ACTA KOREANA
VOL. 16, NO.1, JUNE 2013: 199–229

THE *KUGYŎL* GLOSSES IN THE ASAMI COLLECTION COPY OF THE *CH'ŎLLO KŬMGANG KYŎNG* 川老金剛經

By ROSS KING

This paper analyzes the *kugyŏl* 口訣 glosses in the Asami Collection copy of the *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng* 川老金剛經 owned by the University of California-Berkeley. Though the text itself was printed in 1387 at the end of Koryŏ, making it the oldest glossed Korean text available in North America, the analysis shows that the vast majority of the glosses were copied over from the 1464 *Kŭmgang kyŏng ŏnhae* 金剛經諺解 and the 1482 *Kŭmgang kyŏng samgahae* 金剛經三家解. However, the glosses also include a few archaisms, show interesting hybrid glosses that combine abbreviated Chinese character *kugyŏl* graphs and *Hunmin chŏng'ŭm* glosses, and include instances of 'final sound suffixation' (*marŭm ch'ŏmgi* 末音添記)-type glossing and other vernacular script annotations in the lefthand margin that raise interesting questions about the transition from high Koryŏ 'interpretive' glossing (釋讀口訣 *sŏktok kugyŏl*) to Chosŏn 'sequential' glossing (順讀口訣 *sundok kugyŏl*) and the role of the new Korean vernacular script as an extension of *kugyŏl* glossing practice. In other words, it would appear that after the demise of the older 'interpretive' glossing at the end of Koryŏ that used both sides of the line in an integrated process, the lefthand side of the line was more or less abandoned for many decades with the advent of the newer 'sequential' glossing that used only the righthand side of the line. However, with the invention of the vernacular script in 1446, a new use was found for the lefthand side of the line: vernacular glosses that complemented the newer-style 順讀口訣 *sundok kugyŏl* glosses on the righthand side of the line and partially reprised the role of the now-defunct 'interpretive' glossing in a new, 'two-dimensional' glossing practice.

Keywords: *kugyŏl*, *gugyeol*, glossing, *Diamond Sutra*, Asami Collection

0. INTRODUCTION[1]

It is by now a well-established fact in Korean *kugyŏl* glossing studies that the Korean practice of glossing canonical *hanmun* 漢文 texts underwent a major change between the late Koryŏ and early Chosŏn periods. In essence, an earlier system of 'interpretive *kugyŏl*' (*sŏktok kugyŏl* 釋讀口訣) that used both sides of the *hanmun* line in conjunction with 'back marks' (*yŏktokchŏm* 逆讀点) in such a way as to convert (in effect, translate) the *hanmun* text into a Korean text with Korean nominal particles, Korean verbal endings and Korean word order while also rendering~reading some of the sinographs in vernacular Korean (see Chung 1999 and Paek 2005), gave way by the end of Koryŏ to a system of 'sequential *kugyŏl*' (*sundok kugyŏl* 順讀口訣; also referred to as *ŭmdok kugyŏl* 音讀口訣) that used only the right-hand side of the *hanmun* line, read the sinographs exclusively in their Sino-Korean pronunciations, and placed vernacular Korean morphological markers at natural clause breaks in such a way as to punctuate the text while leaving the Chinese word order intact (see Nam Kyŏngnan 2005/2006 and 2009).

However, despite the relative abundance of early Chosŏn texts with both *kugyŏl* and *han'gŭl*[2] glosses, the ongoing hunt for and focus on Koryŏ-period (and earlier) materials has led scholars by and large to neglect texts from the mid-fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In my survey of pre-Imjin Korean texts with *kugyŏl* glosses held in North American library collections (King 2010), I called attention to an edition of the *Ch'ŏllo kŭmgang kyŏng* 川老金剛經 held in the Asami Collection at the University of California-Berkeley[3] that falls into this quasi-'no-man's land' in *kugyŏl* studies, and this paper is a more detailed examination of that text.

In his excellent description of the Asami collection, Fang (1969) describes this edition as follows:

---

[1] This work was supported by the Academy of Korean Studies Grant funded by the Korean Government (MEST) (AKS-2011-AAA-2103). My thanks also to Professors Nam Punghyon, Jung Jaeyoung, Gernot Wieland, and John Whitman for helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper presented at the "Workshop on Korean Historical Linguistics, with a Special Focus on *Kugyŏl* Materials," hosted at the University of British Columbia, July 21-23, 2010. I am also grateful to two anonymous peer reviewers for their comments and corrections.

[2] Because the term '*han'gŭl*' for the vernacular Korean script was not coined until the 19teens and did not gain wide acceptance until the 1930s, it is—technically speaking—anachronistic to use this term to refer to the *Hunmin chŏng'ŭm* 訓民正音 (or *Ŏnmun* 諺文) before the modern period, but in this paper I follow standard South Korean (anachronistic) practice for the sake of convenience.

[3] As of April 9, 2013, the entire text is available online for viewing and PDF download at the Internet Archive at this URL: http://archive.org/details/chonnokumganggyo008800rich.

"28.40 *Ch'ŏnno kŭmgang kyŏng* 川老金剛經 [천노금강경] by Tao-ch'uan 道川(twelfth century). 1387 and earlier. 1 vol. Woodblock.

Commentaries on the *Kŭmgang kyŏng* by Tao-ch'uan. The work is also known under the title *Chin-kang-ching Ch'uan-lao chu* (or *sung*) 金剛經川老註(頌). It was written about 1161 and first printed about 1179.

This Korean edition consists of thirty-one leaves and an added leaf containing a postscript by Yi Saek 李穡(1328-1396) dated Hung-wu twentieth year (1387), followed by the names of those responsible for this "reengraved" (重刊) edition. In the postscript, Yi Saek named the chief sponsor of this engraving Kŭnbi 謹妃, Queen of King Sin'u 辛禑, who became ruler in 1374 and was dethroned in 1388. Hence this 1387 edition may be referred to as the Kŭnbi edition.

The style of engraving indicates that the new material of the Kŭnbi edition consists only of the leaf of the postscript, and that the preceding thirty-one leaves were printed from blocks engraved previously. At the end of leaf 31 is a postscript giving the date of engraving as *Chung-gwang muo maengdong* 重光戊午孟東 or "tenth month of *muo* year of Chunggwang." Without an identification of Chunggwang, the *muo* year could be any of the years 1378, 1318, 1258, and so forth. Asami tried to find an answer without success. The puzzle can be solved by examining the *Koryŏsa* 高麗史, *kwŏn* 133-135, carefully. During his reign, Sin'u carefully vacillated in his allegiance between the Chinese Ming emperor and the Mongol Yuan court, which had withdrawn to Kharakorum in Mongolia. Early in 1377 Sin'u, who had been denied recognition as king by the Chinese, received confirmation of his title from the Mongol ruler, Yuan Chao-tsung 元昭宗 (reigned 1371-1378) and at once declared the adoption of the latter's reign title, Hsuan-kuang (Sŏn'gwang) 宣光, for reckoning years in Korea. Although it is recorded that in the ninth moon of 1378 a restoration of the use of Hung-wu for year reckoning was ordered, it seems to have been only for certain documents dealing with China. It seems that Mongol reign titles continued to be generally used, and the relationship with the Mongols was very close. In the seventh moon of 1378 a Mongol envoy arrived at Kaesŏng announcing the death, three months previously, of Yuan Chao-tsung and the succession of a younger brother, T'ien-yuan 天元 but the facts that in the sixth moon of the following year (1379) another Yuan mission arrived declaring that the reign title had been *changed* to T'ien-yuan and that a month later a Korean mission was sent to bear congratulations to the Yuan court on the change of reign title indicate that the reign title of the new ruler had at first not been T'ien-yuan. If so, and if a book printed in the tenth moon of 1378 gives the reign title as Chunggwang 重光, then it may be concluded that from the seventh moon of 1378 to the fifth moon of 1379 Chunggwang was the reign title used in Korea. The relevant passages are in the *Koryŏsa*, *kwŏn* 133."

What is most interesting about this work (and Fang's description of it) for our purposes here is the fact that it contains numerous *kugyŏl* glosses; in fact, the entire main text of the *Kumgang kyŏng* and Yefu Daochuan's poetic commentary is glossed with rather elegant *kugyŏl*. Oddly, Fang in this rare instance makes no mention of the presence of these markings in his description of the edition, despite his otherwise careful attention to this detail in his descriptions of other works in the Asami collection. Equally odd is the fact that the *Haeoe sojang Han'guk chŏnjŏk munhwajae* website (http://koreanbooks.nricp.go.kr/) appears to have overlooked this important work. O Yongsŏp (2008:90-97) also gives a description of this work, but-true to form with his Korean *sŏjibak* colleagues-neglects to mention the *kugyŏl* annotations[4].

My initial excitement about this text owed to two reasons: its status as a late-Koryŏ edition (of which there are precious few in North American collections), and the verbal morphology reflected in the annotations. At first blush, the latter appear to have been added in the late fifteenth (or perhaps early sixteenth?) century; if so, this would make them the oldest *kugyŏl* markings available in any North American library collection. The *kugyŏl* markings are also interesting for their hybrid nature; the Middle Korean politeness marker *-ngi*[5] is rendered here with the *hunmin chŏng'ŭm* symbol ㅇㅣ, while most of the other *kugyŏl* glosses are marked with traditional *kugyŏl* graphs (*yakcha kugyŏl* 略字口訣—*kugyŏl* glosses created by abbreviating full-form Chinese characters). Traditional *kugyŏl* annotational conventions had no straightforward means of representing this syllable (ㅇㅣ-*ngi* in Yale romanization) with Chinese characters or their abbreviated forms. Thus, Kim Namgyun (2000:95) notes that whereas the edition he examined (which he dates to 1387, and which he assumes to have been glossed shortly thereafter) renders this Middle Korean politeness marker with the clumsy combination 𠂉 + 丨, and other earlier *kugyŏl*-annotated editions of this text used just 丨 or 丶 (i.e. *i*, ignoring the velar nasal).

In general, Kim Namgyun (2000) provides a useful point of comparison for a more detailed examination of the Asami edition's *kugyŏl*. But first please recall that the *Kŭmgang kyŏng* 金剛經 was one of the four main textbooks in the early Chosŏn-era Buddhist clerical training programs. Nam Kwŏnhŭi (2000:163) notes that the *Ch'ŏllo* or Yabu (Yefu 冶不) version of the *Kŭmgang kyŏng* was the most popular of various

---

[4] See also Chŏn (2006) for an annotated translation into Korean of this work and the more recent Yŏngnam Taehakkyo Minjok Munhwa Yŏn'guso (eds.)(2012) for a reproduction and transcription of the mid-13th century edition held at Yŏngnam University along with an overview of relevant research. (This Yŏngnam University edition does not have any *kugyŏl* glosses.)

[5] Henceforth, all pre-modern Korean linguistic forms are rendered in Yale romanization as per Martin (1992). Other Korean forms (proper names and technical terms) are rendered in McCune-Reischauer romanization. Transcription conventions for the glossed text are as follows: Chinese text from the *Diamond Sutra* is in bold, while text from the Ch'ŏllo commentary is in plain. Righthand glosses are in subscript, while lefthand glosses are in superscript.

different editions, as witnessed by the fact that numerous copies of the 1387 edition survive today (many of which have *kugyŏl* annotations). Nam Kwŏnhŭi (*ibid.*:173) distinguishes two main types of edition of the *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng*—(A) and (B). The Asami edition is type (A).

In addition to three officially designated 'treasures' also noted by Chŏng Chaeyŏng (2007)—Pomul 974, 1127 and 919 (the latter bound together with the *Pŏmmang kyŏng* 梵網經)—Nam writes that he has examined six other editions. Kim Namgyun (2007:92) describes four editions in personal collections (the same as those described by Nam) as well as one edition in the Tōyō Bunko, but the Asami edition appears to have gone unnoticed thus far in Korea (except, that is, for O Yongsŏp 2008, who neglects to note the presence of *kugyŏl* glosses). For more on the *Kŭmgang kyŏng* in general, and on the *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng*, in particular, see also Chŏng Chaeyŏng (2007), Ko Ikchin (1974), Nam Kwŏnhŭi (1997) and Nam Kwŏnhŭi (1998:559-562) [6].

1. THE KUGYŎ*L* GRAPHS IN THE ASAMI EDITION *CH'ŎLLO KŬMGA NG KYŎNG*

Please refer to the chart below for a full listing of the *kugyŏl* graphs deployed in the Asami edition and for comparisons with the edition studied by Kim Namgyun (2000) and the Song Sŏngmun edition of the *Nŭngŏm kyŏng* 楞嚴經 (1401). The latter two editions are thought to contain markings that can be considered typical or representative of early Chosŏn *sundok* (順讀 'sequential reading') *kugyŏl* [7].

---

[6] The officially designated treasures are: Pomul no. 974 owned by the Seoul Museum of History (Sŏul Yŏksa Pangmulgwan); Pomul no. 919 (bound together with the *Pŏmmang kyŏng* 梵網經) owned by the Adan Mungo; and Pomul no. 1127 owned by the National Library of Korea. However, this latter copy appears to be unglossed. We can also mention: an early nineteenthth-century edition owned by Tongguk University; an edition from 1869 owned by Koryŏ University and the National Library of Korea; the Toyo Bunko copy; the Tenri Library copy from the Imanishi collection (glossed, but most of the glosses have been obliterated by a later reader); a nineteenth-century edition with glosses owned by Waseda University Library; etc. Chŏng Chaeyŏng and Kim Sŏngju (2010) report a late Koryŏ~early Chosŏn glossed fragment found recently at Pulgapsa Temple.

[7] As opposed to the Koryŏ-era *sŏktok* (釋讀 'interpretive reading') *kugyŏl* that essentially translated the *hanmun* text into vernacular Korean with Korean word order.

The *kugyŏl* Graphs in the *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng* [8]

次例	Usual Sound Value	Yale	Base character	口訣 Characters		
				Asami *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng*	Kim Namgyun *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng* (1387)	Song Sŏngmun *Nŭngŏm kyŏng* (1401)
1	ㄱ/기	*k/ki*	只		ㅅ	
2	가	*ka*	可	ᄀᆞ	ᄀᆞ	ᄀᆞ
	가	*ka*	可			
	가	*ka*	可			
3	거	*ke*	去	ㅿ	ㅿ	ㅿ
	거	*ke*	去			ᄎᆞ
4	고	*kwo*	古	ᄀᆞ	ᄀᆞ	
5	고	*kwo*	古	ㅁ	ㅁ	ㅁ
6	과	*kwa*	果		ㅅ	
	과	*kwa*	果	ᄒᆞ[9]		
※7	긔	*kuy*	中		ᄒᆞ	ᄒᆞ
8	(으)ㄴ	$^{(u/o)}n$	隱	ㄱ	ㄱ	ㄱ
9	나	*na*	乃	ᄀᆞ	ᄀᆞ	ᄀᆞ
	나	*na*	那			ᄋᆞ
	나	*na*	那	ᄋᆞ		
10	노/로	*nwo*/ $^{(u/o)}lwo$	奴	ᄉᆞ	ᄉᆞ	ᄉᆞ
	노/로	*nwo*/ $^{(u/o)}lwo$	奴			ㅅ
11	니	*ni*	尼	ㅣ	ㅣ	ㅣ
※12	ᄂᆞ/ᄂᆞᆯ	*no(l)*	飛	ㅣ	ㅣ	ㅣ
13	ᄂᆞ/ᄂᆞᆯ	*no(l)*	斤		ᄀᆞ	ᄀᆞ
14	다	*ta*	多	ㅣ	ㅣ	ㅣ
15	대	*tay*	大	ㅅ	ㅅ	ㅅ
16	더	*te*	加	ᄀᆞ		
17	뎌	*tye*	宁	ᄀᆞ	ᄀᆞ	ᄀᆞ

[8] The chart is adapted from that in Kim Namgyun (2000:93-95), but also draws on Nam Kyŏngnan (2009).

[9] Note that ㅗ is often rendered in such a way that it is difficult to distinguish from ㅜ (*tu*).

	뎌	*tye*	宁			宁
18	뎡	*tyeng*	丁	丁	丁	丁
19	뎨	*tyey*	弟		弟	
20	도	*two*	刀	刀	刀	刀
	두	*twu*	斗			斗
21	디	*ti*	地	扌	扌	扌
※22	드/들	*tu/tul*	入	入	入	
※23	ᄃᆞ/ᄃᆞᆯ	*to(l)*	等		朩	
※	ᄃᆞ/ᄃᆞᆯ	*to(l)*	月	月		月
※24	ᄃᆡ	*toy*	矣	厶	厶	厶
25	(으)ᄅᆞ	*(u/o)l/'l*	乙	乚	乚	乚
26	라	*la*	羅	丶	丶	丶
27	라	*la*	羅		丆	丆
27[a]	러	*le*	驢	馿		
27[b]	러	*le*	驢	馬		
※28	로	*(u/o)lwo*	以		灬	
29	리	*li*	利		禾	禾
30	리	*li*	利	刂	刂	刂
31	마	*ma*	麻	广	广	广
32	며	*mye*	彌		尒	尒
	며	*mye*	彌	爻		爻
33	면	*myen*	面	𠂇	𠂇	𠂇
34	면	*myen*	面		面	
34[a]	ㅂ	*p*	邑	巴		
※35	ᄇᆞ/ᄇᆞᆯ	*po(l)*	火		火	火
36	ㅅ	*s*	叱	七	七	七
37	사	*sa/za*	沙	氵	氵	氵
38	샤	*sya*	舍	亼	亼	亼
39	샤	*sya*	舍	舍	舍	舍
	샤	*sya*	舍			舍
※40	셔	*sye*	立		立	立
41	셔	*sye*	西		西	西
42	소	*swo*	所	户	所	户

43	쇼	*swyo*	小	小		
44	시	*si*	示	示	示	示
45	스	*so*	士	士	士	士
※46	아	*a/ya*	良	良	良	
47	아	*a/Ga*	阿		阿	
	아	*a/Ga*	阿	阿		
47[a]	야	*ya*	也	也		
48	어	*e/Ge*	於	於	於	於
	어	*e/Ge*	於			於
48[a]	언	*en/Gen*	言	言		
49	여	*ye*	亦	亦	亦	亦
50	오	*wo/Gwo*	午	午	午	午
51	와	*wa*	臥	臥	臥	臥
52	와	*wa*	臥		臥	臥
53	요	*ywo*	要		要	
54	우	*wu*	于		于	
55	의	*uy*	衣	衣	衣	衣
	의	*uy*	衣			衣
※56	이	*i*	是		是	是
※57	이	*i*	是	是	是	是
58	이	*ngi*	應	이	广＋是	
※59	저/제	*ce(y)*	上		上	上
60	하	*ha*	下	下	下	下
61	호	*hwo*	乎	乎	乎	乎
62	히	*hi*	兮	兮	兮	兮
63	ᄒᆞ	*ho*	爲	爲	爲	爲
	히	*hoy*	令			令
				53	61	69

Including the *hunming chŏng'ŭm* graph 이, then, our Asami edition deploys a total of 53 different *kugyŏl* graphs:

可, 云, 古, 口, 木, 冂, 乃, 尹, 又, 匕, 匕, 丨, 大, 方, 宁, 丁, 刀, 才, 入, 月, 厶, 乚, 丶, 馿, 馬, 刂, 广, 又, 亠, 巴, 七, 氵, 人, 伞, 户, 小, 二, 士, 氵, 尸, 也, 才, 言, 亠, 午, 卜, 氵, 丶, 이, 下, 丿, 兮, 丷

This is already a significant decrease in the total number of such graphs deployed in Koryŏ-era *kugyŏl* texts, but not quite so low as the 40 or so typically found in mid- to late Chosŏn texts.

The following *kugyŏl* graphs are new (new, that is, compared to the edition examined by Kim Namgyun):

古 (3x)

This graph is used exclusively for interrogative *kwo*:
(金剛2b:10) 誰為安名古
(金剛3a:05) 作麼生古
(金剛6a:07) 是甚麼相古

言 (x1)

This graph corresponds to Middle Korean (henceforth, 'MK') -*Gen* in the following example:
(金剛29b:10) 飜大浪[10]丶言丁
三家解 5:68 *iGentyeng*

ㄉ (x1)

This graph corresponds to MK –*te*- in the following example:
(金剛15a:09-10) **若有我相人相衆生相壽者相**丷ㄉ丁大丁
三家解 3:55 *hotentayn*

丁 (x1)

This graph corresponds to MK *tyeng* in the following example:
(金剛29b:10) 飜大浪丶言丁
三家解 5:68 *iGentyeng*

丁 (x1)

This graph corresponds to MK exclamatory *tye* in the following example:
(金剛13b:04) **希有**丷ニ丁丁
三家解 3:31 *hosintye*

木 (x6)

This graph is rendered in such a way that it looks almost like ホ (*tu*), but there is no danger of ambiguity as this latter graph does not occur in our text. The sign 木 occurs six times in regular *kugyŏl* glosses deployed consistently to the right-hand side of the characters:
(金剛4a:01) 與大比丘衆千二百五十人木 俱丶馬ニヒ
三家解 1:28A *kwa* *ilesini*

---

10 Henceforth, unless otherwise noted, all forms in italicized Yale romanization placed beneath *kugyŏl* markers represent the corresponding Middle Korean *han'gŭl* forms in the *Samgahae* 三家解.

(金剛7a:08) 法相ㅚ 非法相ㆍ
三家解 2:68 *kwa* *i*

(金剛24a:03) 兔角杖ㅚ 龜毛拂ㆍㅡㅣ
三家解 4:72 *kwa* *ilwota*

(金剛18a:08) 鎭州蘿蔔ㅚ 雲門胡餠ㆍㅡㅣ
三家解 3:101 *kwa* *ilwota*

The next is a nice example of MK 'collective case-marking':
(金剛8b:08-09) 須彌頂上ㅚ 大海波心ㅚㆍㅡㅣ
三家解 2:95 *kwa* *kwa 'ylwota*

乃 (x1)

This graph corresponds to *na*, which is otherwise typically represented as ᄫ in our edition:
(金剛8a:09) 橘ㆍㆎ
三家解 2:86 *ina*

ᄉᆞ (x1)

This graph corresponds to *sya*, which is otherwise typically represented by ㅅ in our edition, and occurs just once close to the beginning of the text:
(金剛4a:07) 惺惺着著ㆍᄉᆞㅏㅣ
三家解 1:31a *isyasta*

ᄐᆞ (x4)

Corresponding to *ti*, this graph appears exclusively in the lefthand supplementary glosses rather than in the regular righthand glosses. Three of the examples represent the *-ti* of the long negation pattern, as can be seen from the Korean translations from the 1482 *Kŭmgang kyŏng samgahae* 金剛經三家解.
(金剛15a:03) 莫道ᄐᆞ不ᄭᅩᆞ 相識ᄐᆞㆍᄋᆞᄉᆞ
三家解 3:54 *selu :a**ti**:mwot ·hwo·la nilo·**ti**:malla*

(金剛15a:07) 不責ᄐᆞ愚어리ᄒᆞᄂᆞㆍᄒᆞᄋᆞ
三家解 3:57 *e·lini ·lol* 責*·COYK[ho]·**ti** a·ni ·ho·non i '·la*

In the following example, the pattern is *-(wu/o)lq ·ti 'n i '·la* "should/must/ought to," glossing 應:
(金剛6a:02) **但應如所教住**ᄃᆞᆫᄋᆞᆼᄒᆞᄉᆞᄀᆞᄅᆞᄎᆞᆷᄌᆞᆼㆍᄒᆞᄋᆞ
(金剛I.28b) ...住*·TTYWU **·hwɔl ·tt i** 'n i '·la.*
"[lit.] Bodhisattvas should only abide /persevere as per the instruction."

馬 (x4)

This graph does not appear in the chart of *kugyŏl* characters provided by the HWP '*Arae-a han'gŭl*' word processing program, but appears to be an abbreviation of 馹 representing *le*. All of the examples are of the retrospective *-te-* lenited after the copula *-i[y]-* or prospective marker *-li-*:

(金剛3a:01) 看朝艷ㆍ馬ㄷ
三家解 1:11B *ileni*

(金剛4a:01) 俱ㆍ馬ㄴㄷ
三家解 1:28A *ilesini*

(金剛15a:10) **應生瞋恨**ᄆᆞᅀᆞᆷ ㆍㅣ馬ㄷㆍ
三家解 3:55 *holilenila*

(金剛16a:03) 追而不及ㆍ馬ㄷ
三家解 3:70 *ileni*

馹 (x1)

This graph appears just once, representing retrospective *-te-* lenited to *-le-* after the copula *-i[y]-*:

(金剛16b:04) 看時有ㆍ馹ㄷ
三家解 3:78 *ileni*

尹 (x14)

This marker represents *na* and appears exclusively in renderings of ㆍ尹 *ina* and ㆍㆍ尹 *hona*.

小 (x1)

This marker appears just once in a lefthand interpretive gloss and reflects MK *sywo* from the *Samgahae ŏnhae* translation in the following example:

(金剛6b:01-02) 有ᄉᆞ相有小ᄎᆞ求ㆍ
相·*SSYANG isi·mye* 求*KKWUW i·**sywomi***
"[lit.] The presence of marks and desires..."

尸

This graph appears more than fifty times, always as the yes-no question marker *Ga*, except for this one example of *-Ga-* lenited from first-person affective *-ka-*:

(金剛29b:04) 穿珠ㆍㅣㄱㅏㄴㅁㄹㄷ
三家解 5:62 *iGanmalon*

巴 (x5)

This graph is unusual in that it represents a single segment (*p*) rather than a syllable. It is used exclusively to render the *p* in allomorphs of

deferential/object-honorific -*zoW*-:
(金剛5a:02) 願樂欲聞ㅇㅗㅂㅈㅜㅣ
三家解 2:13 *hozopnwongita*

(金剛6b:04) 得聞如是言說章句ㅇㅗㅂㅁ
三家解 2:52 *hozopkwo*

(金剛13b:03) 聞說是經ㅇㅗㅂㅁ
三家解 3:31 *hozopkwo*
(金剛14a:03) 我今得聞如是經典ㅇㅗㅂㅁ
三家解 3:38 *hozopkwo*

(金剛24a:06-07) 聞說是法ㅇㅗㅂㅁ
三家解 4:76 *hozopkwo*

也

This graph appears frequently throughout the text in just one usage: as a rendering of *ya*, the allomorph of plain vocative *a* (as opposed to exalted vocative ᄒᆞ *ha*, which is reserved for 世尊 'World-Honoured One') on 須菩提 Subhuti (the name of the disciple addressed by the Buddha throughout the sutra) [11]:'
須菩提ㅁ "Subhuti!"

月

This graph represents *to* or *tol*. In the following three examples, it corresponds to the *tol* of concessive -$^{(u/o)}$*ntol*, which is typically followed by a rhetorical question:
(金剛3a:02) 疾雷ㄱ月 何太急ㆍㅣㅓ
三家解 1:12A *'ntol* *iliGwo?*

(金剛19b:08) 少他一分ㅇㄱ月 又爭得ㆍㅣㅓ
三家解 4:5 *hontol* *iliGwo?*

(金剛24a:09-10) 指鹿ㅇㄱ月 豈能成駿馬ㆍㅅ
三家解 4:79 *hontol* *imye*

言烏ㅇㄱ月 誰謂是翔鸞ㆍㅣㅓ
hontol *iliGwo?*

In the following example, 月 corresponds to the *to*- in
-*tos* ~-*tus* 'as if, like':

11 But note that there are also two examples of **須菩提**ㅁ in this same vocative usage: (金剛4b:09) and (金剛5a:09). In both cases, the 1482 *Samgahae ŏnhae* records *ya*.

(金剛16b:07-08) **見種種色**ᄆᆞᆫᄒᆞᄫᆞᆫᄇᆞᆨᄉᆞᆨᄋᆞᆯ
金剛經 1:88b [*ho-*]*toshonila*

2. THE KUGYŎL *T'O*(吐) IN THE ASAMI EDITION *CH'ŎLLO KŬMGANG KYŎNG*

The Asami edition of the *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng* contains a total of approximately 210 different *t'o* (grammatical particles and endings), as opposed to the 302 found by Kim Namgyun in the edition with the earlier glosses that he examined. The sections below examine locative endings (2.1), *Ho*-deletion vs. *o*-deletion-plus-aspiration (2.2), optional deletion of ¬ᄉ- (2.3), and ᄌᆞ (*z̧a*) and ᄂᆞᄌᆞ (*iz̧a*) (2.4).

2.1. LOCATIVE ENDINGS

The locative markers deployed in the *kugyŏl* glosses reveal the transitional nature of the overall *kugyŏl* glossing in the text. That is, we find a mixture of earlier (Koryŏ) locatives in just ᄒᆞ (or ᄒᆞᄀᆞ with the the topic~contrastive marker ᄀᆞ) and locatives corresponding grapheme-for-grapheme with the MK locatives *·ey*, *·ay*, and *·yey* as they occur in the *Kŭmgang kyŏng samgahae*. MK also had locative markers in *·oy* and *·uy*, but the *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng* does not have anything corresponding to these. Thus, the locative markers found in our text are as follows:

ᄒᆞ (+ ᄒᆞᄀᆞ),
ᄋᆡ ᄂᆞ (+ ᄋᆡ ᄂᆞᄀᆞ) corresponding to MK *·ey* (+ *·eyn* [12])
ᄒᆡ ᄂᆞ corresponding to MK *·ay*
ᄫᅴ ᄂᆞ corresponding to MK *·yey*.

The *kugyŏl* locative markers correspond exactly to the expected MK shapes in the majority of cases, but in a number of other examples (clustered mostly toward the beginning of the text), the marker ᄒᆞ appears, corresponding to all three of MK *·ey*, *·ay*, *·yey* in the *Samgahae*. This is an orthographic archaism reflecting an earlier stage of *kugyŏl* marking which, in turn, was probably reflected in one or more earlier *kugyŏl*-glossed version(s) of the texts consulted by the glossator(s) of the Asami edition.

2.1.1. Examples of ᄒᆞ corresponding to Samgahae ey, ay, yey

1) 에 *ey*
(金剛3a:06-07) 靜夜長天ᄒᆞ ... 鏡水ᄒᆞ 塵風ᄂᆞ 不到時ᄒᆞ
ey *yey* *yey*

2) 애 *ay*
(金剛3b:01) 最愛晚秋霜午夜ᄒᆞ
ay

---

[12] There is just one example of ᄋᆡ ᄂᆞᄀᆞ: (金剛17b:09) 胸中ᄋᆡᄂᆞᄀᆞ.

(金剛5a:02) 往往ㅣ
ay

(金剛5b:07) 虛空ㅣ
ay

(金剛7a:01) **[已於無]量千萬佛所**ㅣ
ay

(金剛8a:05) 廓落大虛空ㅣ
ay

(金剛9a:04) 眉間ㅣ
ay

(金剛15b:03) 乾坤萬古ㅣ
ay

3) ᅨ *yey*
(金剛3b:04) **時**ㅣ
yey

(金剛3b:10) 門外ㅣ
yey

(金剛4a:05) **食時**ㅣ
yey

(金剛4a:07-08) ... 敷座坐來ㅣ ... 平地ㅣ
yey *yey*

(金剛6a:03; 8a:09) 春來ㅣ
yey

(金剛6b:05) **如來滅後後五百歲**ㅣ
yey

2.1.2. Examples of ᄋᆡ *corresponding to* Samgahae *ayn*

(金剛8a:09) 江南ㅣㄱ
ayn

(金剛9b:09) 放行也ㅣㄱ
ayn

2.1.3. Examples of ᄒᆞᄂᆞ *(ay) corresponding to* Samgahae *yey*

Examples of ᄒᆞᄂᆞ corresponding to *Samgahae yey* are again transitional or hybrid, in the sense that a) they preserve the older uniform locative ᄒᆞ and b) they nonetheless incorporate the final *y* of MK *yey* (and *ay* and *ey*). Note that all MK examples with locative *yey* occur after forms ending in *i* or *y*.

(金剛7b:02) 懸崖ᄒᆞᄂᆞ
yey

(金剛13a:03) 南北東西ᄒᆞᄂᆞ
yey

(金剛13b:02) 箇中ᄒᆞᄂᆞ... 此時ᄒᆞᄂᆞ... 一朝ᄒᆞᄂᆞ
ey *yey* *ay*

(金剛15a:03) 此時ᄒᆞᄂᆞ... 誰知遠煙浪ᄒᆞᄂᆞ
yey *ay*

(金剛24a:06) **於未來世**ᄒᆞᄂᆞ
yey

In contrast with these five examples of ᄒᆞᄂᆞ corresponding to *Samgahae yey*, there are twenty-seven examples of ᄂᆞᄂᆞ = *Samgahae yey*; again, these are always after forms ending in *i* or *y* (including 西 and 水, which had the MK shapes *syey* and *swuy*, respectively). For example:

(金剛17b:03) 南北東西ᄂᆞᄂᆞ

(金剛21a:06) 死水ᄂᆞᄂᆞ

Note that there is also one example of ᄒᆞᄀᆞ corresponding to *yeyn*:

(金剛17b:09) 眼裏ᄒᆞᄀᆞ
yeyn

2.1.4. ᄋᆞᄂᆞ *(ey) corresponding to Samgahae ey, yey*

There are more than one hundred examples of ᄋᆞᄂᆞ = *ey*, and just two examples of ᄋᆞᄂᆞ = *yey*:

(金剛10a:10) 南北東西ᄋᆞᄂᆞ
yey

(金剛20b:01) **汝於來世**ᄋᆞᄂᆞ
yey

Needless to say, these two examples should be treated as mistakes for ᄂᆞᄂᆞ on the part of the glossator.

2.2. *Ho*-deletion vs. Aspiration

It is not uncommon in glossed texts of all periods for the stems *i-* and *ho-* of the copula and the dummy verb 'do; be', respectively, to delete, leaving just the verb

endings in the gloss. In our text, too, forms of the MK verb *ho-* 'do; be' from the *Samgahae* beginning with effective *-ke-* are frequently treated in the *kugyŏl* glosses as though the preceding stem in *ho-* were deleted, whereas the *ŏnhae* glosses show aspirated *khe-* from deletion of the first vowel in *h[o]-ke-* [13]:

ᄀᆞᄒᆡ (*keni*)
(金剛22b:10) 萬波ㅣ隨似蟻循環ᄀᆞᄒᆡ
kheni

ᄀᆞᄒᆡᄒᆞ (*keniwa*)
(金剛17a:07) 即不無ᄀᆞᄒᆡᄒᆞ
kheniwa

ᄀᆞᄀᆞᆫᄃᆡ (*kentayn*)
(金剛17a:10) **須菩提**ᄠᅴ **以要言之**ᄀᆞᄀᆞᆫᄃᆡ
khentayn

ᄀᆞᄂᆞᆫ (*ketun*)
(金剛3b:09) 客來ᄀᆞᄂᆞᆫ
khetun

Cf. (金剛20a:05) 君行楊柳岸ㅣᄒᆞᄀᆞᄂᆞᆫ
hoketun

It is tempting to interpret examples like the following as somehow reflecting an archaic holdover of an interpretive glossing practice whereby **有** was read in vernacular Korean ([*is-*]*ketun*), but there is no other evidence for such a suggestion, and here we must assume *ho-*deletion in light of the *ŏnhae* gloss in *ketun*:

(金剛16b:07) **如人**ㅣ **有目**ᄀᆞᄂᆞᆫ
ketun

A similar deletion phenomenon can be observed with ᄫ = *-kwo* or *khwo* (from

---

13 One of the anonymous reviewers of this article made the interesting observation that *ho-*deletion is in fact rather infrequent in *kugyŏl* texts compared to copular *i-*deletion, and therefore questioned whether the examples in this section should be taken as instances of *ho-*deletion. To be sure, in some cases like these it is entirely possible that the deleted verb stem is the copula rather than *ho-*. However, the presence of parallel *kugyŏl* forms with ᄒᆞ *ho-* in the text along with the fact that the glossator was often copying from *Samgahae han'gŭl* glosses that clearly included *ho-* make this a rather vexed question. Note also that examples like 金剛3b:08 一枝無孔笛ㅣ with just ᄒᆞ (and where the *Samgahae* shows *hoya* in any case) cannot be taken as instances of copular deletion, since there was no such combination as *ㅣᄒᆞ (copula + *-a*). A comparison with other glossed versions of the *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng* will likely clarify this issue somewhat, but note also that Nam Kyŏngnan (2009:89) records frequent examples of deletion of *ho-* before ᄀᆞ *-ke-*, and indeed, claims that deletion was the default practice. She also writes in footnote 29 on the same page that the materials she studied frequently delete ᄒᆞ *ho-* before ᄒᆞ.

h[o]-kwo):

(金剛12b:07) 入草求人ㄴ 不奈何ㅇㅋ 利刀ㅅ 斫了ㅁ 手摩挲ㅇㅌㅣ
khwo

But one also finds examples of just ㅇㅁ:

(金剛3a:10) 猿啼嶺上ㅇㅁ
hokwo

We also find cases of optional deletion of *ho-* before *ya* (i.e., deletion of ㅇ before ㅋ):

(金剛3b:08) 一枝無孔笛ㅋ
hoya

2.3. Optional deletion of - s - ?

Our text offers nine examples of what Martin (1992:736) calls the modulated processive emotive indicative assertive in *-nwosta* (< **-(·)n[o]-·wo-s-ta*), rendered as -ㅅㅓㅣ in the *kugyŏl* glosses.

However, there are also two examples where the same *ŏnhae* gloss *honwosta* is rendered ㅇㅅㅣ rather than ㅇㅅㅓㅣ:

(金剛22b:07) 識醉人[14] ㅇㅅㅣ
honwosta

(金剛24b:08) 日生月落ㅇㅅㅣ
honwosta

It is tempting to interpret these examples as cases of optional deletion of *-s-* in this ending, but the following lone example of *kugyŏl* ㆍㅅㅣ (normally representing the extremely frequent copular form in *·ihwo·ta*) corresponding to the *ŏnhae* gloss in *honwosta* suggests that we are dealing instead with a scribal error on the part of the glossator, who was mechanically transferring glosses from the *Samgahae* to his text:

(金剛3a:02) 疾雷ㄱ月 何太急ㆍㅐㅠ 迅電ㅂ 亦非光ㆍㅅㅣ
honwosta

2.4. ㅈ (*za*) and ㆍㅈ (*iza*)

The *kugyŏl* character ㅈ appears in just two contexts in our text: as part of the verb form ㅇㅗㅈ corresponding to MK *·ho.ya ·za* and to *hoyaza* in the *ŏnhae* glosses (ten examples), and as the nominal particle ㅈ ~ ㆍㅈ corresponding to MK *·za* ~ *·i·za* (usually just nominative *·i* + *·za*, but see Martin 1992:592 for other possibilities). This particle sequence had an alternate form in *y·za*, usually only after Chinese characters ending in a vowel; *han'gŭl* words ending in a vowel usually took just *·za*[15]. Our text has just two examples of the particle. Because the *kugyŏl* glosses had no way to indicate

---

[14] NB: The *ŏnhae* has 惜醉人 instead of 識醉人.

[15] However, the *ŏnhae* translation in the *Samgahae* renders our second example here as *y·za*.

a semi-vowel, the *yza* of the *Samgahae* gloss in the second example was carried over as *kugyŏl* ᄂᆞᄋᆞ:

(金剛14a:03) 信ᄭᆞᄂᆞᆫ解ᄋᆞ라受持ᄋᆞ 不足為難ᄂᆞᄋᆞᄒᆞᆫᄃᆞ
za *iGeniwa*

(金剛17a:07) 人天福報ᄂᆞᄋᆞ 即不無ᄉᆞᄒᆞᆫᄃᆞ
yza *kheniwa*

3. INFLUENCE OF THE *KŬMGANG KYŎNG SAMGAHAE* 金剛經三家解

By now it should be clear that the *kugyŏl* glosses in the Asami Collection of the *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng* bear a close relationship to those in the 1482 *Kŭmgang kyŏng samgahae* 金剛經三家解.

3.1. Glosses with non-traditional shapes

One obvious piece of evidence suggesting that the glossator relied heavily on the *Samgahae* for his glosses is the occasional appearance of *kugyŏl* glosses with shapes atypical for traditional glossing practice. For example, the traditional *kugyŏl* shape for the topic~contrast particle was just ᄀ, but our text has five examples with the shape ᄒᆞᆫᄀ corresponding to the MK shape ·*non* and to the *ŏnhae* gloss *non*:

(金剛27a:01-02) 發阿耨多羅三藐三菩提心者ᄒᆞᆫᄀ
(金剛27a:02-03) 發阿耨多羅三藐三菩提心者ᄒᆞᆫᄀ
(金剛27b:08) 如來者ᄒᆞᆫᄀ
(金剛28b:07) 發阿耨多羅三藐三菩提心者ᄒᆞᆫᄀ
(金剛29a:08) 末後一句ᄒᆞᆫᄀ

And in yet another case the same gloss is written in *han'gŭl*, suggesting yet again that the glossator was copying mechanically from the *Samgahae*:

(金剛20a:02) 世尊ᄭᅮ 如我解佛所說義ᄂᆞᆫ
non

3.2. ᄀᆞᄆᆡᄋᆞ = *hwamiye* vs. *hwamistonye*

In the following example, the *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng* and the *Samgahae ŏnhae* gloss agree in recording ᄀᆞᄆᆡᄋᆞ and *hwamiye*:

(金剛11b:10-12a:01) 何況有人ᄋᆞ 盡能受持讀誦ᄀᆞᄆᆡᄋᆞ

But the (or at least a) glossator of the *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng* has added *han'gŭl* 호미ᄯᅳ녀 *hwamistonye* in the righthand margin, while the *Samgahae ŏnhae* translation (not the *ŏnhae kugyŏl* gloss) reads:

·*homol·mye :ta* 能*nung·hi wo·on* 經*kyeng ·ol ta·nye nilol :salo·misto·nye*
"[If such is the case with a person who reads just one portion], what then of the person who is capable of reading the entire sutra?!" [16]

---

16 Unless preceded by "[lit.]," translations from the *Diamond Sūtra* are taken from Price and Wong

The same pattern in *hanmun* 何況 ... triggering a rhetorical question glossed with *iye* can be seen in the following example:

(金剛7b:05) **何況非法**ㆍㆎ
金剛經I: *·homol·mye* 非*PI* 法*·PEP ·isto·nye*
"... how much more so misteaching!"

We seem to be dealing with an older vernacular glossing pattern for 何況 ... in N *·i·ye* (or nominalized V-*·w$^{o/u}$·m i·ye*) that was replaced by MK N *·i·sto·n ye* (V-*·w$^{o/u}$·m i·sto·n ye*).

3.3. Hybrid Glosses with *han'gŭl* 이 *ngi*

One of the more interesting features of the glosses in our text is the use of *han'gŭl* 이 alongside abbreviated character *kugyŏl* glosses to create hybrid glosses for verb ending strings that incorporate the MK bound politeness marker *–ngi* [17]. As noted already in the introduction above, earlier (pre-*han'gul*) glosses from late Koryŏ and early Chosŏn had to resort to combinations like 厂 + 丨 (reported by Kim Namgyun for the glossed copy of the *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng* he examined) or just 丨 or 丶 (as in, for example, the Adan Mungo copy of our text). Here is a list of all the different hybrid glosses using 이 in our text along with their corresponding *ŏnhae* glosses (note the occasional appearance of ㅇ丨ㅅ):

又户이丨	*-'lwoswongita*
丶又丶ㅅ又이丨	*-ilwola honwongita*
丶ㅂ잇ㅁ	*-iningiskwo*
丶이丨	*-ingita*
丶잇可	*-ingiska*
丶丶ㅅㄴㅌ이丨	*-ila honinongita*
丶丨잇ㅁ	*-ilingiskwo*
丶ㄴㅂ이丨	*-isiningita*, *-'siningita*
ㅅ이丨	*hongita*
ㅅㄴㅂ이丨	*hosiningita*
ㅅㄴㅌㅂ이丨	*hosinoningita*
ㅅㅗ午丨이丨	*hozowolingita*
ㅅ丨이可	*holingiska*
ㅅ丨이丨	*holingita*

While our text is relatively consistent in deploying 이 exactly where the *Samgahae* does, there are nonetheless a few lapses:

丶ㅌ可 for *–ingiska*, *-'yngiska*

(金剛24a:07) **生信心**ㅅ丨이可 **不**丶ㅌ可
holingiska *ingiska*

(金剛6b:04-05) **生實信不**丶ㅌ可
'yngiska

(1969), and translations of the Ch'ŏllo commentary are taken from Qian Su (2002).

[17] See Martin (1992:714) and 1996 for this marker.

ᄂᆞᄉᆞᆫᄂᆞᆡ for *-ilwoswongita*
(金剛13b:09) **人ㅣ 成就第一希有功德**ᄂᆞᄉᆞᆫᄂᆞᆡ
ilwoswongita

It is tempting to interpret these cases of ᄋᆡ-less glosses as holdovers (archaisms) from earlier glossed versions of our text. This is especially true in the cases of the glosses in ᄂᆞᄒᆞ可 on 不, as these are yes-no questions ('... or not?') where other glossed versions of our text often leave the preceding main verb (生 in our examples here) unglossed and gloss only 不. This suggests that the glossator of our text relied on an earlier glossed version for his glosses on 不, but transferred the gloss with ᄋᆡ from the *Samgahae* because his earlier glossed version had to gloss to copy.

3.4. Other Partial or Whole *han'gŭl* Glosses

Besides the hybrid glosses seen above, there are a few other examples of glosses either partially or wholly in *han'gŭl* demonstrating yet again the glossator's reliance on the *Samgahae*.

The following example mixes *han'gŭl* and an abbreviated character gloss for MK *·i·ye* (see also section 3.2 above):

ᄂᆞ여
(金剛17a:06-07) 何況書寫受持讀誦ᄒᆞᄋᆞᆯ 為人解說ᄂᆞ여
hoya *iye*

Sure enough, the 1464 *Kŭmgang kyŏng ŏnhae* (II:91b) renders this with *-·w$^{o/u}$·m i·sto·n ye*:

·homol·mye 書*SYE* 寫:*SYAho·mye* 受:*SSYWUW* 持*TTI*
ho·mye 讀·*TTWOK* 誦·*SSYWONG* *·ho·ya :salom*
爲·*WUY·ho·ya sa·kye nil·Gwo·misto·nye*
"But how can any comparison be made with one who
writes it down, receives it, retains it, and explains it to others!"

In two other examples, the *han'gŭl kugyŏl* is transferred intact from the *Samgahae* into the position reserved for traditional abbreviated character glosses at the bottom lower righthand corner of the Chinese character:

옛
(金剛12b:09) 三千大千世界옛 所有微塵ᄉᆞ
yey s

타 (three examples)
(金剛14b:06; 20a:03; 24b:02) 如是如是타
tha (= *·tha* < *ho-·ta*)

4. GLOSSING IN TWO DIMENSIONS

Thus far we have focused on the glosses deployed in the traditional position for 'sequential' (*sundok* 順讀) *kugyŏl* glossing: the righthand margin of the *hanmun* line,

commencing from the bottom righthand corner of the last character in the glossed string. Historical surveys of the development of *kugyŏl* glossing practices in Korea point out that Koryŏ-period glossing was similar in nature to Japanese *kanbun kundoku* 漢文訓讀. The glossing conventions used both sides of the *hanmun* line in one integrated process that made extensive use of vernacular glosses as opposed to just Sino-Korean chunks read in Sino-Korean pronunciation: the reader proceeded first down the righthand side until a 'go back' sign (*yŏktokchŏm* 逆讀點) was reached, at which point he went back up the lefthand side of the line to the first gloss there, and continued up the lefthand side until he ran out of 'back marks', at which point he resumed reading from the point with the last gloss on the righthand side. Both sides of the line were used in a process that rendered the *hanmun* text into a Korean text in Korean word order with substantial use of vernacular glosses for many of the Chinese characters and with Korean nominal and verbal morphology throughout.

Diachronic studies of Korean glossing practice emphasize that this sort of interpretive glossing practice that reached its peak during Koryŏ was waning by the end of that dynasty and was more or less moribund by early Chosŏn. Instead, it was replaced by a sequential glossing (also known as *ŭmdok* 音讀 *kugyŏl* or 'sound' glossing because the Chinese characters were read according to their Sino-Korean pronunciations rather than their vernacular glosses) practice that read the *hanmun* straight down the line in chunks of what William Skillend (in the slightly different context of late Chosŏn vernacular fiction) called 'Sino-Korean holophrase'—now without the benefit of 'back marks' or accommodations for Korean word order, and therefore without the need for glosses on the lefthand side of the line. The exact chronology and details of the shift from interpretive to sequential (or 'sound') glossing, though, are not entirely clear, and sequentially glossed texts from early and even mid-Chosŏn can contain traces of techniques for indicating both vernacular Korean word order and vernacular Korean glosses (*hundok* 訓讀) of Chinese characters [18].

It is therefore yet another interesting feature of our text that it occasionally deploys glosses—often in *han'gŭl*, but also in abbreviated character *kugyŏl* and mixtures of the two—along the lefthand margin of the *hanmun* line of a more 'interpretive' (*sŏktok* 釋讀) type.

4.1. Lefthand glosses in the *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng*

The lefthand glosses in the *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng* have two sources: in the case of the main text from the *Kŭmgang kyŏng* (which is not provided with *ŏnhae* translations in the 1482 *Samgahae*), the glosses are copied over from the *Kŭmgang kyŏng ŏnhae* translations (1464), and in the case of the Ch'ŏllo 川老 commentary, the glosses are copied over from the *ŏnhae* translations in the *Kŭmgang kyŏng samgahae ŏnhae*. However, both types of lefthand gloss stop abruptly at the point where volume one of the *Kŭmgang kyŏng ŏnhae* ends, suggesting that the glossator had access to only the first of the two volumes, and simply stopped glossing at that point.

---

[18] In this regard, see especially Fujimoto (1992; 1993).

Below are some of the more interesting examples of lefthand glosses, along with the source passages and English translations. Lefthand glosses are marked in **bold**, as are the matching strings in the source text.

4.1.1. *Glosses copied from the* Kŭmgang kyŏng ŏnhae *(1464)* [19]

The very first example is of especial interest because it is also the only example in our text of true 'interpretive' glossing: three of the characters have dots to their left indicating the Korean word order (the dots are vertical in the original) [20]:

(金剛6a:02) **菩薩ㄱ·但應…如所…教住**ㄱㄴㅅㅂㅅㅣㅂ

(金剛I.28b) 菩*PPWO* 薩·*SALQ* ·*un*[1]*wo*·*cik*[2]*kolo*·*chywom*[3]·*kothi*
住·*TTWU* ·***hwol*** ·***tt in*** *i* '·*la*.
"[lit.] Bodhisattvas should only abide /persevere as per the instruction."

Note also that the glossator's analysis of the 'should; ought to' pattern glossing Chinese 應 suggests a contemporary analysis as -*(ŭ/o)lq*·*ti* + copula, whereas Martin's analysis (reflected in the transcription) is more diachronic.

The next example and many others following it suggest that a kind of vernacular glossing (*hundok* 訓讀) regime lurked vestigially just below the surface, even while actual glossing practice had already become largely sequential. The gloss in 샨 *syan* on 說 'speak; say; tell' can be interpreted as a relic of the earlier practice of 'final sound suffixation' (*marŭm ch'ŏmgi* 末音添記) whereby the vernacular gloss to a Chinese character was hinted at by adding a gloss denoting the final segment or syllable of the vernacular equivalent. Thus, the 샨 here indicates that 說 is to be read as the Korean verb stem *nilo-* + honorific modulated modifier -·*syan* (< *-*si*-·*wo*-*n*):

(金剛7b:09) **我ㅅ解**아로ᄆᆞᆫ**佛所說**샨**義**ㄱ

(金剛I.38b) ·*na* ***ypwuthye s nilo*·*syan***·*ptut* ***a*·*lwo m on***
"As I understand Buddha's meaning..."

In this particular case, the point is reinforced further by the marginal gloss in the bottom left gutter: 니ᄅᆞ샤... (*nilosya[n]* with the final ㄴ cut off. Finally, note also the ㅅ on 我 "I", reinforcing evidence (as if it were needed) that (di)graphs like ㅐ (ㅏ + ㅣ) really were diphthongs at the time of glossing in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century.

More examples of *marŭm ch'ŏmgi* 末音添記 'final sound suffixation' include 當ㄱ = *pan*·***to ki***, 昔ㅅ = *:nye* ***y***, 名ᄆᆞ = *il*·*hwu* ***m i***, 生ᄆᆞ = *:nayywo* ·***m i*** and 無ᄂᆞᆫ = *:ep* ·***sun*** in the examples below:

(金剛14b:07) **當ㄱ知**아ᄅᆞㅂᄆᆞᆫ**是人**ㄱ **甚為希有**ㅅㅣㅎᄆᆞᆫㅅㅂ

(金剛I.77b) 甚·*SSIM*·*hi* 希*HUY* 有:*NGWUW* ***hon*·*tol*** *pan*·***to ki a*·*lwolttti*·*ni***

---

19 *Kŭmgang kyŏng ŏnhae* examples are cited from the version available online from the Hangeul Museum at: www.hangeulmuseum.org/sub/information/bookData/total_List.jsp?d_code=00423&g_class=01.

20 For discussion of similar word order glosses in an earlier edition of the *Kŭmgang kyŏng* from Koryŏ, see Chŏng (2007).

"...be it known that such an one is of remarkable achievement."

(金剛15a:05) **我**、**昔**ㆍ**為歌利王**ㅣ **割截**ᄉ **身體**ㄴ ㅅㄱ
(金剛I.79a) *nay :nye***y**歌*KA* 利*·LI* 王*NGWANG ·uy* 身*SIN* 體*:THYEY* ***·ldi*** *pe·hywo·****mi*** *towoy·ya*
"[lit.] when old my body was dismembered by the Rajah of Kalinga..."

(金剛9a:09) **斯陀含**ㄴ **名**ᄉ**一往**ㅅㅣ번가며**來**오미로ᄃᆡ ㅊㅁ
(金剛I.51a) 斯*SO* 陁*TTA* 含*HHAM ·ol il·hwu****mi hoŋpen ka·mye :wo milwo toy***
"[Because] "Once-to-be-reborn" is merely a name."

In the following example, the glossator has glossed 無 with *epsulsoy* where the 1464 source text has *:epsul·ssoy*, but this is consistent with the abandonment of geminate spellings in cases like this starting with the *Wŏn'gak kyŏng ŏnhae* 圓覺經 諺解 in 1465:
(金剛9a:09) **而實**ᄉ **無**업슬식**往來**가며오미 ㅅㅣㅂㅗㅅ
(金剛I.51a) 實*·SSIL* ***·lwo ka·mye :wo mi :epsul·ssoy***
"There is no passing away nor coming into existence."

In the next example, there is a difference in the interrogative endings between the *ŏnhae* and the *kugyŏl* glosses (*ka* and *Ga* in the *kugyŏl* glosses vs. *·ye* in the *Kŭmgang kyŏng ŏnhae*), suggesting that the glossator was not always entirely mechanical in his work:
(金剛12b:05) **如來**ㆍ**有所說**닐옴**法**ㅣ **不**ㅱ
(金剛I.67a) 如*ZYE* 來*LOY y* 法*·PEP* ***nil·Gwo****mi****sno·****n ye ani·n ye?***
"Has the Tathāgata a teaching to enunciate?"

And the same (very occasional) independence of spirit can be seen in the next example, where the ㄹ gloss on 他人 is not supported by the *ŏnhae*, and is thus the work of the glossator [21] (The initial ㄹ in 리를 is a mistake, and the final ㄹ is hard to make out):
(金剛13a:09) **復有人**ㆍ ... **乃至**리를**受持四句偈等**ㅅㅣ **為他人**ㄹ**說**ㅅㅓ
(金剛I.71a) *talon :salom* 爲*·WUY ·ho·ya nil·Gwu·m ay* ***ni·lul·****myen*
"if ... anyone receives and retains even only four lines [of this Discourse], and teaches and explains them to others..."

Likewise, in the next example the glossator has subsituted ㅅㅈ for what should be ㅅㅎ:
(金剛15a:10) **應生瞋**ㅅㅈ**恨**믜유믈 ㅅㅐ馬ㅂㆍ
(金剛I.79b) *pan·toki* 瞋*CHIN* 心*SIM* ***·ho****ya* ***muy·ywu·mul*** *:nay·lile·ni·la*
"...feelings of anger and hatred would have been aroused within me."

---

[21] The only other example in the text of a gloss not supported by either the *Kŭmgang kyŏng ŏnhae* or the *Samgahae* is the gloss here on 中 corresponding to MK *·eys*: (金剛22b:03) **湏菩提**ㅡ **於意云何**ㅎ **如一恒河中**ㅇㆍㄴ **所有**

The following righthand gloss also happens to be a nice example of the nominal use of MK processive modifier *-non*:

(金剛12b:10) **諸微塵**ᄂ **如來說**니르ᄂᆞᆫᄂᆞᆫ **非微塵**ᄂᆞᆫ

(金剛I.68a) 諸*CYE* 微*MI* 塵*TTIN* *·ul* 如*ZYE* 來*LOY* *y* ***nilonon****i* 微*MI* 塵*TTIN* *a·ni·la*

"[lit.] that which the Tathagata calls molecules are not molecules..."

4.1.1.1. Other glosses from the Kŭmgang kyŏng ŏnhae

In just a couple of cases the *Kŭmgang kyŏng ŏnhae* glosses are entered not in the lefthand margin but directly at the righthand side of the relevant Chinese character or just beneath it, showing again that the glossator was using this text as a crib. For example, in the following two cases, the translation gloss is placed immediately to the right:

(金剛7b:01) **是故**ᄉᆞ **不應**맛당티**取法**ᄌᆞ **不應取非法**ᄂᆞᄇᆞ

(金剛I.37b) *·ilol·ssoy* 法*·PEP* *·ul* 取*:CHYWU* *·hwomi* *·mastang·thi* *:mwot ho·mye*

"[lit.] For this reason, one should not adopt the Dharma, and ..."

(金剛14a:07) **信解아라受持**ᄉᆞᄆᆞ

(金剛I.74b) 信*·SIN·ho·ya* ***a·la***

"receive and retain it with faith and understanding..."

4.1.2. Glosses copied from the *Samgahae ŏnhae* translation

The most interesting glosses copied over from the *Samgahae* are those that are rendered in 'final sound suffixation' (*marŭm ch'ŏmgi* 末音添記) style—examples like the following, rendered in more detail below:

頭ᄇᆡᄉᆞ = *me****·li***, 開ᄒᆞ = *:ye****ti***, 不斷ᄒᆞ = *kus****·ti***, 不離ᄒᆞ = *ye·huy****ti***, 有ᄉᆞ相有ᄉᆞᆷᄌᆞ = *isi****·mye****... i****·sywom****i***, 無ᄉᆞ...無ᄇᆞᄋᆞᆼᄀᆞ = *:eps****ur·mye****... :ep****ta****·ho****ya****·two***, 石ᄉᆞᆨ = *:twol****hi***, 無ᄀᆞᄉᆞᄂᆞ = *:ep·sun****key***, 莫道ᄒᆞ不...識ᄒᆞ = *nilo****·ti****... :a****ti***, 不責ᄒᆞ = *·COYK[ho]****·ti***, and 火ᄅᆡ吹ᄎᆞᆷ = *·pul****ey****... pwu·hwu****mi***.

(金剛5a:03-04) 神ᄒᆞ頭ᄇᆡᄉᆞ鬼面ᄂᆞᆺᄀᆞᆺ、棒打ᄠᅴ도不開ᄒᆞᄉᆞ刀ᄉᆞ割ᄭᅡ不斷ᄒᆞᄂᆞᄉᆞᄀᆡ 閻浮ᄋᆞᆷ 踔躑ᄇᆞ、ᄃᆞᆯ와ᄃᆞ、ᄃᆞᆫ됴미[sic]、幾千迴도라ᄒᆞᆫ 頭頭、不ᄇᆞᄭᅡᄀᆡ離ᄒᆞ空王殿ᄂᆞᄂᆞᆡ

神*SSIN* 靈*LYENG* ***·uy****me****·li****'·mye****kwuyske·s uy no·ch i ·hwoswo·ni ·may hwo* ***·thye two*** *:ye****ti*** *a·ni ho·mye ·kalh* ***o·lwo*** *pey·hye* ***two*** *kus****·ti*** *a·ni ·honwos·ta.* 閻*YEM* 浮*PPWUW ·ey* ***pol·Gwa tot·nywom i*** *·myes CHYEN ·ol* ***two·la*** *·wona·****nywo****?* 頭 *TTWUW* 頭*TTWUW* *y* 空*KHWONG* 王*NGWANG* 殿*·TTYEN ·ey ye·huy****ti*** *a·ni* ***·hotwo·ta.*** (*Samgahae* 2:14, column 6)

"Because these are the heads of spirits and the faces of ghosts, even if one strikes them with a club they do not crack and even if one cuts them with a knife they do not sever. How many thousands of times do they leap around in Jambudvīpa? Every time, they are unable to get away from the Hall of the King of Emptiness."

(金剛6b:01-02) 有ᄀᆞ相有ᄉᆞᆷ求、
相·*SSYANG isi·**mye*求*KKWUW i·**swomi*
(*Samgahae* 2:47, column 8)
"The presence of marks and desires..."

(金剛6b:02) 無ᄀᆞ形無ㅣᄂᆞᄋᆞᄆᆞ見、、ㅁ 墮偏기우리枯ㅅㅣ、
*elkwul :eps**u·mye**:pwom :ep**ta·hoya·twoki·wule**i·wuntoy pte·leti·l i 'la*
(*Samgahae* 2:47, column 8)
"Even without form or discernment, one is bound to fall into bias."

(金剛10b:10) 頑어린石ᄉᆞ、動也、ㅌㅣ、
***e·lin**:twol**hi**:mwuyn i '·la* (*Samgahae* 2:129, column 7)
"... the senseless stone has moved."

(金剛12b:03) 無ㄱᆞᄉᆞᆫ絃ㅇᆞ、
*si·[G]wul :ep·su**n·key*(*Samgahae ŏnhae* 3:12 column 2)
"[playing on] a stringless [zither]..."

(金剛15a:02-03) 萬別ᄇᆞ 千差ᄎᆞᆫ、從此出ㅅㅌㅌ 鬼面ᄉᆞ神ᄉᆞ頭、對ᄇᆞᄉᆞ面ᄂᆞ來ㅇᆞㅅㄱ 此時ㅅ、ᆞ 莫道ᄉᆞ不ᄇᆞᄉᆞᄒᆞ相識ᄉᆞ、、ㅅ、
萬·*MEN* 別·*PPYELQ **·[G]wa* 千*CHYEN* 差*CHA **·wa y**·i lol pu·the ·nano·ni kwuys·ke·s uy nos **·kwa* 神*SSIN* 靈*LYENG **·uy** me·li no·ch **o** TWOY·**hoya** ·woke·ton ·i ·psk uy selu :a**ti** :mwot **·honwo·la** nilo**·ti** :malla*
(*Samgahae ŏnhae* 3:36 column 9)
"[What is called the first Paramita] is whence all differences and distinctions arise; if you should encounter the faces of ghosts or the heads of spirits, do not say at such a time that you are not acquainted."

(金剛15a:07) [三57] 智혜不責ᄉᆞ愚어리ㅌㄴ、ㅌ、
智*TI* **慧*HHYWUYEY e·lini·ld*** ·*COYK[ho]·**ti** a·ni ho·non i '·la*
(*Samgahae ŏnhae* 3:57 column 10)
"The wise do not blame fools."

This example is interesting because the Sino-Korean pronunciation for 慧 is glossed as colloquial vernacular *hyey* in contrast with the artificial *Tongguk chŏng'un* 東國正韻 reading *HHYWUYEY* in the *Samgahae*. Note also the mixture in mid-word of *han'gŭl* and abbreviated *kugyŏl* gloss in 어리ㅌㄴ = *e·lini ·lol*.

(金剛15a:07) 如刀斷水ㅅㅈ 似火ᄒᆡ吹ᄉᆞᆷ光ㅇᆞㅈㅣ
·*kalh o·hwo ·mul ku·chwum i ·kotho·mye ·pu**l ey***光*KWANG*
*pwu·hwu**mi** ·kottwo·ta* (*Samgahae ŏnhae* 3:58 column 6)
"It is like cutting water with a knife, and like blowing heat into a fire."

4.1.2.1. Other glosses from the Samgahae ŏnhae

As with glosses copied over to the lefthand margin from the *Kŭmgang kyŏng ŏnhae*, in a few cases the *Samgahae ŏnhae* glosses are entered not in the lefthand margin but directly at the righthand side of the relevant Chinese character:

(金剛10b:07) [二124] 雖**비록**然**그러나컨마른**恁麼ㆍᄆᆞ 爭奈目
pi·lwok kŭ·le·na khemma·lon (*Samgahae* 2:124, column 11)
"Even though such is the case..."

(金剛13b:05) 自小**져믄제**來
ce·mun·cey *pu·the* (*Samgahae ŏnhae* 3:33 columns 3-4)
"Ever since I was little..."

5. MARGINALIA IN THE *CH'ŎLLO KŬMGANG KYŎNG*

The Asami edition of the *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng* contains a substantial number of marginalia (more than thirty), written by hand in the upper and lower gutters, in the remaining space in lines of the main text with few Chinese characters, and occasionally in the righthand margin of the page. These marginalia are invariably translation glosses copied over verbatim (albeit without the pitch-accent dots) from the explanatory notes to the *Samgahae ŏnhae* passages. Most of the translation glosses like these copied into the upper and lower gutters were cut off on either the top or bottom, respectively, when our text was remounted and rebound at some later date, but the translation glosses copied into either the righthand margin of the page or the blank lines within the text proper are mostly intact. For example:

a) In the right-hand margin of 金剛4a we find the handwritten gloss:
堂堂ㄱ盛ㅅㄴㅣ、
This glosses the characters 堂堂 in 金剛4a:02 巍巍堂堂ㅅㅅ ... and is copied from *Samgahae* 1:28B column 2, line 2:
堂*TTANG*堂*TTANG ·on* 盛·*SSYENGhol ·s i·la.*
Note, however, that the *han'gŭl* gloss here has been converted into an abbreviated character *kugyŏl* gloss.

b) In 金剛5a:04 the line ends halfway down the page with 離空王殿ㄴㆍㅊㅣ after which the following is entered by hand:
空王殿ㄱ人人分上ㅅㆍ本覺妙心ㆍ、
Here again the glossator has converted into an abbreviated character *kugyŏl* gloss the following note from 二 14 column 8:
空*KHWONG*王*NGWANG*殿·*TTYEN on*
人*ZIN*人*ZIN*分·*PPWUN*上:*SSYANG ·ay*
本:*PWON*覺·*KAK*妙·*MYWOW*心*SIM ·ila.*

c) In 金剛5b:08 the line finishes halfway down the page with:
絲頭念ㅅㄴㅕㆍ所以彰名大覺仙ㅅㄴㅂ、

This is followed by the following handwritten translation gloss:

絲毫念ㄱ中ᄋᆞᆯ니ᄅᆞ니中ᄋᆞᆯ아ᅀᅡᄇᆞ리다혼 ᄠᅳ디라.

Cf. *Samgahae* 二 30, column 8, where the note reads:

絲*SO*毫*HHWOW*念·*NYEM ·on* 中*TYWUNG ·ol nilo·na*
中*TYWUNG ·ol a·za po·lita ·hwon ·ptut ila.*

That is, the glossator has copied verbatim from the *Samgahae*, including the replacement of 毫 for 頭, but the note is hybrid (abbreviated character *kugyŏl* plus *han'gŭl*) in its execution.

d) The short line in 金剛6a:04 ends with 舊百花香ㆍㅣ、and is followed by the handwritten gloss:

五湖ᄂᆞᆫ므리니다ᄉᆞᆺ가ᄅᆞᆯ로흐ᄅᆞᆯᄉᆡ五湖ㆍ、ㆍㅣㆍ、

This glosses 五湖 in the preceding line: 金剛6a:03 但得五湖風月ㆍ在ㆍㅣ
and is copied from the note in *Samgahae* 2:35 column 6 which reads:

湖*HHWO ·non ·mul i·ni ta·soska·lol ·hwo hulol ·s oy* 五*:NGWO*
湖*HHWO y ·la ho·n i '·la*

Once again, the gloss is hybrid, incorporating both abbreviated character *kugyŏl* and *han'gŭl*.

e) 金剛12b:03-04 contains the passage:

格調ㆍ新ᄉᆡᆨᄅᆞ외리니ㆍㅣㅣㆍ知音ᄋᆞ知ᄀᆞ後ㆍ、徒ᄒᆞᆫᄌᆞᆺ名邈ㆍᄋᆞㅣ

The bottom half of line carries the gloss:

律ㄱ法ㆍᄉᆞ調ㄱ曲調ㆍ、名ㄱ일훔ᄒᆞᆯ시오 邈ㄱ머다ᄒᆞ논마리라
"律 is 'law; rule' and 調 is 'tune'. 名 is to name and 邈 is an expression meaning 'far'."

Here again the glossator has copied verbatim from the *Samgahae*, including its use of 律調 instead of 格調 (note on 3:12, column 3):

律·*LYWULQ ·on* 法·*PEP ·iGwo* 調*TTYWOW ·non* 曲·*KHWOK*
調*TTYWOW y·la* 邈·*MAK ·on :meta ·honwon :mal i·la.*

6. CONCLUSIONS

This study of the glosses in the Asami Collection copy of the *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng* was undertaken in the first instance to provide, for the first time ever in English, a detailed analysis of a Buddhist work in *hanmun* from traditional Korea with *kugyŏl* glosses and thereby to provide a tentative model for similar studies in future. It has also aimed to introduce the oldest such glossed *hanmun* text held in a North American library collection.

Though the text itself was printed in 1387 at the very end of the Koryŏ dynasty, our analysis has shown that the glossator of our text relied heavily on both the 1464 *Kŭmgang kyŏng ŏnhae* and the 1482 *Kŭmgang kyŏng samgahae* for his glosses. It is impossible to know when exactly the text was glossed, but it was likely within twenty to forty years of the printing of the *Samgahae* in 1482—perhaps as early as the 1480s. That the glossator likely completed his work before the end of the 15th century is suggested by the presence of certain archaisms in the *kugyŏl*, such as the numerous locatives marked with older ᄋᆞ and the one example of word order dots.

But perhaps the more enduring lesson to be learned from this particular text concerns the impact that the invention of the *hunmin chŏng'ŭm* had on inscriptional practices in general and glossing practices in particular, and we have suggested tentatively that the availability of this new inscriptional technology may have led to the existence of a new kind of 'two-dimensional' glossing practice that used both sides of the *hanmun* line again, but in ways different from the earlier integrated 'interpretive' glossing of the high Koryŏ. In other words, the claim is not that the invention of the new vernacular script led to the demise of the older 'interpretive glossing' system (it was already dead by the mid-1400s), but that once the *Hunmin chŏng'ŭm* was available, glossators seized on it to add vernacular glosses to the (now unused) lefthand side of the *hanmun* line in ways that partially reprised the role of interpretive glossing on a limited scale and supplemented the new 'sequential glossing' system (which was rather unforgiving for less advanced readers of *hanmun*).

A related and parallel lesson would be the enduring impact of Sejong's and especially Sejo's projects to provide canonical Buddhist texts with authoritative *kugyŏl* glossings and *ŏnhae* translations [22]. Indeed, the temptation is to imagine our glossator sitting down sometime in the early 1480s with our (clean) text on one side, an earlier glossed version beside it, and a copy of the 1464 *Kŭmgang kyŏng ŏnhae*; he starts to copy over the older glosses, only to come into possession of the newly printed *Samgahae*, after which he abandons the earlier glossed version and copies most of his glosses from the new *ŏnhae* version and its (*han'gŭl*) *kugyŏl* glosses. In other words, our text is an eloquent demonstration of the powerful standardizing effect of Sejo's *kugyŏl* projects in the Kan'gyŏng togam 刊經都監, of which the *Samgahae* was one (albeit much delayed in publication, appearing only in Sŏngjong's time).

Glossed texts from early Chosŏn—particularly messy ones full of both abbreviated character *kugyŏl* glosses and *han'gŭl* glosses—have not received the same attention and care as have texts from Koryŏ and Silla, but deserve to be studied in more detail because of the need to understand better the transition from interpretive to sequential glossing, and to appreciate the role that the newly invented vernacular script played in glossed texts once it was invented. In this regard, then, it will be useful in future to compare the Asami edition glosses with those in other known editions of the *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng* with *kugyŏl* glosses.

Submitted: 10 April, 2013
Sent for revision: 13 May, 2013
Accepted: 20 May, 2013

ROSS KING (ross.king@ubc.edu) *is Professor of Korean and Head of the Department of Asian Studies, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.*

[22] See Plassen (forthcoming) for a useful discussion.

REFERENCES

An Pyŏnghŭi. 1977. *Chungse kugŏ kugyŏl ŭi yŏn'gu* [A study of *kugyŏl* in Middle Korean]. Seoul: Ilchisa.

Ch'oe Pŏmhun. 1979. *Maengja chipchu* ŭi honsŏng kugyŏl e taehayŏ [On the hybrid *kugyŏl* in the *Maengja chipchu*]. *Ch'ŏngjusadae nonmunjip*, 1-20. Ch'ŏngju Sabŏm Taehak.

Chŏn Kich'ŏl. 2006. *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng*. Seoul: Tasi.

Chŏng Chaeyŏng. 2006. Han'guk ŭi kugyŏl [Korean *kugyŏl*]. *Kugyŏl yŏn'gu* 17:129-189.

Chŏng Chaeyŏng. 2007. Ch'ŏngju Koinswae Pangmulgwan sojang Wŏnhŭngsa-bon *Kŭmgang kyŏng* e taehan yŏn'gu [A study of the Wŏnhŭngsa Temple edition of the *Kŭmgang kyŏng* held at the Ch'ŏngju Early Printing Museum]. *Kugyŏl yŏn'gu* 19:227-257.

Chŏng Chaeyŏng and Kim Sŏngju. 2010. Yŏnggwang Pulgapsa pokchang chŏnjŏk e taehan kugŏhakchŏk yŏn'gu [A linguistic study of the texts recovered from a statue at Yŏnggwang Pulgapsa]. *Sŏjihakpo* 35:207-251.

Chung Jae-Young [Chŏng Chaeyŏng]. 1999. Sŏkdokkugyŏl in the Koryŏ period. *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 12:29-45.

Fang Chaoying (Elizabeth Huff, ed.). 1969. *The Asami library: A descriptive catalogue*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Fujimoto Yukio. 1992. Ri-chō Kundoku-kō: ki ichi—*Moguja susimgyŏl* wo chūshin ni shite [A study of *kun*-readings in the Yi dynasty: Part 1—focusing on the *Moguja susimgyŏl*]. *Chōsen gakuhō*143:109-218.

Fujimoto Yukio. 1993. Han'guk ŭi hundok e taehayŏ [On Korean *kundoku*]. In: *Kugŏsa charyo wa kugŏhak ŭi yŏn'gu*, 642-649. Seoul: Munhak kwa chisŏngsa.

Hwang Wiju. 2008. Haeoe ko-munhŏn chosa ŭi hyŏnhwang kwa hyanghu kwaje [Current status and future tasks of the investigation of old Korean documents overseas]. *Han'guk hanmunhak yŏn'gu*, vol. 41:273-308.

Kim Mubong. 2002. Chosŏn sidae kan'gyŏng togam ŭi yŏkkyŏng saŏp [The Buddhist sutra translation projects of the Kan'gyŏng Togam during the Chosŏn era]. *Chŏnja puljŏn* 4:7-53.

Kim Mudŭk chusŏk. 1992-1993. *Kŭmgang kyŏng kwa kŭ sŏnhae* [The *Diamond Sūtra* and its Zen interpretation]. Seoul: UriCh'ulp'ansa.

Kim Namgyun. 2000. *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng* kugyŏl ŭi chosa yŏn'gu [A study of the *kugyŏl* particles in the *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng*]. *Che 22-hoe kongdong yŏn'guhoe palp'yo nonmunjip*, pp. 91-124. Seoul: Kugyŏl Hakhoe.

King, Ross. 2006. Connecting dialects and kwukyel. In: Kugyŏl Hakhoe (eds.), *Hanmun tokpŏp kwa tong-asia ŭi muntcha* [Hanmun reading techniques and writing in East Asia]. Seoul: T'aehaksa, pp. 291-320.

King, Ross. 2010. Pre-Imjin *kugyŏl* sources in North American library collections: A preliminary survey. *Kugyŏl yŏn'gu* 25:217-282.

Martin, Samuel E. 1992. *A reference grammar of Korean*. Rutland, Vermont: Charles E. Tuttle Publishing.

Martin, Samuel E. 1996. The Middle Korean marker of politeness *-ngi*. In: Jae-Kee Shim, Hong-Pin Im, Young-Kun Ko, Sang-Oak Lee, Ik-Sop Lee, Myung-Ok Choi, Pyonggeun Lee and Hyeon-Hie Lee, eds., *Essays in Honor of Ki-Moon Lee*, pp. 1011-22. Seoul: Shin-gu Publishing Co.

Nam Kwŏnhŭi. 1997. Ch'aja p'yogi charyo ŭi sŏji [The bibliography of 'borrowed graph' materials]. *Sae kugŏ saenghwal* 7:4:147-194.

Nam Kwŏnhŭi. 1998. Koryŏ-mal esŏ Chosŏn chunggi kkaji ŭ kugyŏl charyo e kwanhan sŏjihakchŏk yŏn'gu [A bibliographic study of *kugyŏl* materials from late Koryŏ to mid-Chosŏn]. *Tosŏgwanhak nonjip* 27:485-572.

Nam Kwŏnhŭi. 1999. Chosŏn chunggi put'ŏ kuhanmal kkaji ŭi kugyŏl charyo e kwanhan sŏjihakchŏk yŏn'gu [A bibliographic study of *kugyŏl* materials from mid-Chosŏn to the end of the Old Han]. *Sŏjihak yŏn'gu* 18:445-519.

Nam Kwŏnhŭi. 2000. Ch'ŏngjumok Wŏnhŭngsa kanhaeng ŭi *Kŭmgang Panya P'aramilgyŏng* kwa Koryŏ sidae ŭi *Kŭmgang kyŏng* kanhaeng [The *Kŭmgang Panya P'aramil kyŏng* published at Ch'ŏngjumok Wŏnhŭngsa Temple and *Kŭmgang kyŏng* publishing in the Koryŏ era]. *Koinswae munhwa* 6:159-181. Ch'ŏngju Koinswae Pangmulgwan.

Nam Kyŏngnan [Kyŏng-ran]. 2005/2006. *Yŏmal~Sŏnch'o ŭmdok ipkyŏt (kugyŏl) ŭi chonghap-chŏk koch'al* [A comprehensive study of Late Koryŏ~Early Chosŏn *ŭmdok kugyŏl*]. Seoul: Kyung-in Publishing Co.

Nam Kyŏngnan [Kyŏng-ran]. 2009. *Yŏmal~Sŏnch'o ŭmdok ipkyŏt (kugyŏl) chahyŏng kwa kinŭng ŭi t'ongsi-jŏk yŏn'gu* [A diachronic study of the functions and shapes of Late Koryŏ~Early Chosŏn *ŭmdok kugyŏl* graphs]. Seoul: Kyung-in Publishing Co.

O Yongsŏp. 2008. *Tollyŏ patchi mothan ch'aek tŭl: Pŏk'ŭlli taehak ŭi uri kosŏ* [Unrepatriated books: the Old Korean books at UC-Berkeley]. Seoul: Kyŏng'in Munhwasa.

Paek Tu-hyŏn. 2005. *Sŏktok kugyŏl ŭi muntcha ch'egye wa kinŭng: Koryŏ sidae han'gugŏ yŏn'gu* [The interpretive *kugyŏl* writing system and its function: A study in the Korean language of the Koryŏ period]. Seoul: Han'guk Munhwasa.

Pak Hŭisuk. 1976. Puljŏn ŭi kugyŏl e taehayŏ [On *kugyŏl* in Buddhist sutras]. *Sŏnch'ŏng ŏmun* 7:191-200. (Also in: *Kim Hyŏnggyu kyosu chŏngnyŏn t'oeim kinyŏm nonmunjip*, 1976. Seoul: Sŏul Taehakkyo Sabŏm Taehak Kugŏ Kyoyukkwa).

Plassen, Jörg. (Forthcoming). Some preliminary (and mostly prefatory) remarks on the historical context of Buddhist *ŏnhae*. To appear in Ross King (ed.), Kugyŏl *and* kunten: *glossing techniques in Korea and Japan in comparative perspective*, 38 pp.

Price, A. F. and Mou-Lam Wong. 1969. *The Diamond Sutra and the Sutra of Hui Neng*. Berkeley, CA: Shambala Publications.

Ryu T'ag-il. 1977. Sŏnch'o munhŏn e ssŭiŏjin pulga kugyŏl [Buddhist *kugyŏl* written in early Chosŏn documents]. In: *Hasŏ Kim Chong'upaksa hwagap kinyŏm nonmunjip*, 68-89. Reprinted in *Han'guk munhŏnhak yŏn'gu* (Asea munhwasa, 1989)

Su Qian. 2002. Poetry: Yefu Daochuan' s Commentary on the *Diamond Sutra*. Unpublished MA thesis, UC-Santa Barbara.

Yi Chŏn-gyŏng. 2000. Kan'gyŏng togam ŭi ŏnhaesŏ wa pulgyŏng ŭi kugyŏlja pigyo: kugyŏlja ŭi umga ch'ujŏng kwa ch'aja unyongch'eje [A comparison of the *kugyŏl* graphs in *ŏnhae* texts from the *kan'gyŏng togam* and Buddhist sutras: estimating sound values of the *kugyŏl* graphs and the 'borrowed graph' deployment system]. *Che-23hoe kongdong yŏn'guhoe palp'yo nonmunjip (Kugyŏl Hakhoe)*, pp. 41-52. Seoul: Kugyŏl Hakhoe.

Yi Kyuho. 2000. '*Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng* kugyŏl ŭi chosa yŏn'gu' e taehan t'oron [A discussion of 'A study of the *kugyŏl* particles in the *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng*']. *Che 22-hoe kongdong yŏn'guhoe palp'yo nonmunjip*, pp. 125-129. Seoul: Kugyŏl Hakhoe.

Yi Pongjun. 1980. Chosŏn chŏn'gi puljŏn ŏnhae wa kŭ sasang [*Ŏnhae* translations of Buddhist classics in early Chosŏn and their thought]. *Han'guk pulgyohak* 5:41-70.

Yŏ Ch'an-yŏng. 1988. Chosŏnjo kugyŏlmun kwa ŏnhaemun ŭi sŏngkyŏk yŏn'gu [A study of the character of Chosŏn dynasty *kugyŏl* and *ŏnhae* texts]. *Kungmunhak yŏn'gu* 11:27-65.

Yŏngnam Taehakkyo Minjok Munhwa Yŏn'guso (eds.). 2012. *Ch'ŏllo Kŭmgang kyŏng* 川老金剛經 (Yŏngnam Taehakkyo Chung'ang Tosŏgwan sojang kwijung tosŏ yŏng'injip 1). Seoul: Kyungin Publishing Co.