The cover of this book is adorned by a picture of Han’gul consonants and vowels written horizontally across the page. It is taken from the book *Mal üi sori* (The Sound of Language, 1914) by Chu Sigyŏng (1876-1914), but unlike the current Han’gul writing system, which is written in syllable blocks, the letters are broken up and arranged consecutively. In the context of his research on spelling standardization, Chu Sigyŏng proposed a horizontal writing system, including an experimental version such as this. During the period of modernization starting with the so-called Enlightenment Era he played a leading role in establishing a new orthography for Han’gul; the chief outlines of the writing system that is still in use today were designed by him.

The book examines Chu’s linguistic theories, analyzes in detail the writing systems described in his papers, and meticulously lays out the relation between his linguistic theories and his writing system, the principles and detailed rules of his writing system, and the process of establishing his writing system.

The author of this book, Song Cheol-Eui (professor of Korean Language and Literature, Seoul National University) is specialized in the fields of phonology and morphology and has recently taken up research into the modernization process of Korean language and literature, as is evident in his most recent publications: *Han’guk kündae ch’ogi üi önö wa munhak* (Korean Language and Literature in the early modern period, jointly authored), *Ilche singminji sigi Han’guk üi önö wa munhak* (Korean language and literature in the Japanese colonial era, jointly authored), and *Han’guk kündae üi öhwi* (Korean vocabulary in the early modern period); these efforts culminate in the present work, *Chu Sigyŏng’s Linguistic Theories and his Writing Systems*. 

---

**Chu Sigyŏng üi önö iron kwa p’yogibŏp** (Chu Sigyŏng’s linguistic theories and his writing system) by Song Cheol-Eui [Song Ch’ŏruï]. Seoul: Seoul National University Press, 2010. 276pp.
The main objective of this book, as the author states in the introduction, is to examine Chu Sigyŏng’s writing system concretely and to find out the exact process through which it was established. To achieve this, the author first scrutinizers Chu Sigyŏng’s research on the Korean language, i.e. his linguistic theories; this is set forth in chapters 2 and 3, entitled “Chu Sigyŏng’s phonemics and morphology” and “Chu Sigyŏng’s theory of letters (munjaron).” The reason why the author devotes so much effort to reconstructing Chu’s linguistic theories is because Chu’s writing system went through a number of revisions on the basis of his research in phonology and morphology. Chapter 2 reconsiders Chu’s perspective on the syllable and his creation of the concept “original sound” (ponŭm). It also investigates his morphologic insights on the classification of parts of speech and word formation on the basis of his Kōbon mal (unpublished ms. on language), Kugŏ munpŏp (Korean Grammar), and Mal ūi sori (The sound of language). Chapter 3 addresses Chu’s newly devised letter structure, including his views on letter forms and the shape of Han’gŭl letters and the principles of their formation.

In the second part of the book, the author explains Chu’s writing system in two parts, chapter 4 “The Logic of Chu Sigyŏng’s Writing System” and chapter 5, “The Practice of Chu Sigyŏng’s Writing System and Detailed Principles of the Writing System.” Chapter 4 reexamines the logic of Chu’s writing system, unraveling the process of creating his “spelling system centered on original sounds,” which reveals the “original sound” and “original form,” concepts that were established in his research on phonology and morphology. Chu Sigyŏng’s writing system based on original sound is defined as a “morphophonemic syllabic system,” which aims to reveal each morpheme’s basic form and fixes its shape. Chapter 5 describes how Chu’s writing system changed and explains the reasons for those changes, bringing order into the detailed rules of Chu’s writing systems. He initially followed the general writing system of the time, gradually refining it on the basis of his theories. The author examines the process of change in Chu’s writing system, considering Chu’s papers in chronological order.

As a conclusion, chapter 6 explains the rules in Chu’s writing system systematically by grouping them in topics, thereby giving a comprehensive summary of the book’s main findings. Although numerous studies about Chu Sigyŏng’s linguistic theories and writing system have appeared, some problems still remained. The value of this work lies in the fact that it clarifies some of these problems, especially by examining in detail the changes Chu’s writing system underwent and bringing order into his detailed rules.

As the author explains in the introduction, this work can be considered a “frontrunner” in the project of a detailed reconstruction of the formation of
modern Korean spelling. What remains to be done is to trace how his project was continued, and to ascertain who used which parts of it in establishing the “unified spelling of Korean,” and the transition process from Chu’s system to the Unified Spelling of Korean. Finally, it should be mentioned that this work is part of the series of Korean Studies monographs published by the Kyujanggak Institute for Korean Studies and that the Chin-Tan Society has awarded the author with its 30th Dugye prize for this book.

Boyoun Park
HK Research Assistant, Kyujanggak Institute for Korean Studies
Seoul National University


···Someone who is under the same sky as I, who treads the same ground as I, who eats the same food as I, who breathes the same air as I - they all correspond to “I” but are not “my I.”

···The one who incessantly writes this “I” like this, he is the “genuine I”

- Yi Tôngmu, from “A Critique of Yanghwan chipsŏ”

The eighteenth century Chosôn scholar Yi Tôngmu 李德懋 (1741-1793) described the present-ness and uniqueness of the “I” like this; it is a statement of subjectivity (chuch’e 主體). For Yi Tôngmu, commenting on his best friend’s writing was an act of the unique and only “self” enjoying the day. He made the compilation of critical essays Chongbuk sosŏn 鐘北小選 (Small anthology made north of the belfry) by choosing writings of Pak Chiwôn 朴趾源 (1737-1805), who was his teacher, friend and also a writer of great literature, and this work by Pak Hüibyŏng reveals the fruits of his research into Yi Tôngmu’s Chongbuk sosŏn.

Yi Tôngmu collected ten of Pak Chiwôn’s essays, and appended critical comments to them. First, he transcribed Pak’s text in black ink, then added punctuation in red ink and finally added small circles (for emphasis) in blue ink. Before each piece he added his critical comments in red ink. His beautiful handwriting and the combination of black, red and blue are so well harmonized
that *Chongbuk sosön* seems to be a piece of art. The work can thus be regarded both as a unique anthology and as a piece of critical commentary in its own right.

Then, why did Yi Tôngmu expend so much effort in collecting and reviewing Pak Chiwon’s essays? This cannot be explained without an understanding of their relationship. The author explains it through the concept of “ontological affinity.” The critical comments, based on intimate ontological affinity, are different from contemporary criticism, where the author talks as author and the critic as critic, each in his own voice. The criticism in *Chongbuk sosôn* is intimately connected with the original writings, but also retains its own identity. Yi Tôngmu’s criticism parallels Pak Chiwon’s prose, thus showing harmony and synergy through confronting and engaging with each other. The author thinks that this ensemble of essayistic action and critical reaction stems from their relationship. It could be termed a “conversational relationship,” which means that the existential relationship between the writer and the critic shows both mental and aesthetic interference.

Yi Tôngmu’s criticism is based on aesthetics of sorrow and sympathy. He considered it more important to read the writer’s mind in the writing than to focus on the figure of rhetoric. In this regard, Yi Tôngmu could be considered a critic who pursued genuine sentiment. The Gong’an school, which was active in the late Ming – early Qing dynasty of China, also pursued genuine sentiment, but Yi Tôngmu’s approach is somewhat different. The genuine sentiment pursued by the Gong’an School is close to passion, while Yi Tôngmu sought genuine sentiment in the sadness that is closer to the human condition. That is why the author characterizes Yi Tôngmu’s aesthetical principles as an “aesthetic of sorrow.” At the same time, Yi Tôngmu shows an extraordinary ability to sympathize with other people’s agony. This was related to his own life experience: as a secondary son he experienced social exclusion, moreover he was prone to disease in youth, suffered from poverty and lost his mother and sister.

As mentioned, Yi Tôngmu appended ten critical comments at the beginning of each text. The product of an encounter between the greatest writer and the greatest critic of the day, and of their friendship, *Chongbok sosôn* is a perfect meeting of mind and aesthetic sensibility. Yi Tôngmu criticized other writers’ clichéd writing habits by developing his original and liberal tropology in his theory of literature. He sympathized with other people’s sorrows and genuine sentiments, and epitomizes a conversational relationship between kindred spirits. He used his pennames as subject matter to play psychological games, and showed his unique creativity in his blending of fact and fiction. He also appeared not to be interested in living with greed because he recognized the finitude of the
Yi Tŏngmu regarded the “self” in the “here and now” as the true subjective agent. The author calls this philosophy a “thinking for today,” or a “carpe diem” philosophy. However, this is not the same as the decadence seen in the philosophy the Chinese literatus Jin Shengtan 金聖嘆 (d. 1661), because Yi Tŏngmu’s “thinking for today” is based on faithfulness to life. In so far that it adopts the so-called p’yŏngjŏm 評點 (Ch. pingdian) style of commentary (a combination of punctuation and the commentator’s personal reaction to the text), Chongbuk sosŏn is connected to the East Asian commentarial tradition. However, this formal resemblance does not detract from the value of Chongbuk sosŏn, because Yi Tŏngmu’s criticism is closer to independent prose than a text subordinate to the writing it comments on. Its critical comments have their own structure and show perfect composition and beautiful expression. It proves that Chongbuk sosŏn inherited the traditional heritage of East-Asian p’yŏngjŏm criticism and also transformed it creatively. The author concludes that in its criticism the Chongbuk sosŏn reveals the unique subjectivity (chuch’esoòng 主體性) of the Chosŏn period, and emphasizes that the work should be recognized for this value.

Kim Yujin
Research Assistant, Kyujanggak Institute for Korean Studies
Seoul National University


This most welcome anthology is the first in English to concentrate on the literature written by Koreans in Japan. With the appearance of this volume and last year’s publication of Kim Sŏkpŏm’s The Curious Tale of Mandogi’s Ghost (Columbia University Press, 2010), it is finally possible for the general reader of English and university student alike to gather some sense of the fashion in which literature developed in tandem with the Korean community that emerged out of Japan’s imperial history. It is a community that has been comparatively well documented by scholars in other fields – such as in the historical and anthropological works of Michael Weiner and Sonia Ryang. It is high time that the artistic output of this community was given its due and Melissa Wender has
with this anthology provided a solid building block in that direction.

As Wender notes at the beginning of her introduction, in recent years Koreanness has become hip not only in Japan but throughout Asia with the export of wildly popular music and TV soap operas. This anthology, however, focuses on the second half of the twentieth century and portrays the struggles of a colonized population left stranded in the imperial metropole for various reasons. The emphasis is on the struggle to be accepted by others and to accept oneself, and on spirals of violence, whether national, ethnic, and/or domestic. Comprising eight short stories or excerpts from longer works, the anthology opens with Kim Saryang’s famous 1939 “Into the Light” and ends with Yū Miri’s 1997 novella “Full House.” In between, and arranged chronologically, there are stories from the pioneering generation of Korean writers in Japan, such as Kim Talsu and Noguchi Kakuchū (perhaps more well known by his Korean name, Chang Hyŏkchu), and the strong women writers who emerged in the 1980s, notably Chong Ch’uwyol and Yi Yangji. I was particularly struck by the excerpt from “Frozen Mouth,” a novel by the less well known Kim Hagyŏng, in which the struggle to control a stutter hints at the multi-layered experience of a budding resident Korean chemist. Interestingly, although perhaps not deliberately, this chronological trail of the anthology also charts a gendered transition from earlier male writers to more recent female writers. Although the rich attention to gendered issues is compelling, it does tend here to produce a singular narrative of resident Korean history that could have been made more complicated.

As an anthology, Into the Light inevitably raises questions about selection. In the introduction Wender explains the logic for her choices. Most of these writers self-identify as resident Korean authors and the stories selected focus on the nature of a specific minority experience. The opening story by Kim Saryang is an exception here, as Kim did not self-identify as an immigrant, and yet his story from 1939 has been adopted by other writers as one beginning for a specifically Korean-Japanese minor literature. This makes sense, although one could certainly find earlier stories written both in Japanese and Korean by writers in the imperial metropolis that would open up the history of the community. One could also include writers such as the above-mentioned Kim Sŏkpŏm, who explored traumas in Korean history as a natural part of his own identity. This anthology tends, on the other hand, to limit questions of identity to that of issues specific to everyday life in the space of Japan. As a result, I think this anthology will be useful for classes focusing on the minority experience in Japan, but less interesting for those wishing to open up the notions of Japanese and Korean literatures. The editor states that an anthology cannot and should not “pretend
to cover the diversity of Zainichi literature” and yet the intriguing references to
diversity in the introduction call out for a more varied selection of works – by
authors who continued to write stories set in Korea’s past, raising the question of
how the Korean national history lives on, those that desire to speak beyond
Japanese-Korean subjectivity, or perhaps some of the more playful current
popular culture alluded to at the end of the introduction.

The introduction itself provides some background history to the emergence
of a Korean minority community in Japan. However, how the fact of national
division on the Korean peninsula can go unmentioned in such a narrative is a
puzzle to me, as it is a major cause for so many Koreans staying in Japan after
the liberation of the colony and also colors the political experience of the
postcolonial community. But these are trivial complaints when placed next to the
achievement of producing this first anthology, which will surely be the basis of
much more work to come.

Janet Poole
Assistant Professor, Department of East Asian Studies
University of Toronto

Inkwŏn pyŏllon han sidae. Hong Sŏng’u pyŏnhosa ŭi chungmyŏng
(An era of defense for human rights: Testimony of the attorney Hong
Seong-woo) by Hong Sŏng’u, Han Insŏp. Seoul: Kyŏngin munhwasa,

On the recommendation of attorney Hwang Inch’ŏl, who had defended many
democracy activists who had run afoul of the Yusin constitution, Hong Sŏng’u
became involved in the Democratic Students’ Union (Minch’ŏnghangnyŏn) affair
of 1974. After that he was involved in many important cases for many decades,
and decided to keep the police reports and the trial records of his cases.
Considering that those materials could be of help in writing the history of the
struggle for democracy, and also in the hope that one day the defendants could
apply for retrial, despite moving his office several times he held on to all the
records.

In 2006, Professor Han Insŏp, of the College of Law of Seoul National
University, took the documents from the basement of Hong’s office to his office
in SNU and started to analyze them. Professor Han then interviewed attorney
Hong for about 60 hours in the course of a fifteen-week period between October
16, 2009 and February 11, 2010 and on the basis of the documents and the
interviews published the present work.

This book contains many records of various cases from the time of the dictatorship. We can hear the voice of people who participated in the campaign for democracy through the “Cases for the defense” and “appeals” for numerous cases involving the National Security Law. In other words, through the trial records the book reconstructs the social situation of the period of dictatorial government in modern Korean history. Not only the students and intellectuals who took part in the movement for democracy but also people from all walks of life such as workers, farmers and soldiers appear in the book. As such, these records are not simply a collection of reports on the democratization movement, but materials that show Korean society of that time.

This book deals with many cases from the 1970s and 1980s, which reveal all aspects of the history and society of that period. Most of the cases were fabricated or improperly adjudicated under the National Security Law. Also, some cases were concluded by torturing suspects. Therefore the trial reports of these cases could play an important role in revealing the truth.

Another interesting feature of the book is the interview between Prof. Han, who organized and analyzed the archive, and lawyer Hong, who created and stored the material. The interview allows us to retrieve facts that could not be reconstructed on the basis of the documents alone; this brings us one step closer to the truth of those cases.

For a few cases, the truth is indeed uncovered in this book, and in a few cases a retrial has resulted in the defendants’ acquittal. But there are also some cases where the truth has not yet been revealed. A good example of such a case is the O Wŏnch’un affair of the late Yusin period. Political maneuvering by the dictators has managed to conceal the truth to this day. But this book brings us closer to that truth through the trial records and the testimony of lawyer Hong.

While the book carries the records and statements on fairly well-known affairs of modern Korean history, it is also important for dealing with various contradictions that appeared in Korean society but have received scant attention. Issues such as conflicts caused by the patriarchal system or the human rights of minorities can be retrieved through the trial records and oral statements to show Korean society as it was. This book can serve as the starting point for such a project.

Park Tae-Gyun

Professor, Graduate School of International Studies
Seoul National University
Professor Myung-Lim Park’s *History, Knowledge, and Society: Interpretations of the Korean War after the Kwangju Uprising* (the book’s English title; its Korean title does not mention the Kwangju Uprising) completes the trilogy of the Korean War, a topic the author has been researching for more than twenty years. The first volume (in two parts), *The Korean War: The Outbreak and its Origins* scrutinized why and how the war broke out. The second, *The Korean War, 1950: A Reflection on War and Peace* analyzed how the Korean War evolved during the first six months, a period representing one of the most violent changes in modern Korean history.

The new book focuses on the consequences, legacies and impacts of the Korean War. More specifically, it is a socio-intellectual survey of research by Korean scholars on the Korean War conducted during the eventful thirty years from the 1980 Kwangju Uprising to the present. Each chapter is organized according to topic, field, organization, perspectives, and researchers, with detailed bibliography, to present the general trend of studies in the context of contemporary issues and changes.

Chapter two, entitled “Understanding Post-Liberation History” begins by assessing the significance of the post-liberation era for intellectual history as it marks the beginning of critical historiography in Korea. The 1980s were marked by the publication of research and translations of scholarship that served as an academic countermovement to the repressive discourse and system of the authoritarian regime.

Chapter three reviews the pioneers of critical research on the Korean War, assessing their contribution as well as limitation under the circumstances imposed by the Cold War. Chapter four, “the Rise and Limitation of Radical Structuralism: Studies of the Korean War by Bruce Cumings” introduces Cumings’ “monumental masterpiece” that had profound influence on studies of the Korean War and modern Korean history in general. Chapter five, “Reality and Scholarship: Dismantling of the Cold War, North Korean Crisis, Democratization and Introspective Sublation” examines the meaning of the post-Cold War era in the research and analysis of the Korean War. Chapters six and seven deal with the emergence of a new generation and the development of new perspectives, methodology and research topics that overcame ideological
division. Chapters eight and nine focus on humanitarian perspectives and the achievements by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission investigating civilian massacres during the war.

There has been a growing trend of diversification and particularization in research on the Korean War; political scientists focused on political and military aspects or North-South relations and Korea-US relations; sociologists explored the issue of society, class, the people, memory, and religion; economic historical or socioeconomic historical studies, which exploded in the mid-1980s, examined the impact of Korean War on the course of Korea’s economic development; researchers of Korean history have been actively conducting in-depth historical analyses based on detailed knowledge of documents; literature, gender, legal and art historical approaches are also developing.

During the past thirty years, the emphasis of research on the Korean War has shifted from ideology, organization, institutions, the military, and strategy to villages, individuals, prisoners of war, family, community, and life experienced in local settings. Still, the need to promote philosophical, comparative analytical, and theoretical interpretations are pointed out as limitations of previous studies. The integration of history and social science, social science and humanities (social humanities), reconciliation of general theory and historiography, communication between universality and particularity, Western and Korean perspectives are called for in order to upgrade the level of research on Korean War.

The book is a comprehensive, interdisciplinary and balanced guide to the understanding of the Korean War, which, the author hopes, will initiate lively discussions on various academic topics in view of current problems and perspectives of Korean society, in connection to the broader themes of mankind, life and peace. Such dialogues between knowledge, society and history will be critical for paving the way to the future of the Korean peninsula. At the start of the twenty-first century, when the research environment has radically improved in terms of topics, materials and perspectives, the fundamental issue of Korean War research should be how to overcome the Korean War, the author says, putting an end to the post-war system, and creating positive changes for peace.

Kim Chong Min
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