

Ural-Altaische 12/13

# Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher

Ural-Altaic Yearbook

Internationale Zeitschrift für uralische und altaische Forschung  
International Journal of Uralic and Altaic Studies  
Journal International des Études Ouraliennes et Altaïques  
Международный журнал урало и алтаеведения

Herausgegeben von/Edited by

GYULA DÉCSY

51 (1979)



1979

Kommissionsverlage

Otto Harrassowitz  
Wiesbaden, Germany

Eurasian Linguistic Association  
Bloomington, Indiana

Raun, A.: <i>Molnár, Ferenc A.: On the History of the Word-Final Vowels in the Permian Languages</i> .....	167
Editorial Announcement .....	180
Redaktionsmitteilung .....	180
Index Nominum .....	182

## Old Korean and Altaic

By Roy Andrew Miller (Seattle)

1. The significant progress toward a better understanding of the inter-relationships among the Altaic languages achieved by comparative linguistics in recent years<sup>1</sup> has until now left the question of the status of Korean virtually untouched. General agreement exists to the effect that Korean must be assigned an important role in comparative Altaic studies,<sup>2</sup> but scholarship in the field remains far from a consensus on even the most general scheme in terms of which Korean might be placed into historical relationship with the other Altaic languages.<sup>3</sup> But this should hardly occasion surprise. Almost without exception, all the Korean linguistic data that have been introduced into the study of Altaic comparisons have either been NK, or at the oldest MK; and little or nothing has been made, in this connection, of the light that OK linguistic materials might be able to cast upon all these questions. This has meant, in turn, that comparative Altaic studies, even when they have attempted to take Korean materials into account, have cut themselves off from the oldest Korean written records, and also from whatever these early written records might be able to tell us of the stages of the language prior to MK.

Altaicists are hardly to be blamed in this connection; there are good reasons for the general neglect of OK by comparativists. The written records of OK, such as have survived, are philologically extremely complex, and have not been generally available in editions from which they might be cited with confidence. Even when we set out to exploit these OK written records, we soon discover the sad truth that actually we know very little—and certainly far less than we would like to know—about any of the three

<sup>1</sup>Poppe 1975 is the most recent, as well as the most comprehensive, summation of work in the field; it may be studied with profit together with Poppe 1972 and Poppe 1974, which also supply important overviews of the subject. Menges 1975 is another recent work of importance, with particular emphasis upon Japanese (on which see also Poppe 1975, pp. 180-6).

<sup>2</sup>EAS 1.32-4 and *passim*; VG 6-7; Poppe 1975.175.

<sup>3</sup>E.g., VG 8; Sasse 9-11; Lewin 1976.408; Yi-Lewin, pp. 11-30, 294, for a representative sampling of the different schemata proposed to date.

# URAL-ALTAISCHE JAHRBÜCHER

Herausgegeben von/Edited by

GYULA DÉCSY

Für die in dieser Zeitschrift abgedruckten Beiträge sind die Autoren und nicht der Herausgeber verantwortlich.

Anschrift der Redaktion/Office of the Editors: Gyula Décsy, Indiana University, Goodbody Hall 141, Bloomington, Indiana 47401, U.S.A.

Ohne im voraus erteilte ausdrückliche schriftliche Genehmigung des Herausgebers, dürfen auch Teile dieses Bandes weder übersetzt noch in irgendeiner Form vervielfältigt und verbreitet werden.

© Gyula Décsy, Bloomington, Ind. 1978

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

ISBN 0-931922-00-3

## Inhalt/Contents

### A. AUFSÄTZE/ARTICLES

Brunauer, Dalma H.: <i>Apples and Rosemary: Images and Symbols in Hungarian Folk Poetry</i> .....	66
Décsy, Gyula: <i>Linguistische Sinndeutungen II</i> .....	55
Erdal, Marcel: <i>Die Konverb- und Aoristendungen im Alt-türkischen</i> .....	104
Fáj, Attila: <i>The Prehistory of the River Novel and its Reappearance in Contemporary Fiction</i> .....	81
Miller, Roy Andrew: <i>Old Korean and Altaic</i> .....	1

### B. BERICHTE/REPORTS

Décsy, Gy.: <i>Ein Handbuch der Finnisch-Ugrischen Sprachwissenschaft in russischer Sprache</i> .....	127
Kovacs, L.L.: <i>The Hungarian Collection in the Lilly Library of Indiana University. Part II</i> .....	147
Kunze, E.: <i>Finnische Literatur in deutscher Rezeption</i> .....	150
Martins, E.: <i>Synaesthesia: Results of a Hungarian Research Work</i> ...	133
Reiter, N.: <i>Das Ungarische in der Balkanologie</i> .....	141

### C. BESPRECHUNGEN/REVIEWS

Anttila, R.: <i>Karlsson, Fred: Finnisch Grammar (Swed.)</i> .....	163
Bodrogligeti, A.J.E.: <i>Menges, Karl Heinrich: Volkskundliche Texte aus Ost-Turkistan. Aus dem Nachlaß von N. Th. Katanov</i> .....	169
Décsy, Gy.: <i>Nay, André Du: The Early History of the Rumanian Language</i> .....	177
Décsy, Gy.: <i>Katz, Hartmut: Generative Phonologie und phonologische Sprachbünde des Ostjakischen und Samojedischen</i> .....	176
Kazár, L.: <i>Menges, Karl Heinrich: Altaische Studien II</i> .....	157
Kazár, L.: <i>Unger, J. Marshall: Studies in Early Japanese Morphophonemics</i> .....	155
Kontra, M.: <i>Lotz, János: Sonetti a Corona on Language (Hung.)</i> ....	162
Minn, A.K.: <i>Sebeok, Thomas A.: Cheremis Literary Reader</i> .....	168
Raun, A.: <i>Batalova, Raisa Mihajlovna: Komi-permjackaja dialektologija</i> .....	167
Raun, A.: <i>Birth of Carelia (Finn.)</i> .....	165
Raun, A.: <i>Estonian Poets (Hung.)</i> .....	166
Raun, A.: <i>Makarov, Grigorij Nikolajevich: Russko-karel'skij slovat</i> .....	165

major varieties of OK, i.e., the languages of the 'Three Kingdoms' of Paekche, Koguryō, and Silla.<sup>4</sup>

The Paekche variety of OK is almost entirely lost; of it we can recover only a few precious fragments, important though many of them may be, particularly for the history of the Korean-Japanese linguistic relationship.<sup>5</sup> The Koguryō variety of OK is somewhat better documented; again, only fragments are attested, but they amount to a substantial number, and they have been studied frequently, particularly in recent years.<sup>6</sup> About the Silla variety of OK we are the best informed; here we have substantial literary texts, even though they are preserved in an involved writing system that renders only portions of the texts available to linguistic analysis and comparative work.<sup>7</sup> Since Silla OK is generally believed to have had a particularly important role in the formation of MK,<sup>8</sup> the language is of course of importance even over and beyond the mere fact of its fairly substantial documentation.

2. The paucity of OK linguistic data, and the complexity of their written records, particularly when contrasted with the abundance of MK, together with the rigorously scientific alphabetic documentation in which the bulk of the more recent MK evidence is preserved, have led to an understandable if unfortunate tradition, in Korean linguistic scholarship, of interpreting all OK written records solely in terms of MK. Often, to be sure, this cannot be avoided. When a given OK linguistic form is recorded solely by means of a Chinese character (or characters) used as a logogram,<sup>9</sup> nothing else can possibly be done except to assign to such a logogram the value that it would have if it were being used to write MK instead of OK, i.e., to 'read' it in MK. But this is nothing more than a philological working-practice of desperation, something that is unavoidable in the case of logograms for which we cannot otherwise establish an OK linguistic

<sup>4</sup>The traditional dates for the three Old Korean kingdoms are Paekche, 18 BC-660 AD; Koguryō, 37 BC-668 AD; Silla, 57 BC-935 AD; but all the dates traditionally ascribed to the founding of these three states must surely be adjusted downward. For example, the founding of Paekche may possibly be placed by the tradition as much as 360 years (i.e., six sexagenary cycles) too far back in absolute chronology (Ledyard 235).

<sup>5</sup>The most important of these Paekche fragments are collected and studied in my paper 'Some Old Paekche Fragments,' *Journal of Korean Studies*, 1.1-69 (1979).

<sup>6</sup>Most recently in my paper 'Old Japanese and the Koguryō Fragments, A Re-Survey,' to appear in a *Festschrift for Dr. K. Inoue*, scheduled for publication in Tokyo in 1979.

<sup>7</sup>On the philological problems posed by these texts, see my paper 'The Altaic accusatives in the light of Old & Middle Korean,' in *Altaica, Proceedings of the 19th Annual Meeting of the P.I.A.C. Held in Helsinki, 7-11 June 1976* (Suomalais-ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia, 158) (Helsinki: 1977), pp. 157-69, esp. p. 164.

<sup>8</sup>E.g., Yi-Lewin 99 (cf. also the passage cited *infra* in note 169).

<sup>9</sup>JL 90 ff.; further, in *JJS* 3.261, note 18, 267, note 20 (1977).

form. What has happened is that this working-practice of desperation for logograms has been mechanically carried over into the interpretation of Chinese characters used as phonograms in the writing of OK fragments and texts, and here this methodology is both unnecessary and indefensible. When we are fortunate enough to have at least portions of some OK texts written in Chinese characters used as phonograms, we must rigorously respect the linguistic testimony of these precious materials. It is not only possible but also extremely probable, particularly in view of the time-depths involved, that the phonological systems of the three principal OK languages not only differed one from the other; it is also quite likely that all three of them differed significantly from the much later attested forms of MK. A number of important differences between OK and MK, including certain linguistic features that clearly prove to be of capital importance for clarifying the historical position of Korean with respect to the other Altaic languages, have been almost totally obscured by the routine decision of Korean linguistic scholarship to interpret not only the logograms but also the phonograms of OK texts and fragments as if the language underlying them all were identical with the MK of later centuries. We have no reason to believe that it was.

3. This principle may be illustrated most effectively by studying the evidence of a representative Chinese phonogram frequently employed in surviving OK texts and fragments, particularly those from Koguryō and Silla; the graph in question is [5756],<sup>10</sup> NC *shī*<sup>11</sup> MC *śi*.<sup>12</sup> This graph is commonly employed as a phonogram in the orthography of the *Samguk sagi* of 1145, particularly in chs. 35-37 of this text where, by happy accident, we have preserved most of the Koguryō lexical fragments that have survived, along with other valuable OK data, much of which—particularly

<sup>10</sup>Numbers enclosed in [ ] identify phonograms by means of the numbers assigned to the Chinese characters in R. H. Mathews, *A Chinese-English Dictionary* (Shanghai: 1931; rev. American ed., Harvard University Press: 1944), where if desired the reader may easily locate and verify each of the phonograms whose employment in OK orthography is here discussed.

<sup>11</sup>I.e., modern standard Chinese, transcribed according to the system now commonly used in China, and found, e.g., in the *Xīnhuà zìdiǎn* (Peking: 1976).

<sup>12</sup>I.e., Karlgren's so-called 'Ancient Chinese,' according to the *Analytic Dictionary* (Paris: 1923; reprint Taipei: 1966), but not using the '\*' that each of these reconstructions ought properly to carry. The '\*' has also often been left off of OK and other forms reconstructed on the basis of written records when the context in which the forms appear makes it clear how they have been arrived at.

that relating to the Paekche language—still awaits study.<sup>13</sup> The employment of this phonogram in these portions of this text implies that it was also commonly employed in the orthography of the now-lost earlier written records that must in turn underlie this text, and hence also in the orthographic conventions of the scribes of the Koguryō kingdom itself. As we shall see below, the same conclusions obtain with respect to the use of this graph by Silla scribes recording their own Silla-version of OK. The same graph was also used as a phonogram by Japanese (or Korean?) scribes in writing certain OJ texts, where it has, quite as we would expect from its value in Chinese, the OJ phonetic value of *si*.<sup>14</sup> Both these Korean and Japanese orthographic and scribal traditions—which are in origin probably only a single tradition after all—ultimately derive from the customary use of this phonogram in Chinese transcriptions of Buddhist Sanskrit, where this graph was regularly used to render Indic *ś(i)*,<sup>15</sup> again quite as one would expect. As a phonogram, graph [5756] can hardly be taken as anything except a writing for *ś*, *ṣ*, or *ṣ*, either as a consonant in isolation or followed by *i*.

4. But when we study the OK fragments and texts in the orthography of which this phonogram *śi* is employed, we soon notice that, in a significant number of cases within the corpus, this phonogram *śi* is used to write an OK consonant in words that, in their much later MK and NK cognates, have *l* in the same location within the morphemes in question where this same *śi* appears in OK. There are also cases—important cases, as we shall see—where this phonogram *śi* is used to write an OK consonant that indeed has later cognates of the order of *s* or *z* in MK and NK; but these

<sup>13</sup>The linguistic information preserved in the *Samguk sagi* takes two principal forms. One consists of notices to the effect that a given Chinese-style placename or other geographical designation was devised at some specific time in order to replace an earlier OK placename or geographical designation; in such cases the earlier OK term is included in the text, written in Chinese characters used as phonograms. In such instances the implication is that the later Chinese-style designation not only replaced but also translated the earlier OK designation, thus providing us with both the OK linguistic form, and also with its meaning in Chinese translation. In the other form of notice found in this text, we are told that a Chinese geographical designation was an alternative term for an OK term, again written in phonograms. Again, the implication is that the Chinese term translates the OK one. For examples of both types of notices, see my paper cited in note 6 *supra*.

<sup>14</sup>Ōno Susumu, *Jōdai kanazukai no kenkyū* (Tokyo: 1953), pp. 295, 278 cites early examples of the graph in question as a phonogram in OJ texts for the syllable *si* (> NJ *ṣi*); see also the tables in the *Jidaijiten kokugo daijiten*, *Jōdaihen* (Tokyo: 1967), p. 894, for a complete inventory of the employment of this phonogram in OJ texts.

<sup>15</sup>Typically in the Chin. transcription of Takṣaśilā (Pulleyblank, *AM* 9.108 [1962], with references to the earlier literature); other examples of the employment of this same phonogram for the transcription of Indic *ś* may easily be located in W. E. Soothill & L. Hodous, *A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms* (London: 1937), pp. 138b, 231b, 305b (*viṣeṣa*), 167b (*kāṣa*, *kāṣi*), 305b (*Vipāśyin*); cf. also *loc. cit.*, 101a-102b, for *ś(i)*-initial.

have tended to be ignored, while attention has instead focused on the cases where this OK *śi* phonogram corresponds to MK and NK *l*. The result has been the curiously anachronistic practice of interpreting this *śi* phonogram as if it were a writing for OK *l*, which of course it cannot be.

Thus, modern Korean scholars studying the Koguryō fragments, and Japanese and German scholars as well, following their lead, have uniformly elected to interpret the orthographic usage of the phonogram *śi* as if the graph in question were being used to write Old Koguryō *l*; in other words, solely on the basis of later MK and NK cognates, they have reconstructed Old Koguryō words written in the *Samguk sagi* with this phonogram *śi* as if they had *l* in Old Koguryō, rather than the *ś(i)* or *ṣ(i)* that the original phonogram orthography of the text overtly and unambiguously indicates. Professing to deal with OK, they have instead worked on the unverbalized assumption that OK phonology must necessarily have been identical in all requests with the phonology of MK and NK, which seems unlikely to have been true. And while stressing on the one hand that Old Koguryō was not the same as MK, and that 'NK is not an offspring of the Koguryō language,'<sup>16</sup> both of which statements are above question, these same scholars have nevertheless allowed themselves to be guided in their reconstruction of the shapes of Old Koguryō words written with the phonogram *śi* solely by the phonetic shapes of the much later MK and NK forms—forms whose only tangential relationship to Old Koguryō they simultaneously, and inconsistently, stress.

In this highly inconsistent and strikingly anachronistic interpretation of the phonogram orthography of the *Samguk sagi* and its earlier, now-lost, sources, modern Korean scholars have also been misled by their prior knowledge of a parallel orthographic usage in the OK *hyangga* corpus, poem-texts transmitted in a complex script that employs Chinese characters in several different fashions, including logograms, phonograms, and rebus graphs, as well as occasionally as writings for Chinese loanwords.<sup>17</sup> The *hyangga* orthography was essentially an achievement of the United Silla kingdom (669-935), but it had earlier ancestors, and it is found more-or-less fully developed in texts that date from *ca.* 888.<sup>18</sup> In the *hyangga* texts we find the same employment of the phonogram *śi* that appears in the Old Koguryō fragments in the *Samguk sagi*, i.e., to write a consonant that in

<sup>16</sup>LW, p. 25.

<sup>17</sup>Thus, the orthography of these texts is, as has sometimes been pointed out, reminiscent of the orthography of the OJ anthology known as the *Man'yōshū*—nor are the two probably without some direct historical connection, as far as their orthographic traditions are concerned.

<sup>18</sup>Yi-Lewin 59. It is of course to these earlier beginnings that the connections, if any, between the *hyangga* orthography and the orthography of the OJ texts such as the *Man'yōshū* must be traced.

later MK and NK would appear as *l*. In these *hyangga* cases of *śi* also it has again been the practice to ignore the evidence of the texts themselves and to read *śi* as *l*, i.e., to ignore the Old Silla linguistic evidence of the texts in favor of the much later evidence of MK and NK. When the *Samguk sagi* fragments of Old Koguryŏ and other OK languages came to light, this already established inconsistent and anachronistic interpretative practice was simply taken over intact from the field of *hyangga* studies and applied mechanically to the study of these new fragments as well. Now that the nature of this curious reversal of philological method has been clarified, it is unlikely that many would wish to argue for its further perpetration. Surely it is incumbent upon us to read OK texts as we would any other texts, i.e., as nearly as possible in the language in which they were written, and not rewriting them in the process of interpretation in order to anticipate linguistic data that do not appear on the scene until centuries later.

5. For all these reasons, then, whenever we find the phonogram *śi* used in an OK text or fragment, we will wish to interpret it literally, and understand it as a writing for OK *śi*,<sup>19</sup> even though in many words this OK *śi* may correspond to (be cognate with) *l* in later MK and NK. The correctness of this methodology is further demonstrated by the fact that, alongside the numerous cases (particularly in OKg.) where this OK *śi* corresponds to MK and NK *l*, we find equally numerous cases (again, with striking frequency particularly in OKg.) where Chinese phonograms in *l* are clearly employed to write OK *l*<sup>20</sup> in words where this OK *l* quite simply corresponds to MK and NK *l*. These latter examples are of course of capital importance, since they prove that in the OK corpus we do not have, as might possibly otherwise be imagined, a situation in which, e.g., any and all cases of OK *l* had simply been written with the phonogram *śi* merely out of scribal caprice, or because of orthographic idiosyncrasy, or due to any other non-historical linguistic considerations. The evidence of the texts shows that such extra-linguistic factors cannot be invoked; the texts in question, and their phonogram orthography, are telling us something about the history of the language concerned.

5.1 To write OK *l* the texts use Chinese phonograms in *l* according to one of two different orthographic principles (and at least once in the corpus, they employ both these two devices simultaneously): (1) for OK *-l*,

<sup>19</sup>More exactly, for OK *\*śi* (cf. note 12 *supra*); throughout we employ the writing *śi* to indicate the MC reconstruction for the phonogram in question, and thus distinguish between this value and the proposed value for the OK syllable that it is employed to write in the texts, which we render *śi*.

<sup>20</sup>Of course, we do not know the pronunciation of this OK phoneme */l/*, whether it was [l] or [r] or what kind of *l* or *r* it may have been, etc.—the symbol used is to be understood not only as a reconstruction, but also as a general indication for a liquid phoneme that we may recover for the language, even though we lack more precise data concerning its articulation.

they employ Chinese phonograms in MC *-l*; (2) for OK *-l*, they employ Chinese phonograms in *-l* < *\*δ* < MC *-t*.<sup>21</sup>

The best example of (1) that is at hand is particularly informative, both because the word in question has a well-established Altaic etymology, and also because the OK orthography here happens to show this same *śi* phonogram employed to write initial *śi* in the word in question, i.e., in circumstances where both because of etymology and because of structural considerations the phonogram in question cannot possibly be taken as a writing for *l*. The word is OKg. *\*śilap* 'white,'<sup>22</sup> written with [5756, 3764], NC *shī-lā* < MC *śi-lāp*, obviously cognate with OJ *sirō* 'white.' In the first place, this OKg. form does much to clarify the history of the OJ form, since it shows how the *-ō* of OJ *sirō* must have originated in the assimilation of some other, earlier vowel to a nominal-morpheme-final *\*-p*, which phoneme then itself disappeared in pre-OJ, leaving this and the other color-word nouns in OJ *-ō*. Secondly, both the OKg. and OJ forms go closely with Altaic: cf. pA *\*sīār-a* 'be light-colored,' Mo. *sira* 'yellow,' MT *sariy* 'id.', Ma. *šara-* 'become white.'<sup>23</sup> If *śi* had ever really been an OK phonogram for *l*, neither the initial nor the medial consonant of this OKg. word could possibly be explained; but it was not, and the writing is completely in keeping with what we know of the history of this same word in other Altaic languages, including OJ.

5.2 Examples of (2) are numerous in the OK corpus, particularly among the OKg. fragments, from which the following are drawn.

We begin with examples in which OKg. *-l* written in phonograms having *-l* < *\*δ* < MC *-t* corresponds without question to MK and NK *l*.

1. OKg. *\*śāñāli* 'zephyr,' MK *sō'nāl-*, *'sōnāl-*, NK *(s)ōñāl-ha-*, *sanül-ha-* 'is cool, refreshing,' NK *(s)sanül-ha-* 'is chilly, icy.' The sequence *\*-nāl-* is written with [3095], NC *rē*, MC *nīlāt* used as a phonogram, with final *-t* > *\*δ* > *l*. In the OKg. form, the final *\*-i-* is probably a secondary stem-deriving suffix, parallel in function (but different in form from) the NK *-ha-* (LK 18.61.)<sup>24</sup>

<sup>21</sup>Cf. Yi-Lewin 83. This well-documented shift of MC *-t* to a liquid is the traditional explanation for the employment of Chin. transcriptions for MK *-l*, as well as for the later Sino-Korean values for Chin. words in original *-t*; details remain to be verified, but in this case, the traditional view appears to be substantially correct. Since Korean is an Altaic language, there was no need for writing initial *-l*. Erling v. Mende, *CAJ* 22.161 (1978), discusses later MK examples of *-l* in Chin. transcription, but it is not correct to write that "Im Ch'ao-hsien-kuan i-yü wird jeder *-l*-Auslaut unterschiedslos mit *erh* . . . wiedergegeben," actually that source employs also original Chin. *-t* along with *er* in this function, see Ogura Shinpei, *Tōhō Gakuhō* 28.559 (1941).

<sup>22</sup>LW 25; of course, the OKg. form could equally correctly be written *\*sirap*, since we cannot determine the pronunciation of the initial or the medial in any more precise terms.

<sup>23</sup>AEOJ § 20, esp. p. 135, and on the OKg. form, p. 136.

<sup>24</sup>Exs. 1 through 8, LW 26; all are preserved in the sources in phonograms. LK reconstructs somewhat different forms, and is not always reliable for MK forms, partly because of a number of typographical problems.

2. OKg. \**kāmul* 'black,' MK *kōmül* (HMCH B 14 r). The sequence \*-*mul* is written with [7208], NC *wù*, MC *mkuət*. (LK 14.21)

3. OKg. \**sulni* 'peak, summit,' MK *sunülk* 'ridge, mountain pass.' The sequence \**sul* is written with [5890], NC *shù*, MC *dž'üet*. (LK 18.65)

4. OKg. \**salgan* 'frost,' MK *sōli*. The sequence \**sal-* is written with [5410] NC *sā*, MC \**sāt*. (LK 17.59)

Further examples of this same correspondence between OKg. *l* written with phonograms in *l* and MK and NK *l* may be cited in which there are, however (and in contrast to the above) substantial problems, either because of discrepancies in forms, or differences in meanings, or sometimes because of both.

5. OKg. \**kūäl* 'river' has been compared with MK *kä'lām* 'river, lake' (HMCH A 2 v) (LK 15.33). The OKg. word is written with phonogram [1621], NC *qū*, MC *k'üet*. Poppe further compared the MK form with Mongolian forms represented by Mo. *γoriqan* 'brook, rivulet.'<sup>23</sup> It would be easier to reconcile the forms involved if we were to assume that the OKg. word in the phonogram fragment is a later metathesis of an earlier \**kūlä*. (LK 15.33)

6. OKg. \**Xual* may be reconstructed for 'walled town, castle,' with phonogram [2194], NC *hū*, MC *Xuət*, and we are told that "Korean philologists have identified" with this MK *kor* 'valley, village' (LK 15.27), but the question of the semantics remains unsolved, since the traditional walled town or other fortified position is typically located on high, not low or valley ground.<sup>24</sup>

In several other words, OKg. *l*, attested for OKg. by phonogram writings, surely corresponds to *l* in other stages or varieties of Korean, including MK and NK, but the attestation of these other *l*-forms as such is here not as obvious as in the above examples; in these words the necessary *l*-forms from other varieties of Korean are attested only in MK examples themselves written only in phonograms, or (generally unsatisfactorily) in scattered records of modern non-standard dialects, or in some cases they can only be postulated on the evidence of borrowings from or into other languages.

7. OKg. \**naimul* 'lead' is written in phonograms, using the same graph for the sequence \*-*mul* that is employed in the writing of the word cited above as ex. 2. MK and NK have *nap* 'id.', but an early (13th c.) MK form written in phonograms may be reconstructed as \**namul*, and the existence of *l*-forms for this word is also attested by OJ *namari* 'id.' (LK 16.46).<sup>25</sup>

<sup>23</sup>Poppe *HJAS* 13.574-5 (1950).

<sup>24</sup>The connections of this MK word with the Altaic words meaning 'fence, shelter,' *resp.* 'fortification, tumulus' most recently clarified in Poppe 1974.130 remain to be studied.

<sup>25</sup>More on this word at Yi-Lewin 98.

8. OKg. \**wōl* 'well, spring' is written with phonograms [7643, 3017], NC *yü l*, MC *l'wo l'et*. A late Silla cognate is written with the second of these phonograms; probably the word in this text is to be reconstructed \**ōl* 'well.' "We are informed, though unconfirmed, that in one dialect of southern Korea there is a word *el* which means 'clean well water drawn at night of the fifteenth day of the first month in the lunar calendar' (LK 13.7)." Postulation of other *l*-forms is further substantiated by the evidence of a Japanese historical text,<sup>26</sup> where the name of a Korean regicide is rendered in phonograms that would write OJ *iri*; in Chinese and Korean sources the name in question appears to be rendered with Ch. *quán* 'spring' as a logogram, so that OJ *iri* in this text would be a Japanese version of an OK original in *-l* meaning 'spring.'<sup>27</sup> Perhaps also relevant here is late OJ *wido* 'spring or other natural source of water,' MJ and NJ 'well.'

9. OKg. \**šōmul* 'Buddhist monk' again has the sequence \*-*mul* written with the same phonogram that has been seen above in exs. 2 and 7 (LK 18.64). The word in question eventually goes back to an Indic borrowing, and some form of the general shape \**ša(r)mir*, cf. Kuch. *šarmire* and OTk. *š(a)rmiri* 'Novize,'<sup>28</sup> with labialization of the original \*-*i*- following the \*-*m*-. The same forms underlie OJ *samī* 'Buddhist cleric in minor orders.' But the OJ form is surely a loan from OPk., in consideration of the history of Japanese Buddhism, and one also suspects that the OKg. form came from Indic-Chinese originals by way of a Paekche intermediary.

5.3 In one important example, both method (1) and method (2) are used for the phonogram writing of OKg. *l*:

10. OKg. \**pāl(l)ök-* 'green,' written with phonograms [1765, 3920], NC *fä l*, MC \**b'iwōtläk*, MK *p'älä-* 'is blue, green,' *p'äläl*, *p'ülül* 'blue, green, azure,' NK *p'ulü-* 'id.' (LK 17.54). Here the final \*-*k*- of the OKg. word most likely is to be associated with the aspiration of the initial of the MK and NK forms.<sup>29</sup> At any rate, there can be no question that the OKg. form had *l*, corresponding to later MK and NK *l*, since the phonogram orthography in effect writes this OKg. *l* not once but twice, the first time with the final consonant of the first phonogram, the second time with the initial consonant of the second graph.

<sup>26</sup>*Nihon shoki*, Kōgyoku 1st year = 642 AD, tsl. Aston 2.172. Yi-Lewin 36-7.

<sup>27</sup>But questions are raised in the Iwanami edition of the *Nihon shoki*, 2.238-9, note 12, that require further study before this identification may be accepted in its entirety.

<sup>28</sup>A. von Gabain, *Altürkische Grammatik* (Leipzig: 1950), p. 336a.

<sup>29</sup>But much more work remains to be done concerning the historical origins of the MK and NK aspirated consonants; in this, we must not overlook the suggestions of V. I. Tsintsius, 'On the Pre-Altaic System of Consonants,' in L. Ligeti, ed., *Researches in Altaic Languages* (Budapest: 1975), pp. 299-306, concerning the possibility of eventually relating these phonemes with original features in earlier stages of the Altaic linguistic unity. Meanwhile, the comparison suggested in Martin 232.94 with J *awo* 'blue, green' is surely to be discarded.

5.4 Finally, we have available an almost classical instance of the 'exception that proves the rule' in the approach of traditional Korean linguistic scholarship to the reconstruction of the following OKg. word:

11. OKg. \**yasi* 'wolf,' written with phonograms [7312, 5756], NC *yě shī*, MC *īa śi* (LK 19.80). Though still insisting that in all other cases within the OK corpus the phonogram *śi* is to be understood as a writing for OK *l*, traditional scholarship in this one case blithely turns its back upon its own methodological assumptions, and instead elects to understand the phonogram in question as a writing for OKg. *s*, for the reason that the MK cognates of this word have *z*, and NK has *s* and *h*: MK *yōzū* 'fox,' NK dial. *yōu*, *yōsu*, *yōho* 'id.'<sup>32</sup> The OK scribes would have had to be not only capricious but also clairvoyant to have managed to use the phonogram *śi* in order to write this single case of a word that centuries later would appear with *z* > *s* (> *h*), while at the same time managing to employ *śi* for *l* in all the other words that centuries later would appear with *l*. Also relevant in this same connection, and providing yet another variety of evidence arguing strongly against the traditional Korean linguistic interpretation of these ancient written records, are the numerous cases in the corpus where OK *s* is written with the phonogram [5524], NC *śī*, MC *śig*. Important words in this category include OKg. \**kos* 'gem, jewel,'<sup>33</sup> and OKg. \**wus(i)kam* 'rabbit,'<sup>34</sup> among several that could be cited if space allowed. But we hardly need dwell further on this point; evidence has already been presented above in sufficient amount to make it clear that we must take seriously the phonological data preserved in OK phonogram orthography, and not obscure that precious historical-linguistic data by reading the OK phonograms as if they were writing different, and much later, languages. In the phonogram orthography for OK, illustrated above chiefly by examples

<sup>32</sup>Yi Ki-mun in this single instance admits the inconsistency of the traditional interpretation of the phonogram *śi* when he writes, "if we can reconstruct \**yasi* here . . ." (LK 19.80). He further compares MK *yezi* 'fox,' i.e., MK *yōzū* 'id.', HMC A 19r, the form attested only in the Tokyo University Library exemplar, and corresponding to NK dial. *yōsu*, *yōho* (this last with *-h* < *-s*), and so not, as in Martin, Lee & Chang, *Kor-Eng. Dict.*, 1167b, a loan from Chin. *hū*), *yōu*. LW 26 compared the OKg. form with the same MK, but reconstructed OKg. \**yai*.

<sup>33</sup>LK 15.31, but the comparison with Ma. *gu* 'jade' made there cannot be maintained, Ma. *gu* is a loan from Chin. *yū* 'id.', TMS 1.164a. More on this word in my paper 'Old Japanese *sirō* 'fortress, citadel',' in Walter Heissig, ed., *Tractata Altaica* (Wiesbaden: 1976), pp. 409-10.

<sup>34</sup>LK 17.50. The treatment of this word in JOAL 116-8 has been greatly advanced now by Menges 1975.40-3. The reconstruction by Pritsak of \**dval'an*, metathesized from \**davl'an*, with original *t* > *d* under the influence of the subsequent voiced consonant (*Fürstenliste* . . . , pp. 56-7) may well provide the clue for explaining POJ \**wusagi*, \**wosagi* 'rabbit': these forms would have secondary initial *w* < \**j* regularly resulting from \**d*, the \**j* having in turn been secondarily shifted to *w* in its position before the \**-v*, or, equally likely, \**davl'an* > \**javl'-* > \**jus-* > \**wus-*, etc.

from OKg., we have substantial evidence for OK *l* corresponding to MK and NK *l*; we also have equally substantial evidence for OK *š* corresponding to later MK and NK *l*; and at the same time, we have evidence for OK *s* corresponding to later *z* and *s*.

6. The Altaic comparativist is likely to have been following the above exposition of the philological problems in the interpretation of the OK data with increasing impatience and growing expectations; and in the latter at least he is unlikely to be disappointed, since the direct relevance of this OK linguistic data, now that we have finally disentangled it from the obfuscations of traditional scholarship, for the study of the relationship between all the Altaic languages, including Korean itself, is immediately apparent. OK, in both its OKg. and OSI. varieties, had *š* in many words where later MK and NK have *l*. In other words, we now have available for study and analysis additional, new data relating to the much-mooted *l* : *š* correspondences that have long played such an important role in comparative Altaic studies; at the same time, since the original Altaic *l* : *r* contrast was levelled out in the direction of a single undifferentiated liquid phoneme in pre-Korean,<sup>35</sup> potentially we also have here, in these same data, evidence that further relates to the parallel, and equally famous *r* : *z* correspondences of the Altaic comparativists. Most importantly, since these new data are from outside the Turkic branch of Altaic, but still remain strikingly reminiscent of the well-known Turkic-Altaic correspondences, they open the possibility for at last achieving something resembling a methodological break-through in the treatment of this entire question, one that has too long inhibited the clarification of the internal relationships among the Altaic languages largely because of the narrowly limited scope of the linguistic materials until now available for its analysis.

Actually, no other single set of data within the comparative-historical phonology of the Altaic languages argues as convincingly for the ultimate historical relationship of all these languages to one another, and at the same time also for their ultimate relationship to an original linguistic unity, as do the well-known and often discussed correspondences that involve some, but not all, of the *l*'s and *r*'s in Mongolian and Tungusic, and also in Chuvash, with the *š*'s and *z*'s in the rest of Turkic.<sup>36</sup> Nevertheless, this set of correspondences, which ought properly to be the cornerstone of comparative Altaic linguistics, has instead become a block of stumbling in the path of many. If these reflexes, and their full historical implication for

<sup>35</sup>See the discussion below in the present paper § 9.

<sup>36</sup>Among the vast literature on this question, one of the most recent as well as one of the most informative treatments is that of L. Ligeti, 'La théorie altaïque et la lexico-statistique,' in L. Ligeti, *Researches in Altaic Languages*, pp. 99-115, esp. p. 102, note 4 and the other contributions there cited.



the relations between the Altaic languages, have not carried full conviction in all circles, this has partly been because of a certain residual unfamiliarity with the assumptions, principles, and methodology of comparative grammar that lingers on in Altaic studies, and also partly because until very recently the data in this area of Altaic comparative phonology appeared to be somewhat strange and unbalanced, e.g. / throughout Mongolian and Tungusic and also in Chuvash, itself generally regarded as a Turkic language," against *š* solely in Turkic except for Chuvash, etc. The problem has seemed almost solely a Turkological one, and sometimes too its analysis has been approached as if a solution could be reached solely in terms of the history of the Turkic languages. About the first of these problems, it goes without saying that next to nothing can be done: this difficulty will apparently always be with us. But now the second offers somewhat more hope, even though for several decades the situation with respect to the available data remained apparently a solely Turkological one, and nothing new was added to the materials available for comparison. The discovery of the Japanese reflexes for pA \**l*, and \**r*, demonstrated that what appear to be very 'Turkic-like' reflexes for these proto-Altaic phonemes could also be documented from elsewhere in the Altaic linguistic area." This threw new light upon these long-familiar Turkic reflexes, and particularly upon their historical relationship to the Altaic linguistic unity;" in a sense, the entire question now ceased to be solely Turkological, since this new data had opened up the possibility of reevaluating the well-known evidence against a rather more comprehensive historical-linguistic horizon than any yet attempted. Now evidence from OK, and particularly from the OKg. and OSi. varieties of OK, as introduced above, clearly opens the possibility of establishing further early documentation for pA \**l*, appearing in our texts as OK *š*, and possibly also for pA \**r*. The earlier discovery of the Japanese evidence for these two critical Altaic phonemes showed that their Turkic reflexes were by no means as isolated within Altaic as had long been believed to be the case. The documentation of the relevant OK forms now shows that these Japanese reflexes were, in their turn, by no means isolated within the easternmost portion of the Altaic linguistic area to which both Korean and Japanese must surely be related, in one way or another.

"Poppe 1974b.

"The Old Japanese Reflexes of Proto-Altaic \**l*,' *UJb* 42.127-47 (1970); *JOAL*, *passim*.; 'Japanese-Altaic Lexical Evidence and the Proto-Turkic "Zetacism-Sigmatism"', in L. Ligeti, ed., *Researches in Altaic Languages*, pp. 157-172.

"Menges 1975.36-67, esp. p. 37: "Das Erscheinen von *s/š* im Japanischen für \**l*, wie im Türkischen gibt dieser Sibilans ein sehr beträchtliches Alter, und sie ist in beiden Sprachfamilien ein äußerst archaisches Charakteristikum, das ohne Zweifel nicht erst am Ende der ur-altajischen Sprachperiode und kurz vor der einzelsprachlichen Trennung vorhanden war, sondern weit in die zeitliche Tiefe der ur-altajischen Epoche hineinragt."

Above we have already documented numerous examples of OK *š* corresponding to later MK and NK *l*, i.e., for the 'Turkic-Altaic'-type of *š* : / correspondence solely within Korean itself. To these data we now add further lexical evidence for OK *š* corresponding to later MK and NK *l* as above, but also including a number of important cases where cognates can also be cited from outside of Korean, and some that as a result clearly go back to pA \**l*, for OKg. in §7 and OSi. in §8.

7. 12. OKg. *kaš*<sup>40</sup> 'plough' (cf. LW, 26-7, with the reconstruction \**kal*, and LK 14.18, with \**kar*; both suggest comparison with MK *kalai* 'plough,' and additionally with Ma. *halhan*, *halgan* 'ploughshare,'<sup>41</sup> but like so many other Korean-Manchu comparisons in the literature of this question, the comparison appears to have been taken over uncritically and without acknowledgment from SK, p. 46, no. 62). The comparisons most immediately relevant for the OKg. form are MK \**kal* 'plough' (HMCH C 3r), and NK *kāl*- 'to plow, cultivate, till.' Fortunately we now have available a complete documentation and study of all the relevant Altaic terms that bear upon the etymological analysis of this OKg. word, as well as upon its later cognates within other stages and forms of Korean,<sup>42</sup> to which reference may be made in lieu of a complete study at this point. To sum up in very brief form, we must begin with recalling that the 'plough' is a tool of settled agricultural peoples, and hardly a very 'Altaic' implement at best, nor one for which we would expect to find an original etymological root in the parent language of the oldest stages of Asiatic nomadism. Hence also it is hardly surprising to learn that words for 'plough' in the languages concerned generally prove to be later semantic specializations of verbs originally meaning scratch, scrape, or cut into something. The original language had two verbs in these general senses, pA \**kar*, - and pA \**kal*, V-; both were ultimately the source for words meaning 'plough' in one of more of the later languages, and both also became contaminated with one another early in the history of Altaic, because of their similarities in forms and meanings (today we can determine which later forms go with which original root in phonological terms, but the meanings of the two roots, presumably once distinct, have become hopelessly intermingled). The OKg.

<sup>40</sup>It is interesting to note that the phonograms that were employed to write this OKg. word are the same that were used to transcribe Indic *kāśi* 'a species of grass, *Saccharum spontaneum*' in Chinese Buddhist texts (Soothill & Hodous, p. 167b), cf. Skt. *kāśah* 'eine Grasart,' M. Mayrhofer, *Kurzg. etym. Wörterb.*, 1.204-5, further evidence arguing in favor of the correct interpretation of this phonogram.

<sup>41</sup>All these comparisons need to be restudied in the light of K. Menges, 'Altajische Lehnwörter im Slavischen,' *Zt. für Slavische Philologie* 23.327-334 (1955); this study has recently been neglected, e.g., Larry V. Clark, 'Mongol Elements in Old Turkic?', *JSFOu* 75.144.

<sup>42</sup>AEJ 8.68-72.

word here at issue clearly goes directly with pA *\*ka/V-*, as represented in pTk. *\*kašV-* 'to scratch (an itch), to comb, curry' (VEWT, p. 240b); its close correspondences with its Altaic originals both in form and in meaning make it a particularly valuable relic of OK lexical resources. Note also that otherwise in Korean, this verb generally appears with a velar root-enlargement (AEOJ, loc. cit., p. 72), both as MK *külk-* and MK *kälk-*,<sup>43</sup> where the different vocalizations relate to the Korean phenomenon of 'light' (*a*) and 'heavy' (*ü*) phonetic symbolism.<sup>44</sup> To sum up, the OKg. word *\*kaš* 'plough' belongs to a set of words whose history within Altaic is exceptionally well documented; the word may be related directly, both in form and meaning, to dozens of cognate forms in many other languages; and by no means the least important aspect of the form is its correct consonantism in *š*, until now obscured by the philological convention of interpreting this important OK word solely in terms of its later MK and NK cognates.

13. OKg. *\*kūnš* 'written character, script' (LW, 26 reconstructs the OK form as *\*kūl*, as also does LK 14.24 and MK 112.104; all compare the form directly with MK *kül* 'id.', and all also compare Ma. *hergen* 'writing, lines, design,' another Korean-Manchu from SK, p. 56, no. 78, but surely beside the point, if only because the history of the Manchu word remains obscure). In this word, the phonogram orthography documents a most important and valuable feature, in that it preserves an original morpheme-final consonant cluster, here reconstructed as *\*-nš* (written with phonogram [1059], NC *jīn*, MC *klān*), but this writing of the original has been overlooked in the literature to date, which not only reads the *š* as *l*, but simply ignores the evidence for the *-n(-)* that comes before it. As we shall discuss in somewhat more detail below (§9), the possibility exists that such *-n(-)* writings in OK texts and fragments indicate some variety of morpheme-final liquid; Chinese transcriptions of foreign words and names in the Han period often employed Ch. *-n* to render foreign *-r*. For the moment we leave the question open, and simply reconstruct what the text writes, though this sequence *\*-nš* is almost surely a cluster of morphological as well as of phonological significance for the history of this word. At any rate, in this particular OKg. word we have what is most likely the earliest attestation of a Korean word for writing, surely something that is in itself of great interest and importance. Like later, cognate MK *kül* 'id.', this OKg. form must also go semantically with the verb MK *külk-* 'scratch, etc.' already cited above in connection with the previous example, but in MK

without the velar root-enlargement, and in OKg. with some other morphological element involved with the final *š* that goes with the pA *\*l*, to which the MK *-l-* in *külk-* also relates. The semantics of the Korean forms is identical with the semantics of J *kak-* 'scratch' > 'write,' on which cf. AEOJ, loc. cit., p. 69 for a full discussion.

14. OKg. *\*maiš* 'garlic' (LW, pp. 24, 26, 28, and LK 16.38, all comparing the word, which they reconstruct in *l*, with MK *manal*, for which read MK *ma'nāl*, and Mo. *manggir-*, as well as with OJ *mīra* 'id.').<sup>45</sup> This OKg. word remains full of unsolved problems, both linguistic and botanical, at every level of its study. It has often been compared with OJ *mīra*, and this has often been glossed as meaning 'garlic,' but OJ *mīra* is commonly understood to be an 'older form' going with later *nira* 'leek, scallion.' The *Myōgishō*<sup>46</sup> gives three forms, OJ *mīra*, *nira*, and *Fīru*, glossing them all with Ch. *xiè* 'shallots, scallions.' The Chinese gloss for MK *ma'nāl* in HMCH A 7 r, on the other hand, is the unequivocal *suàn* 'garlic.' The Mo. form often cited in the literature, read: *mangirsun*, is 'wild onion,' and is almost surely either a loan from, or a loan into, Korean, since it is attested, in Altaic, only in Mongolian and Korean.<sup>47</sup> OJ *mīra* > *nira* might very well be a loan from some early Korean *l*-form related to the OKg. form here introduced; but it can hardly be related directly to that OKg. form, any more than either it or the OKg. form can go directly with MK *ma'nāl* > NK *manūl*. One is tempted to see in all these Korean forms evidence for an original metathesis of the first two syllables, and to begin the history of this word on Korean territory with something along the lines of *\*namdl*.<sup>48</sup> This might in turn be associated with a pA *\*ñamil*, which would then go with pTk. *\*ñāmīš*, attested in such forms as Chagatai, Osm. *jāmīš* 'Frucht,' Oir. *id.*, 'Speise, Futter,' etc. (VEWT, 197a).<sup>49</sup> But beyond such speculation at present we are unable to advance. There can be little doubt that the history of all these words in the several languages, most of

<sup>43</sup>It was in connection with this particular word that the suggestion to interpret the phonogram *š* literally as OK *š* was first made in the literature, by the author in JJS 2.200-2.201, note 16 (1975).

<sup>44</sup>A late OJ lexical source dating from the period 931-938, cited for this word in Ono Susumu, Satake Akihiro, & Maeda Kingorō, eds., *Kogo jiten* (Tokyo: 1974), p. 1242b. But the so-called 'Kor. *p'il* 'garlic' ' cited in loc. cit., 1111c, appears to be a lexicographer's ghost-word.

<sup>45</sup>But we must also keep in mind that Ramstedt's original comparison (in the SKE) of NK *manūl* with Mo. *manggir* is one of the Korean-Altaic etymologies that Poppe characterized as being, in his opinion, 'convincing' (HJAS 13.570 [1950]).

<sup>46</sup>Certain parallels for the analogical changes suggested are supplied by the vicissitudes of the words for 'needle' (Martin 237.153) and 'lead' (note 27 *supra*).

<sup>47</sup>In which case the relationship of these words to pTk. *\*jē-* 'eat, devour' would be reduced to the level of folk-etymology.

<sup>48</sup>Martin 240.189.

<sup>49</sup>Samuel E. Martin, 'Phonetic Symbolism in Korean,' in N. Poppe, ed., *American Studies in Altaic Linguistics* (Bloomington: 1962), pp. 177-89.

which probably refer to related but quite different varieties of the genus *Allium*, has been complicated extensively as a result of linguistic borrowing and reborrowing that paralleled the botanical history of the plants actually involved. This botanical history includes not only their importation and cultivation, but originally also their domestication—not to mention the sometimes careless application in one language or another of the name of a specific imported plant to a superficially similar but actually quite different native variety. We know of the importance of garlic in modern Korean culture; but what do we know of its earlier history there? Similarly, we know of the modern Japanese aversion to the plant and its employment in the preparation of food, which in Japan appears to stem directly from the prohibition of the Buddhists who early ruled that garlic was a forbidden fruit because it excited the eater to carnal passions.<sup>90</sup> But at the same time, Japanese Buddhism is of Korean origins, specifically from the Old Paekche kingdom; and how do we resolve the internal contradiction in this set of data? Here we have a representative example of the etymological tangle, further involved in a cultural-historical tangle, that is all too commonly encountered when we begin to study the names of many important cultivated plants. These tangles can only be resolved by the intensive study of the history of the plants themselves within the cultures that employed them; in other words, such problems must first be treated by the historical botanist, and by the historian of culture, before the historical linguist can do much with or about them.

15. OKg. \**yaš* 'wild,' glossing Ch. *yě* 'wild, uncultivated.'<sup>91</sup> In its historical phonology this word is very reminiscent of the above; etymologically it goes directly with pA \**ñāl* 'raw,' with representations throughout all the branches of Altaic, and including MK *nal* 'raw thing,' NK *nal* 'raw, uncooked, green, unripe, fresh, crude, unprocessed.'<sup>92</sup> The Turkic branch represents this original root with pTk. \**jāš*, for OT, Uig.,

<sup>90</sup>The strong aversion to garlic displayed by Japanese culture has also had its linguistic results; in NJ, and for some time past in the history of the language, a taboo-avoidance euphemism term *ninniku* (a Chin. loan, lit. 'avoidance, abstaining from') has been used to mean 'garlic,' an interesting instance of linguistic substitution that has had the effect of obliterating the earlier evidence for Japanese inheritance of Altaic forms for this plant-name.

<sup>91</sup>The word is attested in the same text, the *Samguk sagi*, ch. 35, from which most of the other OK fragments are extracted, but it does not yet appear to have been studied (e.g., in LW or LK) together with the others. Yang, p. 94, cites it as an example where in his view the phonogram *ši* must be taken as a writing for *š*, not for *l*!

<sup>92</sup>SKE 159 (which appears to draw upon SK 119.217 !); VG 39, 77, 97-8; TMS 1.639a-b.

Chag., Osm. 'etc.' *jaš* 'fresh, young.'<sup>93</sup> In Tungusic, formations based upon pTg. \**nal*- 'id.' are found in Go., Evenk., Lam., Neg., Udh., Ulč.,<sup>94</sup> but not apparently in Manchu. Korean *nal* is a secondary derivative in its morphology; if it is indeed from *na*- 'come into existence, is born, grows, breaks out,'<sup>95</sup> then the possibility must be considered that in all these words, including the earliest forms in the original Altaic language, we have a secondary stem-formation in \*-*l*, onto a root \**ñā*-, thus pA \**ñā-l*-. As Martin (*loc. cit.*) has pointed out, this would also make it possible to incorporate J *nar*- 'become,' and its causative-transitive equivalent, *nas*- 'do, make, cause to become' within this same etymology, the Japanese verbs *nar*-, *nas*- further extending the analysis to provide evidence for original pA \**ñā-l*- (giving J *nar*-) alongside pA \**ñā-l*- which gave J *nas*- and the Turkic forms in *š*, as well as the OKg. form here under study.<sup>96</sup>

16. OKg. \**uš* ? \**yuš* ? 'people of the same kind coming, gathering together.' This is one of the more difficult of the OKg. fragments; the correct vocalization of the form, and indeed its entire phonology, present serious problems, while the question of its meaning shows once again the dangers inherent in literal translations from Chinese glosses, relying solely upon dictionaries and uninformed by the contexts to which the glosses may have reference. The initial and vowel of the OKg. word are written with phonogram [7592], NC *yú*, MC *jū*; it would be possible to interpret this as a writing for \**u*, \**ju*, or \**ü*; furthermore, we know from Chinese transcription practices that the initial of the MC form in question was pronounced in such a fashion that it could also serve to write foreign words with initial velars.<sup>97</sup> This we indicate by the variant reconstruction above in \**γ*-, using *γ* simply as a symbol for a velar consonant of still undetermined quality. The OKg. form was studied in LW, pp. 25-6, and LK, 19.77; both translate it to mean 'having neighbors,' and both compare MK *ul* 'relatives, relations,' and OJ *udi* 'lineage, family name.' This translation 'having neighbors' is a literal rendering of the Chinese gloss for this OKg. word,

<sup>93</sup>VEWT 192a. Street 34 is important, for pointing out that in these and apparently related words "probably several roots are represented, which at various times got contaminated with each other," and also for beginning to untangle the considerable tangle that has been brought about in this particular sector of Altaic word-comparison: until even more has been done along these lines, however, we are left with what are in effect *lucus a non lucendo* etymologies, in which 'old' is apparently the same as 'young,' which is obviously not correct.

<sup>94</sup>TMS 1.630a; J. Benzing, *Lamutische Gr.*, p. 221b, *ñalakā* 'frisch, roh (Haut, Fisch, Fleisch, Holz).'

<sup>95</sup>Martin, s.v. 'greens' (232.95) and 'become' 225-6.11.

<sup>96</sup>This meets the very proper objections of Menges 1975.58-9, and is instructed by them.

<sup>97</sup>Pulleyblank, *AM* 9.86, 91 (1962) on this problem and also on the evidence for its solution provided by the Chinese transcriptions of the original name for Khotan; the historical-phonological side of the question is brilliantly solved in the classic paper by Lo Ch'ang-p'ei, 'Evidence for Amending B. Karlgren's Ancient Chinese *j* to *γ*,' *HJAS* 14.285-90 (1951).

*yōu lin*; but to render this word-for-word as 'having neighbors' is to overlook the fact that this phrase is a classical tag, which can only be understood in the context of its *locus classicus*, *Lun yū* §4.24 'Virtue is not lonely; it always has neighbors,'<sup>58</sup> i.e., persons of similar interests and quality will necessarily cluster around the man of virtue. Establishing this correct meaning for the OKg. form of course enhances our understanding of its etymology; this is particularly true of OJ *udi*, which should itself be more correctly glossed as meaning 'a powerful group, forming the upper levels of OJ social structure,' not 'lineage, family name,' and which could hardly be compared with the OKg. word if the OKg. word had actually meant 'having neighbors.' Fortunately we now know that it did not; and what we have learned about its meaning enhances, rather than diminishes, the force of the comparison with OJ *udi*, particularly when that word in its turn is correctly glossed.<sup>59</sup> For other Altaic and Korean cognates for this OKg. word, the problem is difficult, largely because of the difficulty in recovering the phonology of the word, where only the final *š* is totally unambiguously written. On semantic grounds, a promising cognate is available in pTk. \**ēš*, attested in Uig. *iš*, *äš* 'companions,' MTk. *ēš* 'id.,' and Chuv. *jīš* 'Familie, Hausvolk' (VEWT p. 50b), the Chuvash form to be accounted for as a loan from another Turkic language. But one must hesitate to associate these forms with the clearly labial vocalization of the OKg. word, in spite of the close semantic connections and the Turkic evidence for pA \**l*, that these forms preserve. Much better for vocalization, but lacking evidence for \**l*, are the forms that Ramstedt related to OT *ud*- 'follow, obey,' including Mo. *udum* 'posterity';<sup>60</sup> because of the varied treatment of medial -*d*- in Turkic,<sup>61</sup> this root appears in many shapes, including *ud*-, *uđ*-, *ut*- and *uz*-.<sup>62</sup> Finally, if we consider the possibility of reconstructing this OKg. word as \**yuš*, we have perhaps the most promising Altaic cognates of all in such forms as Chag. *koš* 'eine Menge in der Steppe stehende Jurten, das Lager, Heer,' and many related Turkic forms relating to camps and camping (VEWT p. 283b). We shall see in more detail below (ex. 20) why we suspect that pA \**g*- appears as OK *g*- or *γ*-, but has been shifted to zero-initial by the time of MK and NK. If this was the case, then it does not greatly matter which of the two alternate OKg. reconstructions

<sup>58</sup>Tsl. W. E. Soothill, *The Analects or the Conversations of Confucius* . . . (London: 1910; reprinted 1958) as "Virtue never dwells alone; it always has neighbours" (p. 106).

<sup>59</sup>On the proper definition of OJ *udi*, cf. Ōno et al., *Kogo jiten* s.v., though the various Altaic forms cited in that place clearly go with quite another Turkic etymon, Uigh. *uruy* 'seed, sperm, descendant,' Soj. *uruy* 'child,' etc. (VEWT 516a), and have nothing to do with OJ *udi*.

<sup>60</sup>EAS 1.143.

<sup>61</sup>Menges 1968.89-90 summarizes these treatments.

<sup>62</sup>Citations in DTS 606, 620, 617; cf. further Ė. V. Sevortjan, *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskix jazykov* (Moscow: 1974) 1.565-6, s.v. *uda*.

noted above we follow in searching for a later Korean cognate for this form: in either case the most likely cognate is MK \**ul* (HMCH B 4'), glossing Chin. *fān* 'barrier, protective fence (separating China from the outside barbarians); hence, a feudatory, neighboring, vassal state.' And since pA \**g*- is represented by pTk. *k*-,<sup>63</sup> the Turkic forms cited above that relate to camps and camping would still be relevant to the discussion. Otherwise, MK \**kol* 'side street, narrow lane' (HMCH A 3v) might seem to be a likely cognate, but the semantics argue against the comparison. Also arguing in favor of MK \**ul* is the fact that this is one of the MK nouns that appears with -*h*-, as \**ul+ h*-, when in composition with case-endings, a morphological feature that we already have other grounds for believing may possibly be one of the distinguishing marks of the Korean reflexes of pA \**l*, (cf. MK \**tol+ h*- 'stone,' which belongs to the same noun-type). Finally, with the introduction of MK \**ul*, we again encounter the possibility of a comparison with OJ *udi*, noted above.<sup>64</sup> When we consider the social history involved, and also the senses in which OJ *udi* is employed in the early texts,<sup>65</sup> it does appear that this word is more likely to have been an early loanword into Japanese from some still unattested continental form—perhaps from a form related both to this OKg. word and also to MK \**ul*—rather than simply being cognate with either or both of these Korean forms. This much is clear: even though there does not appear to be any direct route out of this etymological tangle at present, nevertheless the study of these words, which has only begun, begins to throw light upon the earliest stages in the formation of Japanese society and state; and as always, the further back we go, the more notable these earliest stages are for the evidence they reveal concerning early connections between Japan and the Asiatic mainland, including Korea.

17. OKg. \**kōš* 'heart, mind' (glossing Chin. *xīn* 'id.'). LW, p. 24 reconstructed this OK word as \**kōl*, LK 14.20 as \**ker*; both compared it with OJ *kōkōrō* 'id.' In neither case, however, are we told what the Korean and Japanese words were supposed to have in common apart from their meanings, or whether it was the intent to compare the totality of the OJ

<sup>63</sup>VG 23.

<sup>64</sup>Martin 228.44. But the glosses 'clan' and 'relatives' found in some of the secondary literature for MK \**ul* are lexicographers' ghosts, generated most likely out of an undue eagerness to compare the form with OJ *udi*—which as explained *supra* also does not mean 'clan.' Kwōn 154 registers another form that requires more study, OK \**ibulč* 'neighbor(s),' where the \**č(i)* may however be a suffix; the form is apparently cognate with NK *iūs* 'neighborhood, vicinity; neighbor(s),' which would provide an example of OK *l* (or *lč*!) corresponding to MK and NK *s*! Otherwise, the usual MK word for 'neighbors' was *mžāl* (HMCH B 5r).

<sup>65</sup>See *inter alia* the comprehensive treatment in R. J. Miller, *Ancient Japanese Nobility* (Berkeley: 1974) of this and other OJ technical terms relating to the social system and orders of rank and precedence.

form with the OKg. word, or perhaps only a portion of the OJ form? At any rate, such a comparison, just as it stands, surely cannot be justified, nor may it be employed, as in the literature cited, as an example of similarities in form and meaning such as would justify the postulation of an early genetic relationship between OKg. and some variety of OJ, without further clarification. As the comparison now stands in the literature, it would be necessary to divide up OJ *kōkōrō* as *kō-kōrō*, and then to compare the OKg. word with this final *-kōrō*; but such a morpheme-division is out of the question. The etymology of OJ *kōkōrō* is well understood; the word is a cognate with Mo. *kōkūn*, Chuv. *kāGār*, Tk. *kōküz* 'breasts, teats,'<sup>66</sup> deverbal from pA *\*kōkü-* 'to suck at the breast.'<sup>67</sup> The only possible morpheme-division of OJ *kōkōrō* is *kōkō-rō*, and the vocalization of the final syllable of the form as usually attested in OJ is secondary, by a kind of 'vowel-harmony' (if one wishes to use the term in this connection) from an earlier *-i* as seen in the also-attested OJ *kōkōri* 'id.'<sup>68</sup> This *-rō* < *-ri* morpheme is ultimately the OJ reflex of an original Altaic morphological marker for the *Nomina dualitatis*, concerning the reconstruction, forms, and morphological roles of which in the various Altaic languages, including Japanese, we have most recently been corrected and further instructed by Menges.<sup>69</sup> Since OJ *kōkōrō* consists of *kōkō-ri* > *kōkō-rō*, we are left with nothing that is liable for direct comparison with OKg. *\*kōš*. No later Korean cognate for this form is advanced in the literature. MK *'k'ül* (HMCH C 11r) is at least a possibility, since it glosses both Chin. *rén* 'the virtue of human heartedness' and Chin. *yì* 'righteousness.'<sup>70</sup> The aspirate initial of MK *'k'ül* is, in some ways, the most interesting portion of the form, particularly with respect to the possibility of ultimate comparison with OJ *kōkōrō* and its remote Altaic originals. Apocope is one of the most characteristic, as well as one of the most important, varieties of sporadic sound-change that must be reckoned with in the internal history of many Korean lexical items.<sup>71</sup> The initial aspirate in this word may very well have resulted from apocope, and the resulting collapse of a pre-MK *\*kokül* > MK

<sup>66</sup>On the etymology of OJ *kōkōri* > *kōkōrō*, the summary in my paper 'Japanese-Altaic Lexical Evidence and the Proto-Turkic "Zetacism-Sigmatism"', p. 162, is the most recent, and has comprehensive references to the other places where these words have been studied.

<sup>67</sup>Street 18, incorporating VG 108, 132.

<sup>68</sup>On this important form in *-i*, in particular JOAL 142, 167-8.

<sup>69</sup>Menges 1975.9 and *passim.*, esp. 68.

<sup>70</sup>Yang 857 cites the relevant texts, and discusses these glosses.

<sup>71</sup>On apocope in the history of Korean, Yi Ki-mun, 'On the breaking of *\*i* in Korean,' *Asea yōn'gu* 11:2.133, note 8 (1959). But again, in studying this question in future, one must also take into consideration the possibility advanced by Tsintsius that the Korean aspirates are of significance on the level of historical comparison with the other Altaic languages (cf. note 31 *supra*).

*'k'ül*, a form that would then go quite closely with OJ *kōkōrō* and its Altaic kin. But that does not really bring us that much closer to this difficult OKg. word, or make us much better informed about its etymology. One problem will always be the Chinese gloss *xīn*; it is most difficult to ascertain the original sense of any non-Chinese word glossed, as in this case, by a word so deeply involved with traditional Chinese thought, culture, and world-view.

18. OKg. *\*čōuš* 'silver' (LK 13.12). The first of the two phonograms [234] underlying this reconstruction is ambiguous with respect to its initial; the reconstruction has employed the unvoiced *\*č* rather than the voiced *\*ž* that would also be possible for this graph because the corpus also has a variant for this word employing phonogram [267], which can only be writing *\*č*. This variant is also important because the phonogram in question is one in MC *-i*, here used for OK *-i*, so that the form that we may reconstruct for it, OKg. *\*čöl*, preserves another, variant OKg. word for 'silver' with a slightly different vocalization and—most importantly—final *l* for *š*. This variation within OKg. confirms us in our suspicion that here we are faced with two OK versions of a single but widely distributed, *Wanderwort* for 'silver,' with further representations almost universally throughout the Altaic domain. The history of the forms is, as with all *Wanderwörter*, greatly complicated by ancient borrowing and reborrowing back and forth in all possible directions. But surely in these two OKg. words, we must recognize yet another version, with affricate *\*č* for earlier *\*k*, of some form related to the pWestern-Altaic *\*kümVl, V* that underlies OT *kümüš*, Chuv. *kemel*, and Tk. *gümüš* 'silver';<sup>72</sup> OKg. *\*čōuš*, in addition to having affricated the original velar initial before *ü* before this *ü* was itself shifted to *\*ō*, further shows *-u-* for the original *-m-*, and of course *š* for *\*l*. The other OKg. form has a quite different history, and must go with some other currents of borrowing, since it has simplified the vocalization and has *l* for *\*l*; nevertheless, it shares the affricate treatment of the initial. A Chinese etymology for *\*kümVl, V* 'silver' is out of the question;<sup>73</sup> and the form cannot be discussed apart from WrTib. *dṡul* 'silver,' where *d-* before *ṡ* is in complimentary distribution with *g-*,<sup>74</sup> and the Tibetan dialects show such suggestive forms as *γnul*, *χmul*, and *šmul*.<sup>75</sup>

19. OKg. *\*kaiš* 'molar' (LK 14.15). Little can be made of this word, either in Altaic or within Korean itself. NK *ippal* 'tooth (vulgar)' < *nispal* is

<sup>72</sup>AEOJ 22.170 ff.

<sup>73</sup>A. J. Joki, 'Die Lehnwörter des Sajansamojedischen,' *MSFOu* 103 (1952).209-10, cited VEWT 308b, is surely to be corrected; the Chinese compound proposed is not attested, except as individual morphemes in other contexts.

<sup>74</sup>Inaba Shōju, *Chibetto-go koten bunpōgaku* (Kyoto: 1954), p. 73.

<sup>75</sup>Róna-Tas András, *Tibeto-Mongolica: The Tibetan Loanwords of Monguor and the Development of the Archaic Tibetan Dialects* (Budapest: 1966), p. 105.

reminiscent of NK *iph* 'leaf,'<sup>76</sup> particularly in view of the semantics of NJ *ha* 'leaf' and 'tooth' (though the pitch of the two words show that they are not etymologically identical). The much-discussed<sup>77</sup> pTk. \**tīš* 'tooth' might possibly be involved here: \**nap* 'flat, low'<sup>78</sup> + \**tīl*<sub>2</sub> with metathesis of the vowels > \**nīpal* > *ippal* for NK (the -s- of *nīpal* is only orthographic), while in the OKg. form we might have \**kap* 'flat, even'<sup>79</sup> + \**tīl*<sub>2</sub> > \**kadil*<sub>2</sub> (simplification of internal consonant sequence) > \**kaijil*<sub>2</sub> (with -j- resulting from a treatment of -d- similar to that well-attested in preTk.) > the OKg. \**kaiš* of the text-fragment. But all this is very much speculation.

20. OKg. \**gūs* 'child, boy' (LK 15.35, who finds comparisons with Tg. *kuṇa*, *kuṇakan* 'child' and OJ *ko* (read: *kō*) 'quite convincing'; thus also LW, p. 27). The phonogram orthography unambiguously indicates *s*, not *š*, for this word. We have noted above (ex. 16) evidence for reconstructing an initial *γ* for OKg.; in the present case, we more likely have *g*, at any rate, another voiced velar initial. Martin's reconstruction of the linguistic unity that he calls 'proto-Korean-Japanese' found evidence for original \**b*-, \**d*-, and \**g*-, but no \**g*-<sup>80</sup>; this opens the possibility that original pA \**g*- eventually shifted to zero-initial in MK and NK, but left traces in the form of a voiced velar in OK. The OKg. word here is reminiscent of pA \**gōl*-, 'young, of animals,'<sup>81</sup> and seems more closely allied to such a form than to the Tungusic words earlier suggested in the literature.<sup>82</sup> OJ *kō* is a very likely candidate for membership in this etymology, particularly when we consider the use of this form as the prior member in compounds signifying young animals (NJ *koinu* 'whelp,' *koneko* 'kitten,' etc.). This leaves the \**l*, unaccounted for; perhaps it turns up as *J s*, its regular reflex, in such words as OJ *kōsamē* 'a light rain' (OJ *amē* 'rain'), and late MJ *kosa* 'something small, fine, fragmentary,' though such a development would involve major semantic displacements. At any rate, if we admit the development pA \**g*-> OK *g*-, *γ*- > MK, NK *ø*- (zero-initial), then later Korean cognates of this OKg. form are not difficult to identify in MK *al* (HMCH C 4r) 'egg,' NK 'egg (of bird, fish); counter for small round things,' and MK *ō' lil* 'foolish, stupid' (HMCH C 13r), NK *ōli*- 'is young, immature, young (of a child).'

<sup>76</sup>The Korean forms in SKE 165, 186 draw upon the *Dictionnaire coréen-français* (Yokohama: 1880), p. 285a.

<sup>77</sup>E.g., Róna-Tas, *Acta Orientalia* 32.214, note 13 (1970). In some relationship to the words for 'fish with teeth' that he studies there is *J tara* 'the cod, other fish of the *Gadidae*,' while OJ has *tara* in the name of a bush-like tree covered with thorns (i.e., 'teeth').

<sup>78</sup>Street 20, incorporating VG 37, 44, 88.

<sup>79</sup>Street 16, incorporating VG 43, 88.

<sup>80</sup>Martin 198-204; in other words, there is an unfilled 'hole' in the system of consonant phonemes that he reconstructs for pKJ, as far as their structural distribution is concerned.

<sup>81</sup>Street 13, incorporating VG 25, 78; EAS 1.49.

<sup>82</sup>For which cf. now TMS 1.433a-b, s.v. *kuṇa* 'childhood, infancy.'

But if this OKg. form indeed originated in a word with \**l*, it remains to be explained why it has *s*, not the expected *š*.

8. Even though substantial texts survive for the Old Silla language, the complex nature of the writing system employed in the bulk of this corpus severely limits the exploitation of these records in historical-linguistic studies. A few OSi. words that document OSi. *š* as the reflex of MK, NK *l*, and also presumably for pA \**l*, have fortunately been preserved intact in phonogram writings; in these words, we again find the OSi. *š* written with the same *śi* phonogram with which we are now familiar from its use in OKg. orthography; also again, these writings have been misinterpreted in the traditional Korean literature as if they were writings for MK, NK *l* (§8.1). Apart from these very few phonogram writings, in studying OSi. we must be prepared to cope with mixed-script writings in which phonograms were employed along with other Chinese characters used as logograms (§8.2). In many of these logogram writings the familiar phonogram *śi* is found written following a logogram, or a series of logograms, or sometimes following one or more logograms followed in turn by one or more other phonograms. In such cases, we are able to reconstruct with requisite scientific precision only those portions of the OSi. word written in phonograms, while for the portions written in logograms we can do little more than take over intact what would be the corresponding MK form, following the semantic import of the logogram(s), i.e., follow the traditional practice of Korean scholarship. But when, as in examples 23-28 below, the MK form in question had *l*, and the logogram is followed by a phonogram writing for OSi. *š*, we have excellent evidence here too for recognizing OSi. forms in which *š* corresponds to MK, NK *l*, even though this *š* may be the only part of the OK form concerning which we have absolutely unambiguous evidence in our texts. Finally, we study below (§8.3) two important grammatical elements from the OSi. language that are preserved in the text-corpus in phonogram writings, where it appears that not only OK *š* but also OK *ž* corresponded in certain cases to MK, NK *l*, with of course important concomitant implications for the relationship of Korean to the other Altaic languages.

8.1 21. OSi. \**koš* 'reeds,' glossing Chin. *jiān* 'id.,'<sup>83</sup> is written completely in phonograms. Within Korean, the word is cognate with MK \**kol* (HMCH A 5r) 'id.,' which survives as an archaic term in NK as *kol* 'rush, sedge.' Further the OSi. word has some etymological relationship with MK \**kāl* 'reed, rush' (HMCH A 4v), which regularly became NK *kal*

<sup>83</sup>Yang 95, particularly important for his textual emendation there justified; but note also that in this same passage, Yang 93-7 sets forth in detail the traditional justification for taking the phonogram *śi* as a writing for *l* in all (or almost all!) texts. On this word see also Kwōn 154. One wonders if this form is not in some way also related to Indic *kāśi* (note 40 *supra*), which may itself possibly be Dravidian (Burrow, *BSOAS* 12.372, 1948).

'id.' The disparity in the vocalization of the MK forms remains to be explained; in NK, different but related forms with *a* ~ *o* vocalization are attributed to different developments of MK *ǎ* in certain environments,<sup>44</sup> but it is difficult to see how such circumstances could have been operative in the case of this word. There is also early phonogram evidence for this same word in the shape *kol*,<sup>45</sup> in date considerably earlier than the earliest alphabetic writings for MK. In Altaic, Ramstedt (EAS 1.110) has compared the NK version of this word with MTK. *kaš-ak* 'reed, sedge' (VEWT p. 240b) and Ma. *hali* 'untillable marshland, swamp,' (cf. SKE p. 87, and now also TMS 1.461a), even though the semantics of Manchu and Tungusic comparisons raise questions. But the Turkic-Korean comparisons, and particularly this new evidence from OSl., point in the direction of pA *\*l*, for this word.

22. OSl. *\*kaš(i)gi* is glossed with Chin. *xīn fù* [2737, 1992],<sup>46</sup> but unfortunately this expression is difficult to pin down semantically, nor is it—unlike some other of the Chinese glosses for OK words—a well-attested compound or set-expression. Chin. *xīn* is 'new, newly,' but what are we to make of *fù* [1992]: the Chinese words usually written with this graph mean 'repeat, repeatedly, return, double, reply; again,' but the graph is also used to write words (perhaps cognate, perhaps not) that mean 'embankment, artificial elevation of terrain; earthworks,'<sup>47</sup> and since this OSl. word has been preserved for us as a place-name, these meanings cannot be dismissed lightly. The difficulties in studying this word are enormous, because of the ambiguity of its Chinese gloss; but since it is one of the few OSl. forms for which we have a phonogram orthography uncomplicated by logograms, we will wish at least to make the effort to solve some of its problems. Traditional Korean scholarship has always taken the word to mean 'renew, replace,'<sup>48</sup> a perfectly satisfactory interpretation of the Chinese gloss, though it does not exploit the full semantic range of the words in the text, particularly those likely to be relevant to a place-name; this scholarship has also uniformly passed in silence over the last syllable of the form, written with the phonogram [2414], NC *xi*, MC *yiei*.<sup>49</sup> If, as Korean

<sup>44</sup>Martin 193 has a concise statement of the developments of MK *ǎ*. OJ *kusa* 'grass, herb' also surely belongs to this same etymological group.

<sup>45</sup>Yang 106 cites in this connection a placename in the Kwanggaet'o stele inscription of 414, face 1, line 10, characters 38, 39 in the edition (with rubbings) of Saeki Arikiyo, *Shichishitō to Kōkaitō ōhi* (Tokyo: 1977), p. 35. For an introduction to the inscription of this stele and its bibliography, Ledyard 226 and note 21.

<sup>46</sup>Yang 93, citing *Samguk sagi*, ch. 34.

<sup>47</sup>Morohashi 4.903d-904a, s.v. 10183, *fù*, has all the relevant lexicographical documentation.

<sup>48</sup>Kwōn 154 has the usual explanation; cf. Yang 94.

<sup>49</sup>Though Yang sometimes does take notice of the phonogram in a few placenames, e.g. Yang 719.

scholarship generally maintains, the OSl. word meant 'renew, replace,' then it is likely to be cognate with MK *'kal-*, 'id.,'<sup>50</sup> which in turn goes directly with NK *kal-* 'change, replace, renew.' For this word, Ramstedt's etymology (EAS 1.46, 154; SKE p. 88) relating the MK and NK forms to Manchu *hala-* 'exchange, change' and other Altaic forms is convincing;<sup>51</sup> taken together with the cognates suggested by Ramstedt, the OSl. form would provide evidence for *\*l*, even in the absence of a Turkic cognate for this root. If, on the other hand, this OSl. word meant something closer to 'double, redouble,' senses also quite in keeping with its Chinese gloss, then we would probably wish to consider instead pA *\*kol-* 'add, mix together,'<sup>52</sup> where the semantics of the reflexes in Turkic are particularly promising (VEWT p. 283a-b), even though at the same time we again encounter another of the *a* ~ *o* disparities in vocalism already noted above. Finally, if the OSl. word meant 'embankment, artificial elevation of terrain; earthworks,' then both semantic and phonological considerations are eminently satisfied by the pTk. *\*kaš* implicit in such forms as OT, Uig., etc., *kaš* 'Erhebung, Wall, Hügel, ein hohes Ufer,' Kalm. *xaš* 'Zaun, Wall, Damm,' and similar forms that may be cited (VEWT p. 240a). But for this group of Turkic forms, we also find attested meanings along the lines of 'Seite, Rand, Grenze,' and so at the same time this interpretation of the OSl. word cannot but remind us of MK *\*kās* (HMCH A 3v, B 4v), glossed with a variety of Chinese forms all meaning 'boundary, territorial extent, frontiers,' and hence an almost perfect semantic match for what is perhaps the central meaning of pTk. *\*kās*. The phonology of this MK form is also encouraging, since we would then have yet another instance of the MK pitch "corresponding to an original Altaic long vowel." It is truly unfortunate that the ambiguity of the Chinese gloss for this OSl. word makes it impossible to decide which of these several possible Korean and Altaic etymologies is most likely to have been historically responsible for the word in our texts. Given these basic, and unsolved, problems concerning the meaning of this OSl. word, it is pointless to speculate at length upon what the morphological or other grammatical function of the final *\*-gi* that we reconstruct for this word may have been; but by the same token, we are not entitled to ignore the full shape of the word as it has been preserved for us. Given the fact that the OSl. word in question is a place-name, this suffix might very well be related to the Altaic *nomina loci* otherwise seen in Tk. *-qi* / *-ki*, OJ *-kī*.<sup>53</sup>

<sup>50</sup>Nam Kwang-u, *Ko'ŏ sajŏn* (Seoul: 1973), p. 20b.

<sup>51</sup>More on the Tungusic forms now in TMS 1.364a, s.v. *kala* 'amend, convert, change, vary,' where the semantics of the comparisons are particularly encouraging.

<sup>52</sup>Street 17, incorporating VG 78, 134, 138.

<sup>53</sup>Cf. MK *\*tol* 'stone,' pTk. *\*tās*, etc.; also, note 102 *infra*.

<sup>54</sup>Discussed in useful detail in Menges 1975.11.



8.2 Unlike the two examples just cited, most OSi. words have generally come down to us in mixed orthography that combines logograms with phonograms. We continue below with a selection of words that appear in the texts in this mixed orthography, where the phonogram portion of the orthography indicates OK *š*, which in many cases further appears to correspond to MK, NK *l* and also pA *\*l*. We continue to transcribe phonograms in *miniscules*, as above, distinguishing their linguistic evidence in this fashion from that of the logograms, which *faute de mieux* we render in MK and transcribe in *MAJUSCULES*.

23. The OSi. word for 'road, way, path' is a typical example of the mixed logogram-phonogram writing with which we must generally contend in the OSi. texts. The word appears written with two Chinese graphs, the first Chin. *dào* 'road, way, path' as a logogram, followed by Chin. *sī* in its by-now well-established role as a phonogram for OK *š*. Following the transcription conventions summarized above, we can only render this word as OSi. *\*KIš* 'road, way, path,' carrying over the initial and vowel of this form from MK *'kil* 'id.' (HMCH A 3v), and NK *kil* 'id.' It has been suggested that all these Korean forms—OSi., MK, and NK alike—are cognate with Ma. *giri* 'stripe, line, file, row, section, area,' and this proposed etymology has been cited in turn as a justification for interpreting the OK phonogram that we now understand to be a writing for *š* as if it had instead been a writing for *l*,<sup>99</sup> but we need no longer concern ourselves with the reversal of philological logic that such a position represents; at the same time, semantic considerations rule out any connection between this Manchu word and the Korean forms in question.<sup>100</sup>

24. OSi. 'day; sun' is similarly written in mixed logogram-phonogram orthography in a single text<sup>101</sup> as *NAš*, with Chin. *ri* 'id.' as the logogram. Neither the context in which the word appears<sup>102</sup> nor the logogram makes clear whether the word should be understood as 'sun' or 'day,' and if as 'sun,' in which sense of that term. In MK we find *na* 'sun (planet; opposed to 'moon')' (HMCH A 1r); other MK texts<sup>103</sup> have *'nal*, but again only with the usual ambiguous Chinese gloss *ri*. (This Chinese word itself is from MC *rižiet*, which may also have played a part in the selection of this particular

logogram.) NK has *nal* 'a day, 24 hours,' *nac* 'the day, daytime,' but *hai* 'the sun (planet); the daytime.' The OSi. writing has been taken as *\*nal*, and a comparison with Mo. *naran* 'sun' invoked to justify reading the phonogram for *š* as if it were a writing for *l*.<sup>100</sup> Street<sup>101</sup> has made an excellent beginning in unravelling the etymological tangle that still confuses the origins of a large number of important Altaic words in all the languages, involving roots of the original shapes *\*ñāl*, and *\*ñār*, but more remains to be done about this problem before we will be in a position to say much more about the Korean etymologies involved. In the meantime, rather than looking in the direction of Mo. *naran* and other *r*-forms, one might well direct attention instead to the Tk. words going with pTk. *\*jaš* in the senses of 'leuchten, Licht, Blitz,' including such forms as Uig. *jašuk* 'Glanz, glanzend,' and Chag. *jašik* 'Sonne (als Planet),' also in the same sense in the *Kutadyu bilig* (VEWT, p. 192a); in Tungusic, on the other hand, there is also an enormous family of words (TMS 1.348b-350a), represented throughout all the languages (but strangely missing from Manchu!), that are apparently derivatives from a root meaning 'appear, come out,' cf. Lam. *ñūltan* 'Gestirn; Sonne,' and these too may eventually prove to be relevant to the etymology of the OSi. form (cf. NK *na*- 'become,' and its Japanese cognates, already discussed above).

A number of OSi. forms are preserved in even more complex orthographic combinations, with more than one phonogram following the logogram. For some of these words Korean scholarship has suggested that the employment of multiple phonograms was an OK orthographic technique for marking vowel length,<sup>102</sup> a thesis that is particularly convincing when the MK cognate for the word in question has the MK "pitch that in turn correlates with NK vowel length.<sup>103</sup>

<sup>99</sup>Yi-Lewin 79, and esp. on the phonogram *si* in writing this word, 72. Cf. also Qytan *njā-la* 'sun, day' (Menges 1968.92), preserved only in Chin. transcription, and hence possible to be taken either as *\*ñara* or *\*ñala* (perhaps another early instance of the beginning of the consolidation of the liquids?).

<sup>101</sup>Street 34. In the eventual further unravelling of these etymologies, it will also be useful to take notice of early analogic shifting of original *\*r* > *n*- before liquids, which appears to have taken place independently in the various languages at early stages in their histories: on OJ *tōri* > *nōri* 'dharma' (both forms attested in written records), cf. OT *tōrū* 'id.', Menges 1975.36; also attested but not yet noticed in the literature in this connection is the Korean cognate, MK *nal*, which glosses Chin. *jīng* in the special sense of 'warp in fabric' (Yi Sung-nyōng, *Chungse kug'ō munpōp* [Seoul: 1957], p. 135 §174(2)), which meaning however goes directly with Chin. *jīng* 'classic, basic text (Confucian); sūtra (Buddhist),' and hence also with the 'dharma' meaning.

<sup>102</sup>Staffan Rosén, *A study on tones and tonemarks in Middle Korean* (Stockholm: 1974), p. 121 ff.

<sup>103</sup>Martin 103.

<sup>99</sup>Yi-Lewin 79.

<sup>100</sup>Cf. TMS 1.155a-b, particularly the Nanai forms cited 155b with the meaning 'precipice,' the Ma. word in question probably represents a localized semantic specialization of earlier *\*giri* 'shore, bank, precipice.' One is tempted to compare OJ *kisi* 'id.', but such a form, if cognate, would suppose pTg. *\*l*, not *\*r* (unless this is more early evidence for the first stages of the Tungusic consolidation of the liquids?).

<sup>101</sup>Yang No. 24, SS No. 24, line 5.

<sup>102</sup>Cf. the commentary in Yang 849-50, and the tsl. by Peter Lee in SS 99; the sense of the line is something like 'the day when one attains the ocean of enlightenment.'

<sup>103</sup>Yang 850 has two MK citations of *'nal*; Nam, *Ko'ō sajōn*, 95a has two others.



25. An Old Silla text has a form that appears to be cognate with MK *\*ul-* 'lament, cry,' written with a series of four Chinese characters: the first graph is Chin. *kū* 'id.,' generally taken as the logogram in the writing, and the last three are generally taken as phonograms,<sup>104</sup> [7212, 5756, 2932] MC *\*uk ši i*. The OSi. form has generally been taken as representing *\*uli-*, on the basis of the MK form cited, and also NK *ūl-* 'weep, cry, sob, shed tears; utter characteristic cry (of birds, animals),' even though such a reconstruction leaves the testimony of the three phonograms virtually unaccounted for. Furthermore, Shiratori long ago compared these MK and NK verbs with Ma. *ura-* 'to echo' (SK pp. 250-1; cf. now also TMS 2.23a), a comparison often repeated thereafter (e.g., MK, 118.232), even though the semantics of the words make their etymological relationship unlikely. On the evidence of the logogram-phonogram orthography, we must reconstruct OSi. *\*Uukši* for this word. The *š* inclines us to look for an etymology involving *\*l*, (which again renders the Ma. word cited an unlikely cognate); a promising candidate is that provided by the Turkic root *\*uš-*, as attested in MTK. *üşkür* 'schreien, pfeifen,' Kzk., Tara. *üşkür* 'zwischen, einen pfeifenden Ton von sich geben' (VEWT, p. 523b). This comparison would imply that the OSi. word is a metathesis, in the text, from original *\*Uuški*, in which the *-u-* phonogram following the logogram is writing an original OK long vowel; the *-š-* is a reflex of pA *\*l*; the *-k-* an OK reflex of the Altaic original of the Turkic intensive verb-stem suffix;<sup>105</sup> and the *-i* the OK reflex of the Altaic deverbal noun morpheme *\*-i*.<sup>106</sup> In this way, we are able to account for the entire form as it is written in the text, not only in terms of OK orthography, but also in terms of Altaic-OK etymology. Also probably cognate with this same pA *\*ul-* established by the above comparisons is J *uso* 'a whistling sound or noise' (attested in a text of 1252 AD, but not in OJ proper); and if OJ *ora-* 'lament, cry'<sup>107</sup> is related to these Korean and other Altaic words, it must be explained as a loan into OJ from some form of late

OK, which already had *l*, not *š*, for *\*l*, a route that would actually fit in very well with the circumstances of this OJ word's attestation.<sup>108</sup>

26. An OSi. word meaning 'turn, revolve' is written variously as *hui yú shī* and *hái yú shī*; in both writings, the first characters, *hui* or *hái*, are logograms for 'turn, (re)turn, revolve,' while the last two are phonograms,<sup>109</sup> [7643, 5756], MC *l'wo ši*. The word is surely cognate with MK *\*tol-*, NK *tōl-* 'turn, spin, rotate, revolve,' with OSi. *š* for the final consonant, and OK vowel length indicated by the phonogram *yú* that follows either of the two logograms used to write the word. We may reconstruct OSi. *\*TOwoš* for this word. Japanese cognates elsewhere suggested for MK *\*tol-* have already implied the original *\*l*, that the OSi. *š* also indicates.<sup>110</sup> Shiratori's suggestion (SK, pp. 239-40, taken over in MK 118.223) that Ma. *torho-* 'circle, revolve, rotate, spin' is a cognate with the MK and NK forms is now less convincing, because of the Ma. *-r-*; the ultimate Altaic etymology of these Korean words will involve the study of an enormous family of related terms,<sup>111</sup> which cannot be undertaken here. But such study is urgently needed, if only because it will at the very least provide important data concerning one of the possible historical origins of the Korean long vowels,<sup>112</sup> which as we have seen here may even be established from the evidence of OSi. orthography.

Two final examples may be cited of OSi. lexical materials that appear to bear, in one way or another, upon the same general question here under discussion, even though both are difficult and neither admits of a simple solution at the present time.

27. The Chinese logogram *bái* 'speak, say' followed with two phonograms, *wū shī* (the same two phonograms that we saw as the first two phonograms in the writing of ex. 25), is employed to write an OSi. word that has been taken, in both form and meaning, as equivalent to MK *salp-*

<sup>104</sup>The *Tōdaiji fujū monkō* has been described as containing "Musterformeln für Totenmessen, und zwar vermutlich der Hossō-sekte" (G. Wenck, *Japanische Phonetik*, Bd. III.284, Wiesbaden: 1958); the miscellany is an interpolated palimpsest that preserves, *inter alia*, fragments of a number of early Buddhist liturgical texts and sacramentaries. Given the Old Korean, and particularly the Old Paekche, origins of early Japanese Buddhism, OK loans in such a source would hardly be surprising.

<sup>105</sup>Yang No. 1, cf. his 142; SS No. 5. Cf. Rosén, *A study on tones* . . . , p. 122 and pp. 124-5.

<sup>106</sup>Martin 245.246.

<sup>107</sup>E.g., the forms involved in the reconstruction *\*topār-* 'round (?)', Street 28, as well as in *\*togā-* 'to be round, go around', Street, *ibid.*, with references there to VG, esp. VG 14. Cf. now also TMS 2.204b.

<sup>112</sup>Reminding one of the early suggestions by Pelliot and Ligeti for 'vowel-consonant- (or semivowel)-vowel' origins for some of the 'original' long vowels, L. Ligeti, 'Les voyelles longues en turc,' *JA* 230.177-204 (1938), following up P. Pelliot, 'Les mots à h initiale . . . ,'  
*JA* 206.231, note 1 (1925).

<sup>104</sup>Yang No. 1; SS No. 4; on this poem, Yang 91 ff; Rosén 121 ff.

<sup>105</sup>On the morphological structure of this word, Ė. V. Sevortjan, *Ėtimolog. slovar* 1. 645; on the intensive derivational suffix, G. J. Ramstedt, *Zur Verbstammbildungslehre* . . . (MSFOU 28, 1912) §9 ff., p. 10 ff.; EAS 2.170-173; Menges 1968.126; Menges 1975.50, 64.

<sup>106</sup>N. Poppe, *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies* (Helsinki: 1955), p. 264; N. Poppe, 'Ancient Mongolian,' in *Tractata Altaica* (Wiesbaden: 1976), p. 471. The form in the text is a noun, *pace* the translation in SS; cf. Rosén, *loc. cit.*

<sup>107</sup>Attested in this form in the OJ Buddhist miscellany known as the *Tōdaiji fujū monkō*, line 320, where it glosses Chin. *hào* 'to wail, cry with a loud voice' (ed. Nakata Norio, *Tōdaiji fujū monkō no kokugoteki kenkyū*, p. 162 (Tokyo: 1968)). In this unique source, the word is attested in the bare stem form *ora-*, not with the secondary stem suffix *-b-* that it usually has in other OJ texts (e.g., *orab-*, in the same sense).

'say, tell,'<sup>113</sup> a form that has in turn been compared with Sol. *silba-* 'teach, name, call.'<sup>114</sup> It is difficult to reconstruct an OSi. form from this writing; it appears to show the same suffixal elements as the word in ex. 25.

28. The Chinese logogram *qi* 'pray, implore' followed with two phonograms, [2932, 937], MC *i ísié*, NC *yí zhī*, is employed to write an OSi. word that has been taken, in both form and meaning, as equivalent to MK *\*pil-* (HMCH C 10r), NK *pil-* 'ask for, beg.'<sup>115</sup> There can be little or no question that in this writing Chin. *qí* is a logogram; equally clear appears to be the role of the first phonogram in writing the original OK long vowel that the word apparently had. But the role of the second phonogram, NC *zhī*, is difficult, and traditional scholarship has even classified it as an 'empty graph,' i.e., a phonogram whose sound value is zero,<sup>116</sup> as if such a denomination explained anything. Again, Shiratori was the first to identify this Korean verb with Ma. *firu-* 'to pray' (SK, pp. 145-6), in an etymology often repeated since his day (e.g., MK, 109.59), though hardly ever with acknowledgement of his original publication. pA *\*pirü-* 'pray, ask' has been reconstructed,<sup>117</sup> but this form does not include Turkic data, nor of course does it take cognizance of the OK evidence. The question centers about the graph *zhī*; unless we are to agree with the modern Korean scholars that this graph here is of 'no phonetic value,' we must assign some value to its employment as a phonogram. In view of its MC value, an OSi. value as *\*č* or *\*j*, i.e., a voiceless or voiced dental-palatal affricate, with or without a following *i*-vowel, seems reasonable. If the phonogram *yí* is being used to indicate the long vowel of the word in question, then this *zhī* must be writing the final consonant of the same word, as *\*č(i)* or *\*j(i)*. Turkic has various verbs meaning 'seek, want,' which are apparently denominal formations upon pA *\*ir*, 'trace, track.'<sup>118</sup> But an original pA *\*pir*, 'seek, beg, pray for' would, as a regular development, have yielded a homonymous *\*iz-* in proto-Tkc., and would also fit in regularly with the MK and NK forms cited. At least the possibility cannot be excluded that the

<sup>113</sup>Yang No. 7; SS No. 12.

<sup>114</sup>Yi Ki-mun, '... *i* breaking,' p. 135; but the form is difficult to verify, and appears to have escaped the attention of the TMS editors. Perhaps Ev. *sinma-* < *\*silba-*, cf. Mo. *šilga-* < *\*sil(i)-kā-* 'to examine, to select' (N. Poppe, 'On some cases of Fusion and Vowel Alternation in the Altaic Languages,' CAJ 19.314, 1975) was intended? With this Ev. form and its suffix in particular, cf. J *sirab-* 'investigate, study,' and J *sir-* 'know.'

<sup>115</sup>Yang No. 7. SS, No. 12; cf. Yang 463, Rosén 123-4.

<sup>116</sup>Thus, e.g., by Yang 463, who dubs it an 'empty graph' (Chin. *xū zì*), cf. Rosén 124. But is it really likely that an orthography ever employed any written symbols for absolutely no purpose at all? And if it did, how could such symbols be selected, for if they had no purpose in the orthography, in theory at least any of the symbols in the script (i.e., in the present instance, any Chinese character!) might equally well have been selected.

<sup>117</sup>Street 23, incorporating VG 12, 60, 116, 127.

<sup>118</sup>VEWT 175b; Menges 1975.65-67.

graph *zhī* in the orthography of this particular word is a phonogram that was employed to write OSi. *\*č* or *\*j* as a reflex of pA *\*r*. In such a case, we might reconstruct the OSi. word as *\*Plič*. But problems concerning the orthographic role of Chin. *zhī* as a phonogram are by no means isolated within Korean. The employment of this same graph as a phonogram in writing OJ texts is also still difficult to explain;<sup>119</sup> as an OJ phonogram, *zhī* has the surprising value of *kī*. Proto-Mongolian has this same root in the derivative form *\*pirügē*,<sup>120</sup> and the Tungusic evidence also shows a related stem-format suffix involving a velar stop (TMS, 2.327b-328a). Given the role of this graph as an OJ phonogram, the possibility also cannot be excluded that in this OSi. writing, the character is being used to transcribe an OK reflex of this same velar stem-format morpheme—though at the same time, such an interpretation puts into question the earlier assignment of the phonogram *yí* as a vowel-length marker. The word in question is so fully attested throughout all the Altaic languages that it is particularly unfortunate to find that the OK evidence is orthographically this complicated.

8.3 Although the OSi. writing system, because of its unpredictable mixture of logograms and phonograms, was generally an unfortunate orthography, and one that moreover usually ill serves the ends of historical-linguistic study, a welcome exception is provided by the grammatical elements (case markers, post-positions, derivational and inflectional morphemes, etc.), which were most often written in phonograms. In the case of these also, the plain phonological testimony of the texts has too often been obscured by traditional scholarship, which regularly renders OK grammatical elements, along with OK lexical items, as if they were always identical in form with their later MK and NK cognates; again, the evidence of the phonogram orthography of the texts argues strongly against this anachronistic approach. Applying to the grammatical elements of OSi. texts the same principles of interpretation demonstrated above for lexical items, we soon learn that the OSi. corpus in particular preserves a rich repertory of OK grammatical morphemes that prove to be of considerable value, not only for the internal history of Korean but also for clarifying the relationship of Korean to the other Altaic languages. The two examples that follow are only a sample of the data available from this sector of OK, almost all of which still awaits exploitation by the Altaic comparativist.

<sup>119</sup>JL 13-15, 360-61.

<sup>120</sup>VG 127. The graph in question is employed as a phonogram for OJ *kī*, for reasons that have yet to be explained in a completely satisfactory fashion; but this is at the same time curiously redolent of the suffixal elements in the pMo. reconstruction cited.

29. In the Old Silla text-corpus the imperfect adnominal verb suffix,<sup>121</sup> apparently cognate with later MK, NK *l*, is regularly written with [5756]<sup>122</sup>; the same phonogram that we have seen regularly employed for OK *š*. Again, traditional scholarship has uniformly interpreted this phonogram writing for *š* as if it were later MK and NK *l*.<sup>123</sup> But recognizing it for what it must surely be, now makes it possible to associate this morpheme on the comparative level of inquiry with pA *\*-l*, corresponding to Mo. *l* and Tk. *š*, as well as also to MK, NK *l*, and representing the formant of the well-known Altaic nomen verbale.<sup>124</sup> An often-cited text-passage that displays multiple examples of this verb suffix as it functioned within OK is the following:<sup>125</sup> *KULLiś MĀZĀmāi NYŌXoś KIS* 'the road along which [I] pass / in [my] heart (that) longs for [you].'<sup>126</sup> The first word in this passage, *KULLiś* '(that) longs for [you],' is written with Chin. *mù* 'desire, long for' as a logogram, followed by two phonograms, [3864], NC *li*, and this followed in turn by the same well-known phonogram for *š* that we have seen so often above. The phonogram *li* apparently writes both the final *-l(-)* of the OS. *kul-* that is simultaneously written with the logogram that it follows, as well as the following *-i-* (hence the *KULLi-* of our transcription, with its double *-li-*, which is however orthographic, not phonological). The verb is most surely cognate with MK *kul-* 'id.' The *š* phonogram final in this form is, of course, writing OS. *-š*, cognate with the later MK, NK imperfect adnominals in *l*. The phonogram in question also has the same function in the third word in this passage, *NYŌXoś*, where Chin. *xing* 'go, come' is a logogram for what we have interpreted as OK *nyō-* 'id.,' followed by two phonograms, [2154], NC *hū*, and again [5756] for *š*. This third word is in turn adnominal to the fourth, in the writing of which the function of the *š* phonogram, following Chin. *dào* as a logogram for 'road, path, way' has

<sup>121</sup>G. J. Ramstedt, *A Korean Grammar* (Helsinki: 1939; reprinted Seoul, n.d.) §215, p. 106; §221, p. 108.

<sup>122</sup>Yang 174.

<sup>123</sup>Yi-Lewin 85 ('als Endungen der Verbalnomina . . .').

<sup>124</sup>Menges 1975.53. Professor Menges now also reminds me that an OJ form such as *arisi* (OJ *arisi* *Fī* 'the day that once was,' with *Fī* 'day') is completely parallel in morphological structure with OT *ār-m-iš*, the only difference between the two forms being that the Tk. incorporates an additional morpheme *-m-* for past tense nomina verbalia.

<sup>125</sup>Yang No 1, SS No 5, line 7 (the poem is traditionally attributed to the period ca. 692-702). The same poem is also the subject of the paper by Sō., *loc. cit.*

<sup>126</sup>Peter Lee, SS 61, translates '. . . the course of my fervent mind.' The text is cited, discussed, and translated into Japanese in the most valuable fashion in Fujimoto Yukio, in his translation of Yi Ki-mun's *Kugōsa kaesōl* under the title *Kankokugo no rekishi* (Tokyo: 1975), p. 90, and p. 299, note 25. The same passage is rendered in Yi-Lewin, 79 (cf. also 85), but without venturing a German translation for the OK. Yi's Korean-language original-text (p. 70) has only the usual MK version of the text; the German translation has an attempt at interpreting the OK vocalism (*kōrir mōzōmay nyāur kir*), but naturally follows the traditional interpretation of the phonogram *si* as *l*.

already been discussed under ex. 23 *supra*. The second word in the passage uses Chin. *xīn* 'heart, spirit' as a logogram for some OS. form cognate with MK *māzām* 'id.,' followed by [7114] as a phonogram writing some OS. equivalent of the MK referent particle *-āi / -ūi*, here as a locative-directional. Word 1 in the passage modifies word 2, and word 3 modifies word 4, so that in the necessarily rather free translation already given, *KULLiś* is '(that) longs for [you],' *MĀZĀmāi* is 'in [my] heart,' *NYŌXoś* is 'along which [I] pass,' and *KIS* is 'the road,' the noun that functions as the nucleus of the entire syntactic structure represented by the passage as a whole.

Most of the above examples have seemed to show OK *š* corresponding not only to MK, NK *l*, but also to pA *\*l*, at least in those cases where comparative evidence from the other Altaic languages has been available. Under these circumstances we may well wish to ask what the OK reflex for pA *\*r* may have been. The question can hardly be answered in full here, but evidence may be cited, in conclusion, that points in the direction of an OK *ž* < pA *\*r*. Because this OK phoneme apparently fell together with OK *š* < *\*l*, to appear later as MK, NK *l*, the phonogram evidence of the old texts for its presence in OK has been obscured by traditional scholarship in the same manner that we have documented above for the case of OK *š*. The following single example must suffice.

30. The last line of the same famous OS. poem-text cited in example 29 *supra* concludes with an OK word that is generally equated with MK *isili*<sup>127</sup> or MK *isiali*<sup>128</sup>; it is written with a logogram, Chin. *yōu* 'be, have,' followed by three phonograms, [1046, 2520, 5794], MC *is'let ya žie*. This logogram is surely a writing for some OK verb cognate with MK *isi-* / *is-* 'be'<sup>129</sup> known also in the early MK, i.e., Koryō form *isil* preserved in the Chinese transcription of the *Kyerim yusa* vocabulary (ca. 1102-1106).<sup>130</sup> We may with confidence reconstruct OK *\*wis-* for this verb on the basis of

<sup>127</sup>Yang No 1, SS No 5, final line; cf. Yang 60.

<sup>128</sup>Sō, 81. And if we can rely upon the accuracy of the citation in Kim Sa-yeup, *Kodai Chōsengo to Nihongo* (Tokyo: 1974), p. 153 (a dangerous assumption with this book, however), the same word has also been read by Hong Ki-mun as *isiali*. This demonstrates once more how far traditional scholarship is from any significant consensus on reading even the most simple words in these poems, vowels and consonants alike.

<sup>129</sup>Yi-Lewin 254; cf. also 172, 188.

<sup>130</sup>Sasse 137.348 (but the gloss 'haben' is incorrect, read instead 'sein,' so also with 137.349, not 'nicht haben' but 'nicht sein').

comparison with the other Altaic languages.<sup>131</sup> Phonogram [1046] is likely to have been a writing for OK *-s-*.<sup>132</sup> The function of the second phonogram, and particularly of its initial  $\gamma$ , remains almost totally obscure; the Korean scholars all ignore its consonant, and most of them also its vowel. Though there is thus much remaining that we do not understand about this OK word, we may at least recover an OSi. form something along the lines of *WIs(γ)āzi* for the orthography in the text, where the word is apparently to be understood as meaning something like 'would, may there be,' or even (as a rhetorical question, perhaps) 'is there (ever) to be?'.<sup>133</sup> Whatever the original meaning and form of this word in Silla OK, what is important for our present purposes is the evidence that what is clearly the same word is employed in another text—where again it is in a last-line—by the Buddhist poet Kyunyō (917-973): in his version, the first three graphs are the same, but for the final phonogram, instead of *zi*, Kyunyō substitutes [4280], MC *l̥ʷo*,<sup>134</sup> in other words, a phonogram indicating an *l*-phoneme where the other, and earlier, text had a phonogram indicating an *ž*- or *z*-phoneme. Kyunyō's sequence of eleven poems on the *Bhadracaripra-nidhāna*<sup>135</sup> is, at one and the same time, both the last OSi. text, and the first Early MK, i.e., Koryō, text.<sup>136</sup> Given this poet's unique literary-historical role, as a bridge between the end of the OK poetic period and the initiation of the MK poetic tradition, it is surely of more than routine interest, particularly in comparative Altaic terms, to find as we do here that he replaces an OSi. *ž* or *z* with an early MK *l*. And even though our present understanding of both forms and meanings remains, in this case, unfortunately incomplete, these two early Korean versions of forms that

<sup>131</sup>EAS 2.91; SKE 68 (but the remark in that place about "the initial sound . . . in oldest documents" is to be corrected; the symbol  $\phi$  is a writing for initial  $\eta$ - in late MK (Yi-Lewin, 131). References to "Old Korean" in SKE uniformly refer not to OK properly so-called, but rather to late MK, e.g., SKE 208, s.v. *spur*, *spj̄r*, and *passim*. Together with the inherited Altaic verb for 'be,' PEA also preserves the inherited Verbum negativum, in the form of MK, NK *ōps-* (registered for early MK in Sasse 137.349, with the correction in the gloss as immediately *supra*, and understanding that the first two graphs of the Chinese transcription are mistakenly interchanged with each other). This form goes directly with the Altaic, resp. Tg. Verbum negativum \**š-si-* (Menges 1975.96 ff.), but in the PEA forms the *-s-* of the inherited aorist formation appears in metathesized order with the *-p-* that here continues the original labial initial of the verb 'be': *ōps-* < \**ōsp-* < \**š-s-bi-*.

<sup>132</sup>Yi-Lewin 84; also several other places noted s.v. Genitiv-s in the Sachregister, 320.

<sup>133</sup>Yang 193; Peter Lee, SS 61, translates, 'would there be . . . ?' 'can it (find sleep)?.'

<sup>134</sup>Yang No 19, SS No 19; Yang 763.

<sup>135</sup>P. H. Lee, *Korean Literature: Topics and Themes* (Tucson: 1965), 11-2; see also his paper, 'The Importance of the Kyunyō chōn (1075) in Korean Buddhism and Literature . . .,' JAOS 81.409-414 (1961).

<sup>136</sup>Lee, *Korean Literature* . . . , p. 15.

must be related to the verb \**wi-*, *wis-* 'be' (cf. OJ *wi-* 'id.'<sup>137</sup>) first of all remind us of the characteristic secondary Tungusic formations in *-si-* for this same verb (Udh. *bi-*, *bih-*; Negd. *bi-*, *bisi-*; Ev., Lam. *bi-*, *bis-*), secondary forms that are further represented in the Manchu imperfect participle *bisire*, itself in turn exactly mirrored in J *wisiri* 'sitting down; the buttocks (while sitting)'.<sup>138</sup> Benzing believed that Ma. *bisire* was to be explained by an earlier \**bisiri*, seeing in that form an anomalous 'double aorist' in which a formation in *-si(-)* had additionally suffixed *-re* < \**-ri* "aus der I.Klasse ubernommen."<sup>139</sup> Particularly in view of the OK evidence, and for other reasons as well,<sup>140</sup> one may well now wish to question this explanation. Perhaps in Ma. *bisire* we should attempt instead to find a much older formation, one incorporating a Tungusic reflex for the pA deverbal noun suffix in \**-r*, that has now been clarified, after much earlier misunderstanding, for Tk. *-z* formations of the nomen verbale.<sup>141</sup> If so, then the OK and Ma. forms, as well as the Japanese,<sup>142</sup> would fit together neatly: OSi. *WIs(γ)āzi*, Koryō *WIs(γ)alo*, MK *isili* = J *wisiri*, Ma. *bisire*, all showing an inherited formation of a nomen verbale in \**-r*, onto \**bisi-* from \**bi-*.

Other examples in the OK corpus of phonogram evidence for *ž* or *z* corresponding to later MK, NK *l*, and perhaps also to \**r*, remain to be studied in detail. The *Ch'an kilborang ka* poem, attributed ca. 742-65, has another important OK formation upon this same verb *wi-*, *wisi-* 'be': the word is in mixed logogram-phonogram orthography, and is traditionally taken as equivalent to MK *isyula*, an exclamatory or emphatic meaning 'is, be there';<sup>143</sup> but in the text itself the final syllable is written with phonogram [2625]. This phonogram is unfortunately ambiguous: it was both MC *zla* and MC *la*, so the form that it writes in part may have been OK *WIsyuzya*

<sup>137</sup>The form seems to go directly with a pA \**bi-*, as reconstructed e.g. in Menges 1968.145, considering as a secondary development within pMo. the \**bü-* otherwise and generally reconstructed for this verb, Street 10, VG 112. More on the connections of this OJ verb with Tg. and pA in ZDMG 126.\*71.\*72\* (1976); cf. Poppe 1975.184 note 217.

<sup>138</sup>The form is unfortunately not attested in Japanese until the *haikai* poets of the early NJ period (citations in Ōno et al., *Kogojiten*, 1404b), but it fits the characteristic Tg. aorist formations precisely, both in form and in meaning.

<sup>139</sup>J. Benzing, *Die tungusischen Sprachen. Versuch einer vergleichenden Grammatik* (Mainz: 1955) §133, p. 1072.

<sup>140</sup>Menges 1975.105-6, with citations of important earlier literature; K. H. Menges, 'Die tungusischen Sprachen,' p. 80 and *passim*. in B. Spuler, ed., *Handbuch der Orientalistik, I.5.3, Tungusologie* (Leiden/Köln: 1968).

<sup>141</sup>Menges 1968.96-7 (also *passim*.) deals with these deverbal nouns in Tk. *-z* in an authoritative fashion.

<sup>142</sup>On the Japanese reflexes for pA \**r*, i.e. OJ *r* in regular variation with *r*, see 'Japanese-Altaic Lexical Evidence . . .' cited in note 38 *supra*.

<sup>143</sup>Yang No 4, SS No 10, line 5.

or *Wisuyya*, but it scarcely could have had the *-l-* that traditional scholarship takes over for it intact from MK. Another of the Koryŏ poems of Kyunyŏ<sup>144</sup> uses phonogram [1756], MC *nizi*, as a phonogram for the second-to-last syllable in yet another formation on this same verb, a form generally equated with MK *isiliyŏ*, with *-yŏ* an exclamatory or interrogative particle. This particular phonogram is a *hapax* within the OK corpus, so not too much may be made of the passage; but at the very least it shows the possibility of yet another OK formation on this verb *wi-*, *wisi-*, of the type *wisiz-*, again probably to be compared both to the later MK formations in *-l-*, as well as with Ma. *besire* and J *wisiri*. Finally, the last line of the *Chemangmae ka* poem, attributed to an author active ca. 742-65, has a mixed logogram-phonogram writing for a verb form in which one of the phonograms, [5794], writes *ž(i)* in a verb that in MK would have *-l-* in the same position;<sup>145</sup> the OSI. word may be restored as *KITŪžikoTA* 'would, will wait,' cf. MK *kitül-* 'wait, wait upon,'<sup>146</sup> NK *kitali-* 'wait (for), lie in wait for; anticipate, expect.'

8.4. The above discussion has exploited the evidence of certain OK written records, in an effort to clarify a number of historical aspects of the OK consonantism, especially the OK reflexes for the original Altaic liquids, and within the set of the liquids, particularly for pA *\*l<sub>2</sub>* and *\*r<sub>2</sub>*. But Korean historical-linguistic data relating to this question is by no means restricted to the always difficult OK written records. It is also available in significant measure even from within the synchronic structures of MK and NK, where it may be recovered ('reconstructed') by the technique of internal reconstruction. Again, much remains to be done in this connection, and in the present lines we may only indicate in broad outline the principal directions that such future work may fruitfully take.

NK inherited from MK and preserves pretty much intact a small set of verbs that are morphologically anomalous. These are the so-called "instable *t/l* stems" or bases,<sup>147</sup> verbs that have been categorized as being "consonant bases ending in basic *l* that alternates with *t*".<sup>148</sup> A representative example of this small set of morphologically anomalous verbs<sup>149</sup> is NK *tül-* 'listen, hear,' with forms such as *tüt-ta*, *tukkŏ* < *\*tut-ko*, etc., but *tül-uni*,

<sup>144</sup>Yang No 25, SS No 25.

<sup>145</sup>Yang No 11, SS No 9.

<sup>146</sup>Yang 560; the MK form is attested in the *Yongbi ŏch'ŏn ka* eulogy cycle composed in 1445-1447 (additional citations in Nam, *Ko'ŏ sajŏn*, 78a).

<sup>147</sup>B. Lewin, *Morphologie des koreanischen Verbs* (Wiesbaden: 1970) §1.12.22.4, p. 11.

<sup>148</sup>S. E. Martin, Lee, & Chang, *A Korean-English Dictionary* (New Haven: 1967), p. xvii; S. E. Martin, *Korean Morphophonemics* (Baltimore: 1954) §11.1.4, p. 30.

<sup>149</sup>Yi-Lewin 187 has only a brief notice of these verbs, but no account of their possible historical origin. Ramstedt, *Korean Grammar* §118 II 5, p. 64, speculated that "stems of this kind had probably originally spirantic *d*," a perceptive comment.

*tül-ŭmyŏn*, etc.; i.e., these verbs display morpheme alternants of their bases in *-t* before an enclitic suffix with an initial consonant, but alternants in *-l* before an enclitic with initial vowel. Furthermore, the verbs that belong to this small set contrast morphologically with "stable *t*-stems" or bases that have *-t* throughout: *kŏt-* 'gather, roll up,' *kŏt-ta*, but also *kŏt-ŏtül-* 'take up, tuck up' is a stable base that contrasts morphologically with *kŏt-* 'go on foot,' with *kŏt-ta*, but *kŏl-ŏka-*, etc.

Ramsey has studied the MK evidence for this set of anomalous verb stems, correlating that evidence with the data that 15th and 16th century written records preserve for the MK system of pitch-accent.<sup>150</sup> He concludes that "these verbs must be reconstructed in proto-Korean with a stem-final vowel"; all these MK and NK "instable *t/l* stems" would, in his formulation, go back to earlier disyllabic forms ending in a vowel, of the shape *-Că / -Cŭ*, thus MK *tüt-* 'listen, hear,' < *\*tütŭ*, MK *kŏt-* 'walk' < *\*kŏtŭ*, etc. Ramsey's formulation represents a significant contribution to our understanding of this important if small set of anomalous Korean verbs. He is surely correct (as we shall demonstrate immediately below from comparative Altaic evidence) in reconstructing disyllabic stems for these verbs, as well as in the precise details of the vowels that he would reconstruct. His treatment is particularly commendable because it readily accounts for the NK long vowels, which correspond regularly to the MK "pitch, that distinguish almost all the verbs that belong to this set: in his terms, this MK pitch arose in such verbs from pitch-crisis resulting from the loss of the original *-ă / -ŭ* that he reconstructs, when the 'pitch of this vowel was incorporated into the pitch of the preceding, and surviving, syllabic vowel, with ' + ' > ", e.g., *\*kŏ' tŭ* > *\*kŏt-*, etc. Yet at the same time Ramsey's reconstruction is lacking, in that it all but ignores the central issue of the essential morphological anomaly of these verbs, i.e., their stem or base alternation of *l* and *t*. This feature of these verbs—the feature that makes the set to which they belong an anomaly within both MK and NK morphology—Ramsey does not attempt to explain; his three 'Rules' for deriving the forms in the MK texts deal only with the vowels and the pitch, but simply ignore all the consonants involved, including the *l* and the *t* of the alternation. In conclusion he simply claims, but does not demonstrate, that "all occurrences of [MK] *W*, *z*, and *t/l* as the last consonant of a verb stem must have developed through the lenition of /*p*, *s*, *t*/, respectively." But this is simply a synchronic descriptive correlation of the evidence, and leaves both unasked, and unanswered, the essential question of both how and why the alternation *t/l* should have resulted from a "lenition of *t*."

<sup>150</sup>S. Robert Ramsey, 'Middle Korean *W*-, *z*-, and *t/l*-Verb Stems,' *Language Research* 11.59-67 (1975).

Now, however, that we understand both that OK had distinctive reflexes of pA  $*l_1$  and  $*r_2$ , and also that the OJ reflexes of pA  $*r_2$  are represented by OJ  $t$  and  $r$  in regularly predictable phonological environments,<sup>151</sup> we are in a position to bring Ramsey's formulation and reconstruction into direct correlation with actual historical developments within the Altaic languages. From MK and NK, we would have to reconstruct an additional consonantal phoneme—or morphophoneme, but the point in the end is the same—that would account for the alternation in these "instable  $t/l$  stems." Let us write this  $*R_2$ , and assign it, as the evidence directs, to at least the stage of pre-MK. Ramsey has shown that the MK reflex of this  $*R_2$  was always found followed by  $-ä$  /  $-ü$  in pre-MK (the selection between these two vowels being determined by vowel-harmony considerations). A representative example of this set of anomalous  $t/l$  verbs is MK  $köt$ - 'go by foot,' i.e., pre-MK  $*kōR_2ü$ - (incorporating Ramsey's reconstruction with the assumption of  $*R_2$ , and omitting pitch as irrelevant to the problem at hand). With this pre-MK  $*kōR_2ü$ - we may directly compare pA  $*ker_2ü$ - 'roam, wander, travel,' cf. Mo.  $kerü$ - 'wandern, sich umhertreiben,' OT  $kāz$ - 'reisen,' Az.  $kāz$ - 'laufen.'<sup>152</sup> Ramsey's reconstruction of these  $t/l$  stems as original disyllabics ending in a labial vowel, its shape determined by vowel-harmony considerations, is exactly substantiated by the Altaic data, down to and including the quality of the vowel in question. At the same time, the Altaic data also clearly identify our projected pre-MK  $*R_2$ : it is the reflex of pA  $*r_2$ .<sup>153</sup> Two other Korean  $t/l$  verb bases that show etymological connections with Altaic roots in  $*r_2$  may be cited: NK  $tat$ - 'run,' pA  $*ter_2$ - 'run, flee,'<sup>154</sup> and NK  $kyōt$ - 'become greasy, ölig sein,' pA  $*kar_2$  'fat (especially on belly).'<sup>155</sup> Particularly when we remember the small total number of verbs that belong to this  $t/l$  instable stem set in Korean (not more than 15 even with the most generous accounting, and probably a few less than 15 when proper notice is taken of later semantic differentiation of what were most likely originally the same

<sup>151</sup>Described in 'Japanese-Altaic Lexical Evidence . . .' (cited in note 38 *supra*), esp. pp. 157-60.

<sup>152</sup>Street 16, incorporating VG 19, 104.

<sup>153</sup>Martin 245.252 compared "J *kasi*, *kati* 'walking' " with NK  $kōl_1$ - 'walk,' reconstructing pKJ  $*kaš$ -,  $*kal$ -,  $kat$ -, but this comparison must be revised, since the only form that ought properly to be introduced into the problem is OJ *kati* 'going on foot.' OJ *kasi* cited by Martin in the same sense is from the 'Azuma' ("eastern") or non-standard dialect of OJ, and the correspondence between standard OJ  $-i$ - and 'Azuma'  $-s$ - was apparently common if not regular (JL, 166).

<sup>154</sup>Street 27, incorporating VG 14, 104.

<sup>155</sup>Street 16, incorporating VG 17, 87, 96.

word<sup>156</sup>), that three Altaic etymologies of this sort, all with  $*r_2$  and one with  $*r_2ü$ , should be so close at hand, is hardly without historical significance. Even without the orthographic evidence of the OK written records, we should have to make provision for some stage in the history of the language prior to MK in which a separate and independent reflex for pA  $*r_2$  was to be identified, a reflex that contrasted with and was distinct from the reflex of pA  $*r$ . Now, in the light of the evidence of the OK written records, this inference becomes all the sounder, especially since the OK written records extend the overall formulation into the areas of pA  $*l$  and  $*l_2$  as well, i.e., into the total range of the probable OK reflexes of the pA liquids, themselves representing a closed set of distinctive phonemes that we anticipate, with considerable justification, finding operative as a unified phonological set not only in the pA linguistic unity but also in each of the descendant languages as well.<sup>157</sup> For pA  $*l_2$  also the MK written records (but not NK) impose the necessity for the recognition of a distinctive pre-MK reflex. MK has a limited set of nouns that appear in isolation (citation form<sup>158</sup>) in  $-l$ , but that add  $+h$ - to this  $-l$  before an enclitic suffix in initial vowel, e.g. MK  $tol$  'stone,' but  $tolhi$  <  $tol i$  (nom.),  $tolhün$  <  $ün$  (topic marker),  $tolhül$  <  $ül$  (acc.), etc.<sup>159</sup> The morphological anomaly displayed by this limited set of nouns presumes a pre-MK  $*L$  that would have yielded this

<sup>156</sup>A complete inventory of these verbs may be put together from the lists in Lewin, *Morphologie*, Martin, *Morphophonemics*, and Ramsey, . . . 'Verb Stems,' as cited above (notes 147, 148, and 150 *supra*), no one of which appears to be either complete or identical with any other. To arrive at an absolute total number for the class, one would have to make a number of difficult decisions about whether differences in meaning are sufficient to make what is cited as a single form count as two different verbs, e.g.  $kyōl_1$ - (Martin, Lee & Chang, *Korean-English Dictionary* 115b-116a) appears to represent two different words, 'become greasy' and 'weaves, braids;' but to answer whether or not the first of these is the same word or different from *id.*, 'become experienced, is quite at home (in)' is a more subtle problem.

<sup>157</sup>Eric P. Hamp, 'The Altaic Non-obstruents,' pp. 67-70 in L. Ligeti, ed., *Researches in Altaic Languages* (Budapest: 1975) is a particularly important contribution to the entire question, not only of the Altaic liquids, but indeed to the whole range of Altaic linguistic comparisons and historical relationships among the languages, remarkable amidst the Altaic literature for its strong focus on recognized principles of comparison, and its emphasis on the structural functioning of the phonological entities assumed for the earlier stages as well as for the original language. The remarks of L. Clark (JAOS 98.142 ff., 1978) on this paper are quite wide of the mark: no contribution to historical questions of Altaic linguistics in the past decade more deserves the widest possible attention than does this short paper.

<sup>158</sup>E.g., when they are cited in the HMCH. Martin (e.g., 243.244; 228.44) has written all these forms with final  $-lh$ . It is interesting to note that this notation, innocent in itself, has apparently misled some into thinking that the writing stood for a voiceless  $l$  phoneme in MK, and even into postulating a "Proto-Turkic voiceless  $[l]/[h]$ " as does Shirō Hattori, 'The Studies of the Turkic Languages in Japan,' *Sciences of Language* 6.195 (1975). But all this is simply based upon an overliteral misunderstanding of the way those MK forms have sometimes been written in roman transcription.

<sup>159</sup>Yi Sung-nyōng, *Chungse kug'ō munpōp* § 174 (3), p. 135.

-l/-l+h- alternation, and further also that this \*L was an original phoneme distinct from another pre-MK \*l that yielded simple MK l in identical environments (cf. MK *sul* 'rice liquor, wine' + *ün* > *sulün*; *mül* 'water' > *mülün*; *pal* 'foot' + *äl* > *paläl*; *pöl* 'bee' > *pölül*). The occurrence of this \*L in the word for 'stone' at once suggests identifying it with pA \*l<sub>2</sub>.<sup>160</sup> Above we have seen reasons to recognize OK *š* in example (16), where there is further evidence for MK -l+h- as well as for pA \*l<sub>2</sub>. Example (22) is too full of unsolved problems to be of critical assistance, but here too at least a possibility along the same general lines must be admitted to exist. And example (23) is rather more suggestive: MK *kil* 'road' is actually *kil+h-*, while we have seen that the OK cognate is to be reconstructed as *KIš*, completing another OK *š* = MK -l+h- set, and thus pointing once more in the direction of pA \*l<sub>2</sub>.<sup>161</sup> Again, even without the evidence of the OK written records, it would be necessary to recognize pre-MK \*L alongside pre-MK \*l; but now that the evidence of those OK written records is available, it becomes possible further to identify this \*L as the OK reflex of pA \*l<sub>2</sub>.

<sup>160</sup>Pope (1974.133) refers again recently to the difficulties that still exist when we attempt to bring together all the words for 'stone' in the various languages, particularly the difficulties in connecting the Tg. words in -ō- (Ev. *jolo* 'large stone, boulder, rock,' Lam. *jöl* 'stone,' Nan. *jolo* 'id.') with the Tk. forms in -ā-. Difficulties remain here to be sure, but much can be done to resolve them by considering together the Korean and Japanese evidence. Most important is the pitch of MK \**tol+h-*, for which we may with confidence reconstruct an earlier bisyllabic form \**tól-hā* (Ramsey, *op. cit.*, p. 65 and note 8 with additional examples and citations). Probably to be compared directly with this and the other original \*-o- forms is not OJ *isi*, as usual in the literature, but OJ *isō* 'large rock in the ocean or on a seashore; a rocky beach;' and for the -a- forms in Tk., cf. the OJ word *isagō* 'sand, pebbles.' This is usually taken as an OJ combining form noun *isa-* plus a suffix -gō, but particularly in the light of OPk. \**tulak* 'rock' (cf. the text following and note 164 *infra*), one suspects instead that OJ *isagō* is even more closely related to the inherited form for these words than it might at first glance appear to be. In this light OJ *isi* 'stone, rock' is probably the least useful form of the word for etymological purposes, its final -i most likely being not etymological but simply an echo-vowel based upon the vocalization of the first syllable. Cf. in this same connection MK *sal+h-* 'flesh' (Martin 232.83), which goes with pA \**sil*, EAS 1.108, JOAL 119. In all the languages, the long vowels appear not to be absolutely original, but rather to have resulted from apocope and crasis; and these are the phenomena that in turn eventually account historically for the troublesome -a- vs. -o- vocalizations in the different branches of Altaic for these words at least.

<sup>161</sup>It is of course necessary to keep firmly in mind that the form OK *KIš* is no more than the transcription convention employed indicates, i.e., that in this form only the final -š is overtly indicated in phonogram orthography, while the *KI-* syllable is simply, and *faute de mieux*, a MK gloss for the Chin. logogram *dào* 'road, way.' There is no absolute reason, apart from the traditions of Korean scholarship, not to interpret this mixed-script writing (*dào-š*) instead as OK *KŌši*, modelling its first syllable on MK *kōli* 'road, path, street, way' (HMCH A 3v, B 5v, where the form glosses ten different Chin. words in this same general semantic category). But MK *kōli* is clearly a deverbal noun in -i going with the verb *kōli-* 'go on foot' (Lewin, *Morphologie*, §3.22, p. 42). In this fashion, such an interpretation of the OK written records would further involve our understanding of this important *t/l*-verb also.

9. Conclusions embracing the full range of these findings concerning the OK consonantism, and exploring all their implications for the history of the Korean-Altaic relationship—particularly their implications for the solution of the problem of the pA liquids \*l<sub>2</sub> and \*r<sub>2</sub>—are still somewhat premature; but enough has been learned here to allow us to sketch the major implications of these new data, at least in outline form. While necessarily brief, it is hoped that the following summary will at least serve to indicate some of the principal directions for future research into the still largely unexploited resources for the history of the Altaic languages represented by the OK written records.

9.1 First priority in a sketch of conclusions must surely be assigned to the new light that may now be brought to bear upon what might be termed the 'classificatory status' or 'historical position' (*Stellung*) of Korean among the other, and also as one of the, Altaic languages. The OK data from written records relative to the OK reflexes for pA \*l<sub>2</sub> and \*r<sub>2</sub>, together with the correlative evidence from MK, and even for the NK verb morphology, conclusively show that it is no longer possible to speak or think of 'Korean,' as a useful term with reference to a single linguistic entity, anymore than one may meaningfully speak or think of 'Turkish' or 'German' in equally simplistic terms. This is particularly true of all future historical-comparative discussions involving 'Korean' with the other Altaic languages. 'Korean' must henceforth, particularly in historical-comparative contexts, be understood as representing an early linguistic unity of considerable scope and significant scale, and as a subbranch or subgroup of the Altaic linguistic unity, on much the same historic-linguistic level as 'Turkic,' another subbranch or subgroup of Altaic with which it may very usefully be compared, both in general terms of its own internal scope and complexity, and also in more specific terms relative to certain critical details of historical phonology (esp. *š* for \*l<sub>2</sub> and *z* for \*r<sub>2</sub>). 'Korean' is not on the level of 'Turkish' or 'German'; it is on the level of Turkic and Germanic. In order better to point up the necessity for considering, and studying, the complex relationships between all the various varieties and historical stages of Korean, one is even tempted to coin a new term, something on the order of 'Koreanic,' if only to stress that these varieties and stages constitute a linguistic horizon quite comparable to Turkic or Germanic. But 'Koreanic' is an uncouth-looking term, unlikely to gain general favor, and its aims as a neologism may quite as well be served by the less exotic-appearing coinage 'Peninsular East Altaic' (PEA), which we propose be employed, in the sense of the entire Korean (i.e., the 'Koreanic' !) sector of Altaic, embracing all varieties and historical stages of Korean, and all types of OK, as well as early and late MK, and of course NK as well.

9.2 Second priority must naturally be assigned to the problem of just what happened between OK and early MK, in the sense of identifying the overall pattern of historical linguistic change that, as we now understand the situation, appears to have characterized the history of PEA. In other



words, how are we to account for, or explain, what seems to be the disappearance of the *š*, *z*-languages of the OK period, and their apparent replacement by the simple, undifferentiated *l*-languages of MK and NK? Were the *š*, *z*-linguistic strains in old PEA absorbed or replaced by other, and later, *l*-strains; or did they somehow simply 'die out'? And if they did simply 'die out,' how and why did this happen? And if so, how shall we advance the purely figurative language of the previous two sentences onto the solid ground of observed and verifiable linguistic history? Almost all the answers to these and related questions remain to be formulated; nevertheless, at least a few of the factors that must be considered in this formulation may even now be identified.

9.2.1 First, it seems clear that the language of the Old Paekche kingdom (traditional dates, 18 BC-AD 663) played an important, perhaps a critical, role in all this, though almost all the details of its involvement with the question remain obscure. We know far too little about OPk; only a few fragments have survived from its lexical store,<sup>162</sup> plus what are perhaps a few lines of an OPk. poem-text that have survived (though their meaning is lost) because they were embedded as refrain-lines in an early MK recension of the OPk. original.<sup>163</sup> At best, this is too little to work with; but fortunately we are able to reconstruct the OPk. word for 'stone,' something along the very general lines of *\*tulak*,<sup>164</sup> i.e., this important word apparently had OPk. *l* for pA *\*l*, like MK and NK, but quite strikingly different from OKg. and OSI., with their *š*, and also different from OJ,

<sup>162</sup>Ten fragments are studied in detail, and a few others noted briefly, in the paper cited *supra*, note 5.

<sup>163</sup>The lines read, *ōkāwiya ōkang tyoli* and *āu talong tili*; they have survived in the *Akhak kwebom* of Sōng Hyōn et al., completed 1475, printed 1493, as part of the poem *Ch'ōng'ūp-sa*. Peter Lee, in SS, 18 translates the entire poem, even though, as he concedes (p. 134, note 88) "the original . . . has no meaning in Korean." Similarly, a fragment of the Old Silla language has survived in the *Nihon shoki* (ed. Iwanami shoten, 2.124-5, tsl. Aston 2.84, Kinmei 23 = 562 AD), where the expression *kusunizili* is written in phonograms. Its meaning is unknown; in the context, it is apparently an oath, uttered by the Silla military commander when his Japanese enemy escaped from him. As late as 761 AD, the Japanese were training young men in the Silla language in order to prepare them to participate in a punitive expedition against the Silla kingdom (Murai Yasuhiko, *Kokyō nendaiki* [Tokyo: 1973], p. 233). How grateful we all should be if our Japanese colleagues might one day discover, in some still unexplored Heian document hoard, some 'teaching materials' surviving from this, surely the first recorded instance of an Altaic 'language and area center.' Even without control of the lexical meanings of either of these OK fragments, we cannot help but note that the OPk. fragment abounds in *l*'s, while it has not a single *s* or *z*, while the OSI. fragment has both *s* and *z* as well as *l*. More and more, one suspects that OPk. was an *l* (or, *l* and *r*) language, while OSI. was a language with both *š*, *z* alongside *l* (and *r*?).

<sup>164</sup>Yi-Lewin 74; Yang 708; *Nihon shoki*, ed. Iwanami shoten, 1.611-2, note 8.

with its *s*.<sup>165</sup> There can be little question but that the existence, within OK, of an *l*-language such as OPk. must somehow have played a decisive role in the later linguistic changes within PEA; but unfortunately, so long as we know as little as we do about the OPk. language, it is difficult to postulate in any significant detail just what this role might have been. And so the thread of the narrative of these developments within PEA remains obscure, lost sometime between the end of OK and the earliest stages of MK.

9.2.2 Second, it is clear that whatever happened had already taken place, and was apparently over and done with, by the time of our earliest MK written records. The 'MK' that we generally cite, already totally an *l*-language, ought more precisely to be termed 'late MK'; actually it is quite late, none of it before 1445.<sup>166</sup> But from what can be learned of the earlier varieties of MK, it is apparent that these also were *l*-languages. The Sino-Korean bilingual *Chi-lin lei-shih*<sup>167</sup> preserves a number of significant early MK forms: it has *l*-words for 'stone' (ed. Sasse 104/57), for 'written graph' (133/313, 4, 5), and 'go on foot' (134/322). As evidence for an even earlier variety of early MK, we have already noted the work of the Buddhist poet Kyunyō: from cultural and literary considerations he may continue to be counted as the last OK poet, as common in traditional scholarship in Korean literature, but linguistically Kyunyō must be regarded as the first MK poet, or at least as the linguistic precursor of MK. And we have seen above that the poetic-sequence ascribed to Kyunyō has an *l*-version for an *z*- or *ž*-form that appears to go back to pA *\*r*. What we may only refer to as this replacement of the OK *š*, *z*-languages by the uniform *l*-language of MK, however it took place and whatever set it off, was apparently not only early, but also as rapid as it was far reaching.

9.2.3 In one way or another, this replacement must have been associated with, if not actually motivated by, the sudden geographical displacement of the focus of Korean political, social, and cultural life from the Old Silla capital of Kyōngju in the south to the new Koryō capital of Kaesōng in the central portion of the peninsula, a site significantly nearer the junction of the peninsula with the Asiatic mainland, and also significantly closer to the long-standing northeast Asiatic homelands of the Manchu-Tungusic speakers to whose language, in one way or another, all

<sup>165</sup>None of the newly edited OPk. fragments appear to provide unambiguous evidence for *\*l*, apart from the previously noted *\*tulak* 'stone.' Two of them may relate to *\*r*, OPk. *\*tohel* 'field, land,' and possibly the unidentified OPk. original from which OJ *iraka* 'roof tile, upper ridge of a tile-covered roof' may have been borrowed (cf. pA *\*ir*, 'border, edge,' Street 14, Menges 1975.67 ff.).

<sup>166</sup>Yi-Lewin 122 ff.

<sup>167</sup>Sasse, *Das Glossar Koryō-pangŏn* . . . , cited with page and number of entry in his edition of the text.



varieties of PEA must surely be linguistically in debt. With this we encounter also the necessity for considering the ultimate linguistic debt of PEA to the original language (unfortunately unknown to us) of the Puyō,<sup>14</sup> those northern ancestors of at least certain segments of the later PEA speakers, who were also in a particularly close relationship, according to traditional sources, to the origins of the Paekche kingdom—which then in turn brings us once more back to the role of the OPk. version of OK in all these linguistic changes early in the history of PEA. The geographical focus of PEA suddenly shifted from the far south of the peninsula to the central, western coastal area, a site that inevitably looked toward the north, and toward Manchu-Tungusic northeast Asia. And with this sudden shift, we find OK ʃ, z-languages suddenly replaced by the early MK /-languages exemplified by the early Koryō of the *Chi-lin lei-shih* bilingual. Is all this mere coincidence? Probably not.

Traditional Korean scholarship, to be sure, does not at all belittle the role of the Kaesōng language (or, dialect?) in the formation of MK, and hence also in the genesis of MK. “Mit der Gründung der Koryō-Dynastie am Anfang des 10. Jahrhunderts verlagerte sich das politische und kulturelle Zentrum nach Kaegyōng (Kaesōng). Infolgedessen trat die dortige Regionalsprache in den Vordergrund. Auf der Basis dieses Dialektes bildete sich das neue zentrale Idiom Koreas. . . . Zusammengefaßt kann man sagen, daß die Sprache, die im 10. Jahrhundert in Kaesōng gesprochen wurde, ein Dialekt der Silla-Sprache war, der sowohl ein Substrat der Koguryō-Sprache als auch Elemente aus deren Wortschatz enthielt. Das Mittelkoreanische bildete sich auf der Grundlage dieser Regionalsprache. Jedoch ist anzunehmen, daß die Elemente der Koguryō-Sprache von denen der Silla-Sprache abgelöst wurden und allmählich verschwanden.”<sup>15</sup> But this and all other existing scenarios of linguistic change and development for PEA must now, it is clear, be rethought and rewritten *ab initio*, since they are based upon inadequate philological control in the handling of the OK written records. The role of OSi. and OKg. in the formation of the language of Kaesōng in the 10th century cannot have been as described in the lines just cited, since we now understand that both were ʃ, z-languages. The scenario cited ‘explains’ everything except the most important single linguistic datum that may be established for the transition from OK to MK, i.e., the replacement of ʃ, z-languages by an /-language. In other words, the explanation cited explains nothing; therefore other explanations must be

<sup>14</sup>On the Puyō, commonly ascribed Tungusic origins in the literature, Lewin, *JJS* 2.407-9 (1976), Ledyard 232 (but discounting much of the speculation *loc. cit.*, 234-8 on the etymology of Puyō, which probably does no more than obscure yet another important OK isogloss, that dividing languages with -y- (< \*d- ?) from languages with -l-, -r-, another major issue in the linguistic history of OK that awaits satisfactory treatment).

<sup>15</sup>Yi-Lewin 97-9.

sought in future studies. What is required is what alone would serve as an explanation for the observed facts: some account of how an /-language came to be at hand in the Kaesōng region in the early 10th century or earlier, and also of how such a language was not only available in the right place at the right time but also how it was able to replace the older ʃ, z-languages of the earlier, and largely southern, Korean cultural-linguistic centers. At the moment, no such account is immediately forthcoming.

9.2.4 It is still too early to do more than speculate in very general terms concerning the directions that this account, when eventually formulated, might possibly take. But when it is finally worked out, surely it will not be totally unconnected with the phonological idiosyncrasies of the Manchu-Tungusic sector of the Altaic linguistic community. MK, and following it NK also, is more than simply an /-language in the sense in which this expression is being used in the present discussion. Both these later forms of PEA are further remarkable historically in that they consolidated the four original liquids (\*l, \*l<sub>2</sub>, \*r, \*r<sub>2</sub>) of pA, and the two liquids of Mongolian-Chuvash-Manchu-Tungusic (\*l, \*r) into a single phoneme, a phonologically undifferentiated /l/ having allophones (positional variants) as NK [l] in morpheme-final position, but as NK [r] when intervocalic. This sweeping, radical consolidation of the Altaic liquids in PEA—but historically something that is true only from the time of MK on, we now understand—must surely also have some connection with the equally sweeping and equally radical consolidation of two of the inherited Altaic liquids together with some of the reflexes of the third such phoneme into a single OJ /r/, a phoneme that in NJ also has both [r] and [l] allophones, where however (and unlike NK) they are in free, not in regularly conditioned, variation.

At any rate, the entire history of the Altaic languages in the northeast, peninsular, and pelagic sectors of the Altaic domain is a history of increasingly comprehensive consolidation within the inventory of the liquid phonemes. The replacement of the OK ʃ, z-languages with the MK and later /-language, specifically their replacement by the /-language of the Koryō state that served as the basis for MK, as well as playing its own specific role as a kind of PEA *koiné* from the 10th century onwards, must eventually be viewed and evaluated as a part of this larger phenomenon of overall liquid consolidation.<sup>16</sup> Nor is it probably an accident that it is in

<sup>16</sup>Few treatments in the notoriously vast literature having to do with pA \*l<sub>2</sub>, \*r<sub>2</sub> have considered the overall structural implications of the question; Hamp's recent contribution (cited note 157 *supra*) is a welcome exception. Also important along the same lines is A. Róna-Tas, ‘Some Problems of Ancient Turkic,’ *AO* 32.209-229 (1970), because of the emphasis placed there on overall structural considerations of the entire set of liquids in all the languages involved, rather than (as too often in the literature) treating each of these phonemes as nothing more than a sound or noise, without relationship to any coherent linguistic system.

Manchu-Tungusic that we are first able to detect the earliest signs for this later consolidation of the liquids, in the form of cases of pA \**r* that turn up as *l* sometimes, "ohne daß man irgendwelche Regeln aufstellen könnte."<sup>171</sup> The evidence of this early unpredictable wavering between *r* and *l* documents a likely starting-point for this entire phenomenon of liquid consolidation in eastern Altaic, a phenomenon that was then eventually carried to its conclusion in pre-MK, and in pre-OJ as well (but whether it happened in the two independently, or was something common to some stage of a pre-KJ, it is difficult even to speculate). Also probably somehow relevant to this question is the well-known secondary development of forms in initial *l*- in Manchu-Tungusic, forms that are so very anomalous in terms of overall Altaic phonological canons.<sup>172</sup> Can this phenomenon be totally isolated from the surprising receptivity that OJ was to show to Chinese *l*-words as loans, taking them over as it did with amazing phonological aplomb, even though this meant quite radically altering the entire occurrence-canon of the language?

Whatever actually happened in this connection, it is important to understand that it happened fairly late in the history of PEA, where it is observed only after, or at the earliest at the very end of, the OK linguistic period. It is also necessary to make it clear that OK itself stands apart from what may be termed the Manchu-Tungusic-Korean-Japanese consolidation of the inherited Altaic liquids. Because OK and its treatment of the inherited Altaic liquids—except perhaps for OPk.—go instead directly with the more complex system of pA itself, OK could not, in either its OSl. or OKg. varieties, have served directly as the 'foundation' or as the 'substratum' or as any other integral constituent element for the formation of the later Koryŏ language, i.e., early MK, or for the MK *koiné*, contrary to what is now generally assumed by traditional Korean scholarship. Just how OK fits into the overall picture of the linguistic history of Korean, i.e., into the overall linguistic history of PEA or 'Koreanic,' together with what happened to it at the end of the OK period—particularly including what role if any it played in the development of MK—are still difficult and largely unanswered questions. But OK does not, and cannot, go directly over into MK.

Indeed, so late is the evidence from PEA for a uniform *l*-language that one might even ask whether or not some part of this phenomenon might have been due to Chinese linguistic influence. The Kaesŏng area is not far removed from the old Chinese colonial territories of Lo-lang and

<sup>171</sup>VG 78; Benzing, *Die tungusischen Sprachen* 44.

<sup>172</sup>VG 74.

Tai-fang;<sup>173</sup> this was the part of the peninsula that earliest came under the most pronounced impact of Chinese cultural and social forces. With these there must also have come significant linguistic contacts, which might also have played their part in the later PEA developments, though it is unlikely that we will ever be able to document them in any precise detail.

9.3 Third, it must be pointed out that even at the present early stage of these studies, considerably more than problems and unanswered questions result from the correct philological interpretation of the OK written records, especially from the identification of OK *š*, *z*-reflexes for \**l*<sub>2</sub>, \**r*<sub>2</sub>. This identification, despite the still unsolved problems it raises, nevertheless can already contribute to the solution of still other and earlier questions. In particular, it does much to clarify the relationship of Japanese to the other Altaic languages.

The identification of OJ *s* as the regular reflex for pA \**l*<sub>2</sub>, and of OJ *r* and *t* as regular reflexes for pA \**r*<sub>2</sub>, have not only advanced our understanding of the Japanese-Altaic relationship; they have also pointed to the reconsideration of the entire situation of the four original Altaic liquids, and their differentiation, as a phenomenon of enormous time-depth within Altaic, rather than, as had sometimes been imagined, a later, superficial characteristic of these languages.<sup>174</sup> But until now, this identification has also left many of the earlier proposed Korean cognates for OJ words involving the inherited Altaic liquids somewhat difficult to explain. If we work and think in terms of an early pKJ linguistic unity, how are we to explain that the Japanese side appears to be so much older, i.e., linguistically more highly differentiated, than does the Korean side? Now it is clear that the anomalous situation here was only apparent, not real, and also that it seemed to be anomalous only because we have been working in terms of MK and NK, not in terms of OK.<sup>175</sup> It is MK, and NK following it, that are anomalous; but OK—or more precisely stated, as much as we know of OSl. and OKg.—fits in perfectly well both with pA and with OJ and its *s*, *t*, and *r* reflexes for \**l*<sub>2</sub> and \**r*<sub>2</sub>. If there ever was, literally and historically, a

<sup>173</sup>On the Chinese colonies in Korea, Ledyard 232; also the *Samguk sagi* text that he translates, 235, that begins, "East of our country is Lo-lang, on the north are the Malgal . . ." Even what can be recovered of the early ethnic designations for the northern areas appears to point in the direction of *l*-languages (Malgal, etc.), just in those regions where early Chinese influences were most significant. One begins to think in terms of a 'language area,' in Emeneau's sense of "an area which includes languages belonging to more than one family but showing traits in common which are found not to belong to the other members of (at least) one of the families" (*Language* 32.16 note 28, 1956).

<sup>174</sup>Menges 1975.37 ff.

<sup>175</sup>Or, e.g., Martin, which essentially compared NK and MK with NJ, not with OJ, which led to still further difficulties in the correct identification of the reflexes of the pA liquids in all these languages.

historical stage that might properly be dubbed the 'Proto-Korean-Japanese linguistic unity,' then this was the linguistic unity represented by the regular correspondences between OJ and OK, not between OJ and MK or NK, or any other similarly anachronistic combination (MJ or NJ and MK or NK, etc.). Put in such simple, straightforward terms as these, all this seems hardly remarkable or 'unusual'; but given the difficulties imposed by the philological materials surviving from OK, it has taken a good while to come to this actually quite simple conclusion.

The phonological evidence from OK developed in the present paper also throws new light on many particulars of the Japanese-Korean linguistic relationship. No longer, for example, may we argue, as we once did,<sup>176</sup> to the effect that the comparison of, e.g., such a set of forms as NK *mal* 'unit of dry measure' with NJ *masu* 'square-shaped measure for grain, etc.' on the one hand, and with OJ *mari* 'cup-shaped container for liquids' on the other, necessarily points to a genetic relationship between *mal* and *masu*, but to a loan-word relationship between *mal* and *mari*, on the grounds of the absence *resp.* presence of gross phonetic similarities between the forms involved (supposing, at the outset, that the semantic and phonological parallels exhibited by all the forms cited are not the result of coincidence, which seems a satisfactory working hypothesis). Argumentation along these lines was satisfactory so long—but only so long—as we were limited to PEA forms not older than MK. But now we understand that, when studying the history of any given MK form in *l*, we must also always consider the possibility of the earlier existence of other forms, either in *l*, or else in *š*, at some earlier, and generally now lost, stage of OK. OJ *masu* 'measure for grain', we now realize, might very well be a loan into Japanese from an otherwise unattested OK *\*mašu*, just as OJ *mari* is almost surely a loan from an earlier *l*-form for the same word, cognate with the later attested MK and NK *mal*, but earlier than both of these. Indeed, given the exceptionally close semantic agreement in the fairly technical meanings of MK *mal* and J *masu*, such an early borrowing of the Japanese form from an otherwise unknown OK original surely seems a more likely explanation than did the earlier suggested cognate relationship. In this sense, even when as here the necessary OK forms cannot be documented, our enhanced understanding of the history of OK phonology, and particularly of the OK reflexes of the inherited pA liquids, considerably advances our understanding of the Japanese-Korean linguistic relationship, particularly in a number of critical details.

9.4 Fourth, finally, and perhaps most important of all, these ancient linguistic data now newly recovered from the OK written records reveal

themselves able to contribute directly to the central task of any and all comparative-historical linguistic study, which is the demonstration of earlier order and unity underlying later discrepancies and apparent anomalies. It is, after all, such demonstration that is actually the goal of all these studies, even though they are too often misunderstood as if they were instead directed toward such essentially trivial ends as 'proving that languages are related' (a proposition at best not susceptible to scientific proof<sup>177</sup>), or even toward other even more patently absurd purposes such as attempts to 'prove' that they are not. It is in this, i.e., in the enhancement of our understanding of the regular arrangements and earlier orders that underlie certain of the later, apparent anomalies obtaining among the Altaic languages, that the true importance of these OK data lies. They demonstrate, among other things, that the much-mooted position of Chuvash, both with respect to the other Turkic languages, as well as with respect to the rest of the Altaic languages, is not nearly as anomalous as it has up until now appeared to be.<sup>178</sup> Nor, at the same time and thanks to the evidence of these same ancient linguistic materials, does Turkic any longer hold its hitherto much-debated special position among the major sub-branches of Altaic, a distinction that it could continue to enjoy only so long as Chuvash appeared to continue in its own quite anomalous role. Chuvash (and Turkic as a whole along with it) has had to be considered anomalous among the Altaic sub-branches because it appeared to have *l* for both *\*l<sub>1</sub>* and *\*l<sub>2</sub>*, and *r* for both *\*r<sub>1</sub>* and *\*r<sub>2</sub>*. But now we understand that so also did MK and NK (though in these two, earlier *l* and *r* had fallen together into the single phoneme that we write *l*), while at the same time OK—or at least OKg. and OSi.—had both *š* and *z* as well as a similarly undifferentiated *l*. The major difference between the Turkic sub-branch of Altaic and the Korean (i.e., the 'Koreanic') sub-branch that we here propose to denominate PEA is that MK and NK in a sense are parallel to Chuvash in their treatment of the original Altaic liquids, while it is OK—and OJ—that are most nearly parallel to the remainder of the Turkic languages apart from Chuvash. Of course, the treatment of the Altaic liquids is hardly the only anomalous feature in the linguistic history of Chuvash, nor is it the only distinctive feature in the language that puts it into a special relationship with the other Altaic languages; Poppe has demonstrated "daß das Čuv. eine Reihe von Überbleibseln eines Entwicklungsstadiums hat, das älter ist als die türkische Ursprache (das Urtürkische od. die türkische

<sup>177</sup>Cf. the author in *JJS* 2.342 (1976).

<sup>178</sup>On the 'position' (Stellung) of Chuvash, most recently we have Poppe 1974b, a magisterial summing up of the problem, one that has concerned the doyen of our field ever since the publication of one of his earliest scientific papers in 1925 (cited *loc. cit.*, p. 135, note 6).

Grundsprache), auf die die alten und jetzt lebenden Türk Sprachen zurückgehen."<sup>179</sup> Nevertheless, the treatment of the Altaic liquids remains, among the various critical historic-linguistic isoglosses, the most salient of all the anomalies; but it is now an anomaly that Chuvash, and Turkic, must share with Korean.

Much more remains to be done with the precious written records of Old Korean. Here it has been possible only to sketch the main direction that such studies must take in the future, and to point out the importance of a philologically sound, non-anachronistic approach to the interpretation of the texts. We may confidently expect that the further exploitation of these still largely unexplored resources for Altaic comparative linguistics can only shed more and yet more light upon many other aspects of the pre-history of all these languages. Two examples must suffice. The possibility of a morphological interpretation for both original Altaic  $*l_2$  and  $*r_2$ , and of their ultimate origin in clusters of the type  $l + C$ ,  $r + C$ , remains an important issue in Altaic linguistics;<sup>180</sup> there is little question but that the OK written records will eventually be made to yield data on this issue also.<sup>181</sup> So also for the phenomenon of the so-called Chuvash rhotacism; again, this is now no longer solely a Turkological question, in view of the

<sup>179</sup>Pope 1974b §12, p. 146. Rewriting this statement slightly, and replacing the language designations with Korean equivalents, one could make it fit the PEA linguistic situation almost exactly.

<sup>180</sup>Omeljani Pritsak, "Der "Rhotazismus" und "Lambdazismus", *UAJb* 35.337-349 (1964); Menges 1968.97-100; Menges 1975.48, 63-4; Pope 1974b §3, p. 140.

<sup>181</sup>Such forms as OK  $*ibulč$  'neighbor(s)' (note 64 *supra.*) are already suggestive in this area. So also Ex. (13) above, OK  $*kūnš$  'written character, script.' As a further example of OK data on the possible morphological origins of pA  $*l_2$  and  $*r_2$  that await exploitation, one may note a placename that the *Samguk sagi* registers (Yang, p. 95) in both  $š$  and  $l$  forms, as  $*aš(i)gi$  and  $*a(š)lgi$ . This placename was translated (Yang, pp. 110, 333) by Chin. *ān xián* 'gently worthy, wise, virtuous,' and the forms have been understood (e.g., Sō, p. 61) as the OK equivalents of MK  $*ō' til-$ , which glosses the same Chin. *xián* (HMCH C 11r) that was used to translate the OK placename, cf. NK  $ōčil-$  'be gentle, kindhearted, considerate, wise.' The attestation of this early OK doublet showing both  $š$  and  $l$  forms is of course of great value, but so also is the possibility presented by these and the later PEA forms for relating this evidence for  $*l_2$  to a still earlier morphological process involving  $l + C$  clusters.

Japanese data,<sup>182</sup> and surely one may entertain lively expectations that Korean evidence will eventually have a part to play here also.<sup>183</sup> These are without question only a few of the many ways in which Old Korean, and the evidence of its written records, both so long neglected, will soon be made to supply new data directly contributing to the central task of all Altaic comparative linguistics,<sup>184</sup> i.e., to clarifying the involved network of historical and genetic relationships that connect all these languages, and that continue to unite them in an essentially orderly fashion, across enormous expanses of space and time alike.

<sup>182</sup>OJ *ura* 'bottom, inside; invisible portion or surface' (cf. OJ *asiura* 'sole of the foot') can hardly be kept separate from Chu. *ura* 'foot' (cf. Menges 1968.97); the Japanese form not only shows  $-r < *d-$  but, equally significantly, it has the same development of vocalism in its first syllable as the Chuvash word does. Certain OJ  $-r-$  and  $-y-$  doublets (e.g., Menges 1975.59) probably are also to be explained along parallel lines: the  $-r-$  forms are the result of a Chuvash-like rhotacism in POJ, while the  $-y-$  forms are the result of a POJ development allied with the general Tk.  $-d > -j$  shift (Menges 1968.89). Similarly, the well-known OK placename doublets in  $-y-$  and  $-l-$  ('Kara,' i.e. *kala*, vs. 'Kaya,' etc.) are probably the result of a parallel phenomenon, as is the  $-y-$  in 'Puyō' (cf. note 168 *supra.*). On the subject of OJ *ura* 'bottom, inside,' note that OJ *ura* 'sheltered cove along a river, used for overnight shelter during riparian journeys' is a different word; it goes rather with Ma. *ula* 'a large river, a relay post' (and the Japanese shows that these are essentially the same word), and Ma. *ula-* 'to hand down, pass on,' cf. TMS 2.260a-b, s.v. *uli* II 'river,' pA  $*ulā-$  'to continue, hand down' (Street 29, VG 75, 101, 124), another instance of the otherwise well-documented Tungusic non-differentiation of original noun and verb roots (Menges, *Die tungusischen Sprachen*, p. 56). Władysław Kotwicz, 'Contributions aux études altaïques, A, Les termes concernant le service des relais postaux,' *RO* 16.326-355 (1950; published 1953) glosses this root as 'unir, rapporter les uns aux autres,' and demonstrates that it signified 'la communication elle-même, s'avancant progressivement d'un point à l'autre' (p. 349). His study is also important for the evidence it brings together demonstrating how this inherited root, in the various languages, underwent considerable but always quite easily comprehensible semantic evolution, depending upon the circumstances of society and terrain: it refers to beasts of burden, human porters, or boats, according to the circumstances.

<sup>183</sup>But Martin's comparison of NK *tal-* 'give me' with the form that he cites as 'NJ *yar- 'id.'*' (Martin 232.91) is probably to be discarded, as is the reconstruction of pKJ  $*dar-$  (e.g., Menges 1975.8, 31, 104). The semantics of the comparison are unsatisfactory, since the NK word refers only to donatory acts toward or in benefit of the speaker, while the Japanese word has, ever since OJ (OJ *yar-* 'send, order, dispatch (a person or thing) away, somewhere else') been used in just the opposite sense, and signifies instead donatory acts on the part of the speaker, but directed away from him, toward and for the benefit of others. Hence these forms most likely are not to be cited in support of an original Ablaut relating this pKJ root (Menges, *loc. cit.*) to pA  $*dolī-$  'exchange, ransom' (Street 11, VG 75, 134). Rather, OJ *yar-* is likely to be yet another example of a Chuvash-like rhotacism in POJ, and hence may well go directly with pTk.  $*yā-$  (Menges 1975.104 note), the Japanese vocalism as well as the rhotacism then being quite parallel to the Chuvash developments.

<sup>184</sup>Or, as Ramstedt put it most explicitly and correctly, "Die altaische Sprachwissenschaft ist ein Zweig der allgemeinen vergleichenden Sprachforschung. Ihr besonderes Gebiet ist, die Gesetze, die in der altaischen Sprachfamilie festzustellen sind, zu erforschen, zu erklären und darzustellen" (EAS § 01, 1.13).

Abbreviations, for languages: O = Old; M = Middle; N = New. C = Chinese, J = Japanese; K = Korean. Within OK = Old Korean, OPk. = Old Paekche; OSi. = Old Silla; OKg. = Old Koguryō. p = proto- (e.g., pA = proto-Altaic; pKJ = proto-Korean-Japanese). P = Pre- (e.g., POJ = Pre-Old Japanese). PEA = Peninsular East Altaic (cf. § 9).

For frequently cited literature:

- AEOJ = John Street & Roy Andrew Miller: *Altaic Elements in Old Japanese Part 1* (Madison: 1975); *John Street, Part 2* (Madison: 1978)
- AM = *Asia Major*, n.s.
- AO = *Acta Orientalia*
- Aston = W. G. Aston, *Nihongi: Chronicles of Japan from the Earliest Times to A.D. 697*, translated from the original Chinese and Japanese. 2 vols. (London: 1896; reprinted Tokyo: 1972)
- DTS = V. M. Nadeljaev et al., eds.: *Drevnetjurkskij slovar' (Leningrad: 1969)*
- EAS = G. J. Ramstedt, ed. Pentti Aalto: *Einführung in die altaische Sprachwissenschaft*. 3 vols. (Helsinki: 1957, 1952, 1966)
- HJAS = *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*
- HMCH = Hunmong chahoe, 1527, citing the edition of Yi Ki-mun (Seoul: 1971)
- JJS = *Journal of Japanese Studies*
- JL = Roy Andrew Miller: *The Japanese Language* (Chicago: 1971)
- JOAL = Roy Andrew Miller: *Japanese and the Other Altaic Languages* (Chicago: 1971)
- Kwōn = Kwōn Chae-sōn: 'Silla'ō ūi sōngjo yōn'gu, pp. 103-165 in *Hangug'ō munhakhoe*, ed., *Silla sadae ūi ōn'ō wa munhak (Hangug'ō munhak taegye, 1.)* (Seoul: 1974)
- Ledyard = Gari Ledyard: 'Galloping along with the Horseriders: Looking for the Founders of Japan.' *JJS* 1.217-254 (1975)
- Lee, Peter = SS
- Lewin 1976 = Bruno Lewin: *Japanese and Korean: The Problems and History of a Linguistic Comparison.* *JJS* 2.389-412 (1976)
- LK = Lee Ki-moon (= Yi Ki-mun): 'Materials of the Koguryō Language.' *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*. Korean Research Center No. 20.11-20 (1964)
- LW = Bruno Lewin: 'Japanese and the Language of Koguryō.' *Papers of the C.I.C. Far Eastern Language Institute* 4.19-33 (1973)
- Martin = Samuel E. Martin: 'Lexical Evidence Relating Korean to Japanese.' *Language* 42.185-251 (1966)

- Menges 1968 = Karl H. Menges: *The Turkic Languages and Peoples.* (= *Ural-Altaische Bibliothek*, XV.) (Wiesbaden: 1968)
- Menges 1975 = Karl H. Menges: *Altajische Studien II. Japanisch und Altajisch.* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XLI, 3.) (Wiesbaden: 1975)
- MK = Lee Ki-moon: 'A Comparative Study of Manchu and Korean.' *UJb* 30.104-20 (1958)
- Poppe 1972 = Nicholas Poppe: 'A Symposium on the Altaic Theory.' *CAJ* 16.37-58 (1972)
- Poppe 1974 = Nicholas Poppe: 'Remarks on Comparative Study of the Vocabulary of the Altaic Languages.' *UJb* 46.120-134 (1974)
- Poppe 1974b = Nicholas Poppe: 'Zur Stellung des Tschuwaschischen.' *CAJ* 18.135-147 (1974)
- Poppe 1975 = Nicholas Poppe: 'Altaic Linguistics—An Overview.' *Sciences of Language* 6.130-186 (1975)
- Sasse = Werner Sasse: *Das Glossar Koryŏ-pangŏn im Kyerim-yusa.* (Veröffentlichungen des Ostasien-Instituts der Ruhr-Universität Bochum, 18.) (Wiesbaden: 1976)
- SK = Shiratori Kurakichi: 'Chōsengo to Ural-Altai-go to no hikaku kenkyū.' *Tōyō Gakuhō* Vol. 4, Nos 2, 3, 5; Vol. 5, Nos 1, 2, 3; Vol. 6, Nos 2, 3 (1914-16); cited according to the reprint, with index, in *Shiratori Kurakichi zenshū*, Vol. 3, *Chōsenshi kenkyū*, pp. 1-280 (Tokyo: 1970)
- SKE = G. J. Ramstedt: *Studies in Korean Etymology.* (Helsinki: 1949)
- Sō = Sō Chae-kūk: 'Mo Taemara ka yōn'gu.' pp. 49-81 in *Silla sadae ūi ōn'ō wa munhak* (see under Kwōn, *supra.*)
- SS = Peter H. Lee: *Studies in the Saenaennorae: Old Korean Poetry.* (Rome: 1959) (citing poems from the corpus by their numbers in this edition and translation, which employs a numbering system different from that in Yang, q.v.)
- Street = John Street: *On the Lexicon of Proto-Altaic: A Partial Index to Reconstructions.* (Madison: 1974)
- TMS = V. I. Cincius, ed.: *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' tunguso-mańčurskix jazykov. Materialy k etimologičeskomu slovarju.* 2 vols. (Leningrad: 1975, 1977)
- VEWT = Martti Rasanen: *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Turksprachen.* (Helsinki: 1969)
- VG = Nikolaus Poppe: *Vergleichende Grammatik der Altaischen Sprachen Teil 1. Vergleichende Lautlehre.* (Wiesbaden: 1960)
- Yang = Yang Chu-dong: *Koga yōn'gu.* (Seoul: 1974) (citing poems from the corpus in the numbering system of this edition, which is different from that in SS, q.v.)

Yi-Lewin = Ki-Moon Lee: Geschichte der koreanischen Sprache. Deutsche Übersetzung herausgegeben von Bruno Lewin (Wiesbaden: 1977) (translation of Yi Ki-mun, Kugösa kaesöl, Seoul: 1972.)

## Linguistische Sinndeutungen II

Von Gyula Décsy (Bloomington, Ind.)

### 14. Ung. *fény*, *fehér* und *fekete*

Die ungarischen Wörter *fény* 'Licht', *fehér* 'weiß' und *fekete* 'schwarz' besitzen keine zufriedenstellenden Etymologien. Das erste von ihnen, *fény*, belegt seit dem 11.-12. Jh., wird im ETSz 1.888 als ein Wort "unbekannter Herkunft" angezeigt; es besitzt keine Entsprechungen in den verwandten Sprachen, Lakó-Rédei nahmen es daher nicht in ihre Liste auf; *fehér* hat nur eine einzige Entsprechung im weit entfernten Lappischen (einfachste Form: *pääju* ~ *pääjuk* 'weiß, weißes Rentier' usw. im Lulelappischen, mit Verbalableitungen, auch in der Schriftsprache: *baeggjot -aej-* 'shine white', LR 1.188); *fekete* scheint wiederum ein ugrisches Wort zu sein, ohne Entsprechungen im Finnopermischen und Samojedischen, vorhanden allerdings nur im Ostjakischen (Vach *pëghtë*, Obdorsk *puti* usw. 'schwarz'; wog. *pit* ~ *piti* 'schwarz' wird als ostj. LW angesehen, TESz 1.867). Es unterliegt keinem Zweifel, daß alle drei Wörter sehr alt sind, *fény* ist im 11-12. Jh., *fehér* 1055 und *fekete* ebenfalls 1055 erstmalig schriftlich aufgezeichnet (TESz 1.888, 1.860, 1.867). Auch der Wortanlaut *fe-* weist sie als alt aus: der Lautwandel *p-* > *f-* im Anlaut (der an die erste germanische Lautverschiebung erinnert, vgl. meinen Artikel in: Betz-Festschrift 558-559, 1977), ist nämlich zumindest frühurungarisch, hat also spätestens zwischen 1500 v.Chr. und 450 n.Chr. stattgefunden. Wörter mit anlautendem *p-* im heutigen Ungarisch sind entweder späte Lehnwörter oder omomato-poetische Fossile bzw. Spätprodukte. Trotz Lakó's und Rédei's Bedenken betrachte ich die lappischen Entsprechungen zu *fehér* und die obugrischen zu *fekete* ausreichend für die Annahme entsprechender grundsprachlicher Formen, die ich aufgrund vereinfachter Rekonstruktionsprinzipien als *\*pākārā* und *\*pākātā* ansetzen möchte. Obwohl das Wort *fény* keine ernst zu nehmenden Entsprechungen in den verwandten Sprachen besitzt, kann dafür wegen seiner altertümlichen Gestalt eine grundsprachliche (ugrische, fiugr. oder uralische) Form vorausgesetzt werden. Hierbei können wir davon ausgehen, daß das lange *-é-* als das Ergebnis eines sehr alten (auf jeden Fall urungarischen) Kontraktionsvorgangs darstellt. Unter dieser Voraussetzung dürfte der Annahme einer präungarischen Form *\*pākāndā* 'Licht' eigentlich nichts im Wege stehen. Hieraus ergibt sich eine—vielleicht präprotosprachliche—Basis *\*pākā* ~ *\*pākkā* für 'Licht, scheinen' usw., die