

# Fó (佛), *Pwuche* (仏體), and *Hotoke* (保止氣)

Ye Xu  
Zhejiang University

**Abstract:** The aim of this article is to discuss how the Chinese loanword *fó* (佛) was incorporated into pre-Old Korean (pre-OK), Old Korean (OK), and Western Old Japanese (WOJ) on the basis of textual research using various primary sources from China, Korea, and Japan. The author proposes that two routes exist to explain the borrowing of the Chinese word *fó* (佛) into pre-OK, OK, and WOJ: one route from the Six Dynasties to the Korean Three Kingdoms period to Japan's pre-Nara period, and one from the Sui and Tang dynasties to the Unified Silla and Koryŏ periods.

**Keywords:** 佛, 佛體, 仏體, 保止氣, sinographic writing, language contact

The etymology of the Korean word corresponding to *Buddha* in Sanskrit (SKT) is enigmatic and the subject of ongoing debate (Kim 1977; Yi 1998; Pak 1990; Vovin 2005, 2006, 2007; Lee and Ramsey 2011; Nam 2014; Pellard 2014; Hwang 2014). Tracing back, this word takes the following forms.

Modern Standard Seoul Korean (MSSK) *pwuche* (부처, [pu.tʰɕə]), Late Middle Korean (LMK) *pwũthyĕy* (부테, [pu.tʰiɛi]) ~ *pwũthyè* (부터, [pu.tʰiɛ]), Old Korean (OK) 仏體 (Later Han Chinese (LHan) \*but.tʰei<sup>B</sup> > Middle Chinese (MC) \*bjwət.tʰiei<sup>B</sup>; Middle Sino-Korean (MSK) *pwultheye* (불테, [pul<sup>H(L)</sup>.tʰiɛi<sup>H</sup>]) ~ *pultheye* (불테, [pil<sup>H</sup>.tʰiɛi<sup>H</sup>]), hereafter *pwuche*, appears in the *hyangga* (鄉歌, “country songs” or “local songs”)<sup>1</sup> known collectively as *Songs of the Ten Vows of Samantabhadra* (Pohyŏn sibwŏn'ga 普賢十願歌), which were written down by Korean Buddhist master Kyunyŏ (均如, 923–73 CE) and collected in Hyŏk Yŏnjŏng's (赫連挺, ca. twelfth century CE) “Biography of Kyunyŏ” (Tae hwaŏm sujwa wŏnt'ong yangjung taesa Kyunyŏjŏn 大華嚴首座圓通兩重大師均如傳) during the Koryŏ (高麗, 918–1392 CE) period.<sup>2</sup>

This article argues that the Chinese rendering of the word for Buddha, *fó* (佛, LHan \*but > MC \*bjwət), comes from the way in which Chinese *fó* (佛) was borrowed into OK as the word *pwuche* (仏體); it further argues that the honorific suffix \*kej ~ kəj in pre-OK<sup>3</sup> was loaned as *kĕ* into Western Old Japanese (WOJ) *hotoke* (保止氣). It bases these claims on a reexamination of various primary texts—including chronicles, literary texts, and epigraphs from China, Korea, and Japan—and their analysis from a historical linguistic perspective.

### Fó (佛) Is Not a Chinese Rendering of SKT *Buddha*

On the etymology of fó (佛) for “Buddha” in Chinese, after much discussion over the past century, a consensus has finally been reached. In 1933, preeminent scholar Hu Shi (胡適, 1891–1962) debated with Chen Yuan (陳垣, 1880–1971) about the usage of the Chinese words *fútú* (浮屠, LHan \*bu.da > MC \*bjəu.duo) and fó (佛) for “Buddha” in different texts. Hu Shi contended that *fútú* (浮屠) was a derogatory rendering in old Chinese used by non-Buddhists,<sup>4</sup> while fó (佛) was used by Buddhists uniformly as a logogram without specific meaning in Chinese, especially after a large volume of scriptures had been translated (Hu 1998: 5, 145–67). Here we must observe that the first accounts of the translation of Buddhist scriptures into Chinese date to the Eastern Han (東漢) period. These occur in the scriptures translated by An Shigao (安世高, ?–188 CE) from Anxi (安息, i.e., Parthia, Aršak), Zhi Loujiachen (支婁迦讖, SKT Lokakṣema, 147 CE–?) from the Great Yuezhi (大月氏, i.e., the realm of the Kushans, Guishuang 貴霜), as well as by other monks from Xiyu (西域, the Western Regions), but none directly from India (Zürcher 1991; Nattier 2008; Fang and Gao 2012).<sup>5</sup>

Subsequently, Ji Xianlin (1948, 1990) considered the pronunciation of the sinograph for “Buddha” fó (佛) to correspond to words in Indo-Iranian and Tocharian languages during the early period, including Middle Persian (i.e., Pahlavi) *bwt* in Zoroastrian classics;<sup>6</sup> Manichaean Parthian *bwt*, *bwtj*, and *pwtj* in Manichaean Sogdian scripts; *pwt* in Buddhist Sogdian scripts; and a voiced \**but* in early Tocharian, attested as *pāt* in Tocharian A (Yanqi 焉耆, Agni) and *pūt*, *pudʹ* in Tocharian B (Qiuci 龜茲, Kucha).

On the other hand, Ji (1948, 1990) considered that the word *fútú* (浮屠) for “Buddha” during the earlier period was a borrowing from the disyllabic *bodo*, *boddo*, *boudo* in the *Daxia* language (大夏語), that is, Bactrian. And for Ji, *fótuó* (佛訶, LHan \*but.dai > MC \*bjwət.dā) was certainly a much later disyllable rendering from SKT *Buddha*.

Undoubtedly, among the sixteen earliest and verifiable Chinese Buddhist translations<sup>8</sup> from the Eastern Han and Chinese Three Kingdoms periods, the word for “Buddha” is the monosyllabic fó (佛), not *fútú* (浮屠) or *fótuó* (佛訶), as is attested via the Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association (CBETA 2020). However, *fútú* (浮屠) and its alternate transcription (i.e., alternate phonetic spelling, or spelling variant) *fútú* (浮圖, LHan \*bu.da > MC \*bjəu.duo) that occur in non-Buddhist texts probably do not correspond to Bactrian, but rather come either from *Buddho* in Indian Prakrit (i.e., vernacular) languages and Pāli (Zhou 1956: 203) or possibly from SKT *Buddha* or Gāndhārī *Budha* (Pulleyblank 1962: 213).

In this article, I propose that the argument above is difficult to validate, since *fútú* (浮屠 ~ 浮圖) appears only in non-Buddhist texts and, under the present state of Chinese historical phonology, the phonological study of the transcription between non-Sanskrit and Chinese in Buddhist texts prior to the MC period is rather tentative. However, the Eastern Jin dynasty (東晉, 226–420) phonogram *fótuó* (佛訶) as a rendering of SKT *Buddha* became more widely used in Chinese Buddhist texts, and has other transcriptions with different sinographs and different usages in other texts. For example, *fótuó* (佛訶, MC \*bjwət.dā), *fótú* (佛圖, MC \*bjwət.duo), *fútúó* (佛馱, MC \*bjwət.dā), and *fútúó* (浮陀, MC \*bu.dā) usually appear in the names of monks in

Chinese Buddhist scriptures. The phonograms *buótuó* (勃陀, MC \*bwət.dā), *buótuó* (勃馱, MC \*bwət.dā), *mǔtuó* (母馱, MC \*mǔu<sup>h</sup>.dā), and *mòtuó* (沒陀, MC \*mwət.dā),<sup>9</sup> meanwhile, appear in incantations of the Esoteric Buddhist (Mizong 密宗) scriptures as more exotic and mysterious transliterations. By contrast, *fútú* (浮屠) ~ *fútú* (浮圖) ~ *fútuó* (浮陀) continue to be used only as terms for Buddha, Buddhism, monks, and pagodas in non-Buddhist scriptures (Ding 1984; Yu 2011).

In summary, the Chinese monosyllabic word *fó* (佛) refers to a word for Buddha, which is neither a rendering of SKT *Buddha* nor an abbreviation or a shortened term of *fótuó* (佛陀), but a rendering of a monosyllabic word in early Indo-Iranian languages. The origin of the disyllabic *fútú* (浮屠) ~ *fútú* (浮圖) in Chinese non-Buddhist scriptures is uncertain; it probably derives from Bactrian or Indian Prakrit languages, or even from classic Sanskrit, but certainly not from a monosyllabic source.

### ***Pwuche* (仏体) Is a Korean Phonogram in OK**

According to the “Koguryō Annals” (Koguryō pon’gi 高句麗本紀, vol. 18) and the “Paekche Annals” (Paekche pon’gi 百濟本紀, vol. 24) in the *History of the Three Kingdoms* (Samguk sagi 三國史記 [hereafter SK]; 1145 CE), the seventeenth king of Koguryō, Sosurim Wang (小獸林王, ?–384) officially accepted Pudo Sundo (浮屠順道, “Monk Sundo”) in 372 CE, a Buddha statue and Buddhist scriptures from Emperor Fu Jian (苻堅, 337–85 CE) of the Former Qin (Qiánqín 前秦, 351–94 CE), thus making Koguryō the first kingdom on the Korean peninsula to adopt Buddhism. Shortly after, in 384 CE, the fifteenth king of Paekche, Ch’imnyu (枕流), officially welcomed the monk Marananta (摩羅難陀, ?–?) from the Western Regions, who had traveled from the Eastern Jin dynasty and began to build temples in the next year. Finally, in 526 CE, Silla officially converted to Buddhism, though it may have been in contact with Buddhism before that time.

The phonogram *pwuche* (仏体, LHan \*but.t<sup>h</sup>ie<sup>h</sup> > MC \*bjwət.t<sup>h</sup>ie<sup>h</sup>) is the so-called first Old Korean (of Unified Silla period) attestation of the word for “Buddha,” appearing thirteen times in the *Songs of the Ten Vows of Samantabhadra* composed by Kyunyō. Certainly *pwuche* (仏体) ~ (佛体) is not a purely Chinese loanword, since it refers semantically to the “body of the Buddha” in Chinese, and not the word for “Buddha” itself. According to Ding (1984: 592), *fótī* (佛体) appears only once in the phrase *fótī sèxìng shuàidūpó* (佛体色性率都婆), which means “pagoda” (i.e., SKT *stūpa* 率都婆) in Esoteric Buddhism.

It is well accepted by most Koreanists (e.g., Kim 1977; Yi 1998; Pak 1990; Lee and Ramsey 2011; Nam 2014; and Hwang 2014) that MSSK *pwuche* (부처) has antecedents in LMK documents. These are *pwüthyëy* 부테 [pu.t<sup>h</sup>ie<sup>h</sup>] in the *Sōkpo sangjöl* (釋譜詳節, Detailed Articles on the Record of Sakyamuni, 1446 CE; 6:16) and *pwüthyè* 부터 [pu.t<sup>h</sup>ie<sup>h</sup>] in the *Wōrin sōkpo* (月印釋譜, a book combining the *Wōrin ch’ōngang jigok* [月印千江之曲, Songs of the Moon’s Imprint on a Thousand Rivers], and the *Sōkpo sangjöl*, 1459 CE; 10:13) and in the *Hunmong chahoe* (訓蒙字會, Collection of Characters for Training the Unenlightened; Ch’oe [1527] 1971: 2). In MSSK, *pwüthyëy* and *pwüthyè* were palatalized to *pwuche* [pu.t<sup>h</sup>ɕ] (i.e., pu.t<sup>h</sup>ie<sup>h</sup> > pu.t<sup>h</sup>ie<sup>h</sup> > pu.t<sup>h</sup>ɕ > pu.t<sup>h</sup>ɕ). As Yi (1998: 83) and Lee and Ramsey (2011: 65, 164, 187) have demonstrated, *pwuche* (仏体) corresponds to the phrase *pwüthyëy* (부:테), with

a rising tone incorporating the low-pitched *pwũthyè* (부터) followed by the high-pitched nominative particle *y* (ㅣ), and the consistency between the consonant [tʰ] in *tĩ* (本) in MC and [tʰ] (ㅍ) in MK implies the existence of dental aspirates in OK.

Earlier studies such as Kim (1977: 100) have explained MSSK *pwuche* (仏体) as a borrowing of *fótuó* (佛陀, LHan \*but.dai > MC \*bjwət.dâ), from the Chinese rendering of SKT *Buddha*. More recently Nam (2014: 47, 77, 85) has vaguely sought an etymology from an uncertain Sanskrit word. Both of these proposals, however, must be rejected for the following reasons.

First, as discussed in the previous section, *fó* (佛) was already a well-established word for “Buddha” in Chinese Buddhist translations from the Eastern Han and Three Kingdoms periods. It would thus not have been necessary or persuasive to borrow a later form, *fótuó* (佛陀), in MC. Second, it is impossible to explain the vowel correspondences between *tĩ* (体, LHan \*tʰei<sup>B</sup> > MC \*tʰiei<sup>B</sup>) to MC rhyme *ji* (薺), and *tuó* (陀, LHan \*dai > MC \*dâ) to rhyme *gē* (歌). Importantly, if we assume the laws of vowel harmony<sup>10</sup> to have been developed during the OK period, *fótuó* (佛陀) does not obey these: the combination of the back vowel LHan \*u > MC \*jwə of *fó* (佛) and the front vowel LHan \*ai > MC \*â of *tuó* (陀) violates the vowel harmony rules in OK. Third, we should note that the sinographs *fó* (佛) and *fó* (仏) coexist in the eleven *Songs of the Ten Vows of Samantabhadra* with different usages.<sup>11</sup> In the history of Chinese calligraphy, *fó* (仏) appears during the Six Dynasties (Liuchao 六朝, 220–589 CE) in Chinese texts as a *suzi* (俗字, popular form/vernacular character) of the formal character *fó* (佛) (Zhang 2010: 387). In the *Songs of the Ten Vows of Samantabhadra*, *fó* (佛) appears in Chinese loanwords, including *Nammwupul* (南無佛, “Namo Buddha”) in the “Song of Praising the Thus Come One Tathagata” (no. 2; Ch’ingch’an Yōrae ka 稱讚如來歌 [hereafter CC]: 2), *pwulto* (佛道, “Buddhism, Buddhist doctrines”) in the “Song of Following the Teachings of the Buddhas at all Times” (no. 8; Sangsu pulhak ka 常隨仏學歌 [hereafter SS]: 9), *pwulyeng* (佛影, “statue of Buddha”) in the “Song of Requesting the Buddhas to Remain in the World” (no. 7; Ch’ongbul wangse ka 請仏住世歌 [hereafter CP]: 10), and the title of the “Song of Paying Homage and Respecting to all Buddhas” (no. 1; Yegyōng chebul ka 禮敬諸佛歌 [hereafter YK]).

By contrast, *fó* (仏) occurs mostly in phonograms like *pwuche* (仏体), in YK: 2, 7; “Song of Making the Abundant Offerings” (no. 3; Kwangsu kongyang ka 廣修供養歌 [hereafter KS]: 7); “Song of Repenting Misdeeds and Evil Karmas” (no. 4; Ch’amhoeöpchang ka 懺悔業障歌 [hereafter CH]: 8); CP: 1; SS: 1; “Songs of Accommodating and Benefitting All Living Beings” (no. 9; Hangsun chungsaeng ka 恒順衆生歌 [hereafter HS]: 8, 10).<sup>12</sup>

In addition, *pwuche* (仏体) can attach to other phonograms, like the phonogram -置 (i.e., 仏体置 in SS: 8) corresponding to the Korean verb stem *twu-* (두-, “to put, to place”), -刀 (i.e., 仏体刀) in the “Song of Transferring All Merits and Virtues to Benefitting All Beings” (no. 10; Pogaehoe yang ka 普皆廻向歌 [hereafter PK]: 9) corresponding to the Korean particle *to* (토), and 叱 (i.e., 仏体叱) in YK: 5; PK: 5; “Song of Keeping Vowing Endlessly” (no. 11; Ch’onggyōlmujin ka 摠結无尽歌 [hereafter CK]: 8) corresponding to the Korean adnominal particle *s* (스) as mentioned in Pak (1990: 42). Furthermore, in the phonogram *pwul-i* (仏伊, “Buddha-

nominative particle *i* [ㅇ])” in the “Song of Rejoicing in Others’ Merits and Virtues” (no. 5; Suhŭi kongdök ka 隨喜功德歌 [hereafter SH]: 3) and *pwul-ap* (仏前, “Buddha-locative noun *ap* [앞]”) in KS: 2, the postpositive Korean grammatical phonogram *i* (伊) and locative noun *ap* (앞) are added after the popular form *fó* (仏). The character sequence *pwulpwul* (仏仏, “Buddha Buddha”) in KS: 8, *Pwulhoyahuy* (仏會阿希, “Ceremony for Buddhists?”) in the “Song of Requesting the Buddhas to Continue Teaching” (no. 6; Ch’ongjŏn pŏmnyun ka 請轉法輪歌 [hereafter CCP]: 2) are still only tentatively deciphered. The sinograph *fó* (仏) also appears in the titles of the CP (Ch’ongbul wangse ka 請仏住世歌) and the SS (Sangsu pulhak ka 常隨仏學歌) when we would rather expect the full form *fó* (佛).

Meanwhile, we must take into account the Sino-Korean pronunciation of *fó* (佛). In the *Assorted Matters of Jilin* (Jilinleishi 雞林類事; Sun [1103] 1990), Sunmu (孫穆, ?–? CE) from the Northern Song dynasty probably wrote down the pronunciation of *fó* (佛) of Early Middle Korean (EMK) using Song dynasty Chinese pronunciations (i.e., Late Middle Chinese). In one note he writes “*fó* *yuē* *bó*” (佛曰孛, *pwul wal pal* in modern Sino-Korean pronunciation), meaning “*fó* (佛, *pwul*) is pronounced like *bó* (孛, *pal*),” and later he notes, “*huō* *yuē* *bó*” (火曰孛, *hwa wal pal*), meaning “*huō* (火, *hwa*, ‘fire’) is also to be pronounced like *bó* (孛, *pal*).”

It would be misleading, however, to read *huō* (火) as “*hwa*” in its modern Sino-Korean pronunciation. Around 1103 CE, during the Koryŏ period, *fó* (佛) and *huō* (火) had the same Late Middle Chinese pronunciation *bó* (孛), so it is reasonable for us to infer that *huō* (火) should be understood as a semantogram, used to represent the vernacular Korean word, corresponding to *pul* (불, [pʰil<sup>M</sup>]) with the Koreanized coda [-l].<sup>13</sup> In MSK texts, *fó* (佛) was read as both *pwul* (불, [pul] ~ 불, [pul<sup>M/L</sup>]) and *pul* (불, [pil] ~ 불, [pil<sup>M</sup>]) (Itō 2007: 166, 182).

On the premises of the discussion above, this present article proposes that *pwuche* (仏体) is a pure Korean phonogram, which can be reconstructed in OK as \*pu.t<sup>(h)</sup>je/ɛi<sup>(h)</sup>. There are four arguments to support this.

First, it is reasonable to reconstruct the first syllable as a voiceless \*pu- internally, but with a final \*-t. The final \*-t is attested in Chinese Buddhist scriptures from the Koryŏ period accompanied by *sŏktok kugyŏl* (釋讀口訣) interpretive glosses.<sup>14</sup> Thus the *Commentaries on the Mahā-vaiḥulya-buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* (Taebang-gwangbul Hwaŏm kyŏng so 大方廣佛華嚴經疏 [hereafter HS], first half of the twelfth century; vol. 35, 7:18–19, 13:12–13/13–14, 20:1–3, 13–14, 14–16, 16–17, 23:15–16, 16–17, 19–20, 25:2–3, 26:18) glosses *fó* (佛) as ?*puti* (佛矣), while the *Mahā-vaiḥulya-buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* (Taebang-gwangbul Hwaŏm kyŏng 大方廣佛華嚴經 [hereafter HK], second half of the twelfth century; vol. 14, 3:13, 2:13–14) glosses it as ?*puti* (佛矣) (vol. 14, 4:19/23, 7:19, 8:3/23, 10:15, 11:3, 14:1–2, 15:10, 17:3).

According to Nam (2014: 149, 483), the *kugyŏl* glosses ?*ti* (矣) and ?*ti* (矣) can be functionally (or morphosyntactically) interpreted from their abbreviated sinographs, *zhǐ* (止, LHan \*tʰǝp > \*tʰǝp > MC \*tʰǝp) and *zhī* (知,<sup>15</sup> LHan \*tʰie > MC \*tʰie), as corresponding to the nominative and genitive particles, respectively, and both can be reconstructed as \**ti* (ㄷ [ti]). In other words, we can conclude in that ?*puti* (佛矣 ~ 佛矣) represents the pronunciation \*pu.ti as a result of resyllabification in the *kugyŏl*-glossed Buddhist scriptures.

Importantly, \*pu.ti (佛<sup>ㄷ</sup>) coexists with its nominative form \*pu.ti.i (佛<sup>ㄷ</sup> ㅁ), in HS, vol. 35, 13:1–2) additionally glossed with nominative particle \*-i (ㅁ), an abbreviation of the sinograph *shi* (是; > LMK *i*, *y* [i] -o/|). This indicates, in *kugyöl*, that the final \*-t of *fó* (佛) from MC was probably kept in OK and not naturalized as a final [-l]. The argument for resyllabification is further support through the occurrence of the phonograms *pwuli* (仏伊) in the *hyangga* corresponding to the *kugyöl*-glossed \*pu.ti (佛<sup>ㄷ</sup> ㅁ ~ 佛<sup>ㄷ</sup>), in which case it is possible to consider *pwuche* (仏体) as a native OK form corresponding to \*pu.ti.i (佛<sup>ㄷ</sup> ㅁ). In other words, the *kugyöl* glosses ㅁ and ㅁ represent \*ti ㅁ as *marümch'ömg*i (末音添記; for more details, see Sin 1998), and the latter particle in 佛<sup>ㄷ</sup> ㅁ is in fact pleonastic, functioning as a phonetic determinative.

Second, Vovin (2005, 2006, 2007: 74–75) suggests that the word for Buddha in OK can be reconstructed as \*pwutukye with a voiceless \*p- and a suffix \*-kye. For this, Vovin employs an external reconstruction premised on OK being the source for Manchu *fucihi* and WOJ *potökë*. In the case of Manchu, Vovin proposes *fucihi* < Old Jurchen (OJur; i.e., Pre-Manchu) \*puciki (?), where pre-Manchu had no distinction between *k* and *h*. Kim (1977: 101) has further proposed that *-ci* in Manchu *fucihi* is probably from previous \*-ti. If so, \*pu.ti.i (仏体 ~ 佛<sup>ㄷ</sup> ㅁ) may represent an unaspirated \*-t- in the pre-OK period, rather than the aspirate consonant [t<sup>h</sup>] that is apparently represented by *t̃* (體 ~ 体) in MC. The LMK *pwüthyè* (부터) that contains an aspirated *th* (ㅍ, [t<sup>h</sup>]) must be a later form.<sup>16</sup> One problem, however, is that the OJur form \*putiki ends in \*-i, which does not match either the OK or the WOJ forms. Nevertheless, it is still likely to be a borrowing from OK, as theoretically OJur could have borrowed OK \*-ye [jə] as OJur \*-iye [jə]. Although *-iye* rarely occurs in final position in Manchu, it is possible that \*-iye [jə] existed in OJur too. Additionally, OJur \*-i is a substitute for front OK \*[e] (> \*-ye [jə]), as mentioned in Miyake (2018).<sup>17</sup>

Third, phonologically the vowel \*-i in OK \*pu.ti (仏伊 ~ 佛<sup>ㄷ</sup> ~ 佛<sup>ㄷ</sup>) probably changed to a glide-vowel sequence \*je ~ jə as a result of the i-breaking phenomenon, as happened in the word for “island” in OK \*sima (斯麻 ~ WOJ [sima] > ㅁ EMK \*fjem > :ㅁ LMK [fjəm<sup>LH</sup>] > ㅁ MSSK [səm]) (Kwön 2005; Vovin 2010: 183–84). In addition, it is more reasonable to consider \*pu.ti.i (仏体 ~ 佛<sup>ㄷ</sup> ㅁ) as a nominative form of OK \*pu.tje ~ \*pu.tjə (仏伊 ~ 佛<sup>ㄷ</sup> ~ 佛<sup>ㄷ</sup>), since the nominative particle in LMK, *i* (ㅁ/|), only co-occurs with the vowel *o* (ㅁ, [ʌ]—i.e., the “*arae a*”), *u* (ㅁ, [i]), *wo* (ㅁ, [o]), *a* (ㅁ, [a]), *wu* (ㅁ, [u]), and *e* (ㅁ, [ə]), and not with vowel *i* (ㅁ/|) itself (Yi 1998: 311–14).

Fourth, as discussed in further detail below, considering the direction of the historical spread of Buddhism from the Korean peninsula to Japan, we may also propose that the word for “Buddha” in WOJ *potökë* (保止氣, ホト<sub>(ㄷ)</sub>ケ<sub>(ㄷ)</sub>, [pə.tə.kəj]) is a borrowing from pre-OK, possibly from Paekche.

In summary, according to Buddhism-related texts such as the *Songs of the Ten Vows of Samantabhadra* and data from *söktok kugyöl* sources, the word for “Buddha” in Korean must be a loan word from the Chinese rendering of the word *fó* (佛 ~ 仏) that then evolved through the addition of grammatical elements and phonologi-

cal change, thus: 仏伊 ~ 佛<sup>ㄷ</sup> ~ 佛<sup>ㄸ</sup> OK \*pu.ti > \*pu.t<sup>(h)</sup>je/ə ~ 仏体 ~ 佛<sup>ㄷ</sup> OK \*pu.t<sup>(h)</sup>je/ə.i<sup>(h)</sup> > \*pu.t<sup>(h)</sup>je/əi<sup>(h)</sup> > 부터 LMK [pu.t<sup>h</sup>iə] ~ 부테 LMK [pu.t<sup>h</sup>iəi<sup>h</sup>].

### Hotoke (保止氣) Is a Loanword from Pre-OK

According to the nineteenth volume of the *Chronicles of Japan* (Nihon shoki 日本書紀 [hereafter NS]; 720 CE), Buddhism was introduced from Paekche to Japan in 552 CE, when King Sōngmyōng (聖明王, ?–554 CE) sent Buddha statues and Buddhist scriptures to Japan. However, the Japanese may have been in contact with Buddhism before that time. The popular form sinograph *fó* (仏) was also borrowed into WOJ as well. *Fó* (仏) accurately corresponds to the disyllabic voiced ブツ [bu.tu] (> Modern Standard Japanese [MSJ] [bu.tsu]) and voiceless フツ [pu.tu] (> MSJ [pu.tsu]) in Go-on and Kan-on pronunciations, respectively. The word for “Buddha,” MSJ *hotokesama* (仏様, ホトケサマ [ho.to.ke.sa.ma]), is a compound combining *hotoke* and the honorific suffix *-sama*.

*Hotoke* is first attested in the form 保止氣 in the “Songs of the Stone with Footprints of the Buddha” (Bussokusekika 仏足跡歌, 753 CE). Pellard (2014) analyzed WOJ *potōkē* (Proto-Japonic [p]) \*pə.tə.kəi ~ pə.tə.kai > ホト<sub>(乙)</sub>ケ<sub>(乙)</sub><sup>18</sup> [pə.tə.kəj] > [po.to.ke] > [fo.to.ke] > [ho.to.ke]) as a trisyllabic compound loan from OK. The etymology of the initial two syllables *potō* cannot be precisely determined. According to Arisaka’s Law, neutralization could have occurred between *o* (才<sub>(甲)</sub> [o]) and *ō* (才<sub>(乙)</sub> [ə]), due to the fact that no root in WOJ can contain both *o* and *ō*. If it was borrowed as \*putə, the form \*pətə could have resulted from assimilation, since pJ \*u and \*ə do not usually coexist within the same root (Pellard 2014: 690). Meanwhile, considering the fact that the voiced stops of Japanese come from earlier prenasalized obstruents, and the opposition between voiced and voiceless in OK cannot be reconstructed, it is better to suppose that *potō* corresponds to a voiceless stop, probably in a loan from pre-OK (Paekchean). The syllable structure of pre-OK in Paekche was likely C<sub>1</sub>V<sub>1</sub>.C<sub>2</sub>V<sub>2</sub>. This is attested in other Paekche phonograms, including: *pwuli* (夫里; cf. OK ?\*pel 伐 > LMK pel 벌, OK ?\*pul 火 > LMK pul 불 MSK [pi<sup>h</sup>]) “community,” *kwoma* ~ *kwuma* (固麻 ~ 久麻; i.e., LMK *kwōmā* 고.마 > LMK *kwōm*: 厶) “bear,” and *sama* (斯麻) “island” (see the previous section). Thus, it is natural to expect a disyllabic \*putə in Paekche corresponding to *fó* (佛, LHan \*but).

Pellard (2014) suggests that the third syllable *kē* is a borrowed suffix from pre-OK with the meaning of “sir, lord.” I agree on this point and further propose that WOJ *kē* corresponds to the phonograms *jiě* (解) ~ *jiē* (皆) ~ *xié* (諧) ~ *xī* (奚) representing a homophonous honorific suffix in OK. This is based on three lines of textual evidence, elaborated below.

First, concerning the phonogram *jiě* (解, MC \*kai<sup>B/C</sup> ~ ɣai<sup>B/C</sup>), I propose it to be an honorific suffix or a title meaning “sir, lord” in pre-OK, similar to “king.” According to the “Account of Eastern Barbarians” (Dongyizhuan 東夷傳) in the *History of the Sui* (Suishu 隋書; 656 CE), vol. 81, the *History of the Northern Dynasties* (Beishi 北史; 659 CE), vol. 94, and the *New History of the Tang* (Xintangshu 新唐書; 1060 CE), vol. 220, we are told that the phonogram *jiě* (解) is one of eight clan names (i.e., Shā 沙, Yàn 燕, Lì 荔, Jiě 解, Zhēn 貞, Guó 國, Mù 木, Bái 苜<sup>19</sup>) of

Paekche. Importantly, a notable number of official names from Paekche with *jiě* (解) are attested via epigraphs from China, Korea, and Japan.

In some cases, *jiě* (解) occurs as a clan name at the start of the names. Examples include the Paekche general Hae Yegon (解禮昆, where 解 is a variant of the character 解) from the *History of Southern Qi* (Nanqishu 南齊書; 519 CE), vol. 58, and officials like Hae Ch'ung (解忠), Hae Su (解須), and Hae Ku (解丘) from SK, vol. 25. In other cases, however, *jiě* (解) occurs at the end of the names. These include one king's brother called Hun Hae (訓解) in SK, vol. 25; Prince Kyu Hae (紕解) in NS, vol. 26; King Ŭiridu Hae (意里都解) in the *New Selection and Record of Hereditary Titles and Family Names* (Shinsen shōjiroku 新撰姓氏錄 [hereafter SJRK]; 815 CE; see Saeki 1981); the general Makko Hae (莫古解) in SK, vol. 24, and NS, vol. 15; Makko (莫古) in NS, vol. 9; and some others like Chōngmagi Hae (適莫爾解) and Koi Hae (古爾解) in NS, vol. 15.

Meanwhile, the phonogram *jiě* (解) also appears in the names of kings in Koguryō and Silla. For example, according to the “Annals of Koguryō” in SK, the first ancestor Sage King Tongmyōng (東明) is called Chung Hae (衆解) in SK, vol. 13. The family name of the second king Yuri Wang (瑠璃王) is written as *jiě* (解) in the *Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms* (Samguk yusa 三國遺事 [hereafter YS]; 1281 CE; vol. 1), and the third king Taemusin Wang (大武神王) is also called Tae Hae Churyu Wang (大解朱留王) in SK, vol. 14, with the adnominal *tae-* (大) “big” and the phonogram *jiě* (解). The fourth king Minjung Wang (閔中王) is transmitted as Hae Saekchu (解色朱) and the fifth king Mobon Wang (慕本王) is written as Hae U (解憂) in SK, vol. 29. The seventeenth king Sosurim Wang (小獸林王) is also called So Hae Churyu Wang (小解朱留王, with So meaning “small”) in SK, vol. 18, and Hae Miryu Wang (解味留王) in SK, vol. 30.

In spite of this, according to the “Annals of Silla” (Silla pon'gi 新羅本紀) in SK and the “Account of the Calendar of Kings” (Wangnyōk 王曆) in YS, vol. 1, the first Silla king is recorded as Nam Hae ch'ach'aung (南解次次雄, with Nam meaning “south”) or Nam Hae Wang (南解王) in YS, vol. 1, the fourth king is written as T'al Hae nisagūm (脫解尼師今) in SK, vol. 1, T'al Hae (脫解) in YS, vol. 1, or T'o Hae (吐解) in YS, vol. 1; the tenth king is written as Na Hae (奈解) in SK, vol. 23, Na Hae Nisagūm (奈解尼師今) in SK, vol. 2, or Na Hae Wang (奈解王) in YS, vol. 1; the twelfth king is recorded as Chōmhae Nisagūm (沾解尼師今) in SK, vol. 2, Chōm Hae Wang (沾解王) and I Hae Nisgūm (理解尼叱今) in YS, vol. 1. The sixteenth king is Hül Hae Nisagūm (訖解尼師今) in the SK, vol. 2. The phonogram *jiě* (解) appears before the phonograms *ch'ach'aung* (次次雄) and *nisagūm* (尼師今) ~ *nisgūm* (尼叱今), as well as before the semantogram *wáng* (王, “king”). Unfortunately, the meaning of *ch'ach'aung* (次次雄) is still not deciphered, but *nisagūm* (尼師今) ~ *nisgūm* (尼叱今) represents a compound of *ni* (尼, OK \*ni > ni ㄋㄧ > i ㄛ) “tooth” + adnominal/genitive *sa* ~ *s* (師 ~ 叱, OK \*-s- > -s- -ㄱ-) + *kūm* (今, OK \*kim > kūm ㄱㅓ) “king” in the meaning of “king with many teeth,” as written in SK, vol. 1. The word *wáng* (王) is a Chinese loanword in OK. The position of phonogram *jiě* (解) allows us to analyze the Silla kings' names as compounds or suffixed elements and to segment out *jiě* (解).

Additionally, according to the “Annals of Paekche” in SK, one king from North Puyō (北扶餘), written as Hae Puru (解扶婁), was the ancestor of the first



Paekche king, Piryu Wang (沸流王), and had the clan name *jiē* (解). One official from South Okchō (南沃沮), which was located to the north of Silla, is recorded as Kup'a Hae (仇頗解) in SK, vol. 23, which includes a final *jiē* (解) as well.

Second, the phonograms *jiē* (皆) ~ *xié* (諧), MC \*kǎi ~ yǎi and *xī* (奚), MC \*yiei) can all be regarded as different phonograms of *jiē* (解), which is attested in toponyms from SK and names of nobility in the Kara (加羅) area from NS.

Concerning the phonograms *jiē* (皆) ~ *xié* (諧), the “Geography Treatise” (Chiri-ji 地理志) of SK records that in the year 757, King Kyōngdōk (景德王, ?–765 CE) of Unified Silla standardized the toponyms of conquered Koguryō and Paekche as Chinese-style place names. The phonograms deployed in the newly created Chinese-style toponyms comprise a mix of both semantic and phonetic renderings of the original toponyms. For example, the new sinicized term for the original Koguryō toponym of Kae Paek (皆伯, MC \*kǎi-pək) is attested variously as Uwang-hyōn (遇王縣, “king-meeting county”) in SK, vol. 35, and as Wangbong-hyōn (王逢縣, “king-meeting county”) in SK, vol. 37.<sup>20</sup> The phonogram *jiē* (皆) is supposed by modern Koreanists to have the meaning of the semantogram *wáng* (王) “king.” This same *jiē* (皆) occurs in another toponym *Kaeri'i* (皆利伊, MC \*kǎi-li<sup>c</sup>-ʔi) that was subsequently sinicized as Haerye-hyōn (解禮縣, MC \*kai<sup>B/C</sup>/yǎi<sup>B/C</sup>-liei<sup>B</sup>) in SK, vol. 37.

Separately, according to the “Account of Koguryō” (Gaogouli zhuan 高句麗傳) of the *Weishu* and the equivalent account in the *Beishi*, the courtesy name of the son of the Koguryō king Chumong (朱蒙) is transcribed as Shiryo Hae (始閭諧, MC \*sɿ<sup>B</sup>-lywo-yǎi). The phonograms *jiē* (皆) and *xié* (諧) share the same phonetic element *jiē* (皆). Thus, we can propose that *jiē* (皆), *xié* (諧), and *jiē* (解) are variant phonograms.

Moreover, exclusively in Japanese texts, the final phonogram *xī* (奚, MC \*yiei) occurs more than seven times in the titles of nobility from Kara, including Shin'i Kei (辛巳奚) in NS, vol. 17, Koden Kei (既殿奚) in NS, vol. 17, Shiton Kei (夷吞奚) in NS, vol. 19, Koden Kei (古殿奚) in NS, vol. 19 (twice), and Sanhan Kei (散半奚) in NS, vol. 19 (twice), all with a final *xī* (奚). Meanwhile, the descendant of the thirteenth Paekche king Sokko (速古, i.e., Künch'ogo Wang 近肖古王, ?–375 CE) is recorded as Monku Kei (汶休奚, in Go-on) in the SJRK. Note that the phonogram *xī* (奚) is only found in Japanese texts and represents the pronunciation of 久, *ke* [ke] in *Man'yōgana*,<sup>21</sup> [gei] in Go-on, and [kei] in Kan-on. So it is possible to regard *xī* (奚) as having the same meaning and grammatical function as the phonograms *jiē* (皆) ~ *xié* (諧) ~ *jiē* (解).

What remains is to confirm the phonetic reconstruction of the phonograms *jiē* (解) ~ *jiē* (皆) ~ *xié* (諧) ~ *xī* (奚). First, it is reasonable to reconstruct a voiceless plosive velar \*k- as the consonant in OK because all four phonograms share the common consonant [k-] in MC, in spite of the cases of *jiē* (解) ~ *xié* (諧), which can be pronounced as the fricative [ɣ] or as \*k ~ ɣ, if the alternation also existed in OK. According to the “Account of Foreign Countries” (Zhu-yizhuan 諸夷傳) in the *History of the Liang* (Liangshu 梁書; 636 CE) and the equivalent account in the *History of the Southern Dynasties* (Nanshi 南史; 659 CE), the Chinese noun *rú* (襦, “short jacket”) in Silla was called *wèijiē* (尉解, MC \*ʔjwət-kai ~ yǎi); Yi (1998: 77) and Lee and Ramsey (2010) propose the Korean

reflex of this to be *wuthuy* (우투, [ut<sup>h</sup>ij], “clothes”), as attested in the *Translation of the Lesser Learning* (Pönyök sohak 翻譯小學, 1518 CE; vol. 9, 59). If this hypothesis is correct, then we can explain the aspirated [t<sup>h</sup>] as having resulted from the lenition of the previous plosive \*k (> h), and subsequent aspiration of the coda [-t] before the consonant [h-] according to well-known processes in MK phonology. Second, from the vocalism \*ai ~ äi ~ iei of the phonograms *jiě* (解), *jiē* (皆) ~ *xié* (諧) and their pronunciations in MSK as ㄐ [hɬi<sup>R</sup>], ㄗ [kɬi<sup>L</sup>] ~ ㄑ [hɬi<sup>R</sup>] (LMK [ɬ] < OK \*ə, cf. Itō 2007: 267), and *xī* (奚) in Sino-Japanese, as mentioned above, we can reconstruct the phonograms *jiě* (解) ~ *jiē* (皆) ~ *xié* (諧) ~ *xī* (奚) as \*ej ~ əj phonetically, including a final semivowel \*j in OK. We conclude that the phonograms *jiě* (解) ~ *jiē* (皆) ~ *xié* (諧) ~ *xī* (奚) represent \*kej ~ kəj as an honorific suffix or a title meaning “sir, lord” in words for kings and officials, and that they were probably shared across Koguryō, Paekche, Silla, and Kara in pre-OK.

I propose as a further cognate to pre-OK *jiě* (解) ~ *jiē* (皆) ~ *xié* (諧) \*kej ~ kəj or WOJ *xī* (奚) ~ *ke* the *ke* (ケ) of *orikoke* (オリコケ), attested in NS as a katakana rendering of the sinographs for “Koguryō king” or 狛王. Previously, Pellard (2014: 690) and most Koreanists (e.g., Kōno 1987 and Lee and Ramsey 2011) have analyzed *orikoke* as cognate with the aristocratic word for “king,” *yúluóxiá* (於羅瑕, MC \*ʔuo ~ ʔjwo-lâ-ya) as attested in the *History of the Zhou* (Zhoushu 周書), vol. 49. This is premised on the “Puyō language family” hypothesis. Certainly, Paekche *xiá* (瑕, MC \*ya) and Koguryō *ke* (ケ) look like a perfect match phonetically, but this must be rejected for the following reasons.

First, *orikoke* (オリコケ) is written in katakana, rather than in *Man'yōgana* or other sinographs used as phonograms, and it is uncertain during which period it was transcribed. In any case, the Iwasaki edition of the *Nihon shoki* is the oldest edition we can find, and it was completed at the end of the tenth century during the Heian period.

Second, the hypothesis premises both vowels being reflexes of MC \*ya, but the vowel correspondence between *xiá* (瑕) and *ke* (ケ) does not enable this reconstruction. *Xiá* (瑕) can only represent the pronunciation of MC \*ya in the Chinese dynastic chronicles and not in Sino-Japanese sources. By contrast, the correspondence of *xiá* (瑕) to the *ke* (ケ) in *orikoke* (オリコケ) rather relies on a separate Go-on pronunciation of *xiá* (瑕) as *ke* (ケ) in Japanese sources. There is no explanation by which the shared *e* vowel could be explained as a reflex of MC \*ya because \*a and \*e are distinct vowels.

Third, Vovin (2005) has already convincingly demonstrated that *yúluó* (於羅, MC \*ʔuo ~ ʔjwo-lâ) corresponds to \*era- > ira- “high esteem for a man” which was loaned from Paekche to WOJ. If *yúluó* corresponds to \*era-, then it cannot also correspond to *oriko-* of *orikoke*.

Fourth, there is alternative evidence to suggest that the *xiá* (瑕) of *yúluóxiá* (於羅瑕) rather corresponds with the *jiā* (加) that occurs in official Koguryō and Puyō titles attested in the “Account of Eastern Barbarians” (Dongyi zhuan 東夷傳), in the *History of the Northern Wei* (Weishu 魏書) of the *Records of the Three Kingdoms* (Sanguozhi 三國志; ca. 280–90 CE). These include *xiāngjiā* (相加, MC \*sjaŋ<sup>c</sup>-ka), *gūchújiā* (古雛加, MC \*kɑ<sup>B</sup> ~ kɑ<sup>B</sup>-dzju-ka), *mǎjiā* (馬加, MC \*ma<sup>B</sup>-ka) “horse ka,” *niújiā* (牛

加, MC \*njəu-ka) “cow ka,” *zhūjiā* (豬加, MC \*tywo-ka) “pig ka,” *gōujiā* (狗加, MC \*kəu<sup>B</sup>-ka) “dog ka.” Here the phonograms *jiā* (加) and *xiá* (瑕) have the same *má* (麻) rhyme in MC phonology and may thus be considered variant renderings of cognates of words from a northern Puyō-type system. By contrast, *ke* (ケ) in *orikoke* (オリコケ) corresponds to the phonograms in pre-OK *jiě* (解) ~ *jiē* (皆) ~ *xié* (諧) \*kej ~ kaj or WOJ *xī* (奚) ~ *ke* with the meaning of “sir, lord.” It is thus cognate to *kē* in WOJ *potōkē*.

In summary, WOJ *potōkē* can be hypothesized to be a loanword from pre-OK. *Potō-* means “Buddha,” probably from Paekche, while *-kē* corresponds to a homophonous suffix *jiě* (解) ~ *jiē* (皆) ~ *xié* (諧) ~ *xī* (奚) \*kej ~ kaj meaning “sir, lord” in pre-OK, and is cognate with the *-ke* (ケ) in *orikoke* (the katakana rendering of 狛王 “Koguryō king”).

### Conclusion

In conclusion, I propose two routes for the borrowing of the Chinese word *fó* (佛) in pre-OK, OK, and WOJ:

Route 1: Six Dynasties → Korean Three Kingdoms period → Japan’s pre-Nara period 佛 LHan \*but → pre-OK (Paekche) \*pu.tə.kej/kəj → 保止氣 ホト<sub>(乙)</sub>ケ<sub>(乙)</sub> WOJ [pə.tə.kəj]

Route 2: Sui and Tang dynasties → Unified Silla and Koryō periods 佛 LHan \*but → 仏 伊 ~ 佛 ⇄ ~ 佛 矣 OK \*pu.ti > \*pu.t<sup>(b)</sup>je/ə ~ 仏体 ~ 佛 ⇄ ㄹ OK \*pu.t<sup>(b)</sup>je/ə.i<sup>(tt)</sup>. 佛 LHan \*but → 불 MSK [pʰil<sup>tt</sup>]; 仏 (ブツ) Go-on [bu.tu]

While evidence for pre-OK and OK is, in most cases, scantier than we would like and in many cases is still under active investigation, the study of the various renderings of the word for “Buddha” in the sections above show us that the veil of OK can nonetheless be lifted by reexamining various primary sources in Chinese, Korean, and Japanese and analyzing them from a historical linguistic perspective, thus uncovering the way to a deeper understanding of language contact among these three languages in the early period.

Ye Xu (燁徐) is an assistant researcher and postdoc fellow in Research Center for Chinese Language History at Zhejiang University (Hangzhou). Her fields of research interests are Korean language history, Old Korean, and language contact among Chinese, Korean, and Japanese in the early period.

### NOTES

I am extremely grateful to two anonymous reviewers and *SJEAS* editor Ross King—this article benefited greatly from their very valuable insights and detailed comments. I also wish to express my deepest gratitude to the following people, whose generous help and support made this article possible: Wang Weihui (汪維輝), Fang Yixin (方一新), Kwon In-han (權仁翰), Zhen Dacheng (真大成), Bhumi Nath Tripathi, Andrew Logie, Xiao Yuening (蕭悅寧), Han Kyeong-ho

(韓昞澹), Meng Yichen (孟奕辰), Yang Wanglong (楊望龍), Ji Huaye (嵇華燁), Walter Strömberg, Zhang Hang (張航), and Zhang Huan (張幻). All mistakes and shortcomings remain my own responsibility.

1. *Hyangga* are the twenty-five oldest poems (including the eleven *Songs of the Ten Vows of Samantabhadra*) of completely Korean writing and literary composition that are still in existence. The method of transcription in *hyangga* is called *hyangch'al*. See more in Yang 1965, Kim 1980, and Lee and Ramsey 2011.

2. In this article, romanized Korean data related to the word “Buddha” are rendered in Yale Romanization. However, other MSSK words and proper nouns are rendered in McCune-Reischauer. Phonetic reconstructions of LHan, *fanqie* (反切) spellings, and MC reconstructions (based on the *Qieyun* 切韻, 601 CE) use the systems presented in Schuessler 2009. The phonetic reconstructions of WOJ are based on Miyake 2003a and Frellesvig 2010. Phonetic reconstructions of the MSK and OK vowel systems are based on Itō 2007. The Go-on (吳音) and Kan-on (漢音) readings in the Sino-Japanese system are based on Tsukishima 2007 and Mair 2016.

3. Generally speaking, Old Korean is defined as the language of the unified Silla state (668–935) (Yi 1998; Lee and Ramsey 2011). In the present article, I refer to the period before OK during the Three Kingdoms period as pre-OK.

4. Literally, in *futu* (浮屠) the character *fú* (浮) means “floating, superficial” and *tú* (屠) means “to massacre, to separate.”

5. Regarding the traditional dating of Buddhism’s arrival in China, the “Monograph on Buddhism and Daoism” (Shilaozhi 釋老志), in the *History of the Wei* (Weishu 魏書; 554 CE), states that an envoy from the realm of the Kushans called Yicun 伊存 had orally transmitted *Futujing* (Buddhist Sutras 浮屠經) to Jing Lu 景盧, who was a student at the imperial academy, in 2 BCE. According to the “Biographies of Ten Princes of Emperor Guangwu” (Guangwushiwang liezhuan 光武十王列傳) in the *History of the Later Han* (Houhanshu 後漢書), written before 445 CE, we are told that the Prince of Chu (楚王) Liu Ying 劉英 (?–71 CE) of the Han was the first person to officially study and chant Buddhist doctrine (Liang 1999: 13, 3715). Meanwhile, according to “Master Mou’s Treatise Settling Doubts” (Mouzi lihuolun 牟子理惑論) in the *Collection Aggrandizing and Clarifying [Buddhism]* (Hongmingji 弘明集; 517 CE), written by Sengyou 僧祐 (445–518 CE), and the *Scripture in Forty-two Sections* (Sishi'erzhangjing 四十二章經) in the so-called Doubtful Scripture (Yijing 疑經), Emperor Ming (明帝) Liu Zhuang 劉莊 (28–75 CE) of the Han had sent envoys to the Western Regions to search for Buddhist scriptures after dreaming about a “golden man” in 64 CE, and this incident is regarded as the start of Buddhism’s spread into China (Tang 2015: 15–26; Hu 1998: 5, 144; Nattier 2008: 35).

6. As mentioned in Ji 1990, Bailey (1981) suggested that in the *Vīdēvdāt* (19, 1, 2, 43; completed in the middle of the second century BCE) *but* in *Bundhišn* corresponded to *Būiti* in the *Avesta*. The vowel *i* in *Būiti* here is probably from East Iranian languages. Moreover, a \**Buti* existed in New Persian, which corresponds to Sogdian *pwti*. For more, see Bailey 1981, 1978.

7. Recently, according to *A Dictionary of Tocharian B* by Douglas Q. Adams, Tocharian B has listed *pūd-* instead of *pud* for “Buddha.” See <http://ieed.ullet.net/tochB.html#pu%CC%84d->.

8. The sixteen earliest verifiable Chinese Buddhist translations include the following twelve by An Shigao: the *Daśottarasūtra* (*Chang’ahanshibao fa jing* 長阿含十報法經), *Mahānidānasūtra* (*Renbenyusheng jing* 人本欲生經), *Sarvāsravasūtra* (*Yiqieliushehouyin jing* 一切流攝守因緣經), *Satyavibhaṅgasūtra* (*Sidi jing* 四諦經), *Benxiangyizhi jing* (本相猗致經; its Sanskrit title is uncertain), *Shifafeifa jing* (是法非法經; there is no parallel text in Pāli), *Nirvedhika-sūtra* (*Loufenbu jing* 漏分布經), *Arthavistarasūtra* (*Pufayi jing* 普法義經), *Mithyātva-sūtra* (*Bazhengdao jing* 八正道經), *Saptasthāna-sūtra* (*Qichusanguan jing* 七處三觀經), chapter 6 of the Pāli

*Petakopadesa* (Yinchiru jing 陰持入經), and *Daodi jing* (道地經; its Sanskrit title is uncertain). The remaining four are Zhi Loujiachen's *Aṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā* (*Daoxingbore jing* 道行般若經) and Pratyutpanna Samādhi Sūtra (*Banzhousanmei jing* 般舟三昧經; there are only unrevised prose portions); *Ugrapariprcchā* (*Fajing jing* 法鏡經), translated by An Xuan 安玄 and Yan Fotiao 嚴佛調; and *Middle-[length] Scripture on Former Events* (*Zhongbenqi jing* 中本起經), translated by Kang Mengxiang 康孟詳, Zhu Dali 竺大力, and Zhu Tanguo 竺曇果. For further details, see Zürcher 1991, Nattier 2008, and Fang and Gao 2012.

9. Here the phonogram *mū* (母, MC \*mǝu<sup>b</sup>) and *mò* (沒, MC \*mwət) both have the onset [m-] in the groups of the initial *míng* (明; i.e., 明母, *Míngmū*) in MC. This may indicate that characters in the groups of initial *bíng* (並; i.e., 並母, *bíngmū*) had a nasalized Northwestern pronunciation \*mb- in MC. For further details, see Luo 2012.

10. The vowel harmony system certainly existed in Middle Korean texts, however, it is not very clear in OK. For basic understanding about the laws of vowel harmony in Korean, see Yi 1998 or Lee and Ramsey 2011.

11. See File No. K2-723-v001 in Digital Jangseogak (jsg.aks.ac.kr/dir/view?catePath=&dataId=JSG\_K2-723), not revised Modern Korean editions.

12. Moreover, the popular form *fó* (仏) appears already in the *Memoir of the Pilgrimage to the Five Indian Kingdoms* by Silla monk Hyech'o (慧超, 704?–783? CE). Although scholars generally agree that the only extant manuscript discovered by Paul Pelliot (1878–1945) in Dunhuang's Mogao caves is not in Hyecho's hand, it is possible to consider it as a copy of the original. For further notes and interpretations of the manuscript, see Zhang 2000.

13. Some Koreanists believe that Korean directly borrowed [-l] from a Northern MC dialect with -r < \*-t. However, considering that the disyllabic phonogram *fūli* (夫里, MC \*bju- lji<sup>b</sup>), the monosyllabic phonograms *fá* (伐, MC \*bjwət), *bá* (拔, MC \*bwāt), and *fú* (弗, MC \*pjwət), and the semantogram *huō* (火) refer to the same administrative unit in OK toponyms, the coda [-l] must have existed from the pre-OK period, and thus does not directly reflect a late MC \*-r.

14. *Sōktok kugyōl* is a kind of *kugyōl* glossing (*kwukyul*, 口訣) used to add Korean vernacular grammatical morphology (*t'ŏ* 吐) to texts in Literary Sinitic.

15. The gloss *?ti* (ㄷ) is regarded as an abbreviated form of the sinograph *tī* (體) in Hwang et al. (2009: 353) without detailed explanation, but this proposal must be rejected. According to the history of Chinese calligraphy during the Six Dynasties, especially in the *Caoshuti* 草書體, “cursive scripts style” (Sun 2012: 804, 474; Mao 2014: 876, 1211), *?ti* (ㄷ) is more similar to *zhī* (止) at first glance, rather than *tī* (體), which is written with the popular form *tī* (体) in *hyangga*.

16. There are two explanations for the development of the aspirates in OK: (a) combination between plain obstruents medially and h (e.g., -ph-, -hp-); (b) clusters following the syncope of an interceding vowel (e.g., \*huku- > khu-, “big”). For more details, see Lee and Ramsey 2011: 64–65.

17. Although a borrowing between pre-OK and OJur may be possible, we should note that we do not have any earlier materials for OJur prior to the inscription on the “Stele of the Hills of Victory” (Dajin desheng tuosongbei 大金得勝陀頌碑, 1185 CE). We also need further research on the history of Buddhism in Khitan and Jurchen.

18. Regarding the usage of the word *hotoke* (ホト<sub>(ㄷ)</sub>ケ<sub>(ㄷ)</sub>) after the OJ period, it is well attested in Sinitic texts glossed with Japanese *kunten* (訓點). For more details, see Tsukishima 2007, 7:146–47.

19. In this article, passages from Chinese dynastic chronicles are cited according to the new revised Zhonghua Book Company edition, where available.

20. There is one passage of classic Chinese alongside this toponym: 漢氏美女迎安藏王之地, 故名王迎 (It is the place of the beauty of Han (漢) clan to welcome King Anjang (安藏王) of Koguryō, so it is called *Wangyōng* (王迎) “king-welcome”).

21. *Man'yōgana* refers to the subset of sinographs used to write Japanese phonographically (not logographically), not only in the poetry anthology *Man'yōshū* but also in other texts in the Middle Japanese period. For further details, see Frellesvig 2010.

## REFERENCES

### Primary Sources

- Chen Shou 陳壽. (Ca. 280–90) 1962. *Sanguozhi* 三國志 [Records of the Three Kingdoms]. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.
- Ch'oe Sejin 崔世珍. (1527) 1971. *Hunmong chahoe* 訓蒙字會 [Collection of sinographs to enlighten the ignorant]. Seoul: Academy of Asian Studies in Dankook University.
- Fan Ye 范曄. (Ca. 445) 1965. *Houhanshu* 後漢書 [History of the Later Han]. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.
- Fujiwara no Otsugu 藤原緒嗣 et al. (815) 1981. *Shinsen shōjiroku* 新撰姓氏錄 [New selection and record of hereditary titles and family names]. In Saeki Arikiyo 佐伯有清, *Shinsenshōjiroku no kenkyū* 新撰姓氏錄の研究 [Studies on *Shinsenshōjiroku*]. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- Iryōn 一然. (1281) 1904. *Samguk yusa* 三國遺事 [Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms]. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Hanshichi.
- Kim Pusik 金富軾. (1145) 1928. *Samguk sagi* 三國史記 [History of the Three Kingdoms]. Keijō: Chōsenshigakukai.
- Li Yanshou 李延壽. (659) 1974. *Beishi* 北史 [History of the Northern Dynasties]. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.
- Li Yanshou 李延壽 et al. (659) 1975. *Nanshi* 南史 [History of the Southern Dynasties]. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.
- Linghu Defen 令狐德棻. (636) 1971. *Zhoushu* 周書 [History of the Zhou]. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.
- Ōtomo no Yakamochi 大伴持家 et al. (700s) 2009–18. *Man'yōshū* 万葉集 [Collection of ten thousand leaves]. Translated by Alexander Vovin as *Man'yōshū: A New English Translation Containing the Original Text, Kana Transliteration, Romanization, Glossing and Commentary*. 20 vols. Leiden: Global Oriental.
- Ou Yangxiu 歐陽修 et al. (1060) 1975. *Xintangshu* 新唐書 [New history of the Tang]. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.
- Sun Mu 孫穆. (1103) 1990. *Jilinleishi* 雞林類事 [Assorted matters of Jilin]. In Kang Sinhang, *Kyerim yusa koryō pangŏn yŏn'gu* [A study of the Koryō local language in the *Jilin leishi*]. Seoul: Sungkyunkwan University Press.
- Toneri Shinnō 舍人親王 et al. (720) 1994. *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀 [The chronicles of Japan]. Collated by Sakamoto Tarō 坂本太郎, Ienaga Saburō 家永三郎, Inoue Mitsusada 井上光貞, and Ōno Susumu 大野晉. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Wei Shou 魏收. (554) 2017. *Weishu* 魏書 [History of the Wei]. Rev. ed. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.
- Wei Zheng 魏徵 et al. (656) 2019. *Suishu* 隋書 [History of the Sui]. Rev. ed. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.

- Xiao Zixian 蕭子顯. (Ca. 526) 2017. *Nanqishu* 南齊書 [History of Southern Qi]. Rev. ed. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.
- Yao Silian 姚思廉. (636) 2020. *Liangshu* 梁書 [History of the Liang]. Rev. ed. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.

## Secondary Sources

- Bailey, Harold W. 1978. *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bailey, Harold W. 1981. *Opera Minora: Articles on Iranian Studies*. Vol. 1. Edited by M. Nawabi. Shiraz, Iran: Forozangah.
- Ding Fubao 丁福保, ed. 1984. *Foxue dacidian* 佛學大辭典 [Great dictionary of Buddhism]. Beijing: Cultural Relics Publishing House.
- Fang Yixin 方一新 and Gao Lieguo 高列過. 2012. *Donghan yiwei fojing de yuyanxue kaobian yanjiu* 東漢疑偽佛經的語言學考辨研究 [Linguistic studies on apocryphal Buddhist scriptures from the Eastern Han dynasty]. Beijing: People's Publishing House.
- Frellesvig, Bjarke. 2010. *A History of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Han'gŭlhakhoe 한글학회, eds. 1992. *Urimal k'un sajon* (1, 2, 3, 4) 우리말 사전 [(1, 2, 3, 4) Grand dictionary of the Korean language (1, 2, 3, 4)]. Seoul: Ōmun'gak.
- Hu Shi 胡適. 1998. *Hu Shi wenji* 胡適文集 [Collected works of Hu Shi]. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- Hwang Sōnyōp 한글학회 et al., eds. 2009. *Sōktok kugyōl sajon* 석독구결 사전 [Dictionary of Sōktok kugyōl]. Seoul: Pangmunsa.
- Hwang Sōnyōp. 2014. "Hyangga ūi ōhwi" 향가의 어휘 [The lexicon of Hyangga]. In *Kugyōl hakhoe nonmunjip* [Proceedings of the conference on Kugyōl], 49–60. Seoul: Society of Kugyōl.
- Itō Chiyuki 伊藤智ゆき. 2007. *Chōsen Kanjion Kenkyū* 朝鮮漢字音研究 [A study of Sino-Korean phonology]. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin.
- Ji Xianlin 季羨林. 1948. "Futu yu fo" 浮屠與佛 [Futu and fo: On the oldest Chinese transliteration of the name of the Buddha]. *Lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan* 歷史語言研究所集刊 22: 93–105.
- Ji Xianlin 季羨林. 1990. "Zaitan futu he fo" 再談浮屠和佛 [Yet again on futu and fo]. *Lishi yanjiu* 歷史研究 2: 3–11.
- Kim Wanjin 金完鎭. 1977. *Kugō ūmun ch'egye ūi yōn'gu* 國語音韻體系의 研究 [Studies on the phonological system of Korean]. Seoul: Ilchogak.
- Kim Wanjin 金完鎭. 1980. *Hyangga haedokpōp yōn'gu* 鄉歌 解讀法 研究 [A study in Hyangga interpretation]. Seoul: Seoul National University Press.
- Kōno, Rokurō 河野六郎. 1987. "The Bilingualism of the Paekche Language." *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 45: 75–86. Tokyo: Oriental Library.
- Kwōn Inhan 權仁瀚. 2005. "Kodae kugō ūi i-breaking hyōnsang e taehan ilgoch'al" 고대국어의 i-breaking 현상에 대한 일고찰 [A study on the breaking of \*i in Old Korean]. *Chindan hakpo* 100, no. 12: 165–82.
- Lee, Ki-Moon, and Samuel Robert Ramsey. 2011. *A History of the Korean Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liang Qichao. 梁啟超. 1999. *Liang Qichao quanji* 梁啟超全集 [Collected works of Liang Qichao]. Beijing: Beijing Publishing House.
- Luo Changpei 羅常培. 2012. *Tangwudai xibei fangyin* 唐五代西北方音 [Northwestern dialect during the Tang and Five Dynasties]. Beijing: Commercial Press.
- Mair, Victor H. 2016. *ABC Dictionary of Sino-Japanese Readings*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

- Mao Yuanming 毛遠明. 2014. *Hanwei liuchao beike yitizidian* 漢魏六朝碑刻異體字典 [Dictionary of Chinese variants in the tablet inscriptions from the Han-Wei and Six Dynasties]. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.
- Miyake, Marc Hideo. 2003a. *Old Japanese: A Phonetic Reconstruction*. London: Routledge Curzon.
- Miyake, Marc Hideo. 2003b. 'Philological Evidence for \*e and \*o in Pre-Old Japanese,' *Diachronica* 20, no. 1: 81–137.
- Miyake, Marc Hideo. 2018. "Fishy Rhymes: Sino-Korean Evidence for Earlier Korean \*e." In *Studies in Japanese and Korean Historical and Theoretical Linguistics and Beyond*, edited by Alexander Vovin and William McClure, 37–44. Leiden: Brill.
- Nam P'unghyön 南豊鉉. 2014. *Kodae han'gugö non'go* 古代韓國語論攷 [Studies on Old Korean]. Paju: T'aehaksa.
- Nattier, Jan. 2008. *A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 Periods*. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University.
- Pak Pyöngch'ae 朴炳采. 1971. *Kodae kugö üi yön'gu* 古代國語의 研究 [Studies on pre-modern Korean]. Seoul: Korea University Press.
- Pak Pyöngch'ae 朴炳采. 1990. *Kodae kugöhak yön'gu* 古代國語學研究 [Studies in ancient Korean linguistics]. Seoul: Research Institute of Korean Studies, Korea University.
- Pellard, Thomas. 2014. "The Awakened Lord: The Name of the Buddha in East Asia." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 134, no. 4: 689–98.
- Pulleyblank, Edwin George. 1962. "The Consonantal System of Old Chinese: Part II." *Asia Major* 9: 58–144, 206–65.
- Schuessler, Axel. 2009. *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Sin, Chung chin 신중진. 1998. "Marümch'ömgü üi saengsong kwa paltal e taehayö" 말음첨기의 생성과 발달에 대하여 [On the creation and development of *Marümch'ömgü*]. *Kugyöl yön'gu* 4: 85–114.
- Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士. 1992. *Nihon Bukkyöshi* 日本仏教史 [History of Japanese Buddhism]. Tokyo: Shinchösha.
- Tang Yongtong 湯用彤. 2015. *Hanwei liangjin nanbeichao fojiaoshi* 漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史 [History of Buddhism during the Six Dynasties period]. Beijing: Commercial Press.
- Tsukishima Hiroshi 築島裕, ed. 2007. *Kunten goi shüsë* 訓點語彙集成 [Compendium of Kunten glossed vocabulary]. Tokyo: Kyüko shoin.
- Vovin, Alexander. 2005. "Koguryö and Paekche: Different Languages or Dialects of Old Korean?" *Journal of Inner and East Asian Studies* 2, no. 2: 108–40.
- Vovin, Alexander. 2006. "Why Manchu and Jurchen Look So Non-Tungustic?" In *Tumen jalafun jecen akü: Manchu Studies in Honor of Giovanni Stary*, edited by Alessandra Pozzi, Juha Antero Janhunen, and Michael Weiers, 255–66. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Vovin, Alexander. 2007. "Korean Loanwords in Jurchen and Manchu." *Altai Hakpo* 17: 73–84.
- Vovin, Alexander. 2010. *Koreo-Japonica: A Re-evaluation of a Common Genetic Origin*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Xu Ye 徐燁. 2019. "Paekcheö üi chaüm yön'gu: Hanchaüm üi ümun taeüing ül chungsim üro-" 백제어의 자음 연구: 한자음의 음운 대응을 중심으로 [A phonological decipherment of the consonants of Old Korean in Baekche: Based upon the phonological correspondences of sinographic readings]. PhD diss., Ewha Womans University.



- Yang Chudong 梁柱東. 1965. *Koga yŏn'gu* 古歌研究 [Studies on Old Korean poems]. Rev. ed. Seoul: Ilchogak.
- Yi Kimun 李基文. 1998. *Kugŏsa kaesŏl* 國語史概說 [An introduction to the history of Korean]. P'aju: T'aeahaksa.
- Yu Ch'angdon 劉昌惇. 1971. *Ōhwisa yŏn'gu* 詞彙史研究 [Studies on the history of the Korean lexicon]. Seoul: Sŏnmyŏng Munhwasa.
- Yu Liming 俞理明. 2011. "Cong 'fotuo' jiqi yiyi kan fojiao yongyu de shetuan chayi" 從“佛陀”及其異譯看佛教用語的社團差異 [The differentia of Buddhist diction in Chinese from the word Buddha and its different translations]. *Hefei shefan xueyuan xuebao* 合肥師範學院學報 29, no. 4: 18–24.
- Zhang Yi 張毅. 2000. *Wang wu tianzhuguo zhuan jianshi* 往五天竺國傳箋釋 [Notes and interpretations on *Memoirs of a pilgrimage to the five kingdoms of India*]. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.
- Zhang Yongquan 張涌泉. 2010. *Hanyu suzi yanjiu* 漢語俗字研究 [Studies on Chinese popular characters]. Rev. ed. Beijing: Commercial Press.
- Zhou Fagao 周法高. 1956. "Lun futu yu fo" 論浮屠與佛 [Remarks on *Futu* and *Fo*]. *Lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan* 歷史語言研究所集刊 [Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology] 27: 197–203.
- Zürcher, Erik. 1991. "A New Look at the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Texts." In *From Benares to Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion*, edited by Koichi Shinohara and Gregory Schopen, 277–304. Oakville: Mosaic.