

- Hādoxt nask*. Trad. et ed.: Mir Faxrā'i, Mahšid. Tehrān, 1371/1993
- The Holy Bible*, in Persian. Great Britain 1963 (Kitāb al-Qods ya'ni kotob-e ahd-e atiq va ahd-e jadid)
- Kār-nāme-ye Ardašir-e Bābakān (az matn-e pahlavi)*. Trad.: Hāšemi-Nejād, Qāsem. Tehrān, Našr-e Markaz, 1375/1997, 84 p.
- La Bible*, traduction oecuménique. TOB, Les Editions du Cerf et Société Française, 1988
- Lazard, Gilbert (avec l'assistance de M. Ghavam-Nejad). *Dictionnaire persan-français*. Leiden-New York-Kobenhavn-Köln, E. J. Brill, 1990
- Lüdi, G., *Aspects énonciatifs de la traduction*. Paris, Cahiers de Département des Langues et des Sciences du Langage, no 5, 1987
- Pismo Święte Starego i Nowego Testamentu*. Ed. resp. K. Dynarski. Poznań, Pallotinum, 1996
- Pisowicz, Andrzej. Some remarks on Christian terminology in Persian, dans: *Folia Orientalia*, Kraków, PAN, T.XXI, 1980, p.171-174
- Poure Davoud, Aga. Gaotōma, dans: *Dr Modi Memorial Volume*, Bombay, 1930, p. 424-436
- Seleskovitch, Danica; Lederer, Marianne (ed.). *Interpréter pour traduire*. Paris, Ecole Supérieure d'Interprètes et de Traducteurs (ESIT), Didier Erudition, 1993
- Tabakowska, Elżbieta. *Gramatyka i obrazowanie. Wprowadzenie do językoznawstwa kognitywnego*. Kraków, PAN, Nauka dla Wszystkich nr 474, 1995
- Venuti, Lawrence (ed.), *Rethinking translation. Discourse, subjectivity, ideology*. London-New York, Routledge, 1992

ROY ANDREW MILLER

## TWO MIDDLE MONGOLIAN TITLES IN EARLY KOREAN

In his article 'Les mots mongols dans le *Korye sū*', *JA* 217 (12<sup>e</sup> sér.) (1930), 253-266, a reworking of and elaboration upon a paper published the previous year by Shiratori Kurakichi, '*Kōraishi ni mi-etaru Mōkogo no kaishaku*', *Tōyō Gakuhō* 18.2 (1929) = rpt. *Shiratori Kurakichi zenshū* (Tokyo 1970), vol. 3, Paul Pelliot discussed, *inter alia*, two important Mongol titles that were apparently current in the quasi-independent late Old Korean kingdom of Koryō. Shiratori had briefly commented upon these two titles, discovered by him in Čong Lin-či's 1451 Chinese-language history *Koryō-sa*, but in each case Pelliot was able to identify their Middle Mongolian originals with more precision than the pioneer Japanese scholar had been able to bring to bear upon them. Each is also today worth a second glance, in part because of the intrinsic interest that must naturally attach to all textual evidence for bilingualism in the greater Asian realm of the Mongol empire, but also in part because, as it happens, in both instances we now have access to additional linguistic data from early Korean sources not available either to Shiratori or to Pelliot.

"The conquest of Korea by the Mongols took place over a long period lasting from 1218 to 1259. The Wang family, the ruling kings of Koryō, were allowed to continue governing. ... [I]n 1299 [Koryō] was instructed to follow the laws of Yüan China, but the king ... protested that this was inconvenient, and Korea was allowed to follow its own laws and customs" (Farquhar 1990.399-400). But as we shall see, this "following of its own laws and customs" did not by any means pre-

clude significant inroads by Middle Mongolian administrative and military terminology into the Korean lexical store. From 1259 on Koryŏ was in effect a Mongol vassal state, and its nomadic overlords constantly meddled in its internal affairs, using its resources in order to stage two invasions of Japan (1274; 1281). Hence it comes as no surprise to find Mongol organizational terms in use during the Koryŏ period itself. But what becomes increasingly interesting as we study the history of these terms in Korea is the sociolinguistic vitality they displayed, apparently continuing in vigorous vogue long after the collapse of the hegemony of their Mongol originators.

One of the titles originally discussed by Shiratori (his no. 6, pp. 406-7 in the 1970 reprint) was 波吾赤 (Chin. *pō.wú.ch'ih*); this the Koryŏ history identifies as a “section de la garde royale coréenne” but does not further explain its function. Pelliot turned his attention to the Middle Mongolian form *\*ba'urči* presumably underlying this word twice in the same year. In his glosses to Barthold's *Turkestan* (T'P 27, 1930, 26-27 note 2) he discussed the pro's and con's of translating, “sans grande conviction”, this term as ‘cuisinier’; and in his critique and correction of Shiratori's clearly unconvincing attempt to relate this form to WMo. *bayu-* ‘descend’, and *bayurčīn gār* ‘auberge’ (JA 217, 1930, 256), he wrote, “l'équivalence [of the Koryŏ title] à *ba'urči*, quoique probable, est incertaine”.

We now understand that this Mongol title was only one of several “occupational assignment” terms awarded to members of the ‘Four Shifts of Bodyguards’, MMo. *dörben kešig-üd*: “[T]he main function of the Bodyguards was to protect the ruler and provide his personal services. Members were given occupational assignments which they kept throughout their lives and passed on to their sons”. Organized by Chinggis Qan before 1189, these Bodyguard “occupational assignments” included ‘Quiver Bearers’, ‘Sword Bearers’, ‘Horse Tenders’, ‘Musicians’, ‘Scribes’, etc., and, ranking at least second from the top in most listings, ‘cooks’, attested in several different Chinese transcriptions (none identical with that of the *Koryŏ-sa*) all of which revert to MMo. *\*ba'urči*, pl. *\*ba'určīn*, *\*ba'určid* (Farquhar 1990.245).

Much of Pelliot's hesitation in rendering this title was due to Radloff's morphological analysis of the parallel Turkic word as a secondary formation in *-či(n)* upon *bayır* ‘liver’ (IV.1433); but despite the

clear folk-etymological implications of this attempted derivation, the dialect forms collected by Radloff, *loc. cit.*, are clearly relevant: Chag. *baurči* ‘der Koch; der Vorkoster, Oberküchenmeister’; Kir. *bauršy* ‘ein Mensch, der die Fleischstücke auf der Schüssel gut zu verteilen versteht’ (IV.1433, 1434). Further, we now have available the MMo. forms *baḥurci*, *ba'o'urci* ‘Koch’ of the 1389 Mongolian-Chinese *Huayī I-yü* (ed. Haenisch 1957, no. 468, p. 22; cf. WMo. *bagurči(n)* ‘cook’, Lessing, *Dict.*, 72b). Doerfer's collection of citations of this word and its borrowings into other languages (*TMEN* 1.202-205, § 82) is valuable for its documentation of the implication of high rank inherent in this title (“man sieht deutlich, daß es sich hier nicht um einen simplen ‘Küchenbullen’, sondern um eine Persönlichkeit von hohem Rang handelt”, *op. cit.*, p. 203); especially striking and possibly relevant to the role of this post in the Koryŏ court is the 14<sup>th</sup>-century text he cites from Ibn Baṭūṭa (p. 204: “Chaque émir a un bâwerdjy [Arab. *bāwurğī*] ... c'est-à-dire l'écuyer tranchant ... et lorsque la table a été dressée, cet officier s'assied devant son maître”, etc.). To Doerfer's collection must also be added a citation, more immediately relevant to the Middle Mongolian employment of the term: in the *Yüan shih* ch. 77 description of the four animal sacrifices conducted in the imperial ancestral temple, “[d]er mongolische Truchseß *boerchi* (*ba'urči*) kniet nieder und schlachtet das Opfertier” (Ratchnevsky 1970.429 with n. 21).

But even more to the point in identifying (and eventually translating) this Koryŏ title is the discovery of its survival as a loanword into Korean at least down into the third decade of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, by which time it had become so naturalized that it was taken to be Korean, not Mongol at all, even though it still retained what must have been close to its original lexical (and etymological?) meaning.

This survival is documented in a gloss embedded in vol. 8 of the Chinese-language text of the so-called *Veritable Records* of the Chosŏn dynasty, *Sŏichong čanghwŏn taiwang sillok*. The passage is found in *čhuan* 78, p. 39b, lines 6-9, of the facsimile-edition by the Gakushūin tōyōbunka kenkyūjo, Tokyo, 1956, where it is dated in correspondence with the year 1437, i.e. the 19<sup>th</sup> year of King Sŏichong (usually known in Western literature as ‘King Sejong’; this portion of the *Sillok* text was completed in 1453 by the same Čong Lin-či who compiled the *Koryŏ-sa*).

This text records a recommendation to the throne by an office charged with “advising” higher authorities, to the effect that because of administrative redundancy obtaining between several different offices, the number of appointments being made of persons to serve as ‘butchers’ appeared to be grossly excessive; in particular, while the office specifically concerned with ‘cutting up, slicing meat’ for the court had its own six regular employees who were supposed to carry out these duties, at the same time it had taken the liberty of engaging eight additional, unauthorized *pō.wú.ch’ih*; and the recommendation that the number of ‘butcher’-officials be reduced was, the text laconically concludes, “implemented”.

In view of the virtually sacerdotal function of the *ba’urči* documented in the *Yüan shih* account of the Mongol imperial ancestral cult, one can only speculate concerning the role of the similarly named officers at the Koryō, and later at the Chosŏn, court. If the latter in particular were also charged with liturgical duties, this would help to explain the attention that the *Sillok* devotes to the question of their numbers and “chain of command”. Perhaps other texts relevant to this question are to be found elsewhere in the hundreds of volumes of the *Sillok*; unfortunately they remain to be discovered.

In the meantime, interesting of course is the fact that this text uses the word *pō.wú.ch’ih* ‘butcher’ three times; but even more interesting is an interlinear Chinese gloss (ed. *loc. cit.*, l. 7) that explains this word the first time it appears: “in our national vulgar [tongue, i.e. in Korean!] one who cuts up meat (*kó.jòu.chě* 割肉者, lit. ‘Fleischhacker’) is called *pō.wú.ch’ih*”. It is clear that this *Sillok* passage documents the continued employment of this Middle Mongolian title in Korean centuries after the eclipse of the Mongol hegemony, while at the same time its interlinear gloss tells exactly what this *\*ba’u(r)čĭ* alias *pō.wú.ch’ih* did: he was not a ‘cook’ but specifically a ‘butcher’, one who cuts up, dresses, or otherwise prepares meat rather than in the sense of one who slaughters animals. Nothing could possibly be more straightforward. And finally, most interesting of all, we learn that by the time of this *Sillok* notice, which we must, given the nature of the *Veritable Records*-genre, assume to be virtually contemporary with the events it describes, the word in question was believed to be Korean, rather than a foreign borrowing.

Nor does evidence for the total naturalization of this term within Korean come to an end with this 15<sup>th</sup>-century *Sillok* notice. In modern times we find the late eminent Korean scholar of the Old Korean poetic corpus Yang Chudong citing the *Sillok* gloss as if *pō.wú.ch’ih* were a Korean word (<sup>8</sup>1974.587), reading the form as *pālič’i* and attempting to employ it in his documentation of forms attested in connection with MKor. *pāli-* ‘cut, hack; take meat off bones’ (= Chin. *kó*, *supra*). How Yang arrived at the internal *-l-* in his reading *pālič’i* is not clear: perhaps he took Chin. *wú* ‘we’ as a semantogram for Kor. *uli* ‘id.’, a daring but perhaps brilliant solution that would for our purposes have the incidental value of accounting for the *-r-* in Pelliot’s WMo. *\*ba’u[r]čĭ*, though of course Yang does not make this point, since for him the word is Korean, not Mongol. Such a mixed phonogram + semantogram + phonogram writing would be extremely unusual, but it is by no means out of the question; at least the possibility should be considered that in the *Koryō-sa*’s *pō.wú.ch’ih* transcription we actually do have the representation of a Middle Mongolian word with its intervocalic *-r-* regularly accounted for, just as in the other better-known purely Chinese transcriptions which employ Chin. 兒 *érh* for this purpose (citations in Farquhar 1990.245).

Be that as it may, Yang’s citations, unclear though they are in part, nevertheless may help to clarify the history of several Korean forms that translate Chin. *kó*, and that also may even prove to have significant Altaic connections, even though, *pace* Yang, they probably have no etymological relation to the Middle Mongolian word that was behind the *Koryō-sa*’s transcription.

Oldest of these forms is the important Old Paekche phonogram-gloss 夫里 *fū.lĭ*, †*puli* for Chin. *kó* discovered by Yang in the geographical chapters of the *Samkuk saki*, ch. 37/4 (ed. Chōsen shigakkai, Seoul, 1928, p. 11, l. 1). If one is willing to recognize a labialization of the first-syllable vowel *u* < *\*a*, which seems to call for little comment, we are then in possession of a form that has obvious etymological relevance *inter alia* for a number of later Middle Korean forms, some but by no means all of which Yang cites. Chief among these is MKor. *pāli.t’i-* ‘to cut down through something’; it glosses Chin. *kó* in the 1481 Middle Korean translation of a Chinese poem by Tu Fu (712-770) (text in Harvard-Yenching *Concordance*, ch. 11, poem 13, line 8, trans.: “Er <der große Strom> drängt sich durch und gräbt sich sein

Bett tief in die Erde ...", E. von Zach, *Tu Fu's Gedichte* [rpt. H-Y Inst. Studies, 8, 1952], 2.614); but this verb is transparently a secondary formation with the well-attested MKor. intensive suffix *-t'i-*, NKor. *-č'i-*, onto MKor. *\*pāli-* 'cut off, hack meat; split, open' (Yu, *Dict.* 351a).

Now if we keep in mind that, e.g., in Indo-European, "the distinction between a 'wound' resulting from an external blow, and a 'sore' which may result from a wound or from an internal source, is generally observed, but with some overlapping or shift", also that in these languages "the words for 'wound' are mostly from roots denoting 'strike' or other actions (as 'pierced' or 'tear') from which the wound resulted" (Buck 1949.304, § 4.85), we shall probably understand that in these and other Korean forms to be cited immediately *infra* we have valuable historical-lexical evidence that may well throw light upon the much-mooted proto-Altaic *\*bāl<sub>2</sub>-* 'wound', reconstructed on the basis of MTK. *bās* 'Wunde', Tkm. id.; OTk., MTK. *baš-a-* 'Einschnitte machen (in einem Baum)', alongside OTk., MTK. *bāliq-, bālīy-* 'verwundet', Kyr. *pālīy* 'Wunde, Geschwahr' (VEWT 65a, 60b; Clauson, EDT 375a, 376a; DTS 80, 87; Sevortjan, *Ėtim. slov.*, 2, 1978, 88-89). It would be difficult to imagine a set of forms that might give more striking evidence for the essential correctness of the classical Poppe-Ramstedt reconstruction of *\*-l<sub>2</sub>* than these; along with an original *\*bāl-*, morphologically extended by a *\*-Ik-*, *\*-Ig-* suffix in various languages, we have also an equally original, though historically secondary, *\*-bāl<sub>2</sub>(-)*, where the *\*-l<sub>2</sub>* (> *-š-*) more likely than not originated in a close-juncture joining of the *\*-l-* and the velar of the suffixed *\*-Ik/g-*, the vowel of this suffix earlier disappearing probably as a consequence of the shift in pitch or accent that generated the long vowel: *\*bal-ik/g- > \*bālk/g- > \*bāl<sub>2</sub>(-)*.

Nevertheless, it is this specific Turkic etymology, which in more than one sense vindicates at the same time that it clarifies the Poppe-Ramstedt hypothesis of the *\*l*, *\*l<sub>2</sub>* contrast in the history of the Altaic languages, that is now routinely cited in attempts to refute that same hypothesis. Thus Ščerbak (1970. 84-88) postulates *\*pās* 'wound' as the earliest and only Turkic prototype, and attempts to account for the attested *-l* forms by a 'law' that shifted *\*š > l* following an original long vowel. This revisionist analysis of the data is now widely accepted, albeit sometimes in a somewhat attenuated version (e.g. Róna-Tas 1998.68-69). We are even told that all of the classic *\*l<sub>2</sub>*, *\*r<sub>2</sub>* system is a

"quasi-scientific ... assertion, [behind which] there lies a fundamental misunderstanding of Turkic diachronic phonology" (Janhunen 1996.241). But that is only another way of saying that none of the non-Turkic words for 'wound' or 'ulcer, abscess' attested in, e.g., Korean, have any historical connection with the well-known Turkic forms.

Because of the existence of these views, based more upon phonological legerdemain than upon *Lautgesetze* properly so-called, the available Middle Korean lexical evidence for an original *\*-l(-)* in words with obvious semantic links to 'wound', 'cut', 'pierce through', etc., takes on more than usual historical-linguistic significance. To the verb roots already cited *supra*, we may add MKor. *\*pal*, glossing Chin. 腫 *hsin* 'erysipelas; sloughing of an ulcer' (Yu, *Dict.*, 368b), surviving in NKor. *p'i.spal* 'a bloody congestion' (with *p'i* 'blood'); probably also related, but with the *\*a > u* labialization after *\*b- > p* is MKor. *püzül, püzülüm*, NKor. *pusülöm* 'boil, ulcer, abscess' (Yu, *Dict.*, 405a). And finally, showing syllabic metathesis *\*a...u > u...a*, there is MKor. *pilä*, NKor. *pilu* 'mange', attested in the 1670 Korean version of the *Lao Ch'i-ta* (Yu, *Dict.*, 411a; cf. the corresponding passage in the Chinese text edited and translated in Dyer 1983.133-34, 410-411 = her text ref. 314.1-3, "one [horse] is mangy"), as well as in the *Sön'ka kwikam ōnhai*, a text from "probably shortly before 1638" (Ogura, *Chōsengo gakushi*, 1964, 264-66) which describes "a fox infested with mange" (cited Yu, *loc. cit.*). In Japanese, we expect Altai *\*bāl<sub>2</sub>-* 'wound' to appear as *Fas-*, since before OJ *-s- < \*l<sub>2</sub>* the usual reflex of pA *\*b* as OJ *w-* splits instead to *F-* (Miller 1991.194) (incidentally providing another demonstration that indeed "*\*l<sub>2</sub>* was some sort of *l'*"); and we are not disappointed, for here the obvious cognate is MJ *Fasika* 'measles', homophonous with but etymologically distinct from MJ *Fasika* 'arista, awn' (< pTg. *\*xasī-hta*, TMS 1.56a, CAJ 31, 1987, 33), with which Japanese school-etymology frequently confuses it. Perhaps it is time once more to reconsider the possibility of etymologically connecting all these *-š-* and *-l(-)* forms in Turkic, Japanese, Mongol and Korean, even at the risk of displaying our "fundamental misunderstanding of Turkic diachronic phonology".

At any rate, this particular Mongol loanword into Korean does not appear to have survived as such into New Korean; but that does not mean that there are no traces of it in the modern language. Assuming that behind MMo. *\*ba'určī*, instead of the busy succession of borrow-

ing and reborrowing back and forth between Turkic and Mongol symbolized by Doerfer as “tü <? mo <? tü” (*TMEN* 4, Index, s.v. \**baŋrčī*) there was rather an Altaic prototype variously inherited by these (and other) languages, one is tempted to identify as cognates genetically inherited from the root in that prototype MKor. *pyōlū-*, *pyōlo-* (Yu, *Dict.*, 382b), NKor. *pyōlū-* ‘divide equally, apportion out’ (Martin, *Dict.*, 775a). MKor., NKor. *pyō-* and *pōi-* are frequently no more than etymologically insignificant orthographic variants of each other; this makes it likely that the root of MKor. *:pōit-i-* ‘sever, cut off’ (cf. *supra*; with the secondary intensive stem-suffix *-t-i-* > NKor. *-č-i-*), NKor. *pōi-* ‘cut with a sharp-edged instrument, e.g. meat’ is also related here.

Further light is cast upon the identity of this Altaic root by a valuable set of Tungus cognates (*TMS* 1.95b-96a), all in the sense of ‘divide up, distribute’: Ev. *borūt-/č-*, Lam. *borūt-/č-* (both forms strikingly reminiscent of the Korean intensive stem-suffix *supra*), Ulč., Orok., Nan. *b’ri-* (Ikegami 1980.6 has *borri-* ‘to distribute (fish)’), and Oroč., Neg. *boji-* (again, both forms with their typical Tungus *-r-Verschleiß*, highly reminiscent of the Kor. *-ōi-* developments).

The second *Koryō-sa* Middle Mongolian title to be studied here was Shiratori’s No. 21, pp. 437-38, Chin. 關端赤 *k’uò.tūan.ch’ih*, commented upon by Pelliot under the same number as follows: “C’est une catégorie des gens de la garde royale ... L’original est peut-être *kōtōčīn*, malgré certaines difficultés; la transcription suggère en réalité \**kōtōlčī*” (*JA* 217, 1930, 259; Pelliot’s *k’o* for the first character of the transcription was a lapsus for *k’ouo*). In the same paragraph Pelliot cited ‘Inscriptions et pièces de chancellerie chinoises de l’époque mongole’, *T’P* sér. II, vol. 5, 1904, 436 where earlier Ed. Chavannes had translated the detailed account in *Yüan shih* ch. 99 describing this section of the “Four Shifts of Bodyguards” (Farquhar 1990.245: “Grooms, Servants”). Shiratori had also cited this text, together with other less useful Chinese transcriptions from the later Ch’ing revisionist glossaries, as well as with several Manchu equivalents and their glosses from Manchu-Chinese bilinguals.

For our present purposes we are well served by the following limited selection of Mongol and other related forms, gleaned from a variety of more recent sources: MMo. (*Sec. Hist.*) *kōtōl* ‘a reserve horse led

by the bridle when one rides a horse’, *kōtōčī-n* ‘servant, attendant’ (“perhaps historically [\*]*kōtōl.čī* ‘one who looks after the reserve horses’”, Street 1990.354 note 58); MMo. (Haenisch, 1957, no. 593) *kōtol*, *kotol* ‘Ziehen (am Leitstrick)’; WMo. *kōtel-*, *kōtül-* ‘lead by the hand, conduct’, *kōtūčī* ‘guide, groom, orderly; officer’s servant’ (Lessing *Dict.*, 493b), Mong. *kudoli-*, Urd. *gōtōl-*, Kalm. *kōt-* ‘to lead’ (Poppe 1955.142), Ma. *kutule* ‘serf, banner slave; horseherder’ (*Wut’i* no. 4445; = Uig. *kutal*), *kutule-* ‘to lead (animals)’ (Norman *Dict.*, 182a); Sol. *hutul* ‘id.’, Ulč. *kutulu-*, Orok. *kutu-* ‘to tow, drag’; Ma. *kutečī* ‘groom, coachman’ (*TMS* 1.479a, correcting Doerfer 1985.118 no. 424); NUig. *kūt-* ‘wait on, serve’, *kūtūčī* ‘attendant, servant’ (Hahn 1991.457b; Schwarz 1992.713b, 714a). Again, Doerfer’s collection of citations (*TMEN* 1.459-61) is valuable; and to it may now be added the plural *kōtečīn* discovered in a mid-14<sup>th</sup>-century manuscript of a military intelligence-report now in a Kyoto collection by Franke (1970.138, 142), who translated it “Troßführer”.

The history of the Middle Korean version of this form begins with yet another Korean-lexical gloss to a text otherwise in Chinese, in this case to a passage in the *Samkuk yusa* by the clericus Il’yōn (1206-1289). This text has been well described as “[t]he last work of importance by a Buddhist monk before the founding of the Yi dynasty ..., a treasury of *memorabilia* and *mirabilia* of Korea’s past [in which Il’yōn] struggled to salvage the cultural remains from the Silla and Koryō periods” (P. H. Lee 1975.9). The passage with which we are here concerned fits this description precisely. In the course of recasting in Chinese what can only have already been by his time a very old oral tradition relating to the Hwalang cultus (cf. Miller 1993.251ff.), Il’yōn takes the occasion to gloss a somewhat arcane Chinese compound 左人 *tsō.jén*, lit. ‘persons of the left’, outriders or attendants of inferior status, in a description of a ceremonial procession as follows: “In [the language of] the country [i.e. Korea] one calls these †*kōtilčī* 皆叱知; this means ‘slave’” (text, ed. Kokusho kankōkai, Tokyo, 1974, ch. 2, p. 8, line 4). The *Samkuk yusa* narrative to which Il’yōn added this gloss purports to deal with events in the last decade of the 7<sup>th</sup> century. But from what we can now learn of the history of this Korean word that he introduces in his gloss, such chronology is not to be taken at face value. Nevertheless, it is significant to find Il’yōn using the term

as early as he does; and this in turn must remind us that Il'yŏn's life coincided with the Mongol conquest and their harsh hegemony over Korea.

Commenting upon this *Samkuk yusa* gloss, Yang Chudong (<sup>8</sup>1974.78) flatly states that Il'yŏn's phonograms transcribe MKor. *kŏlŏ-č'i*, i.e. the same word that is found glossing Chin. 隸 *lì* 'servant, menial, underling' in the Chinese-Korean lexicon *Hunmong čahwi* of 1527, and he notes the semantic congruity of the lexical gloss with that of Il'yŏn. Somewhat confusingly he also (p. 450) attempts to involve a gloss for Chin. 丐 *kài* 'a beggar' in the Chinese-Koryŏ glossary (ed. Sasse no. 131, p. 112, but apparently with an error in the first phonogram in the Korean form). This would agree with other modern lexical sources (e.g., Yu, *Dict.*, 40a, who gloss MKor. *kŏlŏ-č'i* as 'beggar'), but it directly contradicts the evidence of the 1527 lexicon. (Yang, p. 155-57 also argues that MKor. *-č'i* in this and a number of other forms is itself a borrowing from Mongol into Koryŏ of the *Nomen actoris* suffix *-či* (cf. Ramstedt, *EAS* 2.236-38, § 116); this etymology is hardly enhanced by his own documentation, *loc. cit.*, for the existence of this same suffix in Old Korean materials that can scarcely be suspected of having been under Mongol linguistic influence. But the issue is unimportant for our present purposes.)

Central of course to the study of the word in Il'yŏn's phonogram transcription is the problem of how best to interpret its admittedly difficult second phonogram. Yang has simply understood it as a writing for *\*-l-*; but it is difficult to agree with this. In the Old Korean poem-texts, with which Il'yŏn was of course well acquainted since his *Yusa* is our source for the bulk of that corpus, this phonogram is frequently, if confusingly, used to write *-s-*, a phonetic value documented independently from the Japanese reading-tradition for several OKor. proper names containing this graphic element (Yang, p. 86; *Nihon shoki* ch. 9, Jingo 5). But Ogura (1929.222, 229) has argued convincingly that when, as most likely in this word, this character was used for a complete morpheme writing and not for a single phoneme, it is to be understood as *\*čil* or *\*čul* (which would reflect its Old Chin. *\*t'jēt*, MChin. *\*t's'jēt* values (Karlgren, *GSR* 400e), with the regular Sino-Kor. *-l* for MChin. *-t*); and of course this initial was either from or interchangeable with *\*t-*, hence the value *\*til* adopted above. (Ogura,

*loc. cit.*, commenting on his poems nos. 23, 24 = nos. A XII, A XIII in Sasse 1989. 239, 251, where however the readings of the phonogram in question reproduce uncritically those of modern Korean scholarship, devised only in order to disagree with Ogura. Note also that in his modern Korean translation [Seoul: Kyomun-sa 1993.152] of this Il'yŏn gloss, Kim Pong-tu opts for the reading *čil* for this phonogram.)

Since neither MKor. *kŏlŏ-či* nor Il'yŏn's *\*kōtilči* is found in texts but solely in a single gloss each, it is all but impossible to discuss the semantic issues that these forms raise with any authority; we can do little except rely upon the two glosses in our two texts. The gloss for the former as Chin. *lì* is absolutely clear; in the classical Chinese system (*Tso-chuan*, Duke Ch'ao, 7<sup>th</sup> year = Legge, *Ch. Cl.*, pp. 611, 616) the *lì* was the 7<sup>th</sup> in order of 10 degrees of human servitude (Legge *tsl.* 'menials'). Nam, *Dict.* 32a takes it correctly as 'menial; slave'; Yu, *Dict.* 40a glosses it only with a Chinese compositum for 'beggar', implying that it is a formation upon the Middle Korean cognate of Altaic *\*kele-* 'to speak', studied in SEC 3.27-43 (1998), which is surely incorrect. Il'yŏn's gloss is similarly unambiguous; he explains his *\*kōtilči* with Chin. 奴僕 *nú.p'ú* 'male slave; slave', the second morpheme of which is most likely the etymological source of the otherwise etymologically obscure (Doerfer, *TMEN* 1.212-3, § 90) WMo. *boyol* 'slave'. At any rate, Il'yŏn's gloss raises no problems. Doerfer (*TMEN* 1.459, § 325) has remarked, "Wie ersichtlich hat das Wort *kōtölči*, das ursprünglich den 'für jemandes Reservepferd Sorgenden' bedeutete, die allgemeine Bedeutung 'Diener' angenommen"; and many of the secondarily borrowed forms he collects are in his sources glossed 'Bannersklave', 'Sklave', and 'slugá' (p. 461). The only remarkable thing about Il'yŏn's gloss is that it documents this semantic transition for the early period at which he wrote.

Interestingly enough, the Middle Mongol original that surely underlies Il'yŏn's *\*kōtilči* and the *Koryŏ-sa*'s *k'uò.tūan.ch'ih*, as well as the MKor. lexicon's *kōkŏ-či*, has managed to survive into the modern language. In his notes not published in the *SKE* but later collected as *Paralipomena* (ed. Kho 1982.74) Ramstedt brought together with the Mongol and Tungus forms studied here NKor. *kōtül-ma* 'horses kept only for show in royal processions', no doubt drawing the form from Gale (1911.34a). Surely connected also is NKor. *kōtül-* 'lend a hand at,

help with, aid; drag in, implicate' (Martin, *Dict.* 82a). Impressively, this Mongol loanword has thus survived in the Korean language for more than half a millennium, with its meaning surprisingly intact.

Not the least of the important considerations in the study of the history of these words is the way in which the relatively abundant documentary resources available, together with certain special circumstances of Korean historical phonology, here frequently make it possible to distinguish between loanwords entering the language in historical times on the one hand and cognate forms inherited from the Altaic *Ursprache* on the other, even in cases where both the loan and the cognates are also and independently related, and mutually descended from Altaic. Had such fortunate circumstances obtained in other areas of comparative Altaic, especially in Tungus and in Mongolian, the troubled history of our studies over the past several decades might well have been very different.

#### Literature Cited

Buck, C. D.

1949 *Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*. Chicago.

Doerfer, G.

1985 *Mongolo-Tungusica. Tungusica* Bd. 3. Wiesbaden.

Dyer, Svetlana Rimsky-Korsakoff

1983 *Grammatical Analysis of the Lao Ch'i-ta*, with an English Translation of the Chinese Text. *Faculty of Asian Studies Monographs*, New Series, No. 3. Canberra.

Farquar, David M.

1990 *The Government of China under Mongol Rule. A Reference Guide. Münchener Ostasiatische Studien*, Bd. 53. Wiesbaden.

Franke, Herbert

1970 *Zwei mongolische Textfragmente aus Zentralasien*. In: *Ligeti*, ed., pp. 137-47.

Gale, J. S.

1911 *A Korean-English Dictionary*. Yokohama.

Haenisch, Erich

1957 *Sinomongolische Glossare*, I, Das Hua-I ih-yü. Abhdl. d. Dt. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin, Klasse f. Sprachen, Lit. u. Kunst, Jhr 1956, Nr. 5.

Hahn, R. F.

1991 *Spoken Uighur*. Seattle.

Ikegami Jirō

1980 *Uiruta-go kiso goi. Uiruta-zoku gengo bunka chōsa kenkyū hōkoku*, 2. Sapporo.

Janhunen, Juha

1996 *Manchuria, An Ethnic History. MSFOu* 222. Helsinki.

Lee, Peter H.

1975 *Songs of Flying Dragons. A Critical Reading. Harvard-Yenching Institute Monograph Series*, vol. 22. Cambridge.

Ligeti, L., ed.

1970 *Mongolian Studies. Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica*, 14. Amsterdam.

Miller, R. A.

1991 How many Verner's Laws Does an Altaicist Need? In: W. G. Boltz and M. C. Shapiro, eds., *Studies in the Historical Phonology of Asian Languages, CILT* 77, pp. 177-204. Amsterdam.

1993 A Shamanistic Term from Old Korean. In: K. Antoni and M.-V. Blümmel, eds., *Festgabe für Nelly Naumann, MOAG* 119, pp. 245-284.

Ogura Shinpei

1929 *Kyōka oyobi Ritō no kenkyū*. Seoul.

Poppe, N. N.

1955 *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies. MSFOu* 110. Helsinki.

Ramstedt, G. J., ed. S. Kho

1982 *Paralipomena of Korean Etymologies. MSFOu* 182. Helsinki.

Ratchnevsky, P.

1970 Über den mongolischen Kult am Hofe der Grosskhane in China. In: *Ligeti*, ed., pp. 417-43.

Róna-Tas András

1998 The Reconstruction of Proto-Turkic and the Genetic Question. In: L. Jo-hanson and É. Á. Csató, eds., *The Turkic Languages*, pp. 67-80. London.

- Sasse, W.  
 1989 Altkoreanische Dichtung: Die Silla-Hyangga. *Oriens Extremus* Jhr. 32, 133-263.  
 Ščerbak, A. M.  
 1970 *Sravnitel'naja fonetika tjurkskix jazykov*. Leningrad.  
 Schwarz, H. G.  
 1992 *An Uyghur-English Dictionary*. Bellingham.  
 Street, John C.  
 1990 Nominal Plural Formations in the *Secret History*. *Acta Or. Hung.* 44:3, 345-79.  
 Yang Chudong  
<sup>8</sup>1974 *Koka yŏnku*. Seoul.

HANNAH NEUDECKER

**ORDINAL NUMBERS IN BOBOWSKI'S  
 TURKISH BIBLE TRANSLATION (1662-1664)\***

**The research**

In this contribution we will occupy ourselves with the vowel-pattern of the suffixes forming ordinal numbers with rounded vowels in Ottoman Turkish. We will do this on the basis of the 17<sup>th</sup> century Bible translation by Wojciech Bobowski (see below). The rounded ordinals are interesting from a historical linguistic point of view, because they show us how far the vowel assimilation has advanced.

Late Ottoman Turkish has fourfold suffixes to form ordinal numbers, *-(I)ncI*, varying according to labial and palatal assimilation, but in Old-Ottoman Turkish you find just partial assimilation: only palatal, not yet labial, e.g. *üçinci*. The development has taken place via intermediate forms in Pre-modern Ottoman ("Mittelosmanisch"), during the transitional period of the development of the language<sup>1</sup>. In this period, forms of this suffix are found in which the vowel of the final syllable is

\* I am indebted to Johanna Jongeling for translating this text into English.

<sup>1</sup> G. Doerfer, *Zum Vokalismus nichtester Silben in altosmanischen Originaltexten*, Stuttgart, 1985, pp. 40-41, where he distinguishes between *üçünji* ("ältere Gruppe") and *üçünji* ("jüngere Gruppe"); cf. G. Hazai, *Handbuch der Türkischen Sprachwissenschaft*, Wiesbaden, 1990, p. 83.