

A Comparative Study of *Gukhanmun* Style in *Seoyu gyeonmun* and Mixed Style in *Seiyo jijo*: *On the Formation of Gukhanmun Style in Korea**

LIM Sang-Seok

Abstract

This article analyzes the role Yu Gil-jun's Seoyu gyeonmun (Observations on a Journey to the West) played in the development of gukhanmun, a mixed-script writing style composed of Korean and literary Chinese. The article begins with an examination of Seoyu gyeonmun's stylistic relationship with Fukuzawa Yukichi's Seiyo jijo (Conditions in the West). By analyzing the integration of literary Chinese in the two books, this study will present Yu Gil-jun's unique stylistic achievements and their influence on Korean literary tradition. While Seoyu gyeonmun may have acquired information about the modern West and ideas about constitutionalism and freedom from Seiyo jijo, in terms of syntax the work is more similar to eonhae (Korean translations of Chinese classics). Yu's rearrangement of the syntactic order of Literary Chinese to fit Korean is likely a legacy of the Korean tradition of the translation of Chinese classics, rather than the influence of Japanese syntax. This exhibits the uniqueness of gukhanmun style in Seoyu gyeonmun, in contrast with the stylistic traits of Seiyo jijo. Moreover, Seoyu gyeonmun displays signs of the author's active involvement in shaping the text through the editing and rewriting that occurred in the process of translation and adaptation.

Keywords: *gukhanmun* style, *Seoyu gyeonmun*, *Seiyo jijo*, Yu Gil-jun, Fukuzawa Yukichi, Korean translation of Chinese classics (*eonhae*), literary Chinese

* This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (NRF-2007-361-AM0059).

LIM Sang-Seok is HK Professor at the Jeonpiljae Institute at Pusan University. E-mail: oakie@hanmail.net.

Introduction

The books *Seoyu gyeonmun* (Observations on a Journey to the West) and *Seiyo jijo* 西洋事情 (Conditions in the West) and their respective authors, Yu Gil-jun and Fukuzawa Yukichi, are challenging texts and figures, frequently referenced in both Korea and Japan. Scholars like Chung Yong-hwa (2004) have produced comprehensive research on Yu Gil-jun's status in political history and the history of thought. Others, like Lee Han-seop (2002), have researched the vocabulary of *Seoyu gyeonmun* and analyzed the document's use of traditional words and the then newly imported Chinese neologisms. Hur Kyoung-Jin (2004) published an unabridged translation of *Seoyu gyeonmun* in which he discussed the work's cultural value and limitations. Kim Jeong-hyun (2006) compared Yu Gil-jun's and Liang Qichao's texts on the basis that they are both records of direct contact with the West. Similarly, Lee Hyung-dae (2009) analyzed the travel experiences and perceptions of civilization presented in *Seoyu gyeonmun*. As these texts and articles demonstrate, a rich discussion has developed around *Seoyu gyeonmun*. This article will concentrate on the document's use of *gukhanmun*, a mixed-script style composed of both Korean and literary Chinese, and compare the syntactic styles of *Seoyu gyeonmun* and *Seiyo jijo*.

Numerous scholars have already pointed out that a considerable portion of *Seoyu gyeonmun* is based on *Seiyo jijo*. Drawing on this observation, many argue that the Korean *gukhanmun* style developed and used by Yu Gil-jun was directly influenced by the modern mixed-script style of Japan (Ko 2004; Min 1994). However, Kim Young-min (2009) rejects the assertion that Fukuzawa's style was implanted into Yu's writing. Kim argues that Yu Gil-jun's *gukhanmun* style is a variation that is primarily composed of literary Chinese diction, Korean particles, and postnominal verbs. According to him, this combination is more immediately related to the style used in *eonhae* 諺解, Korean translations of Chinese classics. This study sees that Yu Gil-jun's style should be viewed in relation to Korean stylistic tradition, rather than as a product of Japanese influence. In line with this perspective, the following sections will examine the cultural significance of Yu Gil-jun's *gukhanmun* style, compare the modes in which

literary Chinese was used in *Seoyu gyeonmun* and *Seiyo jijo* respectively, and clarify the Korean stylistic tradition in which Yu's writing was formed.

There is no doubt that a considerable portion of *Seoyu gyeonmun* was based on *Seiyo jijo*.¹ In his book, *Korea between Empires*, Andre Schmid (2002, 111) points out how the conceptual vocabulary of the former influenced the latter. While the issue of conceptual language is clearly an important one, such concerns are separate from matters of style. Even if a writer utilizes the same conceptual terms, it does not necessarily mean that they also borrow the syntax and rhetoric that constitute style.

During the early modern period of Korea, literary Chinese was the dominant language in terms of vocabulary and transcription. Hence, in analyses and categorization of *gukhanmun* style, literary Chinese cannot be avoided (Lim 2008). Here, the influence of language on rhetorical devices used in Korean is relatively clear. On the other hand, the subtle aspects of the relationship between Korean and Japanese style are more difficult to demonstrate (Lim 2010a; Lim 2010b). Yu and Fukuzawa were both East Asian intellectuals who made efforts to modify their mother tongues into more modern and accessible languages.² Yu's adaptation of Fukuzawa's text is of particular importance as it provides an avenue to examine the historically identified differences in the linguistic and cultural environment of Korea and Japan. While there has been progress in the study of the intellectual and historical background of *Seoyu gyeonmun* and *Seiyo jijo*, there has been little attention paid to the use of literary Chinese in the two texts.

More than a quarter of *Seoyu gyeonmun* is based on *Seiyo jijo*, including adaptations of sections like "The Newspaper," "The Hospital," and "The Steam Engine." While these sections convey information and experiences that may seem minor, the book also includes chapters like "People's

1. Refer to G. Yi's table (1979, 70-73). This table is largely accurate, but there is one inaccuracy. Yi states that the section on *tenin* 癲院 (mental institution) found in *Seiyo jijo* is missing in *Seoyu gyeonmun*, but it is translated and appears as *gwanginwon* 狂人院 in the latter.

2. Both authors explicitly state their positions on this matter in their respective texts (Yu 2004, 5-6; Fukuzawa 1866, 7-9).

Rights,” “Origins of Government,” and “Education,” all of which are closely related to the book’s emphasis on civilization and enlightenment. The aim of this study is to compare *Seoyu gyeonmun* and *Seiyo jijo* by concentrating on both their modes of adaptation and their stylistic traits. In addition, this study will highlight the historical significance of the two texts as part of the backdrop of the development of modern styles of written language in Korea and Japan.

A Comparison of the Mixed-Script Styles of *Seoyu gyeonmun* and *Seiyo jijo*

The *gukhanmun* style used in *Seoyu gyeonmun* was a pioneering form of writing that, in terms of syntax, vocabulary, and sentence and paragraph construction, was highly consistent compared to the forms of writing that were later developed.³ The various styles of *gukhanmun* found in newspapers such as the *Hwangseong sinmun* (Imperial Capital News) or in magazines and journals like the *Daehan jaganghoe wolbo* (Korea Self-Strengthening Society Monthly) oscillated between the syntactic principles of Korean and literary Chinese, and did not adhere to a consistent style. In terms of vocabulary, most writing styles lacked a clear ratio of Chinese and Korean script. As for composition, much of the writing consisted of sentences and paragraphs that would often extend endlessly without proper punctuation or conjunction. The rules of composition that did exist frequently did not have grammatical or syntactic consistency. Pure-Korean language media outlets, such as *Dongnip sinmun* (The Independent) and *Jeguk sinmun* (Imperial Post), which standardized their syntax and vocabulary to Korean, still fell short in paragraph construction and articles were largely written in run-on sentences. Considering that this state of stylistic confusion persisted until the mid-1910s, the *gukhanmun* style produced

3. Yu Gil-jun was the editor of the *Hanseong jubo* (Hanseong Weekly), a government-run newspaper that used *gukhanmun* style for the first time in Korea. The innovative style of *Seoyu gyeonmun* emerged from Yu’s experience with this newspaper.

in *Seoyu gyeonmun* was an unprecedented achievement for Korean linguistics at the time.

Seiyō jijo was similarly effective in terms of style, as evidenced by the fact that it is now considered the origin of Japan's unification of its written and spoken language.⁴ The script prioritized the communication of meaning through an accessible textual form. In addition, just as *Seoyu gyeonmun* was associated with *eonhae*, a translation style developed during the process of rendering Chinese classics into Korean script, *Seiyō jijo* was rooted in *kunyomi* 訓読み, a translation form used in the conversion of literary Chinese into Japanese. While the style of *Seiyō jijo* was based on *kunyomi*, the work became the standard for simpler and clearer modern Japanese sentence construction. By merging traditional Japanese written form with the spoken form, the text helped orient the language towards unification. Another commonality between *Seiyō jijo* and *Seoyu gyeonmun* is the important role the translation of modern Western documents had in their arguments.

In order to provide vivid descriptions of the customs of different countries, in his writing of *Seiyō jijo*, Fukuzawa prioritized clarity of meaning. *Seiyō jijo* faced criticism from Japanese intellectuals, especially those educated in the classics, due to its stylistic differences with earlier writing styles that stressed formal unity and stylistic structure (Saito 2010, 128-131). However, due to Fukuzawa's emphasis on accessible mixed script, he was able to deliver information written in Western languages with ease.

By mixing Korean and literary Chinese, *Seoyu gyeonmun* displays an orientation towards a more accessible style of writing. In contrast, *Seiyō jijo*, which employs a mixture of *kunyomi*, spoken Japanese, and neologisms, exhibits less structural unity. The vocabulary of *Seoyu gyeonmun* is mostly drawn from literary Chinese and supplemented with a limited number of Korean characters of somewhat secondary importance, such as particles and suffixes. However, the work's syntax followed Korean rules.

4. According to Yamamoto, "As the origin of simple and straightforward modern style, he [Fukuzawa] created a new style that was plain and popular and that could found the basis for the unification of the written and spoken language" (quoted in Morioka 1991, 416).

This was a form related to the language policy proposed at the time of the Reform of 1894 (Gabo Gyeongjang) that standardized the mixed-script style of Korean and Chinese character, but still kept writing accessible to intellectuals whose basic education was founded in literary Chinese.

Seiyo jijo was able to target the general public since Japan already had an established reading population. In contrast, Korea's book market in the late nineteenth century was far smaller and Yu Gil-jun, who served as a government official, did not consider the general public in his writing. Even though *Seoyu gyeonmun* adapted both Western texts and sections of *Seiyo jijo*, its style differed from the popular prose of the Japanese Meiji period. In addition, because Yu's work targeted a limited audience, it could present a mixed style of Chinese and Korean characters that was more consistent.

Overall, the *gukhanmun* style in *Seoyu gyeonmun* consistently maintains Korean syntax. Until as late as the 1910s, most versions of *gukhanmun* frequently used four-character Chinese idioms with literary Chinese particles, conjunctions, or verb endings such as “而” (*yi*), “也” (*ya*), or “耳” (*yi*). Considering the circumstances, it is clear how fervent Yu Gil-jun was in his effort to break away from the linguistic customs of his day.⁵ Whereas literary Chinese idioms were employed from time to time, their usage was mainly confined to the realm of vocabulary, while Korean syntax was used throughout the work.

In terms of vocabulary, Chinese characters were dominant throughout the *Seoyu gyeonmun*. At the time, the use of Chinese was unavoidable. With the exception of a few particles, adverbs, affixes, connectives, and dependant nouns, Korean language lexicon and grammar were still at an indeterminate stage of development. As previously mentioned, the primary audience of *Seoyu gyeonmun* were not the general public but Joseon aristocrats who participated in public affairs. At this point, using unadulterated Korean vocabulary was still inadequate for conversing on official

5. In this book, Lim (2008) categorized the *gukhanmun* style of the Modern Enlightenment Era into three groups according to the degree to which literary Chinese was used in the realms of word, phrase, or sentence.

matters. This was true of the Korean language throughout the Enlightenment era and into the 1910s.

Although Chinese characters are dominant in *Seoyu gyeonmun*, there are exceptions to their use that emerged during the transcription of the work into Korean. For instance, in order to express the meaning of absence, the Chinese character “無” was mainly used. However, in the sentence, “如何事物에든지 不就고 安坐야 生涯엿다 稱託 者의” (Yu 2004, 295),⁶ the Korean word “엿다” (*eopda*) was used instead. Although it may damage the consistency of the passage, it seems that this alteration was deemed the more rational choice in terms of readability. This also exposes the author’s attempt to make decisions concerning the subtle boundaries between Korean and literary Chinese.⁷ *Seoyu gyeonmun* may look like any other Korean translation of a Chinese classic, with Korean particles and verb endings that aid in the reading and interpretation of the texts. Nevertheless, separating Chinese terms and rearranging them according to Korean syntax is in and of itself a remarkable progression—one that was not seen in most *gukhanmun*-style writing from late nineteenth-century Korea.

Judging by modern Korean grammar standards, Yu Gil-jun’s work lacks proper punctuation and is filled with both run-on sentences and illogical sentence flow. However, considering the conventions employed in most publications from the period, *Seoyu gyeonmun* was an enormous accomplishment. The comparative strength of the work may have resulted from the fact that, while most *gukhanmun*-style writings were composed on short notice, Yu’s work was written under relatively stable conditions over the course of more than three years.

Through *Seoyu gyeonmun*, Yu Gil-jun attempted a new kind of *gukhanmun*-style writing that could describe and discuss Western civilization and institutions. At the same time, all of the morphemes, with the exception of roots and stems, were written in Chinese characters. This seems to have

6. All underlined emphasis hereinafter is that of the present author unless otherwise specified.

7. The following is a similar case: “他人을 壓過 意想이 美事아니라 謂다나 然하나” (Yu 2004, 305). That is, to indicate negation, the Korean word “아니다” (*anida*) is used instead of the Chinese character “非.” Similar examples can be found throughout the text.

been done in order to avoid excluding traditional intellectuals, who were familiar with reading and writing in literary Chinese. However, throughout *Seoyu gyeonmun*, Yu Gil-jun voluntarily abandoned his educational background in the Chinese classics by not referencing authentic precedents and conventions of traditional prose and verse. While this may seem to be a compromise on a superficial linguistic level, the work contains a deeper reformist ethos. Even if it is difficult to locate traces of traditional training in literary Chinese, *Seoyu gyeonmun*'s style is closely connected to the Korean tradition of translations of Chinese classics. For this reason, before moving to a comparison with the *Seiyo jijo*, the following section will first explore the Korean translation methods of Chinese classics.

Korean Translations of the Classics and the *Gukhanmun* Style of *Seoyu gyeonmun*

Yu Gil-jun's reconstruction of literary Chinese based on Korean syntax was directly related to the Korean method of translating Chinese classics. These earlier vernacular works were referred to by the pejorative term *gyeongseo eonhae* 經書彥解 (translation of Chinese classics into vernacular Korean). Taking into consideration that Yu Gil-jun's formal training as a writer was rooted in literary Chinese, and keeping in mind the formal characteristics of the *gukhanmun* style in *Seoyu gyeonmun*, it is quite probable that the book was composed in a manner similar to previous Korean translations of Chinese classics. In other words, sentences were first conceptualized in literary Chinese and later materialized textually based on Korean syntax.

- (1) 新聞紙 衆人이 會社 結하야 其局을 立고 世間の 自新 事情을 探知야 其 記出 文章을 登板야 天下에 公布 者니 (Yu 2004, 457-458).
- (1-1) 新聞紙者 爲探知世間自新事情 衆人結社會立其局 以登板其記出文章 公布天下也.
- (1-2) A newspaper is something that, through the union of the public and the establishment of the [newspaper] office, investigates the

changing situations and reports and publishes articles to the world.

Passage 1 in *gukhanmun* style is an excerpt from *Seoyu gyeonmun*'s section on the newspaper. Passage 1-1 is the author's translation into literary Chinese. It is likely that the *gukhanmun* version of the sentence was not its initial form, but rather, a rearrangement of the Chinese passage. For Korean intellectuals educated in literary Chinese, such as Yu Gil-jun, literary Chinese was the most common form of written language. For example, Jo So-ang, Yu's junior of thirty years, kept a journal in literary Chinese while he was a student studying abroad in his twenties. Due to this degree of familiarity, it can be assumed that, in order to form a sentence in *gukhanmun* style, it was more natural for writers like Yu to assume a two-stage process: first composing their prose in literary Chinese and then reconstructing the text based on Korean syntax. Through the most visible grammatical change between the two sentences—the position change between the object and the verb—one can deduce that a considerable deal of transformation was required to translate literary Chinese to Korean. Based on rules of literary Chinese syntax, it would have been more natural to have the clause “investigates . . . to the world” precede “through . . . the office.” By the same principle, the phrase “結하야” should have preceded “會社” in the Korean text. Such linguistic indicators demonstrate that the writing of *gukhanmun* style involved multiple layers and stages of translation.

This method of composition shares a striking resemblance to the process of writing *gyeongseo eonhae*. Jeon U, a contemporary of Yu who followed a considerably different path, employed a similar translation process in his work of a Korean version of the *Zhongyong* (Doctrine of the Mean). Like Yu, he rearranged the original literary Chinese sentences in accordance with Korean syntax and partially translated literary Chinese terms into Korean.

- (2) 喜怒哀樂之未發 謂之中 發而皆中節 謂之和 中也者 天下之大本也 和也者 天下之達道也 (Jeon 2011, 2).
- (2-1)喜怒哀樂이發치 아니함을 中이라 이르코 發하야 다 節에 中함을 和 | 라 이르나 니 中은 天下에 大本이오 和는 天下에 達道 | 나라.

(2-2) While there are no stirrings of pleasure, anger, sorrow, or joy, the mind may be said to be in the state of Equilibrium. When those feelings have been stirred, and they act in their due degree, there ensues what may be called the state of Harmony. This Equilibrium is the great root from which grow all the human acting in the world, and this Harmony is the universal path, which they all should pursue.⁸

Passage 2 is an original excerpt from Jeon U's essay, "Jungyong eonhae" (Korean Vernacular Translation of the *Zhongyong*), and passage 2-1 is its translation into *gukhanmun*. In the transformation from the original to the translation, the syntax was first transformed from that of literary Chinese to Korean. That is, the verbs and objects switched their positions; for instance, "未發" (no stirrings) is written in Korean syntax with the standard word order of verb followed by object, and becomes "發치 아니함을" (yet-stirred-not). Additionally, Chinese words were replaced by Korean words. For instance, the word for "everything," which was written in literary Korean-Chinese "皆" (*gae*) in the original text, was replaced with its equivalent Korean word "다" (*da*).⁹ This process of translation into Korean is quite similar to how the *gukhanmun* style of *Seoyu gyeonmun* was formed. Thus, there is little reason to doubt Yu's own statement that he followed the writing style of the Korean translation of *Chilseo eonhae* (The Seven Books).

Nevertheless, there is a clear distinction between the Korean translations of Chinese classics and *Seoyu gyeonmun*. For the former, an original text clearly exists; for the latter, an authoritative version is absent. Hence, if one felt that the translation of the *Chilseo eonhae* was flawed, the reader could refer back to the original. This is not the case for *Seoyu gyeonmun*. Thus, the comparative usage of translation and creative writing does not share the same status in these two cases. While literary Chinese words play a pivotal role in *Seoyu gyeonmun* in terms of vocabulary and mean-

8. Translation by James Legge (1893).

9. Similarly, "謂" (*wi*) was replaced by "이르고" (*ireugo*) and "未" (*mi*) by "아니함을" (*anihom-eul*).

ing, the work abandons the world of Chinese classics, which form the basis of literary Chinese, by deliberately avoiding any reference to authentic precedents from the canonical writing form. As previously mentioned, even though *Seoyu gyeonmun* went through a translation process of sorts, the act of translation must also be viewed as part of the creative process since the original literary Chinese text was also a product of the author. Albeit indirectly, Yu Gil-jun instead replaced the position of Confucian classics with modern Western texts and Fukuzawa's *Seiyo jijo*. Undoubtedly, the status of Western texts and of *Seiyo jijo* did not come close to the stature of the Confucian classics at the time. Nonetheless, it would be best to understand its reference to *Seiyo jijo* as a means of creating a language that could communicate to a larger group of readers since *Seoyu gyeonmun* itself did not pursue universal values. As a result, while *Seoyu gyeonmun* owes a certain portion of its stylistic creativity to *Seiyo jijo*, the process of paraphrasing and translating from one work to another was a product of Yu Gil-jun's sole stylistic endeavor to create what is currently known as the *gukhanmun* style.

Methods of Adaptation

The methods by which Yu Gil-jun adapted and paraphrased *Seiyo jijo* can largely be categorized into two groups. The first group refers to sections that paraphrased parts from *Seiyo jijo* without any excessive alterations. While there were occasional omissions or additions, these alterations do not fundamentally affect the main ideas of the articles in question. The second group refers to cases in which entirely new content is introduced or whole sections are removed due to political, social, and cultural differences. In this case, the thesis of the text is fundamentally altered. The first type of article, where the main point was kept intact through the process of adaptation, focused on communicating information. In contrast, the second type displayed a more intimate relationship to the main theme of *Seoyu gyeonmun*. In both cases, however, the styles are drastically different from *Seiyo jijo*. This contrast can clearly be seen in the two following sec-

tions on the topic of the newspaper.

- (3) 新聞紙は社會ありて新らしき事情を探し之を記して世間に布告するものなり即ち其國朝廷の評議、官命の公告、吏人の進退、市街の風説、外國の形勢、學藝日新の景況、交易の盛衰、耕作の凶、物價の高低、民間の苦樂、死生存亡、異事珍談、總て人の耳目に新らしきことは逐一記載して圖畫を附し明詳ならざるはなし其細事に至ては集會の案内を爲し開店の名を弘め失物を探索し拾ひ物の主を求むる等皆新聞紙局に託して (Fukuzawa 1866, 33).

(3-1) A newspaper investigates the new events of a society and records and announces them to people; its contents include: discussions in government, announcements of official orders, the appointment and resignations of officials, rumors on the streets, international affairs, innovations in the arts and sciences, the ups and downs in trade, good and bad harvests of cultivated crops, the fluctuation of prices, the joys and sorrows among ordinary people, births and deaths, strange stories, things new to everyone's eyes and ears, that which should be thoroughly written about with detailed illustrations, meeting announcements, advertisements for a newly opened store, lost and found, and such things that are requested to the newspaper office.

- (4) 新聞紙는 衆人이 會社를 結하여 其局을 立하고 世間の 自新하는 事情을 探知하여 其 記出하는 文章을 登板하여 天下에 公布하는 者니 朝廷의 政事와 官家의 命令과 官員의 進退로부터 道路의 風説과 商賈의 盛衰와 農作의 豊凶과 物價의 高低와 各處學校의 修學하는 景像과 各地學者의 窮究하는 術業과 民間의 苦樂과 生死며 外國의 傳聞에 至하여는 實景 眞態 奇事 異言의 足히 世人의 聞見을 博할 者를 文人이 文을 術고 名畫가 畫를 作하여 不詳한 者가 無하고 又 他事故에 至하여는 集會하는 消息과 開市하는 名號와 火輪船車의 出入과 家袋什物의 賣買며 遺失物을 拾取하여 基本主를 探索하기와 店舍를 排鋪하고 旅客을 招延하기도 皆 新聞局에 付託하여 其細瑣한 緣由를 記譜하나니 (Yu 2004, 457-458).

(4-1) A newspaper is something that, through the union of the public and the establishment of a [newspaper] office, investigates changing situations and reports and publishes articles to the world in a range of topics, covering political affairs of the court, official orders, appointment and resignation of officials, and the extent of rumors on the streets; ups and downs in trade; rich and poor harvests of agricultural products; the fluctuation of prices; the study conditions

of schools everywhere; research techniques of scholars of every place; joys and sorrows, births and deaths among ordinary people; and international issues. The newspaper presents the real view, truthful descriptions, strange facts, and unfamiliar language on things that can expand people's experiences; the writers compose works and artists draw illustrations in detail. Also, as for trivial events, [it reports] the news about meetings, names of new stores, the comings and goings of steamers or steam engine trains, the trading of ground plots and household goods, the acquisition of lost articles and the search for their owners, advertising businesses and welcoming travelers. All of these are requested of the newspaper office to report, down to the minor details and the sources.

Not much substantive difference can be found between each excerpt. However, *Seiyo jijo* employs Japanese vocabulary to a larger degree than *Seoyu gyeonmun* utilizes Korean. Also, whereas the writing structure of literary Chinese is more common in the latter, the form is broken up with only traces of Chinese in the former. In *Seoyu gyeonmun*, all the words, except auxiliary vocabulary such as particles, dependent nouns, and adverbs, appear in Chinese. However, in *Seiyo jijo*, even when Chinese characters are displayed, they are combined with *hiragana* and read using Japanese pronunciation. This can be seen in the readings of “新らし” as “あたらし” (*atarashii*), “即ち” as “すなわち” (*sunawatsi*), “總て” as “すべて” (*subete*) and “名を弘め” as “なびろめ” (*nabirome*). Moreover, in *Seiyo jijo*, even Chinese idioms and phrases are paraphrased in Japanese or replaced with Japanese versions of Chinese characters.¹⁰ Hence, when *hiragana* is omitted from *Seiyo jijo*, the work is rendered illegible. In contrast, in *Seoyu gyeonmun*, even when Hangeul characters are removed, the meaning is still retained, albeit with a slight modification of word order.¹¹

If a process of adaptation from *Seiyo jijo* to *Seoyu gyeonmun* is inferred,

10. The expression “三舍を避る” in passage 5 on page 119 of this article is one such case. It is a Japanese paraphrase of the Chinese idiom “退避三舍.”

11. To form accurate sentences, characters such as “由,” “之,” or “的” should be added, but even without them, the overall meaning is still communicated.

then it can be assumed that the Japanese sentences were first translated to literary Chinese, then rearranged according to Korean syntax, at which the appropriate Korean particles and endings were inserted. Similarly, another indication of Fukuzawa's commitment to the needs of a large reading audience can be seen in that *Seiyo jijo* even displays the use of hiragana in order to aid the reading of Chinese characters. These variations in the two works may be the result of differences in their intended audiences. Whereas *Seiyo jijo* was geared towards the general public, the primary readers of *Seoyu gyeonmun* were Korean intellectuals who would have been deeply immersed in literary Chinese. The contrast between these two works may have also been based on the different conditions of the two languages. While Japan had already developed grammar books and dictionaries through Dutch and English translations, Korea still lacked such a linguistic foundation at this time. The differences in the two works can also be attributed to the fact that Korea's writing tradition was much more closely related to literary Chinese, especially when compared with Japan. The fact that Yu adopted Fukuzawa's writing, yet modified the work to fit the cultural environment of Korea indicates that *Seoyu gyeonmun*'s style is not merely a simple implantation of *Seiyo jijo*'s style.

As the above passage demonstrates, *Seoyu gyeonmun* includes certain phrases that do not appear in *Seiyo jijo*. At the beginning of the Korean excerpt, the author added the phrase "through the union of the public and the establishment of a [newspaper] office" to emphasize the importance of linking the public with the publishing of newspapers. However, a more significant addition is the reference to schools and scholars. These alterations reflect Yu's creative interpretation, which sought to underscore the main thesis of *Seoyu gyeonmun*: that through education of the people, fair competition can be fostered, and through this competition, society can advance towards civilization. The additions in *Seoyu gyeonmun* do not disrupt the original thesis of Fukuzawa's work, but they do underscore Yu's own thesis, as well as demonstrate that his adaptation was an active one. This feature of Yu's work is seen again in the following passages on James Watt. While similar in terms of content and message, modifications were made in the process of adaptation:

(5) 抑抑これより以前に蒸氣機關を工夫せし者多しと雖ども之を大成して實用にしたる者はワットなるが故に蒸氣機關の發明者として其名を不朽に傳へり惑人これを稱して云く先生の工夫を以て蒸氣の氣管一と度大成し氣力の強大なると其運動の自由なること實に驚駭す可し大象の鼻を以て針を撮み又大木を裂くもこれを蒸氣に比すれば宮に三舎を避るのみならず以て印版を彫刻うれば精巧の手も之に若かず鐵塊を壓碎けば蠟よりも軟なり絲を紡績すれば其細なること毛の如く(Fukuzawa 1867, 24)

(5-1) Generally speaking, there were many who studied the steam engine before him, but it was Watt who fully improved it and put it to practical use, which, in turn, makes him the inventor of the steam engine whose name will be passed down to eternity. Hence, someone commented that, through Mr. [Watt]'s research, the steam engine was fully improved, and its mighty power and free movement became truly mind-boggling. An elephant can pick up a needle or split a huge tree with its nose, but compared to a steam engine, its difference is incomparable. If the steam engine were to carve a printing block, even the most delicate technician could not beat it; if it were to crush a lump of iron and soften it to a wax and spin the thread out of it, it would be as thin as hair.

(6) 蓋瓦妬の先에도蒸氣機關을窮究한者가雖多하나此功을大成하여實用에施한者は瓦妬라天地間の一種自然한剛力を拔出하여人世千萬事物의窮苦艱困한根源을拔去하고便要當達한景況을助成하여利用厚生하는道로天下の人이其福을共享하고且其惠澤이無窮한來世에流被함이니是로以하여瓦妬の名은不朽에傳하여婦人孺子라도尊敬을不可하는者が無함이라(Yu 2004, 469).

(6-1) Although there were people who researched the steam engine prior to Watt, it was he who integrated the results and put it to practical use; who drew strong power from one of the natural sources in the world, and eliminated the source of humanity and the myriad of beings unbearable suffering and destitution; and helped to create the situation that was necessary for the task to be accomplished. Watt did this by promoting public welfare, which can be commonly enjoyed by everyone in the world, and its benefits will affect posterity forever. Hence, transmitting Watt's name to eternity, so that even housewives and children cannot help but admire him.

Both of the above passages are excerpts from biographies of James Watt,

the famed inventor of the steam engine. The passages frame the lead-up to the invention of the steam engine through a chronological description of Watt's birth, background, and achievements. The excerpts provided are the final sections of the biographies. These two passages effectively demonstrate how *Seoyu gyeonmun* is not simply an implantation of *Seiyo jijo*, but a rewriting of the work. In depicting the usefulness of the steam engine, the excerpt from *Seiyo jijo* uses the elephant as means of comparison to emphasize the machine's power and agility. In contrast, *Seoyu gyeonmun* focuses on the contribution of the steam engine to present and future needs through a more abstract description. The former excerpt provides a more vivid depiction that touches on human sensitivities and emotions. Compared to the previous citations from *Seiyo jijo*, this excerpt uses even less literary Chinese. In contrast, the description in *Seoyu gyeonmun* focuses on the greater significance and detailed benefits of the steam engine, and displays stronger ties to traditional literary Chinese through the use of Chinese idioms such as “千萬事物” (the myriad of beings), and “利用厚生” (creating benefits and promoting welfare). Such stylistic traits in *Seoyu gyeonmun* may seem cliché in retrospect, but given the context, were more logical in process. That is, considering that the passages provide an overall judgment about Watt, the explication in *Seiyo jijo* veers away from standard writing in order to better meet the demands of popular culture. However, it seems that Yu did not yield to the appeal of popularism. Some may view the transformation from the more vivid language of Fukuzawa's writing to the somewhat hackneyed explanations of *Seoyu gyeonmun* as dated, but Yu's linguistic choices were more appropriate given the context.

The close relationship between the *Seoyu gyeonmun* and *Seiyo jijo* can also be seen in the following excerpts, taken from a chapter from *Seiyo jijo* and its adaptation in *Seoyu gyeonmun*, respectively:

- (7) 政府の體裁は各各相異なるも其大取義は前にも云ひし如く唯人心を集めて恰も一體と爲し衆民の爲めに便利を譲うより外ならず國政の方向を示し順序を正するの事は一二の君相又は議政官の手に非ざれば行はれ難さが故に人心を集めて一體と爲さざる可らず衆民の便利を譲るにも人心一致せざれば衆

を害して寡を利するの患あるが故に此亦政府の上より處置せざる可らず本來諸國に政府を立てて國民の之を仰ぎ之を支持する所以は唯國內一般に其德澤を蒙らんことを望むのみ取義なれば政府たらんものも若し國民の爲めに利を謀ることなくば之を有害無益の長物と云ふ可し就中其職分にて最も緊要なる一大事業は法を平にし律を正するに在り是即ち人民の生を安んじ自由を得私有の物を保つことを得る所以なり(Fukuzawa 1867, 45-46)

(7-1) Even though government systems differ everywhere, its sole intent is, as aforementioned, to assemble and unite the people's minds and provide ease to the peoples' lives. Showing guidelines for administrative affairs and straightening out commands is a difficult matter if not dealt with through a combination of the king, ministers, and assemblymen. Hence, uniting the people's minds is inevitable, for providing aid to the people should be preceded by uniting people's minds, which would otherwise bring harm to the majority and profit the minority, a matter that must be dealt with from the top positions of the government. The reason that nations establish governments and citizens look up to them is solely dependent on everyone's wish that such benefit can spread nationwide. Hence, if the government does not endeavor to look after the people's interests, it is merely an enormous entity that is more injurious than beneficial. The most important task among its responsibilities is the equal application of the law and the just ruling, which would, in turn, form the basis for stabilizing people's livelihood, accomplishing freedom, and protecting private property.

(8) 大概 政府의 始初ᄃᆞ 制度ᄃᆞ 帝王으로 傳ᄃᆞ든지 大統領으로 傳ᄃᆞ든지 其關係의 最大ᄃᆞ 者ᄃᆞ 人民의 心을 合ᄃᆞ야 一體를 成ᄃᆞ고 其權勢로 人의 道理를 保守ᄃᆞ기에 在ᄃᆞ 故로 其重大ᄃᆞ 事業과 深遠ᄃᆞ 職責이 人民을 爲ᄃᆞ야 其泰平ᄃᆞ 福基를 圖謨ᄃᆞᄃᆞ 保全ᄃᆞᄃᆞ 不出ᄃᆞ니 國政의 方向을 指授ᄃᆞᄃᆞ 次序를 遵定ᄃᆞᄃᆞ 人君과 大臣이며 及其輔弼參佐의 手中에 不在ᄃᆞ 則 難行ᄃᆞ 者가 多ᄃᆞᄃᆞ지라 然ᄃᆞᄃᆞᄃᆞᄃᆞ 人民이 其權을 不有ᄃᆞ나 上에 在ᄃᆞ 者가 衆心을 一體에 成ᄃᆞ기 不能ᄃᆞᄃᆞᄃᆞ 不可ᄃᆞᄃᆞᄃᆞᄃᆞ 又 人事를 審ᄃᆞᄃᆞ 時機를 應ᄃᆞ야 規模를 創始ᄃᆞᄃᆞ든지 法律을 設立ᄃᆞᄃᆞ든지 萬若 政府의 處置로 不以ᄃᆞᄃᆞ 强者를 利ᄃᆞ고 弱者를 害ᄃᆞᄃᆞ 憂慮가 不無ᄃᆞᄃᆞ 攄ᄃᆞᄃᆞᄃᆞ 時日을 延拖ᄃᆞᄃᆞ도록 其失效를 不奏ᄃᆞᄃᆞ야 道傍에 作舍ᄃᆞᄃᆞ 譏笑를 不免ᄃᆞᄃᆞᄃᆞ 衆人의 議論이 公平ᄃᆞᄃᆞ야 汗漫ᄃᆞᄃᆞ 人民을 渾同ᄃᆞᄃᆞ야 政府의 權을 同執ᄃᆞᄃᆞ야 奈何其可리오 夫ᄃᆞᄃᆞ 國家의 政府를 設置ᄃᆞᄃᆞ 本意ᄃᆞᄃᆞ 人民을 爲ᄃᆞᄃᆞᄃᆞ 人君의 政府를 命

令令는 大旨도 人民을 爲함이라 (Yu 2004, 410-411)

- (8-1) Whether the initiative of the government system lies in the king's authority or the president's authority, the most important matters are to assemble the people's mind to form one body, to protect human ways, and reason with power; hence, the most important task and profound responsibility does not go beyond establishing and securing the foundations of peace and happiness, which is difficult to execute without determining the orientation of state affairs or abiding by the orders in the hands of the king, ministers, and those who assist and advise. Thus, people do not have power, but if a person of a superior position is unable to assemble the general public's mind into one mind, governing would be impossible. Also, by appraising the people's mind and responding to opportunity, one can create standards or establish laws. If the government does not deal with matters, the powerful will benefit and the weak will be harmed, which will not only cause concern, but as the days pass and leaders go uninformed of the effects of the losses, the poor will take the roadside as their homes and will be unable to avoid ridicule; the public's discussions is justified, barbarism would confuse the people and they would seize government power together. How could this be possible? The real intention behind establishing a national government is for the people and the great purpose of the king's rule over the government is for the sake of the people.

Both articles start off with descriptions of the historical origins of government and proceed by developing arguments based mostly on Western cases. The above passages are excerpts from the concluding arguments of both Fukuzawa's and Yu's sections on government, respectively. As a result, both emphasize the government's responsibility to protect the people. In terms of content, it is clear that much of the excerpt from *Seoyu gyeonmun* was derived from the *Seiyo jijo* excerpt. However, Yu's writing in this section underwent an active process of adaptation; the difference between the two passages is not only derived from the syntactic or formal differences between Korean and Japanese. The form and vocabulary of literary Chinese that the two texts and languages share also work as major elements that generate differences in the two styles. While the syntax of

Seoyu gyeonmun was adjusted in accordance with Korean syntax, a considerable amount of literary Chinese was still retained in its original form; in *Seiyo jijo*, however, the literary Chinese form was deconstructed and only appeared in the form of Chinese characters. Yu's adaptation was not limited to stylistic aspects alone. Yu and Fukuzawa both endorsed representative politics as well as the restraint of people's direct political participation. However, Yu, unlike Fukuzawa, expressly advocated the monarch's right to order the government and thereby underscored the legitimacy of the Korean Empire's political system. He also considered the people's right to participate in politics as a delusional proposal; this is demonstrated in the section where Yu (2004, 138-139) declared that the presidential system was unfit for Korea's social and political situation. In contrast, Fukuzawa supported a representative system and, unlike Yu, did not focus on the negative effects of popular political participation. In other words, the people are not fixed as the object of political action in Fukuzawa's descriptions. However, in Yu's work, the population is rendered as a passive object that lacks active subjectivity. Before we move on to judge their politics, it is important to note that the differences between Yu's and Fukuzawa's writing reflect their different ideals of civilization. In retrospect, Yu's view of civilization may seem problematic and, due to this, the author may be subject to criticism. However, Yu's view may have also been shaped as a realistic strategy for the Korean people, whose level of civilization and education was still quite low. Quotations from *Seoyu gyeonmun* often seem to present contradicting views, criticizing "people with loose views and attitudes," while simultaneously emphasizing that government and monarch are meaningless unless they exist for the people. Knowing that the primary audience of *Seoyu gyeonmun* were Korean aristocrats, this may have been a cautionary tale warning the leadership to be mindful of the people.

As has been demonstrated, Yu's adaptation of Fukuzawa was not limited to stylistic concerns, and was instead an active and independent project. Consequently, the work that Yu produced demonstrates a considerable understanding of the cultural and political context of Korea and Japan. Although *Seoyu gyeonmun* took on the structure and thesis of

Seiyo jijo, the differences in the authors' politics, cultures, and languages were considerable. In addition, it is important to keep in mind that Yu was a member of the official literati, while Fukuzawa was a journalist with little access to political power.¹²

Conclusion

This article has explored the textual relationship between *Seoyu gyeonmun* and *Seiyo jijo*, as well as the influence Yu Gil-jun's work had on the development of *gukhanmun* mixed-script style. As demonstrated, although an indirect stylistic influence can be established, Yu's *Seoyu gyeonmun* was not a direct implantation of style from *Seiyo jijo*. One could say that *Seoyu gyeonmun* displays a degree of linguistic artificiality because its style sprang from the Korean translations of Chinese classics and was not derived from spoken Korean.

Although the discussion of this article principally rejects the notion that *Seoyu gyeongmun* was a direct implantation of style from *Seiyo jijo*, the former undoubtedly influenced the latter. Even though the structure and the sentences of the two works differ, the existence of *Seoyu gyeonmun* cannot be imagined without the existence of *Seiyo jijo*. Accordingly, scholarship on the ideological and structural influence of *Seiyo jijo* on *Seoyu gyeonmun* is extensive. For this reason, this study has limited its scope to the stylistic relationship between the two works. Studies on the construction of modern Japanese writing, *kunyomi*, and on the unification of the written and spoken languages already exist (Yi 2006; Komori 2003). Elsewhere, Saito Mareshi (2010) has noted the close association modern Japanese has with literary Chinese. Analyses such as these complicate the attempts to assign a single account of the life of the Japanese language. However, the Japanese in the *Seiyo jijo*, which was published more than 20 years before *Seoyu gyeonmun*, has features that are much closer to the

12. The section of *Seoyu gyeonmun* (Yu 2004, 100-107) that conveys the devastation of the Paris Commune could also be analyzed in the same way.

present-day Japanese language. Japan, through its diverse publishing market and translation activities, was able to attempt language forms that were considerably more colorful. On the other hand, by the late nineteenth-century Korea was being shaken to its core and the fact remains that the most stable language norms, rooted as they were on Chinese language, could not be abandoned. Nevertheless, it would be inappropriate to devalue the importance of *Seoyu gyeonmun* simply because of the comparative importance of Chinese or because the unity of Korean speech and writing could not be asserted through the work. As mentioned in the second section of this study, even more than alternative forms of *gukhanmun* that emerged during the enlightenment period, Yu's writing style marked a first in its attention to syntax, sentence structure, and lexical innovation. This achievement will forever remain an important moment in the linguistic and literary history of Korea.

When considering the influence of *Seiyo jijo* on *Seoyu gyeonmun*, the contrast in sentence formation demands attention. While the sentences in *Seiyo jijo* cannot convey their meaning when the Japanese particles are removed, the sentences in *Seoyu gyeonmun* are still decipherable—even without Korean particles. Moreover, *Seoyu gyeonmun* demonstrates the active process of editing and rewriting that occurred during the course of the translation and adaptation of the book. In particular, the rearrangement of syntax from literary Chinese to Korean bears a much closer relationship to the Korean conventions used in translating Chinese classics. The fact that the work was not derived directly from *Seiyo jijo* illustrates the uniqueness of *Seoyu gyeonmun*'s style. Rather than focusing on the work's ties with Japan's mixed script, the task of examining the stylistic experiments conducted regarding *Seoyu Gyeonmun*'s *gukhanmun* style should be directed towards its origin in the context of the linguistic history of literary Chinese and Korean. While it is indisputable that *Seoyu gyeonmun* is indebted to *Seiyo jijo* in terms of ideological orientation and initial thesis establishment, the stylistic achievement of the work should be credited to Yu, whose work exhibits an understanding of the cultural differences between Korea and Japan.

REFERENCES
Primary Sources

- Fukuzawa, Yukichi. 1866. *Seiyo jijo shohen* 西洋事情初編 (Conditions in the West, First Volume). Vol. 1. Tokyo: Jiji Shinposha.
- _____. 1867. *Seiyo jijo gaihen* 西洋事情外編 (Conditions in the West, Supplementary Volume). Vol. 1. Tokyo: Jiji Shinposha.
- _____. 2006. *Fukuzawa Yukichi jaseojeon* (Autobiography of Fukuzawa Yukichi). Translated by Heo Ho. Seoul: Isan. Originally published as *Fukuo jiden* 福翁自傳 (Tokyo: Jiji Shinposha, 1899).
- Jeon, U. [1908] 2011. “Jungyong eonhae” (Korean Vernacular Translation of the *Zhongyong*). In vol. 10 of *Ganjae jeonjip* 艮齋全集 (Complete Works of Ganjae Jeon U), edited by Hwayeonhoe. Seoul: Hakmin Munhwasa.
- Yu, Gil-jun. 2004. *Seoyu gyeonmun* 西遊見聞 (Observations on a Journey to the West). Seoul: Seohae Munjip. Translated by Hur Kyoung-Jin. Originally published as *Seoyu gyeonmun* (Tokyo: Gyosunsha, 1895).

Secondary Sources

- Chung, Yong-hwa. 2004. *Munmyeong-ui jeongchi sasang: Yu Gil-jun-gwa geundae hanguk* (Civilized Political Thought: Yu Gil-jun and Modern Korea). Seoul: Moonji Publishing.
- Hur, Kyoung-Jin. 2004. “Yu Gil-jun-gwa seoyu gyeonmun” (Yu Gil-jun and *Seoyu gyeonmun*). *Eomun yeongu* (Studies on the Korean Language and Literature) 32.1.
- Kim, Jeong-hyun. 2006. “Yu Gil-jun-gwa Yang Gye-cho-ui miguk cheheom-gwa geundae gukga insik” (Yu Gil-jun and Yang Gye-cho’s U.S. Experience and State Consciousness). *Munmyeong yeonji* (Civilization Journal) 18.
- Kim, Young-min. 2009. “Geundae gyemonggi munche yeongu: Yu Gil-jun-eul jungsim-euro” (A Study of the Writing Styles of the Modern Enlightenment Period: With a Focus on Yu Gil-jun). *Dongbang hakji* (Journal of Korean Studies) 148.
- Ko, Yeng-kun. 2004. “Yu Gil-jun-ui gungmungwan-gwa sahoe sasang” (A Study of Yu Gil-jun’s Philosophy of National Language and Social Thought). *Eomun yeongu* (Studies on the Korean Language and Literature) 32.1.
- Komori, Yoichi 小森陽一. 2003. *Ilboneo-ui geundae* (The Modern Foundation of the Japanese Language). Translated by Jeong Seon-tae. Seoul: Somyong Publishing. Originally published as *Nihongo no kindai* 日本語の近代 (Tokyo: Iwa-

- nami Shoten, 2000).
- Lee, Han-seop. 2002. *Seoyu gyeonmun: eohwi saegin* (The Glossarial Index of the *Seoyu gyeonmun*). Seoul: Pak I Jung Press.
- Lee, Hyung-dae. 2009. “Seoyu gyeonmun-ui seogu yeohaeng cheheom-gwa munmyeong pyosang” (Travel Experiences of the West and Representaion of Civilization in *Seoyu gyeonmun*). *Bipyong munhak* (Critical Literature) 34.
- Lee, Kwang-lin. 1979. *Hanguk gaehwasasang yeongu* (A Study of the Korean Enlightenment Thought). Seoul: Ilchokak.
- Legge, James. [1861] 1893. *Confucian Analects, the Great Learning, and the Doctrine of the Mean*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Lim, Sang-Seok. 2008. *20 segi gukhanmunche-ui hyeongseong gwajeong* (The Formation of *Gukhanmun* Style in the Twentieth Century). Seoul: Jisik Sanupsa.
- _____. 2010a. “1910 nyeondae cho, hanil siryong jangmun-ui gyeonggye: hanil siryong jangmunbeop-ui bigyo” (The Topography of Practical Composition between Korea and Japan in the Early 1910s). *Eomun nonjip* (Journal of the Society of Korean Language and Literature) 61.
- _____. 2010b. “Ilje gangjeomgi joseon chongdokbu-ui joseoneogeup hanmun gyogwaseo yeongu siron” (A Study of the Korean Language and Classical-Chinese Textbooks of the Government-General of Korea). *Hanmun hakbo* (Journal of Korean Literature in Literary Chinese) 22.
- Min, Hyun-sik. 1994. “Gaehwagi gugeo munche-e daehan jonghapjeok yeongu (1)” (A Synthetic Study of the Korean Writing Style in the Enlightenment Period of Korea, Pt. 1). *Gugeo gyoyuk* (Korean Language Education) 83.
- Morioka, Kenji 森岡健二. 1991. *Kindaigo no seiritsu* 近代語の成立 (The Establishment of the Modern Language). Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.
- Saito, Mareshi 齋藤希史. 2007. “Gen to bun no aida: kundoku bun to iu shikumi 言と文のあいだ—訓—文というしくみ” (Between the Spoken and Written Word). *Bungaku* 文史学 (Literature) 8.6.
- _____. 2010. *Geundae-oo-ui tansaeng-gwa hanmun* (Literary Chinese and the Birth of the Modern Korean Language). Translated by Hwang Ho-deok et al. Seoul: Hyeonsil Munhwa. Originally published as *Kanbunmyaku to kindainihon* 漢文脈と近代日本 (Tokyo: Nippon Hososhuppan Kyokai, 2007).
- Schmid, Andre. 2002. *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Yi, Yeon-suk. 2006. *Gugeo-raneun sasang* (The Idea of National Language). Translated by Ko Yeong-jin et al. Seoul: Somyeong. Originally published as *Koku-go to iu shiso* 国語という思想 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1996).