


**Koguryō and Paekche:
Different Languages or Dialects of
Old Korean?**

Alexander Vovin, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Journal of Inner and East Asian Studies
volume 2, number 2 (December 2005): 108~140

© 2005 by Koguryo Research Foundation. All Right Reserved.
*No portion of the contents may be reproduced in any form without
written permission of Koguryo Research Foundation.*



Koguryŏ and Paekche: Different Languages or Dialects of Old Korean?*

This paper deals with two perennial questions such as whether the language of the Koguryŏ state was related to Korean or Japonic and whether there was any bilingualism in the state of Paekche. I address these two problems from a new angle that involves analysis of loanwords found in the languages of Koguryŏ and Paekche neighbors, namely Manchu and Jurchen in the North, and Western Old Japanese in the South. In addition, I will also attempt a re-examination of certain textual evidence. On the basis of both evidence from loanwords and textual evidence I come to the conclusion that the linguistic situation during the *Samguk* period was quite homogenous. Namely, both Koguryŏ and Paekche were some dialect forms of Old Korean. No reliable evidence can be found for languages other than Korean on the Korean peninsula during the *Samguk* period, although it is possible that other languages were present there at an earlier date.

* In this article the Yale transcription is used instead of the McCune-Reischauer System.

**Koguryō and Paekche:
Different Languages or Dialects of Old Korean?**

The Evidence from Texts and Neighbors

Alexander Vovin, University of Hawaii at Manoa

This paper deals with two perennial questions such as whether the language of the Koguryo state was related to Korean or Japonic and whether there was any bilingualism in the state of Paekche. I will address these two problems from a new angle that involves analysis of loanwords found in the languages of Koguryo and Paekche neighbors, namely Manchu and Jurchen in the North, and Western Old Japanese in the South. In addition, I will also attempt a re-examination of certain textual evidence.

The answers to these questions up to date were sought predominantly on the basis of Koguryo and Paekche place names recorded in the vol. 35, 36 and 37 of the *Samkwuk saki* (1145 AD). However, in the hierarchy of sources allowing us to determine genetic affiliation of a language that is no longer spoken today, place names should be placed on the lowest level of reliability:

- (1) actual texts;
- (2) loanwords in neighboring languages;
- (3) place names and other proper nouns.

Place names certainly represent a less reliable source than loanwords (and especially documented loanwords), because they are ahistoric; in other words we cannot pin any language preserved exclusively in place names down to a particular polity without a second independent piece of evidence. Moreover, exclusive reliance on place names can lead to erroneous results.

Let us imagine that the only linguistic evidence we had at our disposal from Kiev Russia period would be place names. We would then see that some of them are Slavic, and some of them are Finno-Ugric. We can then quite erroneously conclude that Kiev Russia was a bilingual Slavic-Finno-Ugric state, or we can fall even for a greater fallacy, and claim that the language of Kiev Russia was Finno-Ugric, and explain Slavic place names as a newer layer resulting from the later conquest by Muscovite Russia. I trust that both these hypothetical solutions are quite reminiscent of certain opinions we encounter today in research on both the Koguryo and Paekche languages.

Therefore, I will concentrate below on two other sources: loanwords and textual evidence.

1. Japonic nature of the Koguryo language vs. Old Korean loanwords in Jurchen and Manchu.

The Koguryo place names recorded in the vol. 35 and 37 of the *Samkwuk saki* represent a powerful mix. Some of these place names resemble Japonic, others Korean, third (much fewer in number) Tungusic, and fourth some unknown language(s). The Koguryo debate was always connected with the interpretation of the Japonic portion. Basically speaking, two different interpretations of it emerged, which I will term 'romantic' and 'realistic' (without any negative connotations implied). Romantic approach insisted on interpretation of Japonic portion of Koguryo place names as evidence for the fact that either whole Koguryo population, or at least Koguryo elite spoke some kind of a Japonic language (Murayama 1963; Yi 1963, 1981, Beckwith 2004, to name just few selected publications). Realists, on the other hand, suggested that Japonic elements in Koguryo place names represent previous substratum language, which predates Koguryo (Kim 1983, Kim 1993, 240-61; Janhunen 1996; Mabuchi et al. 2000, 521-679; Song 1999; again to name just few selected publications). The very fact that the debate goes endlessly for more than 40 years, is a good testimony to a no-win situation. Therefore, we must look for a solution elsewhere.

I believe that such a solution can be found in the study of loanwords in the languages of western and northern neighbors of Koguryo, namely in

Jurchen and Manchu. Although the Jurchen language is attested from twelfth to sixteenth centuries by inscriptions, palace memorials and dictionaries, usage of the Manchu data, in spite of the fact that Manchu is a dialect of Jurchen and it is attested only from the seventeenth century, is indispensable due to the two following reasons. First, Manchu is in many respects more archaic than Jurchen; and, second, there are many more texts preserved in Manchu than in Jurchen. Although Jurchen is not attested before the twelfth century, the presence of Jurchen tribes in the area to the north of Amlokkang and Twumangkang rivers is well documented for several centuries before that, and it is furthermore likely that historically Manchuria was the homeland of Tungusic speakers before their expanse to the North and West. Thus, we should expect that some of Jurchen tribes were either directly ruled by Koguryo, and others were in a continuous contact with the latter. Before addressing the issue of loanwords in Jurchen and Manchu, it would be wise to consider some further historical implications.

Shortly after the fall of Koguryo in 667 AD, Tay Choyeng, a former Koguryo general, founded the Parhae state in 686 AD. Parhae incorporated most of the former Koguryo territory. Although the linguistic and ethnic identity of the Parhae elite remains controversial (Janhunen 1996, 138-39, 152), and nothing remains today of the Parhae language in the form of texts, due to these two facts we should presume that there was a certain cultural and linguistic continuity between Koguryo and Parhae elites. We would also expect that the Parhae language, or more precisely the language of the Parhae elite was exerting a considerable influence on the Jurchen language prior to the Khitan conquest of Parhae in 926 AD for more than 200 years.

Consequently, we would expect to find a certain amount of loanwords plus traces of structural influence from the language of Koguryo and Parhae elites in the Jurchen and Manchu languages. If this language were Japonic, as romanticists argue, we should be able to find Japonic-looking loanwords in Jurchen and Manchu. As a matter of fact, there are none. On the other hand, both Jurchen and Manchu include a certain amount of obviously Korean-looking loanwords, which do not occur in other Tungusic languages. Furthermore, there are traces of structural influence that can be attributed to a language of Korean type. I present the evidence below.

Vocabulary

Basic vocabulary

(1) Ma. *fulehe* 'root' < *puleke,¹ not attested in any other Tungusic language, including Jurchen. Cf. MK *pwulhwuy* LH² 'id.' < PK *pwulukwuy. It is interesting that Manchu has doublets for this word: in addition to *fulehe*, there is also Ma. *da* 'root,' which is apparently a native Tungusic word, cf. Ewk. *daVacaan*, Sol. *dagasā*, Or. *daha*, Ul. *daaca(n)*, Nan. *daacā* (Cincius 1975, 188-89), Jur. *da* (Kane 1989, 206). Note that Ma. *fulehe* does not agree with MK *pwulhwuy* in its vocalism, which suggests that the word was borrowed from a dialect different from a predecessor of Middle Korean.

(2) Jur. *niama* 'heart' (Kane 1989, 892), Ma. *niyaman* 'id,' contrary to (Cincius 1975, 534) cannot be related to Ewk. *mēwan* and other similar Tungusic forms reflecting PT *miawan, because there are simply no regular correspondences. Cf. MK *nyem-thong* LL 'heart', where *-thong* is a suffix for body parts (Martin 1992, 811). Since MK /ye/ can go back to both PK *ye and *ya (Kim 1993, 275-96), we possibly have here a perfect match even in vocalism.

(3) Jur. *%ingun* 'cold, chilly' (Kiyose 1977, 102), Ma. *singkeyen* 'chilly' cannot be related to Ewk. *iŋii* 'frost,' Sol. *inigiđi* 'cold,' Ew. *iŋi-* 'to freeze, to catch cold,' Neg. *iŋi-* ~ *ini-* 'to freeze,' Or. *iŋeñi* 'cold,' Ud. *iŋinihi* 'cold,' Ul. *siŋgun* 'cold,' Uil. *siŋguu-* 'to freeze,' Nan. *siiŋgu-* 'to get cold, to become stiff with cold' (Cincius 1975, 321), because the forms without an initial *s-* would be expected in Jurchen and Manchu. Cf. EMK *sik-un* (時根, Kyeylim # 204), MK *sik-* L (attributive form *sik-un*) 'to be cold' < PK *sink-/*sink-un.³

(4) Ma. *biyoran* 'cliff of red earth,' 'precipitous bank' (Zakharov

¹ On the reconstruction of Manchu intervocalic -h- as *-k- and Manchu intervocalic -k- as *-nk- see (Vovin 1997).

² The following abbreviations are used to indicate Middle Korean pitches: L - LOW pitch, H - HIGH pitch, R - RISING pitch.

³ On the origin of Middle Korean non-leniting intervocalic obstruents -p-, -t-, -k-, and -s- from PK clusters of the *-nC- type (more rarely *-lC-) see (Vovin 2003).

1875, 545), 'cliff of red earth' (Norman 1978, 32), (Hu 1994, 98), cited with somewhat aberrant meanings as 'cliff, precipice' in (Cincius 1975, 84), and 'hohes Ufer aus kahler Erde' in (Hauer 1955, 102). The word is not attested in Jurchen. Cincius cites alongside the Manchu form Sol. *biraxan* 'mountain' (Cincius 1975, 84), attested, as it seems, only in Ivanovskii's materials. Note also irregularity in vowel correspondences between Manchu and Solon vowels in the first syllable. Cf. MK *piley* LL ~ *pilyey* LL 'cliff, precipice,' MdK *pyelang* 'id.' Korean dialect data collected in (Choy 1978, 101-102) probably indicate that MK *piley* LL ~ *pilyey* LL is more innovative phonetically than MdK *pyelang*, as the data from diverse dialects seem to support the latter form. In any case, we again have a discrepancy in vocalism between Manchu and Middle Korean, similar to (1) and (2) above.

(5) Ma. *cecere-* 'to press tightly,' 'to embrace tightly' (Norman 1978, 42) does not have parallels in other Tungusic languages. Cf. MK *cicul-* LH, MdK *cicilu-* 'to press down,' 'to weigh on' (Nam 1997, 1274). Once again we see a discrepancy in vocalism, suggesting that the Manchu word was borrowed from an Old Korean dialect, different from the predecessor of Middle Korean, see also (1) and (4) above.

(6) Jur. *in* 'his,' (cf. Ma. *in-i* 'his', gen. case form), Ma. *i* 'he, she, it' is not attested in other Tungusic languages. Cf. MK *i* H 'this.' It is well known that third person pronouns often originate from demonstratives.

(7) Jur. *se-* (Jin 1984, 252), Ma. *se-* 'to say' has no parallels in other Tungusic languages. Cf. MK *ho-* ~ *hoy-* 'to do, to say' < PK **hyo-*. The sequence */hy/ in PK usually gives /s/ in later stages of the language, cf. MdK *sikhi-* 'to make sbd. do,' a causative form of MdK *ha-* 'to do.' Again the discrepancy in vocalism is present, cf. (1) and (4-5) above.

(8) Jur. *neu' u* 'younger sister' (Kane 1989, 268) or *niyohun* (Kiyose 1977, 113) (no apparent Ma. cognate),⁴ not attested in other Tungusic languages. Cf. MK *nwuGui* LL 'sister (of a male)'. Again the discrepancy in vocalism is present, cf. (1), (4-5) and (7) above.

⁴ Kane provides Ma. *non* 'younger sister' as a cognate, but the development even from Jur. *niyohun* to Ma. *non* seems to face several problems, such as depalatalization of /ny-/ to /n-/ and loss of intervocalic /-h-/. It is even more difficult to explain Jur. *neu*' > Ma. *non*.

(9) Ma. *nitan* 'weak, faded (of color),' *nitara-* 'to become weak,' Jur. *nitara-* 'weak, faded,' not attested in other Tungusic languages. Cf. MK *nyeth-* L 'shallow, pale (of color).' Again the discrepancy in vocalism is present, cf. (1), (4?5) and (7-8) above.

Cultural vocabulary

(10) Ma. *fucihi* 'Buddha' < *puciki. Cf. MK *pwuthye* LL 'id.' < OK *pwutukye.⁵ The source for Korean word is, of course, EMC *but* (佛) 'Buddha.' Notice that Manchu word has two Korean features: initial voiceless *p- rather than *b-, and also reflex of Korean suffix *-kye. Again the discrepancy in vocalism is present, cf. (1-2), (4-5) and (7-9) above.

(11) Ma. *boobai* 'treasure', not attested in Jurchen. Cf. MK *pwopoy* RH 'jewel, treasure.' Manchu could be alternatively a direct loan from EMC *paw' paj^h* (寶貝), which is a source for the Korean word, but it is not plausible either chronologically or linguistically (we would rather expect Manchu /f/ < *p under this scenario, and certainly cannot expect EMC *paw'* with a rising tone to be borrowed as a long vowel in Manchu). It is even more phonetically implausible that the Manchu *boobai* would be borrowed from LMC *puaw' puaj*, EM *pɔw ~ puj*, or Mod. Chin. *ba³bei⁴*.

(12) Ma. *fatan* 'comb-like tool used for working silk on the loom' (Norman 1978, 84), (Hu 1994, 260). Not attested in other Tungusic languages. Cf. MK *potoy* LH 'comb of a loom' (Hwungmong II, 18a). Manchu form must have been borrowed from a form like *poton(-i), which might again indicate different dialectal origin.

(13) Ma. *fisen* 'seed,' *fisike* 'millet' < *pisinke also borrowed into some South Tungusic languages (Cincius 1977, 38), Cf. MK *psi* H (?) 'seed' < PK *pVsi. Discrepancy in vocalism and final -n in Manchu may again indicate that it was borrowed from a different Old Korean dialect than a predecessor of Middle Korean, cf. (1-2), (4-5), (7-10) and (12) above.

5 Also borrowed from some variety of Old Korean into Western Old Japanese as *potökē* 'Buddha.'

Morphology

Nominal morphology

(1) One of the most striking differences between Manchu and Jurchen on the one hand and other Tungusic languages on the other is the presence of the genitive case in Manchu and Jurchen, and its absence in other Tungusic languages. Typologically this feature can also be explained by para-Mongolic influence, since both Mongolic and Khitan languages have a genitive case marker. However, it is more likely that this case originated in Manchu and Jurchen under Korean rather than under para-Mongolic influence. The reason for this is quite simple: the main allomorph of the genitive case marker in both Manchu and Jurchen is *-i*, with the allomorph *-ni* found only after stems in *-ng* (in both Manchu and Jurchen) and stems in *-n* (Jurchen). Thus, Ma. and Jur. *-i* cannot be a direct loan from para-Mongolic genitive case marker **-n*.⁶ It is a different story with Korean. One of the MK genitive markers is *-oy* ~ *-uy* < PK **-o-Ci* ~ **-u-Ci*, where **-i* is the genitive/locative case marker itself, while **-o-* ~ **-u-* represent in all probability the intercalating vowels. This is further supported by OK data, where this genitive/locative case marker is usually written with the character 矣 (EMC *hi*⁷), e.g.:

耆郎矣兒史

ki LANG-*hi* CUs-*i*⁷

Ki[pha Hwa]lang-GEN image-NOM

Image of Hwarang Kipha (Hyangka IV, 5)

心音矣命

MOSom-*hi* MYENG

heart-GEN order

orders of the heart (Hyangka X, 3)

⁶ Actually attested as *-n* in Khitan, e.g.: *kuei-n* 'country-GEN.'

⁷ Parts written semantographically in Old Korean and Old Japanese texts are transcribed in capital letters.

(2) Another pure typological feature is the reduction of the number of cases in general. This trend probably started under the Korean influence, but was further reinforced by the Mongolic influence.

Verbal morphology

(1) Ma. alternation of stems *bi-* ~ *bisi-* 'be' is likely to mirror the MK alternation *is-* ~ *isi-* 'exist'.

(2) Ma. finite *-bi* is usually taken as a stem of *bi-* 'exist' (Sunik 1962, 320-22), but it is strange that a bare verbal stem is used as a finite indicative form. Cf. OK form *-ta-pi* [-*ta-bi*] (written as 如 'be like,' cf. MK *-taβi* LH 'like' < **tap-i*, an adverbialization of the verb *taβ-* R 'to be like').⁸

Examples:

卵乙抱遣去如

ALH-ur AN-kwo KA-*ta-pi*

egg-ACC embrace-CONV *go-IND-FIN*

[she] goes away, embracing [him as] an egg (Hyangka VI, 4)

慕人有如

KULI-NU-N SALOM-I IS-*ta-pi*

long for-PRES-ATTR/REAL person-NOM *exist-IND-FIN*

There is a person who is longed for (Hyangka IX, 8)

Thus, we can see that Manchu and Jurchen were influenced to a certain degree by some dialect of Old Korean, spoken on the territory of Koguryo and then Parhae. Incidentally, this fact has great value for the linguistic history of the Korean peninsula, demonstrating that the language of 'pseudo-Koguryo' place names was not the language of the Koguryo state. It strong-

⁸ There is consensus among almost all scholars to read this character as *-ta* rather than *-ta-pi* when it is used as a marker of verb's final form (Ogura 1929), (Yang 1965), (Hong 1956), (Kim 1980), (Kim 1993), (Cen 1994), (Yu 1996), (Sin 2000). The only exception is the position of Ceng Yelmo, who reads it as *-yo* (Ceng 1965, 103). Both points of view are incorrect in my opinion, and I plan to challenge them in greater detail in a different publication.

ly suggests that the Koguryo elite actually spoke some form of Old Korean. Thus, we have to come to an undeniable conclusion that the linguistic situation on the Korean peninsula was much more homogeneous in third-tenth centuries than it is usually thought, with the Old Korean language not being solely confined to Silla.

1a. Korean morphology in Koguryo inscriptions

Although there are no extant texts in the Koguryo language, it has been pointed out that Koguryo inscriptions in Classical Chinese have a Korean-like word order (Hong 1957, 225) and include at least one particle 之 that sometimes cannot be interpreted as a Chinese grammatical marker but as a final clause marker (Yi 1981, 71-72), (Nam 2000, 60-66), (Pay 2003, 410-11). While SOV word order will not offer us any help in establishing affiliation of the Koguryo language, the morphology is much more promising. Let us look at the examples. The first one occurs in the last line of the famous Kwangkaytho taywang inscription:

買人制令守墓之

Purchased people [should] be made to protect the grave (KKP 11.9)⁹

Particle 之 here cannot be interpreted as pivot pronoun ‘them’ in the Classical Chinese pivot construction, because we would expect in this case a sentence like: *買人制令之守墓, with 之 being placed after the causative 令. The same is even truer in the following inscription from the Phyengyang fortress, where 之 is used after the intransitive verb ‘to go over’:¹⁰

⁹Cited on the basis of Ho Hungsik’s edition (Ho 1984). In the numeric notation the first numeral indicates the page and the second the line.

¹⁰Two notes are necessary here. First, Hong Kimun interprets 行涉 as “cultivate” (1957, 234) and Nam Phwunghyen takes it as “expand, take over” (Nam 2000, 64). No “cultivation” is certainly mentioned here, and I doubt that “expansion” is meant either. The character 涉 is quite clearly either intransitive or quasi-transitive verb meaning “to cross over.” In addition, Pay (2003, 411) has 步 “to walk,” and not 涉 “to cross over.” In Chosen kinseki sora printed edition the character 涉 is used (Sôtokufu 1920, 9), but in the photo of the rubbing of the inscription provided on page V in the plate section, the radical “water” on the left cannot be read. However, it is possible that it is a defect of the photo.

自此西北行涉/步(?)之

From here [it] goes [over?] to the north-west (KPP I, 9.2-3)¹¹

It is interesting that the same sentence-final 之 is found in the Silla inscriptions. Pay defines it as a form of final predication and further notes that it is last seen in the *Sengcwu sek pwul myeng* inscription (967 AD), and attributes this 'disappearance' to a sound change (Pay 2003, 410-11). I believe though that there is an absolutely transparent cognate of this OK final predication form, which becomes apparent if we take into consideration Chinese historical phonology and gaps in the distribution of initial consonants in Early Middle Chinese. The character 之 has EMC reading /tɕi/. There were no syllables *ti, *thi, or *di in EMC, and final /i/ could combine only with retroflexes *tr-*, *trh-*, and *dr-*, or with affricates *ts-*, *tsh-*, *dz-*, *tsy-*, *tsyh-*, and *dzy-*. Thus, the choice of /tɕi/ for OK *ti was quite natural, and we could easily identify OK 之 /ti/ with MK final tentative verbal marker *-ti*. Since there is no possible cognate in Japonic, once again we can conclude that the Koguryo language represented an Old Korean dialect.

There is one more Koguryo inscription, where another particle appears, which cannot be explained on the basis of Chinese:

寐錦之衣服建立處伊者賜之

The place where Maykum's clothes were enshrined granted this (KCP 15.11-12)¹²

I believe that the character 伊 here can be interpreted only as the OK marker of the nominative (ergative?) case *-i*.¹³ Although case marker *-i* is also present in Western Old Japanese, it does not occur in other varieties of Japonic (including later varieties of Central Japanese), which makes it a perfect can-

11 This inscription is cited on the basis of the *Chôsen kinseki sôran* edition (Sôtokufu 1920, 8-9). It does not appear in (Ho 1984).

12 Cited on the basis of Ho Hungsik's edition (Ho 1984).

13 In *hyangchal* and *itwu* texts 伊 has phonetic value /i/. There are also cases when 伊 is used as nominative case marker in *hyangcha* and *itwu* texts, e.g. 佛伊 /PWUT[U]JKYE-i/ 'Buddha-NOM' (Hyangka XIX, 3) or 身伊 /MWOM-i/ 'body-NOM' (Hyangka XXIV, 10).

didate for a loan from Old Korean into Western Old Japanese (Vovin 2004, 2006).

Thus, in addition to the form of final predication 之, it is possible to identify in Koguryo inscriptions one more morphological marker 伊 that is undeniably Korean. Therefore, in spite of the scanty nature of Koguryo inscriptions, we can definitely see that a language that underlies them is some variety of Old Korean.

2. Paekche' s "bilingualism" and Paekche words in Western Old Japanese.

It seems to be accepted by a majority of scholars in the field that there were two Paekche languages: "aristocratic" Paekche that is believed to be a Puyo-type language, and "commoners" Paekche that is treated as one of the local Han-type languages. The evidence for this belief seems to be based predominantly on the following passage found in the *Zhou shu* (周書):¹⁴

王姓夫餘氏號於羅瑕民呼爲鞞吉支夏言竝王也妻號於陸夏言妃也

King belongs to the Puyo clan; gentry call [him] 於羅瑕, and commoners call [him] 鞞吉支. In Chinese it equals 'king.' [His] wife is called 於陸, in Chinese it means 'queen' (ZS XLIX, 886)¹⁵

It can be seen from this passage that nobility called the king 於羅瑕 and common people called him 鞞吉支. The conjecture that this might be used as a proof for existence of bilingualism in Paekche was first presented by Konô Rokurô, who pointed out the inherent danger of arguing for bilingualism on the basis of one word, but, nevertheless tried to support this point of view with further argumentation (Konô 1987, 78ff).

I believe that this kind of argument is too weak. For example, in Western Old Japanese there were several terms of reference for the sover-

14 The same passage is found in the *Bei shi* (北史): (BS XCIV, 11a). Cited according to the revised edition of the fourth year of the emperor Qianlong reign (1740 AD).

15 Cited according to the *Zhonghua shu ju* edition (Zhong hua shu ju 1971), where Roman numerals indicates volume and Arabic numerals page number.

eign, with two most frequent: *opo-kîmî*, lit. 'great lord,' which seems to be used only by nobility, as far as we can conclude on the basis of texts, and *mî-kaNtô*, lit. 'honorable gate,' that was used by both members of nobility and commoners. Let us imagine a hypothetical situation that Western Old Japanese and Middle Japanese would have suffered the same fate as Old Korean, with no or almost none texts surviving. But there might be once a visitor from China, with a pen-name 臭山翁 'Old Man from a Stinky Mountain,' who left his description of Japan in early eighth century, where we find the following hypothetical passage:

*公卿謂王號於布几眉民呼爲眉加途

*Nobility call king 於保几眉, and commoners call [him] 眉加途.

Thus, we would get a wonderful opportunity to argue that EMC 於保几眉 /epokimi/ and 眉加途 /mikado/ represent the evidence for 'bilingualism' in Ancient Japan.

The Paekche language in a sense is luckier than the Koguryŏ language because a number of its lexical items are documented in Western Old Japanese texts. Nevertheless, similar to the case of Koguryŏ, the main bulk of research on the Paekche language seems to be concentrated on the place names, see, e.g. the latest monograph by To Swuhuy (To 2005). The welcome exceptions that deal directly with the Paekche words as recorded in Old Japanese texts are the articles by Kôno Rokurô (1987) and John Bentley (2000), although the latter also partially deals with place names. Contrary to Kôno's central goal of demonstrating that there was a 'bilingualism' in Paekche, and Bentley's attempt to find 'cognates' in Tungusic languages, my goal is to evaluate this lexical evidence on its own terms, and see whether we can demonstrate that language of Paekche represented by these words was Korean, Japonic, or Tungusic. Our main source on these Paekche words is the *Nihonshoki* (Annals of Japan, 720 AD), where most of them are preserved. One may present a reasonable objection to their preferential treatment over Paekche place names from the *Samkwuk saki* on the basis of the fact that many of them (but not all) also occur as parts of Paekche place names. However, there are two serious counterarguments to such an objec-

tion. First, they come from a foreign source: it is highly unlikely that Japanese in Kofun and Asuka periods would be engaging in a language documentation project learning and glossing place names from extinct or endangered languages on the Korean peninsula. Second, sometimes the Nihonshoki text has side notes explaining that these words belong to the Paekche language. Therefore, we have philological evidence that these words indeed belong to the Paekche language. In addition, some of these words were borrowed into Western Old Japanese, as I will demonstrate below. It is possible to identify these words as loans from some Old Korean dialect(s) due to three factors: a) they are attested almost solely in Western Old Japanese (the only branch of the Japonic family that was in direct contact with Old Korean), very rarely in Eastern Old Japanese, and practically never in Ryukyuan; b) these words have semantic doublets that occur throughout the Japonic language family, c) they have quite straightforward OK and/or MK etymologies (Vovin 2004). Let us see how the data square against the idea that the state of Paekche was bilingual. Before proceeding to the data I have to warn my readers that I excluded the data from place names recorded in the *Samkwuk saki* on purpose, due to the reasons outlined in the beginning of this article. I have also decided to exclude all Paekche words found in Old Japanese texts if they represent doubtful phonetic transmission or have no apparent etymology in any of the language families of the region that could be immediately identified. Thus, Bentley discusses altogether 81 Paekche words in his article (Bentley 2000, 426-38). Out of these 39 are place name based. Other 24 have multiple problems with their segmentation, identification, documentation, and/or phonology, so I limit my list to 18 items only that are quite transparent for analysis and are reliably attested:

(1) Let us start with 鞮吉支 (EMC *kjən-kjit-tsjɛ*)¹⁶ ‘king,’ a title of the king used by Paekche commoners, according to the passage from the *Zhou shu*,

¹⁶The last character 支 is usually used in both OK and OJ scripts with its reading *ki, reflecting OC *kje, but since here we are dealing with Chinese transcription, we have to assume that its EMC value was used.

cited above. This word also appears as the title of Paekche kings, namely 百濟王 [*KuNtara-nō*] *kokishi* (コキシ) “king of Kudara” in the *Nihonshoki katakana* glosses (NS IX, 260, 263),¹⁷ (NS X, 276), (NS XIV, 377), (NS XVII, 23, 26), (NS XIX, 75, 77, 83), (NS XX, 109), and also as the title of Kara/Mimana kings (NS VI, 176). What is even more interesting that it is used twice as a title of Koguryo kings (NS X, 282), (NS XX, 104). Its variant *konikishi* (コニキシ、昆キシ) is attested as well, and not only in reference to Paekche kings (NS IX, 257), (NS XI, 310), (NS XIV, 377), (NS XXIV, 190, 197), but also to a Koguryo king (NS XIV, 387). Two reasonable questions arise: a) why did Japanese borrow the word from the language of Paekche commoners; and b) why, if it really belongs to a local Han language, as claimed, e.g. by Kôno Rokurô (1987, 78ff), it surfaces as a title of a king of Koguryo, where, according to the romantic approach, no Han-type languages were spoken? It certainly would be expected that Japanese would borrow from the ‘aristocratic’ Paekche language rather than from the language of the commoners, and it is even more unlikely that if Koguryo kings spoke a Japonic language they would use a term borrowed from the language of Paekche commoners.

(2) Let us now turn our attention to the ‘aristocratic’ title of the king: 於羅瑕 (EMC ʔjə-la-ʋəð). There is also a Paekche word corresponding to this title and documented in the *Nihonshoki*, although in somewhat corrupt forms: *orikoke* (オリコケ) (NS XIX, 72).¹⁸ In addition, I also think that we have a loanword in Western Old Japanese that represents the same Paekche word. There are two words, WOJ *ira-tu kô* and *ira-tu mê* that according to Omodaka et al. were appellations of high esteem for man and woman respectively (JDB 105). Based on the textual usage it appears, though that both were some kinds of titles, e.g.:

17 The references to the data from the *Nihon shoki* are provided on the basis of the *Kokushi taikēi* (国史大系) edition (Kuroita 1971). Roman numerals indicate numbers of volumes and Arabic numerals pages in the *Kokushi taikēi* edition.

18 Kôno believes that Koguryo’s king title *worikokisi* (ヲリコキシ) attested in (NS XIX, Kinmei-7), represents a contamination of *orikoke* and *kokisi* (Kono 1987, 80). I was unable to find *worikokisi* in the above mentioned source. However, a quote from the *Paykcey ponki* (百濟本記) there contains both *orikoke* (オリコケ) and *worikoke* (ヲリコケ) as titles of Koguryo king and prince (NS XIX, 73).

藤原伊良豆賣乎波婆婆止奈母念

Puntipara **ira-tu mē-woNpa** papa tō namō omōp-u

Fujiwara **noble(?)**-GEN/LOC **woman-ACC(EMPH)** mother DV PT
think-ATTR

[I] thought **of the noble woman** [from the] Fujiwara [clan] as of [my] mother
(SM 25)

The most interesting problem here is the meaning of the word *ira-*, as the rest of the title is quite transparent: *-tu* is the genitive/locative marker¹⁹ and *mē* ‘woman’ and *kō* ‘lad (in this case)’ are gender tags, perfectly attested in Japonic. The word *ira-*, on the other hand, cannot be explained on the basis of the internal Japonic evidence, and it is not attested as reference to nobility in any other branch of Japonic. Since Western Old Japanese is the only branch of Japonic that consistently raised PJ **e* to /i/ (Thorpe 1983), (Serafim 1985), (Miyake 2003), (Frellesvig and Whitman 2004), we can suggest that both pre-WOJ forms **era-* and **ira-* are equally possible. Paekche **eraGa* ‘king’ that we can surmise on the basis of 於羅瑕 (EMC ?jə-la-ʏæ), fits very nicely with the tentative pre-WOJ **era-*, with the expected development of -G- > -Ø- in Japonic. The WOJ *ira-* must be a loanword, as it is not attested in other branches of Japonic.²⁰ It is very well known from history that titles become ‘degraded’ in meaning in time, e.g.: WOJ *kīmî* ‘lord’ > MdJ *kīmî* 2nd person familiar pronoun; OK *nilim* ‘lord, ruler’ > MdK *nim*, polite suffix, ‘beloved’ (in poetry); Xiong-nu **drang-ga* ‘emperor’ > Mong. *daruGa* ‘chief, commander.

(3) Paekche ‘aristocratic’ word for the queen **oluk* (於陸), recorded in the above-mentioned passage from the *Zhou shu*, is further supported by *koni-woruku* (コニヲルク) ‘great queen’ recorded in the *Nihonshoki* as a

19 In all likelihood, borrowed from Old Korean genitive marker 叱 /ci/ (Vovin 2006, forthcoming).

20 It is possible that EMdJ and MdJ *era* ‘great’ represents a cognate. It seems that *era-* is first attested in texts originating in the Kantō area (KKJ 148), (Maeda 1990, 149), from where it spread to other Japanese dialects. Since the Kantō area is known for sporadic retention of proto-Japonic mid vowels (cf. also MdJ *sugos-* ‘to pass’ vs. WOJ and MJ *sugus-* ‘id.’), it is quite possible that we have here another piece of evidence for initial /e/ in this word.

title of Paekche queens (NS XXVI, 269). Kôno also notes that there is *woriku* (ヲリク) in reference to a queen of Koguryo (NS XXI, 130) (Kôno 1987, 80). There are also Koguryo queens' titles recorded as *orike* (オリケ) and *worikuku* (ヲリクク) (NS XIX, 73). Thus, if his equation with the Koguryo word is right, one might be inclined to think that this is indeed a 'Puye' word. But does it mean that we can demonstrate that it is Japonic? Quite clearly, the Japonic etymology is not feasible. On the other hand, it seems that an internal Korean etymology is likely. First, note the variation of *u-i* in Japanese transcription. It probably indicates that there was a different vowel that was not present in Japanese. Second, cf. MK *wòlô-* ~ *wòlG-* 'to rise' < PK **wòlók-*. The possible etymology is then **wol(G)-ok* 'the exalted one.'

(4) Although Paekche's 'commoners' word for 'queen' is not recorded in the *Zhou shu*, Kôno cogently demonstrated on the basis of glosses in the *Nihonshoki* (NS XIV, 362), (NS XXVI, 273) that there is another word for queen, *pasikasi* (ハシカシ) (Kôno 1987, 81). Kôno's conclusion that it must belong to 'commoners' language, on the other hand, is completely *ad hoc*. If it were so, by his logic we would expect that some kind of Korean etymology would be possible for this word, since it comes from a commoners' language. But this is clearly not the case.

(5) Kôno further brings two more words as a proof for bilingualism in Paekche, namely *sasi* (サシ) (NS X, 277), (NS XIV, 388) and *kî* (キ、基)²¹ (NS XIX, 59, 93) both meaning 'fortress.' We certainly have no evidence, which of them is 'aristocratic' and which one is not, but the etymologies are certainly suggestive for Kôno's bilingualism hypothesis. As Kôno correctly

21 Kôno transcribes this word as /ki/, apparently on the basis of the *katakana* usage (Kôno 1987, 82). Bentley, on the other hand, transcribes this word as **kî* (Bentley 2000, 425), which is correct (although /i/ seems to be more appropriate notation). Unfortunately, Bentley does not provide any textual verses and lines for his citation of Paekche words in the *Nihonshoki*, and I was unable to find any evidence in the *Nihonshoki* where the *man' yôgana* sign 基 was used to transcribe the Paekche word **kî* 'fortress.' The sign 基 was used to transcribe Paekche word for fortress in the *Samkwuk saki* (SKS XXXVI, 4a), and the /i/ vowel can be also confirmed on the basis WOJ *kî* 'fortress.'

notes, Paekche *sasi* can be clearly identified with MK *cás* ‘fortress’ and *kī* with WOJ *kī* ‘fortress.’ There are, however, two problems, and to pay Kōno his tribute, he does not hide the first one, as he mentions that the latter word is a loan from Paekche to Japanese. There is certainly another dimension to this problem, too. The same word occurs in Koguryo place names, transcribed as *xuət ‘fortress.’²² But there is nothing specifically Japonic about this word, as it represents famous Inner and East Asian Wanderwort, cf. Mong. *qoto(n)*, Ma. *xecen* ‘city,’ Ainu *kotan* ‘settlement,’ etc. Thus, while Paekche **casi* is likely to be a native word, Paekche *kī* is a loan that ultimately came from Inner Asia, and from there was also borrowed into Western Old Japanese. The second problem is that *sasi* is used as a reference to a Koguryo ‘fortress’ as well (NS XXVII, 291).

Thus, Kōno’s evidence for ‘bilingualism’ is really non-evident. First, we cannot conclude with certainty whether doublets for titles really belonged to two different languages. Quite to the contrary, they probably belonged to the same. Second, doublets for ‘fortress’ are also not indicative, since one of them turns out to be a common Wanderwort in the region. The case for existence of a specific ‘aristocratic’ Japonic-type language in Paekche evaporates even more, if we look at other Paekche vocabulary preserved in the *Nihonshoki*.²³

(6) Paekche *arosi, arusi* (アロシ, アルシ, 阿留之)²⁴ ‘bottom, below’ (NS XIV, 388), (NS XVII, 17, 26), (NS XIX, 52, 54, 59, 60, 63, 68). The obvious parallels are MK *àlá, àláy* (< **àlá-áy*) ‘below, bottom.’ Although *-si* in the Paekche word needs to be explained, neither Kōno nor Bentley offers such an explanation. One can clearly see that this *-si* occurs in all three Paekche directional terms that are attested in the *Nihonshoki*: *arosi/arusi*

²² Beckwith reconstructs *xuət (2003, 57).

²³ This list was previously studied in (Bentley 2000, 424-28), but since Bentley’s point of view is that Paekche is originally a Tungusic language (Bentley 2000, 424), it is necessary to re-evaluate some of his etymologies.

²⁴ Some Paekche words in the *Nihonshoki* and the *Shoku Nihongi* (796 AD) are preserved only in interlineal *katakana* transcription, not in the *man’ yōgana* transcription. I will be providing either *kana* or *man’ yōgana* spelling in the parentheses.

'below,' *okosi/ukosi* 'north,' and *aripisi* 'south.' One might be tempted to posit a 'directional' suffix *-si* in the Paekche language on the basis of its distribution, but I think that there is a more simple explanation, if we look at usage of these terms in the texts. All of them and in all cases occur before following nouns, that is, they are apparently found in a modifier position. Therefore, this *-si* obviously is cognate to OK genitive marker *-cī* (叱) and MK genitive marker *-s*.²⁵ Consequently, we can reanalyze these three directional terms as *aro-si/aru-si* 'below-GEN, lower' *oko-si/uko-si* 'north-GEN, northern,' and *aripi-si* 'south-GEN, southern.' Thus, we obtain not only the lexical, but also the morphological evidence for the Korean nature of the Paekche language.

(7) Paekche *okosi, ukosi* (オコシ, ヲコシ, ウコヲシ) 'above, north' (NS XVII, 17), (NS XIX, 52, 54, 68). Bentley compared this word with [W]OJ *okōs-* 'to raise, to get up' (Bentley 2000, 425), but in spite of the good phonetic fit, the semantic side of the comparison is more than doubtful, and the morphology and the syntactic usage mentioned above in (6) rule it out completely. I believe that MK *wuh* L 'top, above,' which both Kôno (Kôno 1987, 77) and Bentley also mention, is quite a transparent cognate. Since MK *wuh* L 'top, below' is a monosyllabic noun which belongs to a rare accent class with initial LOW pitch, the most probable reconstruction would be PK **wuku* LH/LL. It is also likely that Paekche *oko-si* 'northern' in the meaning 'north' was borrowed into Western Old Japanese as a unit: WOJ *kōsi* 'North.'²⁶ A couple of textual examples:

25 Incidentally, OK 叱 /*cī*/ is transcribed in the *Nihonshoki* as /*si*/ (NS XVII, 29).

26 It is usually believed that this word in Western Old Japanese is a derivation of WOJ *kōs-* 'to cross over' (Tsuchihashi 1957, 34), (JDB 293). However, in reality WOJ *kōsi* is used in the WOJ texts as a geographical term referring to the historical Hokuriku region (北陸道), which used to include the following provinces: Wakasa (若狹), Echizen (越前), Kaga (加賀), Noto (能登), Etchū (越中), Sado (佐渡) and Echigo (越後). Although the character 越 used in the later texts to write the verb *kōs-* 'to cross over' is present in the name of the three provinces out of the seven, I doubt that it has any specific semantic connection with WOJ *kōsi* 'North' for two reasons: first, one had to cross mountains going from Yamato plain in any direction, not necessarily only in northern; and, second, Hokuriku region is located exactly in the Northern to North-Eastern direction from Yamato.

登富登富斯 故志能久迹迹 佐加志賣遠 阿理登岐加志弓
töpö-töpö-si // *kōsi*-nō kuni-ni // sakasi mē-wo // ar-i tō kīk-as-i-te
distant-distant-FIN // **North**-GEN province-LOC // wise woman-ACC //
exist-FIN DV hear-HON-INF-SUB
[He] heard that in the distant province of the **North** there is a wise woman...
(KK 2)

之奈射可流 故之能吉美良等 可久之許曾 楊奈疑可豆良枳 多努之久安蘇婆米
sina-N-sakar-u // *kōsi*-nō kīmî-ra-tō // ka-ku si kōsō // YAnaNkī kaNturakī //
tanōsi-ku asōNp-am-ë
(sun-LOC-separate-ATTR)²⁷ // **North**-GEN lord-PLUR-COM // thus-INF PT
PT // willow wig // pleasant-INF // enjoy-TENT-EV
[I] wish to enjoy [the party, when we put on] wigs [made of] willow [branches]
with [my] lords of the **North**, which is far from the sun (MYS XVIII, 4071)

WOJ *kōsi* 'North' does not have any counterparts in Eastern Old Japanese and Ryukyuan. This limited distribution points to the fact that it is not a native word. Therefore, it is likely that we deal here with a loanword from Paekche *okosi*.

(8) Paekche *aripisi* (アリヒシ, 阿利比志) 'south' (NS IX, 260), (NS XVII, 24), (NS XIX, 55). This word is clearly a cognate of MK *alph* L, as was pointed out by Bentley (2000, 427). Again, as in the previous case, unusual LOW pitch on a monosyllabic noun allows us to reconstruct PK *alpoH LH/LL. As mentioned above in (6) and (7), *-si* in *aripi-si* is a genitive case marker, therefore it has to be analyzed as *aripi-si* 'south-GEN, southern.'

(9) Paekche *kumu, komu, kuma* (クム, クマ, コム, 久麻) 'bear' (NS XIV,

27 This is my own interpretation of *sinaNsakaru, amakura-kotoba* that applies to *kōsi*. On interpreting OJ *sina* in *makura-kotoba* as 'sun,' see (Murayama 1970). This is contrary to the prevalent view, identifying it with 'slope' (Takagi et al 1962.4, 268), but I should note *passim* that WOJ *sina* 'slope' is a ghost, as it simply does not exist.

388), (NS XVII, 28) superficially looks like WOJ *kuma* ‘id.,’ but we should keep in mind that MK *kwom* R ‘bear’ having a rising pitch points to an earlier disyllabic structure: PK **kwomo* ‘bear.’ This is one of the very few words that usually are accepted as a potential Koreo-Japonic cognate. However, Paekche in three cases out of four shows the same raising of *o to /u/ as WOJ *kuma* does, and it is further confirmed by Paekche *mure* ‘mountain’ (borrowed into WOJ as *mure* ‘mountain’) as compared with MK *mwolwo* LH and *mwoy* R ‘mountain’ (see (12) below). This leaves us with two choices: either WOJ *kuma* is a loanword from Paekche, or, if one wants to insist on Koreo-Japonic genetic relationship, one must maintain that both Paekche and Western Old Japanese underwent *independently* the same innovation. In addition, while Western Old Japanese underwent the raising of all mid vowels (*o > /u/ and *e > /i/), the raising of *e > /i/ did not occur in Paekche, as witnessed by Paekche *syema* ‘island’ and *nyerim* ‘master’ (see (14) and (19) below) vs. WOJ *sima* ‘id.’ Thus, the loanword solution seems to be simpler and more elegant. Bentley’s other comparisons with Ma. *kûwa-tiki* ‘bear cub’ and *kûwa-tiri* ‘an animal resembling a bear’ (Bentley 2000, 425) are completely unrealistic from the point of view of the Manchu historical phonology.

(10) Paekche *kuti* (俱知) ‘falcon’ (NS XI, 311). Bentley correctly points out that this word was also a short-lived loan in Western Old Japanese and Early Middle Japanese, as it is attested in the *Wamyôshô* (WMS XVIII, 1b), where it is also identified as a word of Paekche origin. And I should add, it is attested *only* in the *Wamyôshô*. The comparison with Ma. *heturhen* ‘small hawk’ (Bentley 2000, 426) must be rejected due to the lack of regular correspondences in vowels and unexplained morphology in the Manchu form.

(11) Paekche *nare, nari* (ナレ, ナリ) (NS XVII, 28, 29), (NS XIV, 388); (那禮) (NS IX, 247) ‘stream.’ Bentley is right to compare this word with MK *nayh* R ‘stream,’ and he also mentions the transcription 那利 in the *Samkwuk saki* (Bentley 2000, 427), but he does not indicate the source exactly. This transcription is not listed either in the index to the *Samkwuk*

saki (Payk 1956) or in the new index of the Old Korean script (Song 2004), so it is impossible to determine whether this transcription actually belongs to Paekche.²⁸ The comparison with MK *nayh* R < *naCih LH can be further strengthened by OK NAli (川理) ‘river’ attested in (Hyangka IV, 6), where the second syllable is written phonetically as /li/. Bentley’s other comparisons with Tungusic, such as Ma. *niyari* ‘swamp,’ Ewk. *ñā:rut* ‘lake,’ Ew. *ñarika* ‘swamp,’ etc. (Bentley 2000, 427) must be rejected for semantic, phonetic, and morphological reasons.

(12) Paekche *mure* (ムレ) (NS IX, 262), (NS XIX, 92), *mura*, *mora* (ムラ, モラ) ‘mountain’ (NS XV, 412).²⁹ Bentley correctly compares this word with MK *mwohwo* LH, but besides providing the correct meaning ‘mountain,’ he also misglosses it as a ‘ridge’ (Bentley 2000, 426). There is no meaning ‘ridge’ for this word, as it is a *hapax legomenon*, attested in the commentary to the *Yongpi echenka* (YP IV, 21b) exclusively in the meaning ‘mountain.’ However this *hapax legomenon* is well supported by MK *mwoy* R ‘mountain,’ amply attested in Middle Korean texts. Paekche *mure* ‘mountain’ was also borrowed into Western Old Japanese as *mure*, which appears not only in placenames, but also in WOJ poetry. As there are no attestations in Ryukyuan and Eastern Old Japanese, it can only be a loan. Bentley further adduces proto-Tungusic **mulu* ‘ridge,’ which is reconstructed incorrectly. There are Neg. *mulu* ‘horizontal beam supporting the roof,’ Nan. *mulu* ‘ridge of the roof,’ and Ma. *mulu* ‘mountain ridge, ridge of the roof, spine (of animals and birds)’ (Cincius 1975, 555).³⁰ First of all,

28 It is possible that Bentley has a typo here: there is Paekche place name 乃利阿縣, where 乃利 is supposed to transcribe Paekche *nari* ‘river’ (To 2005, 57). However, in both cases where 乃利阿縣 appears in the *Samkwuk saki* (SKS XXXVI, 6b; XXXVII, 9a), it has nothing to do with ‘river.’ It is also possible that he meant *Nihonshoki* rather than the *Samkwuk saki*, as there is 那利 in a Paekche place name 久麻那利 (NS XIV, 388), also written semantographically as 川 ‘river’ in 熊川 and transcribed in *katakana* as *nare* in (NS XVII, 29)

29 Bentley indicates that this word was also recorded in the *Nihonshoki* in the *man’ yōgana* spelling as 武禮 (Bentley 2000, 425), but I could not locate this spelling in the *Nihonshoki*. I believe that it is not included into the index of the *Nihonshoki* either (Ōno 1976).

30 *Ud.muje* ‘horizontal beam supporting the roof’ is also listed there, but it obviously cannot be a cognate of other Tungusic words for phonetic reasons.

Bentley's reconstruction is incorrect phonetically, as Nan. /u/ indicates proto-Tungusic central vowel *i, thus we have *mili, with vocalism incompatible with PK *wo. Second, Bentley's statement that the "Tungusic form appears to have originally pointed to something of great height" (Bentley 2000, 426) is not fully supported by the data. Thus, this Tungusic 'etymology' should be dismissed.

(13) Paekche *syema* (セマ, 斯麻)³¹ 'island' (NS XIV, 368), (NS XVI, 6), (NS XVII, 22). Bentley notes: "The obvious cognates are MK *syem* R and J *sima* LL 'island, territory' (Bentley 2000, 426). This is a *de facto* accepted position among those linguists who support Koreo-Japonic as a valid genetic unit rather than a *Sprachbund*, see, e.g. (Whitman 1985, 234). There is problem, however, with viewing J *sima* as a cognate, rather than a loan. WOJ *sima* has cognates amply attested throughout Ryukyuan (Hirayama 1966, 351), (Hirayama 1967, 334). EOJ *sima* also appears three times (MYS XIV, 3367, MYS XX, 4355, 4374), although one of these poems has no typical Eastern Old Japanese features (MYS XIV, 3367). Thus, there could be no doubts that we deal with a proto-Japonic lexical item. However, the necessary condition for this comparison on the Korean side is the assumption that proto-Korean underwent breaking PK *i > MK /ye/ that was originally suggested by (Yi 1958; Yi 1959). However, Yi's assumption is based mostly on external data of questionable nature, so it is unreliable for the purpose of establishing Koreo-Japonic cognates. Whitman does not include a correspondence of MK /ye/ : OJ /i/ into the list of his vocalic correspondences, either (Whitman 1985, 129). Therefore, this correspondence is irregular, and the comparison should be treated as an early loan dating back to the period of mutual coexistence at the Korean peninsula. The direction of loan must be from Korean into Japonic, unless the strong internal evidence indicating breaking of *i > /ye/ is provided for the Korean language

31 The *katakana* spelling セマ occurs as a Japanese phonetic gloss, but the character spelling 斯麻 occurs in a quote from a now lost Paekche source *Paekche sinsen* (百濟新撰), so it represents Paekche's orthography, but not the Japanese spelling of it. Both, however, represent roughly the same phonetic value, as EMC reading of 斯麻 is /syema/.

history. In all likelihood, the word was borrowed into proto-Japonic as *sema, but then underwent a merger of *e and *i, which is typical after coronals for all varieties of Japonic.

(14) Paekche *koni* (ㄱ 二) ‘big, large’ (NS IX, 257), (NS XI, 310), (NS XIV, 377), (NS XXIV, 190, 197). Kōno compares this word with MdK adnominal form *khu-n* ‘big’ (Kōno 1987, 79), and Bentley also adds the comparison with MK adnominal form *ha-n* ‘many’, on the basis of the fact that MK *khu-* ‘may go back to *huku-’ (Bentley 2000, 426). However ‘may’ is clearly excessive, since MK *khu-n* indeed goes back to EMK *huku-n* (黑根) (Kyeylim #348), as demonstrated by Yi Kimun (Yi 1991, 18). Bentley maintains that ‘both MK *ha-* and *khu-* ‘big’ are likely related to this Paekche word in a complicated fashion, which cannot be elucidated here. ...the *-ku-* element and *ha-* are what I believe related to PCH *kəni’ (Bentley 2000, 426). It remains unclear how Bentley arrives at his segmentation of *huku-* as *hu-ku-, and what does the mysterious element *hu- then mean? In addition to this ad hoc segmentation, one also has to explain difference in vocalism between MK *ha-* ‘to be many’ and EMK *huku-* ~ MK *khu-* ‘to be big.’ In short, these two words cannot be reconciled etymologically, and one has to choose. I think that Kōno’s solution is right, and we have to compare Paekche *koni* with MK *khu-n* H (why Kōno cites only Modern Korean form is unclear). There are several reasons for that. First, the vocalism of Paekche *koni* agrees better with MK *khu-* than with MK *ha-*.³² Second, semantic fit is also better with MK *khu-*. Third, there is no reason to reject the idea that Paekche might be as innovative as MK and less archaic than EMK in the respect to the development of initial aspirates, in other words the same development *huku-* > *khu-* might have occurred in the Paekche language centuries earlier than it did in Middle Korean. There was no difference for

32 The distinction between WOJ /kô/ and /kō/ survived into MJ at least until 921 AD, when the *Kokin waka shû* was compiled, the last text that differentiates /kô/ and /kō/ consistently. Since the contrast between WOJ /kî/ and /kī/ was already lost by that time, transcribing Korean high central vowel /u/ with mid central /ö/ was the only available option. The same is true of the *Kyeylim yusa* transcription 黑根, where Sun Mu, a speaker of Early Mandarin, who also had no /i/, opted to transcribe EMK *huku-n* as /həkən/.

speakers of Old Japanese between *k-* and *kh-*.

(15) Paekche *kasō* (カソ, 柯曾) ‘father’ (NS XVII, 26). Bentley notes that the word is also found as OJ *kasō* ‘father’ (NS XIV, 376) (Bentley 2000, 436). However, it is found only in WOJ and MJ, with no attestations in EOJ or Ryukyuan. Given the fact that there is another WOJ word for ‘father,’ *titi*, attested throughout Japonic, WOJ *kasō* should be treated as a loan from Paekche (Vovin 2004).

(16) Paekche *nyerim* (ネリム, ニリム, 二林, 爾林) ‘lord, master, king’ (NS XIV, 368), (NS XVI, 7), (NS XIX, 75), (NS XX, 109). Both Kôno and Bentley correctly identify this word with MK *nim* R < *nilim (Kôno 1987, 76), (Bentley 2000, 426). I should add that *nirin* (ニリン) is also used as a *katakana* gloss for the title of a Silla king (NS VI, 177).

(17) Paekche *kopori* (コフリ, コホリ, 己富里) ‘district’ (NS XVII, 27, 32). Both Kôno and Bentley correctly identify this word with MK *koWol* LL, *koGwolh* LL, *kwoGwolh* LL,³⁵ and *kwoGulh* LL ‘district’ and indicate that Paekche *kopori* was borrowed into WOJ as *kopori* (Kôno 1987, 84), (Bentley 2000, 425).

(18) Paekche *sitoro* (シトロ) ‘belt’ (NS XV, 412). Both Kôno and Bentley (with reference to Kôno) correctly identify this word with MK *stuy* H ‘belt.’ Kôno further suggests that the protoform was *s(i) tuli, although he notes that MK *stuy* has high and not a rising pitch (Kôno 1987, 77). This does not present any difficulty in my opinion, as PK *situri LHH would normally give MK *stuy* H, if the vowel in the first syllable was deleted.

2a. A text in the Paekche language?

Among *Silla hyangka* there is a text that might be a text in the Paekche lan-

³⁵ Attested as a *hapax legomenon* in *cwokhoWol* ‘millet district’ < *cwoh-koWol ‘millet+district’ (YP II, 22b).

guage. I mean *Setongyo* (Hyangka VI), which I provide below together with a relevant passage that precedes it in the *Samkwuk yusa*:

聞新羅真平王三公主善花美艷無雙。剃髮來京師。以薯蕷餉閭里羣童。郡童親附之。乃作謠・誘郡童而唱之云。

[Paekche's Yam Boy] heard that the third princess of the king Cinphyeng of Silla had no equals in her beauty. [He] shaved his head and came to Kyengcwu. [He] fed young boys of the district with yam. Young boys of the district became attached to him. Then [he] composed a song and asked young boys to sing it. [The song] said:

善花公主主隱 他密只嫁良置古 薯童房乙夜矣卯乙抱遣去如
 SENGHWA KWONGCWU NILIM-un // NOM KUSUk-i El-a TWU-kwo //
 SE-TWONG-PANG-ur PAM-Ohi ALH-ur AN-kwo KA-ta-pi
 Senghwa princess lady-TOP // other secret-ADV marry-INF put-GER //
 Yam-boy-?-ACC night-GEN/LOC egg-ACC embrace-GER go-IND-FIN
 Princess Senghwa has married secretly from others and embracing Yam Boy as
 an egg [she] goes away (Hyangka VI; SKY II, 27b9-28a2)

Thus we deal here with a song composed by a youth from Paekche, who comes to Silla's capital Kyengcwu and teaches local boys a song that they sing in the streets of the city. Did he compose it in the Paekche or in the Silla language? The chances are 50-50, but at least it is quite clear that he and the local boys could communicate. However, there is one feature that makes me think that the song is actually in the Paekche, and not in the Silla language.

Setongyo is believed to be one of the two oldest of the *hyangka*, tentatively between 579-632 AD (Hong 1956, 28). If it were written in the Silla language it seems to be at odds with the fact that the accusative marker, used twice within this poem is written with the character 乙 /ur/. The character 乙 is used for writing the accusative marker only in the *Kyunye hyangka* and in the *Toicangka* (XVI, 6; XVII, 2; XVIII, 2; XX, 8; XXI, 3; XXVI, 1; etc.). Meanwhile in the rest of Silla *hyangka* (with the notable exception of Setongyo), the accusative case marker is consistently written with the character 𪛗/Gur/³⁴ (II, 3, 4; III, 5, 6, 7; IV, 8; VII, 1, 5, 7; XII, 2). The same

character 𪛗/*Gur*/ appears only once as an accusative marker in the *Kyunye hyangka* (XVI, 7). It is quite apparent that we are dealing here with two temporal varieties of the same marker, with the expected development *-Gur* > *-ur* (Vovin 1995, 229). The usage of *-ur* and not *-Gur* in the Setongyo that is the earliest known *hyangka* then is best explained as a form from a different dialect, which already underwent the development of *-G-* > *-Ø-*. This interpretation can be further strengthened by the fact that while 𪛗/*Gur*/ is not used in the writing of Paekche proper names in the *Samkwuk saki*, 乙 /*ur*/ does appear in Paekche proper names (Song 2004, 770-71).

Thus, if the above proposal is correct, it turns out that the language of Paekche as used by the Yam Boy who would become in due time Paekche's king Mu was Korean. Although the above poem leaves room for various interpretations, one thing is crystal clear: its language is Korean, and not Japonic.

Conclusion

Therefore, on the basis of all evidence presented above, the answer to the question: "How many languages were spoken on the Korean peninsula during the *Samkwuk* period?" should be rather straightforward: it was just Old Korean, which certainly had its regional dialects in Koguryo and Paekche. This certainly does not rule the fact that there was once a Japonic language spoken on the Korean peninsula, but it was a substratum language.

34 Due to the computer font limitation I use this character, and not its allograph, which is actually used in the *hyanga*.

References

- Primary Sources:

Chinese

BS	Bei shi, 7 th century
ZS	Zhou shu, early 7 th century

Japanese

KK	Kojiki kayō, 712 AD
MYS	Man' yōshū, ca. 759 AD
NS	Nihonshoki, 720 AD
SM	Senmyō, 7-8 th centuries AD
WMS	[Ruiju] Wamyōshō, 931-38 AD

Korean

Hyangka	Hyangka, sixth-tenth centuries AD
Hwungmong	Hwunmong cahoy, 1527 AD
KCP	Kokwulye cwungwen pimun, 449 AD
KKP	Kokwulye Kwangkaytho taywang pimun, 414 or 415 AD
KPP I	Kokwulye Phyengyang seng pyekmun, #1, 446 (?) AD
Kyeylim	Kyeylim yusa, 1103 AD
SKY	Samkwuk yusa, 1289 AD
SKS	Samkwuk saki, 1145 AD
YP	Yongpi echenka, 1445 AD

- Secondary Sources:

- Beckwith, Christopher I. 2004. *Koguryo: The Language of Japan's Continental Relatives*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Bentley, John R. 2000. "New Look at Paekche and Korean: Data from Nihon shoki." *Ehak yenkwu* 36.2: 417-43.
- _____. 2001. "The origins of the man' yōgana." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 64.1: 59-73.

- Cen, Kyuthay 1994. *Hyangka-uy yenkwu [A Study of Hyangka]*. Seoul: Paekmunsa.
- Ceng, 'Yelmo 1965. *Hyangka yenkwu [A Study of Hyangka]*. Phyengyang: Sahoy Kwahakwen chwulphanpu.
- Choy, Hakkun 1978. *Hankwuk pangen sacen*. Seoul: Myengmuntang.
- Cincius, Vera I. (ed.) 1975-77. *Sravnitel'nyi slovar' tungusoman' chzhurskikh iazykov*, vol. 1 (1975), vol. 2 (1977). Leningrad: Nauka.
- Frellesvig, Bjarke and John Whitman 2004. 'The vowels of Proto-Japanese.' *Japanese Language and Literature* 38.2: 281-99.
- Hauer, Erich 1955. *Handwörterbuch der Mandschusprache*. Lief. 1-3. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Hirayama, Teruo 1966. *Ryûkyô hôgen no sôgôteki kenkyû [A Comprehensive Study of the Ryukyuan Dialects]*. Tokyo: Meiji shoin.
- _____. 1967. *Ryûkyû Sakishima hôgen no sôgôteki kenkyû [A Comprehensive Study of the Sakishima Ryukyuan Dialects]*. Tokyo: Meiji shoin.
- Ho, Hungsik (ed.) 1984. *Hankwuk kumsek cenmun. Kotay. [Complete texts of Korean Inscriptions]*. Seoul: Aseya munhwasa.
- Hong, Kimun 1956. *Hyangka haysek [A Decipherment of Hyangka]*. Phyengyang: Cosen mincwucwuuy inmin konghwakwuk kwahakwen.
- _____. 1957. *'Yitwu yenkwu [A Study of Yitwu]*. Phyengyang: Cosen mincwucwuuy inmin konghwakwuk kwahakwen.
- Hu, Zengyi (ed.) 1994. *Xin Man-han da cidian [A New Manchuchinese Dictionary]*. Urumqi: Xinjiang renmin chubanshe.
- Janhunen, Juha 1996. *Manchuria. An Ethnic History. M?moires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 222. Helsinki: The Finno-Ugrian society.
- JDB - Omodaka, Hisataka et al (eds.) 1967. *Jidai betsu kokugo dai jiten. Jôdai hen (A Big Dictionary of the National Language Divided by Periods. Ancient period)*. Tokyo: Sanseidô.
- Jin, Jicong 1984. *Nûzhen wen cidian [A Dictionary of the Jurchen Script]*. Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe.

- KKJ 1969. Mabuchi Kazuo and Saeki Umetomo. *Kogo jiten*. Tokyo: Kōdansha.
- Kane, Daniel 1989. *The Sino-Jurchen Vocabulary of the Bureau of Interpreters*. Uralic and Altaic Series, vol. 153. Bloomington: Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies.
- Kim, Juwen 1993. *Moum cohwa-uy yenkwu [A Study of the Vowel Harmony]*. Kyengsan: Yengnam tayhakkyo chwulphanpu.
- Kim, Panghan 1983. *Hankwuke-uy kyeythong [The Origins of the Korean Language]*. Seoul: Minumsa.
- Kim, Senki 1993. *Yeyscek nolay-uy say phuli [A New Decipherment of Old Songs]*. Seoul: Poseng munhwasa.
- Kim, Wancin 1980. *Hyangka haytok pep yenkwu [A Study of how to Decipher Hyangka]*. Seoul: Seoul Tayhakkyo chwulphanpu.
- Kiyose, Gisaburō N. 1977. *A Study of the Jurchen Language and Script*. Kyoto: Hōritsubunka-sha.
- Kōno, Rokurō 1987. “Kudarago no nijūgosei.” In: Nakagiri sensei no kiju o kinen suru kai, ed., *Chōsen no kobunka ronsan: Nakagiri sensei kiju kinen ronshū*. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 81-94. English translation (1987): The Bilingualism of the Paekche Language. *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 45: 75-86.
- Kuroita, Katsumi (ed.) 1971. *Nihonshoki 1-2. Shintei zōho Kokushi taikei [Nihonshoki 1-2. A Newly Revised and Enlarged Edition of the Series on National History]*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- Mabuchi, Kazuo et al. 2000. “Sankoku shiki kisai no Kudara chimei yori mita kodai Kudara go no kōsatsu [The Study of the Paekche language viewed on the basis of Paekche place names in the *Samkwuk saki*],” “Sankoku shiki kisai no Koma chimei yori mita kodai Koma go no kōsatsu [The Study of the Koguryo language viewed on the basis of Koguryo place names in the *Samkwuk saki*],” “Sankoku shiki kisai no Shiragi no chimei jinmei nado yori mita kodai Shiragi go no kōsatsu [The Study of the Silla language viewed on the basis of Silla place and personal names in the *Samkwuk saki*].” In: Mabuchi Kazuo, *Kodai nihongo no sugata [The appearance of the*

- Old Japanese language*, Tokyo: Musashino shoin, pp. 521-679.
- Maeda, Isamu 1990. *Edo go jiten [A Dictionary of the Edo period Language]*. Tokyo: Kôdansha.
- Martin, Samuel E. 1992. *A Reference Grammar of Korean*. Rutland & Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company.
- Miyake, Marc H. 2003. "Philological evidence for *e and *o in Pre-Old Japanese." *Diachronica* XX.1: 81-137.
- Murayama, Shichirô 1963. "Kôkurigo to chôsen go to no kankei ni kan-suru kôsatsu [A study on the connection between the Koguryo language and the Korean language]." *Chôsen gakuho*, vol. 26: 189-98.
- _____. 1970. "Sinateru terusino no kô [Thoughts on *sinateru* and *terusino*]." *Kokugogaku* 82: 16-28.
- Nam, Kwangwu 1997. *Kyohak koe sacen [Kyohaksa' s Dictionary of the pre-Modern Korean Language]*. Seoul: Kyohaksa.
- Nam, Phwunghyen 2000. *Yitwu yenkwu [A Study of Yitwu]*. Seoul: Thayhaksa.
- Norman, Jerry 1978. *A Concise Manchu-English Dictionary*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Ogura, Shinpei 1929. *Kyôka oyobi ritô no kenkyû [A Study of Hyangga and Itwu]*. Keijô: Keijô teikoku daigaku.
- Ôno, Tatsunosuke (ed.) 1976. *Nihonshoki sakuin [An Index to the Nihonshoki]*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kôbunkan.
- Pay, Tayon 2003. *Yektay yitwu sacen [A Historical Dictionary of Yitwu]*. Seoul: Hyengsel chwulphansa.
- Payk, Nakwun (ed.) 1956. *Samkwuk saki saykin [An Index to the Samkwuk saki]*. Seoul: Yenki tayhakkyo chwulphanpu.
- Serafim, Leon 1985. *Shodon: The prehistory of a Northern Ryukyuan dialect of Japanese*. Tokyo: Honpo Soseki Press.
- Sin, Cayhong 2000. *Hyangga-uy haysek [A Decipherment of Hyangga]*. Seoul: Cipmuntang.
- Song, Kicwung 1999. "Kotay kwuke yenkwu-uy saylowun pangpep [A New Method for Study of Old Korean]." *Hankwuk munhwa* 24.12: 1?34.

- _____. 2004. *Kotay kwuke ehwuy phyoki hanca-uy capyel yonglyey yenkwu* [A Study of Characters Usage in the Writing of the Old Korean Vocabulary]. Seoul: Seoul tayhakkyo chwulphanpu.
- Sôtokufu (Japanese government-general of Korea) 1920. *Chôsen kinseki sôran* [A Compendium of Korean inscriptions]. Keijô: Sôtokufu.
- Sunik, Orest 1962. *Glagol v tunguso-man' chzhurskikh iazykakh* [The verb in Manchu-Tungusic Languages]. Moscow & Leningrad: Izdatel' stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Takagi Ichinosuke, Gomi Tomohide, and Ôno Susumu (ed.) 1957-62. *Man' yôshû* [Ten thousand leaves [of words], vol. 1-4, *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* [Series of Japanese Classical Literature], vol. 4-7, Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- Thorpe, Maner L. 1983. *Ryûkyûan Language History*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of South California.
- To, Swuhuy 2005. *Paykcey-e ehwuy yenkwu* [A Study of the Paekche Vocabulary]. Seoul: Ceyiaynssi.
- Tsuchihashi, Yutaka (ed.) 1957. "Commentary and edition of the 'Kojiki kayô,' 'Nihonshoki kayô,' 'Shoku Nihongi kayô,' 'Fudoki kayô,' and 'Bussoku seki no uta.'" In: *Kodai kayôshû, Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei* [Series of the Japanese Classical Literature], vol. 3. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- Vovin, Alexander 1995. "Once Again on the Accusative Marker in Old Korean." *Diachronica* XII.2: 223-36.
- _____. 1997. "Voiceless velars in Manchu." *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 87: 263-80.
- _____. 2003. "Once Again on the Lenition in Middle Korean." *Korean Studies* 27: 85-107.
- _____. 2004. "Once again on the doublets in Western Old Japanese." Paper presented at the Workshop on the History and Structure of Japanese, Oxford Institute, Kôbe, September 2004.
- _____. 2006 (forthcoming). *Koreo-Japonica: A critical review of the language relationship*.
- Whitman, John B. 1985. "The phonological basis for the comparison of Japanese and Korean." Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University dis-

sertation

- Yang, Cwutong 1965 (originally published 1942). *Koka yenkwu [A Study of Old Songs]*. Seoul: Ilcokak.
- Yi, Kimun [Lee Ki-mun] 1958. "A comparative study of Manchu and Korean." *Ural-Altische Jahrbuch* 30: 104-93.
- _____. 1959. "On the breaking of *i in Korean." *Aseya yenkwu* 2.2: 131-37.
- _____. 1963. "A Genetic View on Japanese." *Chôsen gakuhô*, vol. 27: 136-47.
- _____. 1981. *Hankwuke hyengseng sa [The History of the Formation of the Korean Language]*. Seoul: Samseng miswul munhwa caytan chwulphanpu.
- _____. 1981. 'Itwu-uy kiwen-ey tayhan ilkochal [A Study of the Origins of Yitwu].' *Cintan hakpo* 52: 65-78.
- _____. 1991. *Kwuke ehwi sa yenkwu [A study on history of Korean vocabulary]*. Seoul: Tonga chwulphansa
- Yu, Changkyun 1996. *Hyangka pihay [A Comparative Decipherment of Hyangka]*. Seoul: Hyengsel Chwulphansa.
- Zakharov, Ivan 1875. *Polnyi man' chzhursko-russkii slovar' [A Complete Manchu-Russian Dictionary]*. Sankt-Petersburg: n.p.
- Zhonghua shu ju (eds.) 1971. *Zhou shu [The History of Zhou]*. Beijing: Zhonghua shu ju chuban.