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1. Introduction

The goal of this article is to examine the ways in which pre-modern Korean forms have been presented in Korean dictionaries thus far, and then to explore the most rationale methods of treating pre-modern Korean forms in future editions of new Korean dictionaries. First let us define what is meant by the term “Korean dictionary”. In its most general, and common-sense meaning, a “Korean dictionary” can be any dictionary somehow concerned with the Korean language. But such a definition would be too broad for the purposes
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of this paper. Let us restrict the meaning of “Korean dictionary” here to “a dictionary whose entries are Korean words, and whose definitions are in Korean.” In other words, monolingual Korean-Korean dictionaries. Not only is it extremely rare to find pre-modern Korean forms listed in bilingual dictionaries, it is probably not even desirable to include such forms in a bilingual dictionary in the first place. Restricting our definition of “Korean dictionary” in this way, we will divide our examination into two parts: comprehensive modern Korean dictionaries which include listings for pre-modern Korean forms, and specialized dictionaries which treat pre-modern forms exclusively. In the former case, our discussion will focus primarily on the “대사전 大辭典”, or encyclopedic dictionaries.

It is a commonplace to say that dictionaries need to be ‘user-friendly’. A good dictionary is arranged in such a way that the user can find, as easily and efficiently as possible, the information s/he needs. Moreover, a good dictionary must meet the needs of its targeted readership. In most cases, this readership consists of either language learners or academic researchers. All this is true even in the case of general dictionaries, but it is especially true of the (as-yet-largely-nonexistent) specialized dictionaries for pre-modern Korean, which must be compiled in such a way that language learners (learners of pre-modern Korean) and scholars alike can obtain all the information they need in an easy and satisfactory manner. Unfortunately, in actual fact it is rarely that one encounters a dictionary which satisfies these two readerships in these ways. Indeed, in the case of those Korean-Korean dictionaries currently available, slapped together on the basis of earlier dictionaries in a hasty cut-and-paste fashion.

---

2 For a comprehensive discussion of these two functions which a good dictionary must fulfill—the educational and the scholarly—, see Yi Ilkhwon (1992)
with a mind only to increasing the total number of words listed, it has been virtually impossible to expect any such useful qualities. In theory, one would expect any Korean dictionary compilation project to be a virtual embodiment and synthesis of all the Korean language research which had accumulated prior to the project, but alas, this cannot be said of any Korean-Korean dictionaries published thus far.

It would appear that, since the 1980s, rather little attention has been paid to the problem of how best to handle pre-modern Korean forms in Korean-Korean dictionaries. Recently, Yi Kimun (李基文, 1992) has written briefly about the problem of pre-modern forms in Korean dictionaries with a particular focus on the way etymological information is displayed, and Hong Yunphyo (洪允杓, 1992) has discussed rather extensively and in some detail many of the points to consider when editing a specialized dictionary of pre-modern Korean. Han Cayyeng (한재영, 1989), on the basis of an examination of Nam Kwangwu’s 1960 Dictionary of Pre-Modern Korean (南廣祐，《古語辭典》) and Yu Changton’s 1964 Dictionary of Yi Dynasty Korean (劉昌惇，《李朝語辭典》), makes a number of recommendations about ways to improve on these two pioneering works in future dictionaries of 15th-century Korean. Besides these works, the only research to appear has been a few reviews of early dictionaries of pre-modern (Yu Changkyun 俞昌均, 1961, Nakamura Tamotsu 中村虎, 1968) or else studies of selected definitions in these earlier dictionaries (Ch Chwunswu 沈俊洙, 1969a, b). 3

3 After the first draft of this paper had already been submitted, a short review of the Dictionary of 17th-Century Korean (《17세기 국어사전(상, 하)》) was published by Yi Pyeungkun (이평근, 1995)
2. Defining 'Pre-modern Korean'

Ever since the appearance of the Korean Dictionary (Chosengo Jiten 朝鮮語辞典) published in 1920 by the Japanese Government-General, it has been customary for Korean dictionaries -- both encyclopedic dictionaries and specialized pre-modern Korean dictionaries alike -- to include Idu (吏讀) forms and pre-modern administrative terminology (kocyeoto-e 古制度語, most of which are Sino-Korean words). In other words, Idu forms and pre-modern administrative terminology have been treated as 'pre-modern Korean' alongside pure Korean words in Korean script from the pre-modern period. This fact can probably be ascribed to the desire of the compilers, who, at a time when there simply weren't any decent dictionaries, strove to produce the kind of dictionary which would be sufficient on its own to allow its readers to read and decipher old Korean documents. But there is no denying that this early precedent of including pre-modern administrative terminology and Idu forms in Korean dictionaries led pre-modern Korean lexicology off-course and obscured the true nature of a proper dictionary of pre-modern Korean. However, it is also true that, with the appearance in the 1960s of specialized dictionaries of pre-modern Korean which excluded pre-modern administrative terminology and Idu forms, this problem has been somewhat alleviated.

---

4 Strictly speaking, this dictionary does not fall within the purview of this article. But because a great many Koreans participated in the compilation process, and because its original conception as a Korean-Korean-Japanese dictionary meant that all the Japanese definitions were in fact mere translations from the Korean (Oda Kanjūro 1920 275-279, Kim Minsu 1971 242-243), I mention it here. The basis for the published version of the Chosengo Jiten was the Chosengo Jissho Genko (1920) in 61 fascicles. The fact that we can find Korean definitions between Korean entries and Japanese definitions in this original draft also validates this treatment to some extent. For more information on the nature of this original draft, see Yi Pyengkun 孫榮根 (1982)
Let us turn now to defining the notion of 'pre-modern Korean' and 'Old Korean'. Surely nobody would object if we were to define 'pre-modern Korean' as "Korean language used prior to modern Korean". But the problem is that, in Korean language materials from the pre-modern period, one finds in addition to native Korean forms a) lexical items recorded in *chac phyojok* (借用表記語彙) — various techniques of using Chinese characters to write native Korean forms), and b) loanwords, including, of course, the special category of loans in the form of Sino-Korean words. Among these various types of pre-modern Korean language forms, some still maintain a precarious existence in the modern language (let us call these 'relics' '殘存語'), while others are completely obsolete and no longer remain in the modern language (let us call these 'obsolete words' '死語').

Dictionaries differ in character depending on how they treat these two types of pre-modern form. The problem comes down to one of "Do we include relics and obsolete words as separate sections or not?" In the case of encyclopedic dictionaries which include pre-modern Korean, obsolete words get their own sections and relics are treated as (i.e., undifferentiated from) modern forms. Whereas in encyclopedic dictionaries one never finds relics treated as pre-modern forms with their own section and separate entries which cite examples from pre-modern texts, it is standard practice for specialized dictionaries of pre-modern Korean to give both relics and obsolete forms.

---

5 These lexical items recorded in *chac phyojok* include both lexical items in *lido* and *kwun tomok* (群目) lexical items using Chinese characters for their sound value only.

6 The idea of distinguishing these two types of pre-modern Korean words (古語) is also clearly articulated and advocated in Sin Thayhyn (尹泰陰, 1940) Sin (1940) divided 古語 into 'original forms of contemporary word' ('現代語의 前身인 原語') and obsolete word ('死語'), and advocated a strict segregation of the two types. For the position that Sino-Korean words used in earlier times but no longer in use today should also be treated as pre-modern Korean words (고어), see Yi Kimun (李基文, 1992)
their own sections. However, in the case of the encyclopedic dictionaries which at least attempt to be comprehensive, if not diachronic, it would be a big improvement if, for relics, they at least cited the document in which each relic is first attested.

Those large-scale Korean-Korean dictionaries which have appeared to date (especially the various "Tay Sacen" or "Great Dictionaries") are characterized by a combination of both annotational and encyclopedic features, given that their compilation is made possible by the verification of forms in old documents, it is understandable that they tend to include, alongside pure Korean pre-modern forms, Idu forms, Sino-Korean words, old administrative terminology and other loanwords no longer used in modern Korean. On the other hand, because the primary motivation behind the compilation of specialized dictionaries of pre-modern Korean was helping the user to decipher

---

7 But in actual fact, there are a great many relic vocabulary items still surviving precariously in the contemporary language which are not listed as entries in dictionaries of pre-modern Korean.

8 It is not the case that pre-modern forms like '가족' appear as entries in the large-scale 'Tay Sacen'-type dictionaries alone. One can also find them recorded in medium-sized and smaller dictionaries. Representative examples of these latter types would be the Hanka Hakhoy Cunh Cuming-sacen 《한국학회 지은 중사전》 (Hanka Hakhoy, 1958) and the Hanka Hakhoy Cunh So-sacen 《한국학회 지은 소사전》 (Cengum-sa, 1960), both compiled by the Hanka Hakhoy. These dictionaries also indicate pitch-accent in the entries for Middle Korean forms, but do not cite example sentences from texts.

9 However, this is not the case with North Korean dictionaries. As we shall see shortly, except for the Cosemal Sacen 《조선판사전》, 1960~1962, and the Cosemal Tay-sacen 《조 선말 대사전》, 1992), it is impossible to find any North Korean large-scale dictionaries which record pre-modern forms. According to North Korean dictionary compilation policy (especially ever since Kim Il Sung's famous pronouncements on linguistics in 1964), which excludes diachrony and tradition and emphasizes prescription and pragmatism (especially under the guise of the 'contemporaryity principle' or '실대성의 원칙'), dictionary compilers must distinguish clearly between useful and useless words (을 말' and 비말 말'), and record only the useful words in dictionaries. Thus, pre-modern forms have disappeared from even the largest North Korean dictionaries.
and interpret old documents, the earliest examples of this kind of dictionary ended up mostly excluding relics, but including all the various types of obsolete words (Idu forms, Sino-Korean words, old administrative terminology, loanwords, and of course obsolete pure Korean words). It is most unfortunate that this state of affairs has developed over time into something that is more or less 'tradition' by now. Thus, it is only a matter of a few years since we first witnessed the publication of properly conceived and executed specialized dictionaries\(^{10}\) for Idu, old administrative terminology, and the like, and surely the reason for this is be found in the blind imitation on the part of dictionary compilers of the example of earlier publications.

In other words, the problem boils down to "Do we broaden the notion of pre-modern Korean? Or do we narrow the notion?" We cannot produce quality dictionaries of pre-modern Korean in future without first tackling this question and defining more clearly the nature and essence of a proper dictionary of pre-modern Korean. And a true, purely linguistic dictionary of this nature must exclude proper nouns and pre-modern administrative terminology.

3. Pre-modern Korean in Encyclopedic Dictionaries

As we mentioned above, the majority of encyclopedic Korean-Korean dictionaries to have appeared thus far in Korea has included pre-modern Korean forms. And in the case of those dictionaries aspiring to the status of 'Great' dictionary (대사전), this is true almost without exception. But when one examines dictionaries published in North Korea, one finds very few that include pre-modern Korean.

\(^{10}\) I return to the subject of these specialized dictionaries in section 4 below.
The only two North Korean dictionaries to include pre-modern Korean forms are (3) and (8), which we will examine shortly.\(^\text{11}\)

Now let us examine a few representative examples of encyclopedic dictionaries which include pre-modern Korean forms.\(^\text{12}\) Of course, there are other large-scale dictionaries we could include, but those selected here should suffice to give an overview of the current state of affairs.

(1) 1938. Mun Seyyeng 文世榮, 《Cosene Sacen 朝鮮語辭典》, Kyungseng 京城: Cosene Sacen Kanhaynghoy 朝鮮語辭典刊行會 [Reprinted in 1939 by the same Cosene Sacen Kanhaynghoy and in 1946 by Yengchang Sekwan with the title 《Swuceng Cungpo Cosene Sacen 修正增補 朝鮮語辭典 Revised and Expanded Dictionary of the Korean Language》, and twice again in 1954, once by Sammunsan with the title 《Wuli Mal Sacen 우리말사전, or A Dictionary of Korean》, and again by Yengchang Sekwan with the title 《Swuceng Cungpo Kwuke Tay-sacen 수정증보 국어대사전, or

\(^{11}\) Neither of these two dictionaries lists any Idu forms using Chinese characters. But they do include items like ‘마치기’[ 맞추기], ‘반지’[ 반지], and ‘치만’[ 치만], and usually note that these were terms used in feudalistic society (for example, in the case of the latter two terms) Whereas (3) includes native Korean pre-modern forms as entry words in the main text of the dictionary, (8) includes a Dictionary of Pre-modern Korean (고어사전) as Supplement 2, in addition to a Dialect Dictionary (Supplement 1). The latter is comparable to (7), a large-scale Korean dictionary published in South Korea, the latter is different in that, instead of the title ‘Pre-modern Korean and Dialects’ (고어와 방언), volume four carries the heading ‘Old Forms and Idu’ (옛말과 아두), but given that it nonetheless treats pre-modern forms separately, is similar in nature to (8).

\(^{12}\) Previous overviews of Korean dictionary compilation and its history are as follows, for a general survey, see Yi Pyeongkun (李秉根, 1986, 1990a), for a wide-ranging discussion of dictionaries published before the early 1960s, see Nakamura Tamotsu (中村光, 1962a, b), for North Korean dictionaries, see Co Ceysu (조제수, 1986, 1988), Yi Pyeongkun (李秉根, 1990b) and Cha Cayun (차계은, 1991), for a discussion of just three representative types, see Pak Kumsa (박금사, 1989), for a study of the Korean dictionaries compiled by the Koreans in China, see Kim Kicm (김기철, 1992) and Choy Yunkap (최윤갑 ed., 1992)
Revised and Expanded Great Dictionary of the Korean Language.

(2) 1947～1957. Hankul Hakhoys 한글학회, "Cosene Hakhoys cun Co-
sevenmal Khun Sacen 조선어학회 지은 조선말 큰사전, or Great
Dictionary of the Korean Language, by the Hankul Society", Seoul
Ulyu Munhwasa [upon publication of the sixth and final
volume in 1957, the title was changed to "Hankul Hakhoys cun
Khun Sacen 한글학회 지은 큰사전, or Great Dictionary, by the
Hankul Society].

(3) 1960～1962 Kwahakwen Ene Munhak Yenkwusos 과학원 언어문
학연구소, i.e. Language and Literature Research Institute, Academy
of Sciences, "Cosenmal Sacen 조선말 사전, or Dictionary of the
Korean Language", Pyongyang: Kwahak Chwulphansa.

(4) 1961. Yi Huysung 李熙昇, "Kwuke Tay-sacen 국어대사전, or
Great Dictionary of the Korean Language", Seoul Minhwung
Sekwan [revised and expanded edition published by Mincwung
Selim in 1981, and yet another revised edition from the same
press in 1994].

(5) 1975. Sin Kichel 신기철 · Sin Yongchel 신용철, "Say Wudi Mal
Khun Sacen 세 우리말 큰사전, or A New Great Dictionary of the
Korean Language", Seoul: Samseng Chwulphansa [sixth revised
and expanded edition appeared in 1985].

(6) 1991. Kim Minswu 김민수 · Ko Yengkun 고영근 · Im Hongpin
임홍빈 · Yi Sungcay 이승계 (eds), "Kumseng-phan Kwuke Tay-sacen
큰성판 국어대사전, or Kumseng’s Great Dictionary of the Korean
Language", Seoul: Kumseng Chwulphansa.

큰사전, or Great Dictionary of the Korean Language", Seoul.
Emunkak.

(8) 1992 Sahoy Kwahakwen Enehak Yenkwusos [i.e. Linguistics Re-
search Institute, Academy of Social Sciences], "Cosenmal Tay-sacen
조선말 대사전, or *Great Dictionary of the Korean Language*,
Pyongyang. Sahoy Kwahak Chwulphansa

These dictionaries all have in common the feature that, while retaining the characteristics of a purely linguistic annotated dictionary, they also pretend to encyclopedic status.\(^{13}\) Some of them are bound together as one rather hefty tome, while others are divided up into from as few as two volumes to as many as six separate volumes.\(^{14}\)

Strictly speaking, number (1) is not a dictionary with pre-modern Korean forms in the sense that we have defined. Nonetheless, every so often one encounters in it extremely interesting pre-modern words (words no longer used in the modern language). The only problem is that it is difficult to ascertain the basis or source of these words.\(^{15}\) For example, if one looks up *sehm* ‘설미’, one is told that this is pre-

\(^{13}\) But it is not the case that dictionaries that sought to exclude administrative terms and proper names are totally lacking, either. Number (3), the *Casework Sample* (조선말사전), is a representative example.

\(^{14}\) Once a dictionary is compiled, it is advisable to keep the number of volumes the same in future editions or reprints. In cases where this does not happen, it is more likely than not due to a decision on the part of the publisher without reference to the wishes of the compilers, but publishers and compilers both should think twice before suddenly changing the pagination or number of volumes under the pretext of making life easier for the reader. Good examples of such excesses are the recently-published (6), which first appeared as one volume, but was then reissued in 1994 (6th printing) as two volumes (main volume plus supplement), and (7), which originally appeared in four volumes, but was reissued in 1994 (third edition) in two volumes. Number (7) is a particularly egregious case in point, since the original volume four included ‘Ancient Forms and Idiom’, but the newer edition binds this section together with the modern dictionary, making the dictionary most inconvenient to use.

\(^{15}\) This dictionary does not cite example sentences. Because most of these words are poorly attested (if at all) in old documents, there is no legitimate basis upon which to classify them as either obsolete words or relics. Nonetheless, the preface to this dictionary claims that ‘in the case of pre-modern Korean forms, we have included only those which can be pronounced now’ (열전 품은 지금 발음할 수 있는 말만 수용하였습니다), implying that they have included only relics. It remains a matter for further research to determine of these forms were indeed relics at the time.
modern Korean for modern pyenkyeng ‘변경’ ‘border area’ and kalphp ‘갈파’ ‘section’,16 but there is no indication of the evidence for these assertions.17 Like the «Chosengo Itten 朝鮮語辭典, or Dictionary of Korean» published by the Japanese Government-General in 1920,18 this dictionary also includes Idu words as entries. The inclusion of an appendix titled 이두찾기[史讀索引] or "Idu Index" at the end of the volume is also reminiscent of the 1920 Chosengo Itten, and has been imitated by some dictionaries ever since.

Number (2) was published in six volume over the course of several years. In places, one finds obsolete pre-modern forms and Idu words as entries, and these are listed together with definitions, example sentences, and citations of the source. Two noteworthy (and related)

16 This item sehnu (설비) does not appear in the other dictionaries, but it is recorded in (3) as an 'archaism' (앞은 말) In light of facts like this, it would appear that the compilers of (3) made reference to a number of dictionaries published earlier.

17 We can, however, make a good educated guess. For example, if one examines the entries and definitions in Mun Seyyyeng’s Casene Sacen («朝鮮語辭典» and in the Sin Cacen («新字典», 新文館, 1915) edited by Choy Namsen (崔南善) and published by the Cosen Kwangmunhuy (朝鮮光文會), one finds a great many interesting words. The definitions in the latter case were overseen by Cwn Sinyeng and Kim Twupong, and the fact that the majority of the unusual forms in this latter dictionary concord can be verified only with Mun Seyyyeng’s dictionary reveals just how close a relationship these two works had. The word sehnu (설비) from Mun Seyyyeng’s dictionary is glossed in the Sin Cacen («新字典») with the Korean readings for ‘塞’ and ‘塞’, then noted as meaning ‘border area’ (境界) and area (區域). The close relationship between the Sin Cacen («新字典») and Mun Seyyyeng’s dictionary has also been noted by Se Caykuk (徐在克, 1976) In my own article (Yi Hyenhuy, 1994b) I have tried to interpret the word ‘설비’ occurring the Kolye Kayo (고려가요) phrase from the Cheyongka <處容歌> ‘실비 도도와 有徳호신 기수께’ with these two entries for sehnu in the Sin Cacen and Mun Seyyyeng’s dictionary. Thus, it is safe to say that the exact relationship between the Msl Mu («말모이») and Sin Cacen («新字典»), Mun Seyyyeng’s Casene Sacen («朝鮮語辭典») and the Sin Cacen deserves further study in the future.

18 Ever since the Chosengo Itten («朝鮮語辭典») published by the Japanese Government-General included among its entries 727 Idu forms, subsequent large-scale dictionaries have followed this precedent and included Idu. Another precedent set by this dictionary and followed in subsequent publications was the policy of not listing separate, independent grammatical forms.
features are the inclusion of the 'tone dots' or pitch-accent indications of Middle Korean entries, and the indication of distinctive vowel length in modern Korean words. But the pre-modern entries do not include Sino-Korean words like *uy sinhota* '凝心하다'. This latter editorial approach became a model for subsequent large-scale Korean-Korean dictionaries which included pre-modern Korean forms, but with the exception of the 1958 *Kwuke Say Sacen* 국어 사전, or *New Korean Dictionary* (Tonga Chwulphansa), edited by the Kwuke Kwukmun Hakho and a few others, the precedent of including the pitch-accent indications for Middle Korean entries has not been followed. According to the statistics chart at the end of volume 6, this dictionary includes 3013 pre-modern Korean words and 1449 Idu words. The Idu forms are arranged according to their readings,\(^\text{19}\) and volume 6 includes an appendix titled 'Idu mal chacnun Pep' (이두 말 찾는 법), or 'How to Look up Idu words' at the end.

Like Number 2, Number (3) also consists of six volumes and was compiled over several years in North Korea. It is widely assumed that this dictionary took the appearance of (2) in 1957 as its impetus and also relied on (2) for much of its content (Co Cayswu 1986: 26). But one must also consider the possibility that the fact that the editorial process for (3) began in 1957 is a simple coincidence. One feature that (3) shares with (2) is the inclusion of entries for obsolete words and the exclusion of relics. Because the underlying grammatical treatise behind (3) was the *Cosene Munpep*, or *Korean Grammar* of 1960, (3) included entries for pre-modern Korean forms. That is, in its exposition of the prescriptive norms for modern Korean predicative forms, this grammar also includes the process of historical changes in

\(^{19}\) The preface informs us that the Idu readings and character forms take the *Idu Cipseng* (《爾讀集成》), published in 1957 by the Japanese Government-General Chusun as their basis.
pre-modern Korean verb forms. (Pak Kumca 1980: 177). But the exclusion of any Idu forms from this dictionary is a big difference with any of the dictionaries compiled in South Korean.

Number (4) consists of one volume, and number (5) consists of two. In their inclusion of both pre-modern forms and Idu forms, both (4) and (5) are no different from numbers (2) and (3). Numbers (4) and (5) are also similar in that neither of them includes pitch-accent for Middle Korean forms, and that they both include only one or two example sentences. In the case of Idu forms, the conjugational forms are presented as single chunks of information without any morphological analysis. Sad to say, this is also the case in the 1976 specialized Idu dictionary, 《Idu Sacen 이두사전》, and so is a shortcoming which is not restricted to encyclopedic dictionaries alone.

Numbers (6), (7) and (8) share the feature that all three were published recently in the 1990s. Originally, number (6) appeared as one volume, number (7) as four volumes, and number (8) as two, but in later reprints, numbers (6) and (7) both appear as two volumes. These three dictionaries are all quite different in the ways in which they treat pre-modern Korean forms.

In number (6), obsolete pre-modern Korean forms appear as entries in the main body of the dictionary, and in addition to the definition, are presented with rather detailed grammatical information and attempts at morphological analysis. But there are many cases where words which ought to have been treated as separate entries are lumped together under one entry,20 and the fact that Middle Korean entries do not reflect pitch-accent information is a shortcoming Idu

---

20 A representative case in point would be the listing under separate heading of virtually all the conjugational forms for ‘הוא’, ‘הוא니다’, ‘הוא니다’, ‘הוא디라’, ‘הוא디소라’, ‘הוא yan’, etc., all are listed under separate headings.
forms are not treated in the main body of the dictionary and appear instead in an appendix titled 'Idu Ilkku' (이두 읽기, i.e. Reading Idu). The entries for these Idu forms are listed according to the stroke counts and radicals of the Chinese characters, and are followed by readings, no morphological analysis is attempted.

Unlike prior encyclopedic dictionaries, numbers (7) and (8) resemble each other in that they either list pre-modern Korean forms in a separate volume, or include them in a separate section at the end of the dictionary. It would appear that the editors took this approach because they considered it inappropriate for relic words to be treated simultaneously as 'Modern Korean' and 'Pre-modern Korean'. Strictly speaking, then, it is difficult to speak of the entire dictionaries, including the pre-modern forms, as 'encyclopedic' in the normal sense.

Number (7) lists 'Yeysmal kwa Idu' (예말과 이두, i.e. Old Korean and Idu) in volume 4. It is fair to say that the 'Old Korean' section of this volume comprises the best dictionary of pre-modern Korean to appear to date. In addition to detailed pitch-accent data for each Middle Korean entry, this dictionary stands out in its richer exem-

---

21 In (7), in cases where the pitch-accent of the surface form is different, such examples are listed separately after the main entry. This treatment is analogous to the way this work likewise allot separate entries for alternate forms of verb bases whose final segment changes in certain environments. In the case of verbs, in addition to listing all entry forms in the '가' form (but with any final consonants written in morphophonemic notation), the dictionary also lists all alternate forms as they occur before consonant- and vowel-initial endings (this time written with any neutralizations, voicing alternations or other phonological changes as they actually appear on the surface), as separate entries marked off by hyphens, in the case of nouns, too, all alternate forms get their own entries. But in the cases where alternate forms of verb bases get their own entry, the relationship to the representative '가' form and entry is made clear in the definition, likewise, in the case of those entries for alternate noun forms occurring before consonant-initial particles, the relationship to the basic form is made clear. Thus, from the way in which it handles not only pitch-accent, but also allomorphy in both the verbal and nominal paradigms, we can see the guiding descriptive principle behind this dictionary at work. This point shows that this dictionary is a major improvement on the two
plification for each pre-modern form compared to earlier dictionaries, and in its careful listing of related items (especially 유의어) Idu forms are listed in two ways--by their modern Sino-Korean pronunciations and by their readings, whereby in the former instance the forms are followed by the remark ka pola (가 보라, i.e. 'Go to'), with the effect that they are presented in such a way as to obtain maximum concrete information about each form. However, this treatment whereby (7) gives entries to both Sino-Korean pronunciations and to the Idu readings is only superficially different from that in (1) and (2), where only the Idu reading gets an entry, and the modern Sino-Korean pronunciations are relegated to an index at the end of the dictionary [volume six, in the case of number (2)]; otherwise they are identical in their conceptualization.

In North Korea, ever since the advent of the 'Munhwae Wun Tong (문화어 운동, or Cultured Language Movement, 1966), all dictionary compilation activity has been governed by the so-called 'Four Principles of Dictionary Editing', one of which is the 'Principle of Contemporaneity' (Hyentay-seng uy Wenchik 현대성의 원칙). In connection with this last principle, the consistent trend in North Korean dictionaries has been to exclude pre-modern forms. Thus, number (8) is all the more noteworthy for its inclusion of pre-modern Korean.

---

major dictionaries of pre-modern Korean to appear before it-- the Koe Sacen (《古語解典》) and the Yoe Sacen (《李朝語解典》). Take, for example, the treatment of '증감다' in the Koe Sacen 《古語解典》, '증감다' is taken as the base form, and beneath it are listed various conjugational forms, while a wide range of these forms like '증감다', '증거도', '증거비', '증거 볼', '증거불', '증거보며', '증거본', etc, also get separate entries yet again, creating a rather wasteful situation. On the other hand, in the Yoe Sacen (《李朝語解典》, i.e. Dictionary of Yi Dynasty Korean), there is just one entry for '증감다', followed by a series of example sentences meant to illustrate the various alternate forms, creating a rather stingy impression. Thus, we conclude that the editorial policy of the newer (7) (Wuli Mal Khun Sacen 우리말 본 사전) is an improvement over these two older dictionaries.
One supposes that the appearance of the pre-modern Korean forms, albeit only in an appendix at the end of the dictionary, is due to the practical need for studies of pre-modern linguistic materials and education in the classics. When one considers that research in Korean historical linguistics has become more active once again in North Korean academic circles since the 1980s, this supposition gains in credibility. Still, just as was the case with (3), number (8) does not list Idu forms. This treatment would appear to be due to an attitude that there is no pressing need to record *nalkun mal* (님이 말, i.e. defunct words). On the other hand, it is noteworthy that another section of the appendix to this dictionary is occupied by a dialect glossary.

With the exception of numbers (7) and (8) published rather recently, the treatment of pre-modern Korean forms in the majority of the encyclopedic-type dictionaries to appear thus far has gone no further than to offer a smattering of curious or exotic information. We very much hope that any new dictionaries of this type that appear in the future will be much more careful in their presentation of pre-modern Korean material.

4. Pre-modern Korean and Dictionaries Thereof

Although it does not exactly fit into the somewhat narrowly defined definition of Korean dictionary presented above, it would appear that Maema Kyosaku’s *Chosen Kogo Jiten Kohon* 朝鮮古語辭典稿本, i.e. *Draft of a Dictionary of Old Korean* (8 vols., date and present whereabouts unknown) would count as the first-ever

---

22 For an overview of North Korean research on Korean historical linguistics, see Yi Hyenhuy (이현희 1992)
dictionary of pre-modern Korean, if only it survived. At a minimum, this 'draft' must have been compiled on the basis of reading and deciphering the old Korean books and manuscripts that Maema collected for some 18 years before his death in 1942. It is reported that this work was donated to the library of Keijo Imperial University (the present Seoul National University) in 1943, but unfortunately it is impossible to confirm its existence now.23

Ever since the first outpouring of four specialized dictionaries of pre-modern Korean [numbers (10), (11), (12), and (13) below] immediately after Liberation in 1945 in connection with the need for learning pre-modern Korean in schools, a few other similar dictionaries have appeared, but the two dictionaries to wield the most influence and garner the most users over the past 30 years have been Nam Kwangwu's Koe Sacen "古語辭典, i.e. Dictionary of Old Korean" and Yu Changton's Yicoe Sacen "李朝語辭典, i.e. Dictionary of Yi Dynasty Korean". Because there are so few specialized dictionaries of pre-modern Korean, the list below includes some listing and glossaries of pre-modern Korean forms which would not normally qualify as 'dictionaries'.


23 For detailed information on the existence of this unpublished work, see Suematsu Yasukazu (末松保弘, 1957) and Kono Rokuro (河野六助, 1974) I, too, have scoured the Seoul National University Library for this manuscript on many an occasion, but have been unable to locate it.
1947 Pang Conghyen 方鐘銘. 《Koe Caylyo Sacen (Hwucip) 古語材料辭典(後集) [Dictionary of Old Korean Materials, Part III]》, Seoul Tongnongsa 東省社


(14) 1949 Kim Congo 김종오. “Koe Hayley 古語 解例(1~8) [Old Korean, with Annotated Examples, Parts 1-8]”, 《Cosen Ye Yenkwu 조선어 연구》 11~18, Pyongyang: Cosenemun Yenkwuhoy 조선어문연구회.

1950 Kim Congo 김종오, “Koe Hayley 古語 解例(完) [Old Korean, with Annotated Examples, Conclusion]”, 《Cosen Ye Yenkwu 조선어 연구》 2.3, Pyongyang. Cosenemun Yenkwuhoy 조선어문연구회


1997 Nam Kwangwu 南廣弼, 《Kyohak Koe Sacen 教學 古語辭典 [Kyohak’s Old Korean Dictionary]》, Seoul: Kyohaksa (株)敎學社


(19) 1995 Hankwuk Cengsm Munhwa Yenkwuwen 한국경신문화연 구원, i.e the Academy of Korean Studies (Hong Yunphyo 홍윤표・Song Kicwung 송기중・Ceng Kwang 정광・Song Cheluy 송철의) ed, 《17 Seyk Kwoke Sacen 17세기 국어사전 [Dictionary of 17th-Century Korean]》, 2 vols Seoul: Thayhaksas

From the list above one can observe that most dictionary-type treatments of pre-modern Korean in monograph form were published before the 1970s. Numbers (9) and (14) cannot be described as dictionaries. Number (9) is nothing more than a short list which simply records approximately 370 Middle Korean words along with their

24 As I have already mentioned in the preceding section, if one were to remove volume 4 of the Wali Mal Kow Sacen (《우리말 큰사전》) and Supplement Two of the Cosenmal Teyguscn (《조선말 대사전》) and publish them separately, they would be fine dictionaries of pre-modern Korean. In this case, we can say that they are the newest dictionaries of pre-modern Korean to appear, some 30 years since the last such dictionaries were compiled. Note also that, unless my information is wrong, it would appear that no dictionary of pre-modern Korean has ever appeared in China in the Yanbian Korean Autonomous Zone. Choy Yunkap (최윤갑)‘s Cuwngsey Cosene Munpep (Grammar of Middle Korean 《중세조선어문법》, 1987) includes a supplement titled ‘Pre-modern Korean Glosses‘ (‘고어해석‘) in which he gives simple definitions for more than 600 Middle Korean words, but without any examples from texts. This would appear to be the only compilation of pre-modern Korean forms to come out of China thus far. In a few cases, Choy also adds some simple grammatical information after the definitions.
Chinese character definitions, and gives no example sentences. Nonetheless, this work is of some value because the author himself shows evidence of recognizing the need for compiling a dictionary of pre-modern Korean and attempted to at least adopt of the format of a dictionary (한세영 1989 524). In contrast, number (14) was serialized over nine issues, gave definitions in hankul 한글, presented rather numerous example sentences (including even rather detailed citations of the source texts).\(^{25}\) Given its substantial volume, this number (14) could easily have been gathered together and published as a monograph, but like numbers (10), (11), (12), and (13) before it, was compiled for the purpose of aiding the then rather urgent task of establishing education in pre-modern Korean and in the Korean classics. The other dictionaries all appeared as monographs.

Now let us examine briefly those dictionaries of pre-modern Korean which appeared as monographs. If we classify them according to their intended audience, numbers (10), (11), (12), (13), (17), and (18) were designed for beginning learners or for the purposes of general education, whereas numbers (15), (16), and (19) were all edited with a view to satisfying the needs of both education and research.

Number (10) brings together old administrative terminology, historical terms and obsolete words. In the latter case, it is noteworthy that this work includes indications for pitch-accent, not only for the entries but

\(^{25}\) Although we have omitted it from our exposition, another comparable item is Kim Inho's "Pre-modern Korean Glosses" ("옛날말 해석") in the North Korean journal Minhwa Haksap (문화학습) number 1 and 3, 1989. It would appear that since the beginning of the 1980s there has been a renewed interest in pre-modern Korean in North Korean academia. Kim Inho's "Pre-modern Korean Glosses" was written for a general, non-specialist audience, and demonstrates a number of very simple diachronic changes processes. He gives about 30 examples from the letter "k" (?), but for reasons unknown the series was suspended. In any case, this work is basically of the same type as (9), but simply from a different period.
also for the example sentences. Dictionaries of pre-modern Korean published from the 1960s onwards have all included pitch-accent data in the main entry only, without including such information in the example sentences. The dictionary in question here, both in terms of the number of documents consulted and the number of words listed as entries, is rather substantial, but the definitions are limited to a presentation of Chinese character equivalents.

Number (11) consists of three parts: Pre-modern Korean Forms, Idu forms, and Dialect Forms. In terms of relative importance, the pre-modern Korean section occupies 1/8 of the book, and is the skinniest section of the work. In addition, the Middle Korean entries lack pitch-accent marks and example sentences, with the result that this work can hardly be described as a systematic dictionary. Nonetheless, the definitions are in modern Korean.

The title on the edge (書根題) for number (12) reads "Yeysmal Yeysil Idu Yeyschayk Phuli Cosen Koe Sacen 엽말 엽일 이두 엽책 풀이 朝鮮古語辭典, i.e. "Dictionary of Old Korean for the Explication of the Old Language, Old Ways, Idu, and Old Books." As one would expect from this title, the main body of Part 1 treats obsolete words and ancient administrative terminology together, and Part 2 treats Idu forms. Whereas the sections on old administrative terminology and Idu present neither example sentences nor sources, entries for obsolete words and historical terms are listed with one or two example sentences followed by an abbreviated designation for the source text, but without any indication of volume and page number. The definitions are in modern Korean and are rather detailed. In the case of pre-modern Korean obsolete words, this dictionary occasionally shows the course of historical changes and sometimes also attempts morphological analyses, but there is no indication of pitch-accent information.
for the entry words. The vowel 'ar a' (어라) is reflected in the spellings, but for convenience sake in printing, the ha- '하-' (stem) of the verb '하다' is everywhere rendered as ha- '하-'. Interestingly, in cases where the entry word is an historical term and the dictionary adopts the views of others, due credit is given to the originator of the view in question. The Idu forms are arranged according to the stroke number of their constituent Chinese characters, and use the original Idu characters directly as the entry form, followed by the reading enclosed in square brackets [ ]. An appendix titled 'Kwukmun Kose Yakji' (국문 고서 약지, i.e. Brief Information on Old Books in Korean Script) gives a chart with the following on old Korean books: Classification, Title, Author, Date, Type of Edition, Place of Issue, Owner, Remarks, and Abbreviation.

The main body of number (13) lists in the first instance obsolete pre-modern Korean forms only, and thus clearly approximates the characteristics of a purely linguistic dictionary. The pre-modern Korean forms are listed without any indication of pitch-accent. Sources for the example sentences appear directly in front of the example sentences in the form of an abbreviation. There is also an appendix which mixes together Sino-Korean vocabulary and Idu forms, the definitions for the Idu forms are followed by the expression 'Idu' in square brackets. '의만'. These entries are listed in hankul according

26 It would appear that the lack of pitch-accent notations in this work stems not from a lack of awareness about pitch-accent, but from other reasons. The preface to this work states that 'dois for the four tones' (사성 돈(四聲點)) start to decline gradually in use from the time of King Senco (宣祖), the preface goes on to note that the time of publication is one of unprecedented calamities and change, and that the tone dois have been omitted for the sake of convenience in printing.

27 In the majority of cases, this work cites the views of Yang Cwutong in his Coen Koka Yonkan (槻柱東.《朝鮮古歌研究》, 10 A Study of Ancient Korean Songs. Pakmun Chwulphansa, 1942).
to the modern Sino-Korean pronunciations of the Sino-Korean terms and Idu forms, followed by the corresponding Chinese characters enclosed in square brackets, Idu forms are followed by an indication of their readings 'Sino-Korean terms' here corresponds to old administrative terminology

Number (15) contains no Idu forms. The revised edition of 1971 adds a number of forms which were missing from the first edition of 1960. Pitch-accent information is indicated for the main entries but not for the variant forms. Insofar as there are numerous cases where the editors have included mainly those pre-modern words which appear rare or exotic from the point of view of the modern language, this dictionary appears rather uneven and irregular and, despite being a work for specialists, gives the impression of something closer to a beginner's handbook. This dictionary was substantially revised and expanded in 1997 and published by another press, but the revisions amount to no more than adding a few new forms from recently discovered texts, and the basic framework remains unchanged.

Of all the various dictionaries of pre-modern Korean published before the 1990s, number (16) is the one of the best-executed, and for that reason has been most favored by users. Nonetheless, while this work is reliable for basic forms, it gives no entries for declensional forms or conjugational forms, and for this and other reasons is inconvenient for use by non-specialists. For example, in cases where the definition of a Middle Korean form is unknown, this dictionary simply leaves the definition area blank, but it would have been more user-friendly to write '미상 未詳', i.e. Meaning unknown. The lack of any attention to related forms in the entries also stands out as a major deficiency. Iduforms are recorded separately in an appendix at the end of the dictionary, the readings are listed as main entries in Korean alphabetical order, followed by the Idu characters in brackets
( ), a short definition, and an abbreviated source text name but no example sentences.

Number (17) is similar in character to number (12). The main body of the text first treats obsolete pre-modern forms together with old administrative terminology, followed by a section with the title ‘리두(吏讀)’, i.e. Idu The Idu characters are listed according to the stroke number of the characters, and those which are written in chaca phyokja자자표기, i.e. Chinese characters used to represent pure Korean forms, also get their own entry, followed by the reading in hankul in square brackets. Definitions are also given, but there are no example sentences.28

Number (18) states in its preface that it is the first dictionary of pre-modern Korean to appear in North Korea, in effect ignoring the existence of (17). This work betrays its title — Cuwngsey Cosenntl Sacen 중세조선말사전, or Dictionary of Middle Korean — by giving entries to forms from the 15th century right up to the 19th century. Entries are accompanied by brief definitions and example sentences. The entries also include Idu forms, pure Korean place names recorded in Chinese characters, Chinese character idioms (한자성어), and old administrative terminology. Those forms which can be written with Chinese characters are listed in the entries in hankul, followed by the corresponding Chinese characters enclosed in square brackets. Thus, entries for pre-modern Korean forms like ‘가곡다’ appear alongside entries for the Idu form ‘가르트라(枝等如)’, the pure Korean place name ‘울해섬(威化島)’, the old administrative term ‘가금유(加給

28 Because I was unaware of this work, I wrote in Yi Hyenhy (1992 659—660) that no monograph-length dictionaries of pre-modern Korean had been published in North Korea. I would like to take this opportunity to correct that erroneous statement. Of course, number (18), the Cuwngsey Sacen (Middle Korean Dictionary) edited by Kim Yengwhwang (김영황, ed <중세이사전>, 1993), appeared after Yi Hyenhy (1992)
和 the Chinese character idiom ‘가가문전(家家門前)’.

All of the dictionaries of pre-modern Korean examined above share a number of common features. Thus, while none of them is a diachronic dictionary in the strict sense of the word, all of them lump together, without regard to chronology, any and all forms pre-dating modern Korean. All of them record primarily obsolete pre-modern Korean forms, and ignore or give short shrift to relics and other forms which survive into the modern language. Finally, all of them fail to give entries for Sino-Korean vocabulary from earlier stages of the language. Another major cause for concern is the fact that each dictionary employs its own alphabetization scheme. In future, there is a great need to standardize alphabetical order in dictionaries, not only for dictionaries of modern Korean, but also for dictionaries of pre-modern stages of the language. But the greatest problem of all is the lack of rich exemplification for the dictionary entries. While it is true that a dictionary is not the same thing as a compendium of example sentences, it is only through rich exemplification that the reader can grasp the various phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical properties of a dictionary entry. As research continues to accumulate on the various restrictions to which lexical items are subject, and on the various grammatical patterns in

---

29 It is not the case that dictionaries of pre-modern Korean differ from large-scale dictionaries simply by virtue of the fact that they list only obsolete words in their entries. They also include as entries relics like hanol ‘하늘’ (modern hanol ‘sky, heaven’) which had a different orthography in pre-modern Korean but otherwise survive in the modern language.

30 The alphabetical order in modern dictionaries has been prescribed since 1989 according to Clause 4 of the current Hankaul Macchwanpep (《한글 맞춤법》) or Hankaul Orthography, Appendix 2. Because in principle this Hankaul Macchwanpep is concerned only with the modern standard language, it makes no reference to or mention of older hankaul letters which have disappeared from use. In future, we must find a way to standardize not only the alphabetical order for modern Korean forms, but also for entries from earlier stages of the language.
which they appear, dictionary entries in our dictionaries of pre-modern 
Korean must reflect this knowledge through rich and effective 
example sentences and citations from texts.

All the dictionaries above also deserve criticism for their handling of 
Middle Korean pitch-accent information. In the case of those 
dictionaries published in South Korea, most (with the exception of (10)) only record pitch-accent in the main entry form. But the 
dictionaries published in North Korea failed to record pitch-accent 
even in main entries. In either case we must admit that far too little 
attention has been paid to pitch-accent thus far.

Finally, it is also a fact that, looking back from our vantage point 
now, a great many new texts have been discovered over the years, 
and we are now at a stage where our knowledge of Korean language 
history for each of its pre-modern stages is greater than it has even 
been. Thus, it is a matter of pressing urgency that we compile and 
edit new dictionaries of pre-modern Korean which will reflect as 
broadly and accurately as possible all our new knowledge.

The most recent example to appear of a dictionary of pre-modern 
Korean is number (19). In character, it is closer to being a compen-
dium of examples of 17th-century Korean than a dictionary proper. 
Beneath major entries for both pure Korean words and Sino-Korean 
words one finds information about declensional and conjugational 
forms, as well as listings of example sentences. Still, each entry also 
includes a definition, thus lending more dictionary-like flavor to the 
work. With 27,716 separate entries and 202,728 example sentences, 
culled from some 24 17th-century texts in 73 volumes, this work is 
an invaluable source for the study of 17th-century Korean.31 We 
understand that work on a similar "18 Seyki Kwuke Sacen 18세기 국"

31 For a review of this Dictionary of 17th-Century Korean, see Yi Pyeongkun (李秉根, 1995)
어사전, i.e. *Dictionary of 18th-Century Korean* and *19 Seyki Kwuke Sacen 19세기 국어사전*, i.e. *Dictionary of 19th-Century Korean* is already underway.

Now let us examine some of the more specialized and more narrowly constituted dictionaries of pre-modern Korean.


(24) 1994 Song Kicwung 宋基中, Nam Phunghyen 南豊鉉, Kim Yengcin 金永鎭, 《Kotay Kauke Enhucapseng 古代國語 言彙集成 [Compendium of Ancient Korean Vocabulary]》, Sengnam: Academy of Korean Studies (한국정신문화연구원)

(25) 1995. Yi Hoyel 李昊烈, 《Twusi Enhay Saykincap 杜詩譯解 索引集 [Collection of Indices to the Twusi Enhay]》 (I) · (II), Seoul Ihoy Munhwasa 以會文化社,

Some of the works listed above are not dictionaries in the proper sense of the word. Thus, (23), (24) and (25) are basically more akin to collections or compendia or original materials. But we have included them for discussion here because such works show the essential outlines of and will form the basis for any specialized dictionaries to appear in the future.

Number (20) is a specialized Idu dictionary recording only Idu forms. But unlike most ordinary dictionaries, this book made up of an "Introduction" followed by a "Part One: Theory" and a "Part Two: Data" It is this latter section which corresponds to a dictionary, and the forms are arranged in Korean alphabetical order according to the modern Sino-Korean readings of the Chinese characters, followed by a definition, and example sentences with an indication of the source text. All of the Idu entries are recorded in Chinese characters. In keeping with the precedent set by earlier dictionaries, Idu forms comprised of grammatical morphemes are presented as undifferentiated chunks, without morphological analysis, but there are also occasional instances of separate Idu entries recording individual grammatical morphemes. We understand that a certain individual is preparing a new Idu dictionary worthy of rivalry or replacing this work, and dare to hope that we will soon enter a period when large-scale intensive research on Idu will become possible.
Number (21) is a collection of non-inflecting ancient terminological and Idu terms followed by definitions. There are no example sentences or indications of source texts. For the most part, the entries consist of Sino-Korean vocabulary and Idu words. The entries are recorded in hankul according to their modern Sino-Korean readings, followed by the Chinese characters enclosed in brackets. For example, entries like ‘봉상[捧上]’ and ‘위향문학[委巷文學]’ are followed by a simple definition, Idu readings like ‘반지’ or ‘맛자’ do not appear as separate entries, and these readings do not appear in the definitions, either. We also note that there are some instances like ‘되지기’ where no Chinese character or Idu rendition appears in brackets.

Number (22) is a dictionary of Sino-Korean which has appeared only recently. This work covers virtually all of the Sino-Korean vocabulary recorded in ancient documents published in Korea. Each entry provides a reliable definition followed by representative example sentences and in indication of the source text(s). But in the case of widely-known words and proper nouns, the dictionary either simply gives an indication of source text(s), or else omits the examples and source text(s) entirely.

Number (23) is a collection of materials based on the Sino-Korean vocabulary in 15th-century enhay (언해) texts and hammun documents, and consists of two main parts. One part lists as entries Sino-Korean vocabulary appearing in 15th-century enhay texts, along with one example each of representative declensional and conjugational words, followed by an indication of the source text(s). It would have been ideal if this work had included definitions, too, but unfortunately this feature is missing. Given that earlier dictionaries of pre-modern Korean tended to exclude Sino-Korean vocabulary recorded in Chinese characters, the appearance of works like this make it possible now to contemplate the compilation of dictionaries which include this impor-
tant component of the language. The other part of this work is an annotated compilation of the Korea-specific Sino-Korean vocabulary recorded in the «Gosen Wangco Sillok 朝鮮王朝實錄» and the «Kyeng-
kwuk Taycen 經國大典». This section is similar in its make-up to numbers (20) and (21), and includes one representative example for each entry, along with an indication of the source text.

Number (24) is a compendium of Korea-specific Sino-Korean vocabulary from texts issued before the Korye dynasty. Number (24), too, consists of two main parts; one treats the Korea-specific Sino-Korean vocabulary and proper nouns occurring in historical works produced in Korea like the «Samkwuk Sakti 三國史記» and the «Samkwuk Yusa 三國遺事», as well as in historical works produced in China, followed by indications of the source text(s). The other brings together Idu materials and proper nouns attested in ancient inscriptions or texts from the 'Old Korean' period of the language, along with indications of the source text(s). Examples of the structure of the entries in this work are as follows: ‘개리이 皆利伊 [高 地] 史 37.17a’ and ‘거去 [新 動] 赤城 新羅帳籍 21, 禪林院’. In other words, the first item renders in hankul the modern Sino-Korean pronunciation of the Chinese characters following it; there are no definitions or citations from texts. Even more regrettably, no readings are provided for the Idu forms. Still, we can hope that many better works will appear in future on the basis of materials like these.

Number (25) is a collection of indices designed to compare and contrast, or show the equivalencies between, the Chinese characters and Sino-Korean words in Dufu’s original Chinese poems and the Enhay renditions of these in the first edition of the «Twusi Enhay 杜詩詮解». As a work which allows the reader to grasp readily the key features and contours of the «Twusi Enhay 杜詩詮解», this work deserves praise. As more works like this one appear, it will become
considerably easier to make advances in our understanding of the history of the Korean lexicon

5. Conclusions

As we have seen above, the aspects of the pre-modern Korean lexicon have been treated in two kinds of dictionaries in Korea—as part of large-scale encyclopedic dictionaries, and as the unique subject of specialized dictionaries of earlier stages of the language. However, it is our conviction that, at least theoretically speaking, there is no reason for each of these two different types of dictionary to treat pre-modern forms differently. In this sense, it need suffice only to determine how best to organize and present pre-modern Korean forms in a specialized dictionary. Once one has solved this problem, the only remaining problem in the case of large-scale encyclopedic dictionaries of the modern language is how best to handle relic words whose orthography is the same in modern Korean as it was in earlier stages of the language. In other words, we need simply find an efficient means of indicating that such words were also used at an earlier stage in the language. Probably the best solution is to include, after the definition, a sentence to the effect that such-and-such a form was also used in earlier Korea, followed by a citation of the earliest attested example along with an indication of the source text.

Let us reflect for another moment on how best to handle pre-modern Korean forms in a specialized dictionary. At a macro level, the first problem are the entries; what shall the basic units be, how shall we select them and in what order shall we list them? Remembering that the best dictionary is a user-friendly one, we should allow our dictionaries to have as many different entries as possible without going overboard. Thus, we would not want to abandon the principle,
common to both dictionaries of modern Korean and of pre-modern
Korean, that separate declensional forms of nouns and separate
conjugational forms of verbs do not warrant their own entries. In the
case of forms which have a wide variety of attested orthographies, it
will suffice to make ample use of references like "See " or "Refer
to. . .,"32 and allow the reader to consult all the variant forms under
one representative heading. This representative heading would then
also include a definition, information about related forms, etc. As a
matter of principle, all lexical morphemes and all grammatical mor-
phemes should get their own entry. Insofar as is practical, allomorphs
would be handled by the same referral system alluded to above -- by
sending the reader to a representative heading for the definition and
other information. In the case of forms which show different pitch-
accent realizations, whether because of the so-called 'Rhythm Rules'
or because of events connected to the disappearance of distinctive
pitch-accent and the chronology of the attestations, these, too, should
be handled in a similar fashion.

It is a matter of common sense that cases of lexical items with
identical shapes, but different meanings in modern and pre-modern

32 Even if one does not present all the micro-structures after a reference entry, it would
suffice to give some examples from texts. This is because if one were to list even all the
textual examples under the main entry, there is a danger that these main entries would
become too complicated. However there is also a danger that, when example sentences are
listed separately, the reader will not have sufficient access to all the phonological,
grammatical and lexical information relevant to a word. But this may be an overstated
concern on our part, after all, those readers in need of a broad spectrum of grammatical
information are likely to make reference to the other entries and cross-reference anyway. The
easiest way to get around this problem is to present ample information about related words
and forms. The problem of whether or not to cross-reference as separate entries the
allomorphs of irregular verbs and noun forms showing special alternations can also be solved
in this way. With respect to such allomorphy, the policy adopted by the Wih Mal Rhum
Sacen (《우리말 큰사전》, 1992) could serve as a good model, and may provide a solution for
future projects to compile dictionaries of pre-modern Korean
Korean should have this state of affairs reflected properly in the dictionary. Just as in the case of recent encyclopedic dictionaries of modern Korean which include North Korean lexical items, and provide separate entries and definitions for those words which are used with different meanings in North and South Korea, dictionaries of earlier Korean, too, should adopt a similar policy with those words that have undergone semantic change. And it goes without saying that all derived forms and compound forms warrant their own separate entries. Of course, it remains as true as ever that there is no foolproof method for distinguishing certain types of compound form, and we shall have to resign ourselves to struggling collectively with this problem as we compile new dictionaries in future.

We have already noted the wide variety of alphabetization schemes in use in dictionaries of pre-modern Korean. In our opinion, those hankul letter shapes which survive in modern Korean should follow the ordering decreed in the 1989 "Hankul Macchwuppep 침술 맞춤법, i.e. "Hankul Orthography", but vowels like the 'arae a' ('. '), and consonant clusters like 'w' and 'mn', etc., should be arrayed in such a way as to conform to the pronunciation habits and (ortho-)graphic intuitions of modern speakers. But about the alphabetization of pre-modern Sino-Korean words to appear in our dictionaries in future? When we enter a noun like '次第' appears in our dictionary, it would make sense to place it after the pure Korean form '中途'. Here we also encounter the problem of whether, in the case of Sino-Korean forms like '次第', to follow the actual 15th-century pronunciation, or to follow the prescriptive readings laid out in the Tongkwanuk Cengwun 東國正韻. But even while it may be relatively easy to ascertain the actual 15th-century Sino-Korean pronunciations in many cases, it is quite difficult to verify this for each and every Sino-Korean word. It is now common practice for Koreans studying old texts to read all
the hankul symbols and Chinese characters according to the pronunciation rules of the modern language. Thus, the graph ‘ㅏ’ is usually read as a simple vowel [a] whereas in the 15th century it was pronounced as a diphthong [a]. Likewise, the consonant ‘ㅈ’ is customarily pronounced by modern speakers as a palatalized [ʃ], whereas its value in Middle Korean was [s]. In the case of a Sino-Korean words like ‘大夫’, the actual 16th-century pronunciation was something like [thaywu 대우] rather than the modern [taypu 대부], but it is nonetheless accepted practice for modern readers to use the latter pronunciation. Thus, we are in favor of giving consideration to modern pronunciations in the process of determining the alphabetization scheme for future dictionaries of pre-modern Korean. We should recognize that modern Korean speakers read the ‘아라 a’ ‘ぁ’ as ‘a’ [a], the s-cluster ‘sk’ ‘ㅅ’ as tense ‘kk’ [k], the p-cluster ‘pt’ ‘ㅂ’ as tense ‘tt’ [t], and the complex cluster ‘psk’ ‘㎡’ as tense ‘kk’ [k], and construct our alphabetization scheme accordingly. Thus, the letter ‘ぁ’ should follow ‘ㅏ’, the vowel closest to it in pronunciation, ‘ㅅ’ should follow ‘ㅅ’, ‘ㅂ’ should follow ‘ㅌ’, ‘㎡’ should follow ‘ㅁ’ and ‘ㅅ’, etc.

At the micro level, we need to pay special attention to details like the classification of parts of speech, definitions, and the presentation of example sentences, related words and items for reference. For now let us confine our discussion to the problem of example sentences – other issues have already been dealt with in some detail by Han Cayyeng (1989) and Hong Yunphyo (1992). We are of the opinion that a good dictionary should provide rich and abundant exemplification, but this is not to say that our dictionaries should be concordances, since it is impossible to list all attestations of most items. Two example sentences should suffice to show the phonological properties of an entry. Morphological and lexical information can be
accessed relatively easily through the cross-references and through the information contained in the 'related words' sections. The biggest problem is that syntactic information -- information associated primarily with predicates -- is best conveyed through rich example sentences. Because this problem has been treated in some detail in the research literature by Yi Hyenhuy (1991, 1994a), Han Cayyeng (1994), etc., we are confident that future dictionaries will record advances in this area of Korean lexicography. Nevertheless, we need more in-depth research on individual grammatical patterns associated with particular predicates. And in a number of cases we will need to break up some of the seemingly endless long sentences which appear so often in old Korean texts before incorporating certain clauses into our dictionaries as example sentences. Yi Hyenhuy (1994a) proposes breaking up long sentences like these on the basis of semantic units or groupings. These units tend to be punctuated by the connective ending '-ㄴ라'.

There is a deepening consensus in our field that it is now high time to begin compilation of both new encyclopedic dictionaries and new dictionaries of the pre-modern language, and the interest in participating in such ventures is at an all-time high. The National Academy of the Korean Language has already embarked on its 'Cong-hap Kwonke Taysacen, or Comprehensive Dictionary of the Korean Language' (working title), and a number of private universities are also engaged in similar new, large-scale dictionary projects. However, apart from the century-by-century dictionary project for Early Modern Korean underway at the Academy of Korean Studies (한국정신문화연구원) we are not aware that any group or research institution has announced

---

33 The Middle Korean verb ending in '-ㄴ라' has at least two usages, one which allows the cooccurrence of tense-aspect elements, and one which does not. Of these two types, the former has the function of completing a semantic unit or phrase (의미단락). For detailed argumentation on this point, see Yi Hyenhuy (李賢熙, 1994a)
similar plans for a new dictionary of pre-modern Korean. But as we have already seen in the case of the 1995 Dictionary of 17th-Century Korean, the Academy of Korean Studies project is more akin to a concordance or a compendium of example sentences than a pure linguistic dictionary, and the lack of other new major projects is surely evidence of the inherent difficulty of the task. To be sure, the compilation of concordances and indices is an equally important job, and we understand that a number of individual colleagues are currently preparing to embark on projects like these and on century-specific dictionaries of Middle Korean. But the fact remains that the compilation of a new dictionary of pre-modern Korean that would satisfy the criteria outlined in this article is a feat well beyond the talents and erudition of any one individual. In future, after the publication of more century-specific dictionaries, and as more and better financial and human resources become available, we can imagine a time when it will be possible to undertake a truly diachronic dictionary of pre-modern Korean.

We also need new dictionaries for chaca phyok (倣字表記) materials, i.e. native Korean linguistic materials recorded in Chinese character-based writing systems like Idu and Kwukyel (구결). The Idu Dictionary of 1976 is no longer sufficient; it does not reflect the many new Idu materials discovered from the Three Kingdoms period and the Kolye dynasty, and is lacking in morphological analysis and a critical attitude toward its source texts. We need an Idu dictionary which treats not only the Idu materials of early and later Cosen, the readings of which are well known, but also the Idu materials from the Three Kingdoms and Kolye period, the readings for which are still being studied. If possible, it would be best to compile Idu dictionaries on a period-by-

---

34 This dictionary has already been discussed in the previous section.
period basis. In the case of Kwukyel, it is well known that there are
two types -- Hankul Kwukyel and chaca- or Chinese character-based
Kwukyel Because a number of important 'Sektok Kwukyel 释讀口訣',
or Kwukyel annotations reading on the basis of Korean order (e.g.
the 《Kwuyeuk Inwang- kyeng 舊譯仁王經》 (vol. 1), 《Hwaem-kyeng
華嚴經》 vol. 14, 《Hwaem- kyeng-swo 華嚴經疏》 vol. 35, 《Yukasaci-
lon 瑜伽師地論》 vol. 20, and the 《Kumkwangmyeng-kyeng 金光明經》
vol. 3) and other 'Umtok Kwukyel 音讀口訣' or Kwukyel-annotated
materials reading on the basis of Chinese order from the 12th and
13th centuries have gradually been coming to light and stunning
Korean linguists since 1975, materials like these, too, need to be
reflected in any new dictionary or dictionaries. The fact that studies
of chaca phyoka (借字表記) materials have come into their own as a
mature branch of study since the early 1990s is also fueling demand
for this new type of specialized dictionary.

Once the dictionary activity in all these various specialized areas
gains momentum, we might, in our greedier moments, even contem-
plate additional specialized dictionaries such as a diachronic dictionary
of pre-modern Korean, a reverse Dictionary, a modern-to-pre-modern
dictionary (modern language entries with pre-modern equivalents), a
dictionary of pre-modern Korean verbs, and separate dictionaries for
parts of speech like verb, adjective and adverb. Let us remember that
the most important thing of all in lexicography is the lexicographer,
but by the same token let us not forget the readers and their needs.
Whether one speaks of dictionaries for the general user or for the
specialist, every dictionary's design needs to fit the profile of the
targeted user, and the only way to satisfy the diverse needs and
demands of a diverse readership will be to produce many different
kinds of new dictionaries.
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