

## ARE JAPANESE *TURU* AND *ITO* RELATED TO KOREAN *TURUMI* AND *SIL* RESPECTIVELY?

By TAKASHI KAMEI  
*Assis. Professor of Japanese*

### I

For a long time now deep interest has been felt in the affinity problem of Japanese. This situation has resulted in various suggestions being put forward. But if the theories expressed hitherto are broadly divided into two, the two types may be called the 'Northern hypothesis' and the 'Southern hypothesis.' However, as far as concerns a matter of genetic relationship—setting aside the question of borrowing—, it cannot be considered that a single language can be simultaneously traced directly back to two separate parent languages. Consequently the 'Northern hypothesis' and the 'Southern hypothesis' are incompatible, and in fact they have competed with one another. But it is difficult to come to a final conclusion as to which of the two is actually correct. Be that as it may, the two hypotheses have a point of difference in their character. To use an analogy, it may be described as follows. The 'Southern hypothesis' might be acceptable if it did not deceive itself by making such errors as '*Nine divided by three gives tree.*' The example is, perhaps, ridiculous, but it seems to be upon the basis of such ridiculous etymologies that the 'Southern hypothesis' is built (see below, note 25). The 'Northern hypothesis' on the other hand, to judge it in the light of the orthodox dogma of comparative philology, can definitely not be regarded as something proved, but there is less fear in it of confusing '*three*' with '*tree*' by their accidental resemblance. The 'Northern hypothesis' is more likely to say '*Ten divided by three gives three.*' This is the error inherent in the use of large and rough figures in a calculation.

Naturally it is possible, by means of elucidation as tried by some scholars, to reconcile the 'Northern hypothesis' and the 'Southern hypothesis.' This elucidation is to say that Japanese owes its structure largely to Northern languages and owes its vocabulary largely to Southern languages. However, firstly, if prehistory is taken into consideration here, the lexical influence of southern connections (even if we assume that such a pheno-

menon occurred in Japanese) must be very old: in any case it must be regarded as anterior to the time when the influence of the culture from the north, which can be discovered archaeologically, swept powerfully over the islands of Japan. At the same time it must also be borne in mind that the waves of culture from the north must have come to Japan one after another over a long period.

Secondly, if it is assumed that a language of northern affinities was united with a substratum of a language of southern affinities, I am uncertain myself to what extent the structural characteristics of the former could be grafted on to the latter. If we are justified in thinking that vowel harmony which once existed in ancient Japanese<sup>1</sup> lends itself as one proof of affinity, or at least, if we place main emphasis on the structure of Japanese, the discussion of the affinities of Japanese tends more to the advantages of the 'Northern hypothesis.' In other words, the 'Northern hypothesis' of Japanese is all the more difficult to subject to disproof strong enough to reject it. Only the problem is not only to look for specific characteristics of structure (to which vowel harmony also belongs so far as it remains a phonological *feature*), but to establish actual sound laws based on the comparison of individual words. Many scholars have exerted themselves on this work, and it is now clear that it is not an easy task to establish most convincing sound laws. After all, they cannot give a more exact answer than 'Ten divided by three gives three.' Of course, an approximate value will do to a certain extent, but still, as we know, verisimilitude is, regrettably, not proof.

The languages with northern affinities (i.e. those which the 'Northern hypothesis' postulates) are none other than the so-called Altaic languages. However, when the term 'Altaic languages' is used, the problem comes to involve the question 'What is an Altaic language?'. Such a problem is outside the scope of my argument. Nevertheless if Japanese is to be classed among the Altaic languages, Korean must all the more certainly be considered to be one of them.

If we consider that Japanese branched off from primitive Altaic extremely early and that it has only a very distant relationship with the other Altaic languages, although such a theory is only one of the possible conjectures, it is theoretically quite natural to assume that Japanese should be a *marginal language* among the Altaic languages or rather to look for the line of affinity in distant places rather than in near places.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Arisaka Hideyo, *Kokugo on'inshi no kenkyū*, pp. 101-114. However, Hattori Shirō reasonably states that he cannot agree with the opinion that vowel harmony is definite proof of the relationship between Japanese with Korean on the one hand and Altaic languages on the other. This point should receive sufficiently deep recognition by scholars, Altaists excepted. For details, see Hattori's article, "The relationship of Japanese to the Ryukyu, Korean and Altaic languages," *TASJ*, 3rd series, 1, esp. pp. 117-118.

Be that as it may, I here attempt only to deal specifically with the two words in the title of this paper, in the hope of making some contribution to the affinity problem of Japanese by illustrating on the following lines the general picture of how one should face the relevant problem.

## II

The similarity between the Japanese word *туру* and the Korean word *turumi* was noticed early. Furthermore, these words can be compared with Altaic languages and also with Uralic languages.<sup>2</sup> Here, I am not concerned with whether or not the Japanese word *туру* is of Altaic origin. I merely admit the possibility that it is so and advance the following arguments.

When the Korean *turumi* and the Turkish forms *turna*, *torna* are compared, it is assumed that the *r* existed in the prototype, and it may be said that the *r* of the Japanese word *туру* also corresponds directly to this. But in fact the Japanese *туру* is not to be dealt with so simply.

In texts, *туру* appears as early as the *Manyōshū*. The character 鶴 is often used phonetically to stand for the two syllables *tu-ru*.<sup>3</sup> From this it is possible to deduce indirectly, that the crane was called *туру* in the Nara period. But there is another fact, as follows. There are many examples in the *Manyōshū* of the character 鶴 used ideographically.<sup>4</sup> In the *kana* renderings which have been added to the *Manyōshū* from the Heian period onwards, the ideograph 鶴 for the name of the bird has always in these cases been rendered, from of old as *tadu*, not *туру*.<sup>5</sup>

Furthermore, we find such examples as the following in the *Manyōshū*.<sup>6</sup>

若浦爾鹽滿來者滴乎無美葦邊乎指天多頭鳴渡 (No. 919)

Waka-no-ura ni siho miti kureba katawo nami asibewo sasite *tadu* naki wataru.

In these poems what was written in *manyōgana* as *tadu* naturally

<sup>2</sup> As far as I know, the first person to link Japanese *туру* and Korean *turumi* with Ural-Altai was Ogura Shimpei (*Kokugo gogen no mondai* pp. 17-18). But the comparison merely between Japanese *туру* and Korean *turumi* was previously attempted by Polivanov (in *Izvestia Akademii Nauka SSSR*, 1927, quoted by Hattori in the article above p. 120). I touch upon Polivanov's comparison again later in this article, see section IV. There are others who have paid attention to the resemblance between Japanese *туру* and Ural-Altai languages (cf. D. Sinor, 'Ouralo-Altaique-Indo-Européen,' *T'oung-Pao* XXXVII, p. 241 and note 4). But Ramstedt does not include the word *turumi*, for some reason, in his comprehensive *Studies in Korean Etymology*.

<sup>3</sup> In all 54 examples, calculated from the *Manyōshū sōsakuin*.

<sup>4</sup> 鶴 19 examples: 葦鶴 2: 白鶴 1: 鶴群 1. Calculated from the *Manyōshū sōsakuin*.

<sup>5</sup> See the examples collected in the *Kōhon Manyōshū*. Of course, among the variants there are cases where the reading *туру* is found, but there is no example which amounts to proof for rejecting *tadu*.

<sup>6</sup> There are 11 cases written 多豆, 1 多津, 1 多都, 10 多頭 (including 2 *asitadu*).

means 'crane.' On the other hand, *туру* signifying 'crane,' as written phonetically in *manyōgana* never appears in the *Manyōshū*. Accordingly, already in the Nara period, (1) *tadu* and *туру* existed side by side as words for 'crane' (2) as in the Heian period and after, *tadu* was a poetic word and *туру* was the ordinary word.

There are also *kahadu* and *kaheru* as words of a similar type. In the *Manyōshū* there are no examples in which the 'frog' is written with *manyōgana kaheru*, but it is clear that the word *kaheru* existed, since the character 蝦 must be read *kaheru* in the following poem:—

吾屋戶爾黃變蝦手每見妹乎懸管不戀日者無 (No. 1623)

Waga yadoni momidu *kaherude* mirugotoni imowo kaketutu kohinu hiha nasi.

In the *Manyōshū* no other form than *kahadu* appears, as far as is shown by examples in *manyōgana*.<sup>8</sup> Admittedly there is a theory<sup>9</sup> that the *kahadu* of the *Manyōshū* is the same as *kajika* 'Hyla,' but even if this is accepted, it is no obstacle to considering that *kaheru* and *kahadu* are etymologically of the same origin. Whether or not *kahadu* in the *Manyōshū* really only signified *kajika* is rather doubtful. Incidentally after the Heian period *kahadu* was the poetic word corresponding to *kaheru*.<sup>10</sup>

In Japan, from of old, the various species of frogs have long been differentiated by name e.g. *aogaeru*, *akagaeru*, *amagaeru*, *ibogaeru*, *tonosamagaeru*, etc., and toads have also for many centuries been called *hikigaeru* and *gamagaeru*. In other words, Japanese does not have completely separate words for 'frog' and 'toad' respectively (as English has), but always uses the word *kaeru* as the second part of each compound which differentiates them.<sup>11</sup> However, in the Nara period the Japanese word 'toad' at that time was *taniguku*. In parallel examples this word is once written *taniguku* by *manyōgana*<sup>12a</sup> and once ideographically as 谷蟻,<sup>12b</sup> and so it may safely be analysed as *tani* (valley, glen) and *-guku*.<sup>13</sup> If so, the oldest Japanese

<sup>7</sup> There are also cases which employ the character 鶴 as *manyōgana* for the two syllables *ta-du* i.e. 鶴寸 for *taduki* (cf. 多頭積, 多豆伎, 多都吉, 田付, 多付).

<sup>8</sup> See the section on *kahadu* in the *Manyōshū sōsakuin*.

<sup>9</sup> See *Daijinkai*.

<sup>10</sup> It has already been noticed, in the case of the doublets *tadu* and *туру*, *kahadu* and *kaheru* that the former are both poetic words (cf. Saeki Umemoto, *Kokugoshi*, *Jōkohen* pp. 11-14).

<sup>11</sup> Except in the case of *kajika*.

<sup>12a</sup> 多爾具久能佐和多流伎波美 (*Manyōshū* No. 800).

<sup>12b</sup> 谷蟻能狹度極 (*Toshigoino matsuri* and *Otonono hogai*, in the *Norito*).

<sup>13</sup> Certainly there is a weak point in this analysis, for though in the *Manyōshū kahadu* is written 河蝦, it would be wrong to analyse this as *kaha-tu*. Also it may be deduced from the fact that *taniguku* was written in *Manyōshū* 971 as 谷潛 that the meaning of *-guku* was not sufficiently clear. But this is reasonable, after the independent word *kuku* disappeared (on my assumption that it was a word in use from ancient times). The writing 谷蟻 as indicated in note 12 appears in the *Engishiki norito*, and accordingly, viewed as textual evidence is later than the *Manyōshū*. However, it may be interpreted as having been written 谷蟻 from ancient times in the tradition of the *norito*, as a set phrase written in a set manner. Since the

word for the generic class of *kaheru* may have been *kuku* (or else *iguku*). It may be that this survived in the compound *taniguku* and that *kuku* itself was replaced by *kaheru* and *kahadu*. If this view is correct, *kaheru* and *kahadu* go back as far as the Nara period, but may well not go back much farther than that. If so, consideration must now be given to the question of which of the two sounds—*r* or *d*—is the earlier in the doublet *kaheru* and *kahadu*. This may perhaps be regarded as a kind of rhotacism, but there are other arguments in favour of the antecedence of the form containing *d*. If, for example, it is true that when a community discriminates between the values of two words in a doublet, its judgement is subconsciously and inevitably influenced by the relative ages of these words, then is it not likely that the form which was consecrated to poetry—in this case, the form containing *d*—was the older?

Naturally it is impossible to reach a definite decision by such means, but in this event, if we do regard the form containing *d* as the older, changes of words may be diagrammatised as *kahadu* > *kaheru*. However, how did *kahadu* and *kaheru* come into use as a doublet? The change is not only *d* > *r* but involves a shift *a* > *e* in the vowel of the second syllable. What was it that caused the change *a* > *e* as well as changing *d* > *r*? Certainly, if the simultaneous existence of *kahadu* and *kaheru* is explained as a phenomenon of inter-dialect borrowing, it may be as well that the prototype to be restored from these two forms is a separate form identical with neither *kahadu* nor *kaheru*. If such a view is taken, it is very difficult to infer more than that it has some connection with *kahadu* and *kaheru*. However, as far as concerns the correspondence between *d* and *r*, I assume that the *d* is older.

The difference between *tadu* and *turu* on the one hand and *kahadu* and *kaheru* on the other is that the former shows a discrepancy between *a* and *u* in the first syllable. In this respect, the two pairs of words are out of step with each other. For this reason it is not today sufficiently certain whether the correspondence of form between *tadu* and *turu* may be gauged by the analogy of the correspondence between *kahadu* and *kaheru*. However, if it is assumed that *kahadu* and *kaheru* were substituted for *kuku* (as above supposed), in accordance with that it may be concluded reasonably that neither the introduction of the form containing *r* nor the emergence of the situation in which the words became a doublet are so very old.<sup>14</sup> Consequently it goes without saying that if the employment of the form

phrase in *Manyōshū* 800 (and the phrase in 971 is the same) was based on the phrase in the *norito*, the phrase *taniguku no sawataru kihami* was well-known from earlier times. At least in the tradition of the *norito*, even if there was fear of popular etymology, this had been analysed into *tani* (valley, glen) and *guku* (<*kuku* or *iguku*, frog, toad).

<sup>14</sup> This is my suggestion, but even if the supposition of the form *kuku* is denied, the following conclusions remain valid *ceteris paribus*.

*туру* arose by a more or less parallel process with the emergence of the doublet *kahadu* and *kaheru*, the *r* of the *туру* in Japanese must belong to far more recent innovation, after Japanese had lost direct contact with Altaic. In other words, whether or not the word *туру* as a whole is of Altaic origin, the *r* comprised in this form is not descended in the direct line from proto-Altaic down to Japanese.

### III

The next step is to discuss the possibility of Korean *sil* and Japanese *ito* being related.

For the connection of Korean *sil* with Altaic languages, the Manchurian word for 'thread,' *sirge*, has been compared with it by Ogura Shimpei.<sup>15</sup> In addition Ramstedt provides new material, giving words from Tungus and Goldi respectively.<sup>16</sup> Also, at an earlier date, and from a different viewpoint, A. Conrady suggested that the Greek *σηρικ-* was derived from the ancient Chinese *sir*, via Mongolian.<sup>17</sup> This was accepted by H. Jensen,<sup>18</sup> who added the Manchurian word *sirge* to Conrady's theory. At the same time he quoted the Korean *sil* for comparison, but it may be conjectured that he seems to have thought that the Korean *sil* was derived from the Chinese *sir*. It is difficult to give approval to the idea that Korean *sil* was directly derived from Chinese *sir*, but the various common forms signifying 'thread' which were spread among Altaic languages, or at least a part of them, may be explained as having their primary common form borrowed from Chinese (on the assumption that there was a connection with Chinese at that time) before the various Altaic languages branched off or at a time when they still preserved a close mutual contact. There is more to be said about this point but since it has no deep connection directly with my argument I will not touch upon it further here.<sup>19</sup>

I will confine myself to a consideration of Korean *sil* and Japanese *ito*. For an assumption that they are related, a correspondence between Korean *s* and Japanese *zero* (*non esse* of an initial consonant) must first be explained.

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 19.

<sup>16</sup> *Studies in Korean Etymology*, p. 233.

<sup>17</sup> *Alte westöstliche Kulturwörter. Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaft.* Phil.-hist. Kl. 77, 3 Heft. p. 6.

<sup>18</sup> *Indegermanisch und Chinesisch, Hirt-Festschrift* II p. 140. However, as is clear from his note, Jensen's enlargement was based on the article 'Seide' in volume II of Shrader—Nehring's *Reallexikon der idg. Altertumskunde*. Accordingly his quotation of the Korean form as *sir* was based on the *Reallexikon*.

<sup>19</sup> Conrady wrote '*sir* (ser), Seide,' but it is completely obscure why he made such a theory. Both the reconstruction of the form *sir* and the assumption of the meaning *sir* 'silk' are truly incredible to me.

Here at least the correspondence Korean *sɛbi*—Japanese *ebi* (<*iɛbi*) 'lobster, prawn, shrimp' can be adduced.<sup>20</sup> Also, if we go back as far as the ancient Japanese language, it may be surmised that the *s* of modern Japanese was originally *ts*,<sup>21</sup> and accordingly, if we assume that there was a sound *s* in ancient preliterate Japanese (distinct from the *s* of modern Japanese), it may be conjectured that this *s* disappeared before the dawn of the historical period. Since there are cases<sup>22</sup> where even the assumed original *ts* is thought to have dropped out, the supposition that *s* disappeared is not a rash one.

Next, in order to equate *sil* and *ito* linguistically, the correspondence between Korean *l* and Japanese *t* must be explained. There are examples such as Korean *pɔl*—Japanese *hati* (<*pati*) 'bee' and Korean *mul*—Japanese *midu* 'water'. One of the great differences between Korean and Japanese is that the former has many syllables ending with a consonant or consonants. It may be that this is mainly the result of the dropping out in Korean of the vowel elements which originally existed.<sup>23</sup> The process of change from *t*>*l* may be assumed to be—*t*—>—*d*—>—(*r*)>—*l*. In Korean (apart from dialects) the appearance of *l* at the end of a syllable is a special feature of the language, and it is worth noticing that in the pronunciation of Sino-Korean, final *t* of ancient Chinese is represented by *l*.<sup>24</sup>

In this way I have 'cooked up' a correspondence between Korean *sil* and Japanese *ito*. But as I made clear in advance at the beginning of this section, I am discussing this as a *possibility*. It is not my intention to assert that *ito* and *sil* are definitely related (and I wish this point to be fully appreciated). I merely surmise that Korean and Japanese must certainly have passed through many numerous independent sound changes in the period prior to the first extant texts. Nobody can guarantee that not only the dropping out of vowels but also phenomena such as the contraction of vowels resulting from the dropping out of intervocalic consonants did not

<sup>20</sup> With reference to Korean *sebi* the Manchurian examples *sampa*, *sam-p'a* were pointed out by Ogura, *op. cit.* p. 18.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Arisaka Hideyo, *op. cit.* pp. 143–156. It is confirmed that at least the syllable *sa* was [tsa] still at the beginning of the Heian period.

<sup>22</sup> -sine: ine; -same: ame; suuru: uuru; sutu: utu; -siha: iha; se: ie.  
<sup>23</sup> Cf. Hattori's article p. 120. Incidentally, *toinsiot* developed out of a consonantal cluster. Theoretically it is reasonable to regard initials such as *psk-*, among these consonantal clusters, as having arisen from the dropping out of vowels.

<sup>24</sup> No doubt the representation of Sino-Korean of Chinese final *t* as *l* reflects the stage in which in Chinese itself the final *t* had changed into *r*. However, at the time when in China the dental final *t* became *d* and then *r*, the labial final *p* and the guttural final *k* were also changing to *b* and *g* respectively: for all that, the labial final of Sino-Korean remained an implosive *p* and the guttural final *k* an implosive *k*. The fact that the representation of dental final *t* differs from *p* and *k* is because the tendency inherent in Korean itself did not fail, in the case of *t*, to follow the changes that took place in Chinese. In other words, the causes of this particular asymmetry cannot be sought elsewhere than in the history of Korean itself. (That Chinese *p*, *k* and *t* followed the course *p*>*b*, *k*>*g* and *t*>*d*>*r* is clear from many materials of various kinds. It may also be mentioned that the final *p*, *k* and *t* in Chinese were implosive).

often occur.<sup>25</sup> For this reason it must be borne in mind that one should be prepared rather to take into consideration cases of etymological correspondence existing between words which, at a glance, have no resemblance. This does not mean of course that there is much hope of real success in finding such correspondence. But we must not despair; we should persevere and continue to hope for the best.

#### IV

A point about which I must finally add a comment is the difference between genetic relationship and borrowing. Even if *туру* (I mention here of *tadu*) and *ito* (this belongs to cultural vocabulary) are related to Korean words, this gives at the present stage no evidence concerning the question whether they are words directly handed down from a parent language or whether they are borrowings.<sup>26</sup>

Polivanov<sup>27</sup> placed *asa* and *atšom* 'morning' side by side as an example parallel to *туру* and *turumi*. I cannot agree with this proposition as it stands. Apart from *туру* which was dealt with above, there is the following difficulty about *asa* too, namely that in ancient Japanese, to represent the Japanese word for 'morning' there was *asita*, used side by side with *asa*. Was not *asita* chronologically earlier than *asa*? It is highly probable that in ancient times, [s] was [ts] (see note 21). It may be assumed that such a change as [atsita] > [atsa] arose dialectically, and as a result of an interplay of dialects arising from some cause, cultural or political, *asita* and *asa* became current as synonyms within the same dialect. Finally *asita* was relegated to poetic usage.<sup>28</sup>

If there is any truth in Polivanov's proposition, it seems appropriate to me to offer the following interpretation, namely, that there was a fairly close relationship between an ancient language, as used in the south of

<sup>25</sup> The history of the Ryūkyū language may endorse the possibility of such a hypothesis. Incidentally, those who side with the 'Southern hypothesis' should pay more attention to such possibilities.

<sup>26</sup> Concerning the point where it is no longer possible to make a difference between genetic relationship and borrowing, see my paper: *Nihongo keitōron no mondai* (in the *Hitotsubashi Ronsō* XXI and XXII) pp. 242-244 of Vol. XXI. It may be mentioned that 'a parent language' here does not necessarily mean 'proto-Altai.'

<sup>27</sup> See note 2. Also cf. Ramstedt's *Studies* pp. 3-4.

<sup>28</sup> The word *asu* 'tomorrow' may also be a doublet of *asa*, derived from *asita*, passing through a similar development. (*asita* subsequently in colloquial speech became a synonym of *asu*, meaning 'tomorrow'). It may be added that in the Ryūkyū language the word for 'tomorrow' is *attsā*, *atsa* or *atša*, whereas the word for 'morning' is the same as in Japanese, i.e. *asa*. The forms *attsā* etc. derived from *asita* by an independent sound change in the Ryūkyū language. It may be noteworthy that the *attsā* means 'tomorrow' only and not 'morning' and there is no form corresponding to Japanese *asu*.



ancient Korea, and Japanese. The word for 'crane' in the former was *turũ*, and the word for 'morning' was *asã*. This and the Japanese *asita* go back to a form *asitam-*. An ancient Japanese *dialect* borrowed *asã* and *turũ* afresh from an ancient south Korean *dialect*. If this is true, my theory, given above, about the origin of the form *asa* must be understood as having arisen *mutatis mutandis* in ancient Korea. But whether *turu* itself as an individual case must be exclusively regarded as a borrowing of *this kind* is still far beyond a final conclusion, even if I am inclined to favour an assumption<sup>29</sup> that there was a close linguistic—not to say dialectal—connection between ancient Japanese and the language used in certain parts of ancient South Korea, and that this language itself had already in the remote past succumbed to a new language (though ultimately of the same stock) from which modern Korean is directly descended.

---

<sup>29</sup> As put forward by Kōno Rokurō in his outstanding work, *Chōsen hōgengakushikō* p. 172 *et seq.*