

Translating *Baihua* Grammatical Elements in a Fifteenth-Century Korean Buddhist Text: Linguistic and Cultural Notes on the *Mongsan hwasang pöbö yangnok önhæ*

Itō Hideto 伊藤英人
Senshu University 専修大学

Abstract: This article examines the fifteenth-century Korean *önhæ* 諺解 exegesis of the *Mongsan hwasang pöbö yangnok* 蒙山和尚法語略錄 to determine the translation strategies used to render so-called *baihua* or vernacular Sinitic in vernacular Korean. In particular, the article aims first to clarify the linguistic features of the *baihua* materials from the late Southern Song period found in this text, and then to clarify the *baihua* comprehension and translation abilities of a fifteenth-century Buddhist intellectual who was not a trained specialist in spoken Chinese. It finds that, because Korean Buddhist temples were no longer bilingual Korean-Chinese spaces by early Chosön, and Korean Buddhist monks no longer had exposure to spoken Chinese, the Korean translator approached the *baihua* materials as if they were written in orthodox Literary Sinitic. As a result, he made a number of errors and mistranslations, especially when it came to translating vernacular Sinitic tense-aspect particles in vernacular Korean. The article concludes by briefly comparing and contrasting glossing strategies in Japan and Korea.

Keywords: *Mongsan hwasang pöbö yangnok*, *baihua*, *önhæ*, *hanmun hyönt'o* glossing, Zen recorded sayings

1. Introduction

1.1 Goals of This Article

The majority of Sinitic texts translated or annotated (provided with an *önhæ* 諺解 exegesis) in Korea since the fifteenth century are orthodox Literary Sinitic (*wenyan* 文言; henceforth LS) materials, a category that includes Buddhist materials in LS. LS is a language particularly devoid of grammatical morphology, and for this reason, the elements of tense, aspect, and mood in the translated Late Middle Korean (henceforth LMK) texts have been researched on the basis of meaning without reference to the Sinitic originals, using only the internal context of the vernacular Korean.

However, the sixteenth-century *Pönyök Nogöltæ* 翻譯老乞大 and *Pönyök Pak t'ongsa* 翻譯朴通事 from the Interpreters' Bureau are written in spoken Ming-period Chinese and therefore include many tense, aspect, and mood elements. Moreover, insofar as they are conversational texts, the setting of the spoken

utterances is emphasized. The compiler Ch'oe Sejin 崔世珍 (1468–1542), who was fluent in the spoken Chinese of the time, translated the Sinitic texts in their entirety but also left behind his commentary (*Tanjahae* 單字解), which incorporates the elements of tense, aspect, and mood, making it possible to study the tense, aspect, and mood elements of LMK in this case by comparing the vernacular and Sinitic texts.¹

But translations of so-called *baihua* 白話 materials into Korean can also be found from the fifteenth century, as seen in the *Mongsan hwasang pōbō yangnok ōnhae* 蒙山和尚法語略錄諺解, which is the focus of this article. This text differs from the *Pōnyōk Nogōltae* and *Pōnyōk Pak t'ongsa* in two respects. First, the *Pōnyōk Nogōltae* and *Pōnyōk Pak t'ongsa* use Ming-period spoken Chinese, whereas the *Mongsan hwasang pōbō yangnok ōnhae* uses spoken Chinese from the late Southern Song period. Second, the translator of *Pōnyōk Nogōltae* and *Pōnyōk Pak t'ongsa*—Ch'oe Sejin—was fluent in spoken Chinese and was an interpreter who had the opportunity to visit China and come into direct contact with spoken Chinese. By contrast, Hyegak Sinmi 慧覺信眉 (1405?–1480?), the translator of the *Mongsan hwasang pōbō yangnok ōnhae*, was a monk in the Chosŏn period and was therefore unable to visit China or to come into direct contact with spoken Chinese.

This study of the *Mongsan hwasang pōbō yangnok ōnhae* aims to demonstrate three things. First, an examination of these *baihua* materials from the late Southern Song period will clarify their linguistic features. Second, an analysis of the text can clarify the *baihua* comprehension and translation abilities of a fifteenth-century Buddhist intellectual who was not a trained specialist in spoken Chinese. Third, by comparing the particularities of the Korean translated version with other translated materials from Chosŏn (as well as Japanese Zen materials), we can gain insights into the recording and translation of Chan/Sōn materials in Chosŏn from the standpoint of cultural history.

1.2 Background to the *Mongsan hwasang pōbō yangnok ōnhae*

Written vernacular Sinitic or *baihua* first came to the Korean peninsula during the Koryŏ period (918–1392). After Koryŏ became a tributary to the Yuan, the Altaicized creole *Han'er yanyu* 漢兒言語 in use at the time in northern China came into use. The *Kubon Nogōltae* 舊本老乞大, excavated in Taegu in 1998, testifies to the spread of this form of spoken Chinese in Koryŏ. Moreover, the written language version of *Han'er yanyu*—*Mongmun chigyōk* 蒙文直譯, used in legal and penal codes beginning with the Yuan-period *Yuandianzhang* 元典章—also came into use in Korea. This written form was studied under the name of *imun* 吏文 through the Chosŏn period.

The study of spoken Chinese in the Chosŏn period was carried out continuously until the end of the nineteenth century at the Interpreter's Bureau (Sayōgwŏn 司譯院). At first, the target language was called *Han'er yanyu* but later it came to be referred to as *guanhua* 官話. Chinese *baihua* literature was also read and glossaries were compiled early on for works of vernacular fiction like the *Water Margin* (*Shuihu zhuan* 水滸傳). Confucian scholars studied *baihua* in order to read the *Categorized Conversations of Zhu Xi* (*Zhuzi yulei* 朱子語類), and for that reason the specialist glossary *Ōrokhae* 語錄解 was compiled. As pointed out by Sugiyama Yutaka (2011), some Confucian scholars in late Chosŏn also wrote in a register similar to *baihua*.

Aside from these, Zen recorded sayings (Chan *yulu* 禪語錄) were yet another genre of *baihua* materials that needed to be read. In the Chan Buddhism that gained currency after the Tang dynasty, the words of Chan masters were transmitted directly, with some part of those becoming indispensable to later Chan/Zen study in the form of koans.

Among the numerous Zen sayings, it is probably coincidence that certain collections of sayings became widely read in certain geographical areas. Mumon Ekai/Wumen Huikai's 無門慧開 (1183–1260) *Mumonkan/Wumenguan* 無門關 was not particularly popular in China but continues to be widely read in Japan even in the present, and Mengshan Deyi's 蒙山德異 (1232–?) sayings, the *Mongsan pōbō* 蒙山法語, are widely read on the Korean peninsula even today. Each of these collections came to be popular in Japan and Korea, respectively, according to chance occurrence.²

As is recorded in *Pak t'ongsa* (among other sources), the Koryō monk Pou 普愚 (1301–82) held Buddhist services at Yongning Temple 永寧寺 in Dadu in 1347. Naturally, *Han'er yanyu* was the likely means for the sermons. Prior to this, the Indian monk Zhikong 指空/Dhyāna-bhadra 提納薄陀 (?–1363), who was staying in Yuan, visited Koryō. Zhikong came into contact with numerous monks from Koryō in Dadu, and their exchanges are recorded. Let us examine one example, an exchange between Zhikong and the esteemed Naong Hyegün 懶翁慧勤 (1320–76), the Koryō monk responsible for compiling the *Mongsan pōbō*. The conversation is from 1358, when Hyegün first met Zhikong at Fayuan temple 法源寺 in Dadu.

(1) 空又問: 汝從高麗來, 東海那邊 見來也未?

jian4-lai2-ye3wei4

see-PERF-PERFINTRG (did you see?)

師云: 若不見, 淨得到這裏? (cited from Yi Nūnghwa 1918: *chung* 255)

Zhikong asked, “As you came from Koryō, have you seen all the areas around the East China Sea?”

The master replied, “If I had not, how could I have arrived here?”

The first underlined section, 見來也未 (“did you see?”) and the second 這裏 (“here”) are prototypical *baihua*, and there are many examples like this in other Koryō materials as well.

Because Zen temples in Japan received many monks from China at the end of the Southern Song and beginning of the Yuan, Zen temples in Japan functioned as bilingual spaces where both Japanese and spoken Chinese were used.³ At the end of the Ming and beginning of the Qing, too, many monks seeking asylum were received from China, and at temples like Ōbaku-san Manpuku-ji in Uji, Chinese monks were invited generation after generation to serve as head priest, an example of Chinese continuing to be used in the Edo period.

After Hyegün entered the priesthood, his first enlightenment experience happened upon meeting the Japanese monk Sekiō 石翁 (dates unknown) who spent time in Hoeöm temple 檜嚴寺 in Koryō from time to time. As was the case in Japan with Zen temples, Sön temples on the Korean peninsula in the Koryō period must have been spaces where spoken Chinese was in popular use. A letter addressed to the monk Pou from the high priest Paegun Kyōngghan 白雲景閑 (1353–?), born in North Chōlla, contains the following expression:

(2) 同參底事作麼生? (Eda Toshio 1977: 262)

What should we do about studying under the same master?

Here we see the *baihua* grammatical markers *di3* 底 (nominalizer) and *zuo4 ma2 sheng1* 作麼生 used in written correspondence between two Koryō monks.

After Hyegün met Zhikong in Dadu, they went on foot to Jiangnan, and in 1360 celebrated vassa at Pingjiangfu 平江府 in Jiangnan. This was when Hyegün had the opportunity to read the sayings of Mongsan Deyi. Hyegün took notes on the main points and returned to Koryō. It is thought that this summary was the basis for the *Mongsan hwasang pōbō yangnok ōnhae* examined in this article.

Why was it that Hyegün summarized the sayings of Mongsan Deyi, a Southern Song monk from nearly one hundred years earlier? The following record can be found in Yi Nūnghwa (1918: *ha* 864):

(3) 高麗寶鑑國師碑。中吳蒙山異禪師，作無極說。附海舶以寄之。師默領其意。自號無極云々。疑即此蒙山也

Inscription from the master from Koryō, Pogam Province. Zen master Mongsanyi of Jiangnan made an infinite doctrine, put it on a ship, and sent it off. The master from Pogam said nothing and understood the reason for this, and said on his own that his name was Infinite. This was probably Mongsan Deyi.

The Koryō royal family had a close relationship with Mongsan Deyi, and this may have been one motive for having Hyegün summarize Mongsan's sayings.⁴

Hyegün's dharma was inherited by Muhak Chach'ō 無學自超 (1327–1405). Muhak Chach'ō was the royal priest to King T'aejo (r. 918–43). Muhak Chach'ō's dharma was succeeded by Hamhō Kihwa 涵虛己和 (1376–1433). Later the Korean translation of Mongsan's sayings by Hyegün, that is, the *Mongsan hwasang pōbō yangnok ōnhae*, was written by Hyegak Sinmi, who, according to Yi Nūnghwa (1918: *ha* 876) and Kamata Shigeo (1987: 221), was connected to Hamhō's reception of the dharma.⁵ Because the base text of this work was already an "abbreviated sayings" 略錄, it was—just as the *Mumonkan* was popular in Japan as a "compact sayings that practitioners could keep in their pocket to encourage their sitting meditation"—widely and popularly read in Chosōn.⁶ What must be carefully considered is that when the translator Hyegak Sinmi lived, Sön temples in Chosōn

were no longer bilingual spaces, and unlike monks in the Koryŏ period, Chosŏn monks were no longer able to travel to China or interact with Chinese monks.

As is well known, from the inception of the Chosŏn period Confucianism was esteemed and Buddhism was suppressed. Conversely, in the royal family, Buddhism was practiced until the middle of the fifteenth century, and among historical kings, Sejo (世祖, r. 1455–68) in particular venerated Buddhism most of all. In 1459, five years after his accession, the *Wŏrin Sŏkpo* 月印釋譜 was published, and in the same year a royal office of Buddhist publishing, the Kan'gyŏng togam 刊經都監, was established for the translation and printing of Buddhist documents. This publishing office was not in the king's palace but out on the public streets, and with exclusive rice fields in Hwanghae Province set up as its source of funding, it continuously employed nearly two hundred monks. The primary missions of the Kan'gyŏng togam were threefold: publication of the Chinese translation of the Great Treasury of Sutras 大藏經, editing of Ŭich'ŏn's 義天 (1055–1101) collected materials, and translation of the Buddhist canon. The commoner Kim Suon 金守溫 (1409–81) and the monks Hyegak Sinmi, Hagyŏl 學悅, and Hakcho 學祖 were the primary individuals charged with the Korean translation of the Buddhist canon. However, due to the tenacious opposition of Confucian ministers, in 1471 the Kan'gyŏng togam was abolished. Still, Sinmi, Hagyŏl, and especially Hakcho continued to be venerated until the reign of Sŏngjong and continued their translation of the canon. The *Sŏngjong Sillok* calls them the “three preceptors” 三和尚.⁷

Ever since Moguja Chinul 牧牛子知訥 (1158–1210) started the Chogyejong sect 曹溪宗 at Songgwang Temple in Sunch'ŏn, Korean Buddhism has supported sectarian customs that value both the silent reading of sutras and recitation of the Buddha's name. But for monks in the Chosŏn period, was it indispensable to be able to read and understand the *baihua* in Sŏn sayings? This is not the case.

As discussed in Itō (2004a, 2011), the examination subjects for the state examination for Buddhist monks in the Chosŏn period were stipulated as follows.

(4) 爲僧者三朔內告禪宗或教宗試誦經[心經金剛薩怛陀] (*Kyŏngguk Taejŏn* 經國大典, 度僧條)

Those wishing to become monks must announce whether they are of the Sŏn or Kyo sect three months in advance, and an examination in sutra reading will commence [Heart Sutra and Vajrasattva].

The founder's koans required for sitting meditation were given to each practitioner by their masters and existed for the practitioners to contemplate their meaning. There was no need to memorize these in *baihua*; rather it was important for them to correctly understand the “contents” of the subject. *Mongsan hwasang pŏbŏ yangnok ōnhae* was translated into Korean to meet this particular need.

2. Philological Observations

2.1 *The Text of the Mongsan hwasang pŏbŏ yangnok ōnhae*

According to Shibu Sōhei (1983), the *Mongsan hwasang pŏbŏ yangnok ōnhae* was compiled from 1459 to 1461. The oldest manuscripts of the T1 type are the

Tongmun'gwan facsimile, the Simwōnsa-bon 深源寺本 (1525), and the Yujōmsa-bon 楡岾寺本 (1521). In the next T2 type are the Kounsa-bon 孤雲寺本 (1517) and the Pingbaram-bon 氷鉢庵本 (1525), and in the later T3 woodblock variety there is the Songgwangsa-bon 松廣寺本 (1577). Concerning variant texts, there is an article by Pak Pyōngch'ae (1980) and an examination and comparison by Takekoshi Takashi (2004). Details on the particularities of the Korean in the *ōnhae* section are provided by Tamotsu Nakamura (1963). This article uses the explication of the base text by Yi Kimun ([1978] 1996).

The base text includes *hyōnt'ō* 懸吐 or “appended grammatical glosses,” and the *hyōnt'ō* sections include pitch-accent dots (*pangchōm* 傍點). These are features held in common with *ōnhae* texts of the Buddhist canon from before the *Amit'ā kyōng ōnhae* 阿彌陀經諺解, printed in *ūlhae* typeface 乙亥字本 and estimated to have been printed in 1461, and thus they differ from the characteristics of the Buddhist *ōnhae* issued by the Kan'gyōng togam in the 1462 printing. The readings for sinographs in T1- and T2-type texts use the artificial *Tongguk chōngun* 東國正韻 pronunciations, but the Songgwangsa-bon includes traditional sinograph readings.

For the contents of the base text, the sections “示古原上人” (1–10), “示覺圓上人” (10–20), “示淮正上人” (20–30), “示聰上人” (30–50), “無字十節目” (50–63), and “休休庵主座禪文” (63–69) were brought by Hyegūn from China, whereas “示覺悟禪人法語” (69–70) was written by Hyegūn himself. The sections “休休庵主座禪文” and “示覺悟禪人法語” are in LS and thus fall outside the scope of this examination.

3. Characteristic Features of the Chinese Language in the *Mongsan pōbō*

As seen above, the *Mongsan pōbō* are sayings that were not particularly reflected on in China. For previous research on the *baihua* in *Mongsan pōbō*, see Takekoshi (2004) and Itō (2004b, 2005).⁸ Here I generally follow Takekoshi (2004) and stop at a cursory examination of a few particularities, taking up four concrete examples of sections translated into Korean for examination in detail.

There are eight examples of the second-person pronoun {你 ni3} and two of {汝 ru3}. This is the same as in the *Zutangji* 祖堂集 and *Wumenguan*. For interrogative personal pronouns, there are four examples of {阿誰 a1-shui2}, and for proximal demonstrative pronouns there are seven examples of {者箇 zhe3ge4} and one of {者裏 zhe3li3}. This is very close to *Wumenguan*. Takekoshi (2004) claims that on the whole *Mongsan pōbō* resembles *Wumenguan* in terms of vocabulary and grammatical form, but as characteristics not seen in *Wumenguan*, he raises the usage of the measure word 介,⁹ the adverbs {未有 wei4you3} and {無有 wu2you3}, and the adverb {不要 bu4yao4}. He also finds that the adverb {地 di4} is rare in the *Wumenguan* but frequently used in *Mongsan pōbō*, and conversely, that {却 que4} and the counter {向 xiang4} appear in the *Wumenguan* but are rare in *Mongsan pōbō* (among other observations).

In terms of aspect markers, there are seven examples of the continuative {著 zhuo2}. However, as I will discuss later, {著 zhuo2} is not only a continuative but was also used to indicate experience as a perfective. This will be raised in section 4.

4. Aspects of Korean Translations of *Baihua* Grammatical Morphemes

4.1 Translations by Sŏn monks during the Monolingual Period

As seen in section 1.2, unlike the Chinese as a living language seen among monks in the Koryŏ period, temples in the Chosŏn period when the translators of *Mongsan hwasang pŏbŏ yangnok ōnhae* lived were monolingual Korean spaces.¹⁰ Sinmi had no travel experience in China, nor was he a specialist in spoken Chinese. Among Korean language translations of *baihua* materials in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, this text, which was translated by nonspecialists of Chinese, displays the following aspects of *baihua* grammatical elements in Korean translation.

4.2 Affixation

4.2.1 Prefixes

(5) 他是阿誰 (20b)

ta1 shi4 a1-shui2

he be PREF-who

(5') *nom on nwu kwo*

others-TOP who-INTRG

Who are the others?

As stated by Takata Tokio (1988: 232) and Song Shaonian (2002: 165–73), the prefix {阿 a1-} is already present in the *Sanguozhi* 三國志 and also in the materials from Dunhuang. Here {阿誰 a1-shui2} is always translated as {*nwu*}, whereas *nom* for the third-person pronoun 他 is a mistranslation.

4.2.2 Suffixes

(6) 作麼生 (56a)

zuo4-ma2-sheng1

how -SUF

(6') *este ho-nywo?*

how do-INTRG

How is it?

(7) 你作麼生會 (54a)

ni3 zuo4-ma2-sheng1 hui4

you how -SUF know

- (7') *ne-non estyey a-no-nta?*
 you-TOP how know-PRS-INTRG
 How do you know?

{生-sheng1} is a suffix that derives the meaning of a certain state, and appears frequently in the *Zutangji* and other texts.¹¹ In our text, {作麼生 zuo4ma2-sheng1} is the only example seen. As in 6', this is translated as a verb with {*ho-*}, but as an adverb when it accompanies another verb as in 7'.

4.3 Resultative Verb Compounds

4.3.1 破-po4

- (8) 趙州古佛眼皮說破四天下 (53b)
 zhao4zhou1 gu3- fo2 yan3- pi2 shuo1-po4 si4 tian1xia4
 Zhaozhou old- Buddha eye-skin bright-broken four heaven-under
- (8') TTYWOWCYWUW KWOØPPWULQ s nwun s KWANGMYENG i
 Zhaozhou old-Buddha-GEN eye-GEN light-NOM
 SOTHYENHHA lol *pichwuy-no-ta*
 four heaven-under-ACC brighten-PRS-FIN
 The light of the eyes of Zhaozhou, Buddha of the past, illuminates all under heaven.
- (9) 捉破趙州 (60b)
 zhuo1-po4 zhao4zhou1
 catch-broken Zhaozhou
- (9') TTYWOWCYWUW lol *cap-omye*
 Zhaozhou-ACC catch-CVB
Catch Zhaozhou.
- (10) 勘破佛祖得人憎處 (60b)
 kan4-po4 fo2 zu3 de2 ren2 zeng1 chu4
 consider-broken Buddha masters obtain person hate place
- (10') *pwuthye [G]wa CWOØSOØ [G]wa y salom oy muy-Gi-sy-an*
 Buddha-and masters-and-NOM person-GEN hate-PASS-HON-ADNL
kwot ol kus al-myen
 place-ACC ADV know-COND
 If you understand completely the things hated of Buddha and the masters by people.

The verb {破 po4} has the present-day meaning of “destroy,” but when functioning as a resultative it means “to do something incessantly or completely.”¹² This meaning is not reflected in the LMK translations in examples 8’ and 9’. Conversely, in 10’, it is translated using the adverb {kus} to mean “completely.”

4.3.2 盡-jin4

(11) 發盡正信心 (7b)

fa1-jin4 zheng4-xin4-xin1

send-out-exhaust the faith

(11’) CYENG_{ho-n} SINSIM ol PELQ-ho-ya

right-VZ-ADNL faith-ACC send-out-VZ-CVB

Completely put forth the correct faith, and . . .

(12) 發盡正信心

fa1-jin4 zheng4-xin4-xin1 (23b)

send-out-exhaust the faith

(12’) cyeng-ho-n SINSIM ol kocang PELQ-ho-ya

right-VZ-ADNL faith-ACC to-the-last send-out-VZ-CVB

Completely put forth the correct faith to the utmost.

(13) 捨盡一切世間心 (23b)

she3-jin4 yi1-qie4 shi4-jian1-xin1

abandon-exhaust all loka-dhatu-mind

(13’) QILQCHYEY SYEYØKAN oy s mozom ol kocang poli-kwo

all loka-dhatu-LOC-GEN mind-ACC to-the-last abandon-CVB

Completely give up all of your feelings for the outside world, and . . .

The verb {盡 jin4} originally means “exhaust,” but as a resultative, it means “to do something completely,” similarly to {破-po4}.¹³ The base sentences for examples 11 and 12 are exactly the same, but whereas the resultative meaning is not reflected in 11’, examples 12’ and 13’ use *kocang* as an adverb thereby incorporating the meaning of {盡-jin4}.

4.4 Potentiality

As seen in Li and Thompson (1981: 56–57), {得 de2} with the meaning of “to get” ended up functioning as a kind of infix to mean possibility. This is the type A of the pattern V + 得 + N noted by Ōta Tatsuo (1988: 179).

(14) 識得差別機緣 (29b)

shi2 - de2 cha1-bie2 ji1-yuan2

know-obtain various opportunity

(14') yelekaci s KUYØYWUYEN ol al-a

various-GEN opportunity-ACC know-CVB

Be aware of various opportunities, and . . .

(15) 保持得話頭 (27a)

bao3-chi2-de2 hua4-tou2

maintain-obtain koan

(15') HHWAYØTTWUW lol PYPENQAN hi tiny-e

koan-ACC comfortably possess-CVB

Comfortably keep the koan, and . . .

(16) 忽然入得定時 (17b)

hu1-ran2 ru4-de2 ding4 shi2

suddenly enter-obtain samadhi time

(16') HWOLQZYEN TTYENG ey tu-n psk uy

suddenly samadhi-LOC enter-ADNL time-LOC

When you suddenly entered samadhi,

(17) 夢中亦記得話頭 (4b)

Meng4 zhong1 ji4-de2 hua4-tou2

dream in remember-obtain koan

(17') skwum ey two HHWAYØTTWUW lol yenc-uli-ni

dream-LOC-also koan-ACC put-on-FUT-CVB

Because you are even placing koan in your dreams, . . .

The {得-de2} in 14 and 16 is not reflected at all in the Korean translation, and it is impossible to see from the translation that the element of potentiality is included in the original. Next, observe how this works in the negative.

(18) 透不得 (11b)

tou4-bu4-de2

penetrate-not-obtain

(18') *somos-ti* *mwot ho-myen*

penetrate-NZ cannot do-COND

If you cannot see through to that . . .

{透不得 tou4-bu4-de2} is the only example seen of a negative usage, but at any rate the meaning of nonpotentiality is faithfully translated.

4.5 Complex Stative Construction

The complex stative construction (CSC) is a form that includes {得 de2} while also incorporating potential. As Ōta (1988: 179) has stated, this construction is not seen in the *Zutangji*, and naturally, this construction does not occur in LS. An example of a prototypical complex stative construction as seen in Li and Thompson (1981: 623) is as follows:

(19) Li3si4 lai2 de zhen1 qiao3

Lisi come CSC real coincidental

It was a coincidence that Lisi came.

The examples seen in *Mongsan pōbō* are of the type V + 得 + ADJ. In order to translate elements that do not exist in LS, the translator used three differing methods.

(20) 疑得重 (16a)

yi2 de2 zhong4

doubt CSC heavy

(20') *NGUYØSIM* i *TTYWUNG* *ho-myen*

doubt-NOM heavy-COND

If doubts are large, . . .

(21) 坐得端正 (2a)

zuo4 de2 duan1-zheng4

sit CSC straight

(21') *anc-wotoy* *TWANCYENG* *hi* *ho-li-la*

sit-CVB straight do-FUT-FIN

When sitting, I will do so neatly.

(22) 道得諦當 (20b)

dao4 de2 di4-dang1
 say CSC rightly

(22') *mastanghi nilo-myen*

rightly say-COND
 If said correctly,

In 20 and 21, the same *baihua* construction is used, but 20' renders {V 得} as N, whereas 21' translates {V 得} as a verb with accessive –*wotoy*, translates the adjective 端正 that comes later as an adverb, and changes the word order.

4.6 Aspect Markers

4.6.1 却–*que4*

In the examples below, I examine how aspect markers that had already grammaticalized in early *baihua* or alternatively had been present in that process are expressed in translation. First, I take up {却–*que4*}.

(23) 若忘却話頭 (17b)

ruo4 wang4-que4 hua4-tou2
 if forget-PERF koan

(23') *HHWAYØTTWUW [G]wos nic-umyen*

koan-COND forget-COND
 If you forget the koan, . . .

(24) 或忘話頭 (37a)

huo4 wang4 hua4-tou2(37a)
 if forget koan

(24') *hotaka HHWAYØTTWUW lol nic-e*

if koan-ACC forget-CVB
 If you forget the koan, . . .

There are numerous theories about the grammaticalization of {却–*que4*}, but comparing examples 23' and 24' above, we can see that the Korean translator was oblivious to the existence of {却–*que4*}.

4.6.2 也–*ye3*

On the other hand, the perfect marker {也–*ye3*} is seen in the translation.¹⁴

(25) 許多弊病都拈去也 (58a)

xu3-duo1 bi4-bing4 dou1 nian1-qu4 ye3
 many drawback all pick-up go-PERF

(25') hanahan woy-ta ho-nwo-n PPYENG ul ta ket-e poly-/G|e-ni

many wrong-FIN say-PRS-ADNL disease ACC all pick-up-PERF-PERF-CVB
 Because all of you have taken away many handicaps,

Because the patterns in {-e poli-} and {-Ge-} that express the perfect in fifteenth-century Korean are used together here, the perfect as seen in the original is translated accurately.

4.6.3 了也 -liao3ye3

As seen in Itō (2008), in the *Pönyök Nogöltae* Ch'oe Sejin translates the perfect maker as seen below, but the translator of *Mongsan pöbö*, as will be discussed later, mistranslates this formal element.

(26) 錯了也瞎漢 (56b)

cuo4-liao3-ye3 xia1-han4
 make a failure-PERF blind-man

(26') kulu a-n nwun me-n salom i-lwo-ta

wrongly-know-ADNL blind-ADNL person-COP-EXCL-FIN
 It is a person who cannot see and mistakenly understands.

4.6.4 了-liao3

(27) 悟了更問悟後事件 (10a)

wu4-liao3 geng4 wen4 wu4 hou4 shi4-jian4
 enlightened-PERF again ask awakening afterward event

(27') al-Gwo za tasi a-n HHWUW s il tolh ol mwul-ula

enlighted-CVB awaken-ADNL afterward-GEN thing-PL-ACC ask-IMP
 Ask about the things before enlightenment only after becoming enlightened.

The construction in {V 了} expresses a state of completion. In the translation, by using an adverb that shows posterior taxis, it succeeds in translating the original.

4.6.5 *Frequentative*

The method of expressing frequency by using V来V去 is, according to Ōta (1988: 179), seen in the *Zutangji*. This pattern in the two examples below is mistranslated:

(28) 看來看去 (15b)

kan4-lai2 kan4-qu4

see-FREQ see-FREQ

Sees frequently.

(28') wo-lq cey pwo-mye ka-lq cey pwo-mye

come-ADNL time see-CVB go-ADNL time see-CVB

Sees when coming, and sees when departing, and . . .

(29) 疑來疑去 (15b)

yi2-lai2 yi2-qu4

doubt-FREQ doubt-FREQ

Doubts frequently.

(29') wo-lq cey NGUYØSIM-ho-mye ka-lq cey NGUYØSIM-hoya pwo-mye

come-ADNL time doubt-VZ-CVB go-ADNL time doubt-VZ-CVB

Doubts when coming, and doubts when departing.

4.6.6 *Durative*

(30) 築著磕著 (29a)

zhu2-zhuo2 ke1-zhuo2

poke-DUR knock-DUR

(30') mas-tol-a

one-another-strike-CVB

Crashing into each other, and . . .

The string 築著磕著 does not clarify the verbs 築 and 磕 in telicity, and here can be taken as durative. The translator states the following in an intercalary note:

(31) 築著磕著 *non mastotta honwon mal ini* (9b8–10a1)

築著磕著 means crashing into each other.

This gloss manages to capture the meaning of 著 in translation across the whole passage.

- (32) 曾切著者箇無字否 (60b)
- ceng2 qie1-zhuo2 zhe3 ge4 wu2 zi4 fou3
 once cut-DUR this CLSF Mu character INTRG
- (32') *alayi MWUØ-q CCOØ two saki-twoswo-niya*
 once this 無-GEN character-also cut-EXCL-INTRG
- Was this “nothing” character perhaps cut earlier?

The verb 切 (“cut”) is telic, and 著 here is a method for expressing experience. The translator translates this correctly.

4.6.7 Experiential

The verb {過-guo4} is a resultative that expresses completion, but in the process of grammaticalization, it became an aspect marker for experience in the Song period.¹⁵

- (33) 看過藏教藏教儒道諸書 (45b)
- kan4-guo4 zang4-jiao4 ru2 dao4 zhu1-shu1
 read-EXPER all-sutras Confucian Daoist PL-book
- (33') *ITAYØCCANGKYENG imye ZYWUØ [G]wa TTWOW [G]wa ha-n*
 all sutras and Confucian and Daoist and many-ADNL
- kul ul ta pwo-a*
 texts ACC all see-CVB
- Read all the many sutras and Confucian and Daoist [materials].

Here the {過-guo4} is ignored. With LMK adverb :*ta* “all; in its/their entirety,” only the meaning of completion is reflected.

4.7 Sentence Final Particles

4.7.1 Intensive {在 zai4}

In *baihua*, there is a sentence-final particle that expresses modality and does not exist in LS. According to Cao Guangshun (1994: 172), this is a sentence-final particle that appears in the *Zutangji* and in Zen sayings.

- (34) 山僧拄杖子亦未肯打你在 (52a)
- shan1-seng1 zhu4-zhang4-zi3 wei4 ken3 da3 ni3 zai4
 mountain-monk rod not yet dare hit you SFP

- (34') SANSUNG uy maktahi lwo two stwo ne lul thi-kwočye ani ho-li-ni
 mountain-monk-GEN rod-INST-also again you-ACC hit-VOL not do-FUT-FIN
 I dare not hit you with my rod.

- (35) 工夫不得力在 (8a)
 gong1-fu1 bu4 de2 li4 zai4
 efforts not obtain powers SFP
 one's efforts will not be able to attain force

- (35') KWONGPWUØ y him ul et-ti mwot ho-li-la
 efforts-NOM powers-ACC obtain-NZ cannot do-FUT-FIN
 one's efforts will not be able to attain force

For some reason the future prefinal ending {-li-} is used here, and no intensive or emphatic meaning is reflected in the Korean.

4.7.2 Interrogatives

There are four unique sentence-final interrogative particles used in *baihua*: {也無 ye3 wu2}, {也未 ye3 wei4}, {否 fou3}, and {麼 ma2}.¹⁶

- (36) 狗子還有佛性也無 (1a)
 gou3-zi3 huan2 you3 fo2-xing4 ye3 wu2
 dog also have Buddha-Nature SF

- (36') kahi nun PPWULQSYENG i is-no-n i-ngi s ka eps-un i-ngi s ka
 dog-TOP Buddha-Nature exist-HON-INTRG lack-PRES-HON-INTRG
 Does a dog also have a Buddhist nature or not?

- (37) 覺也未 (12b)
 jue2 ye3 wei4
 awaken SFP

- (37') a-no-nta mwolo-no-nta
 know-PRES-INTRG not-understand-PRES-INTRG
 Are you enlightened or not?

- (38) 還有要妙過此無字否 (62a)
 huan2 you3 yao4 miao4 guo4 ci3 wu2 zi4 fou3
 also exist importance pass this Mu character SFP

- (38') *twolohhye cwozoloWoywo-m i i MWUØ-q CCOØ eysye nem-uni*
 actually important-NZ-NOM this 無-GEN character-ABL pass-NZ
is-no-niya eps-uniya
 exist-PRES-INTRG lack-INTRG

Actually, is there anything even more superior to this “nothing” character or not?

- (39) 會麼 (20a)

hui4 ma2

understand SFP

- (39') *al-a-nta*

understand-PERF-INTRG

Understand?

Excepting {麼 *ma2*}, everything in the translation is translated as additional interrogative sentences. This pattern is frequently seen in the sixteenth-century texts *Nogöltae* and *Pak t'ongsa*, and it can be assumed that Chinese interrogative sentences translated into Korean were done so using this one fixed and literal (albeit etymologically accurate) translation method.

4.8 Nominalizers

In this work, examples of the nominalizer {底 *di3*} are all translated using an adnominal ending.

- (40) 有超佛越祖底作略 (50a)

you3 chao1 fo2 yue4 zu3 di3 zuo4-lüe4

exist surpass Buddha surpass masters NZ idea

- (40') *pwuthye skuy teu-mye CWOSOØ ay nem-un hyeyalywom i is-ta*

Buddha-DAT surpass-CVB master-LOC surpass-ADNL(past) idea-NOM exist-FIN

There is an idea that surpasses the Buddhas and masters.

- (41) 開差別智底鑰匙 (53a)

kai1 cha1-bie2-zhi4 di3 yao4-chi2

open prabheda-tattva NZ key

- (41') *CHAØPPYELQTIØHHYWUYEY lol ye-l yelswoy 'la*

prabheda-tattva-ACC open-ADNL(FUT) key(-COP)-FIN

It is a key that opens discrimination.

4.9 Prepositions

The preposition {將 *jiang1*} can serve as either the instrumental or the accusative case. As it originally had the meaning of “to hold,” it is continuous with the following serial verb construction.

(42) 莫將閑學解埋沒祖師心 (57a)

Mo4 *jiang1* xian2 xue2-jie3 mai2-mo4 zu3-shi1 xin1
 don't PREP superficial knowledge bury master mind

(42') *sywokyel eps-un poyhwa alwom ol tiny-e CWOØSOØSIM ol mwut-epoli-ti*

superficial-adnominal knowledge-ACC have-CVB master mind-ACC bury-NZ
mal-wolq ti 'Geta
 stop-obligatory

One should not bury the master's intentions with superficial knowledge.

(43) 却不得將心待悟 (14a)

que4 bu4 de2 *jiang1* xin1 dai4 wu4
 also not obtain PREP mind wait awakening

(43') *stwo mozom kac-y-e alwom kituli-wom i mwot ho-li-mye*

also mind have-CVB awakening wait-NZ-NOM cannot do-FUT-CVB

Moreover waiting for enlightenment with your mind will not do.

Here {將 *jiang1*} is translated in LMK as {have-CVB} with the stems *tini-* and *kaci-*. This contrasts with {以 *yi3*} in LS usually being translated as instrumental. It is fairly common cross-linguistically for verbs with the meaning “hold” to undergo grammaticalization to serve as instrumentals or accusatives (cf. modern Korean *kaciko*, which would work well in example 43'), but no judgment here is made on whether this is a parallel development in both Korean and Chinese or translation borrowing.¹⁷

4.10 Serial Verb Construction

The serial verb construction, which uses independent words in sequence, is translated into Korean using a chaining structure.¹⁸ In *ŏnhae* exegeses of Buddhist texts it is conventional to translate the previous verb into an adverbial structure word for word, but in this translation, there are also cases where it is omitted.

(44) 又去坐 (3b)

you4 *qu4* zuo4

again go sit

- (44') *stwo anc-a*
 again sit-CVB
 sit again

In this and other examples, the translation is of the general impression of the original (here omitting 去 in the Korean). Next is a composite sentence using 有, but it is not translated word for word.

- (45) 有疑提撕 (27a)

you3 yi2 ti2-sil
 exist doubt hold

- (45') NGUYØSIM ul captul-myen

doubt-ACC hold-COND
 If one raises doubts, . . .

- (46) 縱有風動 (27b)

zong4 you3 feng1 dong4
 even-if exist wind move

- (46') pilwok polom i mwuy-e two

even- if wind-NOM move-CVB
 Even if the wind blows, . . .

The 有 above is a marker that introduces “doubts” and “wind” as new/focused information, and the translated sentence matches the meaning of the original.

4.11 Causative Construction

The *baihua* marker {教 jiao4 (lit. “teach”)} is translated correctly.

- (47) 教疑團日盛 (15a)

jiao4 yi2-tuan2 ri4 sheng4
 CAUS doubts day bigger

- (47') NGUYØTTWAN i nal lwo SSYENGkhey hoy-a

doubts-NOM daily big-ADV do-CVB
 Making doubts grow larger by the day, and . . .

4.12 Classifiers

The measure word {箇 *ge4*} need not be translated in most instances, and indeed, the Korean translation here typically omits it.¹⁹

(48) 如是主張箇無字甚奇特 (61b)

ru2-shi4 zhu3-zhang1 ge4 wu2 zi4
in-this-way emphasize CLSF Mu character

(48') *i kothi MWUØ-q CCOØ lol twotwoa pwo-kentayn*

this like 無-GEN character-ACC emphasize-COND

Even emphasizing the “nothing” character like this, . . .

(49) 單單提箇話頭 (34b)

dan1-dan1 ti2 ge4 hua4-tou2
simply hold CLSF koan

(49') *tamontamon HHWAYØTTWUW lol cap-a*

simply koan-ACC hold-CVB

Simply holding up a koan . . .

5. Characteristic Features of Hyegak's Translations

5.1 Mistranslations

As seen above, while some translations of *baihua* elements are correct, there are other cases of mistranslation in this work.

(50) 釈迦弥勒猶是他奴 他是阿誰 (20b)

shi4jia1 mi2le4 you2 shi4 ta1 nu2 ta1 shi4 a1-shui2
sākya metteya also COP he servant he COP PREF-who

syekka miluk i wohilye nom oy cywong ila honi
sākya metteya-NOM on-the-contrary other-GEN servant-COP-FIN say

nom on *nwu kwu?*

he-TOP who-INTRG

One can say that Guatama and Maitrya are slaves to another, but who is this other?

This *baihua* 他 obviously functions as the third-person pronoun “he,” but Hyegak translates it as “an other; somebody else.” The same mistranslation appears in 20b.

(51) 雖然趙州道無 你作麼生會 (54b)

sui1ran2 zhao4 zhou1 wu2 ni3 zuo4 ma2 sheng1 hui4

pilwok kuleho-na TTYWOWCYWUW y nilo-n MWUØ lul ne nun

however so-CVB Zhaozhou-NOM say-ADNL 無-ACC you-TOP

estyey a-no-nta?

how know-PRS-INTRG

Even if that is the case, how is it that you know the “nothing” spoken by Zhaozhou?

First, while everything up through 雖然趙州道無 is a subordinate clause, meaning that 雖然 modifies everything up to 無, 雖然 is taken in Korean as *pilwok kuleho-na* (“Even if that is the case”) and only modifies up to 然. Second, the V+O construction 道無 is mistranslated as “spoken nothing” in an attributive modifying construction. This is already mistranslated at the *hyōnt’o* glossing stage that preceded the *ōnhæ*:

(51') 雖然 *hona* 趙州 *y* 道 *hwon* 無 *lol* 你 *non* 作麼生會 *hononta* (54b)

This suggests that 雖然 was understood as two words in the manner of LS. Ōta (1987: 305) has argued that 雖然’s loss of its original lexical meaning and lexicalization as a single compound dates from after the Tang period. Hyegak and Sinmi applied *hyōnt’o* glosses in the style of LS, thereby rendering the *ōnhæ* as *pilwok kuleho-na*. Thus, in order to float 趙州道無, 道無 was understood as an attributive modifying construction.²⁰

In the next example we also see the the misconstruing of something as a compound due to a lack of knowledge of the final particle aspect makers of *baihua*, and the section that ends up floating is taken again as an attributive modifying construction. This is a repeat of the saying in 26 and 26’.

(52) 錯了也瞎漢 (56b)

cuo4-liao3-ye3 xial-han4

make a failure –PERF blind-man

(52') *kulu a-n nwunme-n salom i-lwo-ta*

wrongly-know-ADNL blind-ADNL person-ADNL-EXCL-FIN

He’s someone who cannot see and mistakenly understood.

Because the translators did not understand the final particle {了也-liao3-ye3}, the phrase 錯了 is translated as an adverb + verb construction, “mistakenly understood.” Originally, the final particle 也 in the following sentence was omitted in order to modify 瞎漢, and 錯了也瞎漢 ended up being understood as an attributive modifying construction.

The extreme lack of knowledge about *baihua* aspect markers is also seen in the following example. This is a repeat saying of the section from 28 to 29’.

(53) 看來看去 (15b)

kan4-lai2 kan4-qu4

see-FREQ see-FREQ

(53’) wo-lq cey pwo-mye ka-lq cey pwo-mye

come-ADNL time see-CVB go-ADNL time see-CVB

Sees when coming, and sees when departing.

(54) 疑來疑去 (15b)

yi2-lai2 yi2-qu4

doubt-FREQ doubt-FREQ

(54’) wo-lq cey NGUYØSIM-ho-mye ka-lq cey NGUYØSIM-hoya pwo-mye

come-ADNL time doubt-VZ-CVB go-time doubt-VZ-CVB

Doubts when coming, and doubts when departing.

The aspect markers from the *Zutangji* as seen above do not exist in LS and this likely caused the mistranslation.²¹

These mistranslations reflect that Hyegak and Sinmi were monks in the fifteenth century when contact with China had ended, unlike in the Koryŏ period. With the exception of the sections that had been transmitted from master to disciple, when they translated *Mongsan pŏbŏ*, they relied on their knowledge of LS when it came to translating grammatical constructions.

5.2 Literary Style

As seen above, and despite the mistranslations, this work is a translation of *Mongsan pŏbŏ* into reasonably clear Korean. Concerning Sŏn question-and-answer exchanges during the Chosŏn period, the author believes that, like this translated text, simple Korean was used. This was a manual for training, and use converged on *Mongsan hwasang pŏbŏ yangnok ŏnhae*, among the numerous Sŏn sayings, because this clear Korean translation functioned as a religious manual that tended toward a vernacular “translation.”

6. Concluding Thoughts: *Baihua*, LS, and *hanmun hyŏnt’o* Style in Korea

This article has examined some of the linguistic particularities in the vernacular translations of *baihua* grammatical elements in the *Mongsan hwasang pŏbŏ yangnok ŏnhae*. Chosŏn dynasty Buddhists, because of their loss of exposure to spoken Sinitic/*baihua*, were unable to properly grasp *baihua* tense-aspect markers,

treating them instead as if they were LS or simply misunderstanding them entirely. Whereas Japanese Zen-style *kundoku* “rarely” reordered the Chinese original, and everything—including grammatical markers—was glossed and vocalized, yielding a peculiar reading method among the various types of Japanese *kundoku*, in sixteenth-century Chosŏn, the Chinese original was *never* reordered. The method of *chiktok* 直讀 or *sundok* 順讀—reading the original aloud, following the LS word order but inserting Korean grammatical glosses—began with Confucian materials and became the method for reading LS texts. This is called *hyŏnt’o mun* 懸吐文 or *hyŏnt’o hanmun* 懸吐漢文, and was remarked on by Amenomori Hōshū 雨森芳洲 (1668–1755), who stated the following concerning the differences between Japanese *kundoku* and Korean *chiktok* (by which he means Korean-style sequential glossing, or *sundok*):

書莫善於直讀 否則字義之粗精 詞路之逆順 何由乎得知 譬如一個助字 我國人則目記耳
韓人則兼之以口誦直讀故也 較之我國人差 (Kissō *chawa* 橘窓茶話, 卷之中)

For reading, *chiktok* is good. Otherwise how can you know the texture of the words or the course of the words? For example, for one particle, Japanese will only remember it with their eyes, but Koreans will also say it out loud. This is thanks to *chiktok*. In comparison, our country is inferior.

For civil service examinations, *ŏnhae* exegeses were not needed at all, as it was *hyŏnt’o*-glossed materials that were the target of memorization.

As Itō (2018: 173) has shown, the “voice inscribed on the body” of officials in the Chosŏn period was *hanmun hyŏnt’o*.²² Itō compares the opening, middle, and final sections of the article “Today I lament 是日也放聲大哭” by Chang Chiyŏn 張志淵 (1864–1921), which appeared in 1905 in the editorials of the *Hwangŏngsinmun* 皇城新聞:

- (a) 曩日伊藤侯가韓國에來흥이 ...
- (b) 彼犬豚不若烹 ...
- (c) 嗚呼라痛矣라 我二千萬為爲人奴隸之同胞여 生乎아 死乎아 四千年國民精神이 一夜之間에猝然滅亡而止乎아 痛哉라痛哉라 同胞아 同胞아 ...

In (a) “when Marquis Itō first came to Korea” we find Korean word order, but (b) then uses a *hanmun* style that ignores Chinese word order (LS would have 彼不若犬豚). In the conclusion (c), if we remove the *t’o* 吐 grammatical markers it is orthodox LS. As Saitō Mareshi (2007) has noted, the rhythm inscribed on the body (the voice of *kundoku* in Japan) was, in the case of Chosŏn, not *ŏnhae* but *hundok hyŏnt’o* 訓讀懸吐—vernacular reading by means of appended Korean glosses—that is to say, it came from *chiktok* based on the sounds of *hanmun*. According to Sassa Mitsuki (2012), this document was not written by Chang alone but together with his friend Yu Kŭn 柳瑾 (1861–1921). As the two shared a large bottle of alcohol in the editing room while drinking and lamenting heavily, they wrote this document in

a state of inebriation. With the exception of Yu Kilchun 兪吉濬 (1856–1914), for the generation of students who had prepared for the civil service examination at the end of the Chosŏn period it was not yet possible to write Korean as they wished. In this editorial, the beginning is in Korean word order, the middle morphs into Korean-style *hanmun*, and the end shifts to pure *hanmun*. Thus, in their drunkenness and excitement, the authors gravitated toward the words that were easiest, most familiar, and longed for. In vino veritas! In any case, Japanese Zen-style *kundoku* and Korean *hanmun hyŏnt'ŏ* both emphasized “reverence for the original text,” and insofar as translations into their respective languages completely sacrificed natural expression, there is an especially similar particularity.

Immediately after the creation of the *Hunmin chŏngŭm*, it was Buddhist documents that were translated as *ŏnhae*, and it took more than a century for *ŏnhae* exegeses of Confucian materials to appear in print. In Buddhism, the tradition of translation into Korean had existed since the “interpretive reading” (*sŏktok* 釋讀) glossing methods of the Koryŏ period, and after the establishment of the *ŏnhae* exegeses for Confucian materials, what students preparing for the civil service examinations had to memorize was how to vocalize—including grammatical markers—an unnatural Korean *hanmun hyŏnt'ŏ* style. Meanwhile, students who wished to study at Zen temples in Japan memorized texts, including all of the grammatical markers, creating a certain similarity to the Korean case, which resulted in an unnatural Zen-style *kundoku* for Japanese.

Future research will need to clarify the use of language and associated writings for old sayings in Korean Sŏn temples, the differences in the cultural value of Zen in Japan and Sŏn in Korea and how these affected the study and translation of different varieties of Sinitic, and whether or not the Sinophilia that existed in Japanese Zen (ever) existed in Korean Sŏn, or, rather, in Korean culture more generally.

Itō Hideto teaches as an adjunct professor at Senshu University 専修大学 in Tokyo, Japan. His research focuses on the history of language and writing in Korea, with a special focus on language and script contact between Sinitic (in various guises) and vernacular Korean. His most recent publications focus on questions of sinography and language contact on the Korean peninsula in antiquity: “Kan-Wa kankeigo tange” 韓倭關係語探源 (*Kotonoha*, 2023), and “Chŏsen no *hyangga*, *hyangch'al*” 朝鮮の郷歌・郷札 in *Kanji o tsukatta bunka wa dō hirogatte ita no ka?* 漢字を使った文化はどうか広がっていたのか, edited by Kin Bunkyō (2021).

NOTES

1 Proper nouns in modern Korean are Romanized using the McCune-Reischauer system, and linguistic examples from the Chosŏn period use the modified Yale system, for which see Martin (1992). Modern Japanese personal names use the Hepburn system. Chinese is Romanized using pinyin, but tone marks are omitted.

2 The Kamakura-period Japanese monk Muhon Kakushin 無本覺心 (1207–98) crossed over to Song in 1249 and returned in 1254 after receiving the dharma from Wumen Huikai 無門慧開 (1183–1260). Nishimura (1994: 213) has suggested that the reason for this text's popularity was that “this text, which is simple and clear in both quality and volume, was a compact collection of sayings such that practitioners could carry it in their pockets to encourage their sitting meditation.”

3 See Murai Shōsuke (1995).

4 The royal family of Koryō were tributaries of the Liao (Khitan) and Jin (Jurchen), but it is thought that culturally they idolized the Southern Song. In fifteenth-century Korean, “China” was called “Jiangnan” 江南, and this is widely known from the note on “China” in the *Hunmin chōngūm ōnhae* 訓民正音諺解, which says “*wuli nala s SSYANGTTAM ey KANGNAM ila hononila*” (“In the vernacular of our country this is called ‘KANGNAM.’”) It also appears that this word was widely used by the general people in the sixteenth century. According to Fujiki (1995), speaking on the *kana* used in the letters by Japanese soldiers during the Imjin war, soldiers of the Ming army were called *kakonami* (かこなみ). This refers to Jiangnan, and we can see that the practice of referring to the whole of China as Jiangnan continued into the sixteenth century. The author supposes this label may originate in the Koryō aspirations for the Southern Song.

5 Yi writes the following (1918: *ha* 867): 慧覺尊者以諺文譯禪師法語。獨多取與翁有關之人簡略。余于是知慧覺尊者疑亦涵虛派故其所流通者亦多取其邊之書也。

6 A copy from Yunghūi 2 隆熙二 (1908) is held in Komazawa University's library.

7 See the entry in *Sōngjong Sillok* 成宗實錄 for 14 Sōnghwa 9 (1483) 年十二月戊子.

8 Takekoshi (2004) and Itō (2004b) were presented on the same date at the same research group.

9 In *Mongsan pōbō*, there are seven examples of the pattern V + 箇 ge + N. In discussing the one example where 箇 is written as 介, Takekoshi (2004) notes “the possibility of a unique inscription method in Korean documents.”

10 See Itō (2005: 34).

11 See Liu (1992: 282–86), Takata (1988: 234), Shimura (1984: 323–35), Cao (1994: 119–24), and Ōta (1988: 165).

12 See Li and Thompson (1981: 54) and Shimura (1984: 227–57).

13 See Shimura (1984: 237) and Song (2002: 402). I use the hyphen to indicate the grammaticalized form.

14 See Takata (1988: 237).

15 See Liu (1992: 103–10).

16 On these various interrogatives, see Ōta (1988: 211–13).

17 In fifteenth-century Korean the modern {Vt-ko} was expressed using {Vt-e}.

18 The name for this structure has not been standardized.

19 This is a major difference with Japanese *kundoku*, which typically insists on translating every occurrence of 箇.

20 On attributive modifying trends in Korean and Korean-style *hanmun*, see Itō (2015).

21 As seen in Itō (2008), the 来 which expresses experience or past habitual action, despite Ch'oe Sejin understanding this as a single-character interpretation (單字解), is mistranslated as the main verb “come” in the phrases 我有一箇火伴落後了来来 and 我沿路上慢慢的行着等候来来. The grammaticalization of 来 in *baihua* is perplexing even to specialists of Chinese language.

22 See also Park (2019) for *hyōnt'ō* glossing and “the sound of learning the Confucian Classics” in Chosŏn Korea.

REFERENCES

Abbreviations

ABL, ablative; ACC, accusative; ADNL, adnominal; CLSF, classifier; COND, conditional; COP, copula; CSC, complex stative construction; CVB, converb; DAT, dative; DUR, durative; EXCL, exclamatory; EXPER, experiential; FIN, finite; FREQ, frequentative; FUT, future; GEN, genitive; HON, honorific; IMP, imperative; INST, instrumental; INTRG, interrogative; LOC, locative; NOM, nominative; NZ, nominalizer; PASS, passive; PL, plural; PREF, prefix; PREP, preposition; PRS, present; SFP, sentence final particle; SUF, suffix; TOP, topic; VOL, volitive; VZ, verbalizer.

Primary Sources

- Kissō chawa* 橘窓茶話, vol. 7, 2nd series. In *Nihon Zuihitsu Taisei*, edited by Nihon Zuihitsu Taisei Henshūbu. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1994.
- Kyōnguk Taejōn* 經國大典 [Great code of administration]. Gakushūin Tōyō Bunka Kenkyūjo, 1971.
- Mongsan hwasang pōbō yangnok ōnhae* 蒙山和尚法語略錄諺解. Yungthūi 2 (1908) copy. Komazawa Daigaku Library.
- Mongsan hwasang pōbō yangnok ōnhae*. Hongmun'gak, 1996.
- Mongsan hwasang pōbō yangnok ōnhae ibon yukchong* [Six different editions of the *Mongsan hwasang pōbō yangnok ōnhae*]. Seoul: Asea Munhwasa, 1980.

Secondary Sources

- Cao Guangshun 曹广顺. 1994. *Jindai Hanyu zhuci* 近代汉语助词 [Modern Mandarin particles]. Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan.
- Eda Toshio 江田俊雄. 1977. *Chōsen bukkyōshi no kenkyū* 朝鮮仏教史の研究 [A study of Chōsen Buddhism]. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai.
- Fujiki Hisashi 藤木久志. 1995. *Zōhyōtachi no senjō: Chūsei no yōhei to doreigari* 雑兵たちの戦場 中世の傭兵と奴隷狩り [Battlefields of the common soldier: Mercenaries and slavery in the Middle Ages]. Tokyo: Asahi shuppansha.
- Itō Hideto 伊藤英人. 2004a. “Kōkei to dokyō: Seion to dokuju o megutte: *Mongsan hwasang pōbō yangnok ōnhae* wo chūshin ni” 刊経都監訳経僧の白話解釈と翻訳をめぐる一『蒙山和尚法語略録諺解』を中心に [Buddhist sutra lectures and sutra recitation: Concerning “correct sounds” and Buddhist chanting]. *Chōsenjo kenkyū* 2: 237–51. Tokyo: Kuroshima Shuppan.
- Itō Hideto 伊藤英人. 2004b. “Kankyō Tokan yakkyōso no hakuwa kaishaku to hon'yaku wo megutte—*Mongsan Pōbō genkai* wo chūshin ni” 刊経都監訳経僧の白話解釈と翻訳をめぐる一『蒙山法語』諺解を中心に [On the translations and *baihua* annotations of translator monks in the Kan'gyōng Togam: Focusing on the *Mongsan Pōbō ōnhae*]. Paper presented at the Daihakkai Higashi Ajia Shogengo Kenkyūkai 第八回東アジア諸言語研究会, Aoyama Gakuin Daigaku, June 6.
- Itō Hideto 伊藤英人. 2005. “Grammatical Markers in Early Baihua and Late Mediaeval Korean in Mengshan's Sayings.” In *Corpus-Based Approaches to Sentence Structures*, edited by Toshihiro Takagaki, Susumu Zaima, Yoichiro Tsuruga, Francisco Moren-Fernández, and Yuji Kawaguchi, 33–49. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Itō Hideto 伊藤英人. 2008. “Pönyök *Nogöltae* chū no kumatsu joshi 了, 也, 来, 裏 no Chōsen-goyaku ni tsuite” 『翻訳老乞大』中の句末助詞了、也、来、裏の朝鮮語訳について [On the Korean translations of the final particles 了, 也, 来, 裏 in the *Pönyök Nogöltae*]. *Tōkyō Gaikokugo Daigaku Ronshuu* 77: 243–63.
- Itō Hideto 伊藤英人. 2011. “Chosŏn sidae künse chunggugŏ ‘pönyök’ e taehan koch'al mit kü chŏnmang” [A study of Chosŏn-period ‘translation’ from early modern Mandarin and its prospects]. Paper presented at Che 2hoe Han-Il Han'guk Ōnŏmunhwa Kukche Haksul Taehoe, Tōkyō Gaikokugo Daigaku, Tokyo, February 19.
- Itō Hideto 伊藤英人. 2015. “SaiChūgokuka jiki no ritō shōsetsu *Wasa ogan* shotan” 再中国化時代の吏読小説『蛙蛇獄案』初探 [Preliminary discussion of the *idu* fictional narrative *Wasa ogan* in the era of re-Sinicization]. Paper presented at the 243rd meeting of the Chōsenjo Kenkyūkai, Tokyo University, Tokyo, June 13.
- Itō Hideto 伊藤英人. 2018. “*Wasa ogan* ritōbun no ichi bunseki” 蛙蛇獄案の一分析 [An analysis of the *idu* in *Wasa ogan*]. *Chōsenjo kenkyū* 7: 151–89.
- Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄. 1987. *Chōsen bukkyōshi* 朝鮮仏教史 [History of Korean Buddhism]. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppan.
- Li, Charles N., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Liu Jian 刘坚. 1992. *Jindai Hanyu yufa ziliao huibian*. *Songdai juan* 近代汉语资料汇编 宋代卷 [Lexicon of modern Chinese grammar sources: Song-period edition]. Beijing: Shangwu inshuguan 商務印書館: 新華書店北京發行所發行.
- Martin, Samuel E. 1992. *A Reference Grammar of Korean*. Rutland, VT: Tuttle.
- Murai Shōsuke 村井章介. 1995. *Higashi Ajia ōkan: Kanshi to gaikō* 東アジア往還: 漢詩と外交 [Coming and going in East Asia: Sinitic poetry and diplomacy]. Tokyo: Asahi Shuppansha.
- Nakamura Tamotsu 中村完. 1963. “*Mongsan Pöbō* no chūki Chōsenjo” 『蒙山法語』の中期朝鮮語 [The Middle Korean of the *Mongsan Pöbō*]. *Chōsen gaku* 27: 26–64.
- Nishimura Eshin 西村恵信, trans. and ed. 1994. *Mumon kan* 無門関 [The gateless barrier]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Ōta Tatsuo 太田辰夫. 1987. *Zhongguoyu lishi wenfa* 中国語歴史文法 [Chinese historical grammar]. Translated by Jiang Shaoyu 蔣紹愚 and Xu Changhua 徐昌華. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe.
- Ōta Tatsuo 太田辰夫. 1988. *Chūgokugoshi tsūkō* 中国語史通考 [A historical study of the Chinese language]. Tokyo: Hakuteisha.
- Pak Pyōngch'ae 朴炳采. 1980. “*Mongsan Hwasang Pöbō Yangnok ōnhae* ibon yukchong haeje” [Bibliographical notes on six different editions of the *Mongsan Hwasang Pöbō Yangnok ōnhae*]. In *Mongsan Hwasang Pöbō Yangnok ōnhae: ibon yukchong* [Six different editions of the *Mongsan Hwasang Pöbō Yangnok ōnhae*], edited by Han'gukhak Munhŏn Yŏn'guso, i–xiv. Seoul: Asea Munhwasa.
- Park, Si Nae. 2019. “The Sound of Learning the Confucian Classics in Chosŏn Korea.” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 79, nos. 1–2: 131–87.
- Saitō Mareshi 齊藤希史. 2007. *Kanbunmyaku to kindai nihon* 漢文脈と近代日本 [The Literary Sinitic context and modern Japan]. Tokyo: Nippon hōsō kyōkai.
- Sassa Mitsuaki 佐々充昭. 2012. “Chōsen kindai ni okeru Paektusan shinsei kannen no keisei—Taejonggyo-kei genronjin no katsudō wo chūshin ni” 朝鮮近代における白頭山神聖觀念の形成—大倭教系言論人の活動を中心に [The formation of the idea of Mt. Paektu as

- sacred in modern Korea: Focusing on Taejonggyo-related Koreans from the mass media]. *Kankoku Chōsen no bunka to shakai* 11: 112–48.
- Shibu Shōhei 志部昭平. 1983. “Yi-jo kan’gyōng togam-bon ōnhae yangsik ūi hwangnip kwa *Mongsan hwasang pōbō yangnok ōnhae* ūi sōngnip” [The establishment of the *ōnhae* translation style for editions of the Yi dynasty Office for Buddhist Sutra Printing and the fixing of the *Mongsan hwasang pōbō yangnok ōnhae*]. In *Diyici KOREAxue guoji jiaoliu semina lunwenji (Chaoxianwen)* 第一次KOREA学国际交流 세미나论文集(朝鮮文), edited by the Nihon KOREA-gaku Kenkyūkai 日本KOREA学研究会, 3–13. Heilongjiang: Heilongjiang Chaoxian Minzu Chubanshe.
- Shimura Ryōji 志村良治. 1984. *Chūgoku chūsei gohōshi kenkyū* 中国中世語法史研究 [Research on the grammar of medieval Chinese]. Tokyo: Santōsha.
- Song Shaonian 宋紹年. 2002. *Hanyushi lunwenji* 汉语史论文集 [Collected theses on the history of the Chinese language]. Wuhan: Wuhan Chubanshe.
- Sugiyama Yutaka 杉山豊. 2011. “Cong *Yōrha ilgi* 熱河日記 kan Pak Chiwōn de Hanyu baihua de renshi” 从熱河日記看朴趾源の汉语白話的认识 [Pak Chiwōn’s understanding of Chinese *baihua* as seen in his *Yōrha ilgi*]. In *Qingdai Minguo Hanyu Yanjiu*, 139–52. Seoul: Hakko-bang.
- Takata Tokio 高田時雄. 1988. *Tonkō shiryō ni yoru chūgokushi no kenkyū* 敦煌資料による中国語史 [Studies in Chinese historical linguistics based on the Dunhuang materials]. Tokyo: Sōbunsha.
- Takekoshi Takashi 竹越孝. 2004. “*Mongsan pōbō Sabōbō* 四法語 no goi to gohō” 蒙山法語、四法語の語彙と語法 [The grammar and vocabulary of the *Mongsan pōbō* and *Sabōbō*]. Presented at Daihakkai Higashi Ajia Shogengo Kenkyūkai happyō kō 第八回東アジア諸言語研究会発表稿, Aoyama Gakuin Daigaku, Tokyo, June 6.
- Yi Kimun. (1978) 1996. “*Mongsan hwasang pōbō yangnok ōnhae* haeje” [Bibliographic notes on *Mongsan hwasang pōbō yangnok ōnhae*]. In *Mongsan hwasang pōbō yangnok ōnhae*, edited by Hongmun’gak, 3 pages (unpaginated). Seoul: Hongmun’gak.
- Yi Nūnghwa. 1918. *Chosōn pulgyo t’ongsa* [Complete history of Korean Buddhism]. Keijō: Sinmun’gwan.