

Pre-Hankul Materials, Koreo-Japonic, and Altaic

Alexander Vovin

Although limited in number and thus far underused, Old Korean and Early Middle Korean data are valuable to comparative linguists. This article discusses several lexical items and grammatical morphemes from this body of data and demonstrates their significance for comparative Koreo-Japonic and Altaic studies. The author proposes a number of etymologies for the first time and, in several cases, refines etymologies suggested by others.

It is well known in comparative linguistics that related languages will diverge further and further with the lapse of time. Therefore, it is more advantageous to compare either reconstructed protolanguages or, when possible, the earliest attested written forms of the languages in question. While considerable progress was achieved within the last fifteen years in reconstructing proto-Japanese (Martin 1987, Whitman 1985) and proto-Korean (Ramsey 1991, 1993), and Old Japanese data are widely used for comparative purposes, the use of the Old Korean and Early Middle Korean data prior to the Hankul materials of the fifteenth century for comparative purposes still lags behind. The pre-Hankul materials (all written in sinograms) are limited to twenty-six short poems, of which the earliest was written probably at the end of the sixth century, and the latest at the end of the twelfth century; to a wordlist of 355 or so words from the early twelfth century; to a wordlist of 596 words from the early fifteenth century (both lists written in Chinese transcription); and to certain morphological markers preserved in *Itwu* texts. These data, though limited, still represent a mine of information for a comparative linguist when approached from the viewpoint of an up-to-date Chinese reconstruction.

In this article I am going to discuss several lexical items and grammatical morphemes either not attested in the earliest Hankul materials of the fifteenth century (or later varieties of Korean) or attested in their later (and consequently less transparent) forms and demonstrate their significance for comparative Koreo-Japonic and Altaic studies.

Another well-known fact in comparative linguistics is that a binary comparison may be insufficient in proving a distant genetic relationship. Therefore, I will also use in the present article data from other Altaic languages, although more than half of the etymologies suggested below are shared by Japanese and Korean only.

Most of the etymologies presented here are proposed for the first time, although in several cases I have tried to further refine the etymologies suggested by others.

Lexicon

(1) HEAD 麻帝 (*Kyeylim Yusa* #161), LMC ma tjej (LMC(P) ma tiaj)

One of the seemingly brilliant Altaic etymologies proposed by Ramstedt half a century ago was a comparison of Korean *meli/mali* “head” with Turkic *baş* “id.” (Ramstedt 1949: 146). The correspondence of Korean *-l-* to Turkic *-š-* seems to be ideal and to support one of the most important Altaic nontrivial phonetic correspondences of Turkic *-š-*: Mongolic *-l-*: Tungusic *-l-*: Korean *-l-*: Japanese *-s(i)-* < Proto-Altaic **-l₂-*.¹ Although Ramstedt does not cite the Middle Korean forms *màli* and *mèli* (Yu 1987: 298a, 311a), both attested in the earliest Middle Korean text “Yongpi Echenka” (Song of the Dragons Flying in the Sky), written in the Korean alphabet (1445 C.E.), these forms seem to support his etymology further.

In spite of a superfluous perfectness, however, there are problems on both the Turkic and Korean sides. In Chuvash, a Turkic language that represents the highest split from Turkic and which has a reflex *-l-* for PA **-l₂-* instead of *-š-* found in other Turkic languages, we find the unexpected *puç* “head” instead of the expected **pul*. Ramstedt (1949: 146) and Starostin (1991: 31–32), who follows Ramstedt’s lead, propose a hypothetical Proto-Turkic form **bal₂č* “head,” since Chuvash *-ç-* normally corresponds to *-č-* in other Turkic languages. There is very little, if any, evidence, however, that Chuvash *-ç-* reflects Proto-Turkic or Proto-Altaic **-l₂č-*.

Yet, the greatest problem for this etymology lurks on the Korean side. The great Finnish scholar was, of course, at his time unaware of any pre-Hankul materials. In this particular case, however, one of these materials turns out to be of paramount importance for his etymology. In the

“Kolye pangen” (Korean dialect) section of the *Kyeylim Yusa*, compiled by a Chinese bureaucrat named Sun Mu 孫穆 in 1103, the word in question (*Kyeylim Yusa* #161) is written with the characters 麻帝 (Kang 1980: 210). Kang Sinhang reads the word as *ma-ti* (Kang 1980: 210), but the basis for this reading is anachronistic: the last character, 帝, has had the reading *ti*⁴ only since Early Mandarin times, that is, no earlier than the fourteen century C.E.² Before that, the Late Middle Chinese reading was *tjej, which must be applied in this case.³ I, therefore, tentatively reconstruct the Korean word of the early twelfth century as *matay or *matae, with intervocalic *-t- than *-l-.⁴ In any case, whether one reconstructs proto-Korean *-t- or *-d- in this word, it cannot be cognate with Turkic *bal₂č “head,” because proto-Korean *-t- (or *-d-) does not correspond to Turkic *-l₂-, nor can it correspond to Turkic *-č- or *-l₂č-.

To the best of my knowledge, there is no word *mata or *mada meaning “head” in Turkic, Mongolic, or Tungusic. However, I believe that there is a very likely etymology in Japanese. A myth of Susanowo, recorded in the *Kojiki* (712 C.E.), mentions a monster *Yamata-no woroti* (*woroti* means “serpent”):

是高志之八俣遠呂智每年來喫。今其可來時。故泣。爾問其形如何答曰彼目如赤加賀智而身一有八頭八尾。

This Yamata serpent every year comes to devour [a young girl]. Now is the time [he] might come. This is why [we] are crying. When [Susanowo] asked them what is his shape, [they] replied: “His eyes are like red winter cherries, and [he] has eight heads and eight tails.”

In the *Nihonshoki* (720 C.E.) we have a similar but not identical account:

毎年為八岐大蛇所吞...頭尾各有八岐。

Every year [they] were swallowed by a great eight-forked serpent... [The serpent] had eight-forked heads and tails.

At first sight, there is an obvious contradiction: while the *Kojiki* describes the serpent as having eight heads and tails, the *Nihonshoki* tells us about eight forks: that is, the serpent should have nine heads and nine tails. More careful scrutiny of both texts, however, reveals that the serpent had eight and not nine heads: Susanowo tricks him by placing eight big jars with *sake* for each head, which the serpent drinks, then gets drunk, and is subsequently killed. Therefore, there are eight heads and tails but only seven forks between them. The only way out of this confusion is to assume that *-mata* in *Ya-mata* really means “head” and not “fork.” *Kojiki* usage of the character 俣 “fork” and *Nihonshoki* usage of the character 岐 “road fork” are best explained as cases of *ateji*. It is also likely that by the early eighth century the real meaning of the word

*-mata “head” in *Ya-mata* was already forgotten, and only the context of the myth in combination with simple arithmetic allows us to reconstruct it.

(2) HAIR 麻帝核試 (*Kyeylim Yusa* #162), LMC ma tjej xfajk ɕi' (LMC(P) ma tiaj xfja:jk ɕi')

The first two characters can be identified with the word for “head” discussed above (Kang 1980: 70), but the last word 核試 seems to have no counterparts in later Korean. I tentatively reconstruct EMK *ka(k)si “hair.” The plausible Japanese etymology is MJ *kasira* 3.4 “head” (no OJ phonetic attestations). It seems that the word could also mean “head hair,” as in the following poem by Funya-no Yasuhide (Kokin wakashū 8, 921 C.E.):

春の日の光にあたる我なれどかしらの雪となるぞわびしき

Although I am under the light of the spring's sun, it is sad that my head hair became snow [white].

The *-ra* in *kasira* is likely to be an obsolete suffix, as there are very few, if any, roots longer than two syllables in Japanese (cf. also OJ *pasira* “pillar,” *makura* “pillow,” *sakura* “cherry-blossom,” etc.).

(3) TONGUE 蜎 (*Kyeylim Yusa* #169), LMC xet (LMC(P) xiat)

Yi Kimun has already pointed out that this word corresponds to LMK *hyé* (which has no final consonant) and is transcribed in the *Kyeylim Yusa* with a character that in Middle Chinese had the entering tone with final *-t* like a number of words that end in *-l* in Middle Korean, for example, LMK *múl* “water” corresponds to *Kyeylim Yusa* 沒 (LMC mot, LMC(P) mut), and LMK *púl* “fire” corresponds to *Kyeylim Yusa* 亭 (LMC bot, LMC(P) pñut) (Yi 1957: 399–400). Yi Kimun also compared his reconstructed *kəl “tongue” to Mongolian *kele-n* “id.” However, the actual situation may be more complicated. First, Sun Mu transcribed with characters that had the entering tone in *-t* not only those Korean words that have counterparts in LMK with final *-l*, but also those that have LMK counterparts with final *-t*, *-c*, and *-s* (e.g., LMK *twòth* “pig” corresponds to *Kyeylim Yusa* 突 (LMC tñot, LMC(P) tñut). Yi Kimun was aware of the problem but suggested an idiosyncratic solution, according to which all LMK dental final consonants developed from EMK *-l reflected as *Kyeylim Yusa -t* (Yi 1957: 403). This solution is, of course, impossible, because it suggests that all later varieties of Korean, including LMK and dialects, had exactly the same unmotivated splits from an original *-l into a number of dental consonants. Therefore, LMC *xet* (LMC(P) xiat) representing the word for “tongue” in *Kyeylim Yusa* offers only evidence that there was some kind of dental consonant in the word, lost by the time of Hankul texts. It might have been *-l*, but it could also have been *-t*, *-c*, or *-s*. There is, however, some evidence that the conso-

nant in question might really have been *-t*. The first piece of evidence comes from the distribution of final dentals in LMK: there are many words with final *-l* and *-s*, and some with final *-c*, but very few with final *-t*. It would be strange if *-l* was unconditionally lost in some words but retained in others. Thus, I hypothesize that final *-t* is the dental most likely to have been lost before the fifteenth century. Further research is certainly needed on this proposal, but it seems to me to be a distinct possibility. The second piece of evidence may come from such dialect forms as Hamkyeng *sette*, *settegi*, and *setti* (Choy 1978: 426). LMK *ye*, as also suggested by Yi Kimun in another article, may in some cases come from an earlier **i* (1959). I tentatively reconstruct PK **hit* “tongue” and compare it with OJ *sita* “tongue” < PJ **sita* 2.3. This comparison was first suggested by Whitman (1985: 168), but he reconstructs PK **hyel* with *-l*, following Yi Kimun’s proposal. The correspondence of Korean *hy-* or *hi-* to Japanese *s(i)-* < PA **khi/i-* was proposed by Vovin (1994: 247; cf. also LITTLE below), while Whitman (1985: 168) suggested the correspondence of K **h-* to J **s-* (see BIG below for a more detailed discussion).

Since PJ **sita* 2.3 belongs to a low-register accent class, it is likely to come from pre-PJ **si:ta*, which in its turn may have developed from still earlier ***sirita* according to Whitman’s law of **-r-* loss. The loss of */l/* before */i/* in Korean is not unknown either, so PK **hit* may theoretically come from an earlier ***hilit*. Unfortunately, there is no other internal evidence to prove these suggestions, so they remain speculative, but if my speculation that both forms come from PJK **hirita* is right, then these forms are likely to be cognate to the PM **kele-n* (comparison with Korean first proposed by Yi Kimun 1957: 400) and PMT **xil-ŋu* “tongue” (comparison with Korean first proposed by Ramstedt 1949: 61) and possibly with PT **käl-* “to speak” (comparison with Korean, Mongolic, and Manchu-Tungusic first proposed by Starostin 1991: 292). Thus, it may be that four out of five Altaic branches have the same word for TONGUE, with a likely etymology in Turkic. In any case, whether Japanese **sita* and Korean **hit* are related to the word for “tongue” in other Altaic languages or not, it is clear that this case presents a commonly shared innovation between Japanese and Korean; it is a lexical innovation, if I am wrong in my assumption of **-r-* loss; and it is a commonly shared morphological innovation (suffixed *-ta* in J and *-t* in Korean), if I am right.

(4) RAIN 霏微 (*Kyeylim Yusa* #7), LMC *fji vji* (LMC(P) *fji vji*)

LMK *pí* “rain” is monosyllabic. Its earliest Hankul attestation is from 1447 C.E. (Sekpo VI: 43). Starostin compares it with PMT **pigi-n* (this comparison was first suggested by Vera Cincius [1977: 322]) and PT **yag-mur* “rain” (1991: 283). The Turkic comparison is dubious both

phonetically (difference in vocalism) and semantically (*yag- probably means “to fall,” so *yag-mur is “falling water”). If Ulcha *piwsulu-* “to sound (of a storm)” and Nanai *piwgi-* “id.” belong to the same etymological set as suggested by Cincius (1977: 322), the PMT form should probably be reconstructed as *piwgi-, but the Ulcha and Nanai connections seem dubious to me for semantic reasons. If Starostin’s reconstruction is to be preferred, the tentative development from PK *piGi- > EMK *piwi must be posited for Korean. In any case, a development from an original bisyllabic stem seems to be supported by dialect data: Kyengsang Namdo *piŋi, piŋii*; Cenla Namdo, Kyengsang Namdo, Chwungcheng Namdo, Kangwendo *pui* (Choy 1978: 38), and it definitely improves the external etymology.

(5) MOON 月羅理 (Hyangka IV: 2, XIII: 5), EMC X la li? (EMC(P) X la li’)

The first character is used logographically, so one can only tentatively read it as TO- on the basis of the later LMK *tól* “moon.” Kim Wancin reconstructs this word as *tolal-i* “moon + suffix” (Kim 1986: 84). He further suggests that the word is written completely phonetically as 達阿羅 in Hyangka XII: 9 (Kim 1986: 84), but the latter suggestion faces phonetic obstacles, as pointed out by Yu Changkyun (1994: 769). Yu Changkyun agrees with Kim Wancin that 月羅理 represents stem *tolal* + suffix *-i* (Yu 1994: 444). I will follow their proposal here. An external comparison with OJ *tukiy* “moon” was suggested by Martin (1966: 236, #143) and has been accepted in the field since then. However, Martin’s reconstruction of PJK **tolgyi* is unacceptable for several reasons. First, the PA cluster *-lg- is reflected as -l- in Korean but as -g- (< *-nk-) in Japanese (cf. LMK *pal*, PJ **panki*, PMT **palga-n* “foot”). Second, as the OK form *Tolal* shows, the word was bisyllabic in Korean, and there are no grounds for reconstructing *-i* in the second syllable. There is a Mongolian etymology that I have once suggested (Vovin 1997: 343): WM *tergel-* “to become full (of moon)” (Lessing 1995: 805), *tergel sara* “full moon” (Lessing 1995: 674), *tergel edür* “fifteenth day of a lunar month,” that is, a “day of full moon.” The word is also attested in the *Yuan Chao Bi Shi* (Secret History of the Mongols) in the compound *hula’an tergel udur* “der Tag Roter Glanz” (the sixteenth day of the fourth lunar month) (Haenisch 1939: 149). Reconstruction of the PA vocalism in this word remains problematic, but Mongolian data point to the PA cluster *-rg-. I tentatively suggest reconstructing PA **torgäl* “moon.”

(6) FISH 水脱 (*Kyeylim Yusa* #104), LMC *çyj’ thwat* (LMC(P) *şyj’ thuat*)

Keeping in mind that the vocabulary of the *Kyeylim Yusa* is highly sinicized and has plenty of compounds like “pheasant (Chin.)-bird”

(*Kyeylim Yusa* #82), I believe that the first element in this enigmatic word may be just Chinese 水 “water.” The remaining character, 脫, probably means “fish” by itself, the whole word meaning “water (Chin.) fish.” It is necessary to note that Sun Mu provides quite an unusual *fanqie* for this character: 剔恙切, which is LMC $t^hɛjk jaŋ^c$ (LMC(P) $t^hɛajk jaŋ^c$). This shows that the character should be read as $t^hjaŋ$ rather than $t^hwaŋ$. It probably consists of the root $*thi-$ and suffix $-aŋ$ and shows the independent usage of the word “fish” that later developed into the LMK suffix $-thi$ (K $-chi$), frequently used in fish names, for example, LMK *myel-thi* “anchovy,” K *sam-chi* “kind of mackerel,” *kkong-chi* “mackerel pike,” *kal-chi* “hair-tail.” This $*thi$ “fish” can go back either to $*tVHi$ or to $*HVti$, according to Ramsey’s law. If it is the first case, the possible external etymologies are OJ *ivo* “fish” < PJ $*(d)ibo$ 2.1 and WM *jiya-sun* “fish.”

(7) ABALONE 必 (*Kyeylim Yusa* #107), LMC *pjit* (LMC(P) *pjit*)

This word is not attested in LMK at all. I reconstruct EMK $*pit$. The following external etymology may be possible. PJ $*apanpi$ 3.3 “abalone” (> J *awabi*) looks like a compound with suppressed genitive $-no$: $**apa-n[ɔ]-pi$. The last part of this compound may well mean “abalone” by itself; “X-GEN abalone” therefore might be comparable with the LMK word $*pit$ “abalone.”

(8) TOAD 虻鋪 (*Kyeylim Yusa* #115), LMC $k^hit p^ho$ (LMC(P) $k^hit p^huə$ [ʔ])

The LMK word for “toad” is $twùthèp$ (attested in *Hwunmin cengum haylyey*, 1446 C.E.) or $twùthèpi$ with multiple attestations in later fifteenth-century texts. The later form incorporates the suffix $-i$. The form $twùthèp$, according to Ramsey’s law on the origin of aspiration in Korean, should go back either to PK $*twuKVtep$ or less likely to PK $*twutVKep$. The existence of the *Kyeylim Yusa* form, which I reconstruct as $*kitpe$, is of a great importance, because it allows us to confirm the first choice of phonological development (< $*twuKVtep$) and shows that the first syllable, $*twu-$, is probably a prefix. EMK $*kitpe$ can be compared to PMT $*kītibē$ “toad” (Neghidal *kutuwe/kutuye*, Orok *kutuyə*, Ulcha *kutu/kutue*, Nanai *kutue* “toad” (Cincius 1975: 440a).

(9) LITTLE 胡根 (*Kyeylim Yusa* #349), LMC $xfiə kən$ (LMC(P) $xfiə kən$)

This word is actually attested in LMK as *hwók-on* “little-ATTR” in the *Kwukup pang enhay* I: 33 (1466 C.E.) (included in Yu 1987: 757) and as *hywòk-* “little-ATTR” in the *Sekpo Sangcel* XIII: 53 (1447 C.E.), *Welin Sekpo* II: 51, 72 (1459 C.E.), and in the first edition of the *Twusi enhay* VII: 5; XX: 2 (1481 C.E.), missing from Yu (1987), but included in Nam (1987: 494) and mentioned by Kang Sinhang (1980: 112). Nam Kwangwu also

cites an alternative form, *hyèk* “small,” with multiple attestations starting from the *Sekpo Sangcel* (1447 C.E.) (Nam 1987: 488–89). LMK attestations demonstrate that the forms with *-y-* are older and more widespread (the form *hwók-on* is limited to two instances within the same text). Meanwhile, the *Kyeylim Yusa* form provides evidence that the form *hywòk-* with the back vowel is older, too. That allows us to reconstruct the PK archetype as **hywòk-*, which can be compared with OJ *sukwosi* B “little (in quantity),” reconstructed as **sukwo-si-* in Martin (1987: 841), but probably not to OJ *sukuna-si* B “little (in quantity)” (see the following item, BIG). Martin (1966: 235, #128) compared both J *sukwosi* and *sukuna-si* with K *cak-|cek-* “little,”⁵ although he mentioned the forms cited here as a puzzling doublet set.

(10) BIG 黒根 (*Kyeylim Yusa* #348), LMC *xək kən* (LMC(P) *xəək kən*)

This word is a predecessor of LMK *khí-* < **huku-* as pointed out by Yi Kimun (1991: 17–18) and followed up by Ramsey (1993: 440). Ramsey further suggested that the first syllable may be a separate prefix **hu-*, but I fail to see internal evidence for his morphemic analysis. I believe that this PK **huku-* “big” can be related to OJ *sukuna-si* B “little,” which I analyze as consisting of *suku-* **“big”/“many”* and *na-si* “does not exist.” It is customary in the field to relate OJ *sukwosi* B “little (in quantity)” with *sukuna-si* B “id.” (see, e.g., Martin 1987: 841), but it seems to me that this equation is not unproblematic in spite of the identical semantics, close phonological shapes, and even congruency of accent. The main problem, I believe, lies in the morphology. Martin views *-na-* in OJ *sukuna-si* as the adjectival marker *-na* (1987: 841). This is, however, problematic, as adjectival *na-* is itself a contraction of the attributive form *nar-u* of the copula *nar-* “be,” and the contracted form appears only in Early Modern Japanese (Hamada 1951: 146). Besides, the adjectival *-na* is never followed by the quality verb final marker *-si*. There are, however, a number of Japanese nominal+quality verb compounds that incorporate *-na-si* “does not exist” as the second element: *kagiri-na-si* “limitless” (*kagiri* “limit”), *nasake-na-si* “unfeeling” (*nasake* “pity”), *kokoro-na-si* “heartless” (*kokoro* “heart”), and so on.⁶ Then, by the same token, *suku-na-si* could originally come from **“big/may-not exist.”* The second problem in relating OJ *sukwosi* and *sukuna-si* is of a phonetic nature: for them to be related, OJ *sukwosi* must be a secondary form, coming from **sukuna-si*, with a loss of intervocalic **-n-* resulting in the diphthong **ua* that further contracts into the OJ vowel *wo*. Everything would be fine, but the loss of intervocalic **-n-* has no basis to be postulated for the pre-history of the Japanese language.

There is, however, a potentially weak point in the comparison of

EMK *huku- to OJ *suku-na-*. It is the correspondence of K *h-* to J *s-*. The correspondence was suggested by Whitman (1985: 168) and supported by nine etymologies (1985: 235–36), which the author critically reviewed (Vovin 1993: 340–41), rejecting all of them except the case of LMK *han-olh* “sky, heaven” and OJ *swora* “sky” and the cases where this correspondence occurs before the following /i/ or /y/, which have a different explanation. Thus, this etymology is the second one supporting the K *h-* : J *s-* correspondence, but some more are needed to make it more valid.

Morphology

(11) DATIVE-LOCATIVE MARKER 良中 (Hyangka VII: 3), 也中 (Hyangka IV: 4), 良 (Hyangka V: 1), 羅 (Hyangka VII: 7)

There is a great amount of controversy as to what phonetic value to reconstruct for this marker. Kim Wancin reconstructs 良中 as *-ahoy* (1986: 97), 也中 as *-yehoy* (1986: 81), and 良 as *-r-a* (1986: 91, 94) and treats 羅 as a copula, not as a dative marker (1986: 92, 97, 129). The major fallacy of Kim Wancin’s study is his attempt to squeeze Old Korean data into the procrustean bed of Late Middle Korean phonology without taking into consideration the data from Chinese historical phonology. From this point of view, Yu Changkyun’s fundamental study of Hyangka (1994) is a welcome break with the long-standing tradition of ignoring Chinese historical phonology, although, unfortunately, he chose to rely on Karlgren’s and Zhou Fagao’s now seriously outdated reconstructions. In addition, Yu Changkyun’s reliance on Chinese historical phonology is sometimes inconsistent, so the interpretations below are mostly my own.

Yu Changkyun reconstructs 良中 as *-lakoy* (1994: 591) and 也中 as *-yekuy* (1994: 408) and treats 良 and 羅 as different morphemes (1994: 506, 607, 744–45). The step forward that Yu Changkyun takes in contrast to Kim Wancin is that he tries to read the character 良 consistently as *-la* or *-lan[g]*. This is, of course, the only reasonable solution if one tries to take into account the Chinese evidence and not just decipher Hyangka as if they were LMK texts. I will argue below that 良 and 羅 also represent locative markers and that all four cases represent a single dative-locative marker that I reconstruct as *-la[ng]*.

First, let us have a look at the contexts where these markers occur.

良中 (Hyangka VII: 3)

千手觀音叱前良中

祈以支白屋尸置內乎多

Kim Wancin’s reconstruction and interpretation (1986: 97):

CHYEN SWU KWANUM-s ALPH-**ahoy**

PI-SOLW-ul TWU-no-wo-ta

- [I] am saying [my] prayers
in front of Kwanum with one thousand arms
 Yu Changkyun's reconstruction and interpretation (1994: 574–75):
 CHYEN SWU KWANUM-s **Alakoy**
 PILwo-ki SOLW-wol TWU-no-wo-ta
 [I] am saying [my] prayers
in front of Kwanum with one thousand arms
 My reconstruction and interpretation:
 CHYEN SWU [CUMUN SWON?] KWANUM-s **ALPH-**
lang
 PIL-Gi-ki SOLG-wul TWU-no-hwo-ta
 [I] am saying [my] prayers
in front of Kwanum with one thousand arms
- 也中 (Hyangka IV: 4)
 沙是八陵隱汀理也中
 耆郎矣良史是史蕪邪
- Kim Wancin's reconstruction and interpretation (1986: 81):
 MWOL-i kal-on MUL-SEli-**yehey**
 KILANG-oy CUz-i-wolsi SWUPHUL-iyā
At the bank of the river, where the sand is polished
 The image of [Hwa]rang Ki[pha] is [like] a forest
- Yu Changkyun's reconstruction and interpretation (1994: 407–09):
 MWOLKAY pol-on MUL-SEli-**yekuy**
 KULMOLO-uy CUs-i i-si-so-la
At the bank of the river, where the sand is widely spread
 The image of [Hwa]rang Ki[pha] is [right there]
- My reconstruction and interpretation:
 MWOLGAY-i phall-on NAri-**lang**
 KILANG-uy CUs-i i-si-swo-la
In the river, where the sand is dark (lit.: blue—dark part of the spectrum)
 The image of [Hwa]rang Ki[pha] is [right there]
 (The image of Hwarang Kipha is represented by the reflection of the moon in the water.)
- 良 (Hyangka V: 1)
 東京明期月良
 夜入伊遊行如何
- Kim Wancin's reconstruction and interpretation (1986: 91):
 TWONGKYENG POLK-ki TOLAL-**a**
 PAM TUL-i NOW-NI-ta-ka
In [the light of] the bright moon in the Eastern Capital
 [I] was playing around in the night, and . . .

Yu Changkyun's reconstruction and interpretation (1994: 493):

TWONGKYENG POLK-ki TOL I-**la**

PAM TUL-i NWOL-NI-ta-ka

[It] **is** the bright moon in the Eastern Capital

[I] was playing around deep in the night, and ...

My reconstruction and interpretation:

TWONGKYENG POLK-ki TOLAL-**lang**

PAM TUL-Gi NWOL-NI-ta Wi-ka

In [the light of] the bright moon in the Eastern Capital

[I] was playing around in the night, and ...

羅 (Hyangka VII: 7)

二于萬吾羅

一等沙隱賜以古只內乎叱等邪

Kim Wancin's reconstruction and interpretation (1986: 97)

TWUWUL KOma-n NA-**Yla**

HOton-za SWUMKI-CWU-SYWOSYE NOLI-no-wo-s-to-ya

[It] **is** me, who is blind (lit.: black) in both [eyes].

Please secretly give [me] just one.

Yu Changkyun's reconstruction and interpretation (1994: 574–75):

TWUPWULwu me-n NA-**Yla**

HOton-sa NENCUSi kwoki-no-wo-s-to-la

[It] **is** me, who is blind (lit.: distant) in both [eyes].

Please secretly support [me] just [with] one.

My reconstruction and interpretation:

TWUGwu ma-n NA-la

HOton-sa-un CWUSi kwoki-no-wo-s-to-**la**

Please support [me] by giving just one [eye]

To me, who does not have two.

It is quite clear that the first three cases are completely identical. Yet both Kim Wancin and Yu Changkyun reconstruct at least three, if not four, markers with different phonetic shapes. In addition to another OK locative that I tentatively reconstruct as *-oy*, which has a reflex in LMK, there seem to be too many locative markers in OK. I believe that there is a simpler and more elegant solution: all three markers 良中, 也中, and 良 have the same reading, *-lang*, with 中 playing the role of a semantic determinative and a kind of “patchim” indicating the final *-ng* at the same time. Given the fact that the Hyangka script uses quite a few characters with readings that can be traced not to EMC but to OC (Yu 1994; Vovin 1999) or to Southern colloquial during the Six Dynasties period (Pulleyblank, personal communication), or maybe even to both OC and Southern colloquial, it is not unreasonable to believe that 也 stands for OK *la

(Yu 1994: 315–18) rather than *ya, or at least, has both readings in Hyangka.

The fourth case, I believe, is a dative, and the interpretation of it as a dative makes the text much smoother than interpreting it as a copula. The difference between the first three cases (locative) and the last one (dative) is the final *-ng*, which might have been used as an additional marker of a locative.

The external etymologies are almost self-inviting: first, OJ locative *-ra*, which was rare even in the eighth-century texts (e.g., *idu-ra* “where” in *Man’yōshū* XV: 3689), but managed to survive even in modern colloquial in the expressions *kokora[hen]* and *sokorahen*; and, second, the Tungusic locative *-la:/*-le: (>Ewenki *-la:|le:*, Ewen *-la|[-du]-le*, Solon *-la|le|-lo|-l̥*,⁷ Neghidal *-la:*, Oroch *-la|le|-lo*, Udehe *-la|le|-lo*, Nanai *-la|-le*, Ulcha *-la|[-du]-le*, Orok *-la|-le*).

ABBREVIATIONS

EMC	Early Middle Chinese	OJ	Old Japanese
EMK	Early Middle Korean	OK	Old Korean
LMC	Late Middle Chinese (Miyake)	PA	Proto- Altaic
LMC(P)	Late Middle Chinese (Pulleyblank)	PJ	Proto-Japanese
LMK	Late Middle Korean	PK	Proto-Korean
MJ	Middle Japanese	PMT	Proto-Manchu–Tungusic
OC	Old Chinese	WM	Written Mongolian

NOTES

1. Proto-Altaic *-l₂- phonetically most likely was [-š-] as witnessed by Common Turkic (all Turkic languages but Chuvash) and Japanese, both located on the periphery of the Altaic world.

2. There is another piece of independent evidence that the Chinese characters in the *Kyeylim Yusa* should be read according to their Late Middle Chinese rather than their Early Mandarin readings: it is quite apparent that the Late Middle Chinese final obstruent stops that disappeared in Early Mandarin are still used in the Chinese transcription in the *Kyeylim Yusa*. Thus, for example, the word for “heaven” (MK *hànólh*) is transcribed as 漢捺 LMC *han-naʔ, reflecting the final consonant in the Korean word. The Early Mandarin reading for these characters is *han-nai (Pulleyblank 1991).

3. I use Marc Miyake’s tentative reconstruction of LMC, which is partially suggested in his Ph. D. dissertation (Miyake 1999). It represents a revision of Edwin G. Pulleyblank’s reconstruction of Late Middle Chinese (Pulleyblank 1991) and is referred to in the present article as LMC. Pulleyblank’s reconstruction of Late Middle Chinese, which I also cite (in parentheses), is referred to as LMC(P).

4. Martin 1996: 20, 49 takes this *Kyeylim Yusa* form with *-t- as one of the pieces of evidence for the /t/ > /r/ lenition theory. Although I abstain from a detailed discussion of the lenition theory here, I would like to note passim that an

alternative explanation of the *Kyeylim Yusa* form with *-t- and later forms with -l- as reflexes of the proto-Korean *-d- is also possible. Cf. MK doublets *pâtâh* and *pâlól* “sea” (Yu 1987: 360–61). Unfortunately, the *Kyeylim Yusa* provides only the Chinese loanword *hai for “sea” (#59).

5. This comparison seems unlikely, as Korean initial *c-* does not correspond to J initial *s-* but rather to J initial *t-*.

6. Some of these formations are not transparent, though, exactly as in the case with *suku-na-si*, for example, *adiki-na-si* “wearisome,” where the meaning of *adiki is unclear, but I believe that they are formed on the basis of the same pattern.

7. Solon data are based on Chaoke (1995: 55).

WORKS CITED

- Chaoke. 1995. *Ewenke yu yanjiu*. Beijing: Minzu chubanshe.
- Choy, Hakkun. 1978. *Hankwuke pangen sacen*. Seoul: Hyenmunsa.
- Cincius, Vera I. 1975–77. *Sravnitel'nyi slovar' tunguso-man'chzhurskikh iazykov*, vol. 1 (1975) and vol. 2 (1977). Leningrad: Nauka.
- Haenisch, Erich. 1939. *Wörterbuch zu Manghol und Niuca Tobca'an*. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Hamada, Atsushi. 1951. “Chūsei,” in *Kokugo no rekishi*, Tokieda Motoki hen, 111–57. Tokyo: Tonoe Shoinkan.
- Kang, Sinhang. 1980. *Kyeylim Yusa “Kolye pangen” yenkwu*. Seoul: Sengkyun-kwan Tayhakkyo Chwulphanpu.
- Kim, Wancin. 1986. *Hyangka haytokpep yenkwu*. Seoul: Sewul Tayhakkyo Chwulphanpu.
- Kojiki*. 712.
- Kokinwakashu*. 921.
- Kwukup pang enhay*. 1466.
- Kyeylim Yusa*. 1103.
- Lessing, Ferdinand. 1995. *Mongolian-English Dictionary*. Bloomington: Mongolia Society.
- Man'yōshū*. ca. 759.
- Martin, Samuel E. 1966. “Lexical Evidence Relating Korean to Japanese,” *Language* 42, no. 2: 185–251.
- . 1987. *The Japanese Language Through Time*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- . 1996. *Consonant Lenition in Korean and the Macro-Altaic Question*. Center for Korean Studies Monograph 19. Honolulu: Center for Korean Studies, University of Hawai'i.
- Miyake, Marc H. 1999. “The Phonology of Eighth Century Japanese Revisited: Another Reconstruction Based Upon Written Records.” Ph.D. diss., University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Monghol Niuca Tobca'an*. 1362(?).
- Nam, Kwangwu. 1987 [1960]. *Koe sacen*. Seoul: Ilcokak.
- Nihonshoki*. 720.
- Omodaka, Hisataka. 1967. *Jidai betsu kokugo daijiten*, Jōdai hen. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1991. *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

- Ramsey, S. Robert. 1993. "Some Remarks on Reconstructing Earlier Korean," *Ehak yenkwu*, 29, no. 4: 433–42.
- Ramstedt, Gustav J. 1949. *Studies in Korean Etymology*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne XCV. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Sekpo Sangcel*. 1447.
- Sinla Hyangka*. VI–IX c.
- Starostin, Sergei A. 1991. *Altaiskaia problema i proiskhozhdenie iaponskogo iazyka*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Twusi enhay*. 1481.
- Vovin, Alexander. 1993. "Notes on Some Japanese-Korean Phonetic Correspondences," *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, 3: 338–50 (Stanford: Stanford Linguistics Association).
- . 1994. "Genetic Affiliation of Japanese and Methodology of Linguistic Comparison," *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, 85: 241–56 (Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura).
- . 1997. "Some Japanese Etymologies," in *Indo-European, Nostratic, and Beyond: Festschrift for Vitalij V. Shevoroshkin*, ed. Irén Hegedüs, Peter A. Michalove, and Alexis Manaster Ramer, 342–48. *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, Monograph Number 22. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man.
- . 1999. "Once again on the reading of the Old Korean 尸." *The Emergence of the Modern Language Sciences. Studies on the transition from historical comparative to structural linguistics in honour of E.F.K Koerner*, vol. 2. *Methodological Perspectives and Applications*, ed. Sheila Embleton, John E. Joseph, and Hans-Josef Niederehe. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 289–300.
- Welin Sekpo*. 1459.
- Whitman, John B. 1985. "The Phonological Basis for the Comparison of Japanese and Korean." Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.
- Yi, Kimun. 1957. "Kyeylim Yusa-uy il-kochal," in *Ilsek Yi Huysung sensayng songswu kinyem nonchong*, ed. Yi Pyengki, 393–407. Seoul: Ilcokak.
- . 1959. "On the breaking of *i in Korean," *Aseya yenkwu*, 2, no. 2: 131–37.
- . 1991. *Kwuke ehwi sa yenkwu*. Seoul: Tonga Chwulphansa.
- Yongpi Echenka*. 1445.
- Yu, Changkyun. 1994. *Hyangka pihay*. Seoul: Hyengsel Chwulphansa.
- Yu, Changton. 1987 [1964]. *Yi co a sacen*. Seoul: Yensey Tayhakkyo Chwulphanpu.