Materials on Korean Studies

Exploring Early Korean Perspectives on Dialectology: Translation and Commentary of Lee Guk-lo's "The Dialects of Korean"

Simon BARNES-SADLER

Introduction

Traditional Korean dialectology has generally paid scant attention to Lee Guk-lo beyond mentioning his dialect taxonomy as pre-dating that more influential taxonomies of the Japanese colonial period, proposed by Ogura Shinpei (1940) and Kono Rokuro (1945). It is even possible to find instances of his complete omission from the field, for example in general surveys of Korean dialectology (e.g. J. Lee 2005) and even works specifically devoted to the history of the scholarship of Korean dialect taxonomy (Lee 1992). This oversight may also be observed in surveys of Korean dialectology disseminated internationally (e.g. Sohn 1999; Lee and Ramsey 2000). Over the last roughly twenty years, however, as the shortcomings of the dialect research carried out during the Japanese colonial period have come to be recognised alongside its achievements, Lee Guk-lo's work has been undergoing re-appraisal following a period of roughly forty years of obscurity. This translation and commentary represents an attempt not only to draw attention to an early alternative account of the Korean dialects, but a demonstration of both the diversity of opinions in early Korean dialectology and its empirical contribution.

In the remainder of this introductory section we provide a short biography of Lee Guk-lo before going on to place his research discipline-historical context. We then provide a translation of his 1932 paper "The Dialects of Korean," which is followed by commentary which addresses its structure, content, and findings.

Lee Guk-lo (1893-1978): Life and Works

Lee Guk-lo (also known by the pen name [*aho*] Koru) was born in 1893 in Uiryeong, South Gyeongsang Province. After his early education there, he took a preparatory course at Shanghai's Tóngjì 同濟 (Korean *dongje*) University where he encountered the radical and erstwhile language researcher, Kim Tu-bong (1889-1958), to whom his initial interest in Korean language research has been

attributed (Jeong 2013, 154). He then went on to be trained as an economist in Berlin, where he received a doctorate. While there he made attempts to raise awareness of and campaign against Japan's expansionism. He further developed his interest in language at this time by attending classes on anthropology and linguistics. Upon his return to Korea, he was especially active in the language movement with one estimate putting his number of works on that area in excess of two hundred (Ko 2008, 7). He was a member of the Korean Language Association[1] (KLA) with a particular interest in Korean lexicography (e.g. Lee 1932b; 1937) and orthographic standardisation (e.g. Lee 1935a; 1935b). Works such as the one under examination here, explicitly examining or even touching upon dialectology, were rare in his output.

His association and activities with the organisation led to him receiving a sentence of six years imprisonment in 1942 following the "Korean Language Association Incident." After taking part in a North/South summit in 1948, he chose to remain in Pyeongyang and subsequently played a significant role in the development of the standard language and language policy in the DPRK. He died in 1978. The work for which he is most remembered, in the ROK at least, is his pre-division writing on language standardisation. While his work covered an array of linguistic disciplines, ranging from historical phonology to contemporary grammar, his approach and objectives have led to the suggestion that he should be considered as "a social philosopher rather than a linguist" (Ko 2008, 26).

This characterisation appears apt from his dialectological work. Rather than an attempt at a full description of linguistic variation on the Korean peninsula, the paper presented in translation below is perhaps better regarded as an impressionistic overview and an attempt to set a research agenda without explicit reference to the extensive early surveys carried out by the KLA in the 1930s. In this regard it conforms with what has been categorised as the early "theoretical" period of the KLA's dialect research (1920-1935), as opposed to its later "practical" period (1936-1950) (Kim 2017, 218). In the following section we examine the context in which this paper was produced in terms of Korean

dialectological research.

Research Context

As implied above, despite its status as a very early attempt at providing a taxonomy of the dialects of Contemporary Korean, the paper presented below does not represent the very first work to address dialectology in Korea. Five years earlier, the study of dialects was acknowledged to be a part of research on the Korean language as it was to be conducted by the Korean Language Society as a matter of principle (Jeong 1927a) and works addressing topics related to dialect vocabulary (Lee 1927), and phonology (Jeong 1927b) appeared prior to the publication of this taxonomy. We further note that the pre-eminently influential Ogura Shinpei's research program began in 1911 with the first of his findings concerning the language of Jeju Island published in 1913 (B. Lee 2005, 43).

In terms of the Korean language research at the time, much as in contemporary research (see Silva 2010), linguistic variation was not one of the major fields of study. The pre-occupations of the field are well reflected in those of Lee Guk-lo, i.e. the practical questions of language standardisation and lexicography. While some did touch upon theoretical concerns relating to phonology and grammar (what might today be called morpho-syntax), these works, too, cannot be considered representative of the field at the time. Linguistics in Korea in the pre-modern period up until the end of the nineteenth century has been characterised as driven by the relationship between China and Korea, and so dominated by Sinitic philology and language pedagogy (Sasse 2000). While it is possible to identify a tradition of language study dating back to the analysis required for the creation of Hunminjeongeum, it was only from roughly the turn of the twentieth century that the concepts of *gugeohak*, *Joseoneohak*, and *eoneohak* (national language study, Korean Language study, and linguistics, respectively) emerged. They did so in the context of a changing intellectual culture increasingly influenced by an influx of new ideas from outside of the Korean peninsula, often mediated by Japan. These included the application of the scientific method in the social sciences at large, and particularly in linguistics (Heo 2015). The fifty years spanning the period of time from the Gabo reforms (1894) to the end of the Japanese colonial period (1945) has been distinguished from "contemporary Korean linguistics" and termed "modern Korean linguistics" (in analogy, if slightly out of sync, with the periodisation of the Korean language itself) due to the field at that time possessing a "prescriptive and nationalist character" and being "inclined towards, traditional grammar and the propagation of letters/literacy due to its emphasis on education" (Nam 2012, 29). These, then, were the academic conditions in which the Korean Language Society came to be founded and the earliest works of Korean dialectology, in the modern understanding, were produced.

Given the constellation of circumstances in which the below paper arose, it undoubtedly merits careful consideration as the first known work with an explicit focus on classification of geographically distinct varieties of the Korean language. It also provides more general insights into the prevailing attitudes and practices of researchers who laid the foundations of the disciplines of *gugeohak* and linguistics as they are practiced in Korea to this day.

Translation

Preface to the Translation

Along with the background information provided above, in order to connect this article's findings and methodology to contemporary research we provide an accompanying commentary. Rather than following the widely-circulated preference of Nabokov for commentary in the form of "translations with copious footnotes, footnotes reaching up like skyscrapers to the top of this or that page so as to leave only the gleam of one textual line between commentary and eternity" (2012, 83 [1955, 512]), we instead present the translation as a continuous text to preserve readability. It is divided into numbered sections based on the textual breaks in the original article and the commentary which follows is structured using the same numbering system, i.e. the content of the section of commentary numbered 3.1 refers to section 3.1 of the translated text.

Examples drawn from the author's knowledge of variation in Korean are cited throughout the text, although their provenance is not given. They are transliterated in the translation exclusively and as necessary in the commentary using a strict interpretation of the Yale Romanisation of Korean (Martin 1992, 9-20) in order to preserve the graphical characteristics of the transcriptions rather than impose a specific, modern reading on them. The characteristics

highlighted by using this Romanization system include the choice of one grapheme over another and the particular arrangement of the Hangul graphemes into syllable blocks. Where such specificity is not required, the Revised Romanisation system is used with exceptions being made for words such as proper names which have a conventional, non-systematic Romanised form.

We end the preamble to this translation with a brief bibliographic note. This article was published in 1932 in *Donggwang*, the magazine of the pro-democracy and civil society youth organisation Heungsadan. This magazine was published intermittently from 1926 to 1933 (Encyclopedia of Korean Culture 2020a). At the time of the publication of this article it was administered by the pro-Japanese novelist Lee Kwang-su (1892-1950) (Encyclopedia of Korean Culture 2020b). The article is formatted over four B5 pages of vertical, mixed script text with two columns of text to each page.

Translated text

1. Introduction

一, 序言

國語 教育이 發達된 나라에도 곧을 따라 사투리가 없지 아니하다. 或은 地理的 環境을 따라 或은 政治 勢力의 變動을 쫓아 或은 이웃 文化의 接觸으로 말미암아 方言의 發生과 存在는 自然의 理어니와 또 사람으로 個性 發達의 特徵이 아니라 할 수 없다.

Even in countries in which national language education has been developed nowhere lacks regional dialects. Whether they arise from the geographical conditions, change in political influence, or contact between neighbouring cultures, the appearance of dialects, and their existence is a natural law and an undeniably unique characteristic of humans.

朝鮮은 그리 크지 아니한 地域으로서 方言이 相當히 다르고 또 많은 셈이다. 假令 教育도 받지 못하고 出入도 넓지 못한 두 다른 方言 地方 사람이 처음 맞난다면 通情이 잘못된 것은 事實이다. 朝鮮말에 方言이 이러케 複雜한 것도 우에 말한 여러가지 原因이 다 잇는 것이다.

For such a moderate territory, Korea has a lot of significantly diverse dialects. For example, it is a fact that communication would not go well if two people from different dialect regions, who had neither received education nor travelled widely, met each other for the first time. There are several reasons why the

dialects of the Korean language are as complicated as this.

山國의 朝鮮이니 交通 不便도 한 原因이요 이웃의 關係로는 政治 上이나 文化 上으로 北에는 女眞 (滿洲), 蒙古, 中國, 露西亞의 一 南에는 日本의 影響을 받은 것이나 國內 移民 關係로는 高麗 睿宗 時에 尹 瓘의, 李朝 世宗 時에 金宗瑞의 北征으로 女眞族을 咸鏡道에서 滿洲로 물러치고 中南 朝鮮人 (特히 慶尙道人)을 그 땅에 移民 시기어 直接 影響을 준 것이 다 한 原因이 된다. 그러나 朝鮮말의 方言은 古今語를 比較한바 大體로 時間的 變遷으로 생긴 것이 많다.

One reason is the difficulty of travelling in mountainous Korea; due to political or cultural relations with neighbours, influence has been received from Jurchen (Manchu), Mongolian, Chinese, and Russian in the North or Japanese in the South; country internal migration, such as General Yun Gwan's expedition to the North in the time of King Yejong of Goryeo, or General Kim Jong-seo's in the era of King Sejong of Yi Joseon, which drove the Jurchen from North Hamgyeong Province to Manchuria and the direct influence of Central and Southern Korean people (especially the people of Gyeongsang Province) who were forced to migrate to that territory are all also reasons. However, comparing the archaic and contemporary language, the dialects of Korean generally possess many differences which arose from diachronic change.

2. Distribution and Territory of the Dialects

二, 方言分布區域

사투리를 細別하야 말하기는 퍽 複雜할 뿐 아니라 오래 동안 詳細한 調査를 하지 않고는 不可能한 일이다. 그러므로 朝鮮語를 五 大方言으로 大別하야 말하려 한다.

(一) 關西 方言 (平安道 사투리, 高句麗 方言)
(二) 湖南 方言 (全羅道 사투리, 百濟 方言)
(三) 嶺南 方言 (慶尙道 사투리, 新羅 方言)
(四) 關北 方言 (咸鏡道 사투리, 沃沮 方言)
(五) 中部 方言 (京畿道 사투리, 混成 方言) -

이 다섯 가지 사투리의 地理 歷史的 關係를 말하자면 關西 方言은 高句麗 故地를 中心 하얏으니 平安 南北 道와 黃海道 一部에 普及되엇고 湖南 方言은 百濟 故地를 中心 하얏으니 全羅 南北 道와 忠淸南道에 普及되엇고 嶺南 方言은 新羅 故地를 中心 하얏으니 慶尙 南北 道와 江原道 一部와 (注文津 以南) 全羅南道

海岸 一帶에 普及되엇고 關北 方言은 沃沮 故地로 女眞族 寓居地이엇섯고 其後에 中南朝鮮의 殖民地인 咸鏡 南北 道에 普及되엇고 中部 方言은 高句麗, 百濟, 新羅 三國 交界地 또 高麗朝와 李朝와의 서울을 두고 千年 동안 政治 中心地로 各 地方 사람의 交際 場이 된 京畿道와 또 그 隣近 地인 忠淸北道와 江原道 一部 (襄陽 以北)와 黃海道 一部에 普及되엇다.

Speaking of the sub-division of dialects is not only very complicated, but impossible without undertaking a long-term, detailed survey. Accordingly, we propose roughly dividing Korean into five large dialects.

1. The Gwanseo dialect (Pyeongan Province Dialect, Goguryeo regional speech).
2. The Honam dialect (Jeolla Province Dialect, Baekje regional speech).
3. The Yeongnam dialect (Gyeongsang Province Dialect, Silla regional speech).
4. The Gwanbuk dialect (Hamgyeong Province Dialect, Okcho regional speech).
5. The Jungbu (Central) dialect (Gyeonggi Province Dialect, a mixed variety).

If we are to address the geo-historical relationships between these five dialects, the Gwanseo dialect centres on the ancient territory of Goguryo and is therefore spread over North and South Pyeongan Provinces as well as a portion of Hwanghae Province; the Honam dialect centres on the ancient territory of Baekje and is therefore spread over North and South Jeolla Provinces as well as South Chungcheong Province; the Yeongnam dialect centres on the ancient territory or Silla and is therefore spread over North and South Gyeongsang Provinces, a portion of Gangwon Province (South of Jumunjin), and the entirety of the South Jeolla coast; the Gwanbuk dialect was the ancient territory of Okcho and Jurchen occupied territory and, thereafter, spread over the Central and South Korean colony of North and South Hamgyeong Provinces; the Jungbu dialect was the three-way border between Goguryeo, Baekje, and Silla. Also, the dialect is spread over Gyeonggi Province, with the Goryeojo (the Goryeo royal court) and Yi Joseon, which kept Seoul as the political centre and place of exchange for people from each other region for one thousand years, as well as the neighbouring North Chungcheong Province, a portion of Gangwon Province (North of Yangyang) and a portion of Hwanghae Province.

3. The Characteristics of each dialect

三, 各 方言의 特色

어느 곧 사투리나 그 特色을 여러 가지 點으로 볼 수 잇다. 或은 語彙가 다르고 或은 語法이 다르며 或은 音韻이 다르고 或은 語調가 다르다. 그러나 그 中에 方言 區別은 語調로써 定하게 되는 것이다. 音韻이나 語法이나 語彙는 한 方言 안에서도 서로 다르고 또 다른 方言과도 서로 같은 것이 많다.

Several points can be regarded as characteristic of the dialect of a particular place. The vocabulary, grammar, phonology, or prosody may all be different. However, among these is prosody which ultimately determines the classification of the dialect. There are many cases of phonology, grammar, or vocabulary varying within one dialect while being the same as another.

3.1. Prosody

1, 語調.

朝鮮말의 語調를 西海岸 平野 語調와 東海岸 山嶽 語調로 大別할 수 잇다. 平野 語調는 高低보다 長短을 重히 여기는 것으로 부드럽고 고운 것이 特色이다. 全羅道, 京畿道, 平安道 사투리들이 여기에 屬하는데 또 各各 特色을 말하자면 全羅道 語調는 情緖의 美感이 잇고 京畿道 語調는 社交의 美感이 잇고 平安道 語調는 活潑의 美感이 잇다. 山嶽 語調는 長短보다 語低를 重히 여기는 것으로 억세고 뚝뚝한 것이 特色이다. 咸鏡道와 慶尙道 사투리들이 여기에 屬하는데 또 各各 그 다른 點을 말하면 咸鏡道 語調는 剛毅의 美感이 잇고 慶尙道 語調는 純直의 美感이 잇다.

It is possible to broadly divide the prosody of Korean into "West Coast Plains" prosody and "East Coast Mountains" prosody. Characteristic of the Plains prosody is its smooth elegance derived from its primary focus on length contrast rather than tone contrast. Jeolla Province, Gyeonggi Province, and Pyeongan Province dialects are included in this classification and each has its own characteristics: Jeolla Province prosody has a sentimental feel, Gyeonggi Province prosody has an aesthetic of social exchange, and Pyeongan Province prosody has a lively feel. Characteristic of the Mountains prosody is its hard roughness derived from its primary focus on tone contrast rather than length. Hamgyeong Province and Gyeongsang Province are included in this classification and, if we address the different points of each, Hamgyeong Province prosody has an unyielding aesthetic and Gyeongsang Province prosody has a straightforward feel.

3.2. Phonology

2, 音韻.

各 地方에 말의 소리가 다름은 퍽 複雜하다. 그러므로 重要한 몇 소리의 歷史的 變遷만을 方言의 實例로 말하려 한다.

The difference between the sounds of the language of each region is very complicated. Therefore, we intend only on addressing a few important historical sound changes as concrete examples of the dialects.

(3.2.1) *The Vowel /o/*

母音 [·] 音價에 對한 여러 學說이 잇으나 그것을 여기에 紹介할 必要가 없고 다만 古書에 그 소리를   던 말이 여러 가지 母音으로 變하는 가온대 ㅏ와 ㅗ 音으로 變한 것만 말하려 한다. 大體로 全羅南道와 全羅北道 一部와 慶尙南道 大部와 咸鏡北道 北部에서는 ㅗ 音으로 變한 말이 其他 各地方에서는 ㅏ 音으로 變하엿다. 例를 들면

ㅍ·ㄹ (臂)을 前者는 폴 後者는 팔

ㅍ·리 (蠅)를 前者는 포리 後者는 파리

ㅁ·ㄹ (馬)을 前者는 몰 後者는 말

While there are many theories about the sound value of this letter, there is no need to introduce them here but we will only mention that the words which used this sound in old documents have changed it into /a/ and /wo/ amongst several other vowels. Generally, in South Jeolla Province, a proportion of North Jeolla Province, the greater part of South Gyeongsang Province and the northern part of North Hamgyeong Province for the words in which it has changed into /wo/, it has changed into /a/ in the other regions. For example, *phol* ([fore]arm 臂 [*pi*]) became *phwol* in the former (regions) and *phal* in the latter; *pholi* (fly 蠅 [*sung*]) became *phwoli* in the former (regions) and *phali* in the latter; *mol* (horse 馬 [*ma*]) became *mwol* in the former (regions) and *mal* in the latter.

(3.2.2) *The Consonant /z/*

子音 [ㅿ] 音價는 英語의 z와 비슷한 것인데 이제 ㅇ (喉音 곧 아야 줄의 子音 자리에 잇는 소리) 와 ㅅ 두 소리로 變하엿다. 大體로 보아서 中部와 關西 地方에서는 ㅇ로 變하엿고 湖南과 嶺南과 關北 地方에서는 ㅅ으로 變하엿다. 例를 들면 가을 (秋)을 가슬 겨을 (冬)을 저슬 구유 (構)를 구수 가위 (剪刀)를 가새.

The sound value of this consonant was similar to that of English <z>, but now it has changed into zero (the laryngeal sound in consonant position of the *a*,

ya row of syllables as they would be presented in a table) and /s/. Generally, it has become zero in the Jungbu and Gwanseo dialect areas, and in the Honam, Ryeongnam, and Gwanbuk dialect areas it has become /s/. For example, *kaul* and *kasul* (Autumn); *kyeul* and *cesul* (Winter); *kwuyu* and *kwuswu* (feed-trough); and *kawi* and *kasay* (scissors).

(3.2.3) *The Consonant /v/*

子音 [ㅸ] 音價는 德 語에 w 音과 비슷한 것으로 이제 우와 ㅂ으로 變하엿는데 大體로 嶺南과 關北 地方에서는 ㅂ으로 其他 地方에서는 우로 變하엿다. 例를 들면

덥다 더버서 더븐

덥다 더워서 더운

곱다 고바서 고분

곱다 고워서 고운

맵다 매버서 매븐

맵다 매워서 매운

The sound value of this consonant is similar to German <w>, but now it has changed into /wu/ and /p/. Generally, it has changed into /p/ in the Yeongnam and Gwanbuk dialect areas and /wu/ in the other (dialect) areas. For example, *tepta, tepese, tepun* as opposed to *tepta, tewese, tewun; kopta, kopase, kopun* as opposed to *kopta, kowese, kowun; maypta, maypese, maypun* as opposed to *maypta, maywese, maywun.*

(3.2.4)

댜뎌 줄과 탸텨 줄이 關西 地方에만 單母音化하엿고 其他 地方에는 口蓋音化 하엿다. 例를 들면

綴字	關西 地方	其他 地方
뎡거쟝 (停車場)	덩거댱	정거장
턴지 (天地)	턴지	천지
텰로	털로	철로

The sequences /tya/, /tye/, /thya/, and /thye/ have undergone monophthongisation in only the Gwanseo dialect region and have undergone palatalization in the other regions. The examples are as follows:

Word	Gwanseo Dialect	Other Dialects
tyengkecyang (stop/station)	*tengketang*	*cengkecang*
thyenti (heaven and earth)	*thenti*	*chenci*
thyello (railway)	*thello*	*chello*

3.3 Grammar

3, 語法.

이것도 各 地方에서 獨特하게 쓰이는 토가 많이 잇으나 이제 몇 가지식 例만 들고서 한다.

While there are many endings which are used characteristically in each area, we present only a few examples of each here.

3.3.1 The Gwanseo Dialect

(一) 關西 方言.

(1) 願望과 要求의 뜻을 表하는 動詞 밑에 쓰는 尊敬 終結토「라구요」

하시라구요 (爲), 잡수시라구요 (食), 오시라구요 (來)

(2) 名詞, 形容詞, 動詞 밑에 다 쓰이는 尊敬 疑問토「나요」

사람 이나요 (人), 희나요 (白), 검으나요 (黑), 가나요 (去), 먹나요 (食)

(3) 名, 形, 動 各 品詞 밑에 쓰이는 平交 或 手下人에게 쓰는 疑問토「습마」(母音 下에는 ㅁ마)

動 감마 (去) [現在] 갓습마 [過古] 가겟습마 [未來]

詞 먹습마 (食) 먹엇습마 먹겟습마

形容詞 높습마 (高) 돗습마 (好) 참마 (塞)

名詞 사람임마 (人) 솜마 (牛) 조흽마 (紙)

(4) 過去完了를 表하는「엇섯」을「엇댓」으로 씀.

갓댓소 (去), 먹엇댓소 (食), 주엇댓소 (給)

(5) 主調토「가」를「래 或 리」로 씀.

내래 (내가) 임재래 (당신이) 개ㅣ리 (그 아이가)

(1) There is a formal final ending which is used with action verbs to express the meanings of wish and demand-*la.kwu.yo. Ha.si.la.kwu.yo, Cap.swu.si.la.kwu. yo, O.si.la.kwu.yo.*

(2) There is a formal interrogative ending which is used with action verbs, stative verbs, and nouns-*na.yo. Sa.lam.i.na.yo, Huy.na.yo, Kem.u.na.yo, Ka.na.yo, Mek.na.yo.*

(3) There is an interrogative ending which is used among equals and with subordinates that attaches to each part of speech, nouns, stative verbs, and

action verbs: *-sum.ma* or following vowels: *-m.ma*. Action verbs: *kam.ma* (present tense) *kas.summa* (past tense) *ka.keys.summa* (future tense); *mek. sum.ma, mek.es.sum.ma, mek.keys.sum.ma.* Stative verbs: *noph.sum.ma, tos. sum.ma* (good), *cham.ma* (cold). Nouns: *sa.lam.im.ma, som.ma* (cow), *cwo. hoym.ma* (paper).

(4) The ending *-es.tays* is used for completion of an action in the past rather than *-es.ses. Gas.tays.so, Mek.es.tays.so, Cwu.es.tays.so.*

(5) Rather than subject particle *-ka*, either *-lay* or *-li* is used. *Nay.lay* (I-SUBJ), *Im.cay.lay* (you-SUBJ), *Kay.i.li* (that person/child-SUBJ)

3.3.2 The Honam Dialect (Jeolla Province and South Chungcheong Province)

(二) 湖南 方言. (全羅道와 忠淸南道)

(1) 名, 形, 動 各 品詞 밑에 尊稱으로 問答語 通用하는 토.「는게라오」,「ㄴ게로오」 (「는그라오」,「는거라오」,「는가라오」)

하는게라오 (爲) [現] 햇는게라오 [過] 하겟는게라오 [未]

큰게라오 (大), 적은게라오 (小), 조흰게라오 (紙), 사람인게라오 (人)

(2) 動詞의 過去와 未來의 問答語에 通用하는 尊稱토「서라오」

햇서라오 (爲) [過], 하겟서라오 [未]

(3) 名, 形, 動, 各 品詞의 問答語에 通用되는 尊稱토.「지라오」,

햇지라오 (爲) [過], 하지라오, 하겟지라오 [未], 히지라오 (白), 검지라오 (黑), 사람이지라오 (人)

(1) There is an ending in popular usage in the indicative as an honorific that attaches to each part of speech, nouns, stative verbs, and action verbs: *-nun. key.la.o, -n.key.la.o, -nun.ku.la.o, -nun.ke.la.o, -nun.ka.la.o. Ha.nun.key.la.o* (present tense), *Hays.nun.key.la.o* (past tense), *Ha.keys.nun.key.la.o* (future tense); *Khun.key.la.o* (big), *Cek.un.key.la.o.* (small), *Co.huyn.key.la.o* (paper), *Sa.lam.in.key.la.o* (person).

(2) There is an honorific ending of action verbs widely used in the indicative in the past and future tenses: *-se.la.o. Hays.se.la.o* (past), *Ha.keys.se.la.o* (future).

(3) There is an ending in popular usage in the indicative as an honorific that attaches to each part of speech, nouns, stative verbs, and action verbs: *-ci.la.o. Hays.ci.la.o* (past), *Ha.ci.la.o, Ha.keys.ci.la.o* (future), *Hi.ci.la.o* (white), *Kem. ci.la.o* (black), *Sa.lam.i.ci.la.o* (person).

3.3.3 The Ryeongnam Dialect

(三) 嶺南 方言.

(1) 名, 形, 動 各 品詞 밑에 尊稱으로 쓰는 疑問토「는기오」「ㄴ 가오」(넝기오, 능개)
하는기오 (爲) [現], 햇는기오 [過], 하겟는기오 [未]
힌기오 (白), 검은기오 (黑), 사람인기오 (人), 갠기오 (犬)

(2) 將次 實行 如何를 表示하는 뜻으로 原動詞에 助動詞「하」를 連接시키는 말
「ㄹ락」(ㄹ라고의 꿍된 말) 할락하닝기오 (爲), 먹을락하닝기오 (食)

(3) 接續토 와, 과를「캉」으로 쓰는 것
소캉 말캉(소와 말과), 나캉 너캉 (나와 너와)

(1) There is an honorific interrogative ending that attaches to each part of speech, nouns, stative verbs, and action verbs: *-nun.ki.o*, *-n.ki.o* (also *–nuyng.ki.o*, *-nung.kay*). *Ha.nun.ki.o* (present), *Hays.nun.ki.o* (past), *Ha.keys.nun.ki.o* (future); *Hin.ki.o* (white), *Kem.un.ki.o* (black), *Sa.lam.in.ki.o* (person), *Kayn.ki.o* (dog).

(2) Expressing the meaning of intending to implement or perform an action at a future time is *-l.lak* (the shortened version of *-l.la.ko*), the ending which connects the auxiliary verb *ha-* to the main verb *Hal.lak.ha.nuyng.ki.o* (do), *Mek.ul.lak.ha.nuyng.ki.o* (eat).

(3) Rather than the commitative particle *-wa/kwa*, *-khang* is used: *So.khang mal.khang* (cow(s) and (horse(s)), *Na.khang ne.khang* (I and you).

3.3.4 The Gwanbuk Dialect

(四) 關北 方言.

(1) 名, 形, 動 各 品詞 밑에 尊稱으로 答하는대 쓰는 토「꼬마」(꾸마, 구마)
하꼬마 (爲) [現在], 햇소꼬마 [過去], 하갯소꼬마 [未來]
희우꼬마 (白), 검소꼬마 (黑), 개우꼬마 (犬), 사람이우꼬마 (人)

(2) 名, 形, 動 各 品詞 밑에 尊稱으로 問答語에 通用하는 토.「ㅁ매」(ㅁ메),
함매 (爲) [現], 햇슴매 [過], 하겟슴매 [未] 흼매 (白), 검음매 (黑), 갬매 (犬), 사람임매 (人)

(3) 動詞 밑에 尊稱으로 쓰는 疑問토「ㅁ둥」(ㅁ 두)
함둥 (爲) [現] 햇슴둥 [過] 하겟슴둥 [未]

(4) 名, 形, 動 各 品詞 밑에 尊稱으로 쓰는 不確實한 것을 보이는 答토.「ㅂ찌비」
합찌비 (爲) [現], 햇습찌비 [過], 하갯습찌비 [未]
희웁찌비 (白), 검으웁찌비 (黑), 개웁찌비 (犬) 사람이웁찌비 (人)

(5) 目的格토「을, 를」을「으 或 우, 르 或 루」로 씀.
밥으 잡수오 (食飯), 옷으 입는다 (着衣), 술우 먹는다 (飲酒), 괴기르 삶는다
(烹魚)

(1) There is an ending used when answering questions respectfully that attaches to each part of speech, nouns, stative verbs, and action verbs: *-kkwo.ma* (also *-kkwu.ma*, *-kwu.ma*). *Ha.kkwo.ma* (present), *Hays.swo.kkwo.ma* (past), *Ha.keys.swo.kkwo.ma* (future); *Huy.wu.kkwo.ma* (white), *Kem.swo.kkwo.ma* (black), *Kay.wu.kkwo.ma* (dog), *Sa.lam.i.wu.kkwo.ma* (person).

(2) There is an ending in popular usage as an honorific in questions and answers that attaches to each part of speech, nouns, stative verbs, and action verbs: *-m.may* (also *-m.mey*). *Ham.may* (present), *Hays.sum.may* (past), *Ha.keys.sum.may* (future); *Huym.may* (white), *Kem.um.may* (black), *Kaym.may* (dog), *Sa.lam.im.may* (person).

(3) There is an honorific interrogative ending that attaches to action verbs: *-m.twung* (also *-m.twu*). *Ham.twung* (present), *Hays.sum.twung* (past), *Ha.keys.sum.twung* (future).

(4) There is an honorific declarative ending that attaches to each part of speech, nouns, stative verbs, and action verbs which shows uncertainty: *-p.cci.pi*. *Hap.cci.pi* (present), *Hays.sup.cci.pi* (past), *Ha.kays.sup.ccipi* (future); *Huy.wup.cci.pi* (white), *Kem.u.wup.cci.pi* (black), *Kae.wup.cci.pi* (dog), *Sa.lam.i.wup.cci.pi* (person).

(5) Rather than the object particle (forms) *-ul/lul*, *-u*, *-wu*, *-lu*, or *-lwu* are used: *Pap.u cap.swu.o* (eat food), *Os.u ip.nun.ta* (wear clothes), *Swul.wu mek.nun.ta* (drink alcohol), *Koy.ki.lu salm.nun.ta* (cook meat).

3.3.5 The Central Dialect

(五) 中部 方言 (서울말).

(1) 名, 形, 動 各 品詞 밑에 쓰는 낮은 사람이 높은 사람에게 對答하는 토.
「사와요」,「와요」
그러사와요 (然), 먹엇사와요 (食), 먹겟사와요, 먹사와요, 크와요 (大),
적사와요 (小), 소이와요 (牛), 사람이와요 (人)

(2) 까닭은 表示하는 토.「니간두루」
가니간두루 (去), 먹으니간두루 (食)

(1) There is an ending used when a subordinate answers a superior that attaches to each part of speech, nouns, stative verbs, and action verbs: *-sa.wa.yo*, *-wa.yo*. *Ku.le.sa.wa.yo* (to be thus), *Mek.es.sa.wa.yo* (eat-PST), *Mek.keys.sa.wa.yo* (eat-FUT), *Mek.sa.wa.yo* (eat-PRS), *Khu.wa.yo* (big), *Cek.sa.wa.yo* (small), *So.i.wa.yo* (cow), *Sa.lam.i.wa.yo* (person).

(2) There is an ending which expresses (reason/cause): *-ni.kkan.twu.lwu*. *Ka.ni.kkan.twu.lwu* (go), *Mek.u.ni.kkan.twu.lwu* (eat).

3.4 Vocabulary

4, 語彙.

이것은 더욱 다른 點이 많으니 그 까닭은 무엇보다도 첫재 同一한 語原을 가진 말도 音韻의 變遷을 따라 形形色色으로 달라젓으며 或은 같은 말을 가지고 아조 딴 뜻으로 쓰며 或은 같은 事物에 딴 語原의 말을 쓰기도 한다. 그 紊亂한 程度는 方言 區域을 갈라서 말할 수가 없으므로 이제 몇 마디 말을 例로 들어서 大槪 調査된 대로 各 方言을 羅列하야 參考케 할 뿐이다.

(1) 할아버지 (祖父)를 할아바지, 할아부지, 할아배, 할아반, 할배, 할부지, 할배씨, 할바씨, 할밤, 할뱀이, 하르방, 한아씨, 큰아바이, 아바이.

(2) 혀 (舌)를 해, 헤, 셔, 세, 쎄, 새, 시, 씨, 쇠, 세바닥, 세까닥.

(3) 키 (箕)를 치, 체, 칭이, 쳉이, 챙이, 푸는체.

(4) 참외 (眞瓜)를 참위, 참웨, 참왜, 참우, 참에, 참이.

(5) 잠자리 (蜻蛉)를 잼자리, 자마리, 잔자리, 붙잔자리, 남자리, 남아리, 찰기, 철기, 철갱이, 철이, 초리, 철니뱅이, 차랭량이, 절갱이, 절철냉이, 소곰쟁이, 까랭이, 어러리, 밤버리.

(6) 여호 (狐)를 여히, 여수, 여시, 야시, 야수, 얘수, 예수, 기, 얏광이, 얏갱이, 엿갱이, 갱, 영갱이, 영끼, 영우.

This (area) has even more differences because, first and above all, words which come from the same root undergo various phonological changes and become different. Alternatively, the same word is used with very different meanings, or words from different roots are also used for the same object. This disordered state is so serious that we are not able to clearly distinguish dialectal zones, therefore here we only enumerate a few words (drawn from) each dialect (as they have been generally surveyed).

(1) *Hal.a.pe.ci* (grandfather): *hal.a.pa.ci, hal.a.pwu.ci, hal.a.pay, hal.a.pan, hal. pay, hal.pwu.ci, hal.pay.ssi, hal.pa.ssi, hal.pam, hal.paym.i, ha.lu.pang, han. a.ssi, khun.a.pa.i, a.pa.i.*

(2) *Hye* (tongue): *hay, hey, sye, sey, ssey, say, si, ssi, soy, sey.pa.tak, sey.kka.tak.*

(3) *Khi* (sieve): *chi, chey, ching.i, cheyng.i, chayng.i, phwu.nun.chey.*

(4) *Cham.oy* (Korean melon): *cham.wi, cham.wey, cham.way, cham.wu, cham.ey, cham.i.*

(5) *Cam.ca.li* (dragon fly): *caym.ca.li, ca.ma.li, can.ca.li, pwuth.can.ca.li, nam. ca.li, nam.a.li, chal.ki, chel.ki, chel.kayng.i, chel.i, chwo.li, chel.ni.payng.i, cha. layng.i, cel.kayng.i, cel.nayng.i, swo.kwom.cayng.i, kka.layng.i, e.le.li, pam.pe.li.*

(6) *Ye.hwo* (fox): *ye.hi, ye.swu, ye.si, ya.si, ya.swu, yay.swu, yey.swu, yays.ki, yas. kwang.i, yas.kayng.i, yes.kayng.i, yays.kayng, yeng.kayng.i, yeng.kki, yeng.wu.*

4. Conclusion

四, 結論

朝鮮語의 方言 狀態는 上述한 바와 같이 紊亂하다. 그러나 우리는 그 方言이 많음을 근심할 바가 아니요 다만 標準語와 標準 綴字가 서지 아니한 것을 걱정할 뿐이다.

Korea's dialect situation is as disordered as presented above. However, the large number of dialects is not something to worry about. We need only worry about not establishing a Standard Language and Standard Spelling.

朝鮮語는 적어도 獨特한 제 文字로 적어온 제가 이미 半 十年이 되엇으니 文獻도 적지 아니 하려니와 또 二千餘萬 人의 혀끝에 살아서 날로 움직이니 그 言語의 研究 材料는 山같이 쌓여잇다. 그러나 科學者의 開拓의 힘이 아직 넉넉이 미치지 못한 것을 恨嘆하는 바이다.

Since Korean has already been written in its own special letters for half a millennium while, to address its unwritten state, it also lives on the tongues of around twenty-five million people, it moves around every day and material for research into the language is piled up like a mountain. However, it is regrettable that researchers' pioneering strength still has not yet been sufficient.

標準語를 세우는 科學的 方法은 여러 方言 中 가장 勢力 잇는 方言 하나를 가리어서 標準을 삼고 不足한 點과 잘못된 點은 文獻과 다른 方言으로써 補充하며 質正하는 것이다. 그래서 우리도 이제 標準 朝鮮語를 세우는 대는 서울 方言을 標準 삼고 다른 地方의 方言과 또 옛 文獻으로 그 못자람을 채우고 잘못됨을 바로잡아서 國語의 科學的 基礎를 세우는 것이 마땅한 일이다. 標準語와 標準 綴字의 成立은 마츰내 標準 辭典이 完成되어야 될 것이다. (끝)

The scientific method for constructing the Standard Language is a process of choosing the most powerful dialect from the several options, constructing a standard on that basis, and using written sources and other dialects to supplement and correct its deficiencies and inaccuracies. Therefore we, too, consider taking Seoul dialect as the basis for constructing standard Korean and using other regions' dialects and older texts to correct its shortcomings and straighten out its inaccuracies for the construction of a national language on scientific foundations to be an appropriate task. The establishment of a Standard Language and Standard Spelling finally make the compilation of a Standard Dictionary a necessarily achievable task.

Commentary

1. The introduction to the article has many points in common with contemporary thinking on linguistic variation, most especially in its consideration of the emergence of dialects as universal to all natural human languages. The evaluation of Korean as particularly dialectologically complex, however, is somewhat more contentious. In terms of mutual intelligibility between peninsula dialects, very little research has been carried out. Comprehension of Jejueo on the part of speakers of various peninsula varieties has been found to be very low, however, the status of Jejueo as a dialect of Korean rather than a separate language is currently the subject of a heated debate (e.g. Yang et al. 2019).

The emphasis placed on linguistic diversity here is somewhat more pronounced than in much modern Korean dialectology. Despite a widespread acknowledgement of the existence of linguistic variation in Korea, a competing discourse surrounding the relative homogeneity of the Korean language has emerged over the latter half of the twentieth century, which may even appear alongside reflections on the diverse dialectological situation of the peninsula (e.g. Lee and Ramsey 2000, 307).

The extra-linguistic factors intuited for the dialectological variation in Korean (e.g. language contact or physical geography) of which Lee Guk-lo was aware are occasionally raised in contemporary Korean dialectology for their explanatory power, but few of them have been systematically studied over the intervening years.

The conception of dialects resulting primarily from diachronic linguistic processes is representative of a longstanding approach to dialect, which sees variation as change in progress. These views are particularly associated with nineteenth century German linguistics and their appearance here may reflect the influence of Lee Guk-lo's experience studying in Berlin.

2. The taxonomy presented here has many points of difference with the current, widely-accepted, six way classification of dialects. The linguistic basis for this classification is not made explicit, but it is interesting to note that the boundaries of several of the proposed dialect areas do not conform rigidly to the then current major political divisions of Korea. This is reflected in their nomenclature, which is based on folk toponyms for regions of the Korean peninsula, unlike the official administrative divisions or compass points of later taxonomies.

Both the terms *bangeon* and *saturi* are used here. They seem to denote the same things, but one slight point of difference that *bangeon* refers to the varieties of earlier polities on the Korean peninsula as well as the newly coined names for the contemporary varieties, whereas *saturi* is reserved for collocations formed with the then contemporary administrative divisions of the peninsula.

It is also notable that Jeju Island is not mentioned here. Jeong Sung-cheol (2013, 153) attributes this to Jeju being considered part of Jeolla Province and thus, its dialect area. The haphazard inclusion of linguistic forms unique to the island, however, suggests that its variety was either less well known than those of the mainland or, possibly, not thought suitable for consideration in the taxonomy presented here. A further point in support of the latter possibility is that the historical polity equated with the Honam dialect did not include the Tamna Kingdom of Jeju Island, which is not mentioned at all in the paper. We note that once more that this position is currently being re-examined.

3. The hierarchical structure suggested here, which divides Korean into two main dialect groups on the basis of one particularly salient feature and then establishes (sub)-dialects within those larger groupings, is typical of traditional dialectology.[2] Latterly, however, no consensus has developed over this position and both hierarchical and non-hierarchical dialect taxonomies have been advocated over the later twentieth century (see Kim 1988 for the former; Lee and Ramsey 2000 for the latter).

The linguistic features examined over the remainder of this section are also in-keeping with traditional dialectology. It is notable, though, that prosody is explicitly identified as the most important feature for dialect classification while the structure of section three implicitly suggests that the importance of other

---

2. Examples of this include the division of both German and French into two major dialect areas. In the case of the former, varieties of German were dividing into High German in the South of Germany and Low German in the North on the basis of the so-called High Germanic sound shift. This prototypically led to, amongst other things, stop consonants /p/, /t/, and /k/ becoming affricates in High German, but not in Low German (e.g. Low German *apel* High German *apfel* "apple," Low German *maken* High German *machen* "to do," etc). In the case of the latter, varieties of French were divided into *langues d'oc* in the South of France and *langues d'oil* in the North on the basis of the roots for their respective words for "yes."

linguistic features for dialect classification is as follows: prosody>phonology>grammar>vocabulary. While such grading of features is not uncommon in dialectology, in more recent research it is typical for grammatical features to be more heavily weighted than phonetic or phonological features (e.g. Song 2001, 110).

The mixed approach taken to describing the variation is also notable. Whereas most modern descriptions adopt either a feature-centred or variety-centred approach exclusively, here a feature-centred approach is taken for phonological characteristics, while a variety-centred approach is taken grammatical characteristics. No geographical information is provided in this article about the distribution of the vocabulary items listed. We address this point in more detail in Section 3.4, below.

3.1 The broad prosodic division of the Korean peninsula into pitch accent and length contrast varieties on the basis of their synchronic presentation has been backed up by later survey data. The use of physical geographical features in the nomenclature is reminiscent of 19ᵗʰ century ideas about the geographical determinism of linguistic features, but no direct connection can be drawn to those ideas from the information presented here. Also notable is the evaluation of prosody in phono-aesthetic terms. These evaluations may be readily compared with the findings of perceptual dialectological research which only came to be carried out in Korea in the late twentieth century.

3.2 The features discussed here have remained prominent in dialectological as well as historical linguistic research. They are crucial isoglosses in many dialect taxonomies including that of Ogura Shinpei. The connection with historical linguistics and related diachronic discussion of the segmental phonological variation in Korean is a significant point of contrast from the above discussion of prosody, which was wholly synchronic and without reference to Late Middle Korean tonology.

3.2.1 The treatment of /o/ (*arae-a*) is further evidence that the varieties of Jeju is not considered here. Otherwise explicit mention of cases where LMK /o/ is retained would be expected alongside discussion of its split into /wo/ and /a/.

3.2.2 and 3.2.3 The assertions made concerning the forms and geographic distribution of the so-called intervocalic consonants are generally consistent with

the findings of contemporary dialectological surveys.

3.2.4 While the lack of synchronic and diachronic palatalization is most strongly associated with North-western varieties of Korean, as they are here, we note that this characteristic is shared by Yukchin varieties in the extreme North-east of the peninsula. It is curious that prototypically Yukchin verb endings are taken as characteristic of the proposed Gwanbuk dialect area in Section 3.3.4, but the lack of palatalization is discussed as if it were unique to the proposed Gwanseo dialect area.

3.3 Due to the structure of this section and the caveat with which it begins, it is not entirely clear whether the features presented in these subsections are meant to be taken as diagnostic features of the dialect areas proposed in this paper or simply present somewhere in the geographical bounds assigned to them in Section 2. The fact that they were mentioned at all in this context, though, suggests that these features had at least a perceptual association with specific dialect areas. We now review the documentation of the grammatical features identified by Lee Guk-lo and their treatment in subsequent dialectological research. For both these features and vocabulary, we rely particularly on the near contemporary data in the edited edition of *Joseoneo bangeon sajeon* (Lee and Lee 2009).[3]

3.3.1 The form *-lakwu* to express a command was also documented by Ogura Shinpei (KDD 2009, 522), but this form was recorded only in Hwanghae and North Hamgyeong Provinces. There is no record of the formal interrogative ending *-nayo* at all, but *-mma* is recorded at three survey sites in South Pyeongan Province and five survey sites in North Pyeongan Province, with the same usage, that is, as an interrogative ending for addressing questions to equals and subordinates (KDD 2009, 527). This form is also found in more recent work with an unchanged function (Choi 2001, 238). It is also in this source that we find the past tense form *-tays-* presented as characteristic of the North-

---

3. This represents the data gathered by Ogura Shinpei over the course of the early twentieth century and then published as 朝鮮語方言の研究(上) in 1944. In the text, we cite its modern edition as revised by Lee Sang-kyu and Lee Sun-hyeong (2009). For reasons of space, we refer to it in all in-line citations after the first as "KDD 2009."

western dialect zone. This resembles the *-es.tays-* ending of this paper, but raises the question of whether this morpheme has undergone functional change from marking the simple past to the remote past over the twentieth century.

In terms of nominal morphology, the form of the subject particle *-lay*, but not *-li*, is recorded by Ogura Shinpei (KDD 2009, 600), but at only one site in South Pyeongan Province and two sites in North Pyeongan Province. Despite this lack of early attestation, the subject particle forms *-lay* or *-ilay* are widely considered characteristic of the varieties of the North-west of the Korean peninsula (Lee and Ramsey 2000, 329; Choi 2001, 237).

3.3.2 The honorific interrogative ending identified in this paper is recorded as being widely used in Jeolla Province (six sites in both South and North Jeolla Provinces). While some variation in the form is attested (KDD 2009, 540), it is not as extensive as that reported here. The more widely attested form is *-n.nun. key.la.o*, while *-n.nun.ku.la.o* is attested at only four sites that straddle the current border of North and South Jeolla Provinces. The formally somewhat similar and functionally identical ending *-n.nun.key.o* is also recorded in the KDD.

Similarly, the ending *-selao* is attested over almost the entire proposed Honam dialect area (KDD 2009, 544), that is, very widely over South and North Jeolla Provinces, as well as in South Chungcheong Province and one site in North Chungcheong Province. We do note, however, that it is transcribed as *-s.se.la.o.*

Finally, a predicate ending *-cilao*, formally and functionally identical to the ending documented in this paper, is reportedly found widely in the South-west of the Korean peninsula with a scant few additional attestations in North and South Gyeongsang Province which do not necessarily neighbour Jeolla (e.g. Uljin) (KDD 2009, 581-82).

Whether these three endings should be considered three separate characteristic endings of the varieties of the South-western dialect zone is debatable. Lee Ki-gap (2001, 232) isolates the final part of these endings *-lao* as a feature of South-western speech, rather than the longer forms. He further characterises it as an honorific ending for use when addressing someone with whom the speaker is familiar, whereas the Contemporary Standard South Korean (CSSK) honorific endings would be used for an unfamiliar person. Nevertheless, Ogura Shinpei's survey data empirically verifies the use of these forms widely and almost exclusively in the proposed Honam dialect area.

3.3.3 The ending *-nunkio* is recorded with much less variation in form by Ogura Shinpei (KDD 2009, 540) and is also attested in South Jeolla Province as well as South and North Gyeongsang Provinces. There, the same form is also assigned the function of being a formal answer to a question, rather than just an interrogative ending. It is this usage specifically which is restricted to Gyeongsang and, in-keeping with the internal migration mentioned in Section 1 of the article, also attested in South Hamgyeong Province. From a more contemporary point of view, an apparently phonologically reduced form with the same function is the first characteristic grammatical feature of the South-eastern variety of Korean mentioned in Lee Sang-kyu's (2001, 90) overview description of the variety, however he makes no mention of the other features advanced by Lee Guk-lo as characteristic of this dialect area.

The ending *-l.lak.ha-* is recorded in near contemporary sources (KDD 2009, 516), but with a much wider distribution than implied here. It is recorded as being used to express purpose or plans of intended actions in the future in Jeju, South and North Gyeongsang Provinces, South and North Jeolla Provinces, North Chungcheong, and South Hamgyeong. While it is attested in all these places, it appears to be used across the whole territory of South and North Gyeongsang Provinces (16 sites in each). In contrast, its attestation in South Jeolla Province over six survey sites is linked to the proximity of these sites to South Gyeongsang Province and attestation in other provinces is even more sporadic. Notably in modern research (and in the popular imagination) this feature is considered highly characteristic of the varieties of the South-east of the peninsula.

The form, function, and distribution in the South-east of Korea of the comitative particle reported in this paper is corroborated by Ogura Shinpei's data (KDD 2009, 599).

3.3.4 Since Lee Guk-lo's Gwanbuk dialect area covers the entirety of North and South Hamgyeong Provinces, it is striking that endings now considered characteristic only of the Yukchin area, that is, a small territory in the extreme North-east of the Korean peninsula, are presented as representative of this entire proposed dialect. The endings *-kkwuma* and *-twu*(*ng*) have even been used alongside evidence of the historical movement of people to construct a separate Yukchin dialect of Korean (e.g. Jeong 1988, 38-40). Current studies on linguistic variation in Korean also associate these endings with overseas varieties of Korean in China and Central Asia, the development of which was greatly

influenced by speakers originating from this area (Barnes-Sadler and Yeon 2019).

Ogura Shinpei's survey, however, attests a slightly more widespread distribution of at least the interrogative ending *-twu*(*ng*) (KDD 2009, 526-27). Although still restricted to the northern region of North Hamgyeong Province, it appears in survey sites outside of the prototypical Yukchin area (e.g. in Musan). This suggests a possibility that Lee Guk-lo is not overgeneralising the distribution of these endings in his proposed Gwanbuk dialect area but was rather aware that these endings were more widely used there at the time he was writing.

Both *-mmay* and *-mmey* are attested by Ogura Shinpei as formal endings for use in interrogative and declarative sentences; the former in two sites in South Hamgyeong Province and the latter widely in both Hamgyeong and Pyeongan Provinces (KDD 2009, 527-28). These patterns of distribution do not necessarily suggest that these endings are solely characteristic of the proposed Gwanbuk dialect zone. They continue to be associated with the area in later work, though, and Jeong Yong-ho (1988, 233) considers the ending *-mmey* to be part of a politeness cline in Hamgyeong Dialect between *-m* and *-mmeyta*, with the former being used for addressing social juniors and the latter for superiors, while *-mmey* itself is used between equals.

The ending *-(p)ci.pi* is recorded variously by Ogura Shinpei (KDD 2009, 535; 582) and is strongly associated with North and South Hamgyeong Provinces. In contrast with its presentation here, it is suggested that is not only an indicative ending but may also be used in interrogative and imperative constructions.

The apocope of the final consonant of the object particle is attested as being both widespread in and entirely restricted to North and South Hamgyeong Provinces (KDD 2009, 598). More recent works on the varieties of the North-east (e.g. Jeong 1988, 192-95; Kwak 2003, 103) also identify this as characteristic of the region.

3.3.5 Paying minimal attention to the features of the Central dialect area is not unique to Lee Guk-lo. Ogura Shinpei's survey, too, collects data from only very few sites in Gyeonggi Province, and the data for Gangwon Province is also far from comprehensive. It is not possible to definitively say whether this is the reason that there is no attestation of a form similar to *-nikkantwulwu* in his data. Later sources, though, also do not record this form in the Central dialect

area (Kim 1987-1995), so its presentation as a characteristic of this large dialect area may be attributed either to the time of writing or Lee Guk-lo's personal experience and opinion.

The form *-sawayo*, or at least *-s.sa.wa.yo* is attested by Ogura Shinpei (KDD 2009, 543-49). Both *-s.sawayo* and *-wayo* are widely attested throughout Gangwon Province, but they are not restricted to the Central dialect area and appear in a small number of sites in North Hamgyeong Province and North Pyeongan Province.

Based on the above, it is hard to identify the criteria upon which the Central dialect area proposed here is constructed although, arguably, its earlier description as a "mixed variety" inoculates it against such criticism.

3.4 Here, we aim to add some spatial detail to the lists of dialect vocabulary forms. In addition to the KDD, where reliable near-contemporary information is not available, we consult more recent sources, e.g. *Hanguk bangeon jaryojip*. We note the presence or absence of each dialect form identified by Lee Guk-lo as well as their reported geographical distributions.

(1) *Hal.a.pe.ci* (grandfather). Only one of the dialect forms which appears in this paper is recorded in the near contemporary dialect survey: *ha.lu.pang*. This form is reported as being ubiquitous on Jeju island (KDD 2009, 103).

Later sources associate two of the recorded variants with the North-east of the Korean peninsula (*khun.a.pa.i, a.pa.i*). The formally similar variant *hal. a.pay*, however, is not attested. Of the remaining variants, one is recorded specifically in North Gyeongsang Province (*hal.pwu.ci*), while *hal.pay* attested widely over North and South Gyeongsang Provinces; one is found in North and South Jeolla Province (*han.a.ssi*), and the association of *ha.lu.pang* with Jeju Island is retained. The variant *hal.a.pwu.ci* is recorded in South Jeolla and South Gyeongsang Provinces, as well as one county in Gangwon, while the now standard form is considered ubiquitous throughout the rest of that province, as well as in Gyeonggi Province, and North and South Chungcheong Provinces. While *hal.pay.ssi* is not attested, the phonologically similar *hal.pa.ssi* has limited attestation in two counties of South Gyeongsang Province (Kim 1974, 44). This pattern is broadly confirmed in the *Hanguk bangeon jaryojip* (Kim 1987-1995). Four variants could not be found in more recent attestation: *hal.a.pa.ci*, *hal.a.pan, hal.pam, hal.paym.i*. This suggests that they are either characteristic of areas of the DPRK that are less comprehensively surveyed and reported upon or

alternatively, they had already fallen out of use by the time of later surveys

(2) *Hye* (tongue). Ogura Shinpei recorded 25 variant forms corresponding to the standard Korean form *hyeo* (tongue) (KDD 2009, 143-44). This is more than double the number of forms reported in this paper, although it includes only ten of the twelve forms reported here with specifically *sye* and *sey.kka.tak* omitted there. These forms are similarly omitted from later sources (e.g. Kim 1974, 75-76).

In terms of distribution, *sey* is notable being attested in the KDD in every province while the now standard form *hye* is recorded only in a limited number of sites in Gyeonggi Province, Gangwon Province, and North Chungcheong Province.

The forms attested here demonstrate that, while Lee Guk-lo may not have been aware of the full extent of lexical variation revealed by later surveys, he was aware that variation in dialect vocabulary could be found over the whole Korean peninsula. Variants used in North and South Pyeongan Provinces (*hey*), North and South Hamgyeong Provinces (*sey*), and on Jeju Island (*sey.ppa.tak* [likely a variant spelling of *sey.pa.tak*]) are all recorded here. The forms *si* and *soy* appear only in the southern provinces. The forms *sey.pa.tak* and hey have much sparser but geographically diffuse attestation. The former was recorded in all provinces to the South of Hwanghae Province excluding North and South Gyeongsang Provinces, and the latter was widely attested in North and South Pyeongan Provinces as well as Hwanghae Province and North Gyeongsang Province, to a lesser extent.

(3) *Khi* (sieve). A slightly larger number of dialect forms are reported in the KDD (2009, 243-44), including *khi.ccak* and *chi.i* along with seven forms given here. These, however, appear in very few survey sites (the latter in just six sites in Hwanghae Province and the former in just a single site in North Gyeongsang Province). Of the forms that are reported, two are widely attested over the whole peninsula (*khi* and *chi*). One variant was found in North and South Jeolla Proivinces (*cheyng.i*), one in North and South Gyeongsang Provinces (*ching.i*), and *chayng.i* is found widely throughout the South of the peninsula, North Chungcheong Province. Comparison with the KDD reveals that Lee Guk-lo once more includes a form unique to Jeju Island in his analysis of vocabulary (*phwu.nun.chey*) in striking contrast to his treatment of phonology and grammar.

(4) *Cham.oy* (Korean melon). Ten variants corresponding to the word *chamoy* appear in the KDD (2009, 272-73), including all of those reported by

Lee Guk-lo. Two of those not reported in this article differ from variants which are only in the quality of the vowel in the first syllable, i.e. *chey.mi* and *choy.mwey*. A striking incongruity between these sources is the difference in the syllabification of the transcriptions. Lee Guk-lo transcribed, for example, *cham.oy* while Ogura Shinpei transcribed the same form as *cha.moy*. The difference is that between a morpho-phonological and phonological system of transcription, respectively.

While some of the forms recorded by Lee Guk-lo appear as far north on the Korean peninsula as Hwanghae Province (*cha.moy*, *cha.mey*, and *cha.mi*), the majority of these variants are restricted in their distribution to the southern-most provinces of the peninsula, potentially implying a more limited knowledge of northern vocabulary.

(5) *Cam.ca.li* (dragon fly). The twenty forms that appear in this paper demonstrate an awareness of the great variability of the dialect forms corresponding to *chamjari* (dragonfly). This relatively large number of variants, however, is overshadowed by the 49 distinct forms reported by Ogura Shinpei (KDD 2009, 410-12). Despite this, two variants that do not appear in the KDD are reported here (*caym.ca.li* and *can.ca.li*). Another interesting discrepancy is between *chel.ni.payng.i* and *chel.nayng.i* in Lee Guk-lo's transcription and *chel.li.payng.i* and *chel.layng.i* in Ogura Shinpei's. Once more we see Lee Guk-lo's tendency to transcribe the underlying morpho-phonological information in contrast to Ogura Shinpei's more surface transcription.

Rather than address the distribution of all twenty variants attested here, we note that later surveys put the vast majority of them exclusively in the South of the mainland of the peninsula. Notable exceptions are the Jejueo form *pam.pe.li* and the North Hamgyeong form *kka.layng.i.* The inclusion of variants used in few outlying areas is likely the decisive factor in the vastly greater number of variants attested by Ogura Shinpei (e.g. *ceym.cey* in one site in South Hamgyeong Province, *hayng.o.li* on Geoje Island and one site on the neighbouring coast of South Gyeongsang Province, the variant form *pap.cwu.li* on Jeju Island, etc.).

(6) *Ye.hwo* (fox). As with the headword *cham.ca.li* we see a far greater number of variants recorded in near contemporary sources (KDD 2009, 386). We also once again see a relative lack of forms specific to the North of the peninsula (e.g. *yeng.wu* in South Hamgyeong and North and South Pyeongan Provinces). Most significantly, we see more evidence of Lee Guk-lo's morpho-phonemic transcription contrasting with Ogura Shinpei's more phonetic transcription as the reinforcement of velar consonants in intervocalic position

is consistently marked using a *sai-sios* in this paper, rather than a <k> in the preceding syllable's *patchim* (cf. *yes.kayng.i* and *yek.kayng.i*).

Given the nascent state of dialectological surveys on the Korean peninsula at the time this article was published, capturing this amount of variation is an impressive achievement. One area in which it falls slightly short, though is the tendency to focus on words drawn from the varieties of the South of the peninsula. Strikingly few of the attested forms are used exclusively in northern varieties.[4] The only example used exclusively in northern varieties which appears here, according to the distribution of forms reported in the KDD, is *yeng.kki* (in South Hamgyeong Province). Consulting later sources only adds the forms *a.pa.i* and *khun a.pa.i* to those associated exclusively with northern, specifically Hamgyeong, varieties.

These lists of dialect forms appear to be listed in order of dissimilarity from the forms supplied as reference which, more often than not, have become the standard forms in CSSK. The only exception to this is *ye.hwo* (fox), for which a form corresponding to CSSK *ye.wu* is not attested.

While the dialect forms are not given any kind of spatial ordering and no reference is made to geographical distribution, the caveat offered at the beginning of this section explains this and our examination of these forms above lends weight to the contention that Korean dialect vocabulary is in a "disordered state." An extreme example of this would be the form *sey*, which Ogura Shinpei's early dialect materials attest in not only the proposed Honam, Yeongnam, Gwanbuk, and Central dialect areas, but also on Jeju Island.[5] Further to that, the inclusion of words exclusively associated with Jeju Island (e.g. *pam.pe.li*) once more raises the question of how the varieties of Korean used there were conceived of in relation to the dialect taxonomy proposed above. The inclusion of these words strongly implies that they do fall within the remit of this paper, so it must remain a matter for speculation why the many phonological and

---

4. Here meaning the varieties of North and South Hamgyeong Province and North and South Pyeongan Province.
5. In more detail it is attested at four survey sites on Jeju Island, four survey sites in North Jeolla Province, two survey sites in South Jeolla Province, three survey sites in South Gyeongsang Province, four survey sites in North Gyeongsang Province, one survey site in South Chungcheong Province, five survey sites in North Chungcheong Province, one survey site in Gyeonggi Province, thirteen survey sites in Gangwon Province, one survey site in Hwanghae Province, sixteen survey sites in South Hamgyeong Province, and six survey sites in North Hamgyeong Province.

morpho-syntactic characteristics which distinguish the language of Jeju Island from that of the peninsula go unmentioned.

4. The conclusion to this piece emphasises the role that dialect research can play in the construction of a standard language. This may be regarded as an attitude particularly characteristic of the time at which the paper was published.

While standardisation was perhaps the pre-eminent issue in language research in early 20th century Korea, the broader academic climate is also reflected in the conclusion in the consistent reference to the application of "scientific" ideas and methods.

Conclusion

Lee Guk-lo was undoubtedly an influential figure in the early Korean linguistics and the Korean language movement. While it was not his main area of research, the foregoing reveals a contribution to Korean dialectology not to be overlooked. Despite making little reference to the methodological or theoretical apparatus of traditional dialectology the paper presented in translation here remains relevant. First, from an empirical perspective, some of the linguistic features reported here, particularly vocabulary, are uniquely attested. From a methodological perspective, the similarities between the concerns and conclusions of this paper and those of the field at large over the entirety of the twentieth century are striking, in particular the distribution of reflexes to historic sound changes and dialect prosody. Considering this invites us to reflect on the progress made in the discipline and identify areas that have been less consistently the focus of study.

Taken as a whole, these findings demonstrate the value of re-visiting early Korean language research for many reasons including the appreciation of work undertaken in a very different historical context, the re-discovery of the data it contains, and the determination of topics for the research agenda going forwards.

References

Barnes-Sadler, S., and Jaehoon Yeon. 2019. "Morphosyntactic Contrasts in Koryo Mar and Vernacular Yanbian Korean." *Lingua* 231. https://doi.org/

10.1016/j.lingua.2019.102742.

Choi, Myeong-ok. 2001. "Seobuk bangeon" [North Western Dialect]. In *Bangeonhak sajeon* [Dictionary of Dialectology], edited by Bangeonhakgyeonguhoe, 235-38. Seoul: Taehaksa.

Encyclopedia of Korean Studies. "Donggwang." Accessed February 14, 2020. https://encykorea.aks.ac.kr/Contents/SearchNavi?keyword=%EB%8F%99%EA%B4%91&ridx=0&tot=15/.

___. "Lee Kwang-su." Accessed February 14, 2020. https://encykorea.aks.ac.kr/Contents/SearchNavi??keyword=%EC%9D%B4%EA%B4%91%EC%88%98&ridx=0&tot=47.

Heo, Jae-yeong. 2015. "Geundae gyemonggi gwahak damnon hyeoseonggwa Iljegangjomgi 'gwahakjeok gugeohak'" [The Science Debate of the Modern Enlightenment Period and the "Scientific Korean Linguistics" of the Japanese Colonial Period]. *Kogito* 78: 117-47.

Jeong, Ryeol-mo. 1927a. "Joseoneoyeonguui jeongcheneun mueot?" [What is the Identity of Korean Language Research?] (*Donginji*) *Hangeul* 1 (2): 68-71.

___. 1927b. "Jilui eungdap" [Questions and Answers]. (*Donginji*) *Hangeul* 1 (5): 130.

Jeong, Seung-cheol. 2013. *Hangugui bangeongwa bangeonhak* [Korean Dialects and Dialectology]. Paju: Taehaksa.

Jeong, Yong-ho. 1988. *Hamgyeongdobangeonyeongu* [Hamgyeong Province Dialect Research]. N.P.: Gyoyukdoseochulpansa

Kim, Byeong-jae. 1988. *Joseoneonejirihaksigo* [A Perspective on Korean Linguistic Geography]. Seoul: Gwahakbaekgwasajeon jonghapchulpansa.

Kim, Chung-hoe. 1987-1995. *Hanguk bangeon jaryojip* [The Collection of Korean Dialect Materials]. 9 vols. Seongnam: The Academy of Korean Studies Press.

Kim, Hyeong-gyu. 1974. *Hanguk bangeonyeongu* [Korean Dialect Research]. Seoul: Taehaksa.

Kim, Jeong-dae. 2017. "Bangeon e daehan Joseoneohakhoe hakjadeului gwansimgwa yeongu seonggwa" [The Dialect Related Interests and Research Results of the Scholars of the Korean Language Society]. *Hangeul* 316: 209-49.

Ko, Yeong-geun. 2008. "I geungno ui eoneosasang wichi" [The Position of Lee Guk-lo's Lingusitic Thought]. *Hangeul* 281: 5-34.

Kono, Rokuro. 1945. *Chōsen hōgengaku shikō: "Hasami" gokō* [A Perspective on Korean Dialectology: A study on the word for "Scissors"]. Keijō/Seoul: Tōto shoseki.

Kwak, Chung-gu. 2003. "Dongbuk bangeon" [The North-eastern Dialect]. In *Bangeonhak sajeon* [A Dictionary of Dialectology], edited by Bangeonhakyeonguhoe, 99-106. Seoul: Taehaksa.

Lee, Byeong-gun. 2005. "1910-20 nyeondae Ilbonin e uihan Hangugeo yeongu gwajewa banghyang—Ogura Shinpei ui bangeonyeongu jungsimeuro" [The Tasks and Direction of Research on the Korean Language by Japanese in the 1910s and 1920s Focusing on Ogura Shinpei's Dialect Research]. *Bangeonhak* 2: 24-61.

Lee, Guk-lo. 1932a. *Joseonmalui saturi* [The Dialects of Korean]. *Donggwang* 29: 9-12.

___. 1932b. "Joseoneosajeon pyeonchan e daehayeo" [On the Compilation of Korean Dictionaries]. *Hangeul* 1 (1): 204-06.

___. 1935a. "Oerayeo pyogi e daehayeo" [On the Written Form of Loanwords]. *Hangeul* 3 (6): 357.

___. 1935b. "Joseoneoui sigan pyosibeop" [A Method for Writing Time in Korean]. *Hangeul* 3 (9): 455-57.

___. 1937. "Sajeon pyeonchan i wae eoryeounga?" [Why is Dictionary Compilation Difficult?]. *Hangeul* 4 (2): 571-72.

Lee, Iksop, and Robert Ramsey. 2000. *The Korean Language*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Lee, Ju-haeng. 2005. *Hangugeo sahoe bangeongwa jiyeok bangeon ui ihae* [Dialects of the Korean Language Society and Understandings of the Local Dialects]. Seoul: Hangukmunhwasa.

Lee, Ki-gap. 1992. "Bangeon bunhwa" [Dialect Taxonomy]. In vol. 3 of *Gugeoyeongu baengnyeonsa* [A History of One Hundred Years of Research on the National Language], edited by Yeong-geun Ko, 624-38. Seoul: Iljogak.

___. 2001. "Seonam bangeon" [South Western Dialect]. In *Bangeonhak sajeon* [Dictionary of Dialectology], edited by Bangeonhakyeonguhoe, 231-35. Seoul: Taehaksa.

Lee, Sang-chun. 1927. "Songdo saturi" [Songdo Dialect]. (*Donginji*) *Hangeul* 1 (5): 140.

Lee, Sang-kyu. 2001. "Dongnam bangeon" [South Eastern Dialect]. In *Bangeonhak*

sajeon [Dictionary of Dialectology], edited by Bangeonhakyeonguhoe, 84-99. Seoul: Taehaksa.

Lee, Sang-kyu, and Sun-hyeong Lee. 2009. *Joseoneo bangeonsajeon* [The Korean Dialect Dictionary]. Seoul: Hangukmunhwasa.

Martin, S. E. 1992. *A Reference Grammar of Korean*. North Clarendon, VT: Tuttle.

Nabokov, V. (1955) 2012. "Problems of Translation: Onegin in English." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by L. Venuti, 113-25. Abingdon: Routledge.

Nam, Ki-tak. 2012. "Gugeohak yeongu 60nyeonui hoegowa jeonmang" [Review and Prospects of Sixty Years of Korean Linguistics Research]. *Gugeogungmunhak* 161: 27-62.

Ogura, Shinpei. 1940. *The Outline of the Korean Dialects*. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko Publications

Sasse, W. 2000. "The Establishment of the Korean Linguistic Tradition." In vol. 1 of *History of the Language Sciences: An International Handbook on the Evolution of the Study of Language from the Beginnings to the Present*, edited by S. Auroux, E. F. K. Koerner, H-J. Niederehe, and K. Versteegh, 63-71. New York; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Silva, David. 2010. "Death, Taxes and Language Change: The Inevitable Divergence of Korean Varieties as Spoken Worldwide." In *Contemporary Korean Linguistics: International Perspectives*, edited by Sang-Oak Lee, 300-19. Paju: Taehaksa.

Sohn, Ho min. 1999. *The Korean Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Song, Cheol-uy. 2001. "Deungeoseonui deunggeup" [Grading Isoglosses]. In *Bangeonhak sajeon* [Dictionary of Dialectology], edited by Bangeonhakyeonguhoe, 110-02. Seoul: Taehaksa.

Yang, Changyong, W. O'Grady, Sejung Yang, N. H. Hilon, Sang-Gu Kang, and So-Young Kim. 2019. "Revising the Language Map of Korea." In *Handbook of the Changing World Language Map*, edited by S. Brunn and R. Kehrein. Cham: Springer. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-73400-2_110-1.

Simon BARNES-SADLER (sb171@soas.ac.uk)
SOAS, University of London