000: 84). They could have, in theory, provided him with information on SA.

It seems highly unlikely that Piłsudski would have shared language data with Batchelor, or the other way around, as there is no evidence whatsoever to support such an exchange. Likewise, it would be preposterous to suggest that Batchelor could have fabricated his version of the text by “restoring” the non-HA features (mainly debuccalization) present in Piłsudski’s version as published in his 1912 book (which Batchelor knew; see, e.g., Batchelor 2000: 62, where he cites from it).

It remains unknown what the extent of Batchelor’s knowledge of Ainu dialectology is, although he was most certainly aware of lexical differences between HA and SA (see, e.g., Batchelor 2000: 74, where he provides some examples for the sake of illustration, or his well-known dictionary, which contains many SA forms; see his own remarks on this issue [Batchelor 1938: 16–21] or Tamura 2013: 228–229 = [1981]: 9)¹⁷.

As it turns out, there is no need to resort to plagiarism or falsification as the explanation of the similarities between the two texts. One can make a case that the language in BT represents a mixed dialect. Unfortunately, there are no exact matches to identify it with. However, the possibility that something resembling the language of BT existed is not far-fetched in the least from what is known of Ainu dialectology. Piłsudski himself included three texts in his 1912 book that show traces of HA influence¹⁸. Two of them were

¹⁶ For the materials gathered in Hokkaido, see the inventory in CWBP-3: 263 and the excerpts that follow (e.g., on pp. 339–341, 343–345, etc.). The whereabouts of some of those materials remain unknown (see, e.g., CWBP-3: 253). Notwithstanding this last caveat, Kotani’s remark that “[d]uring his brief stay in Hokkaido [...] Piłsudski did not collect any Ainu materials” (1995: 74) needs to be reconsidered.

¹⁷ When Batchelor and Piłsudski met in Sapporo, the only language they could chat in was Ainu (Batchelor 1938: 3). Unfortunately, one cannot evaluate how fluid, elaborate or in-depth these conversations between Batchelor and Piłsudski were. Based on this fact alone, statements about the homogeneity of Ainu (see, e.g., CWBP-3: 793 fn. 375) or the extension of Ainu dialectal knowledge by Batchelor and Piłsudski are or would seem unwarranted.

¹⁸ This influence, however, is admittedly minimal. In one text, Piłsudski (1912: 161–162 / 191–192) notes the use of the name *Samayekur* (HA) instead of *Yayresupo* (SA), which designates “a certain demi-god”. This peculiarity aside, the language of the texts is

recited by a couple who lived for some time somewhere in Hokkaido (Piłsudski 1912: 161–162/191–192, 176/206). More importantly, the consultant who dictated the third text claimed to have learned it in Sōya (Piłsudski 1912: 199/229). This is the same area (the northern tip of Hokkaido) mentioned above in regards to the word *unci*, that is, in the context of a lexical item which, although diagnostic of SA, turns out to be documented in Hokkaido as well due to the later relocation of SA speakers. Thus, there is some room to speculate that the woman with whom Batchelor’s collaborator worked came from, or spent some time in Sōya. She may have adopted some features of the original narration in SA (e.g., vocabulary and some morphology) while retaining most of the salient features of her HA native dialect. This would explain, among others, the lack of debuccalization.

Conclusions

The linguistic analysis conducted above shows in no uncertain terms that Batchelor’s Ainu language data can be valuable, in some cases at least as much as the language data gathered by other authors whose linguistic skills have never been questioned. In the case under study, since Piłsudski is universally regarded as an excellent linguist, it naturally follows that Batchelor’s text, which is virtually identical to that of Piłsudski, must be properly (re)evaluated as a genuine piece of Ainu language.

Nowadays, it is common practice to use Piłsudski’s SA language data in works devoted to Ainu linguistics, with no caveats regarding its quality. To claim that this is so only because there is not much material in SA to begin with would be proof of ignorance (and academic malpractice). The Ainu language data collected by Batchelor has never received equal treatment. A second look into it may bring pleasant surprises. The form *asipaxci* discussed above is a case in point – it appears to be documented only in Piłsudski’s materials, in the idiolect of Asai Take (Ōtsuka et al. 2008: 11b s.v. *asipaxci*), and the idiolect of Fujiyama Haru (see, e.g., Fujiyama 1976: 24 [twice])¹⁹. Thus, there is one additional attestation of it in Batchelor’s 1924 booklet²⁰. In light of this evidence, careful consideration of the

unmistakably SA: (1) there is systematic debuccalization, (2) use of *-(a)hci* for plural arguments where expected, and (3) presence of lexical items only found in Sakhalin, e.g., *unci* or *mompecisin* ‘fingers’ (cf. *mompēt* ‘finger’ vs. HA *askepet*, see Hattori 1964: 11 [93]).

¹⁹ As one of the anonymous reviewers kindly reminds me.

²⁰ To discern why Batchelor spelled it {ashippa-atchi} is beyond the purpose of this brief article. It suffices to say, however, that there is nothing in the word-formation or history

remaining texts seems in order.

Needless to say, one still knows nothing about how good or bad Batchelor’s practical knowledge of Ainu was in reality, because the text might have been recorded by an Ainu collaborator. Also, the conclusion reached in this paper should not be taken as further motivation for reevaluating Batchelor’s artificial compositions (e.g., his biblical translations), as they are flawed beyond any reasonable doubt (see, e.g., Majewicz 2005: 455a). Those instances aside, the remaining of Batchelor’s Ainu language data will have to be approached on an individual basis, and, hopefully, in a more flexible and open-minded manner.

Non-bibliographical abbreviations and conventions

BT	Batchelor’s text
C°	consonant-ending base
CAU	causative
HA	Hokkaido Ainu
LOC	locative
PL	plural
PT	Piłsudski’s text
SA	Sakhalin Ainu
SG	singular
V°	vowel-ending base
{ }	linguistic glossing
< >	original spelling ²¹

References

AG-I = Dettmer, Hans A. 1989. *Ainu-Grammatik*. Teil I: *Texte und Hinweise*. Vol. 1 (A) + vol. 2 (B). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

AG-II = Dettmer, Hans A. 1997. *Ainu-Grammatik*. Teil II: *Erläuterungen und Register*. Vol 1 (A) + vol. 2 (B). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

of *asipahci* that would account for, or make one expect, the long vowel and geminate consonant that Batchelor’s spelling (<...ppa-a...> seems to suggest. Asai Take, whose SA idiolect clearly distinguished short from long vowels, pronounced it [aciapahteɪ] (see, e.g., sound recording for Asai 2001: 68, lines 23–24).

²¹ Forms in < > are provided only when necessary, otherwise all Ainu forms are standardized (including those from Batchelor’s and Piłsudski’s materials).

Asai 2001 = Murasaki Kyōko (ed.) 2001. *Kaitei Asai Take mukashi banashi zenshū* [Stories by Asai Take. The complete collection]. Suita: Ōsaka Gakuin Daigaku Jōhōgakubu. | 村崎恭子編訳. 『浅井タケ昔話全集』. 吹田: 大阪学院大学情報学部.

Batchelor, John 1889. “Specimens of Ainu folk-lore”. *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* 16: 111–150.

Batchelor [John] 1924. *Uwepekere or Ainu fireside stories. As told by one of themselves*. Translated by the Ven. Dr. John Batchelor. Tokyo: Kyobunkan.

Batchelor, John 1938 [1889]. *An Ainu-English-Japanese Dictionary*. 4th edition, reprint of 1995. Tokyo: Iwanami-Syoten.

Batchelor, John 2000 [1943]. “Steps by the way or autobiographical notes”. In: Kirsten Refsing (ed.). *Early European writings on Ainu culture: travelogues and descriptions*. Vol. 5. Richmond: Curzon. i–xi, 12–153.

Cortazzi, Hugh 1997. “John Batchelor: Missionary and friend of the Ainu”. In: *Collected writings of Sir Hugh Cortazzi*, vol. 2. London: Routledge. 113–125.

CWBP-3 = Majewicz, Alfred F. (ed.) 2004. *The collected works of Bronisław Piłsudski*. Volume 3: *Ainu language and folklore materials* 2. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dudarec, G. I., V. M. Latyšev 2002. “Èkspedicija V. Seroševskogo i B. Piłsudskogo na o. Hokkajdo v 1903 g.” [The Sieroszewski–Piłsudski Hokkaido expedition of 1903]. *Izvestija Instituta Nasledija Bronislava Piłsudskogo* 6: 137–176. | Дударец, Г. И., В. М. Латышев. ‘Экспедиция В. Серошевского и Б. Пилсудского на о. Хоккайдо в 1903 г.’. *Известия Института наследия Бронислава Пилсудского*.

Fuyijama 1976 = Murasaki Kyōko (ed.) 1976. *Karafuto ainugo* [The Sakhalin Ainu language]. Tokyo: Kokushokan kōkai. | 村崎恭子. 『カラフトアイヌ語』. 東京: 国書刊行会.

Hattori Shirō (ed.) 1964. *Ainugo hōgen jiten* [Ainu dialect dictionary]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten. | 服部四郎編. 『アイヌ語方言辞典』. 東京: 岩波書店.

Kindaichi Kyōsuke 1967 (1931). *Yūkara-no kenkyū/Ainu jojishi* [A study of yukar: Ainu epic songs], 2 vols. Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko. | 金田一京助著. 『ユーカラの研究・アイヌ叙事詩』. 東京: 東洋文庫.

Kotani, Yoshinobu 1995. “Contributions to Ainu material collections by John Batchelor, B. Pilduski’s contemporary”. *Linguistic and Oriental Studies from Poznań* 2: 73–81.

Kubodera Itsuhiko 1977. *Ainu jojishi: Shinyō, seiden-no kenkyū* [Ainu epic songs: a study in venerated stories]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten. | 久保寺逸彦編著. 『アイヌ叙事詩神謡・聖伝の研究』. 東京: 岩波書店.

Majewicz, Alfred F. 2005. “The Bible and prayer in Ainu”. In: Danuta Stanulewicz, Roman Kalisz, Wilfried Kürschner, Cäcilia Klauđ (eds.). *De lingua et litteris: Studia in honorem Casimiri Andreae Sroka*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego. 453–465.

Nakagawa, Hiroshi 2022. “Verbal number”. In: Anna Bugaeva (ed.) *Handbook of the Ainu Language*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 573–612.

Ölschleger, Hans Dieter 1993. “John Batchelor’s contributions to Ainu ethnography”. In: Joseph Kreiner (ed.). *European studies on Ainu language and culture*. München: Iudicium. 137–150.

Ōtsuka Rie, Ueno Airi, Kurashige Yumi, Nakata Kyōhei, Yamashita Shingo, Sakata Arisa (eds.) 2008. *Saharin ainugo jiten. Furoku: Ainugo Kushiro-Shironuka hōgen, Tokachi hōgen, wa-“ai jiten* [Sakhalin Ainu dictionary. With appendices: dictionaries of the Kushiro-Shironuka and Tokachi dialects, and a Japanese-Ainu dictionary]. Asahikawa: Hokkaidō Kyōiku Daigaku. | 小塚梨恵編. 『サハリンアイヌ語辞典. 付録: アイヌ語釧路白糖方言・十勝方言・和愛辞典』. 旭川: 北海道教育大学校.

Piłsudski 1912 = Piłsudski, Bronisław 1998 (1912). *Materials for the study of the Ainu language and folklore*. In: Alfred F. Majewicz (ed.) 1998. *The Collected Works of Bronisław Piłsudski*. Volume 2: *Ainu language and folklore materials*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 5–272.

Siddle, Richard 1996. *Race, resistance and the Ainu of Japan*. New York: Routledge.

Tamura Suzuko 2013 [1981]. “Bachirā-no jiten-ni tsuite [on Batchelor’s dictionary]”. In: Tamura Suzuko (ed.) *Ainugo-no sekai* [the world of the Ainu language]. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan. 222–242. | 田村すず子. 「バチラーの辞典について」. 田村すず子著. 『アイヌ語の世界』. 東京: 吉川弘文館. (This contribution was originally published in Batchelor 1938, reprint of 1995: [1–21], with date of 14.08.1981).