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Abstract

The present study explores the history of discursive practices in constructing one important linguistic emblem of Korean ethno-national culture: Korean linguistic etiquette. The goal of this study is to reconsider the modern-day taken-for-granted understanding of the nature and workings of the grammatical rules of Korean politeness as supposedly embodying Korean society and culture and representing an objective description of a socio-cultural reality. This research argues that the culture-specific models of modern-day Korean linguistic politeness are an ideological artifact peculiar to the history of modernizing Korea. To that end, this study examines the historical formation of the cultural models of Korean linguistic politeness within a network of diverse practices. The analysis focuses on the semiotic processes whereby a set of linguistic repertoires in Korean became structuralized as ‘honorific language’ and gained significance as an icon of ethno-national culture. Primary sources are drawn from both folk and professional metapragmatic discourses over what it means to speak “politely” with regard to the images or identities of self and group. Such cultural models of linguistic politeness rationalize how linguistic practices of politeness should work and what they mean in Korean society and culture. By unraveling the linguistic and cultural political prerequisites for modern normalized views of the “Korean” practice of linguistic politeness, this dissertation demonstrates that it is the social actors’ perspectives on language and their ideological projects that have engendered the dominant societal understanding of Korean honorification in support of the linguistic community.
Lay Summary

Linguistic politeness is a salient emblematic feature of Korean culture and society. Many speakers of Korean believe that the complex linguistic expressions of politeness in Korean reflect respect for superiors in age or status. Research to date has focused on normative and prescriptive aspects of Korean language practice and society. However, this study traces the historical formation of the ideologies surrounding the notion of speaking “up” or “down” in Korean. I ask three questions: Which aspects were deemed important for Korean speakers to speak politely in traditional society? What gave rise to the notion that humble submission and/or respect are central to the code of polite behavior in Korean morals education? How did the modern linguistic- and respect-oriented ideology of politeness come about as a specific emblem of Korean cultural identity? This study uses conduct manuals, early modern morals textbooks and etiquette guides, and linguistic studies as primary sources.
Preface

This dissertation is original, unpublished, independent work by the author, Eunseon Kim.
Table of Contents

Abstract.............................................................................................................................. iii
Lay Summary................................................................................................................... iv
Preface.............................................................................................................................. v
Table of Contents............................................................................................................ vi
List of Tables................................................................................................................... viii
List of Figures.................................................................................................................. ix
List of Abbreviations....................................................................................................... x
Glossary............................................................................................................................. xi
Acknowledgements........................................................................................................ xiii
Dedication.......................................................................................................................... xv

Chapter 1: Introduction ..................................................................................................... 1
  1.1 Goals and Objectives ............................................................................................... 1
  1.2 Korean Honorifics and Linguistic Ideology ............................................................. 2
  1.3 Methodology and Primary Sources ....................................................................... 5
  1.4 Previous Studies of Honorifics and Politeness ....................................................... 7
      1.4.1 The Notions of Politeness in the Korean Honorifics System ......................... 7
      1.4.2 Structural and Socio-Linguistic Approaches ............................................... 9
      1.4.3 Honorifics, Deference, and Politeness Studies ............................................. 11
      1.4.4 An Ideological Approach to the Social Indexicality of Honorifics ............... 15
  1.5 Chapter Outlines and Research Questions ............................................................ 22

Chapter 2: Talking about Linguistic Politeness without Talking about Honorifics in the
           Chosŏn Dynasty (1392–1897) ................................................................................... 25
  2.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................ 25
  2.2 Conduct Literature in Chosŏn Society ................................................................... 27
      2.2.1 The Rise and Spread of Conduct Literature .................................................. 27
      2.2.2 The Readers of Conduct Manuals ................................................................ 30
          2.2.2.1 Conduct Manuals for Children and Beginning students ....................... 30
          2.2.2.2 Family Precepts .................................................................................... 31
          2.2.2.3 Conduct Manuals for Ladies ................................................................. 32
      2.2.3 The Structures and Contents of Conduct Manuals ....................................... 33
  2.3 Propriety in Language-use: Discussions in Conduct Manuals ............................... 35
      2.3.1 Primary Lessons on Speech .......................................................................... 36
          2.3.1.1 Prudence ............................................................................................... 36
          2.3.1.2 Sincerity and Trustworthiness ............................................................... 43
      2.3.2 The Message of the Utterance ........................................................................ 45
      2.3.3 The Behavioral Guide: How to Speak and Listen .......................................... 50
      2.3.4 Linguistic Forms as a Sign of ‘Deference’ ...................................................... 56
  2.4 Reconsidering the Stereotypes of Linguistic Etiquette in Traditional Korea ............ 64

Chapter 3: Politeness for Nation-state Building in Early Morals Education from the 1890s
to 1909 ............................................................................................................................ 69
  3.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................ 69
  3.2 Morals Education and the Contraction of a Modern Nation-State .......................... 71
      3.2.1 The Rise of Modern Education ...................................................................... 71
      3.2.2 New Morals Textbooks for Public and Private Schools ............................... 75
  3.3 Pedagogical Resources for Conduct/Ethics Education ........................................... 78
      3.3.1 The Circulation of Traditional Conduct Literature ........................................ 79
### 3.3.2 The Importation of Moral Standards .................................................. 84
3.4 The Hybrity of Politeness during the Enlightenment Period ......................... 88
   3.4.1 From Confucian Propriety to National Ethics ...................................... 89
   3.4.2 The Promotion of Public Spirit ............................................................ 94
3.5 Deferece, Civility, and Linguistic Politeness ............................................ 102

**Chapter 4: Colonial Shifts in the Concept of ‘Politeness’ in Morals Textbooks from 1905 to 1945** ............................................................. 109

   4.1 Introduction ............................................................................................. 109
   4.2 Morals Education in Korea under the Japanese Authorities ....................... 112
      4.2.1 1905 to 1909 ...................................................................................... 112
      4.2.2 1910 to 1918 ...................................................................................... 114
      4.2.3 1919 to 1936 ...................................................................................... 115
      4.2.4 1937 to 1945 ...................................................................................... 116
   4.3 Changes in the Ideals of Self-cultivation and Politeness in Colonial Education ... 118
      4.3.1 From 1907: Drawing ‘Deference’ into the Notion of ‘Politeness’ ................. 118
      4.3.2 From the 1920s: Politeness for Harmony between Japan and Korea .......... 123
      4.3.3 From the late 1930s: Morals and Politeness Toward a New National Identity .. 130
   4.4 Harmonizing Traditional Respect and Modern Civility through Japanese *keigo* .... 133

**Chapter 5: Engraving ‘Deference’ in the Korean Language from the 1870s to 1945** 138

   5.1 Introduction ............................................................................................. 138
   5.2 The History of Analyzing Linguistic Forms of Polite Speech ....................... 139
      5.2.1 The Regularization of Honorific Forms in Vernacular Glossing Practice .... 139
      5.2.2 The Rise of Korean Honorific Registers: By Non-Koreans ...................... 143
      5.2.3 The Stabilization of Korean Honorific Registers: By Native Speakers ....... 148
   5.3 The Construction of Korean Honorific Registers ....................................... 153
      5.3.1 By Non-Korean Speakers ..................................................................... 153
         5.3.1.1 Metapragmatic Terms for Honorific Registers ................................. 153
         5.3.1.2 The Range of Honorific Registers .................................................... 157
      5.3.2 By Native Speakers .............................................................................. 163
         5.3.2.1 Metapragmatic Terms for Honorific Registers ................................. 163
         5.3.2.2 The Range of Honorific Registers .................................................... 165
      5.3.3 Deconstructing Korean Honorific Registers ........................................... 171
   5.4 Korean Honorific Registers: The Product of Valorized Knowledge ............... 177

**Chapter 6: Conclusions** ............................................................................. 181

   6.1 Summary ................................................................................................. 182
   6.2 Implications ............................................................................................... 188
   6.3 Contributions of the Study ....................................................................... 192
   6.4 Directions for Future Research ................................................................. 194

**Bibliography** ................................................................................................. 197

**Appendices** ................................................................................................. 219

Appendix A Conduct Literature with Discussions of Language from Traditional Korea ... 219
Appendix B Modern manners and/or Morals Textbooks for Public and Private Schools and for the General Public from 1905 to 1945 .................................................. 221
Appendix C Linguistic Works on the Korean Language by (Non)-native Korean Speakers from the 19th Century to 1945 .......................................................... 223
List of Tables

Table 1 Examples of Im’s accounts of vernacular honorific alternations from the “Kudu Haepŏp” ....................................................................................................................... 140
Table 2 Speech levels (Kim Kyusik 1908; Kim Hŭisang 1911) .......................................................... 152
Table 3 Variations in categorizations of honorific registers by Western authors ......................... 155
Table 4 Metapragmatic terms for speech levels (Baird 1911, 16) .................................................... 157
Table 5 Samples of lexical honorific registers (Ridel 1881, 118-119) ............................................. 159
Table 6 Personal pronouns (Roth 1936, 282) .................................................................................... 162
Table 7 The linguistic range of honorific registers as described by early Korean grammarians 166
Table 8 Lexical honorific registers (Kim Hŭisang 1911, 60-61, 68) ................................................. 167
Table 9 Lexical honorific registers (An Hwak 1917, 23, 27-28, 37) ................................................. 167
Table 10 Sample of lexical honorific registers (Ch’oe Hyŏnbae 1937, 272-8, 274-8, 1077-9) .... 169
Table 11 Five different speech forms on the basis of endings (Eckardt 1923, 23-24) ............... 175
List of Figures

Figure 1 Historical changes in the assessment of honorific language in Korean morals education
................................................................................................................................................. 135
## List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CKS          | Chūtō kyōiku shūshinsho 1-2, 4 (GGK, 1935-1938)  
               Chūtō kyōiku shūshinsho 1-3 (GGK, 1940) |
| CS           | Ch’odŭng susin (Pak Chŏngdong, 1909) |
| CSK          | Chungdŭng susin kyogwasŏ 1-4 (Hwimun Academy, 1906) |
| CYK          | Ch’odŭng yullihak kyogwasŏ (Shang Wu; An Chonghwa, trans., 1907) |
| FGS          | Futsū gakkō shūshinsho: seitōyō 1-4 (GGK, 1918/1913-1915)  
               Futsū gakkō shūshinsho: jidōyō 1-6 (GGK, 1923-1924) |
| GGK          | Government-General of Korea |
| JKFGS        | Joshi kōtō futsū gakkō shūshinsho 1-4 (GGK, 1925) |
| Kanpō        | Chōsen sōtokufū kanpō |
| KFGS         | Kōtō futsū gakkō shūshinsho 1-5 (GGK, 1923-1924) |
| KSS          | Kodŭng sohak susinsŏ (Hwimun Academy, 1907) |
| KŬ           | (Pot’ong kyoyuk) kungmin ŭibŏm (Chin Hŭisŏng, trans., 1908) |
| Kyŏngmong    | Kyŏngmong yogyŏl (Yi I, 1577) |
| PHHS         | Pot’ong hakkyo haktoyong susinsŏ 1-4 (Hakpu, 1907) |
| Sohak        | Sohak ŏnhae (1587) |
| SS           | Shotō shūshin: jidōyō 1-6 (GGK, 1939-1941)  
               Shotō shūshin 3-6 (GGK, 1943-1944) |
| YK           | Yullihak kyogwasŏ 1-4 (Sin Haeyŏng, 1906) |
Glossary

**English**

Ceremonial/ritual rules  
Ceremonial rules  
Code of conduct  
Comity  
Common (public elementary) school  
Chosen Education Ordinance  
Courteous and modesty  
Decorum  
Differential treatment  
Educational Authority  
Enlightenment Period  
Ethics  
Etiquette  
Equal treatment  
Format  
Fortunes of the Emperor  
Fukuzawa Yukichi  
Good custom  
Half treatment  
Half-half treatment  
High treatment  
Honorific form  
Honorific language  
Hosoi Heishū  
Humbleness and politeness  
Inoue Tetsujirō  
Kim An’guk  
Linguistic etiquette  
Loyalty [to the nation]  
Loyalty and filial devotion  
Low appellation  

**Korean (K.) and/or Japanese (J.) and/or Sinographs**

K. yeũi 禮義  
K. ūrye; J. girei 儀禮  
K. chakpŏp; J. sahŏ 作法  
K. yejang 禮讓  
K. pot’ong hakkyo; J. futsū gakkō or shōgakkō  
J. Chōsen kyōiku rei 朝鮮教育令  
K. konggŏm 恭儉  
J. teijū 鄭重 or teinei 丁寧  
K. yejŏl or ryejŏl; J. reisetsu 禮節  
K. p’yŏngdae 平待  
K. ch’adae 差待  
K. Hakpu 學部  
K. Kaehwagi 開化期 (1894–1910)  
K. yulli; J. rinri 倫理  
K. yejŏl or ryejŏl; J. reisetsu 禮節  
K. ch’adae 差待  
J. kōun fuyoku 幸運扶翼  
J. bijū 美風  
K. pandae 半待  
K. pan-bandae 半半待  
K. sangdae 上待  
K. chon’gyŏng-sa 尊敬辭  
K. kyŏngŏ; J. keigo 敬語  
K. ch’ung 忠  
J. bijū 美風  
K. ch’unghyo 忠孝  
K. pich’ing 卑稱
| Lowly treatment                   | K. hadae 下待                                      |
| Manners of Comportment           | J. gyōgi 行儀                                      |
| Matsudaira Yoshifusa             | 松平好房 (1649–1699)                                |
| Middle treatment                 | K. chungdae 中待                                   |
| Morals or morality               | K. todŏk; J. dōtoku 道德                           |
| Nation of Propriety in the East  | K. Tongbang yeŭi chi kuk 東方禮儀之國 or 東方禮義之國; |
|                                  | J. Tōhō kunshi no kuni 東方君子の國                  |
| National citizens                | K. kungmin; J. kokumin 國民                         |
| National language                | K. kugŏ 國語 or kungmun 國文; J. kokugo 國語            |
| Nine Thoughts                    | K. kusa 九思                                      |
| Nine Bodily Expressions          | K. kuyong 九容                                     |
| No Kyŏngim                       | 魯景任 (1569–1620)                                 |
| Polite conduct”                  | J. chŏyŏ no jo 長幼の序                            |
| Politeness                       | K. yeŭi; J. reigi 禮儀                              |
| Propriety                        | K. ye; J. rei 禮                                 |
| Respect                          | K. chon'gyŏng 尊敬; J. kei 敬; J. kyōkei 恭敬              |
| Respect for one’s elders          | J. keichō 敬長                                     |
| Respectful appellation           | K. chonch'ing 尊稱                                 |
| Respectful treatment             | K. chondae 尊待                                    |
| Sekiya Teizaburō                 | 関屋貞三郞 (1875–1950)                              |
| Self-cultivation                 | K. susin; J. shūshin 修身                           |
| Self-deprecation or humbleness    | K. kyŏmgong 謙恭                                   |
| Sincerity                        | K. ch’ung 忠                                      |
| Sekiya Teizaburō                 | 関屋貞三郞 (1875–1950)                              |
| Takayama Chogyū                  | 高山樗牛 (1871–1902)                                |
| Trustworthiness                  | K. sin 信                                        |

xii
Acknowledgements

I would not have finished this dissertation without an enormous amount of help from many people. I would first like to express my sincere gratitude to my dear friends, Eurie, Jeonghye, Jeongeun, Jiyeon, and Minami, who have always been there for me in good and bad times. I am also deeply grateful to Sinae and CedarBough, who encouraged me greatly and believed in me when I felt lost and exhausted. Special thanks go likewise to Sue, Craig, and Harabŏji for giving me strength with their words of wisdom, and also with their sense of humour. I also thank Hyoeun, Audrey, and Nancy for filling me with endorphins whenever I needed a break from my studies.

I thank Scott, Caleb, and Daniel, with whom I have had the pleasure of studying throughout my graduate program. The wonderful group of study-mates in the Asian Studies graduate student space—Kurtis, Ying, Yuki, and Jiaqi, among others—has made the writing of this dissertation more enjoyable. I am particularly indebted to Cyrus, Woon, Azalea and Surya for their valuable feedback on my dissertation. I thank Yinzong and Xiaoyi who helped me with Classical Chinese texts and Lucia Park from the Asian Library for her invaluable assistance. I would also like to thank the staff in the Department of Asian Studies for their unfailing support, as well as the Center for Korean Research and William L. Holland for their financial suppport.

The completion of this dissertation has been possible thanks to the expertise and guidance of my committee members, university examiners, and external examiner. Each of them has given me extensive personal and professional advice for my dissertation and future research. Most importantly, my deepest appreciation goes to my supervisor, Dr. King, who directed this dissertation patiently and tirelessly at every stage of the project. He has taught, inspired and encouraged me more than I could ever give him credit for here. Of course, I am solely responsible for the final form.
And finally, I owe a debt of profound gratitude to my family members whose love is always with me in whatever I pursue. Without their moral and emotional support along the way, I could never have made it this far.
Dedicated to all those who have supported me so generously and patiently in the preparation of this dissertation.
Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Goals and Objectives

The present study investigates a historical formation whereby language users come to single out a particular group of linguistic forms to stand for the nation and for certain idealized qualities of the population. Like a national flag, a language can be mobilized as a source of identity and identification (Friedman 1999). A particular concern of this dissertation is Korean honorifics or honorific registers, the lexical and morpho-syntactic marking system of politeness. The elaborate linguistic system of deference and demeanor indexicals is one of the most salient linguistic emblems of modern-day Korean society, along with the indigenous Korean writing system called Han’gūl (Harkness 2015a). People who speak or study Korean honorifics have generated similar views of a unique world-view of ‘a people’ or ‘a nation’ and similar cases can be found with Javanese and Japanese (Errington 1998; Wetzel 2004). Linguistic manners or etiquette in Korean are primarily understood today as the manifestation of ‘honor’ or ‘respect’ in power relations. Tropes of Korean honorifics at a macro level include a social structure characterized as sóyŏl munhwa ‘rank-based/hierarchical culture,’ sangha kwan’gye ‘superior-inferior relations’ or a behavioural–moral norm summarized in the expression changyu yusŏ ‘elders take precedence.’

Another common epithet of Korean culture, Tongbang yeūi chi kuk (東方禮儀之國: ‘The nation of propriety in the East’), indicates the widespread perception of a cultural identity associated with politeness in Korean society.

The use of Korean honorifics as a manifestation of a collective identity is often taken for granted, as if a linguistic feature neutrally ‘reflects’ a culture-specific experience. However, language itself is ideological. That is, ideas or beliefs about language—what it is and how it
should work—are value-laden propositions which develop in tandem with other ideologies (Cameron 2006). A particular feature of a language needs first to be seized upon as a salient and significant issue, then circulated in society and subjected to contestations and changes, before being naturalized as common sense understanding (Inoue 2004; Agha 2004). Therefore, this study critically approaches the emblematic functions of Korean honorific registers, by tracing the process whereby Korean linguistic politeness emerged as a linguistic emblem of Korean culture. It aims to explain and historicize the socio-ideological workings of “politeness ideologies”—widely shared beliefs pertaining to polite behavior that are particularly perpetuated by power relations (Brown 2011a, 72)—in Korean society.

1.2 Korean Honorifics and Linguistic Ideology

As a point of departure, it is necessary to clarify what makes the predominant modern culture-specific images of Korean honorifics a form of linguistic ideology. Silverstein’s (1979, 193) notion of ‘linguistic ideology’ explains the relation of ideology to linguistic structure and use as follows: “Sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use.” One of the major interests in the study of linguistic ideology is what sorts of conceptual or social activities are required to construe language in a particular pattern from a particular perspective.¹ Researchers of linguistic ideology have discussed that the cultural conceptualizations of language involve distortion (e.g., mystification, rationalization) or contestation—not necessarily a false consciousness—which derives not only

---

¹ For more discussions of language ideology, linguistic ideology, and ideologies of language, see Silverstein (1979), Schieffelin et. al. (1998), and Kroskrity (2000).
from the defense of interests and power but also from limitations on human perception and cognition (Schieffelin 1998, 7).²

The focal point of this dissertation is the sociocultural signification of Korean honorifics. When speakers talk about how to use language politely in Korean or what it means to be polite by means of the Korean language, there are two kinds of shared and commonsensical assessments of Korean honorifics: form-oriented and deference-oriented conceptions of linguistic politeness. The perception of an honorific function is embedded in lay terms for “honorific language” such as nop’im-mal ‘elevating speech’ or chondaen-mal ‘respectful speech.’ The essential function of linguistic repertoires is super-imposed upon the denotational meaning of the metapragmatic labels. These terms also presuppose that a set of formal language forms—including both lexical and morpho-syntactic forms—constitutes a highly recognizable code of politeness. The awareness of a linguistic style designated as “honorific language” guides language users in what to count as and how to interpret the appropriateness (therefore, politeness) of language-in-use.

The use of Korean honorifics as a linguistically and culturally salient norm has been naturalized as a form of dominant socio-cultural knowledge in contemporary Korean society. Speakers often understand that the performance of linguistic politeness in Korean depends largely on the obligatory deployment of grammatical encodings of deference to an interlocutor who is superior in age or social standing (Hwang Juck-Ryoon 1990; Brown 2011a). While the use of Korean honorifics has a long history, attested in texts for a millennium, the linguistic capability of native speakers does not guarantee which aspect of speech speakers can identify as a significant component of politeness, particularly as an indexical of deference. As Ehlich points

out (1992, 73), “the phenomenon of politeness and concepts of politeness that exist in a society should be distinguished,” as the latter are subject to social debates about, and appropriation of, the former.

In this dissertation, both form-oriented and deference-oriented conceptions of linguistic politeness are understood as rationalized explanations of appropriate speech shaped only by perceivable signs and perceivable functions. The use of honorific language as a denotationally discernable sign of ‘deference’ presupposes the recognition of: i) linguistic expressions as an essential constituent of polite speech; and ii) ‘deference’ as the default reading of language-in-use. The obligatory and complex use of linguistic forms of deference receives more attention as an influential determinant than do other forms of linguistic etiquette such as the tone of one’s voice or one’s general comportment. The emphasis on the cultural norm of respect for one’s superiors restrictively frames linguistic politeness as deference in power relations. However, conventions of linguistic politeness also include integrated workings of the appropriate use of message, para-linguistic components, etc. Moreover, linguistic etiquette encompasses appropriate behaviour in communicative interactions with a variety of people in various settings. The naturalized scheme of linguistic politeness is in fact considerably narrower than the total range of pragmatic signs and functions of language in the actual workings of polite speech (see Agha 2004, 40-41).

If the naturalized scheme of linguistic politeness is a rationalized model of the linguistic phenomenon of politeness in real life, this requires us to ask after the social history of “how seemingly essential and natural meanings of and about language are socially produced as effective and powerful” (Schieffelin 1998, 10). What did it take for these salient linguistic and cultural conventions to be incorporated and taken for granted as the cultural frame of linguistic politeness in Korean society? The tropes of Korean honorifics as collective identities of
community and society are worth reconsidering in a similar vein: how did formal elements of
politeness come to be *discovered* and *constructed* as recourses for social and/or cultural
identities? The concept of linguistic community is integral to the representation of Korean
honorifics as a linguistic emblem of a national culture.

1.3 Methodology and Primary Sources
In order to unravel the ideological prerequisites that allowed Korean honorifics to take hold as a
linguistic emblem of national culture, this dissertation traces the semiotic processes whereby the
linguistic and cultural knowledge of Korean linguistic politeness came to gain significance.
Central to this study is the human construction of language, because cultural concepts are
grounded in a system of symbols and their meanings are produced by social actors. Thus, I pay
close attention to the ideologies of speakers about Korean linguistic politeness as a mediator
between language and society and culture. The rules of Korean linguistic politeness have been
discussed, produced and regularized by a variety of social practices ranging from institutional
activities (e.g., education, linguistic studies, and social campaigns) to individual comments on
language, society and culture. Some of them are meant to establish the structural system of
language itself while others have attempted to control social morals and order through a code of
behavioral norms of politeness including language-use.

This dissertation explores metapragmatic or metalinguistic activities—various discourses
about, opinions on or views of language and the pragmatics of linguistic politeness. Such
reflexive accounts of language and language-use occur both casually and professionally,
including genres such as language/grammar references and manuals, ‘policing’ works, and
public discourses (mass media, campaigns) (see, e.g., Joseph and Taylor 1990; Cameron 1995;
Wetzel 1994). This dissertation focuses on three types of printed material as the primary locus of
discursive practices in formulating and normalizing the linguistic and cultural knowledge of politeness.

Firstly, I examine codes of propriety in language-use as illustrated in premodern conduct manuals produced mainly from the time of the Chosŏn Dynasty to the proclamation of the Korean Empire (1392–1897) for use in the language, moral and social education of various groups of members of society. Secondly, morals textbooks for early modern education from the late 19th century to 1945 illustrate a major shift in politeness behaviour tied to the cultivation of a desirable member of society for smoother management of the emerging modern nation and colonial state of the Empire of Japan. Lastly, I discuss the encodification of the nation-bound stereotypes of polite conduct in structural analyses of the Korean language, by examining language manuals, grammar books, and other accounts of the linguistics and pragmatics of Korean linguistic politeness in the early history of modern Korean linguistics.

Prescriptive activities regarding morality and linguistic sanctions of institutionalized activities offer a primary locus in which those cultural models of social behaviour considered desirable and undesirable are circulated, maintained or contested by social actors who codify and discuss linguistic and cultural knowledge. In the case of the linguistic and social models of Korean politeness, good manners or etiquette as a social and moral norm have been a public issue for the interests of the individual, society and nation-state, even before the time when lay speakers analyzed the form-function system of honorific registers. Linguists, intellectuals, activists and laypersons have produced a wide range of resources such as conduct manuals, textbooks, language manuals, and other comments or accounts of Korean linguistic etiquette.
1.4 Previous Studies of Honorifics and Politeness

Previous approaches to Korean honorifics and linguistic politeness can be illustrated in the following main strands of studies; a) structural-linguistic approaches (the formal analysis of normative grammar); b) sociolinguistic and/or pragmatic approaches (interactional models, sociological analyses, or empirical studies of speech acts); c) discursive and/or ideological approaches. I present here an overview of the significance and challenges of previous scholarship on Korean honorifics and linguistic politeness so as to contextualize the directions of the present study.

1.4.1 The Notions of Politeness in the Korean Honorifics System

I first outline the metalinguistic terms regarding politeness in Korea and discuss the prevalence of the normative concept of ‘Korean’ linguistic politeness in both popular and academic discourses on Korean language. Polite manners in Korean are expressed by two modes of behavior toward others (referents or addressees) and oneself (the speaker) (Sŏng Kich’ŏl 2007, 4, 11-15). *Chondae* (尊待) or *chon’gyŏng* (尊敬) refers to a speaker’s respectful behaviour toward his/her superiors. The linguistic expressions of *chondae* or *chon’gyŏng* are often explained as ‘raising’ or ‘exalting’ treatment (*nop’im*) for a referent or addressee in a higher position (i.e., they are perceived as ‘deference’). Humbleness/humility (*kongson*; 恭遜) or self-deprecation (*kyŏmyang*; 謙讓) is the other mode of politeness expected of a speaker in a lower position. Because the expression of a speaker’s ‘lowering’ (*nach’um*) attitude or position is linked to the ‘raising’ effect for others, it is considered a polite and virtuous behaviour in Korean social interactions.
Lay terms for Korean honorifics such as *chondaen-mal* ‘polite speech’ or *nop’im-mal* ‘deferential/exalting speech’ also indicate the sociolinguistic norm imposed on speakers regarding, e.g., the attitude toward ‘raising’ others or ‘lowering’ oneself. Korean linguist Yi Yunha (2001) has classified the various terms suggested by Korean scholars into three categories as follows:

1. Metalinguistic terminology for honorifics in Korean linguistics (adapted from Yi Yunha 2001, 61-64)
   i. Terminology with expressions of ‘raising’:
      *Kyŏngŏ-bŏp* (敬語法; Kim Kŭnsu 1947; Yi Sungnyŏng 1954; An Pyŏnghŭi 1961; Yi Ilksŏp 1974), *chondae-bŏp* (尊待法; Hŏ Ung 1963), *nop’im-bŏp* (Han Kil 1991), honorifics (Underwood 1890; Gale 1894; Martin 1954)
   ii. Terminology with expressions for both ‘raising’ and ‘lowering’:
      *chonbi-bŏp* (尊卑法; Ko Yŏnggŭn 1974), *tŏ nach’um-bŏp kwa tŏ nop’im-bŏp* (‘speech with accentuated lowering and accentuated raising’; Kim Sŏktŭk 1977)
   iii. Terminology with expressions of ‘treatment’ rather than ‘raising’ and ‘lowering’:

Terms in (1)-i depict the central characteristic of Korean honorifics as honoring or respectful behaviour (敬, 尊待, or *nop’im*) toward someone of higher status. Examples in (1)-ii connote both ‘respecting’ (尊) and ‘disdaining’ (卑) or ‘lowering’ behaviours performed by the (non-)use of Korean honorifics. But the ‘raising’ and/or ‘lowering’ behaviours are not obvious from the terms in (1)-iii. Terminology such as *taeu* or *taejŏp* ‘treatment’ focus on how people “treat” (*taeu*; 待遇) someone, including social interactions broader than just superior-inferior relations: e.g., emotional distance, benefactor-beneficiary relations, etc. Still, all these terms for Korean honorifics take vertical relations (*nom-naji kwangye*) as a primary metaphor and variable for choosing the ‘appropriate’ use of (non-)honorific forms.
The metapragmatic function of “raising” or “lowering” someone indicates a speaker’s perception of relative social positions and of appropriate reactions to the perceived context. As far as social norms are concerned, the hierarchical behaviors—by either applying ‘nop ‘im’ (raising) to others or ‘nach ‘um’ (lowering) to oneself—are entrenched in the conceptualization of the essential rules of Korean honorifics concerning what is considered polite in Korean and how to express politeness. The metalinguistic terms for politeness in Korean—yeŭ- (禮儀-) or yejŏl- (禮節-) parŭm, or kongson-ham (恭遜-)—imply Korean native speakers’ perceptions of social norms of correct courtesy, etiquette, or politeness, as directed primarily toward someone with a higher social position\(^3\) than the speaker (see Yoon 2005). Although speakers do strategically manipulate honorifics on the pragmatic level, the normative knowledge of Korean honorifics posits speakers who simply conform to social structures and norms of politeness by “raising” others or “lowering” themselves in accordance with power differences.

1.4.2 Structural and Socio-Linguistic Approaches

The complex system of Korean honorifics has been one of the most closely studied areas of Korean grammar ever since the onset of such study by foreigners starting in the 1880s (see Chapter 5:). Traditional studies on Korean honorifics have concentrated on the analysis of the linguistic components and structures, and on the semantic functions of the linguistic forms.\(^4\) The grammatical typology of honorifics in modern Korean is based on the following principles: i) referent (subject and object) and addressee honorifics according to whom the honorifics refer; ii)

\(^3\) ‘Power’ (primarily understood as age differential or family/social rank) in vertical relationships is regarded as the primary social factor in Korean society, although such power differences can be sometimes unclear or contestable (Brown 2011b: 49-51).

lexical or syntactico-grammatical honorifics, depending on the linguistic type of the honorific forms. The functional analysis of Korean honorifics has focused primarily on a speaker’s expression of ‘deference’ or ‘respect’ toward others, since the main targets of honorifics are interlocutors who are superior to the speaker in terms of age, social status, etc. In other words, Korean honorification is seen as a grammaticalized phenomenon that marks position or status based on the speaker’s perception of social relationships in a hierarchical context (Yi Chŏngbok 2012, 17). The structural analysis of Korean honorifics from a historical or diachronic perspective has shown that the status-based system of polite language has a long history, even while undergoing numerous linguistic and/or pragmatic changes.

Sociolinguistic approaches to Korean honorifics have been interested in analyzing the patterned use of honorifics and their changes in relation to sociological variables. Studies on the linguistic means of marking honorification—“relationships involving social status, respect or deference between communicative interactions”—are not limited to the Korean language (see Agha 1994, 2009; Irvine 2009). A large body of literature on honorification through the use of pronouns and terms of politeness exists for many languages. Brown and Gilman’s (1960) model of the pronominal contrast between T and V forms in Indo-European languages has been one of the most influential frameworks for the study of Korean honorification and appears to have strengthened the notion that the use of (non-)honorifics in Korean depends primarily on power or solidarity in social relations (e.g., Yu Songyŏng 1994; Koh 2006; Yi Chŏngbok 2008). Early studies in the 1970s attempted to identify linguistic patterns of honorifics according to speakers’

---

6 See Yi Chŏngbok (2006) for an overview of the major research interests and methods.
generation, social class, gender, or changes in social structures (e.g., Yi Maengsŏng 1973; Pak Yŏngsun 1976; etc.). Subsequent studies attempted to fine-tune the relevant macrosocial variables by considering other contextual variables such as formality and solidarity in individual speech events (Park Byung-soo 1992). Sociological studies of honorifıcs like these have identified power or seniority in terms of social status, age, and kinship as the most influential variables in the Korean linguistic community (e.g., Yi Iksŏp 1994; Yi Yunha 1995, 2001; Han Kil 1996).

1.4.3 Honorifics, Deference, and Politeness Studies

Aside from syntactic approaches, honorification regained attention in larger discussions of politeness in language use. In their seminal work on linguistic politeness universals, Brown and Levinson (1979, 1987) viewed politeness as a volitional and strategic individual speech act used to mitigate face-threatening acts such as requests (see Kasper 1990, 1997, 2006). Likewise, honorifics were understood as a speaker’s strategic deployment to minimize face-threatening acts by signaling the superior status of an interlocutor. Early politeness research on Korean and Japanese honorifics argued for models where politeness was distinctive from honorifics use, which they comprehended as an obligatory social code of deference (Lee Won-pyo 1988; Hwang Juck-Ryoon 1990; Haarmann 1992). While the shared codes and meanings of honorifics in East Asian languages challenged the alleged universality of politeness, researchers’ conceptualization of honorifics as an obligatory code of deference distorted the nature of honorifics use by highlighting only the normative and stereotyped aspects of a speech model. Moreover, the dichotomy between politeness and deference exacerbated the generalization of a cultural divide between ‘East’ and ‘West,’ uncritically and unwittingly reinforcing the incomplete assessment of honorifics use as natural reality.
Admittedly, the “choice” of an appropriate honorific form may leave little room for variation because, in any interactive communication among interlocutors, it is a grammaticalized convention that requires a speaker’s assessment of social relationships in terms of power or status (Strauss and Eun 2005, 616-618). However, pragmatic studies based on natural conversations have located honorifics in a much broader context of politeness rather than in a static practice or an obligatory conformance to social convention. The following three phenomena can offer good examples: i) mixing or shifting honorifics; ii) strategic usages of (non-)honorifics; and iii) politeness outside the use of honorifics.

Firstly, flexibility (fluidity) in the actual use of Korean honorification indicates a kind of “expressive” or “affective” meaning of Korean honorification separate from marking one’s superior social status (Kim Sŏktŭk 1977, Lukoff 1978; Sells and Kim 2007). Unlike the syntactic analysis of strictly status-based systems, numerous studies have observed that the choice of honorific forms such as -si-, sentence-final endings, subject or dative honorific particles (-kkeyse, -kkey), or lexical forms of honorification such as terms of address (-ssi, -nim) is not entirely or uniquely a grammatical phenomenon; rather, there is frequently room for speakers to use these forms optionally or to mix or switch (non-)honorific forms within the same stretch of communication or to the same interlocutor (Yi Chŏngbok 2002; Mun Hyesim 2009; Brown 2015; etc.). The social indexicality of the use of Korean (non-)honorifics that can be implied from this fluidity in the use of (non-)honorification may vary. For instance, Choe Jae-Woong (2004) contends that the honorific function can be assigned or strengthened by adding honorifics when honorification is unnecessary or optional. Aside from deference, shifting speech styles or adjusting the use of honorific markers in the same discourse or to the same interlocutor can also indicate a speaker’s recognition of shifting roles, moods or attitudes toward a referent, an addressee, or a speech situation: e.g., a speaker’s own self-image in public (Shin Gi-Hyun 2001),
the degree of relative sharedness of experience or cognition (Strauss and Eun 2005), intimacy (Lee and Cho 2013), change of footing (Yoon Sang-seok 2015), etc.

Similarly, as an alternative to prescriptive models of politeness, empirical studies in sociolinguistic or politeness research have made a significant contribution by examining the strategic use of honorifics performance. As illustrated above, speakers may use or “upgrade” honorifics to someone whom they usually do not honorificate. Or, speakers may drop or “downgrade” honorifics to someone with whom they usually use honorific forms. Sociolinguists and pragmaticians in Korean (historical) linguistics have been interested in speakers’ interests and goals underlying shifting and manipulation in honorifics on both appropriate and inappropriate levels (Wang Hansŏk 1986; Yi Chŏngbok 2001; Brown 2008, 2013; Yang Yŏnghŭi 2010; Kim Alan Hyun-Oak 2011). Studies of the strategic uses of (non-)honorifics have shown that mechanisms of honorification concern not only a speaker’s politeness strategies by acknowledging a referent or addressee’s social status, but also a speaker’s power performance in order to project his or her authority or refinement, or else to gain or assert social control. Furthermore, the use of honorifics can be part of a speaker’s interpersonal strategy in coping with mismatched power relations, to signal the changing identities or interactional roles of a speaker, or to maintain a favorable relationship by signalling submission. Rather than being constrained by social status (kinship, status, age, etc.), such manipulation in the use of (non-) honorifics shows that a speaker’s strategy in indicating the speaker’s perception of parameters other than power such as psychological distance, gratitude, seriousness of an incident or reduced force of a speaker’s intention, can be also motivations for shifting levels of honorifics.

In a similar vein, more recent approaches to honorifics in pragmatic traditions have begun to consider contextualized expressions of (im)politeness (e.g., see Pizziconi (2011) in the case of Japanese). Scholarly attempts to understand politeness as an emergent property of specific
contextual and interactional conditions have contributed to a reconceptualization of the indexical meanings of honorific forms. For instance, Alan Hyun-oak Kim (2011) illustrates that non-honorific utterances can nonetheless function as polite utterances, while at the same time deployment of honorifics need not necessarily guarantee politeness. Brown (2008; 2013) demonstrates how the violation of conventional usages of honorifics can serve to indicate sarcasm or humor. Brown et al. (2014), Brown and Prieto (2017) and Idemaru et al. (2017) suggest that politeness and readings of deference in Korean do not depend solely on the appearance of honorifics but also occur along with politeness markers other than honorifics such as phonetic cues and/or non-verbal means. The context-dependent aspects of honorific discourse force us to consider that honorific forms are neither a prerequisite for nor a guarantor of politeness effect. Drawing on Agha (2007, 302), Pizziconi (2011, 62) states: “They [honorifics] are not sufficient because unless some other variables presupposed or made available in the interaction permit the assumption of a deferential relationship, contextually they are not necessarily interpreted as indices of respect. [...] They are also not necessary because deference can be expressed without them.”

In short, deference is not inherently encoded as a semantic meaning; rather, the indexical functions of honorifics emerge through “inference arising from the association of that encoding with other contextually relevant and available information” (Strauss and Eun 2005, 628). The same expression may be polite in certain contexts, but impolite in others, and thus needs to be interpreted according to the pragmatic situation. Empirical studies that attend to a speaker’s volitional, flexible use of language have revealed that Korean honorification can function as an invested performance. Deference is not simply obligatory in Korean; rather, honorific levels are adjustable by mixing or shifting honorifics flexibly, allowing a speaker’s affective, creative, and strategic use of language. Furthermore, the social indexicality of honorifics in actual context has
a number of interactional stance-marking functions through which individuals frequently take on the interested perspectives or roles of specific interactions in addition to signaling social status sensitivity.

The diverse pragmatic effects of honorific forms exist in practice but are less obvious or salient in speakers’ own talk about linguistic politeness, where it is only the narrowly ‘mirroring’ aspects of native speaker politeness ideology about linguistic usage that are reported within the normative models of honorific use and function. This point forces us to consider the metapragmatic understanding of Korean honorifics as grammatical encodings of deference (i.e., the linguistic practice of politeness based on a speaker’s perceptions of power relations) more as an ideological phenomenon than as pragmatic reality in language-use. Discursive research critiques the most salient assessment of politeness and honorifics at the level of cultural or societal interactions as a stereotyped and obligatory interpretation (Kádár and Mills 2011).

1.4.4 An Ideological Approach to the Social Indexicality of Honorifics

Empirical studies like those seen above are connected to the study of linguistic ideology. They demonstrate that the widely taken-for-granted perception that there are linearly-ranked levels or styles of speech in Korean is rather a normative and stock/stereotyped model of speech acts rather than an objectified reality. Lay speakers’ notions of the pragmatic structure of language (i.e., metapragmatics) rest upon restricted perceptions or partial descriptions of pragmatic information in the sense that they deal with a normative speech model, whereby referential meanings and constituents of speech are deemed to be concentrated in discrete (referential and segmentable) linguistic forms and the specific, unique and purposive function in a speaker-addressee relationship (Silverstein 1976, 1979, 1992). Simply put, it is the stereotyped readings of a recognizable sign that restrictively characterize the seemingly transparent set of speech acts.
Research on (linguistic) politeness as an ideological phenomenon explores what values or interests affect our judgement or views of (im)politeness, what relations linguistic ideologies have with linguistic structure and uses, and how social agents shape and justify enacted models of individual interaction or of cultural identities.

Following Silverstein’s initial discussions on the relationship between ideology and structure in linguistic etiquette in Javanese, a considerable number of studies have dealt with ideological issues of honorifics in a variety of languages. In more recent studies, discursive researchers in politeness studies have begun to focus on the production and/or formation of specific ideologies of politeness (see Kádár and Mills 2011 for more discussion). What gives rise to the presupposed interpretation of linguistic politeness whose occurrence is determined by grammaticalized devices in a presupposed context? Questions regarding the validity of any direct or indirect linkage between social ideology and linguistic patterns—particularly, between grammatical honorific forms and pre-existing social status—were first raised in the field of anthropological linguistics. For instance, Irvine (1998/2002) argues that power or rank-based social structure tied to class stratification or royal courts is not a prerequisite for the distribution of honorific forms; rather, honorifics are embedded in an ideology that considers a low-affect and less-engaging style as an appropriate way to express respect for others, whether it is related
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8 Agha (2002, 25) illustrates that the native terms for honorific registers like those below are commonly based on native stereotypes of the use of honorific forms, such that an expression X employs respect or status because X is used for talking to superiors:

Zulu: hlonipha ‘respect’
Guugu-Yimidhirr: Guugu-Dhabul ‘forbidden words’
Tibetan: s’esa ‘respect; respectful speech, behavior’
Samoan: ‘upu fa’aaloalo ‘respectful words’
Japanese: keigo ‘respect language’; sonkei-go ‘honoring language’; kenjōgo ‘humble language’; teineigo ‘polite language’
Javanese: ngoko ‘speech; the language’; madya ‘middle(-polite)”; krama ‘polite speech, behavior’; krama inggil ‘high polite’; krama andhap ‘humble polite’; basa ‘language, polite language’
to rank and power or not. In other words, the presupposed interpretation of certain linguistic forms as a deferential marker is not a natural outcome one way or the other but needs to be enacted.

One of the core interests of researchers in language ideology lies in the mediating roles that ideologies play, through investigations of how ideologies of different groups of speakers inform or construct what inevitably biases its metapragmatic stereotypes. Specifically, linguistic anthropologists’ investigations of metalinguistic beliefs or discussions articulated by different groups in a society have revealed multiple ideologies underlying the assumptions of polite speech and their relations to strategic uses of honorifics (Beeman 1986; Hill 1998). Silverstein (1992, 319) shows that diversity of ideological manifestation in speech communities exists at the intersection of different sociopolitical interests that articulate, debate, and contest the images in terms seemingly understandable to one another. Similarly, Agha (2002) identifies competing valorizations, functional reanalysis, and change as part of the ideological character of honorific registers. Agha (ibid., 30) notes that a particular socially-positioned model of speech may contrast and coexist with another because individuals’ register competences differ in their access to institutions, and because systems of normative value are imbued with different interests of speakers. He goes on to note that a distinct register may be susceptible to further reanalysis and change. For example, a prestigious register that undergoes devaluation due to overly widespread use can lead to the creation of new prestige forms.

As a specific example, native Japanese theories and use of honorifics have been contextualized in the socio-historically mediated phenomena of modernization and modernity, including nationalism and language standardization (Yamashita 2001; Koyama 2004b; Takiura 2005). These studies illuminate the emergence of the socio-emblematic character of Japanese honorifics through the ideological configurations of group identities and power relations within a
modern state. Besides, the co-existence of multiple ideologies like egalitarianism and commercialism reveal modern Japanese *keigo* ‘honorific language’ to be a product of modernity, which helps explain the seemingly contradictory phenomena, i.e., simplification and complication of Japanese honorifics (Koyama 1997; 2004a). In addition to academic and political involvement, the prevailing concerns over prescribed deployment of Japanese *keigo* are also involved in the industry of ‘how-to’ advice literature in educational enterprises, which have therefore also participated in popularizing and policing *keigo* (Wetzel 1994, 2004, 2008; Wetzel and Inoue 1999). As a result, the sociolinguistic norms of how to be polite in Japanese and what such speech behavior means have become uniformly distributed. Furthermore, *keigo* has taken on a life of its own as it has become objectified, commodified, and reinterpreted as an ensemble of stereotypes for a speaker’s desirable (self-)images (Pizziconi 2011, 68). Similar studies have been made on the historical construction of the cultural knowledge around so-called Japanese women’s language in connection with Japanese national modernity and capitalism, which played a role in social evaluations of gender roles and culturally appropriate behavior (Ide 1990; Inoue 2004, 2006; Nakamura 2012).

As seen above, a growing body of studies in historical pragmatics, applied linguistics, linguistic anthropology, and critical sociolinguistics has suggested that Japanese *keigo* is “deeply implicated in social institutions, in culture, in society, in political relations;” it is no passive reflection of society (Cameron 1990, 94). The widely shared beliefs about status, deferential entitlement, or femininity as fixed or inherent properties of expressions have been challenged. Paying attention to metalinguistic or metapragmatic accounts of language has helped us discern that the language ideologies that inevitably bias a metapragmatic “take” are in fact invested with language users’ interested positions or selected perspectives grounded in social experience. In the case of Korean, linguistic ideology received little attention until a handful of interdisciplinary
studies recently paid attention to so-called ŏnŏ insik/ŭisik ‘linguistic awareness/perception’ or ŏnŏ-gwan ‘views of language.’ Scholarly interest instead has tended to focus mostly on how the construal of ŏnŏ ‘speech,’ muncha ‘script; writing system’, kugŏ/kungmun ‘national language/national script’ unfolded in premodern and/or (early) modern Korean society.9 Studies have tended to deal with the issue of linguistic politeness or etiquette in Korean society as a normative linguistic or cultural practice (Kim Chongt’aek 1987; Yi Sŏkchu 2009). A few researchers in the fields of sociolinguistics, pragmatics or psychology have conducted surveys or empirical studies on language users’ judgements of appropriateness, verbal or behavioral norms underlying interactional communication, and/or positive or negative attitudes towards Korean honorifics.10

While the studies on Korean honorifics and linguistic politeness listed above corroborate the culture-specific norms or values surrounding deference, respect, and modesty prevailing among native speakers, one of the problems with this body of research is that it has tended to reinforce the tendency for such norms to be taken for granted as part of a “Korean” socio-cultural identity. Rather than giving an account of where the norm ‘comes from’—as Cameron (1990, 90) puts it—, the majority of approaches to the cultural pattern appear to assume it to be a natural outcome of traditional Confucian ideology. Indeed, deference has been understood as the essential core notion of politeness rooted in the socio-interactional systems of pre-modern (Neo-)Confucianism within the social ideological tradition in the East Asian region (Yum June Ock 1988; Hwang Juck-Ryoon 1990; Hong Jin-ok 2006; Sohn Ho-min 2006; etc.). Stereotypical norms of polite behaviours in Confucian dogma feature denigration of the self and elevation of
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9 For example, see Yi Kunsŏn (2007), Sŏ Minjŏng and Kim Int’aek (2009), Cho T’aerin (2009), Ch’oe Kyŏngbong (2012), and Cho Hŭijŏng (2013), etc.
10 E.g., Ch’oe Sangjin and Kim Ênmi (2001), Yoon Kyung-Joo (2005), Yi Chŏngbok (2006, 430-431), and Im Ch’il-sŏng and Yi Ch’angdŏk (2011).
others, especially one’s superiors, in a hierarchical social structure (Kádár and Mills 2011, 9-10). Drawing upon Whorfian ideas of linguistic relativity whereby the grammatical categories of a language can influence the worldview and behavioral patterns of speakers, anthropological linguists have considered the grammar of honorification to be a linguistic reflection of Korean culture—as a sort of linguistic specialization resulting from social stratification. By the same token, the prevailing view on the decrease in the use of humble expressions and simplification of speech levels is that these linguistic changes owe to societal changes such as egalitarianism, casualization, and decline of social hierarchy (e.g., Sŏ Chŏngsu 1979, 1980; Yang Yŏnsŏk 1980; Kim-Renaud 2001; Kim Chaemin 2004). Furthermore, the cultural conception of the origin of Korean honorifics has led to second-order criticism that this linguistic feature reinforces discrimination in Korean society.

We must be cautious about drawing hasty conclusions that tie linguistic features and shifts to an unmediated projection of a particular cultural ideology in Korean history (and its changes). The fact that Korean has a rich honorific system does not seem to have obvious correlations, either with hierarchical social structures or Confucian tradition (see King 2007). As Kang Hyŏnsŏk et al. (2014, 287-288) has pointed out, a correlation between language and culture is not simply a transparent image of a certain cultural feature, just as one cannot simply compare women’s status in Korean culture with other cultures based on the linguistic convention whereby married women conventionally switch their last name to that of their husband or not.
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11 Following Brown and Gilman’s (1960) theory of power and solidarity as the explanatory variables for the pronominal change from V forms to T forms, a large volume of research on language-in-society has treated language as a secondary or derivative phenomenon determined by societal or historical conditions. Brown and Gilman understand linguistic patterns and changes as an outcome of social ideology whereby an asymmetric relation results in the use of honorifics non-reciprocally, whereas a symmetric relation leads to the mutual usage of the non-honorific T forms.

12 E.g., Hwang Pyŏngsun (2008), Yi Chŏngbok (2014), Kim Kwangsik (2014), etc. See also Mun Sŏnghun (2015) for further discussion.
Similarly, the linguistic shift from _thou_ to _you_ in 16th- and 17th-century English did not result from a general victory of egalitarianism over a power dyad but involved the expansion of the middle class and a specific language-structural change (Wales 1983). Besides, Klein (1994) discusses that it was the rise in the cultural value of politeness (esp., the art of self-presentation in conversation, the virtue of gentlemanliness and urbanity) in the 18th century that prompted writers to define standards of specific linguistic usage (e.g., choice of relative pronouns) as morally or politically charged. In other words, a necessary step for the choice of _you_ over _thou_ as a characteristic mark of egalitarianism was to establish the linguistic relevance of “politeness” as embedded in historically specific ideologies pertaining to moralist and cultural issues. It is not so much that a certain ideology naturally brings about a coherent change in language; rather, the relations between language and ideology are contingent upon the evaluative discourses of language(-use) which language users invoke, and which they mediate as a social practice.

If a culture-specific model of Korean linguistic politeness is emergent from a metapragmatic activity in which language is symbolically connected to a particular ideology, it is necessary on the one hand to pay closer attention to how language use is appreciated as polite behavior, but also to determine discursively how linguistic forms and deference emerged as the central constituents of the effective model of politeness in language use. Recently a handful of studies challenging or problematizing the static social meanings of Korean honorifics has appeared. Lo and Howard (2009) have shown how the pervasive politeness ideology in Korean culture of respecting elders and maintaining social hierarchies is discursively constructed in language education. Eunseon Kim (2010) and Brown (2011) have demonstrated how the popular media, linguistic standardization, and academics have intervened in setting and maintaining the normative models of Korean honorifics. Yi Ongnyón (1996) and King (2014) have explored North Korean language planning and discourses of linguistic etiquette as an ideological tool for
mobilizing ‘indigenous, superior, and Communist moral culture’ to discipline the populace. As illustrated above, critical analyses of linguistic etiquette and honorifics as an ideologically saturated phenomenon have demonstrated that symbolic connections to morality, ethno-national characteristics, or civilization have tended to provide the ideological motivations for maintaining the linguistic practice of honorifics.

1.5 Chapter Outlines and Research Questions

This dissertation begins with the question of what creates the culturally specific ways in which native speakers view language (structures and uses) and social relations (Lee 1997). It explores the historical process whereby the meaning of Korean honorifics came to take hold as an icon of deference in the ethno-national culture among speakers of Korean. In so doing, this dissertation critically approaches cultural concepts of language, rather than adopt traditional approaches of the ‘objective description’ of language-in-society. Below, I outline the structure of the dissertation along with the questions and tasks crucial for a critical examination of present-day ideas about Korean honorifics as an icon of cultural identity.

The four main chapters are devoted to the analysis of the semiotic processes behind the dominant ideologies of Korean honorifics. The first phenomenon is related to the constituents of politeness: what aspects of language-in-use stood out as the essential signs of politeness in the language users’ accounts of linguistic manners? The second phenomenon is related to the concepts of politeness: how the language users came to recognize ‘deference’ as the essential effect of linguistic etiquette. Lastly, it is necessary to probe the ideological grounds for the characterization of Korean linguistic politeness as a culturally salient phenomenon.

Chapter 2 analyzes customary models of polite conduct through an examination of metalinguistic discussions in premodern conduct literature printed in the context of moral and
behavioral education in the Chosŏn Confucian tradition. Special focus is placed on the salience of formal (grammatical or lexical) elements in the constitutive model of linguistic politeness. A wide-ranging survey of the moralist advice literature in conduct manuals suggests that a full history of discussions of linguistic politeness needs to look beyond the narrow evidence of works typically included in the history of the modern Korean grammatical tradition.

Chapters 3-4 trace changes in the models of ‘politeness’ promulgated in Korea during the social and political upheavals of the late nineteenth and first half of the twentieth centuries. I explore the emergence of (linguistic) politeness as a public issue in modern education. The discussion focuses on the shifts in the social meanings of ‘politeness’ and in the code of conduct, including linguistic etiquette, in response to social needs and agenda steered by the early nation-state of Korea and followed by the Japanese colonial government. Lastly, I probe the ideological grounds for the characterization of Korean linguistic politeness as a linguistically and culturally salient phenomenon. Key questions include: What gave rise to the conceptualization of linguistic politeness which prioritizes linguistic forms as the central constituent of politeness effects? Whence the cultural preconception for the birth of honorific registers, understood as a set of linguistic repertoires denotationally cueing ‘deference’?

Chapter 5 traces the formation of honorific registers in the linguistic tradition of modern linguistics and education. The primary task here is to analyze the birth of honorific registers and determine where and how the study of and education in the ‘national’ language intersected with cultural knowledge of the (Neo-)Confucian tradition on the Korean peninsula.

In Chapter 6, I conclude by summarizing the major findings and the significance of this study in larger context and propose suggestions for future research.

This dissertation is an attempt to reconsider the seemingly transparent relationship between Korean honorific registers and Korean social structure, history, and cultural values, by
showing how the discursive work of formal linguistics and ‘national language studies’ shaped the culturally and linguistically distinctive construct that is honorific language in modern Korea. My examination of the social practices of meaning-making seeks to demonstrate the ideological underpinnings of the dominant readings of language-in-society in both their conceptual and formative aspects. The characteristic practices of Korean honorific language provide important insights into the construction of the linguistic emblem of honorific registers as an enactment of ‘deference,’ rather than as a simple reflection or pre-existing hierarchical social relations.
Chapter 2: Talking about Linguistic Politeness without Talking about Honorifics in the Chosŏn Dynasty (1392–1897)

2.1 Introduction

One of the taken-for-granted beliefs about Korean honorific registers in contemporary Korean society is that the grammar of Korean honorification inevitably sustains social hierarchy and authoritarianism. This association between a linguistic feature and a social structure is often presumed to be transparent and factual as if the former reflects the latter. Indeed, Korean honorific registers have a long history, as numerous studies on the history of Korean honorifics have illustrated. However, as discussed in Ehlich (1992), the language-bound nature of politeness is problematic because concepts of linguistic politeness are constrained by the evaluators’ understanding of what exactly is to be evaluated as polite. In order to trace the historicity of politeness, Ehlich suggests examining the understandings of what was to be evaluated as polite in history. In a similar vein, this chapter first focuses on historical debates about the social appropriation of politeness.

The origins of Korean linguistic manners tend to be understood as linguistic marking of social status, originating from the social structure and cultural values. However, I intend to take human representation and enactment into account for a more historicized social understanding of linguistic politeness, by examining the folk characterization of the linguistic forms in the metapragmatic discussions of conduct manuals. In this chapter, I delve into the following questions regarding the conceptualizations of linguistic politeness in premodern Korea: How was one supposed to express polite behaviour through language? Did speakers of Korean in Chosŏn Korea (1392–1897) consider linguistic forms to be the core constituent of linguistic manners or
etiquette? And did they perceive ‘deference’ as the primary effect of linguistic politeness? The constructive aspect of manners or etiquette leads us to the goal of this chapter: a reconsideration of the contemporary perception of linguistic etiquette.

In order to discuss the metapragmatic constituents and functions of linguistic politeness in traditional Korean society, this chapter draws attention to works on speech as part of a code of conduct. Conduct literature is a genre of discursive activities where one can find advice, lessons, guidance and opinions on a higher standard of behaviour and virtue. Conduct manuals could take the form of comprehensive and detailed books, or could be concise and brief lists of precepts. Such manuals also adopted different narrative styles, including rules *pŏm* 範, precepts *kye* 戒, normative statements or admonitions *hun* 訓 and/or anecdotes about episodes of exemplary models from history *kam* 監. The moral and behavioural guidance in such works allows us to observe what sorts of values were invested in certain ways of doing things, what the ideal models were, and why they mattered. Thus, conduct manuals can provide valuable clues for illuminating the roles of human activity in developing, regulating, maintaining or changing moral percepts and behavioural norms. The source materials used in this dissertation are limited to conduct manuals that include reflexive accounts of language behaviour, i.e., explicit direct instructions or rules concerning the use of language. The list of primary texts can be found in the appendix. Note that the list is by no means complete, and that I have not been able to locate or gain access to all of them.

This chapter proceeds as follows: Section 2.2 outlines the nature and functions of the early conduct literature in premodern Korean society. Section 2.3 investigates the contents of

---

13 Thus, lessons on language-use through stories of role models are excluded (e.g., *Samgang haengsilto* 三綱行實圖 ‘The illustrated conduct of the Three Bonds’ (1434), *Oryun haengsilto* 五倫行實圖 ‘Illustrated Exemplars of the Five Relationships’ (1797), etc.).
conduct books in Chosŏn Korea, including the prescriptive grounds for the conceptualizations of linguistic politeness with a focus on the repertoires of linguistic politeness and their contributions to the effects of politeness in language-use, followed by a summary in Section 2.4.

2.2 Conduct Literature in Chosŏn Society

2.2.1 The Rise and Spread of Conduct Literature

The education of “good” or “proper” conduct has been interested in codifying higher standards in social customs (e.g., ordinary or ritual activities), including linguistic norms of politeness. Nearly two thousand years before the compilation of the Bible, the ancient Egyptians had a behavior manual, *The Instruction of Ptahhotep*, written in the hieratic script of priests on papyrus. Written as advice for children from parents, this book was a precursory discussion of values and attitudes which were to be echoed in Western ethics and morals a few thousands year later (Aresty 1970, 17). Ancient China compiled classics on the elaborate rules of court or family rituals such as the *Li ji* ‘Book of rites,’ one of the Five Confucian Classics written between the late Warring States (5th C–221 BCE) and Former Han periods (206 BCE–8 CE). Developed by the Chinese philosopher Confucius (551–479 BCE), Confucianism (and particularly neo-Confucianism after the Song dynasty) had an immense influence on the construction of authoritative models of virtuous and refined behaviour across the East Asian cultures.

Upon the foundation of the Chosŏn dynasty on the Korean peninsula, the new state took a leading role in establishing (Neo-)Confucianism as the ideological basis of its society. The state of Chosŏn upheld the model of Confucian ritual proprieties from ancient China as the authoritative basis of civilization/civility (Koh 2002). Central to the Confucian norm was the
notion of *li* ‘propriety’ 礼, which can be roughly understood as the “proper” conduct that humans ought to observe in daily and ritual life. The rules of propriety include the Confucian code of conduct concerning how to train and cultivate oneself, how to manage the family, and how to govern the world. In other words, the interest in a superior standard of conduct emerged as a form of guidance in building one’s character and in guaranteeing correctness in social relations. Personal cultivation for propriety also has a salient political dimension insofar as it is directly connected with maintaining social order and morality. On a macro-social scale, the active involvement of the state in the practice of propriety was carried out through policies of edification *kyohwa 敎化* which provided members of society with guidelines for the proper practice of propriety (Kim Ŭnsun 2007).

The goal of the Chosŏn Dynasty to mould its society in conformity with neo-Confucian ideologies and customs gave rise to the production and circulation of conduct manuals. The Chosŏn state, as well as members of noble families, produced a substantial number of conduct manuals for use in both institutional and domestic education. With a vision to inculcate Confucian customs in members of society, the state initiated publication of the major Confucian Classics, manuals for family rites and conduct books from China. Not only did the royal court lead several projects to publish edited and/or annotated volumes of original Chinese texts, but vernacular exegeses (*ŏnhae*) of the Chinese classics were also inevitable after the creation of the Korean script, *Hunmin chŏngŭm*, in 1444. Since Literary Sinitic was the exclusive property of male intellectuals in the upper class, vernacular translations of conduct manuals facilitated wider access to the Confucian texts. Printed materials on Confucian discipline were disseminated for

---

14 *The Illustrated Conduct of the Three Bonds* 三綱行實圖, *The Five Moral Rules* 五倫行實圖, and *Zhu Xi’s Family Rituals* 朱子家禮 were widely read from the early period of the Chosŏn Dynasty (Kim Ŭnsun 2007).
institutional and domestic education for people of different backgrounds, ranging from the royal court to local village schools.

Moral education through conduct books did not automatically affect the entire society as a top-down project led by the royal court. The neo-Confucian elites in the upper echelon of Chosŏn society were the main group who took the lead role in inculcating Confucian culture in families and local societies (Kim Ŭnsun 2007). Not only did Koreans from the royal court and noble families study at central and local institutions or at home, they often cited passages from the Chinese classics (words of the sages and anecdotes about exemplary personages in history) when they articulated their opinions in various forms of writings of their own. They also participated in teaching and codifying rules of etiquette further. Many leaders of noble families propagated Confucian norms to the wider society by disciplining their family members to learn and practice them under both ordinary and ritual circumstances. The essential basis for proper conduct in Chosŏn society was inherited from Chinese texts and reproduced by the Confucian scholars and elites. From the sixteenth century onward, Confucian-minded officials and scholars produced their own primers for children since the Chinese models from years past were not always suitable for application in local situations.

Through the coordinated efforts of the state and social members, Confucian prescriptions for propriety in conduct manuals offered the “proper” ways of doing things. The ideal model for men expected them to strive to attain superior moral qualities, and inculcating individuals with a “good” nature and exemplary behaviour in social life was also instrumental in keeping society under control. Therefore, essential guidance in morals and manners constituted an essential part of early literary education throughout the Chosŏn period.
2.2.2 The Readers of Conduct Manuals

The main targets of conduct manuals were young men, members of noble families, and women.

2.2.2.1 Conduct Manuals for Children and Beginning students

Young (mostly male) students just acquiring rudimentary literary skills in Literary Sinitic learned moral values, daily habits and social customs through conduct books before taking up the study of the Confucian Classics. These primers were used not only for learning literary skills in Literary Sinitic but also as Confucian guidelines for self-cultivation and social engagement. Two texts written by Confucian master Zhu Xi (朱熹, 1130–1200) and his disciples exerted immense influence over the standards of ethics and customs in Chosŏn society. The Elementary Learning (Sohak 小學, 1187) and the Essential Knowledge for Children (Tongmong suji 童蒙須知, n.d.) were circulated extensively for children’s education. These texts were read in the original Literary Sinitic in the early Chosŏn period and then later annotated and/or translated in the vernacular Korean script throughout the rest of the Chosŏn era.\(^{15}\)

Korean scholars also wrote their own reference works for primary education starting from the late 16th century. Compared to the classic Chinese texts, these textbooks were easier and shorter and focused on more specific examples and practical matters of life applicable to the local situation in Chosŏn. The earliest text of this kind was the Primer for Children (Tongmong sŏnsŭp 童蒙先習, 1543). Confucian scholars and officials Pak Semu (朴世茂, 1487–1564) and

\(^{15}\) For instance, the Elementary Learning was annotated and translated into vernacular Korean script multiple times at both the national and local level throughout the Chosŏn era. The state’s interest in distributing these is evident from the fact that the textbook was translated twice with the support of the royal court in the 16th century: Translation of the Elementary Learning (Pŏnyŏk sohak 韷譯諺解, 1518) and Vernacular Exegesis of the Elementary Learning (小學諺解, 1587).
Min Chein (閔齊仁, 1493–1549) compiled quotes from famous Chinese Confucian texts to teach the fundamental duties and practices of daily life for young students at local institutions. A similar kind of primer, the Essentials to Dispel Ignorance (*Kyŏngmong yogyŏl* 擊蒙要訣, 1577; *Kyŏngmong* hereafter) was written by renowned scholar Yi I (李珥, 1536–1584) who also drew up the Model for Schooling (*Hakkyo mobŏm* 學校模範, 1582), the sixteen instructions endorsed by the order of King Sŏnjo (1552–1608) for Confucian scholars to cultivate their minds and bodies. Other primers were published and circulated for children’s education at the local level for regional or private education until the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

### 2.2.2 Family Precepts

The publishing culture of family precepts *kahunsŏ* 家訓書 during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries bolstered the production and circulation of practical guidelines for the Confucian way of life (e.g., Kim Ŭnsun 2009). The family was the primary venue for the transformation of Chosŏn society into a Confucian culture, and this transformation took place in the course of practicing the rules of everyday habits and rituals. Although the readership of family precepts was not as wide as that of conduct manuals produced and distributed by the state, a set of handed-down advice on or guidelines to matters of daily life, or lessons for family members and descendents, provided Confucian norms for dealing with family matters and social interactions in general. Noble families began to produce family precepts intensively from the seventeenth century onward. The formats of family precepts varied, ranging from lists of precepts to complete conduct manuals. Since family precepts were originally intended for private members of families, family precepts were mostly handed down privately by the descendents of the families or included as part of the compilations of the patriarch authors’ literary works.
Some books were popular enough to be copied and circulated beyond family boundaries: e.g., Yi Tŏngmu’s (1741–1793) *Elementary matters of etiquette for scholars* (*Sasojŏl* 士小節, 1775). This conduct manual was written for aristocratic family members (e.g., noble men, married women and children) to learn the proper customs of ‘trivial behaviours’ (細行, 小節) (Yi Ŭlhwan, 1986). The author wrote the book to create a model of practical manners because the conduct manual, the *Elementary Learning*, was not adequate due to the differences of historical period and customs and children between his time and the earlier teachings of Zhu Xi.

2.2.2.3 **Conduct Manuals for Ladies**

Advice literature addressed to females was circulated in the early and middle periods of the Chosŏn Dynasty (Son Chiksu 1982; Cho Kyŏngwŏn 1995). Confucian models from China set the principal standards of conduct for female education. Only a small number of women from royal or aristocratic families read primers and Chinese Classics, as literary education in Literary Sinitic and social activities for women were discouraged in Chosŏn society. Chinese conduct manuals were circulated in their original forms or in edited or translated versions. Koreans from royal or noble families also participated in producing the edited volumes of Chinese conduct manuals. One of the few female authors of conduct books was Queen Sohye (1437–1503) who compiled the *Instructions for Women* (*Naehun* 內訓, 1475) based on quotations and excerpts from Chinese texts. The three-volume set consists of conduct models for virtuous ladies along with sample passages from the classics and conduct literature from China.

The social roles of women in Chosŏn society centered on domestic boundaries due to the gender segregation that confined upper-class women to the private sphere. Female education aimed to cultivate female virtues and domestic duties as an ideal member of the family and clan.
Conduct manuals presented filial, faithful, obedient and gentle daughters(-in-law) or wives as models who served as a source of counsel on matters concerning house chores, family rites, child rearing, etc. The circulation of conduct manuals continued to expand throughout local society with the rise of family instructions. Some family precepts were written especially for female members (e.g., daughters, sisters, daughters-in-law). A specific genre of literature for disciplining women—*kyenyŏsŏ* 戒女書—proliferated as one of the limited resources for female education. Some native conduct manuals were popular enough to be copied and translated into the vernacular script as references for women from other families.

### 2.2.3 The Structures and Contents of Conduct Manuals

Conduct literature provided a prescriptive model of conduct in life in order to discipline and correct oneself. A set of rules for behaviour stipulated what to value and cultivate for one’s mind and body and social life. The readers of conduct manuals learned what kinds of social performance were “proper” or not, along with accounts of their values of conduct. The comments and instructions on linguistic behaviour in conduct manuals explained what people should bear in mind during communicative interactions and why. The contents of conduct manuals varied, but learning how to do things in the “proper” ways generally focused on internal morals and outward manners.

Internal morals were concerned with general principles such as the values or attitudes of an ideal person. The ethical standards for self-cultivation and improvement in social relations took multiple dimensions of life into consideration, ranging from the disciplining of one’s mind and body to the management of family and social relations. The Five Moral Rules were the cardinal guides to human relationships in Confucian ethics and highlighted: i) righteousness between lord and vassal; ii) intimacy between father and son; iii) separate roles between husband
and wife; iv) order between the old and the young; and v) faith between friends. Based on these cardinal ethics and relations, certain moral and social values were highlighted more than other qualities. For example, all people, but particularly children and women, were expected to respect their superiors (e.g., parents, parents-in-laws, teachers, the aged or husbands) and behave modestly themselves. Filial piety, obedience, and modesty were also valued as virtuous conduct toward people in superior positions according to Confucian ideals. However, it should be mentioned that ‘deference’ was not the only way of expressing proper conduct in power relations. In addition to filial piety, loyalty, and obedience, other moralistic virtues such as sincerity, trust, affection, modesty, prudence, kindness, gentleness or patience were also attributed to and expected of an ideal man or woman and both men and women were encouraged to cultivate these virtues through specific practices in daily and ritual life.

External formalities dealt with more practical lessons concerning how to cultivate these values and how to enact them through proper manners. The moral qualities of an ideal man in conduct manuals were followed by the behavioural models applicable in the course of one’s personal, family and social life. Girls before marriage learned the qualities of an ideal woman, along with the basic do’s and don’ts, duties and skills required of a married woman. A variety of circumstances was linked to one’s duties and skills as a social being (e.g., parent, servant, wife, child, and a man of virtue in general), including regulations in daily encounters, etiquette in interpersonal relationships, and family rites. Personal cultivation included daily behaviours such as dress, table manners, learning, cleaning, etc. Controlling one’s appearance (e.g., facial expressions, deportment), emotions and desires was important in the presence of others. Patterns of behaviour in family life included customs or practices relevant to relationships with family members, relatives and servants, and family rituals (e.g., ancestral worship, weddings, funerals), child rearing and education, and management of the household economy (e.g., cooking, finance)
and so forth. Social life beyond the family involved learning how to get along with relatives or people in one’s village, how to treat one’s friends, acquaintances and guests, how to manage taking exams, how to perform one’s official duties and behave in social gatherings, etc.

Conduct manuals also offered a code of speech behaviour that was conventionally accepted as representing the highest standard. Speech behaviour or the use of language in social interactions was closely linked with prescribed ethical and social behaviours. If ‘deference’ was one of the primary virtues in human relations the crucial code of conduct for junior members toward senior members, one might expect the same principle to have been applied as a prescriptive basis for how to use language politely in communicative interactions. Considering the long history of Korean honorifics, did speakers of Korean perceive the linguistic means themselves as a quintessential expression of politeness? In particular, did they perceive the linguistic forms as indexical of the ‘honor’ that the modern linguistic term ‘honorifics’ suggests? In order to investigate these questions, it is necessary to examine how traditional speakers of Korean construed what it meant to use language “properly” or “politely” in social interactions. The next section looks into comments on propriety in language-use, that is, the normative framework of linguistic models as portrayed in conduct manuals.

2.3 Propriety in Language-use: Discussions in Conduct Manuals

Language consists of a set of rules or regulations in daily life, just as dress codes or table manners can serve as embodiments of ‘propriety’ in social relations. Among protocols for doings things “properly,” language was a favorite topic that often warranted its own separate section in such manuals. The code of conduct for speech stipulated more than just getting one’s meaning across. Unlike nowadays, when the deployment of honorific forms assumes a central position in metapragmatic talk about linguistic politeness, conduct literature in premodern Korean societies
rarely discussed the appropriateness of specific linguistic forms as the primary norms of linguistic etiquette.

2.3.1 Primary Lessons on Speech

2.3.1.1 Prudence

The essential ethics for propriety in language, before even talking about how to use linguistic forms properly, involved carefulness in speech; that is, not saying much and/or keeping one’s tongue bridled or checked. Among the list of premodern conduct manuals with sections on language, the majority contain a section on prudent speech as imperative. The first and foremost maxim is grounded in one of the teachings of Confucius from the Chinese children’s primer, *Elementary Learning* (1187), addressed in the vernacular translation *Sohak ŏnhae* (1587; *Sohak*, hereafter) as follows: “Look not at what is contrary to propriety; listen not to what is contrary to propriety; speak not what is contrary to propriety; make no movement which is contrary to propriety” (*Sohak* 3: 4a).

Why was ‘prudence’ the principle in communicative interactions? The rationale for ‘prudence’ was supported by the construal of language from two perspectives. The first aspect is the indexical function of language as the manifestation of one’s mind. This means that one of the motives for investing in propriety in speech derived in part from cultivating the minds and personal virtues of those who desired to be an ideal man (*kunja* 君子). Indeed, linguistic practice during the Chosŏn period was regarded as one of the key evaluation criteria for judging a person’s nature and quality (Cho Hŭijŏng 2013, 196). The Comportment chapter (*Chisin* 持身)
in *Kyŏngmong* points out that excessive talking and thinking is the most harmful deed in cultivating one’s mind:

Excessive words and an abundance of ratiocinations are the worst plagues for the work of the mind. [...] In our business with others, we must choose our words according to their weight. If we speak at the right moment, our words will necessarily be circumspect; he who speaks with circumspection approaches the Way (多言多慮最害心術… 接人則當擇言簡重 時然後言 則言不得不簡 言簡者近道).

The second aspect is concerned with the pragmatic effects of language as an essential means in managing social relations. Conduct literature frequently placed language under the category of a social and moral practice that fulfills one’s role in interpersonal relations. Take the following as an example. The Kaŏn 嘉言 ‘Great remarks’ chapter in the *Sohak* states what language means and why it is an important code of conduct in social life:

The *Yan zhen* 言箴 ‘Admonition about speech’ says: “The movements of a person’s heart-and-mind are made manifest in speech. [If one] forbids haste and frivolity in speaking, the mind can be calm and sound. Moreover, this becomes an important factor [in people’s daily lives]: It causes conflict or creates good fortune. Good fortune and bad luck, fame and shame—all are summoned [by speech] alone. Careless speech loses one’s integrity, and rambling and overly troublesome speech is incoherent. If my speech is unbridled, it runs counter to the nature of things. And if I emit untoward speech, the consequences brought will be contrary to my wishes. Speak not what is counter to the norm, and respect these admonitory words [of the ancients]. 其其言箴曰，人心之動，因言以宣，發禁躁妄，乃斯靜專，矧是樞機，興戎出好，吉凶榮辱，惟其所召，傷易則誕，傷煩則支，己肆物忤，出悖來違，非法不道，欽哉訓辭. 16

The indexical association between speech and mind, that is, the linguistic ideology whereby speech is seen as a reflection of the mind, encourages training that keeps speech under control.

---

16 The above quote was reproduced and circulated in children’s primers throughout the Chosŏn period: e.g., the *Guidance for Practical Studies* 2 (下學指南 *Hahak chinam*, 1784; *Hahak*, hereafter) by An Chŏngbok 安鼎福 (1712–1792).
The dire consequences of losing control over prudence in one speech are many: excessive or shallow speech can bring about harm, venom and failure in interpersonal relations.

Based on the understandings of the core values and functions of speech as a manifestation of one’s identity and as a means for social relations, conduct manuals primarily approached propriety in speech as a morally and socially appropriate behaviour. This functional signification was closely related to the maxim of prudence in speech because once words come out of one’s mouth, the utterance can give rise to positive or negative affairs in life. Such a stance toward language from China were taken seriously in Chosŏn society. The section on language in the Precious Mirror for Enlightening the Heart (Myŏngsim pogam 明心寶鑑, 1454), an early anthologization of moralizing precepts excerpted from various Chinese classics and compiled during the Koryŏ era (918–1392), warns of the fearful functions of language as follows: “[one’s] mouth is an ax that can hurt people. [One’s] speech is a sword that can cut off one’s tongue. Thus, if one covers one’s mouth and hides one’s tongue, the body will be in peace anywhere (口是傷人斧 言是割舌刀 閉口深藏舌 安身處處牢).”

Attention to the possible evil influences of language is also conspicuous in precepts for family members. The notion of one’s tongue or speech as a double-edged weapon is a recurrent metaphor in many family lessons, as seen below:

a) “Be prudent with language. In general, speech is the gateway to calamity and blessing and a vehicle for good fortune and bad […] As the old saying goes, ‘the mouth is a trap that ensnares humans and the tongue is a knife that can kill people.’” 懶言語 夫言語者 禍福之門 吉凶之機 […] 古語云 口為陷人斧 舌為殺人刀 (Chŏng Honggyu (鄭弘規; 1753–1836); cited from Kim Chonggwŏn 1983, 656)

b) “One’s mouth is a threshold that can decide unhappiness or happiness. The language of a virtuous speaker derives from his generous mind; but rumors that come and go among many people covet riches and tempt others. Thus, careless speech often leads one to make mistakes, resentful speech makes one act without thinking through the consequences, and absurd talk is invariably nonsense well worth fearing. Hence people cannot help but watch their mouth.” 人之有口 禍福樞紐 有德之言 其出自厚 衆人雖雖物欲外誘 言不
The awareness of the risks of speech as seen above justified ‘prudence’ as a rational solution because it allowed speakers to minimize potential misconduct and be vigilant about one’s flaws. Language users viewed speech as a source of concern and misfortune. The primary lesson on language gives prominence to the negative consequences caused by poor speech for both speakers and their interlocutors. The anxiety over the consequences of releasing unrestrained speech combined with social actors’ expectations about superior character and the smooth running of daily life played a role in motivating speakers in support of the rules of propriety.

What about occasions when it is necessary to speak? In order to avoid the potentially adverse effects of speech, brevity stood out as a rule of thumb. As noted in the “Mun’gan kong chagyŏng susinhun” ‘Lessons for self-cultivation of Mun’gan kong’ (文簡公自警修身訓, 1633), Yi Su-gwang’s 李睟光 (1563–1628) precepts on self-cultivation, brevity of speech was expected in order to prevent one from saying anything contrary to propriety. Brevity in speech was rationalized for both speaker and interlocutor(s). In Sasojŏl (1: 7), Yi Tŏngmu’s comprehensive reference to everyday minor manners of etiquette, the section on speech manners for noble men warns of the drawbacks of loquacity or repetitive speech as follows:

- Those who talk too much hurt their dignity, reduce sincerity, and ruin things. If good words are insincere, the listener actually resents them, so imagine the case when somebody always uses bad words! 多言者傷威損誠害氣壞事善言之支離聽之者尙厭之 况惡言之多者
- When sending a servant on an errand to ask somebody something, do not be wordy. The servant will not be able to convey it in its entirety, and the matter at hand will only be delayed. 使奴婢問訁於人不可語之煩細奴婢未必盡傳事從淹
- In the matter of speech, do not engage in long-winded prefatory remarks, just as in writing you should not indulge in long litanies in a preface, for this arouses resentment in...
the listener. Speech is only of value when it is simple and concise, and tedious repetition and detail are to be avoided. 凡言語勿先作假辭如作文昌頭然使人厭聽語貴精詳簡當忌煩複纖璅

Unbridled speech was connected to negative qualities of the speaker, such as lack of dignity. Brevity in speech also mattered for utilitarian purposes such as efficient communication with servants and the completion of tasks. Lengthy and repetitive speech can only bore one’s listeners and cause servants to delay or fail in their tasks. Rambling, repetitive, and long-winded speech bores one’s interlocutors or else leads the speaker to disregard the speech context or listeners’ reactions. In the same section, the writer states that anyone who gets excited, telling the same story again, or continues talking even if the listener is not paying full attention, is not an accurate person and such speech behaviour is a symptom of low intelligence or an insensitive mind (ibid., 1: 8-9).

Such rationales for prudence in speech were a commonplace in premodern conduct literature and were used to motivate the intended targets, regardless of their gender role. Specifically, ‘prudence’ in speech was one of the principal virtues of a Confucian woman. Language is also underlined in conduct literature for women, whose social activities and ideal models were different from men. According to the so-called Four Standards of female conduct (virtue, speech, looks, and skills) from the Chinese Lessons for Women (Nüjiao 女敎), eloquent speech was not a feature of the ideal Confucian woman (Naehun 1:13b). Instead, a favourable woman was expected to watch what she says, and to speak kind words when presented with a reasonable opportunity. Excessive loquacity was sinful, as was disobedience toward one’s parents-in-laws, failure to produce a son, adultery, theft, jealousy and illness. The so-called “Seven Divorceable Sins” (ch’ilgŏ chi ak 七去之惡) for women mentioned by Confucius give
some idea of the disciplining of women during the Chosŏn era (Sohak 2: 54b-55a).

The rationale for prudence in language for women was generally grounded in acquiring female virtues, securing love from others, and gaining peace or harmony in family relations. One of the early speech models for women in Chosŏn society can be observed from the chapter on Language and Conduct (Ŏnhaeng 言行) in the Naehun. The need for caution and circumspection in speech lies in the perception of language as an embodiment of one’s emotions and the realization of the dangers of speech (Naehun 1: 1b-2a). Since language was viewed as a critical potential source of fortune and misfortune in life, for fear of incurring shame and reprobation, wise women were advised not to say anything annoying or flattering without first thinking carefully in the presence of elders or even when alone (ibid.).

Lessons on cautious language as part of education for virtuous ladies were productively circulated in conduct literature of the late Chosŏn period written by Koreans. For instance, Yi Tŏngmu in his lessons for his sister, “Maehun” ‘Precepts for [my] Sister’ (妹訓, late 18th c.), remarks on the danger of speech as follows: “Both good speech and evil speech come out of the mouth. Once evil speech is out, who can you blame even if you regret it? Good and evil of one body is as easy as turning over one’s hand” 善言惡言 皆出于口 一出惡言 悔之誰咎 一身善惡如反覆手 (Ch’ŏngjanggwan chŏnsŏ 5). He also associates speech with qualities or demeanors of women, warning talkative ladies lest their conduct be inconsistent with their speech and index a lack of sincerity (ibid.). Kim Chongsu 金宗壽 (1761–1813), who wrote an advice book for his daughter called Elementary Learning for Women 女子初學 (1797), portrays excessive speech as seriously evil conduct on the part of women. Instead, his guidance for a happy life suggests that ladies’ conduct and character be gentle and kind, by refraining from talking about whatever they know or have heard.
Unworthy speech mostly includes morally improper or interpersonally upsetting topics such as an emotional outbursts, vicious or malicious speech, gossiping about others at home, or voicing judgmental comments about others (See 2.3.2). The *Ryuhandang ŏnhaeng sillok* 柳閑堂言行實錄 (1795) written by Lady Kwŏn, a Catholic Korean and wife of late Chosŏn scholar, Yi Pyŏk (李霹, 1754–1785), suggests that the gentle, neat, and kind speech of women refrain from discussing the faults of family members. In addition, absurd or inauspicious stories and complaints about nature are also proscribed. As listeners, women are advised to take what their servants say with a grain of salt. All in all, the prohibited matters are concerned particularly with managing household affairs peacefully among members of a family:

The speech of married women should be docile and terse, neither glamorous nor rough. [Married women] should not talk of what they have heard from others or of what they did not see. They should not be boisterous even about appropriate topics or be prolix even about delightful subjects. The speech of married women should be correct, neat, gentle, consistent, polite, and kind. [Married women] should mention nothing but the virtues of others, nor the faults of their siblings. They should not circulate malicious gossip among acquaintances or relatives or pass on to their parents-in-laws or husband gossip which might damage faith [in interpersonal relationships]. They should neither take what their servants say at their word nor pass on what their servants tell them. Wise wives should listen only to matters about what happens in their household and eschew saying anything else. The Lord in Heaven says, ‘do not talk too much as it would be attended by many evils.’ If people of all ages and both sexes kept this in mind always, there would be no disputes or troubles but only beneficial things in life. Spread only good words, not ugly ones. Do not talk at night about ghosts, thieves, or murder. Do not lay blame upon the rain or wind, or curse the sun, the moon, and the stars. Tidy yourself up and respect the Lord in Heaven.

The danger of speech is related to both speakers themselves and to others among their social relations. In order to prevent any quarrels or resentment or contempt, the rule of thumb for women’s speech comes down to refraining from talking at all. Song Siyŏl 宋時烈 (1607–1689), a renowned civil servant and scholar in late Chosŏn, advises his daughter to keep her eyes,
mouth and ears shut, and says: “Three years like a blind man, three years like a deaf man, and three years like a mute” (cited in Kim Sinyŏn 2000, 89-90).

The language ideologies described above shed light on the issue of “good” or “proper” language at the intersection between a moral code and “correct” demeanor in social relations. The speech of good manners possesses the power to ‘infiltrate the soul’ and transform social relations (Young 2004). Propriety in speech was advocated as part of the cultivation of one’s inner state of mind and as essential for the management of social relations. Etiquette or courtesy books did not exist merely to enumerate normative behaviours, as they had to convince the readers why the readers should follow the regulations in the conduct manuals. Readers’ own interests in enhancing moral cultivation and the management of social relations was supposed to stimulate them to internalize the normative behaviours. At the same time, regulations concerning language in conduct manuals socialized social members with desirable qualities, e.g. as a good woman, wife, daughter-in-law, and mother who can control her emotions (e.g., rage or grudges), interact harmoniously with others, and care for others.

2.3.1.2 Sincerity and Trustworthiness

After ‘prudence’, conduct literature underlined ‘sincerity’ 忠 17 and ‘trustworthiness’ 信 as key guiding ethical principles. While ‘prudence’ highlighted the virtue of suppressing and controlling utterances, the virtues of ‘sincerity’ and ‘trustworthiness’ were concerned with how to deal with spoken and written language. In essence, the practice of speech ethics meant to speak in earnest and to keep one’s word. According to “Quli” 曲禮 ‘Summary of the rules of propriety’ cited in

17 Not to be confused with the colonial-era usages of 忠 ch’ung meaning “loyalty [to the nation]” or embedded in the term 忠孝 ch’unghyo for “the valorized traditional Confucian notions of loyalty and filial piety.”
the third chapter on Reverencing the Self 敬身 from Sohak (3: 6b), ‘propriety’ 禮 “does not go beyond the definite measure, nor encroach on or despise others, nor is it fond of (another) recklessly (禮不踰節, 不侵侮, 不好狎).” It goes on to define good conduct as cultivating one’s mind and keeping one’s word (修身踐言, 謂之善行). The virtue of ‘sincerity’ in speech derives from the Nine Thoughts 九思 a gentleman should keep in mind. The Sohak (3: 5b-6a) reads as follows:

If his words be not sincere and truthful, and his actions not honorable and careful, will he, with such conduct, be appreciated, even in his neighborhood? For a noble man, there are nine things of which he thinks: In seeing, he thinks of clarity; in listening, he thinks of sharpness; in countenance, he thinks of gentleness; in manner, he thinks of courtesy; in speech, sincerity; in service, he thinks of reverence; in doubt, he thinks of questioning; in anger, he thinks of difficulties [that may involve him]; when he sees gain to be got, he thinks of righteousness. 言忠信 行篤敬 雖蠻貊之邦行矣 言不忠信 行不篤敬 雖州里行乎哉 君子有九思 視思明 聽思聰 色思溫 貌思恭 言思忠 事思敬 疑思問 怨思難 見得思義

The Nine Thoughts were circulated as the ideal model for gentlemen in children’s primers throughout Chosŏn society. For instance, the third chapter on Comportment 持身 in Kyŏngmong advises not to speak a single word without sincerity, citing the Nine Thoughts.

The virtue of keeping one’s words can best be explained as the speakers’ devotion to the practice of ‘sincerity and trustworthiness’ 忠信 ch‘ungsin through language in social relations. In his precepts to his family, Pak Hadam (朴河淡, 1479–1560) uses a metaphorical statement to explain the indexical value of sincere speech as follows: “Speech makes one’s literary fame bloom, but if there are only flowers with no fruit—that is, if one’s words are not true—one cannot fulfill his duty to get along with others” (Soyodang ilgo 1: 214). Similarly, Yi I’s “Haeju Hyangyak” (1577) ‘Village Compact in Haeju,’ a set of rules for local people in Haeju,
Hwanghae Province, as a guide to interpersonal manners (yesok sanggyo 禮俗相交), mentions insincere and unfaithful speech as one of the misdeeds that village people should guard against and correct among themselves, for it deceives people (Yulgok sŏnsaeng chŏnsŏ 16).

2.3.2 The Message of the Utterance

Regardless of the specific targets of conduct manuals, most sections on language mention topics to be avoided in communicative interactions. As long as people needed to talk, what speakers really needed to know was what sorts of talk were allowed or not. Although formality accounts for a significant part of decorum in the cases of letter-writing manuals and ceremonial occasions (e.g. Ebrey 1985), the ideas contained or delivered through language were one of the obvious cues for deciding propriety in speech. Thus, the maxim of ‘prudence’ in speech often led to more specific guidelines as to what topics were “good” or “appropriate” for speech.

One of the obvious guidelines for judging speech conduct was that conversational topics ought to be morally and socially correct. The act of speech delivers a message about an attitude of the speaker toward the situation or the interlocutor. Thus, speakers were advised not to make interlocutors feel offended or embarrassed, or to encourage them to do anything wrong. In particular, commonly prohibited topics were concerned with negative or inconsiderate comments about others or tricky or personal topics: faults committed by others, wealth or profit, etc. Conduct literature considered the rules of speech important not only as a means for social interactions but as a means for moral cultivation. Thus, speech served as an essential code of conduct for the discipline and cultivation necessary to become an ideal man (kunja). For speakers, one of the most universal lessons was to express modesty, which was practiced by constraining oneself from speaking ill of others or boasting of one’s social rank, family, wealth,
or in-group members, and so forth. The section for Noble Men 
士 in 

Sasojŏl I provides a number of examples in various situations as follows:

- When sitting with a person who is wearing warm clothes in the summer, do not say that it is hot, no matter how hot it is. When seeing a person who is wearing thin clothes, do not say that it is cold, no matter how cold it is. When having a meal and seeing a starving person, do not lament over the taste of the food. 紕者在座 雖炎 勿言 熱 見單衣者 雖寒冬 勿呼寒也 見凪者 而適當食 毋歎鹹酸不調
- Upon seeing a student of Confucianism, do not provoke him with talk about the civil service examination. Do not threaten him by saying the examination is impossible. Alas, how could one examination possibly measure someone’s importance? 見儒生 不可以科舉之說 聳動之 亦不可以不能科舉恥唫之也 嗟乎 一科舉 豈能使人輕重
- Do not brag about your appearance and do not praise and flatter others’ looks or criticize their ugly appearance. 勿自貌吾之相貌好 勿諂譽人之相貌好 勿訾貶人之相貌不好
- What would you do with the shame if you came across someone entering the room when you were speaking ill of the person behind his back? Therefore, a kunja does not talk wastefully but puts great value on refraining from judging others. 方言人之過失 而其為愧恥當奈何 故君子貴罕言 而必慎於長短人物
- When attending a banquet for a relative’s wedding, do not discuss carelessly the merits of the family’s son-in-law or daughter-in-law. 參族人婚姻會勿妄論婿婦優劣
- If the children are already married, never mention the former candidates for son-in-law or daughter-in-law. 子女既成婚姻切 勿言前日嘗與擬議壻婦之人

The rationale for discouraging talk of negative aspects about others underlined the dreadful consequences for the speakers themselves—consequences which could jeopardize the speaker’s relationships with others and imperil his identity in front of others. The gravity of talking rashly about decrees from the royal court or the flaws of acquaintances was justified by the potential risks of gaining enemies or suffering punishment. Talking about the gains or losses of others, or malicious talk about others, was considered bad not only for the sake of keeping one’s own Moral Heart-Mind (K. sim 心) calm, but also for putting others’ minds at ease.

---

The Kyŏngjang 敬長 section under the chapter on Regulations for Children 童規 (Tonggyu) has an anecdote about a child who teased and insulted an old officer, criticizing that any such child who could disdain his older brother, parents or king, was engaging in behaviour that would lead to heinous deeds (Sasojoł 8: 15). In the chapter on Etiquette for Ladies 婦儀 (Puŭi), the author advises against men voicing concerns or moaning, and against women blaming and lamenting groundlessly, since one can thereby predict the breakdown of family order and the decline of the family’s fortunes (Sasojoł 6: 7).

The other driving force behind morally and socially appropriate talk was closely related to the belief that utterances speak for the speaker’s moral or social identity. For instance, the Kaŏn 嘉言 chapter in the Sohak (5: 100a-100b) advises the readers to avoid talking about anything politically sensitive, anything negative about others, or obscene or materialistic matters, for the speaker’s own sake—because such topics are indicative of the speaker’s moral disposition and are harmful for one’s ethical cultivation. Linguistic etiquette for men in the Sasojoł (1: 7-8) portrays vulgar speech, jokes or jesting as an inner state of the speaker which has the potential to degrade the speaker’s demeanor and dignity, to render a speaker’s mind dissolute, and invite disdain from others. Similarly, Cho Chun 趙焌 (1819–1889) warns in an advice book for his daughter, Kyenyŏ yagŏn 戒女略言 (Brief Remarks to Admonish Girls, 1860), that those who say: “One might look forward to saying ‘Serves him or her right’ when someone disliked dies all of a sudden. They say, ‘a woman’s resentful voice can bring frost in the summer.’ What would the person do if such speech came to her? Be careful and vigilant about this” (cited in Ch’oe Hyejin 2004, 191).

Readers were encouraged to talk about Confucian precepts and ethics such as loyalty, faith, benevolence, and good deeds based on social relations. Specific messages could vary,
depending on the various social roles of the speakers and their interlocutors. For instance, the social role of men with a government post demanded of them that they speak only about subjects related to their status at work and not comment on the merits or demerits of others or government affairs. The Kyŏngsin 敬身 chapter of the Sohak (3: 14b-15a) quotes the Chinese models of “good” talk from the Shi Xiang Jian Li 士相見禮 ‘Meetings and Greetings among Literati’ of the Book of Etiquette and Ceremonies 儀禮 as follows, which depends on with whom one is communicating:

“[…] In communication with a king, one should talk about how the king deploys his officials. In communication with a person of high rank, one should talk about how they serve their king. In communication with one’s elders, one should talk about how they work with their younger brothers and sons. In communication with youth, one should talk about how they serve their parents and siblings. In communication with a group of people, one should talk about loyalty, faith, benevolence, and good deeds. In communication with people with a governmental position, one should talk about loyalty and faith.”

This passage encourages children to discipline themselves and to change the morals in their local societies. Likewise, topics improper to share with others are divided by the ideal gender roles of the speakers and their interlocutors. The chapter on Ladies’ Duty 婦儀 in Sasojŏl (6: 7) gives detailed directions for women in the different stages of their lives. Ladies should not talk shamelessly about bearing and raising babies, comment on their in-laws, or exaggerate the merits of their husbands. Unlike for men, it was discouraged for women to use sinographs (muncha 文字) indiscriminately in letters (e.g., Cho Chun 1860; cited in Ch’oe Hyejin 2004, 191).

Children are expected to be careful in their speech so as to better serve the elderly in the village. In particular, the Human Relations 接人 chapter of the Kyŏngmong illustrates how children should interact with others. One way to be polite in response to an elder’s questions is to tell the truth. When with friends, children ought to cultivate morality. One way to practice this
verbally is to talk only about sinographic learning (muncha 文字) and trustworthiness and stay away from the vulgarity of the mundane world, from the pros and cons of current politics, from the wisdom of local magistrates, and from the faults and wrongdoings of others. Dirty talk with village people is not allowed, even as a mere response to a question. Even though children should be strict in maintaining decent conduct, they are not supposed to show even a hint of being superior to others.

Discussions of what is “good” or “proper” to talk about suggest that the contents of one’s speech play a significant role in signalling propriety in speech. Manners in speech were considered important as a matter of ethics and as a means of maintaining amicable relationships with others. Such speech helped the speakers themselves keep their own relations amicable and cultivate their personalities. Polite models of conservation required speakers to express their modesty, consideration, and kindness towards others, as well as to talk about social and/or morally ideal roles. Conduct manuals warned against statements that express dishonesty, flattery, teasing, sensual and mundane desires, blaming, jealousy, contempt, anger or resentment, comments adverse to their interlocutors, or personal or political topics. Propriety in speech was not limited to the expression of deference; messages that were ethical, favorable to, and/or helpful for others were what amounted to polite behaviour in communicative interactions. Selecting a “proper” topic for conversation was closely related to one’s ethical and social duties. Speaking of “good” things was no different from cultivating a “good” mind and practicing “good” deeds in communicative interactions (Ko Taehyŏk 2006). The next section considers the performative aspect of language—ŏnhaeng 言行—in communicative interactions as prescribed by conduct manual authors.
2.3.3 The Behavioral Guide: How to Speak and Listen

In addition to the actual message of an utterance, speakers also had to be mindful of controlling their physical actions that co-occurred with the speech acts and thus comprised the outward comportment of propriety or politeness. While morality guides were interested in what to talk about as an ideal person in social relations, sections on linguistic etiquette in conduct manuals also dealt with how to deliver and listen to speech; that is, with how to perform ideal roles as speakers and listeners in communicative interactions. The Kyŏngsin 敬身 chapter of the Sohak (3: 8b-9a) addresses the practice of propriety or politeness requires the control of outward behaviour, as follows:

“The Chapter on “The Meaning of Capping” 冠義 says: Generally speaking, that which makes man is the meaning of his ceremonial or rite rules (yeŭi 礼義). The first indications of that meaning (yeŭi 礼義) appear in the correct arrangement of the bodily carriage, the harmonious adjustment of the countenance, and in the natural ordering of the speech. When the bodily carriage is well arranged, the countenance harmoniously adjusted, and speech naturally ordered, the meaning of the ceremonial usages (yeŭi 礼義) becomes complete, and serves to render correct the relation between ruler and subject, to give expression to the affection between father and son, and to establish harmony between seniors and juniors. When the relation between ruler and subject is made correct, affection secured between father and son, and harmony shown between seniors and juniors, then the meaning of those usages (yeŭi 礼義) is established.”

In particular, the Nine Bodily Expressions 九容 from one of the Chinese Classics, the Book of Rites 礼记 (Chapter: Yu Zao 玉藻) were often quoted as the embodiment of a speaker’s polite disposition.

The carriage of a man of rank was easy, but somewhat slow, grave and reserved, when he saw any one whom he wished to honor. He did not move his feet lightly, nor his hands irreverently. His eyes looked straightforward, and his mouth was kept quiet and

composed. No sound from him broke the stillness, and his head was carried upright. His breath came without panting or stoppage, and his standing gave (the beholder) an impression of virtue. His looks were grave [...].

君子之容舒遲 見所尊者齊邈 足容重手容恭 目容端 口容止 聲容靜 頭容直 氣容肅 立容德 色容莊

The guidelines for the cultivation of mind and body required keeping one’s body and voice calm. The Nine Bodily Expressions hint that the proper use of speech in communicating concerns controlling paralinguistic cues such as body movements and vocal qualities and keeping them neat and straight:

Although lacking in literal meaning and form, the control of the quality of voice or breath was one of the frequently mentioned cues. Premodern conduct manuals considered vocal quality a key part of propriety, stressing slow, gentle and calm mannerisms in communication. The voice of a speaker here is treated as an embodiment or expression of polite behaviour. In sociocultural anthropology, such culturally mediated “experiences of sensuous qualities” (e.g., sounds) or feelings are referred to as “qualia” (see Harkness 2011, 2015b; Chumley and Harkness 2013). The qualia of softness, clearness, heaviness, etc. are endowed with the values of an appropriate character or conduct of a speaker such as gravity, clarity, neatness, calmness, etc.

For instance, one of the earliest children’s primers compiled by a Chosŏn literatus, Tongmong sŏnšūp (1543), states in the preface that a filial son serves his parents by asking after their conditions and needs with ‘bated breath and in a soft voice’ 下氣怡聲. Chŏng Kyŏngse 鄭經世 (1563–1633) points out in the Yangjŏng p’yŏn 養正篇 (1604, 9-10) that keeping one’s voice soft and peaceful is part and parcel of proper manners for children, along with sincerity.

---

20 English translation from James Legge (1885/2001).
21 These ideal features of demeanor were repeated in conduct manuals of the later period: e.g., Yi I’s Kyŏngmong yogyŏl (Yi I, 1577), Hakkyo mobŏm 學校模範 (Yi I, 1582), Sasojŏl 士小節 (Yi Tŏngmu, 1775), etc.
and the actual content of their speech. Yi Chu’s (李澍, 1534–1584) family precepts, the *Punbong kahun* 盆峯家訓 (1706), also highlight “bated breath and soft voice” 下氣怡聲 because this demeanor indexes stability or calmness of one’s mind and energy, thereby helping reduce mistakes and conceal excited or enraged emotions, as seen below:

- Dread angry or hasty speech in times of anger. 怒時，言動，常恐其暴戾粗悍
- If one’s mind is stable, one’s energy is stable; then one makes no mistakes even in unexpected moments. Speech follows facial expression. 心定則氣定, 故倉卒無疾, 言遽色
- If one’s mind is gentle, one’s character is gentle; then there will be no sign of delight or anger in one’s speech. 心和則氣和, 故喜怒, 不形於辭色.
- One’s voice must be gentle, soft and low. One should not change it, even in times of anger or joy. 音聲，必須和緩低闊, 雖甚怒盛喜，不可變.

Furthermore, the section on speech manners for men in the *Sasojŏl* provides detailed guidelines on how to call servants and even wail. The art of controlling one’s voice properly was even related to the aesthetic assessment of expressing one’s mourning. As seen below, the tone of voice should be calm and gentle but not too flimsy, too dreary with technical skills, or too expressive (*Sasojŏl* 1: 7):

> The sound of a command to bring water or fire and the call to a servant should not be flimsy, dreary, complicated or raging. The sound of wailing should be neither urgent like gasping nor slacking or yawning. Do not sound like you are singing in an overly delicate or rustic voice; do not invite upon yourself the scorn of women and children by surprising your listeners with cries like those of an ox or horse. The customs of our land call for mourners to wail by crying *aego* (哀告) continuously. My great-grandfather, Master Pak Hyojŏng, said: “The sound of aego barely comes out of the throat, so the sound naturally gets cut off. This is not as good as the one sound of *aeae* (哀哀), the continuous sound of moaning that comes directly from one’s mind.” 呼水呼火呼婢僕聲 呼而長也 呼頽而短也 呼頽而短也

> The sound of *aego* barely comes out of the throat, so the sound naturally gets cut off. This is not as good as the one sound of *aeae* (哀哀), the continuous sound of moaning that comes directly from one’s mind.” 呼水呼火呼婢僕聲 呼而長也 呼頽而短也 呼頽而短也
To keep one’s voice gentle and calm appears to derive from associating rapid, high-pitched or rough sounds with impetuosity or ill temper, which also have consequences for the cultivation and manifestation of one’s personality in social relations. In the case above, the writer evaluates the native sound of crying, aego, which was rendered in the pseudo-etymological sinographs 哀告 (lit., “announcement of grief,” but homophonous with the Korean wailing cry of aego/aigo, etc.) as having a poor quality of sound. Instead, he describes the sound of undisturbed moaning of one’s mind, aeaе (哀哀; again, homophonous with Korean wailing cries of ae–ae, ai–ai), as a good sound of crying. It it also worth noting that the evaluative condition of the ideal sound of moaning, aeaе, is in fact grounded in a famous passage with authority from one of the Chinese Classics, the *Book of Songs* (詩經), which all Koreans learned through the Korean morals textbook, *Samgang haengsilto* ‘The illustrated conduct of the Three Bonds’: e.g., 哀哀父母. 生我劬勞. 未嘗不三復流涕 ‘My parents, poor things, gave birth to me...,’ (Hyoja 15, Wang Pou: Wang Pou Stops in the Middle of Reading the *Shijing* (State of Wei) 王裒廢詩 (魏)).

The manners of speech are closely related to the social roles of the speaker in communications. Tranquility and gentleness in speech were highlighted as virtuous conduct for women. The code of conduct for virtuous women included no laughing, a quiet voice, and a soft countenance that helped promote kindness to and harmony with others. According to *Lady Han’s lessons for ladies* 韓氏婦訓 (1712), the author, Han Wŏnjin 韓元震 (1682–1751), describes tranquility 靜 (one of the four virtues of ladies: chastity 貞, tranquility 靜, harmony 和, and obedience 順), as follows: “To speak little and be stable and calm in your demeanor, and to not show your teeth, grin, swear or scold someone out of anger” (Yi Kyŏngha, trans., 2010, 46).

22 With thanks to Ross King for pointing this out to me.
On a similar note, Yi Tŏngmu’s “Maehun” 妹訓 recommends that women’s behaviour be quiet, gentle and calm in speech (see below). All of these regulations are justified by the need to bring fortune and peace to the household, as well as for self-presentation:

- Lower your energy and voice, and discipline yourself through moderation. Manage your comportment with a quiet grace so as to make it consistent with your mind. This is auspicious and is bound to lead to good fortune. 下氣低聲 中正以裁 從容周旋 事與心諧 是為吉祥 諸福畢來
- Reckless speech and laughter make one look like a clown. Too solemn a countenance with low energy makes one look distressed. How to achieve moderation, you ask? One should seek it in softness and compliance. 言笑無節 近于俳優 色厲小溫 亦近于憂 云何得中 柔順以求
- Be quiet and do not make noise in the women’s quarters. Nurture harmony by not raising your voice. When no voice goes beyond the gate, the entire household is at peace. 閨房之內 靜而無譁 不大其聲 以養其和 聲不出戶 乃安一家

In addition, the section on speech manners for ladies associates things like sitting idle with one’s chin in one’s hand, whispering, and being overjoyed or chatty, with signs of negative emotions in social relations such as resentment, defamation, lewdness, and severity (Sasojŏl 6: 7).

Children were required to control their physical appearance in communications with their superiors. The Myŏngnyun 明倫 chapter in the Sohak 2 illustrates the external features of speech in communicative interactions, including: quick answers to the speech of honoured members, gaze, speaking only after listening to the speech of elders, keeping a proper distance, and posture (standing or getting down on one’s knees) when making a request of or listening to a teacher.

Similarly, the chapter on manners for children (Tonggyu 童規) in Sasojŏl deals with the behavioral norms of respectful conduct toward elders in daily life. In a subsection on lessons on how to pay respect to elders (Kyŏngjang 敬長), we find detailed guidelines on the proper attitude for a speaker while talking and listening. For example, the requirement of a humble and circumspect attitude suggests that children should stand and listen solemnly with their hands held
in front of them when an elder scolds them (Sasojŏl 8: 16). When children need to write down something or listen to something inappropriate, they are advised to step back or leave the scene quietly (ibid.). Children were supposed to ask questions to make sure everything said was clearly understood, rather than say reluctantly “Yes, I know” (Sasojŏl 8: 17).

In short, conduct manuals during the Chosŏn society took into consideration a variety of paralinguistic bodily actions and gestures as integral constituents of good manners in speech (see also Kim Chongt’aek 1987). Educational resources for children stressed respect 敬 for teachers or seniors through various channels. Speakers with a gentle countenance were supposed to use a moderate tone and pace of speech without hesitating or stopping. When listening, control of the hands, feet and gaze with minimal movement were required to demonstrate a grave and humble posture. Furthermore, conduct manuals also specified bad manners like eavesdropping, interrupting others’ conversations, or taking a long time to respond, thus teaching children how to behave throughout the course of communicative interactions. What all these regulations tell us is that “polite” conduct in speech behaviour was not limited to the linguistic code itself or to ‘deference’ in communicative interactions. The process of physically transmitting an utterance consisted of the quality of voice, bodily carriage, the sequence of spoken conversation, and the physical distance between interlocutors, among other factors. All of these were part of the expressive means for a gentle, calm, considerate and submissive demeanor toward one’s interlocutors. If children failed to perform the role of ideal speaker or listener in communications with their elders, the social meanings associated by the culture with such behaviour in speech acts could be interpreted as showing a disrespectful attitude toward seniors and superiors.
This section considers the formal aspect of linguistic etiquette—that is, linguistic forms themselves as a code of propriety. As indicated in the title of this chapter, the first thing to note is that linguistic forms were never the central focus as compared to what to say, how to deliver it, and how to listen. To the best of my knowledge, only the small handful of advice literature titles listed below presented any stipulations as to which actual linguistic forms should be deployed when and for what functions:

- The chapter on “Duties in Miscellaneous and Small Matters” 雜細事宜 in the Tongmong suji 童蒙須知 (1517)
- “Chŏnhun”庭訓 ‘Family Precept’ (Yu Hŭich’un 柳希春, 1559) from Miam sŏnsaeng chŏnjip 眉巖先生全集 4 (1897)
- The chapter on Mourning Customs (喪制) in the Kyŏngmong yogyŏl 極蒙要訣 ‘Essentials to Dispel Ignorance’ (Yi I 李珥, 1577)
- The “Miscellaneous Notes” (Chapki 雜記) in the T’oegye sŏnsaeng ŏnhaengnok 5 (退溪先生言行錄; ‘Records on the Speech and Behaviour of T’oegye’) (Yi Hwang 李滉, 1732)
- Sasojŏl 士小節 ‘Elementary matters of etiquette for scholars’ (Yi Tŏngmu 李德懋, 1775)

Even in these few cases, the discussions of linguistic forms were restricted to lexical items. Almost none of the conduct literature from the Chosŏn period mentioned any of the grammatical devices used to indicate deference—such as honorific particles, sentence-final endings or verbal affixes—which modern speakers of Korean easily recognize as the standard components of nop’im-mal ‘elevating speech’ or chondaet-mal ‘respectful speech,’ i.e., the metapragmatic categories of honorifics in modern Korean. But as I discuss below, this is by no means to say that premodern Korean speakers used fewer honorifics.

Premodern conduct manuals prescribed that readers use distinct terms of address or reference to an adult or to an interlocutor superior in age or rank. The complex use of terms of
address and reference derives from the scarcity of personal pronouns or names, which were considered bad form for addressing or referring to others in Korean, particularly in formal situations or with someone respectable in age or rank. Instead of using a bare personal name, speakers were expected to use the following forms:

a) Honorary or official titles (e.g., ἀρχιπρέσβυς “adult; senior,” sŏnsaeng 先生 “master”)

b) Cha 字 (courtesy names to be used with an adult man instead of a 2nd-person pronoun or an original name used in his childhood)

c) Pyŏlho 別號 (a pseudonym or pen name used to refer to someone instead of one’s original name or cha)

d) Honorific suffixes attached to a personal name or a kinship term (e.g., -ssi 氏, -nim 主)

Special names such as cha or pyŏlho were used to refer to or address an adult. However, titles were preferred for those who had one. For instance, Yi Tŏngmu advises children not to use 2nd-person pronouns such as “you” (爾 or 汝, both representing vernacular Korean nŏ) with other children who have celebrated their coming of age ceremony (kwallye 冠禮) because they deserve to be treated as an adult even if they are the same age as the speaker (Sasojŏl 8: 15b). Once boys attained manhood, they were usually given another name, a cha. In the chapter on Mourning Customs in Kyŏngmong, Yi I recommends against calling a deceased person by their personal name in a mourning ritual, especially if the deceased was an adult (Yulgok chŏnsŏ 27, 751). While the cha was a polite term of address for a child who had become an adult, the same form was considered improper if used to an elder. According to the Tongmong, one of the early children’s primers from China, the proper way of referring to a senior was to use a generalized term like ἀρχιπρέσβυς ‘adult; senior’ instead of the person’s cha 字. For those who had a respectable position or rank, using a title was considered more appropriate as a term of address or reference instead of using a name such as the cha or pyŏlho. For instance, Yi Tŏngmu underlines that a
teacher should be referred to by the title of sŏn-saeng 先生 ‘master’ and not by his pyŏlho, even if the teacher is simply a scholar with no official position (Sasojŏl 8: 17-18). The anecdote about Yi Chinok 李陳玉 (dates unknown) notes that the use of pyŏlho with one’s teacher instead of the respectful title sŏn-saeng indicates a reckless mindset and a lack of self-discipline in cultivating one’s character and social affairs. Quoting Yi Chinok, Yi Tŏngmu writes that “if impudent speech is the sign of an impudent mind, and if people take no mind of their seniors, this means there are no rules to their life or character.” Yi goes on to say: “Alas! Kids nowadays address their teachers or elders as they please, using their names and cha (courtesy names); how would they ever call them by their pyŏlho or sŏn-saeng?” As seen below, he argues that the use of cha with one’s elders and teachers should be corrected to their pyŏlho, although the old manners from Song China allowed a grandchild and a student of Confucius and Zhu Xi to refer to their grandfathers and teachers by their cha:

They often say, “Zisi 子思 referred to his grandfather, Confucius, as Zhongni 仲尼 [Confucius’ cha], and Chengzi 程子 also referred to his teacher, Zhouzi 周子 or Zhou Dunyi 周敦頤, as Maoshu 茂叔 [Zhouzi’s cha].” But they don’t realize that times have changed. The fact that it is not allowed now to call an elder by their pyŏlho is just like the way people could no longer call their grandfather by his pyŏlho during the Song dynasty. Thus, it is their guardians’ fault for making children so rude and arrogant. [Children] should not use [their teacher’s and elder’s] cha freely, much less their personal names. 動必曰 孔子祖也 子思稱夫仲尼 周子師也 程子稱夫茂叔 此不知時世之異宜也 今世之不可斥呼長者之字 猶宋之世 不可斥呼王父之字也 故使孺子驕慢無禮者 父兄之過也 字猶不可斥呼 况其名乎

Disgraceful or derisive terms of address or reference for others were considered inappropriate, even with those whose status is in fact low. For instance, the section on Noble Men 士典 in Sasojŏl (1: 7b) forbids a list of “vulgar terms” isok chi ŏn 里俗之言 that frivolous people use to ridicule scholars and military men: e.g., kwe 跪 ‘to kneel down’ or yak 跃 ‘to
jump.’ It goes on to say not to refer to others as a “jerk; lout” han 漢 or “thing” mul 物 or other vulgar terms such as “bandit” chŏk 賊, “farm animal” ch’uk 畜, or “enemy” su 竊, no matter how humble they are (1: 8a). The author warns that such rough words will lead to insult and harm from others. By contrast, speakers were advised to refer to themselves with self-deprecating terms or by their own personal names, but not with the 1st person pronoun. In his family lessons, Yu Hŭich’un (柳希春, 1513–1577) suggests referring to oneself as soin 小人 ‘little man’ in front of one’s superiors (Chŏnghun: 6). Unlike Yu Hŭich’un, Yi Hwang’s 李滉 (1501–1570) Records on Speech and Behaviour (1598) indicate that one should not refer to oneself with the 1st person plain pronoun na 我 ‘I’ in front of one’s elders, nor with soin in front of a high-ranking official (T’oegye sŏnsaeng ŏnhaengnok 5: 17). In response to a question about the proper term for referring to oneself (as speaker), he suggests following the old custom of using the speaker’s own name.

As seen so far, the fundamental concept of proper terms of address or reference for oneself and others existed as a way to mark modesty regarding oneself and respect for the social status of others (in terms of age or rank). Among others, Yu Hŭich’un’s Chŏnghun (庭訓, 1559) presents detailed examples of linguistic forms that can be used to indicate one’s superior or inferior status through linguistic (primarily lexical) alternations. One of the sections, titled “Chŏnghun naep’yŏn 庭訓內篇,” includes a lengthy discussion on how one should treat others in accordance with “chonbi changyu” (‘high and low; old and young’; 尊卑長幼). Yu first introduces the following terms of address based upon a strict perception of who is respectable or
not, depending on age (*Chŏnghun*: 6): 23

a) *Chonja* 尊者 ‘respectable person’: Older person by more than twenty years and a peer of one’s father

b) *Changja* 長者 ‘older person’: Older person by more than ten years and peer of one’s brother

c) *Tongbae* 同輩 ‘peer’: Person who is younger or older by less than five years

d) *Soja* ‘little person’: A youth who is ten years younger

e) *Yuja* 尊者 ‘young person’: A youth who is younger by more than twenty years

f) *Pija* 尊者 ‘low person’: humble person (person of low social status)

Detailed classifications of who is older or younger like this one above guided speakers how to distinguish linguistically between those who deserved respect or not on the basis of differences in age. The same section in the book above enumerates how people of younger or lower social status are supposed to treat older or more respectable people with respect, including bowing, sitting or standing in a lower place than one’s superiors, giving one’s superiors priority in acting or speaking, and exercising prudence in the ways one speaks or behaves. The following excerpts illustrate linguistic regulations concerning how to mark superior or inferior status properly through linguistic distinctions (*Chŏnghun*: 7):

- In talking with a *chonja* ‘respectable person,’ do not dare ask his age or refer to him with his cha 字; when referring to a person in the same group [as the speaker], refer to him with his name; when referring to *chonja* or *changja* ‘older people,’ refer to them as *momyŏng-ssi* 某名氏 ‘Mr. So-and-so.’ (Note: Refer to them with their title (*kwan* 官) if they have an official position) 凡與尊者語 不敢問其年 不稱人字 稱同等則舉其名 稱尊長則云某名氏 (Note: 有官者稱官)

- [Speakers] must refer to themselves as *soja* 小子 ‘little boy’ in front of a respectable person. When referring to their own parents and siblings, they should not afford them respect—say only *pu* 父 ‘father’ without *nim* 主 (honorific suffix)–; when referring to the

---

23 A similar grouping of people between young and old appears in Yi I’s “Haeju Hyangyak” (1577) (*Yulgok chŏnsŏ* 16). One’s teacher, father, older friend, and elders in the village are considered honorable, not simply by virtue of their age but also because of their rank and/or virtue. An elder is expected to respect even a younger person of reputable status or virtue, just as he would do his peers.
children of respectable or older people, one should treat them with respect—use -ssi氏, even with the names of little children. 凡尊前言自己必稱小人語及己之父兄不必尊(Note: 如但言父而不言主)語及尊長之子弟不可不尊(Note: 雖稱小兒之名必云氏)

As seen above, speakers were expected to refer to their superiors with name-plus-ssi or title, while using a humble term of reference for themselves. Likewise, marking respect for honoured members was extended to their children, whereas speaking “down” of oneself was applied even to older members of the speaker’s own family by suppressing the use of the honorific suffix -nim.

In similar fashion, the discussion of “Manners in Interpersonal Relations” taein yein 待人禮人 in the same chapter includes Yu Hŭich’un’s eight precepts to remember when speaking with others. Here he suggests “referring to one’s own father with his personal name in front of the king, and referring to oneself with the speaker’s personal name—not his cha—in a letter to a high-ranking official or to a person in mourning” (以至御前名父及大臣喪人處通簡不書字而書名皆是) (Chŏnhun: 13).

Furthermore, marking deference through linguistic alternation was extended even to the objects (e.g., writings or letters) of one’s superior. In the same section mentioned above, Yu notes “four levels” 四等 of deference for verbs and nouns with the lexical meanings ‘to give’ and ‘letter,’ respectively. Likewise, he introduces different epistolary styles used to refer to oneself in letters to one’s superiors (Chŏnhun: 8-9):

- The four levels of compositions (mun 文) to people: i) To a respectable person [chon 尊]: hŏn 猷 ‘to offer’; ii) To an older person [chang 長]: chŏng 呈 ‘to present’; iii) To equals or younger persons [chebaesoja 儕輩少者]: chŭng 贈 ‘to present’; and iv) To younger people or individuals of more humble social status [piyu 卑幼]: si 示 ‘to show.’ 凡投文於人有四等於尊長曰獻曰呈儕輩少者曰贈卑幼曰示
- The four levels of letters to people:
  i) To the most respectable [ch’oejonch’ŏ 最尊處]:

Rules for letters from a disciple to his teacher: Refer to oneself as *soja* 小子 ‘little person’ in a letter and as *munha-mo* 門下某 ‘to so-and-so under [your] instruction’ at the end of a letter. 

Rules for letters from scholars or commoners [*min* 民] to the lord of an estate [*sŏngju* 城主]: add *min-mo* 民某 ‘civilian, so-and-so’; in letters to a court official add *hwaha mo* 化下某 ‘so-and-so under [your] guidance’ at the end of the letter. 

As seen so far, the various regulations for deploying proper linguistic forms boils down to addressing or referring to others (and children and objects related to them) with respect for their social status while lowering the status of speakers themselves (i.e., self-deprecation). In another section titled “Chŏnghun oep’yŏn sang” 庭訓外篇上, Yu’s advice on “treating an honored person with respect” 敬貴 provides a list of various titles to use as a token of respect in referring to people according to their positions and degrees of respectability: e.g., *yŏnggam* 令監, *sado* 使道, *yŏnggong* 令公, *haengsu* 行首, etc. While paying respect to a clansman of lower rank with a generalized title like *chinsa* 進賜 (or *năiri*, in its vernacular reading), speakers were expected ...
to refer to themselves as soin ‘little man’ in front of an honored person whom they would address as yŏnggam 令監 ‘lord; sir’ (Chŏnghun: 21-22).

Yu Hŭich’un’s guidelines and his discussions of honorific terms of address and reference imply that the prevailing code of polite/proper speech considered the deferential or humble use of linguistic forms as proper language propriety in communicative interactions. What should be remembered, however, is that the repertoire of linguistic forms that served to index a speaker’s deferential entitlement (or modesty) was limited to words (lexical items) that refer to the speaker or referent. Special pronouns or terms such as soin or soja ‘little man’ indicated a position of humility on the part of the speaker whereas cha or pyŏlho were used to refer respectfully to an adult interlocutor. Suffixes attached to names or kinship terms such as -ssi and -nim were also recognized as honorific markers because they were used to refer to the name of an honorable person. In addition to terms of address or reference, certain nouns or verbs (e.g., the four levels of words for ‘to give’ in letters) indexed the superior or inferior status of a giver or a recipient. Speakers identified the lexical forms as indices of deference because they denoted persons respectable in age or rank (e.g., elders, teachers, officials, family members of others, etc).

However, as far as linguistic forms were concerned, discussions over the propriety of specific linguistic forms in premodern conduct manuals seem to have been confined to lexical honorifics. Non-referential forms of honorification appear to have been less salient for the authors of conduct manuals and thus we find no attempts at interpreting their pragmatic functions as deferential indices, despite the native speakers’ linguistic ability to deploy grammatical devices of honorification properly. The denotational meaning of lexical forms—i.e., the superior or inferior position of an interlocutor—helps speakers to infer the deferential effect of the form-in-use. Unlike lexical honorifics, morpho-syntactic forms of honorification do not refer to a speaker or a referent. Instead, for late-Chosŏn authors of such conduct manuals, it was the
message of an utterance and/or paralinguistic or behavioural norms that indexically signalled a speaker’s embodiment of propriety in speech towards an interlocutor or an interactional context.

2.4 Reconsidering the Stereotypes of Linguistic Etiquette in Traditional Korea

Conduct manuals draw a portrait of how the construal of linguistic etiquette or manners actually took place in late Chosŏn. The normative models of language use as illustrated in conduct manuals afford us valuable insights into how Chosŏn elites understood linguistic etiquette. Today the indexical function of non-referential forms is highly discernable as a deferential marker (K. *nop’im-mal* ‘elevating speech’ or *chondaet-mal* ‘respectful speech’) in the metapragmatic discourses of modern speakers of Korean. However, metapragmatic discussions of linguistic propriety as illustrated in premodern conduct books suggest that ‘deference’ would have been an incomplete and insufficient characterization of Korean linguistic politeness at the time (see Agha, 2007: 302; Pizziconi 2011).

Firstly, the constituents of politeness were not restricted to alternations of linguistic forms; a wide range of signals participates in linguistic propriety. Linguistic politeness consisted of more than just linguistic forms. The first priority guideline on how to behave with language in conduct manuals concerned prudence in speech in order to reduce potentially harmful effects on interpersonal relationships. When speaking, ‘sincerity’ was the other important ethical guideline. In addition to these two guiding ethical principles, the practice of speech manners required other, more detailed guidelines. A wide range of repertoires was integrated into the expressive means for linguistic manners in terms of both message and behaviour. One obvious cue for judging the propriety of speech utterances in social relations depended on the ideas or content contained in one’s utterance. Linguistic etiquette also demanded the control of behavioural patterns in speaking and listening skills. Behaviour norms for speakers and listeners included linguistic,
paralinguistic, and corresponding behaviours. All of these factors participated as expressive means in creating a ‘polite’ effect in communicative interactions.

Moreover, it is equally important to note that marking ‘deference’ was not only the effective way of enacting “proper” or “polite” speech in premodern conduct manuals. Premodern conduct manuals stressed that the overall effect of proper or polite speech was more than simply paying deference to others; rather, such deference needed to be accompanied by displays of one’s consideration, kindness, carefulness and sincerity. The moral and behavioural guidelines for speech manners as presented in conduct manuals stipulated for readers how to present themselves properly and how to maintain amicable and ethical social relations.

After his discussion of marking ‘high versus low and old and young’ chonbi changyu 尊卑長幼 through linguistic form alternations, Yu’s eight suggestions for speaking with others in his “Manners in Interpersonal Relations” taein yein 待人禮人 did not simply require people to refer to themselves humbly or to refer to their father using his personal name in front of the king (Chŏnhun: 13). The rest of the eight guidelines drew attention to what was good to talk about, not to mention overarching guidelines such as prudence and sincerity that were applicable in general situations. Speakers were advised not to make others feel offended or insulted, and not to entice them to do anything unethical by talking about unfavorable topics, speaking ill of others, downplaying one’s own merits, or flattering others. The Respect the Elder kyŏngjang 敬長 section on children’s manners in Sasojŏl 8 illustrates that the code of conduct for children in showing respect to their elders included more than just the issue of terms of address or reference. The author, Yi Tŏngmu, criticizes the verbal action of the boy who teased an old official as contemptuous behaviour (Sasojŏl 8: 15b). Likewise, a list of behavioural norms for participating in a meeting of elders includes the control of reckless talking and laughing, careful responses
when spoken to, and clear questioning (Sasojŏl 8: 16b-17a). Likewise, Song Siyŏl’s conduct book for his family advises women to avoid talking to their parents-in-laws or husband or making excuses or interrupting in conversations (cited in Kim Sinyŏn 2000: 89-90). He expects such behaviour to minimize the possibilities of things going wrong in their communications with esteemed people.

The polite functions of the expressive means discussed above were not limited to deference in terms of speaking “up” to others and “down” about oneself. The guidelines and recommendations governing language use in conduct manuals were not so much concerned with linguistic forms per se. The control of morally good ideas and outward behaviours was an integral standard of refined speech. Conduct manuals demonstrate that politeness standards in language were conceived of as a kind of moral and social code for behaviours in all communicative interactions. What was “good” to talk about was related to individuals’ social morals and duties as an ideal man or woman. ‘Prudence’ and ‘trustworthiness’ represented the bottom line of speech as the embodiment of one’s heart-and-mind and as a ‘gateway’ leading to either good or evil fortune in human relationships. Self-control in language use was encouraged so as to cultivate the speaker’s inner nature and to learn how to behave in social relations.

Instructions about respect and humble submission remained central to the morals and conduct virtues stressed in conduct manuals. It is also true that conduct manuals stipulated adopting an honouring or humbling attitude towards one’s superiors, and thus recognized certain forms of language as indexicals of deference. Deference through linguistic distinctions was bound up with inferiors’ practice of the Confucian ethics of ‘modesty’ and ‘respect’ in communicative interactions with their superiors in age or rank. However, polite demeanor in language use was not necessarily or primarily tied to a speaker showing a deferential attitude toward his or her interlocutors. What it meant to use language “politely” in social relations was
not conceived of primarily as a problem of speaking “up” or “down.” The informational or operational/behavioural aspects of communication drew more attention as indices of polite or courteous treatment toward interlocutors than did the act of marking politeness or deference through linguistic forms. Sections on language in conduct manuals reveal that the concept and performance of linguistic propriety demanded greater sensitivity to the contents of what people spoke about and to the demeanor and attitude with which they articulated it.

Not all of the linguistic elements were recognized as polite, even if native speakers were able to use the complex set of honorifics. Comments on the formal linguistic elements of speech etiquette were restricted to lexical items such as terms of address, personal pronouns, titles, and special words in epistolary practice depending on the social rank of correspondents. Most of the morpho-syntactic elements in the Korean language were not explicitly recognized as core constituents of linguistic norms of politeness except for a few limited cases such as the honorific suffixes -ssi and –nim, which again are specifically relevant for address and reference. That being said, the lack of normative discussions of honorific registers in premodern conduct manuals cannot simply be attributed to a lack of competence in the formal analysis of language. For instance, the sheer volume of letter writing manuals demonstrates a heightened interest in the rules of linguistic expression. Explicit discussions of using linguistic behaviour to signify a ‘deferential’ attitude in social relations were limited to particular speech contexts wherein a speaker (especially, a junior member) addressed or referred to his or her superiors. Concise and efficient speech, harmonization of speech and action, refraining from improper topics and malicious gossip, a gentle tone of voice and moderate pace of speaking, juncture, and pitch were all associated with multiple modes of politeness such as the speaker’s consideration, carefulness, sincerity, solicitude, gentleness, calmness, and kindness toward interlocutors. In this way,
‘deference’ was by no means uniquely identified as an essential mode of politeness enacted through the proper use of language.
Chapter 3: Politeness for Nation-state Building in Early Morals Education from the 1890s to 1909

3.1 Introduction

As Schmid (2002) has traced in his book *Korea between Empires*, the internal and external turmoil at the turn of the twentieth century propelled Korea to take action and search for strategies to find a place as a nation amid global forces and new discourses of civilization. Schmid (ibid., 4) describes the cultural strategies mobilized in identifying Korea as a nation-state as the dynamic “interplay between those internal and external forces that themselves constituted the nation.” Morals education between the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was not an exception. As noted in previous studies of morals education in Korea, the end result of these various and sometimes conflicting strategies for the formation of public education for the nascent modern-state was the simultaneous mobilization of traditional Confucian moral lessons and modern ethics for socio-national advancement.25

This chapter examines the historical emergence of new notions of (linguistic) politeness in modernizing Korea from the end of the 19th century to 1909, the eve of colonization by Japan. It aims to demonstrate the construction of ‘Confucian’ morality and civility as a constituent part of new national identities in the institutional and ideological project to create a nation-state (K. *kukka*) and its ideal citizens (K. *kungmin*). The examination of morals education manuals and related publications on politeness education from the 1890s to 1909 illuminates the nationalist visions of the state and of Korean intellectuals who aspired to construct collective identities by bringing the cultural values of politeness into play. Confucian morals, as represented by loyalty

---

and filial piety, retained their utility in cultivating the moral attitude of a national subject toward the nation and the emperor. At the same time, the demand for educating national citizens that accompanied the rise of urban modernity embraced notions of the public good, consideration towards others in public, and mutual respect beyond class structures.

How did the conduct manuals and morals textbooks bridge the discrepancies between sets of values based in a vertical social order and the newly emerging, more horizontal, social ideals? Unfortunately, virtually no research has been conducted on the reconceptualizations of ‘politeness’ in morals and/or manners education during the Korean Enlightenment Period (1894–1910). And yet, traditional concepts of propriety were in fact undergoing momentous transformations in tandem with the new ambition to mold citizens qualified for membership in a civilized and modern nation. The cultural identification of (linguistic) politeness norms was in fact closely related to nationalism and modernization–Westernization in the construction of the nation-state. The sum total of the realigned models of propriety in Confucian tradition and the emerging notion of civility amounted to a new and hybrid form of politeness necessary for building a nation-state.

This chapter proceeds as follows. Section 3.2 outlines the socio-political background of morals education in early modern Korea, that is, the rise of public education and the importance of self-cultivation (K. susin) under the state’s educational reforms for nation-building. Section 3.3 focuses on the old and new sources of morals education that were integrated into the institutional and ideological project of cultivating national morals and national citizens. Section
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26 As Norbert Elias has demonstrated in his seminal work titled *The Civilizing Process* (2000[1939]), European standards of manners or etiquette, including forms of speech, played a major role in the processes of Western European state formation and civilization. For the changes in the aims and nature of manners or etiquette in relation to class, gender, and new societal ideals in the historical contexts of early American and British societies, see, Carré (1994), Hemphill (1999), Klein (1989), etc.
3.4 examines the rationale behind the hybrid models of politeness as illustrated in conduct manuals, etiquette handbooks, and morals textbooks published for early modern education. Section 3.5 discusses how ambivalent norms of politeness between nationalizing and globalizing forces conspired to change normative accounts of linguistic politeness.

3.2 Morals Education and the Contruction of a Modern Nation-State

3.2.1 The Rise of Modern Education

Following the Treaty of Kanghwa with Japan in 1876, the Korean peninsula was integrated into the global order by signing a series of unequal treaties with the United States, Britain and Germany, etc. in the 1880s. The internal situation of Chosŏn was also at the mercy of the shifting power relations between the neighboring empires of China, Russia and Japan. The Chosŏn dynasty had to grapple with numerous cultural and political shifts. Morals education between the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was no exception; it emerged as a crucial instrument for building the nation-state and molding national citizens.

The Kabo Reforms\textsuperscript{27} (1894–1896) undertook to modernize the educational system. Modern education was initiated as a means for attaining national prosperity, by teaching modern technology and practical knowledge such as commerce, foreign languages or mining, modelled on the modern educational systems of Japan and Western nations (Ryu Pangnan 1998). Public elementary (lit. common) education (\textit{pot’ong kyoyuk}) was at the center of activities as the essential means for the enlightenment of the masses and as the foundation of power for the

\textsuperscript{27} Traditional customs such as early marriage, slavery, and the social status system were abolished as evils of the past dynasty, while notions of independence and liberty emerged as new values for civil society and obligations for national subjects. The Kabo Reforms aimed to mobilize the public to move away from the vestiges of feudal society and to familiarize themselves with new ways of living and thinking.
nation (Chŏng Hŭisuk 2005b). The Educational Authority (*Hangmu amun*) was launched in 1894 as the central authority in charge of educational policies. The centralization of public education allowed the state to assume top-down control over the inculcation of ideals and obligations in citizens in accordance with the state’s vision to civilize and discipline its citizens.28

Advances in print technology were an essential means for the popularization of knowledge. The rise of print capitalism and print media provided opportunities for the general public, regardless of region or social class, to come into contact with the global world at a reasonable price.29 A variety of publications was produced for educational purposes by both governmental organizations and private publishers. Among others, textbooks were an essential medium for disseminating cultural knowledge to the expanding group of school children enrolled in centralized institutional education.

Initiated by the state-led reforms (a.k.a. the Kabo Reforms; 1894–1896), morals education came under the purview of state policy starting from the Korean Enlightenment Period. The reformist government considered moral discipline *central* to national education. In the Royal Edict on Education *kyoyuk ipkuk chosŏ 敎育立國詔書* (1895) announced by King Kojong (r. 1863–1907), moral virtue (*tŏk 德*) was listed as one of the three primary focuses of the educational policies of the state, along with physical and intellectual training. The Edict suggests that national education led by the state embraced the task of morals cultivation as an

28 Hwang’s (2015) examination of educational policies and textbooks on self-cultivation or ethics demonstrates the state’s intervention in the naturalization of the social order and collectivity envisioned by the emerging modern-state through the inculcation of morality in public education. 29 The government’s central office of publication initiated the dissemination of enlightenment ideas and the nationalist movement by printing the state-sponsored newspaper and various translated or imported publications from abroad. In addition to newspapers and translated publications, various social organizations and commercial publishers mushroomed after 1905 and published magazines for many different groups, encyclopedias and books (e.g., scholarly works, handbooks and literary works).
instrument for nurturing the ideal qualities of the nation. As illustrated below, the Confucian principles of the Five Cardinal Relations were deemed to have a role to play in maintaining the order of modern society and in increasing societal happiness. The ultimate objective of public schooling was to nurture a talented, loyal, and patriotic subject who could contribute greatly to the revival of the country:

“[E]ducation has its own way, and first we must distinguish empty nomenclature from utility. Even if their literary prowess should surpass scholars of old and today, those who remain numb to the changes of the times in their reading and studies will be nothing more than useless pupils. We have now decided upon policy guidelines for education, and these are to reject empty nomenclature and adopt that which has practical use. The first is the cultivation of virtue: we must cultivate actual behaviours in accordance with the Five Cardinal Relations so as not to bring disorder to our rules; teach and propagate customs so as to maintain order in the world and promote happiness in society. [...] Thus we affirm that these are the three guiding principles of education. We hereby instruct the government to establish schools widely and train young talents so that you, my subjects, with your knowledge and learning can foster great contributions for the revival of the nation. I hereby enjoin you, my subjects, to cultivate your virtue, propriety and wisdom with a loyal and patriotic heart” (Quoted in Chŏng Hŭisuk 2005b, 53).

The government’s announcement of the educational system of public schooling (Sohakkyoryŏng 小學校令) in 1895 stated that primary education was the foundation of national education aimed at inculcating in children the common knowledge and skills required for daily life. From the onset of the national educational system, susin 修身 ‘self-cultivation’ in combination with yulli 倫理 ‘ethics’ constituted one of the mandatory school subjects for primary and secondary education along with reading, composition, math, physical education, etc. The general guidelines for primary education (Sohakkyo kyoč’ik taegang 小學校校則大綱) announced by the Hakpu in 1895 pronounced the cultivation of moral character as a primary obligation of national subjects for the pursuit of decent customs and dignity in society. Public schooling is a venue where behaviours of the ideal members of society and the acceptance of an
envisioned social order and collectivity are normalized and propagated under the state’s guidance (Hwang 2015, 168-169). The state’s school curriculum considered morals education important from the early stage of schooling, assigning 3 or 4 hours per week from primary to secondary public school for a school subject titled susin or yulli (Kim Minjae 2012, 218-219).

The rise of private schools was pioneered by native Koreans and foreign Christian missionaries starting from late 1880s. The Wŏnsan Academy is known as one of the first non-governmental modern schools founded in 1883 in Hamgyŏng Province (Sin Yongha 1980, 42-55; cited in Chŏng Chaegŏl 1990, 109). Protestant missionaries established a number of other early modern educational institutions in Korea, starting with Paejae Haktang founded by Methodist missionary Appenzeller (1858–1902) in 1886. It was also during the late 1880s when enlightenment thinkers and foreign missionaries called for women to be educated and established women’s schools (see Cho Kyŏngwŏn 1999).

Morals education gained momentum after the signing of the Japan-Korea Treaty of 1905 according to which Imperial Japan deprived Korea of its diplomatic sovereignty. Educational associations and learned societies such as the Taehan chaganghoe or ‘Korean Self-Strengthening Society’ and the Sinminhoe or ‘New People’s Association’ called for the cultivation of national power through patriotic and modern education (Dittrich 2014). Educational officials and scholars played a crucial role as the founders of the first private institutions for higher education. Posŏng School and Hwimun Academy were founded in 1905 and 1906, respectively, as two of the major private schools before the advent of colonial education. Both schools ran their own editorial offices and printing houses where they published textbooks under various authors’ or editors’ names.

30 Founded by Min Yŏnghwi (閔泳徽, 1852–1935) upon the order of King Kojong in northern Kyŏngsŏng, it operated its own printing office, Hwimun’gwan 徽文館, where a variety of textbooks was published not only for Hwimun Academy but for other institutions too.
As demonstrated above, morals education was incorporated into the national project as an ideological apparatus to instill and propagate the constructed narrative of social morality. One might reasonably assume that the reformist government endeavored to move away from Confucian dogma and set out a nationalist vision in tune with the global ideologies of capitalist modernity. Confucian-oriented morals might have been considered obsolete. However, the decline of Confucian studies did not lead to a wholesale discarding of the moral standards of the Confucian tradition. As Sŏ Kijae and Kim Sunjŏn (2006) have discussed, the idea of “modernization” (kŭndaehwa) does not include merely the tangible development of materialistic civilization; morals education gains its significance in the mental training of the nation. It was in such a practical context that morals education became integral to the process of inculcating ideal character in the minds of the subjects of an enlightened nation, and in this context, traditional Confucian morals still had a role to play.

With the centralized domination of educational policy and curriculum, school curricula were gradually replaced with those of the state’s public schools. Most private institutions were discontinued upon Japanese annexation in 1910. The Residency-General’s clampdown on private schools and the publication of textbooks expanded between 1908 and 1910. As a result, private Korean efforts on behalf of the nationalist movement through the circulation of morals textbooks were restricted. Only four out of twelve morals textbooks passed the textbook authorization system in 1910 (Kim Ponghŭi 1999, 104).

3.2.2 New Morals Textbooks for Public and Private Schools

As mentioned earlier, the reformist Korean government considered morals an essential part of national education. However, the concrete operation of morals education was not yet established between 1895 and 1905, due to the loose control of the state over public schooling, not to
mention the weak situation of textbook publishing. Because morals lessons and self-cultivation were a part of literary education in the premodern era, public schools carried out morals education mainly through elementary readers (tokpon) published by the Hakpu. According to the list of publications of the Hakpu, the following three textbooks were classified as government language textbooks out of the total number of twenty-four books published in 1896: *Kungmin sohak tokpon* ‘People’s Elementary Learning Reader’ (1895), *Sohak tokpon* ‘Elementary Learning Reader’ (1895), and *Sinjŏng simsang sohak* ‘Newly Corrected Everyday Elementary Learning’ (1896) (Ku Chahwang 2013, 511).

Early morals education in private schools operated with different curricula and textbooks. While some schools taught with traditional conduct books or the Bible, others did not assign morals education in their curriculum (Kim Yŏngu 1997, 128-129; cited in Kim Minjae 2012, 220). The publication of textbooks for private schools increased significantly between 1906 and 1909 when the Residency-General took over supervision of textbook publication for public schools (Kim Soyŏng 2011, 12-13). While textbooks for public schools were subject to oversight and censorship by the Japanese authorities after the announcement of the *Pot’ong hakkyo kyoyuk-ryŏng* ‘Ordinance of Common School Education’ in 1906, private schools had leeway to operate morals education within their own curriculum until the Residency-General imposed sanctions on private schools in 1908 (i.e., the Sarip hakkyo-ryŏng). The following is a list of textbooks published primarily for morals education in private schools:

---

31 Note that this list is primarily based upon morals textbooks that include discussions of (linguistic) politeness. Educational associations and individual scholars also wrote new-style readers (tokpon) which often included lessons in morals: e.g., *Ch’odŭng sohak* ‘The Elementary Learning for Elementary Schools’ (Taehan kungmin kyoyukhoe 1906); *Sinch’an ch’odŭng sohak* ‘The Elementary Learning for Elementary Schools (New Edition)’ (Hyŏn Ch’a’e, 1909), *Chomok p’ilchi* ‘Required Knowledge for Shepherds and Woodcutters’ (Chŏn Yunsu, 1909), etc.
One of the stark differences with traditional morals education texts was that these modern government textbooks emphasized, to different degrees, modern concepts and practical subjects, while a distinctly Confucian tone nonetheless pervaded many of the chapters. As the provision of modern education was far from ubiquitous, the morals textbooks published during this short period of time show both conservative and progressive tendencies regarding the conceptual and behavioural models of morals or ethics, often depending on their authors’ educational backgrounds. But both reform-oriented Confucianists and enlightenment reformers agreed that morals education should serve as the moral grounding of the nation. As stated in an article from the Taehan maeil sinbo (3 November 1906), morals education and textbooks were imperative for shaping patriotic character in students as well as educating them in modern knowledge. Morals education was perceived as a prerequisite to achieving the primary goals of the nation: patriotism and modernization for national self-reliance and independence.

The early government textbooks professed a sovereign state and a sense of connection to the modern world, while simultaneously evincing loyalty for the king and the monarchy (Kang

---

32 This textbook also exists under a different title and author name: Yŏja susin kyogwasŏ ‘Self-cultivation Manual for Girls in the Style of the Elementary Learning’ (No Pyŏnghŭi, 1909).
Chinho 2012; Ku Chahwang 2013; Yuh 2015). The ideal examples taken from historical figures in both the East and the West instilled general virtues for the improvement of moral rectitude such as diligence, hard work, kindness, and patriotism, and discouraged intemperance, laziness, dishonesty, etc. But above all, it was loyalty, filial piety, and obedience that the books encouraged most. In doing so, Confucian morals were appropriated as a vehicle for the construction of a nation-state and nationalism in Korea, by nurturing desirable moral qualities in familiar terms borrowed from traditional morals education.

It is also significant that the status of women as members of the kungmin citizenry facilitated the rise of modern female education in the early 20th century. In Lesson 52, titled “The Nation,” No Pyŏngsŏn (1909) associates an individual’s duty with the wealth and power of the nation. He also encourages women to be educated and disciplined, both morally and behaviourally, because their role as “mothers of the nation” is more important than that of men. Morals textbooks published for female education appear to rely faithfully on the Confucian models of propriety for the cultivation of ideal woman (See 3.4.1). However, the reproduction of Confucian gender roles did not simply suggest a retrieval or revival of Confucian morals in modern female education. Rather, the continued promotion of traditional Confucian duties for women needs to be understood in the ideological context of modern nationalism (Cho Kyŏngwŏn 1999; Song Inja 2007; Kim Sugyŏng 2011). Since national education emerged as a solution to break through the sense of national crisis, the education of women, including morals education, was interested in fostering female students as members of the nation who could join forces to aid and strengthen the emerging nation-state.

3.3 Pedagogical Resources for Conduct/Ethics Education
3.3.1 The Circulation of Traditional Conduct Literature

The popularity of premodern conduct manuals continued well into the early 20th century when a number of (mostly commercial) publishers began to spring up. The burgeoning number of conduct manuals was disseminated widely among people of all social classes in various formats: reprints, revisions, translations, or annotated versions. The development of printing technology made access to traditional conduct literature easier than ever before at a reasonable price. The following three kinds of premodern conduct books, including their reprints and revised editions, appeared:

A. New editions of the Elementary Learning: Haedong Sok Sohak ‘Latter-day Sohak of the Nation East of the Sea,’ ed. by Pak Chaehyŏng, 1912 (1884)
B. New versions of Sasojŏl34: Ch’ŏngjanggwan chŏnsŏ Sasojŏl (Yi Kwanggyu 1810), Sasojŏl (Ch’oe Sŏnghwan ed. 1853), Sāsojŏl ŏnhae (Cho T’aekhŭi, trans. 1870), Tongmong susinsŏ (Yi P’ung trans., 1908), Hyŏnt’o Sasojŏl (Annotated by Paek Tuyong in 1916), Sasojŏl chijŏl (Mun Wŏnman 1926), Sāsojŏl chijŏl (Excerpted by Ha Sŏngjae 1926)
C. New versions of Kyŏngmong yogyŏl: Sansu Kyŏngmong yogyŏl (Ch’oe Namsŏn, 1909), Kyŏngmong yogyŏl (T’ak Chonggil, 1911), Kyŏngmong yogyŏl (n.a., 1915), (Hyont’o chuhae) Kyŏngmong yogyŏl (Pak Kŏnhoe, 1916), Kyŏngmong yogyŏl (Paek Tuyong, 1922), Kyŏngmong yogyŏl (Kwŏn Osŏng 1928), etc.

The popularity and circulation of these old primers might simply indicate the taste of conservative groups stagnating in a time of change toward a modern and civilized society. It could also have been driven by increased demand from private education at home (sasuk) and in traditional village schools (sŏdang), or by popular education and even in modern private schools.35

33 See Ryu Pangnan (2003), Yi Chuyŏng (2008), Im Mijŏng (2009), Han Migyŏng (2014, 2015), etc.
34 See Han Migyŏng (2015) for details about the existing editions of Sasojŏl (1775).
35 The major conduct books for children from Chosŏn like Sohak ‘Elementary Learning’ continued to be printed for primary education at home or in private classes, or for general readers in the tradition of Literary Sinitic (hanmun) and Confucianism. The expansion of village schools
Traditional conduct literature was still in demand even when the importation of modern ideologies and studies were deemed urgent and when Confucian ideals seemed impractical and unsuitable to the current situation. However, it is important to understand that the motives underlying the revival of premodern conduct books were different from earlier times. Unlike in the premodern era, morals education for the modern Korean nation-state at the turn of the 20th century no longer aimed at cultivating a Confucian ideal man (kunja). The primary concern was to cope with the current crisis and more forward into the future rather than trying to establish an ideal Confucian society of the past. Insofar as there were values or motivations for individual readers and educational institutions to consider Confucian morals valid, these provided sufficient justification to maintain (or repackage) the traditional moral code.

For instance, Chosŏn Neo-Confucianists attempted to re-invent the universal laws of the Confucian legacy within the context of native history while nonetheless following the structure and messages of Sohak to a certain extent. In particular, the sequels to Sohak published from the mid-18th century to 1920 replaced the Chinese-origin model stories in the original text with quotes from the sages in Korean history ranging from the Three Kingdoms period to Chosŏn or even from unofficial Korean historical tales (yadam).36 Besides, the two prefaces to Haedong Sok Sohak (1884), one of the sequels edited by Pak Chaehyŏng (1838–1900), hint at a sense of

---

36 A great number of annotated editions, vernacular translations and edited volumes of the Sohak (1187) had been produced in the process of seeking a more precise understanding of the text already from the early Chosŏn period (Kim Minjae 2012, 233). Neo-Confucian scholars in Chosŏn also created sequels to the Sohak with ‘Chosŏn coloring’ (Chosŏn-saek) added to the original text, starting already from the 18th century onward (No Kwanbŏm 2001).
pride in the Confucian culture of Chosŏn as follows: “The rites and music (yeak 禮樂) as well as the material civilization (munmul 文物) of our native country (referred to as haedong 海東 ‘East of the Sea’ or adong 我東 ‘Our East’) are comparable to those of China moŭi Chunghwa 模擬中華” (cited from Song Chunsik 1988, 4). National knowledge was divorced from Sinocentrism as a more “Koreanised” version of the Sohak was absorbed into moral education in modern schools in the early 20th century.37

Secondly, Confucian texts from the premodern era were popularized as modern primary textbooks for the general public, which traditionally lay at the peripheries of school education (particularly women and children). Take the example of the transformation of Yi Tŏngmu’s family precepts (Sasojŏl, 1775) into a primary textbook for morals education. Although historical records prove that the manuscript originals of Sasojŏl circulated little beyond Yi Tŏngmu’s family, it was Ch’oe Sŏnghwan (1813–1891) who edited and widely distributed the text out into the broader society with the purpose of enlightening the masses in 1853 (Kwŏn Chŏngwŏn 2012, 44; Han Migyŏng 2014, 2015). According to an advertisement for the book published in Hwangsŏng sinmun (from 1908-09-02 to 1908-10-08), the vernacular translation of the section on children’s manners (Tonggyu) in Sasojŏl was published with the title Tongmong Susinsŏ 童蒙修身書 as a “wondrous work of instruction to awaken the mind of children” (童心 ŭl 警覺 hănăn 妙訣) (Kim Ponghŭi 1999, 137; Kwŏn Chŏngwŏn 2012, 53-54). Even after this textbook was

37 For instance, Kodŭng sohak susinsŏ (Hwimun Academy, 1908) cited model stories from the Haedong Sok Sohak (1884). In 1912, Kwangmunhoe, the major publisher dedicated to publishing Chosŏn-era classics for mass enlightenment, re-printed Haedong Sok Sohak with a preface by Choe Namsŏn (1890–1957). As late as 1972, the translated edition of Haedong Sok Sohak was distributed again with the support of the South Korean government as one of the must-reads for secondary students (Pak Munhyŏn 1997, 15).
banned by the Government-General of Korea (GGK) in 1911, more editions were published commercially inside and outside of the capital during the 1910s and 1920s.

Moreover, Confucian lessons and precepts were not simply repeated but “re-created” with merits valid for contemporary society as part of the process of establishing modern morals education. The distribution of the revised edition of Yi I’s _Kyŏngmong Yogyŏl_ (1577) in 1909 is an excellent example of an old Confucian text gaining new cultural value as a component of moral civilization (Yun Yŏnsil 2008; Im Sangsŏk 2010, 2011). Ch’oe Namsŏn (1890–1957), one of the prominent writers and torchbearers of modernization during the pre-colonial and colonial periods, founded the publishing house Sinmun’gwan in 1908 and disseminated his edited version of this text, _Sansu kyŏngmong yogyŏl_ (1909), as one of the company’s first series of books.38 Ch’oe accounted for the utility of Confucian morals in his acknowledgement (sik 識) as follows: “Morality changes in accordance with times; thus it is uncertain what will happen to other writings hereafter. However, the two chapters, “Establishing one’s purpose in life” (Ipchi 立志) and “Breaking through old customs” (Kyŏkkusŭp 擊舊習), will stand eternally as spiritual sustenance (chŏngsin ŭi yangsik) for our young people” (cited in Im Sangsŏk 2011, 59).

Similarly, the discovery of Confucian “tradition” is also observable from the advertisement of the _Sansu kyŏngmong yogyŏl_ printed in _Sonyŏn_ (Youths, November 1908), the first children’s magazine issued by Ch’oe Namsŏn (cited in Yim Sangsŏk 2011, 61). The editor defines the notion of ‘civilization’ (munmyŏng 文明) as the coordinated development of the qualities virtue (tŏk 德), body (ch’e 體), and knowledge (chi 知), and continues with a lament about the shameful situation whereby Confucian classics—referred to as “gems in the rough”

---

38 This translation project, known as “Sipchŏn ch’ŏngsŏ” (Library of Ten-cent Editions), aimed to impart vigorous lessons to young pupils with minimal effort and cost, creating a series of literary classics from Chosŏn’s Literary Sinitic historical tradition (Im Sangsŏk 2011, 54, fn. 2).
(pagok 璞玉)—were thrown to the ground like an “old shoe” or “rag” (nudŏgi). But the editor asserts that Confucian teachings such as the Sansu kyŏngmong yogvŏl can provide boys of the new Korea (Sin Taehan) with precious lessons to cultivate correct minds. This rhetoric shows how the Confucian past, which had in many ways already outlived its day, could be repackaged as a moral tradition worthy of the new frame of reference of the time, “civilization.” Confucian morals were rearranged and re-created as valuable lessons for Korean youth under Japanese colonialism so that they might pioneer the future of their ethnic nation (cf. Yun Yŏngsil 2008, 119-120).

The interest in Confucian-based morals cultivation remained as an extension of the operation of the new modern education system, and premodern conduct literature regained cultural value as a spiritual asset and native tradition to strengthen the moral foundations of society. The Confucian tradition of cultivation was at the basis of mental civilization. As Schmid (2002, 11) points out, enlightenment of the masses was as Eastern as it was Western. However, simply pouring old wine into a new bottle would not suffice; traditional notions of education for individuals’ cultivation were employed as a cultural strategy to establish the Korean Empire as a nation-state. The value of the subject matter itself (Confucian morals in this case) needed to be re-shaped to serve the expectations in the new context as a sort of moral anchor.

39 In order to create the Sansu Kyŏngmong yogvŏl as an effective moral lesson for the new world, Ch’oe took the liberty of reshaping the original text by selecting certain sections to highlight qualities that seemed necessary for self-reliance: deciding one’s purpose in life (ipchi), breaking through old customs (kyŏkkusŭp), etc. Ch’oe also presented his vernacular translations of selected portions of the original text in tandem with famous maxims from Western countries to show the commonalities between East and West.
3.3.2 The Importation of Moral Standards

In addition to the integration of premodern conduct literature into morals education for the patriotic enlightenment movement, the adoption of new knowledge was another source of enlightenment from the late 19th century. In fact, imported texts from Japan and China were an integral means of mass education at a time when Korean textbooks were still unavailable (Kim Ponghŭi 2006, 108-120). Translating foreign texts was an urgent task of the time so as to create a gateway to learning modern knowledge from “civilized” nations. On top of scientific and practical studies, the foreign textbooks suggested the utility of moral studies as moral and ethical training to reinforce social stability and national power. Moral textbooks were introduced to facilitate the formation of morals education for society and nation, enlightening the masses on the desired qualities and manners of the nation.

Ethics or morals as a subject of modern studies unfolded on the Korean peninsula through the importation of morals texts mostly from China and (especially) Japan (Kim Ponghŭi 2006; Kim Soyŏng 2011). The reformist government and progressive educators attempted to attain the cultural identity of a “civilized” nation in the world by importing the latest manners of the world through translations to educate schoolchildren and/or the general public. For instance, the Sŏrye p’yŏn’go 西禮便考 ‘Handy Study of Western Propriety’ (Yi Ch’ŏlchu, ed., 1909[1896]) is known as one of the earliest Western etiquette handbooks to be published by the Hakpu, and indicates an initiative on the part of the reform government to modernize the nation (Kim Ponghŭi 1999, 146). The total number of 17 chapters (46 pages) outline dos and don’ts across a wide range of social interactions, including: how to introduce people, visits, welcoming someone, greetings, eating, clothing, writing letters, speaking, smoking, enjoying oneself at a party, etc.

Translating morals textbooks was also part of the collaborative effort of Korean intellectuals after Korea became a Protectorate of Japan in 1905. This was a time when Korean
intellectuals’ longing for education reached a climax as an essential part of the so-called “Patriotic Enlightenment” or “Education to Save the Nation” movement (Dittrich 2014, 268). For instance, An Chonghwa (1860–1924), a nationalist historian and educator, published his translation of the Chinese morals textbook Ch’odŭng yullihak kyogwasŏ ‘Elementary Ethics Textbook’ (1907). Originally authored by Wu Shang 吳尙 (?–?), An’s translation was published along with a version made by another nationalist educator, Wŏn Yŏngŭi (元泳義, 1852–1928). Likewise, the advocacy of national identity in the Japanese model of national education inspired Korean nationalist intellectuals such as Sin Haeyŏng (申海永, 1865–1909) who studied in Japan on a government sponsorship (Yun Yŏngsil 2008). He translated and edited the Japanese elementary morals textbook, the Shinpen Rinri kyōkasho ‘New Textbook on Ethics’ (1897), written by Inoue Tetsujirō (井上哲次郎, 1855–1944) and Takayama Chogyū (高山樗牛, 1871–1902).40 Sin’s translation, Yullihak Kyogwasŏ (1906), was published as a morals textbook for Posŏng Middle School where Sin worked as the principal.

In particular, the cultural representation of Confucian history as the moral character for the nation in Korea appears to have been modelled after or stimulated by Japan (cf. Schmid 2002, 13-14). The Meiji Imperial Rescript on Education41 (kyōiku chokugo) tried to re-vitalize the

40 Inoue Tetsujirō was one of the influential philosophers of the day who played a leading role in theorizing and popularizing the political ideology of national education. It was German nationalism that had inspired Inoue while he studied in Germany for six years. After returning to Japan, he compiled the Tetsugaku jii 哲学字彙 ‘Dictionary of Philosophy’ (1881), in which he introduced the Western concept of ‘ethics’ in relation to Confucian Classics and translated it as rinri-gaku ‘the study of ethics’ (Koyasu 2011[2007], 137-138). As the author of the Chokugo engi 動語御義 (1891), the official commentary on the Imperial Rescript on Education, Inoue co-authored the morals textbook Shinpen rinri kyōkasho (1897) with Takayama Chogyū, a prominent novelist and an advocate of kokutai or ‘national polity’ thought.

41 The Imperial Rescript on Education illustrates the colonial government’s policy of focusing on people’s loyalty as the “essence of national polity” 国体の精華 (kokutai no seika). Centered on
moralistic teachings of Japanese Confucianism on loyalty and filial piety and to cultivate school children’s loyalties to the emperor and his nation (Koyama 2004a, 426). This particular type of cultural knowledge of “national ethics” in Koreans’ own rethinking of the nation was borrowed from Meiji Japan (1868–1912). Modelled after the proclamation of the Imperial Edict on Education of 1890, the Korean Empire applied a similar scheme for its own national education purposes in 1895, seizing upon the Confucian model of morals education centering on loyalty and filial piety as national ethics (Sŏ Kijae and Kim Sunjŏn 2006, 475).

The new models of modern–Western codes of morals and conduct also entered the Korean peninsula through Japan. Chin Hŭisŏng⁴² 陣熙星 (dates unknown) published the Pot’ong kyoyuk kungmin ŭibŏm 普通教育國民儀範 ‘Models for National Etiquette in Common Education’ (1908), the Korean translation of a Japanese textbook of the Tokyo School of Education, the Futsū kyōiku girei kyōhan 普通敎育儀禮教範 ‘Models for Etiquette in Public Education’ (n.d.) (Chin Hŭisŏng trans. 1908, Preface). As indicated by the book title in the Korean edition, this manual was published specifically to educate Korean nationals. The author remarks in his preface that this handbook of daily manners in the East and the West was published as a textbook or reference work for use in Korean schools or at home. The advertisement for this text in the Capital Gazette (Hwangṣŏng sinmun; 30 August 1908) presents loyalty to Imperial Japan and its emperor, this document specifically enumerates a list of exemplary virtues for the people to cultivate, starting from the Confucian-based ideology of the Five Cardinal Human Relations to various civic duties for the society and nation such as promotion of common interests, abiding by the law, and fidelity to one’s country. The people’s commitment to these “virtues” was encouraged as evidence of faithful subjectionhood and as a demonstration of their ancestor’s heritage. The Imperial Edict on Education reveals at the end that the point of cultivating filial piety, harmony, affection, modesty, frugality, study, and social obligations is the expectation for people to become “loyal subjects” and to “manifest their ancestors’ traditions.”

⁴² Chin Hŭisŏng went to Japan in 1895 to study at the Keiō Gijuku Institute as a government-sponsored student. After his return to Korea, he worked for the Posŏng School press as translator of a few Japanese textbooks into Korean.
this etiquette book as part of endeavours to promote cultural civilization, anticipating the need for “civilizing ceremonial rules” (munmyŏng ŭi ŭirye) in order to get away from criticisms of “being abject and rough” and to enter the “orbit of civilization.”

In terms of public discourses on moral cultivation, Fukuzawa Yukichi’s (福澤諭吉, 1835–1901) ‘Outline of Self-cultivation’ (Shūshin yŏryŏ 修身要領, 1900; K. Susin yoryŏng) was circulated among Koreans from 1909 (Yun Yŏngsil 2008, Song Hyegyŏng 2012; Im Sangsŏk 2011, 2015). Unlike the loyalty-oriented model of morals education supported by the Japanese government and Inoue Tetsujirō, the “Shūshin yŏryŏ” includes twenty-nine items on “new morals for men and women of the new era” to pursue for the attainment of a civilized society (Song Hyegyŏng 2012, 179-182). The practical values and behaviours featured in the book are the modern ideals for individual, family, society and nation in pursuit of the nation’s self-reliance (tongnip chajon 獨立自存); for example, labor, gender equality, mutual respect, learning, etc. In particular, the 18th item on manners/etiquette (yeyŭi pŏpto 礼儀法度) notes that expressions of respect and affection (kyŏngae 敬愛) are an essential duty for interpersonal interactions but should not be excessive. The “new morals” from Japan were reported in magazines and newspapers inside and outside of the Korean peninsula as part of a narrative of self-reliance for the Korean people (Song Hyegyŏng 2012, 185-187). Ch’oe Namsŏn, who translated the code of conduct with his annotations in 1909, published it in his magazine, Sonyŏn ‘Youths,’ as the first article in a series projected to enlighten the young generation. He distributed a book version of this text for a reasonable price with an advertisement in the Sonyŏn
which introduced it as the “new morals for ladies and gentlemen of the new era” (Song Hyegyŏng 2012, 183).

The importation of foreign texts offered insights for Korean educators into morals education on the Korean peninsula as a foundation for social stability and national independence. Translations of foreign texts played a crucial role in shaping national identities with regard to who Koreans were and what they wanted amidst the rapid changes at the turn of the century. Confucian lessons gained modern value as the moral basis for the nation as they were re-assessed as moral obligations for both society and nation and as the moral “tradition” or “civilization” of the East. The importation of Western manners, mostly via Japan, also offered a brand-new approach to conceptual and behavioural models of civilization. Seen as a necessity for any enlightened and civilized nation, Western manners were eagerly studied by Koreans for adaptation on the Korean peninsula.

3.4 The Hybridity of Politeness during the Enlightenment Period

It is evident that both vertical and horizontal concepts of politeness coexisted (and intermingled) in morals education after the educational reforms in 1895. Take the example of the Sinjŏng simsang sohak ‘Newly Corrected Everyday Elementary Learning’ (1896), one of the initial textbooks published by the Hakpu (Educational Authority). Unit 9, on “Propriety, Trust, and Benevolence” (Vol. 2), describes the concept of ‘propriety’ ye 礼 as the two kinds of obligations incumbent upon a human being: the act of showing ‘respect’ to others (konggyŏng) and ‘love’

43 In order to disseminate it for use in Korean society, Ch’oe’s translation omitted respect for the Japanese Emperor and the royal family and added this same “Susin yoryŏng” as an appendix to the Sansu Kyŏngmong yogyŏl, his edited version of Yi Yi’s Kyŏngmong yogyŏl (Im Sangsŏk 2011, 75 fn. 34). As Im Sangsŏk (2011, 2015) discusses, Ch’oe re-created and updated the value of the classic Confucian text as a valid tradition by juxtaposing the Kyŏngmong yogyŏl with the Japanese modern code of conduct.
(sarang) toward fellow human beings. These two axes suggest more than a fleeting transitional phenomenon in Korea from premodern to modern society. What motivated these two notions of politeness as part of modern morals education in the emerging nation-state?

3.4.1 From Confucian Propriety to National Ethics

Modernizing the nation was not just about Western learning or “Westernization.” The reformist government of Korea under King Kojong turned to Confucian ethics as the most ideal and valid moral basis for public education in support of the emerging nation-state (See 3.2.1 Chapter 3:). The new morals textbooks published for public schooling during the Enlightenment period invoked Confucian values, and conventional conduct manuals from the premodern era continued to be printed and consumed. Early textbooks such as Sohak tokpon 小學讀本 ‘Elementary Learning Reader’ (Hakpu 1895) were primarily based on stories of great men and heroes from Chinese and Korean history to serve as models for children to learn from. Of course, the Confucian models of propriety no longer aimed to discipline the public to realize a Confucian order in society. Confucian education was justified as an extension of one of the most important and primary components of traditional morals education, rather than as a completely new subject, by keeping whatever features were perceived as advantageous and dispensing with anything seen as disadvantageous to cultivating good character and good conduct (Chang Ùngjin 1907, 6-7; cited in Kim Soyŏng 2011, 14).

Confucian-centered ethics were elevated to national ethics with the commencement of morals education after the policy reforms in 1895. In particular, the Confucian virtues of loyalty and filial piety shifted to serve as a rationale for the creation of national citizens (kungmin 國民) in collectivist morals education which required allegiance to the nation and monarch (Pak
After Korea became a protectorate of Imperial Japan as a result of the Japan-Korea Treaty of 1905, morals textbooks published for private schools were actively engaged in proclaiming loyalty and filial piety as the core of national ethics. The introductory passage (ch'ongnon) to the Chungdŭng susin kyogwasŏ (Hwimun Academy p’yŏnjippu, ed., 1906) below offers a good example:

“The mores of our country stand on the basis of loyalty and filial piety. Thus, all morality derives from serving one’s parents with devotion and being loyal to the king. This is what our ancestors have observed for generations, a permanent truth. […] Since filial piety is the source of all virtues, those who do everything for their parents are loyal to their king.”

The most fundamental morals of Korea encompassed social duties connecting the family to the nation-state. The articulation of Confucian morality represented by loyalty and filial piety instilled “the proper spiritual orientation of hierarchy, duty, and loyalty (to one’s country and monarch)” (Hwang 2015, 184). The authenticity and authority of loyalty and filial piety as the foundation of national ethics were invoked by appealing to a tradition preserved for generations as an immutable historical truth.

What is worth paying attention to here is the rhetoric of Confucian ethics in the service of new socio-political interests. The Confucian models of propriety were not merely the remnants of premodern customs driven by conservative forces who adhered to the traditional style. Neither were they a mere recycling of tradition or a seamless and natural transition toward a modern society. The continuity of traditional ethics intersecting with modern ideologies in education suggests that, to educational reformers, the pre-existing morals were worth preserving as an intellectual asset or moral resource—not necessarily as old-fashioned and impractical views to reject (Kim Sugyŏng 2011, 133-134). The “old wine in a new bottle” was deemed valid for inculcating in individual members of society the values required by society and the state (Yuh
Virtuous qualities originating in Confucian models of propriety appeared in the collectivist morals textbooks insofar as the models of morally upright individuals contributed to the cultivation of desired members of society and the nation.

Similarly, female virtues of gentleness, patience and obedience are equivalent to the traditional Confucian lessons on filial piety and the four virtues cast as “ladies’ virtue” or pudŏk 婦德, all of which were still regarded as valid ideals for virtuous women in the early 20th century. For instance, No Pyŏngsŏn (1909, 77-78) finds the purpose of morals education for female students to be in cultivating a “good” girl, mother, mother-in-law, daughter, and so forth, as selected from the Confucian Five Cardinal Moral Rules (oryun 五倫) in human relations.

Below is an except from Unit 10 “Manners” (ryeŏjŏl 禮節) of the Nyŏja sohak syusinsŏ (Ibid., 14-15):

“As for manners, again, to become a gentle wife in particular, serve [your] parents-in-law as [you] would always do to [your] own parents, and never go against [your] parents-in-law’s will. Reply politely when [your] parents-in-laws summon you; respect them by serving food first; pay attention to their voices when they ask you to work. Do not lose [your] temper even if you feel distressed, keep your countenance peaceful, and talk in a polite manner [...]”

Manners for female members as promulgated in the textbook above teach how to serve one’s parents-in-law and echo the ideals for women from premodern Confucian conduct manuals. The roles of the ideal woman in society were still seen as taking care of her parents(-in-law), educating her children, and managing household tasks as well as maintaining peace and harmony in family relations; this much was more or less unchanged from traditional Confucian ideals. Indeed, this conservative attitude continued in both traditional and newer forms of female conduct literature circulating into the 1920s and 1930s (Im Mijŏng 2009).
As seen above, Confucian ethics were reimagined among Korean educators, officials and intellectuals as an indigenous form of national ethics as part of the vision to establish a modern nation-state. The collective identity of the population offered a rationale for legitimizing the moral imperatives to nurture kungmin who would be obedient and loyal to the building of a modern nation centered on its monarch. Likewise, textbooks published for female education during the patriotic enlightenment period recognized women as a potential resource for achieving the nationalist project. The code of ethics and conduct for an ideal noble woman in the Korean Confucian tradition was granted a new function as the duties and ideal qualities of all women of the modern nation as members of the kungmin.

It is interesting to note that the narratives of loyalty and filial piety in morals textbooks in early Korean modern education relied on imported works from Meiji Japan. The reconfiguration of the Confucian legacy into a form of patriotic nationalism was introduced in modern education in Korea through translations of Japanese morals textbooks in the process of adopting Western knowledge (Sin Ilch’ol 1986; Kim Soyŏng 2008; 2011). In particular, the Yullihak kyogwasŏ 1-4 ‘A Textbook on Ethics’ (Sin Haeyŏng, trans., 1906), is one of the early morals textbooks that served as a model morals textbook for modern Korean private schools. Known as the Korean translation of the Shinpen Rinri kyŏkasho 1-5 (Inoue and Takayama 1897), the YK resonates with the conception of Confucian moral culture as the grounding of national ethics.44

For instance, the Introduction (ch’ongnon, vol. 1) to the crux of ethics links the Confucian tradition of cultivation of body and mind to moral obligations of the kokumin for the society and nation. It stipulates loyalty and filial piety as lying at the heart of Confucian duties, a notion that Sin altered into “the educational basis of the Korean Empire,” rather than the Empire

44 The YK introduces Sin Haeyŏng as the person who “edited” (p’yŏnsul) this book; we can presume that he made changes in key terms and contents in order to adapt the text to the Korean context. See Kim Soyŏng (2011) for more details.
of Japan. Vol. 2 gives more details about the relationship between filial piety and loyalty as the essence of national ethics. Firstly, the identification of the family as a microcosm of the nation allows for a pseudo-familial relationship between the royal family and the kungmin. In Chapter Two on duties to one’s parents (vol. 2), the metaphorical status of the royal family as ancestors and as parents normalizes loyalty to the monarch as an extension of filial piety to one’s parents and ancestors.

Moreover, the duty of loyalty gains legitimacy by romanticizing and essentializing filial piety and respect for one’s ancestors. The same section mentioned above admires filial piety as “the quintessence of our nation” because the “beautiful custom of Oriental culture” has remained the same since ancient days, with loyalty to the king forming the basis of honorable duties, particularly in “our” nation. The same passage invites readers to value and preserve filial piety as follows:

“Nowadays, ever since material goods have started being imported from all manner of nations east and west, filial piety has come gradually to be held in contempt; this is by no means a happy matter for celebration for the nation. Along with picking out and adapting the strong points of foreign nations, we should take pains to preserve our own praiseworthy indigenous customs (koyuhan mip ’ung).”

Similarly, Chapter Six on duties to one’s family (vol. 2) notes these as an indigenous custom of “our nation.” The concluding chapter on national ethics in the last volume of the YK (vol. 4) asserts again that the “indigenous morals” of loyalty and filial piety ought to be the moral basis for the nation as they are best suited and beneficial to the specific nature of the country.

The Preface to the Shinpen Rinri kyōkasho (ibid., I-4) clearly states that morals education is an urgent task for children who are to become kokumin or ‘national citizens’ and therefore aims to instill the spirit of kokumin on the basis of the Imperial Rescript on Education. The idea of kokutai ‘national polity; national identity’ developed with the expectation of uniting national
subjects under the Japanese emperor by instilling allegiance to the nation and the emperor (Kim Soyŏng 2008, 275-277). The ultimate goal of the promotion of kokutai was to construct a strong modern nation-state that could compete with the Great Powers of the West, a notion that appealed to Korean intellectuals with a similar vision for their own country in crisis. Korean intellectuals who were familiar with the nationalist movement in Japan embraced loyalty and filial piety as national ethics. The YK was translated in these circumstances with the similar goal of creating kokumin and inculcating in them the duties of cooperative patriotism and allegiance to the nation.

In short, loyalty and filial piety were purposefully selected from the cultural store of knowledge of Confucian propriety and elevated to the status of national ethics. They were rearranged as the primary obligations of individual members for their society and nation. The core of Confucian morals, characterized as loyalty and filial piety, gained representative status as the moral grounding for “our country.” The national modernization of modern Japan during the Meiji Restoration appears to have inspired the prominence of Confucian ethics in the construction of the national identity of the Korean Empire, even though the Korean peninsula had its own long cultural history along similar lines.

3.4.2 The Promotion of Public Spirit

While filial piety and loyalty were reconfigured as the national foundation of moral tradition, ‘civility’ in the context of discussions of etiquette or manners that appeared in morals textbooks—mostly with section titles like yeyang 禮讓 ‘comity,’ yeŭi 禮儀 ‘politeness,’ or 禮法 ‘code of decorum’—tended to align with the new concept of manners or etiquette encompassing standards of refined and favorable social behaviour. Unlike Confucian morality, ‘civility’ was deemed as something lacking in Korean society, but nevertheless essential to achieving the
state’s mission of becoming a civilized society. Therefore, civility took pride of place alongside morals education as a necessity and indeed the centerpiece for getting along with others in social relations.

What did it mean exactly to behave like a civilized citizen? One of the initial references to the modern approach to politeness in the CSK (Hwimun Academy, ed., 1906) suggests a social code of consideration and respect for others. Unit 16 of the CSK 2, under the category of duties for the management of life (ch’ŏse 處世), discusses one of the key terms relevant to the notion of civility: yeŭbŏp 禮法 ‘code of decorum.’ The practice of public etiquette or manners for the convenience of others and the public included: yielding one’s seat or giving way to others on public transportation such as trains and steamships or on the street, particularly for the elderly and children; refraining from causing public discomfort and disturbance; respecting elders and not disdaining people in a lower position. The promotion of yeŭbŏp was rationalized as a barometer of civilized society and as a tool for facilitating public order and peace in society.

The notion of civility as a combination of the social rules of a civilized society necessary for keeping public order and as something understood to emanate from consideration and respect towards others and the public by extension, can be found in discussions of yeŭi ‘politeness’ and kyŏmyang ‘modesty’ in textbooks. For example, Unit 25 (CSK 1), under a section about social relations with friends, advises readers to be cautious and respectful of others in order to keep social relations amicable. Concerning the “ways for perfection of social intercourse,” this unit underlines yeŭyang 禮讓 ‘comity’ in addition to sincerity and cooperation. “Comity” includes an understanding of speech and behaviour as embodiments of one’s sincere, respectful and considerate mind toward the benefits and feelings of others. Similar to the notion of yeŭbŏp, the
social value of “comity” brought into focus the concept of kongdŏksim 公德心 ‘public spirit’ as something beneficial for communal life.

Despite the Confucian tradition of propriety that had been treasured for centuries, morals textbooks for modern private schools criticized the lack of rules of etiquette in Korea and advocated ‘civility’ as an essential desideratum for Korean society. Unit 102 “Yeŭi” 禮儀 in the Kodŭng sohak susinsŏ 1 (Hwimun Academy, ed., 1907) explains the lack of yeŭi as a particularly troubling issue in contemporary Korea. It goes on to say why there are few people with decent manners, even when they are educated, as follows (74-75):

“If somebody is overly casual, departs from formality, and is unreserved in his behaviour, they call it ‘refined,’ and if somebody wears threadbare clothes and a dirty face, they say they are frugal and thrifty, while those who sit silent and rigid, even when happy or angry, they call self-assured.”

The above passage suggests that the formal code of propriety rooted in the old Confucian tradition of propriety was no longer valued as a legitimate cultural practice at the time of reforms and modernization, even while loyalty and filial piety were cherished as the basis for national ethics. In sharp contrast to this, the writer denounces the disregard of small manners as “crude, careless, low and unsophisticated (chosol piya 粗率卑野)” habits.

As noted in Unit 16 (CSK 2, 1906), empty formalities were clearly despised for being phony and deleterious to one’s character (p’umsŏng 品性). Unit 25 (CSK 1, 1906) urges people to keep a distance from insincere and flattering behaviour. Why would decent attire and speech manners still be necessary if rules of etiquette were underappreciated as “petty rules of etiquette?” (Hwimun Academy ed. 1906, 27) The author advocates decent appearance and
attitude as a way to keep one’s demeanor gentle and to uphold the dignity of others. Most importantly, the author’s lament that his country will not be able to enter into the ranks of civilized society with its “unrefined and careless” customs illustrates that the demand for polishing proper manners is embedded within the desire for a modern society. It was for this reason that morals textbooks in modern education advocated manners or etiquette even though some works spoke little of the “petty rules of etiquette.”

Japanese morals textbooks also inspired Korean intellectuals to adopt the virtue of ‘civility’ as a form of cultural knowledge imported from the outside world through translated texts. For instance, some of the chapters on yeŭi ‘politeness’ in the YK (also dubbed variously as yejŏl ‘manners,’ yeyang ‘comity,’ or yemun ‘etiquette’) appear similar to and even identical with those from Korean morals textbooks used in private schools mentioned above. The notion of ‘politeness’ was conceptualised as public morals which facilitate smooth social interactions. Chapter Three (vol. 1) on the necessity of yeŭi in the YK advises students to be watchful and anxious about becoming dissipated and careless, because one’s mind would otherwise follow such rough and loud behaviours. As illustrated in the CSK (1906), the fundamental notion of the essence of yeŭi and modesty (kyŏmyang) is based on smooth management of interpersonal relations by being considerate of others: e.g., Unit Twenty-five (vol. 1) and Unit Sixteen (vol. 2).

The interpersonal duty to maintain smooth relations was understood as a tool for maintaining social order. The utilitarian approach to the notion of politeness often critiques those who disparage empty formalities as lacking sincerity. In Chapter Three (vol. 3), a section on “comity” (yeyang) and “etiquette” (yemun), the rationale behind comity (yeyang) focuses on

---

45 To add authority to the demand for proper manners, the author also quotes a Chosŏn scholar, Chŏng Ku (鄭逑, 1543–1620) who endorsed prudence in one’s conduct as the standard for a learned man. The Ch’odŭng susin (Pak Chŏngdong, 1909) carries the almost identical passage in Unit Nineteen “Politeness” (Yeŭi).
amicable relations in society and likens them to a “lubricant that smooths the axle of a wheel.”

The following quote in this section evinces concerns about criticisms of the notion of politeness from public voices who undervalue manners as futile formalities: “[some say], ‘a great man should not adhere to small manners, so why would I pay any mind to petty manners and demeanor?” This passage appears in the KSS (Hwimun Academy, ed., 1907) and the CS (Pak Chŏngdong 1909) slightly later. While empty formalities are denounced as servile and flattering behaviour, filthy clothes and bare feet on the street illustrate bad manners because they make others unhappy. Thus, the declining interest in etiquette nonetheless regained support even though formal customs were no longer valued as they used to be.

Furthermore, the YK urges the necessity of politeness for the construction of a civilized society. The same section (Chapter Three) points out that proper looks and demeanor are a matter of particular importance because there are few gentlemen (sinsa 紳士) in Korea. It criticizes those who are unwilling to take care in their looks and behaviour, framing the negligence of decorum and etiquette as the crude manners of a culturally low-level society. This section concludes as follows:

“If [we] behave in this manner, how could we avoid being rough, careless, vulgar, and savage when we become the gentlemen of a civilized nation? It will not do to favor sweet flattery and kowtow obsequiously, but respect for the feelings of others and the promotion of the happiness of the general public through the adoption of an appropriate demeanor in one’s tasks is therefore an indispensable form of etiquette (yemun) in civilized society.”

The advocacy of etiquette above reveals that morals education sought to set high standards of behaviour ultimately as a vehicle for modern “civilization” (mumyŏng). Western manners were adopted as a barometer of modern civilization. Chapter Three (vol. 3) asserts that those who aspire to middle-class society and above should have a thorough knowledge of the new social
codes introduced from European and American culture. As a model, this passage takes an example from a party in Western customs where people avoid political or religious topics in fear of disturbing the pleasure of others. Chapter Seven on yejŏl ‘manners’ and konggŏm ‘courtesy and modesty’ (vol. 1) embraces imported Western culture, stating that the nature (or internal essence) of politeness was deemed unchanging even though the manifestation of virtue (i.e., the formal aspect of politeness) could change with the changing of the times.

As demonstrated above, the narrative of civility in Japan inspired progressive Korean elites to propose the same ideals for Korean society as a vehicle for modern civilization. This effort is also discernable from another translation of a Japanese etiquette text: the (Pot’ong kyo’yuk) kungmin ūibŏm ‘Models for National Etiquette in Common Education’ (Chin Hŭisŏng, trans., 1908; KŬ) (See also 3.3.2).46 Although the Korean translation of this text came out in 1908 after the CSK (1906) and the KSS (1907), the fact that some discussions of politeness in the translated text overlap with those in other Korean morals textbooks enables us to speculate again as to the influence of Japanese morals textbooks more generally on the narratives of politeness penned by Korean writers of moral textbooks.

The KŬ defines the grounding of yeŭi ‘politeness’ as expressing the virtue of konggyŏng ‘respect’ in one’s attitude and mind-set through well-mannered communications and behaviours. Chapter One notes that the cultivation of yeŭi requires both respect as the beginning and external

---

46 The Preface of the KŬ notes the original text. Little is known about it other than the title, the Futsū kyōiku girei kyōhan ‘Model of Etiquette for Public Education’ (普通敎育儀禮教範, n.d.). The KŬ (24 Chapters in total) includes extensive discussions of politeness, especially in the first four chapters: Chapter One “General Remarks”; Chapter Two “The Need for Yeŭi”; Chapter Three “Politeness (Yeŭi) is Not Simply a Matter of Relying on Old Manners and Old Realities”; and Chapter Four “General Reminders about Yeŭi.” The rest of the KŬ (Chapters Five–Twenty-four) deals with basic rules of self-discipline and a variety of formalities in ordinary and ceremonial settings, including: demeanor, dress, speech, comportment, salutations (kjongnye 敬禮), visiting others, hosting others, entertainment, lending and borrowing, epistolary habits, introductions, ceremonies, public etiquette, and funerals.
appearance as the end. The importance of these combined efforts is illustrated with an analogy to lush trees with branches and leaves but no roots. In Chapter Two, the purpose of yeŭi is understood as an instrument for maintaining social order because it helps maintain smooth interpersonal relations. This effect is compared with that of legal sanctions, which also appears in the CSK 2 (1906; Unit Sixteen “Decorum” (Yebŏp) and the YK 3 (1906; Chapter Three “Public Morals in Society” (Sahoe ūi kongūi). The KŬ takes the utility of yeŭi as a social necessity for the nation: “If the people of the nation all observe this type of yeŭi, social order will harmonize, customs will grow sincerer, inconvenience, rudeness and confusion will disappear in interpersonal relations, and a warmth like a spring zephyr will blow in the arena of social interactions, rendering them smooth and efficient.”

The most striking feature in the KŬ is the aspiration to joining the ranks of civilized nations. As mentioned earlier, lack of concern for manners or etiquette was one of the common rationales for supporting politeness education. Chapter Two mentions the tendency among youth and students to value yeŭi, a “key constituent of civilization” (mummyŏng ūi yoso) only lightly, a trend that the author condemns as degrading not only to one’s individual dignity but also to the honor of the nation. Revealing considerable anxiety about the perceived lack of morals and behavioural training for national citizens, the author calls for politeness education in order to develop virtuous and refined customs in a civilized nation. Chapter Twenty-two draws attention to the basics of public etiquette, pointing out that the lack of a public morale among Koreans has been a fault among the people of “our country,” and urgently needs rectification.

47 A quote from a man of olden days implies that the fundamental ideas and rules of yeŭi are not foreign: “A man of olden days said to be diligent in adjusting your attire and maintaining your dignity; to respect your elders and not be arrogant toward your subordinates’ to place others before yourself; and to follow customary rules in your demeanor.”

100
Chapter Three justifies politeness education with a discussion of the old epithet of the “nation of gentlemen” (*kunja ūi nara*). The same section (Chapter Three) notes that rules and formalities in social interactions are meant to change since people nowadays conduct “inter-civilizational interactions” (*munmyŏng ūi kyoje*) with people around the world. Thus, at the end of this section, the author opines that a learned man (*sŏnbī*) who worries about the collapse of yeŭi should promote “national ceremonial rules” (*kungmin ūirye* 國民儀禮) that is easy and suitable for the contemporary necessities of “our nation,” without adhering blindly to the old forms and times. The author saw the breakdown and devaluation of Confucian proprieties to be inevitable in a time of rapid change, which served as a justifiable reason for Korean elites to adopt the new ideal of politeness from the West through Japan. What seemed desirable for their nation was the rules of politeness for the public, which could go along with the changes in customs according to the times as a benchmark for becoming a civilized nation.48

To sum up, the cultivation of a decent mind and refined and pleasant manners was a significant topic for national education on the Korean peninsula at the beginning of the 20th century. The concept of politeness as a code of moral and behavioural conduct for the management of daily life was seen as a necessity for the modern nation. The importation of modern–Western customs through translations of Japanese morals textbooks offered novel ideas about the analysis of protocols in social interactions. As a means to maintaining amicable social interactions and social order, the promotion of civility was an attempt at cultural reform with the aim of establishing a modern and civilized nation.

---

48 Chapter Three takes an example from greeting customs in the East and the West, mentioning that shaking hands and making a deep bow are the same in the way that they make an effort to show respect and promote friendly relationships with others. The principle of politeness education suggested in this text is clear: “Yeŭi changes according to the changes of the times, so it is unreasonable to inculcate the kungmin with the yeŭi of olden days…”
3.5 Deference, Civility, and Linguistic Politeness

Textbooks published during the Enlightenment Period demonstrate that the creation and nurture of *kungmin* citizens was an integral part of the political project as Korea struggled for nationhood (Kim Soyŏng 2008). In particular, my discussion focused on the state’s shaping of politeness education centering on ‘deference’ and ‘civility.’ The particular models of politeness considered appropriate in morals textbooks published for schools or general education in Korea were expected to play a role in shaping moral qualities for national unity and prosperity. As discussed so far, the desired duties of *kungmin* for the construction of a modern nation transformed the traditional cultural meanings of propriety in Confucian education from two perspectives.

Firstly, Confucian propriety was integrated into national ethics. Government officials and educational reformers made the inculcation of citizen’s duties through morals education one of their top priorities through an interpretation of the Confucian past as “moral civilization and enlightenment” in the East. One might seek the origins of morals education either in the long history of Confucian culture on the Korean peninsula or in the transitional phenomena experienced in the course of modernization. However, the Confucian tradition of propriety was reconceptualized as *national* morals. In this process, loyalty and filial piety took on the essence of the moral tradition of the nation. The cultural identity of ‘deference’ as represented by loyalty and filial piety was imagined as an indigenous legacy inherited from the Confucian tradition. The essentialized models of Confucian propriety gained value as an emblem of national ethics in order to normalize a social member’s obligations for the construction of a modern nation.

Meanwhile, the promotion of ‘civility’ remained a consistent focus in politeness education in the Enlightenment Period. The urgent need in society spurred the reformists’ calls for politeness education after the Kabo Reforms as Confucian rules of propriety were increasingly found no longer fit as a civilizing tool in a modernizing society. Politeness
education encouraged students to cultivate the virtue of consideration towards others and the well-being of society as a civil member of the community. The rationale for the promotion of public spirit infused with courtesy toward others was utilitarian: it contributed to peace in the public sphere and to the civilized culture of the nation.

The conventional models of moral and behavioural conduct in the (Neo-)Confucian tradition of self-cultivation were rediscovered as the moral foundation of the nation. While the Confucian tradition of cultivation persisted in a large number of conduct books and morals textbooks, changing initiatives around morals education circulated in society along with the spread of the modern educational system at the turn of the century on the Korean peninsula. Reform-minded nationalist elites urged civil manners on other members of the community. ‘Civility’ emerged and came to be conceived of as the standard of good conduct for ensuring smoother management of daily life, harmony in society, and entering the ranks of civilized nations. The adoption of the Western-modern notion of civil manners and the nationalization of traditional Confucian cultivation played an essential role in creating the moral requirements or duties of an ideal citizenry and in mobilizing people to fulfill their social roles for social control.

The ultimate goal of both ‘deference’ and ‘civility’ in morals textbooks was to build an ideal nation where loyal kungmin get along well with one another, maintaining the advancement of their society under the guidance of the state. Thus, two contrasting models of politeness emerged as a vehicle of cultural nationalism and modernization in the construction of an ideal society and nation. What should be highlighted, however, is the involvement of socio-political interests—i.e., the creation of the ideal image of the kungmin, society, and nation—in the promotion of loyalty and civility in the early phase of Korean modern education (see 3.3.2). This agenda formulated models of politeness for the Korean Empire through active importation of
Japanese morals textbooks when Korean-authored morals textbooks were still thin on the ground.

How did this hybridity in politeness play out in terms of norms of linguistic politeness? Most of the discussions on propriety in speech illustrated in textbooks written by Korean intellectuals during the Enlightenment Period largely carried over the conventional rhetoric on linguistic manners from their premodern predecessors. Repeating the old saying about “speech as a gate of fortune and misfortune,” Unit 35 on “Speech Manners” (Ŏnŏ chi jŏl 言語之節) of the Ch’omok p’îlchi 棋牧必知 (Pak Yunsu, 1909, 41) also notes prudence as the prime lesson on language. Linguistic etiquette norms, particularly for women, remained conservative as well. Unit Eleven on “Women’s Speech” in Ch’odŭng yŏhak tokpon (Yi Wŏn’gŭng, 1908) includes the conventional Four Virtues of women from the premodern era and writes that women’s speech should be prudent because language is the “sound of one’s mind.” Likewise, Unit Thirty-Seven on “Speech” in the Nyŏjā sohak susinsŏ (No Pyŏngsŏn, 1909) advises female students to be cautious with respect to what one talks about with others.

There was a continuity of linguistic norms between the premodern conduct manuals and morals textbooks published during the enlightenment era. Quotes from Confucian classics such as the Analects and the Book of Changes or from literary works by Chosŏn literati often appeared as specific and authoritative examples of proper speech. For example, Units from Seventy-One to Seventy-Three on “Language” (Ŏnŏ) in the KSS 1 (1907) draw their ideal models of speech from anecdotes about the following Confucian scholars and officials from the Chosŏn Dynasty: Yi Hwang (李滉, 1501–1570) who spoke carefully to keep his faith; a family precept of Kim
An’guk (金安國, 1478–1543); and No Kyŏngim⁴⁹ (盧景任, 1569–1620) who never spoke ill of others. Polite manners in speech behaviour were valued as a form of one’s moral cultivation and as an act of prudence, kindness, consideration and respect toward others.

As was the case with conduct manuals from premodern Chosŏn society, linguistic propriety was treated primarily as a code of ethics and behaviour. Morals textbooks from Hwimun Academy (1906, 1907, 1910) considered the proper expressions of linguistic manners primarily as the morals of the message itself, tone of voice, comportment, and so forth: e.g., Units Eighteen and Nineteen on “Language” of the CSK 1 (1906); Units Seventy-One to Seventy-Three on “Language” of the KSS 1 (1907); Unit Twelve on “Language” of the CS (Pak Chŏngdong 1909); etc. The core of the discussions of what it meant to be polite by means of language involved what was good to talk about and how to behave in communicative interactions, rather than how to speak “up” or “down” by manipulating specific linguistic forms of respect or deference.

On the other hand, some new ideas about speech were also blended into the conventional norms of speech. As mentioned earlier (see 3.3.2), the Sŏrye p’yŏn’go 西禮便考 (Yi Ch’ŏlch’u, ed., 1909[1896]), was published soon after the Kabo Reforms to introduce the daily manners of modernized nations in the West. Chapter Nine on “Speech” (ŏllon 言論) suggests that one should never show anger in communication with others in order to keep one’s self-respect—a point rarely emphasized in the Confucian tradition of propriety. Also, a utilitarian approach to speech as a tool to convey one’s ideas began to appear in some of the private school morals textbooks. The KSS (1907, 49) and its new edition, the Pot’ong kyokwa susinsŏ (1910, 46), pay attention to the communicative function of language as a “vehicle to exchange one’s ideas with

⁴⁹ No Kyŏngim was quoted in Unit Thirty-Seven “Speech” of the Nyŏjŏ sohak susinsŏ (No Pyŏngsŏn, 1909).
others.” In a similar vein, Units Eighteen and Nineteen of the CSK (1906) underline language as a “vehicle to conveying one’s idea to others” while remarking on one’s tone of voice (ŏjo 語調) and stance on a topic of conversation as glimpses into the speaker’s character.

The most interesting example, however, is seen from the KŬ (1908), one of the Japanese textbooks that Chin Hŭisŏng translated into Korean for the Posŏng School (see 3.3.2). Chapter Seven on “Language” portrays speech manners at the intersection between traditional convention and modern innovation. This Chapter begins with the familiar concept of language as the “sound of one’s mind,” followed by a lesson on prudence in speech. In addition, the section on etiquette in conversations includes discussion of both paralinguistic elements of speech (e.g., tone, gaze, pace, etc.) and the moral propriety of the topics of speech.

On the other hand, the same Chapter of the KŬ covers modern-Western protocols of linguistic etiquette in some detail. For instance, readers are advised to avoid regional dialect and trendy expressions (yuhaengŏ 流行語). They are also reminded not to interrupt others in conversation, as this behaviour is loathed in the West, on a par with blocking someone’s way. Furthermore, one section on manners in Public Speaking and Discussions (Section Four: “Yŏnsŏl kwa t’oron”) is also unprecedented in publications about the social settings of conversation. Most interestingly, we find here one of the earliest accounts of kyŏngŏ 敬語 or ‘honorific language’ (J. keigo), the metalinguistic term that refers to a set of linguistic forms that are perceived to represent ‘deference.’

While this Unit of the KŬ calls readers’ attention to speaking politely, the use of kyŏngŏ is discouraged as follows: “Polite speech (chŏngjunghan ŏnŏ) does not necessarily mean using

---

50 The initial section, which is based largely upon the premodern discourse of propriety in speech, echoes admonitions about shallow and talkative speech in Chapter 6 of the YK 1 (Sin Haeyŏng, trans., 1906), another Korean translation of a Japanese morals textbook.
kyŏngŏ all the time, but rather not losing one’s respectful intentions (kyŏngŭi 敬意).” Instead, the author suggests to speakers that “it would not hurt the usual friendly relationship without using kyŏngŏ as long as people treat their peers or juniors with respect.” The author advises to distinguish the different speech styles used to one’s superiors, peers, or people below, depending on distinctions of high or low rank. However, the next section on what to avoid in communications suggests not to use kyŏngŏ all the time—e.g., using a respectful appellation (chonch’ing 尊稱) for an interlocutor—as this can be mistaken as flattery (ibid, 24-25).

The metapragmatic term kyŏngŏ here indicates that language users had begun to draw attention to specific linguistic forms as one of the constituents of linguistic politeness. The metapragmatic term kyŏngŏ implies that the functional analysis of linguistic distinctions was pre-contextualized in power relations, bespeaking a limited interpretation of conversational interaction as either speaking up or down. The critical evaluation of honorification metapragmatics in the KŬ indicates a re-analyzed account of kyŏngŏ whereby the indexical meaning of kyŏngŏ is set as a sign of deference. Note that previously, formal elements of language were not primarily associated with the metapragmatic discussions of propriety in speech, not to mention any recognition of linguistic forms as a sign of deference.

In this regard, it might not be coincidence that the discussion of kyŏngŏ in the KŬ, the Korean translation of a Japanese textbook, shows an interpretation of linguistic etiquette close to the perception of speakers of Korean today. The language-oriented and hierarchy-oriented understanding of linguistic politeness as well as the metapragmatic term kyŏngŏ shown in the KŬ

51 Similarly, Chapter Seventeen is dedicated to rules regarding how to write a letter politely, especially to one’s superior. The rules of letter writing include: the proper use of titles, grammar, aesthetics, etc. In particular, guidelines for writing letters to one’s elders illustrate a variety of conventions for displaying one’s respect to the recipient, by adjusting the size of personal names or by deploying the proper terms of address for inferior senders to superior recipients.
suggest that the modern conceptualization of Korean honorific registers must have been closely related to that of Japanese honorific language (*keigo*).
Chapter 4: Colonial Shifts in the Concept of ‘Politeness’ in Morals Textbooks from 1905 to 1945

4.1 Introduction

The emerging colonial state in Korea under the Japanese Residency-General (統監府; 1906 – 1910) remained rather hands-off when it came to rationalizing a sense of loyalty or citizenship in morals education. The difficulties of assimilation led the early colonial state to maintain its educational focus on social behaviours and obligations in social relations for “good” students, children, and members of society. The colonial authorities had nothing against the idea of promoting manners or etiquette education as an effort to modernize society, which after all was the path that Japan had taken a few decades earlier during the Meiji Restoration. Desired and desirable members of society (at home, in schools and in the community) were expected to control their behaviours for themselves, others, and their society by extension.

As was the case for the Korean Empire as a nation-state, the narratives of politeness in morals education were gradually integrated into the building of the empire of Japan in colonial Korea. The colonial school system transformed the concept of citizenship from identification with the nation-state to loyalty to the Japanese emperor and absorption into the notion of (Japanese imperial) subjecthood (Hwang 2015). After the annexation of Korea, the unfolding of Japanese assimilation policy can be divided into three periods as seen below. During each of three periods, education—as a central vehicle for the GGK’s management of colonial Korea—

52 The periodization of the colonial morals educational systems is adapted from Caprio (2009): i) initial assimilation policy under Military Rule (1910–1918); ii) Post-March First Movement under Cultural Rule (1919–1937); and iii) Radical assimilation under wartime conditions (1938–1945).
was guided by the announcements of four major ‘Chōsen Education Ordinances’ (Chōsen kyōiku rei):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colonial Period</th>
<th>Major incident</th>
<th>Chōsen Education Ordinances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910–1918</td>
<td>Annexation (1910)</td>
<td>- Chōsen kyōiku rei (Chokurei no. 229; Kanpō 1911.8.23) *Revision announced in 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919–1936</td>
<td>March 1st Movement (1919)</td>
<td>- Chōsen kyōiku rei (Chokurei no. 19; Kanpō 1922.2.4) *Revisions announced in 1929, 1933, and 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937–1945</td>
<td>Sino-Japanese War (1937)</td>
<td>- Chōsen kyōiku rei (Chokurei no. 103; Kanpō 1938.3.4) *Revision announced in 1941 (Kokumin gakkōrei ‘National School Ordinance’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific War (1941)</td>
<td>- Chōsen kyōiku rei or Chūgakkō rei (Chokurei no. 36; Kanpō 1943.3.27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the umbrella of the goals and guidelines announced in the different Chōsen kyōiku rei, specific regulations for school management, including curriculum and instructors, were also stipulated for different levels of public schools for Korean school children, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colonial Period</th>
<th>Regulations on School Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910–1918</td>
<td>- Futsu gakkō kisoku or ‘Regulations for common schools’ (1911.10.20; Chōsen Sōtokufu rei no. 110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Kōtō futsu gakkō kisoku ‘Regulations for high schools’ (1911.10.20; Chōsen Sōtokufu rei no. 111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Joshi futsu gakkō kisoku ‘Regulations for girls’ common schools’ (1911.10.20; Chōsen Sōtokufu rei no. 112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919–1936</td>
<td>- Futsu gakkō kōtei ‘Regulations for common schools’ (1922.2.15; Chōsen Sōtokufu rei no. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Joshi kōtō futsu gakkō kōtei ‘Regulations for high schools’ (1922.2.17; Chōsen Sōtokufu rei no. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Kōtō futsu gakkō kōtei ‘Regulations for high schools’ (1922.2.20; Chōsen Sōtokufu rei no. 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937–1945</td>
<td>- Shōgakkō kōtei ‘Regulations for elementary schools’ (1938.03.15; Kanpō 1938.3.4) *Revision announced in 1941 (Kokumin gakkōrei ‘National School Ordinance’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ceremonial propriety and politeness education in daily life definitely became part of the repertoire of means for Japanese authorities to control and modernize their colonial subjects on the Korean peninsula. Besides textbooks on morals and politeness education in schools, the introduction of Japanese decorum in daily life or on ceremonial occasions onto the Korean peninsula accelerated from the 1930s. Meanwhile, the importation of Western notions of etiquette/manners and egalitarianism proceeded apace in colonial Korea, suggesting another cultural ideal to reform and modernize society: it was these ideas that were behind the public campaigns of the Kyemong Kurakpu and the Ch’ŏndogyo (Heavenly Way) religion to use honorifics to and among children (Kim Eunseon 2013), and the Tongsŏ yebŏp taeyo ‘Outline of practical decorum, East and West’ (Son Chinju (a.k.a. Margo Lewis Lee) 1939), etc.

The scope of this chapter is limited to the accounts of (linguistic) politeness and/or etiquette as illustrated in school textbooks published under the supervision of the Japanese authorities. This chapter proceeds as follow: Section 4.2 outlines the socio-political background of morals education in early modern Korea. Section 4.3 examines the shifts in cultural models of (linguistic) politeness as illustrated in conduct manuals, etiquette handbooks, and morals textbooks published for public education in colonial Korea. Section 4.4 discusses how the

---

53 For instance, the GGK published the Girei junsoku ‘Ceremonial standards’ (儀禮準則, 1934), which was reproduced as the standard model for this purpose (e.g., see Kim Yonghyŏk and Chŏng Chinu 1935; Tonga Hyŏphoe (1939)). Cho Kihong’s (1939) magazine article titled “Politeness and conduct in Japan” (Naeji úi yeŭi chakpŏp) is a good example.
changes in the metapragmatic evaluations of honorific language in morals textbooks came to play out in response to the demands of the times.

4.2 Morals Education in Korea under the Japanese Authorities

4.2.1 1905 to 1909

When Japanese authorities seized practical power in 1905, the Residency-General took control over educational policies in Korea, promulgating a series of laws concerned with public schools and textbooks between 1906 and 1910 (Kim Soyŏng 2008, 267). According to the promulgation of the Pot’ong hakkyo ryŏng ‘Common School Regulations’ of 1906 (Edict no. 44), national education of kokumin ‘national citizens’ aimed to teach both common knowledge to and inculcate morals in schoolchildren. The Hakpu also announced the Pot’ong hakkyo ryŏng sihaeng kyuch’ik ‘Rules regarding the Implementation of Common School Regulations’ in 1906 (Hakpu ryŏng no. 23) where practical, recent, and simple instructions were highlighted for morals education for the development and practice of students’ morals (Hŏ Chaeyŏng 2010, 39). As one of the primary school subjects, susin ‘self-cultivation’ along with kugŏ ‘national language’ (i.e., Korean language) and irŏ (the Japanese language) were taught one hour per week each in public schools throughout primary and secondary school (ibid., 40-44).

The centralization of public schools and standardization of textbooks paved the way in colonial Korea to implementing the assimilation policy of Imperial Japan (Yi Yeounsuk 2010, 170-181). The announcement of the Private Schools Ordinance of 1908 put restrictions on thousands of private schools then in operation, requiring them to obtain permission from the Hakpu (Hŏ Chaeyŏng 2010, 57-59; Kim Soyŏng 2011, 13). As a result, a significant number of private schools were forced to close down. In addition, the Kyokwayong tosŏ kŏmjŏng kyujŏng
‘Regulations on Textbook Authorization System’ was also put in effect in 1908 by the Hakpu (See Kim Ponghŭi 1999, 101-107; Hŏ Chaeyŏng 2010, 94-98). Textbooks that encouraged “intolerant patriotic spirit,” “anti-Japanism,” or “antipathy against foreigners,” or that included “comments on current events” were banned by the new approbation criteria (Ko Taehyŏk 2011, 307). The Shinpen rinri kyōkasho ‘New textbook on Ethics’ (新編倫理教科書, Inoue and Takayama 1897) along with another school textbook by Inoue and Ōshima, Chūgaku shūshinsho ‘Middle School Self-cultivation Textbook’ (1903), were denied authorization by the Hakpu in 1910. Japanese morals textbooks were still in use in the 1920s in public schools in colonial Korea (see An Hongsŏn (2015)).

The ultimate goal of the very same obligations in modern society and the nation was replaced by the Japanese empire as the Japanese Residency-General transitioned to colonizing the Korean peninsula. The revised Pot’ong hakkyo ryŏng sihaeng kyuch’ik of 1909 stipulated that morals education be based on the Japanese Imperial Rescript on Education (Kyōiku Chokugō), and was careful to preserve certain traditional “fine customs,” encouraging students to practice what they learned, and stipulating that schools teach students their obligations to their nation and society (cited in Chŏng T’aejun 2004, 245). Morals education was expected to encourage students to obey laws, value public morals, work for the public good, and learn basic etiquette and manners for the greater good (kongdŏk 公德) and public welfare (iyonhusaeng 利用厚生) (quoted in Kim Minjae 2012, 227). Nurturing female virtue (chŏngsuk 貞淑) was part of the responsibilities as well. While loyalty and filial piety promoted the subject’s duties to the monarch in the name of virtuous conduct, morals education asked schoolchildren to move beyond traditional Confucian morals to an embrace of the “advancement of modern society” (Hwang 2015, 185).
4.2.2 1910 to 1918

Japanese officials had full political authority to guide educational policies in the operation of most of the public educational institutions in colonial Korea. The colonial government applied Japanese educational policies for the cultivation of loyal Japanese to colonial Korea. The GGK soon announced the 1st Chōsen kyōiku rei or ‘Chōsen Education Ordinance’of 1911 on the basis of the intent articulated in the Meiji Emperor’s Imperial Rescript on Education of 1890 (Kyōiku ni kansuru chokugo; see fn. 41). Three decades later, the Japanese Imperial Rescript on Education was transplanted to colonial Korea in 1911 as the fundamental and ultimate goal for morals education. The entire text of the Imperial Rescript on Education was reproduced in the GGK’s morals textbooks throughout the colonial period.

According to the GGK’s announcement of the Futsū gakkō kisoku or ‘Regulations for common schools’ in 1911 (Chōsen Sōtokufu rei no. 110; Section 2 Article 8), the gist of morals education in primary schools was to maintain established good customs, and to encourage students to practice them in daily life. According to the Chōsen kyōiku rei of 1911 (Chokurei no. 229; Section1, Article 2), the primary interest of the GGK in morals education was to nurture desirable character in “good and faithful and national citizens” (J. chūryō naru kokumin) through Common Schools as the basis of national education for schoolchildren. Teachers were directed to teach the rules of etiquette—including indigenous Korean manners when necessary—in a simple manner accompanied by examples of actual practice. The contents of morals education covered a

---

54 As illustrated in the Outline of Public Schools (Futsū gakkō no yōryō) of 1911, Sekiya Teizaburō (関屋貞三郎, 1875–1950), Chief of the Educational Bureau, ordered Japanese vice-principals in colonial Korea to “correct the corrupt practices (heishū 勢習) of Korean education by focusing on colonial public education while watching over the teachers and curriculum, teaching methods and materials in both private schools and sŏdang traditional schools (quoted in Chŏng T’aejun 2004, 240). For more about the enactment and revisions of the educational laws during the colonial period in Korea, see Kang Myŏngsuk (2010).
variety of norms for ethics and behaviour, starting from universal ethics and morality to one’s obligations to society and nation. The Confucian notions of propriety were applied to guide Koreans’ obligations at home, in public and for the state. In addition, general “politeness and code of conduct” (J. reigi sahō 禮儀作法) were also taught as a form of cultural knowledge for schoolchildren to practice in daily life. Morals education for female students also underlined teishuku 貞淑 ‘feminine virtue; chastity.’

4.2.3 1919 to 1936

In the aftermath of the March 1st Movement, the Koreans’ nationwide mass protest against the oppressive rule of Japanese colonialism in 1919, the GGK paid attention to consolidating the Korean populace and stabilizing colonial administration. The Chōsen kyōiku rei or ‘Chōsen Education Ordinance’ of 1922 revised the four-year primary school system in colonial Korea to the six-year system in use in Japan. Administrative regulations for vocational and college schools were also included in the educational system. One of the significant changes in the second revision of the Chōsen kyōiku rei of 1922 was the removal of the term “faithful and good national citizens.” Instead, public education in this period primarily aimed to encourage the cultivation of a citizen-worthy character in its Korean pupils (Hwang 2015, 187).

Nevertheless, morals education of this period appears in reality to have continued cultivating children with the moral qualities and duties of “faithful and good national citizens.” The Futsū gakkō kitei ‘Regulations for common schools’ of 1922 (Chōsen Sōtokufu rei no. 8; Section 2, Article 8) notes that elementary schools should respect good customs and inculcate

55 According to the Preface to FGS I (1918/1913), actual practice and simplicity were considered important in teaching manners. In case of need, teachers were allowed exceptionally to teach Korean manners.
virtuous qualities so as to cultivate a “gentle and meek” (junryō 醇良) personality, and to nurture a sense of public service and good customs by extension, which would facilitate harmony between Koreans and Japanese on the Korean peninsula. Morals education in the Futsū gakkō kitei of 1922 (Chōsen Sōtokufu rei no. 16; Section 2, Article 8) highlights teaching students matters of morality, as well as general obligations to the Japanese nation (kokka), in order to cultivate “faithful and good” national citizens who work for the public virtue and benefit. In addition, the Kōtō futsū gakkō kitei or ‘Regulations for high schools’ of 1922 (Chōsen sōtokufūrei no.16; Section 2, Article 9) noted that morals education needs to remind students of the “attributes of Japanese morality” (waga kuni no dōtoku no tokuchō).

4.2.4 1937 to 1945

After the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War in 1937 followed by the Pacific War in 1941, the assimilation policy on the Korean peninsula was radicalized under wartime conditions. The total internalization of Japanese identity as imperial subjects to evoke dedication to imperial Japan and the Emperor became the primary concerns of education in colonial Korea. The intensification of the GGK’s interest in transforming Koreans into imperial subjects (kōkoku shinminka) thus began with the 3rd announcement of the Chōsen kyōiku rei or ‘Chōsen Education Ordinance’ of 1938 (Chokufurei no. 103). According to the Shōgakkō kitei of 1938 (Chōsen Sōtokufu rei Section 3, Article 17), the goal of morals education revolved around imperial Japan with the emperor at the center through the cultivation of desirable qualities in imperial subjects

---

56 Governor-General Minami Jirō announced in the official gazette of the GGK (Chōsen Sōtokufū kanpō, April 1938) the three main points for education in order to mobilize the Korean people for Japan’s wartime effort or, in Minami’s words, “the construction of the New Eastern Asia” (Shin Tōa kensetsu): i) clarification of the national essence (kokutai meichō); ii) the unity of Japan and Korea (naisen ittai); and iii) endurance through adversity (ninku tanren) (cited in Chŏng T’aejun 2004, 250 fn. 42).
(kōkoku shinmin) and the performance of duties or services for society and the nation in the interests of Imperial Japan. The two-track elementary (lit. ‘common’) school system (futsū gakkō for Koreans and shōgakkō for Japanese residing in Korea) was merged into a single Japanese school system. Colonial authorities also doubled the amount of time devoted to morals education from one to two hours along with enforcement of Japanese culture and ideology.57

The blueprint for morals education as illustrated in the Chōsen kyōiku rei of 1938 above emphasized moral mobilization through the cultivation of national morals to construct loyal imperial subjects. The GGK envisioned unexhausted support for the fortunes of the Emperor (kōun fuyoku 幸运扶翼) through inculcating “national morals” (kokumin dōtoku 國民道德), clarifying the essence of the national polity, and stimulating awareness of the attributes of a good imperial citizen. The specific instructions for practicing the national morals included relatively familiar and easy lessons such as filial piety, affection, thrift, respect, sincerity, loyalty, and courage, which were followed by duties toward society and nation, a law-abiding spirit, understanding of co-prosperity, and the promotion of a public-minded spirit and labor for self-reliance. By doing so, morals education was intended to dignify the national grace, strengthen the integrity of imperial subjects, and raise the spirit of loyalty and patriotism.

The Kokumin gakkō kitei of 1941 (Chōsen Sōtokufu rei no. 90) intensified the totalitarian ideology of imperial Japan. Japanese language, morals, history and geography were merged into one subject called Kokuminka or ‘National Citizenship.’ In order to encourage students’ motivation for “loyalty and patriotism” (chūkun aikoku 忠君愛國) as loyal subjects of imperial Japan, morals education focused on the inculcation of a sense of pride or superiority

57 For instance, see Atkins (2010, 42-45) for more about the Name Change Campaign, paying homage to the Japanese emperor at Shintō shrines, the Oath of Loyalty (kōkoku shinmin no seisht), and the Japanese language-only policy.
concerning the people, history, and territory of imperial Japan, the sentiment necessary to eventually render devoted service as imperial subjects (Section 1, Article 3). With the announcement of the last Kyōikurei in 1943 (Chokurei no. 36), colonial education on the Korean peninsula began to train students for wartime mobilization. The school system was reorganized to increase students’ labor or participation in the Japanese wartime effort.

4.3 Changes in the Ideals of Self-cultivation and Politeness in Colonial Education

4.3.1 From 1907: Drawing ‘Deference’ into the Notion of ‘Politeness’

The rules of politeness education regulated the bodies and behaviours of students (primarily through comportment, greetings, dress, and other behaviours, including speech) and common do’s and dont’s in daily life, when visiting others, or on ceremonial occasions. One of the earliest changes observable in the new colonial models for morals education was the promotion of ‘respect’ for elders. Although the virtue of ‘loyalty’ had constituted the moral backbone of public education as conducted by the Korean state and nationals, Imperial Japan switched the deferential notion of moral virtue to school children’s ‘respect’ for parents, elders, the state, and the Japanese emperor. The colonial authorities rationalized this new moral and behavioural model of ‘respect’ as the ethnic Korean tradition of ‘order (precedence) between young and the old’. In so doing, ‘politeness’ was newly and restrictively reconceptualized as centering on ‘deference’, which in turn was alleged to originate in the core tradition of (Neo-)Confucian practices of propriety.

The Hakpu under the control of the Residency-General published a unified morals textbook for primary common schools called Pot’ong hakkyo haktoyong susinsŏ 1-4 ‘Self-cultivation Manual for Use by Pupils in Common Schools’ (Hakpu 1910/1907-8; PHHS). Printed
in Japan, this textbook was entirely translated from the Japanese elementary morals textbooks published by Hakpu (Ministry of Education); with the difference that nationalist content was excluded or downplayed in the PHHS lessons (Ishimatsu 2004). For instance, one finds few mentions of the “liberty, independence, or patriotism” that might have threatened the assimilation of Koreans into the Japanese empire (Kim Minjae and Pak Pyŏnggi 2012, 22–25; Kim Minjae 2014, 85-126). Similarly, censorship by the Japanese authorities in 1908 deleted terms such as kungmin ‘national citizen’ and kukka ‘nation’ endorsed by the reformist writers of textbooks, since those notions might have encouraged anti-Japanese sentiments among Koreans (Hwang 2015, 185).

What is worth noticing most, however, is that colonial morals textbooks incorporated ‘deference’ into the notions and models of ‘politeness.’ Lessons on polite demeanor focused on practical behavioural and moral norms for schoolchildren to abide by in daily life and in social interactions. Ritualized manners of ‘deference’ became evident particularly through greeting manners for one’s elders or teachers. A fair number of morals textbooks published by the Japanese authorities highlighted bowing or saluting. A deferential child remained the ideal in morals textbooks throughout the colonial period in Korea, particularly for the early grades (one through three). Unit Four, titled “Polite Conduct yeyong 禮容” in PHHS 2 (1909/1907) and published under the supervision of the Residency-General, highlights a “good boy” observing propriety with an illustration of a boy making a deep bow to guests.

Whereas ‘filial piety’ was extended to ‘loyalty’ to the nation and its leader(s) in early morals textbooks published for nationalistically motivated private schools, paying respect to one’s elders or teachers recasts the deferential notion of politeness as a personal matter in social interactions. Furthermore, and building on this first step, the virtue and practice of ‘respect’ made it possible for the colonizer to foster a submissive member of society. Although the
deferential notion of politeness at the time was often under fire from those who aspired for their society to move away from rigid, vertical social hierarchy, this newly packaged notion of ‘respect’ could be stipulated as a key component feature of polite conduct, thereby rendering it relatively immune to criticism as a remnant from traditional society or an obstacle to the building of modern society.

On the other hand, it should be also remembered that young students became familiarized with the notion of ‘courtesy’ or ‘civility’ by learning how to behave among friends or for social life in general. Targets of respect included all members of society, regardless of power relations. The same Unit Four of PHHS 2 (1909/1907) mentioned above illustrates an ideal boy with neat manners in his dealings with parents, teachers and friends.58 Unit Two of PHHS 3 (1910/1907) titled “Politeness” (yeŭi) lists the majority of social manners in a general sense: e.g., refraining from yawning, stretching, whispering, goggling eyes or staring, eavesdropping on others’ conversations, reading others’ letters without permission, etc.59 Furthermore, schoolchildren were taught to have good manners, primarily in order not to displease others or not to be treated contemptuously. Maintaining good manners was required for close relationships. Virtuous behaviours and customs included filial piety, respect for others, trust, honesty, self-restraint, etc.

After the Japanese annexation of Korea in 1910, the specific lessons in Futsū gakkō shūshinsho 1-4: Seitoyō ‘Self-cultivation Manual for Use by Students in Common Schools’ (GGK 1918/1913-1915; FGS) suggest that manners education prioritized public peace and order while implicitly encouraging students’ submission to and consideration for others. As the

58 The same content is observable in Unit 17 of the Japanese Jinjō shōgaku shūshinsho 1: Jidōyō 1 ‘Normal Primary School Self-cultivation Manual for Use by Children’ (Monbushō, 1904).
59 Almost identical with Unit Two on “politeness” (Yeŭi) of the PHHS 3 (1910/1907), Unit Twenty-three of the Chosŏnŏ tokpon 5 ‘Korean reader’ (1923–1924) lists a variety of codes of conduct, including conventional norms such as polite speech, circumspect actions, and respect for one’s elders.
instructor’s manual for *FGS 3* (1918/1914) notes in detail in Unit Eight “Code of Conduct or Manners” (*Sahō/Reisetsu*), schoolchildren were expected to sit up straight, bow to others, walk behind the elderly, and use polite speech, not only for their own sake, but also to avoid being rude or offensive to others, or being detested by others. The list of examples of polite conduct goes on at length about public etiquette. Inconsiderate behaviours in the public realm included but were not limited to causing inconvenience on the street, taking up too much space or speaking loudly on public transit, and pushing one’s way forward in crowded places.

The cultivation of the colonial citizen of imperial Japan was covert in the sense that schoolchildren were told to follow etiquette rules primarily for the sake of their own dignity, their own interpersonal relationships, and for the care of others. Unit Eight of *FGS 3* (1918/1914) above points out: “[...] bad manners are not only rude to others but also lower one’s own dignity (*J. hin‘i 品位*).” The rationale for learning and observing good manners was explained from the perspective of the negative impact on the perpetrator’s side—being disliked by others for irritating their feelings and eventually harming their own lives. Nevertheless, the colonial government gradually but systematically started inculcating moral obligations in the new colonial subjects of imperial Japan. Defining *reigi 礼儀* as the external demonstration of one’s mind, Unit Five on “Politeness” (*Reigi*) of the *FGS 4* (1918/1915) advises students to focus on the inner mind rather than on outer formalities. This Unit encourages students to observe polite manners for the betterment of personal “character” (*hinsei 品性*) as well as for the dignity of Japan (*Nihon-koku*).61

---

60 This textbook came in two versions, one each in Japanese and Korean. The same unit was titled *yejŏl 礼節* ‘manners’ in the Korean version.
61 This unit also shows a flexible stance on regional differences in customs and habits, as long as the morals lessons in question are genuine.
In particular, this unit underlines that a youth ought to remember to respect elders—a practice referred as the “hoary and good customs of our nation” (J. waga kuni no mukashi karano bifū). The teacher’s manual for the same lesson of FGS 4 (1918/1915, 37-38) expresses concerns about impudent boys who would despise old people for being ignorant of new learning and the outside world, cautioning that such people cannot be educated people. Through the ambiguous reference to “our nation,” the identification of respect for elders or teachers allowed Korean schoolchildren to embrace the deferentially characterized culture of politeness as an authentic tradition of their own (i.e., Korean), when in fact actual fact it referred to Japan.62

Although early morals textbooks published under the control of the colonial authorities did not overtly attempt to invoke loyalty for Japan, paying respect to one’s elders came to occupy the center of desired morality in colonial morals education. Unit Five on “Manners of Comportment” (gyōgi 行儀) in FGS 3 (1923) introduces one of the great men from Chosŏn history, Yi T’oebye, and his tidy appearance and courteous manners with an illustration of his deep bow to his teacher. Unit Nine on “Conduct Yourself Politely!” (gyōgi o yoku seyo 行儀をよくせよ) in FGS 1 (1930) shows two illustrations of children bowing to and saluting their elders. All of the illustrations in these lessons embody the deferential gesture as the essential model of manners for children in social relations.

As seen from greeting etiquette as well as the tradition of kyōkei 恭敬 ‘respect,’ Japanese education of self-cultivation and politeness underlined a deferential notion of politeness. The emphasis on ‘deference’ was not simply the residue of traditional Confucian notions of propriety.

62 Note also that the positive valorization of ‘respect’ (kyōkei 恭敬) would have been more palatable to the colonialized without provoking hostility against the colonial authorities, since this moral virtue was already culturally familiar to them and was also politically less sensitive than ‘loyalty.’
Even though this virtue seemed traditional to young generations of Koreans, it was in fact something smuggled into the pedagogy of politeness in colonial morals education. The virtue of ‘respect’ was deemed worth keeping and developing as part of the key role expectation for “good” students and submissive colonial subjects, and moreover obviated the need to require politically-sensitive ‘loyalty’ too openly. As morals education and ‘respect’ gradually became associated with the obscure notion of “our nation” and praise-worthy tradition, the virtue of ‘respect’ at the center of politeness models was eventually redirected to honoring the Japanese Emperor and the Imperial nation toward the end of the colonial era. It was in such a context that the colonial education in the Japanese empire implanted the desired moral and/or behavioural qualities in the minds and conduct of young students.

4.3.2 From the 1920s: Politeness for Harmony between Japan and Korea

After the March 1st Movement in 1919, the slogan for colonial strategy in the 1920s was changed to naisen yūwa 内鮮融和 or ‘Harmony between Japan and Korea’ in an effort to mollify the colonized. Morals and politeness education under the GGK in the 1920s and 1930s thus focused more on social harmony and stability in colonial Korea. The Chōsen Sōtokufu hensan kyōkayō tosho gaiyō ‘Summary of GGK Textbook Publications’ (1925, 10; quoted in An Hongsŏn 2015, 38) indicates that the second round of publications of school textbooks during the 1920s tried to highlight more the achievements of Koreans in morals education with respect to individuals, family, society and state, while leaving out overt imposition of loyalty and patriotism so as not to arouse feelings of anti-Japanese hostility (quoted in An Hongsŏn 2015, 38).

Indeed, morals textbooks published by the GGK in 1920s attempted to incorporate native customs of Korea more than before into the ideal model of politeness. For instance, a
behavioural model in Unit Five on “Manners of Comportment” (gyōgi 行儀) of FGS 3 (1923) was taken from the childhood of Yi T’oegye, one of the most renowned Confucian scholars in Korean history. This ideal Korean person served as a specific example for students to follow: children should have a neat appearance, pay respect to their teacher, and be focused when learning. In addition to encouraging neat and prudent manners at all times, this unit shows in detail what specific types of conduct children should control when they interact with elders, other people in general, and even when they act for themselves: careful listening without interrupting, insulting, mocking, or ridiculing; not eating while walking; and not reading while lying on one’s back. Public etiquette/manners appears to have been in great demand for stability in social life, particularly in morals textbooks published in 1920s.

Lessons in FGS 1-6 (GGK 1923-1924/1922-1924) appealed to a functional notion of politeness as an interpersonal lubricant in social interactions and/or as a means of maintaining social order more than did earlier editions of morals textbooks. Unit Thirteen on “Politeness” (reigi) in FGS 4 (1924) considers politeness one of the important points to observe in social interactions in order to avoid causing displeasure in others. It also advises not to neglect politeness even in intimate relations in order to remain on good terms with others. Similarly, Unit Eleven on “Politeness” in FGS 6 (1924) notes that the practice of politeness, which was referred to as the manifestation of one’s sincerity to ‘respect’ others (hito o uyamafu seii o arawashita moto), maintains the actor’s own dignity, smoothens social interactions, and maintains social order by softening the hearts of others. Interestingly enough, this unit also implicitly suggests that Korean students be kind to the Japanese, by emphasizing that students “being prudent and kind to foreigners comprise the ‘good customs of a civilized country’ (bunmeikoku no bifū)” (ibid., 105).
It is also worth highlighting that politeness education in morals textbooks of the 1920s publicized a civility-oriented approach to the notion of ‘politeness.’ In Unit Eleven of FGS 6 (1924) mentioned above, the principal rules of politeness encompassed decent demeanor such as comportment or dress, manners for visiting or inviting others, and etiquette in public life in detail. Students were taught to be circumspect in speech and behaviour at home and to salute the Japanese Emperor and their superiors, not to mention abiding by the ceremonial rules for schools. However, the value of ‘respect’ at the heart of politeness was not tied to social status and instead applied to all people, regardless of questions of power or solidarity. The unit above guides students to be polite not only to their superiors, but also to friends, juniors, and people in general. This unit also advises school children to practice a moderate degree of politeness, warning that excessive courtesy (J. teijū 郑重) might be seen as flattering and could be impolite if handled roughly or lightly.

Similarly, the morals textbooks for older students advocated the virtue of mutual respect (sōgo no sonkei) for similar purposes. Both the Kōtō futsū gakkō shūshinsho 1-5 (1923-1924; KFGS) and the Joshi kōtō futsū gakkō shūshinsho 1-4 (1925; JKFGS) carry a unit titled “Mutual respect” where students were advised to respect and be polite to anyone, even when of low status or completely unknown to them, as a sign of respect for a fellow human being and fellow member of society. Unit Sixteen on “Mutual Respect” in KFGS 3 (1923, 85) asserts that such a sense of respect out of compassion would allow for the realization of interactions between “ladies and gentlemen” (shinshi shukujo 紳士淑女) and enable social customs to become refined.

---

63 The teacher’s manual for this unit in FGS 6 (1923, 106-114) draws attention at length to specific rules in various situations and manners.
64 Similarly, Unit Ten on “Politeness” in KFGS 2 (1923) suggests a moderate level of politeness as the key solution to keeping a balance between flattery (ayu 阿諛) and stinginess (rinshoku 吝嗇).
A similar passage appears in Unit Eleven on “Mutual Respect” in *JKFGS 3* (1925), where students are advised to respect others: not only acquaintances but also strangers. The same unit also advises students not to use vulgar language or disdain anyone in shabby clothes or of low status. As an example of an intelligent but modest person, Fukuzawa Yukichi’s anecdote is introduced as a great man of modern Japan—referred to as “our nation” (*waga kuni*)—whose rickshaman was moved by his courteous (*teinei*) language toward him.

The promotion of ‘civility’ was bound to the state insofar as the colonial authorities’ vision of mollifying any feelings of hostility in Korean society with peace and cultural modernity encouraged the conceptualization and promotion of politeness. Indeed, the *Futsū gakkō hensan shuisho ‘Statement of Editorial Intent of the FGS’* (1924, 16-17) recognizes code of conduct (*sahō*) education as an important part of moral training in the context of the need to facilitate interactions between Korean children and the Japanese residing in colonial Korea. From the perspective of the colonial government, disciplining the populace physically and mentally at all times to get along with one another would eventually promote harmony between the Japanese and the Koreans. Just as Korean reformers had asserted earlier in morals textbooks for private schools, the officials directing colonial public education believed in the value of ‘civility’ as an obligation of the general populace in allegiance with the project to modernize colonial society and the nation. Politeness education was to foster colonial citizens who would cooperate in keeping colonial society peaceful through smooth interpersonal relationships.

---

65 Interestingly, this textbook quotes Samuel Smiles (1812–1904), a Scottish government reformer who was well known as the author of *Self-Help* (1859): “Gentlemen respect others as they do themselves.”

66 Interestingly, the critical stance against excessive politeness was not apparent in the first series of morals textbooks published by the GGK, but had appeared a few times in the *Yullihak kyoogwasŏ* (Sin Haeyŏng 1906), the Korean translation of the *Shinpen rinri kyōkasho ‘New textbook on Ethics’* (Inoue and Takayama 1897): e.g., *YK 1* (Chapter Seven, 117).
That being said, colonial morals education in this period continued with a renewed emphasis on respect in line with the simultaneous promotion of ‘civility.’ As seen from Unit Five on “Politeness” in FGS 4 (1918/1913), Unit Thirteen of FGS 4 (1924) refers to respect for the old as a “hoary and good custom of our nation” (waga kuni no mukashi karano bifū). While this unit repeats almost the identical content from the earlier edition, the earlier explicit association with the dignity of Japan (Nihon-koku) was deleted from Unit Thirteen of FGS 4 (1924), presumably in an attempt to alleviate Koreans’ antipathy against the Japanese authorities in the aftermath of the March 1st Movement of 1919.

As much as it promoted respect for humanity, colonial politeness education between the 1920s and 1930s actively recognized and celebrated the custom of paying respect to elders as a native Korean cultural tradition. Interestingly, Unit Fifteen on “Politeness” in the Shihan gakkō shūshinsho 1 ‘Self-cultivation Manual for Teacher’s Colleges 1’ (1925, 70-75) argues for “respect for one’s elders” (keichō 敬長) to counteract egalitarianists’ disapproval of inferiors showing respect for superiors. While taking politeness as a tool for smooth social interactions and as a token of one’s personal dignity, this unit contends that students should pay respect to their elders and be grateful to them for their contribution to society. It goes on to say that the recent phenomenon of criticizing the custom of respecting one’s elders in favor of “personality egalitarianism” (jinkaku byōdō 人格平等) only aggravates ‘vicious equality’ (aku-byōdō 悪平等).

In fact, the new policy to include more Korean achievements made it easy to inculcate the deferential notion of politeness. For instance, Unit Eleven on “The Young Must Honor Their
Elders’

(\textit{chōyō no jo 長幼の序}) in \textit{JKFGS} 2 (1925, 45-50) encourages students to pay respect to elders even just one year older and to make them feel pleased because they have accumulated more experience in life. Starting with a literal explanation of the phrase “There is order between the old and the young” (\textit{chōyō jo arī}), this unit provides a positive interpretation of this practice as a “good custom of the world” (\textit{yo no bifū}), by taking the practice of \textit{chōyō no jo} as a form of mutual obligation; that is, the elder’s love and guidance for the junior and the juniors respect for the elder (ibid., 46). The act of “the juniors’ respect (\textit{kei 敬}) for elders and the elders’ love (\textit{ai 愛}) for juniors” was deemed exceedingly beautiful (ibid., 49).

The duties expected on both sides from both parties made it favorable to support the tradition of \textit{chōyō no jo} as a worthy custom for harmony in a society where the old lead the young with love, and the young respect the old. On the junior’s side, the acts of making way for seniors or giving up their seat for them were encouraged as an indication of one’s personal dignity (\textit{hinkaku}). The deferential concept of politeness was further supported by stressing the time-honored custom of paying respect to elders as something particularly important in the East (Tōyō), including Korea. As a specific custom of respecting the old in Chosŏn, this unit introduces one of Korea’s most prominent Confucian scholars, Master Yulgok (Yulgok \textit{sensei}; a.k.a. Yi I). Students were enjoined to remember the following quote from Yi I’s Village Compact (\textit{hyangyak}) (ibid., 47):

“In general, someone who is older than me by over twenty years is [referred to as] \textit{chonja} ‘respectable person.’ [Someone older than me] by ten years is [referred to as] \textit{changja} ‘older person.’ One should dismount from one’s horse in the street when bumping into a \textit{chonja} from the same clan. Also, one must make a deep bow when seeing a \textit{chonja} and brings one’s hands together in salute to a \textit{changja}.”

\footnote{See also Unit Thirteen with the same title in \textit{KFS} 3 (1923).}
By 1930, the formal rules of politeness had crystallized into the embodiment of one’s respect and affection, and were imposed upon schoolchildren as a barometer of personal character. For instance, Unit Seventeen on “Don’t Do Rude Things!” (*Mu-sahō na koto o suru na* 無作法な事をするな) of *FGS 2* (1930) illustrates bad manners with an anecdote about a boy named Ch’angdae whose teacher admonished him for not taking off his hat indoors. The teacher’s manual for this unit portrays the boy of this story as reckless and careless. Similarly, the teacher’s manual for Unit Nine of *FGS 1* (1930) encourages proper manners including appearance and behaviour. Those who failed to observe correct manners were to be evaluated as not having a sincere mind towards others because it was not properly expressed. By contrast, positive outcomes included those beneficial to oneself such as respect and love from others, but also honor (*meiyo*) for one’s family and school for having an excellent person.

The rhetoric of politeness continued to publicize the utility of politeness or etiquette/manners as a necessary device for facilitating amicable relationships in society up to the mid-1930s. Unit Seventeen on “Social interactions” (*shakō* 社交) of the *Chūtō kyōiku shūshinsho 1* ‘Self-cultivation Manual for Middle School Education 1’ (1935; *CKS*) portrays the functions of politeness as a set of proper conduct guidelines for amicable interactions in society. The primary interest of politeness education lay in enjoining colonial citizens to conform to the common rules of society for the maintenance of harmony and stability in colonial society. Unit Thirteen on “Politeness” in *CKS 2* (1936, 73-79) notes: in order to express one’s respect and love for others, which was taken as the basis of politeness, one is expected to follow

---

68 This unit also singles out the expression of mind in proper manners as the core of social interactions, describing *reigi sahō* ‘politeness and code of conduct’ as the indication of one’s respect and affection (*keiai* 敬愛) for others. By contrast, improper manners/etiquette or insufficient formality in speech or conduct was stigmatized as deriving from lack of a sincere mind.
the rules or manners of a family or a society as a member of such groups. Furthermore, a section on understanding differences in formality (keishiki no sōi to shi no rikai) in Unit Thirteen demands schoolchildren to be flexible with the different forms of reigi between the West and the East, between Korea and Japan (naichi), nd etc. (ibid., 78-79). The point of asserting differences in formality was not to distinguish between superior and inferior; rather, this unit suggests negotiation and adjustment ( sesshō ōtai 折衝應待) in order to strive for social cooperation and prevent antipathy, especially in a transitional period.

In short, the primary interest of politeness education from the 1920s to the mid-1930s under the GGK was the maintenance of harmony and stability in colonial society. The GGK did not only encouraged the deference-oriented character of the so-called Confucian tradition of chōyō no jo 長幼の序 in the East, but also tried to facilitate peace and stability in colonial society along with the alleviating Koreans’ hostility against the colonial government. Both respect and civility were at the center of politeness education as the desired qualities for “good” students and desirable members of a society. The GGK’s agenda to impose a variety of manners/etiquette and respect in social interactions on school children was presented somewhat covertly as driven by personal motivations (by emphasizing the benefits to individuals who adopted the desired behaviours) or through an appeal to Korean cultural tradition.

4.3.3 From the late 1930s: Morals and Politeness Toward a New National Identity
With the promulgation of the revised Korean School Ordinance in 1938, colonial authorities attempted to achieve total assimilation with the Japanese nation (naisen ittai 内鮮一體). Education of the nation’s people served as the path toward becoming an imperial subject within a totalizing collectivity—the “national character/essence”—stemming from the supreme
sovereignty of the Japanese Imperial line (Hwang 2015, 191). The promotion of the attributes of “national character” (kokuminsei), “national culture” (kokumin bunka) and “national morals” (kokumin dōtoku) was conspicuous in the late 1930s, as illustrated in the unit titles of CKS 4 (1938, 38-80). The mobilization of colonial subjects for Japanese imperialization brought about a number of changes in the instructional guidelines for politeness education under the colonial government between the late 1930s and early 1940s.

First of all, the goal of politeness education began to shift toward mobilizing support for the Japanese emperor. Lessons on politeness drew more attention to the Japanese emperor as the target of respectful deportment. For example, Unit Thirteen on “Politeness” in CKS 2 (1936, 73-79) lists extensive rules of behaviour for various social interactions, detailing specifically how the obligations for members of families and society are imposed upon students, including etiquette for imperial family members, how to pay a visit to a shrine or a temple, etc. Likewise, Unit Eleven on “Dress and Politeness” (Fukusō to reigi) in CKS 1 (1938) gives lengthy instructions to students on how to dress properly to pay respect to the Japanese emperor or to attend imperial ceremonies.

Similarly, disciplining the body and inculcating morality were directed to colonial subjects’ participation in Japanese imperialization. The teacher’s manual for Unit Twenty on “Don’t Do Rude Things!” in Shotō shūshin 2 ‘Elementary School Self-cultivation 2’ (1939; SS) associates good behaviour and language use with the “cultivation of the subjects of a Great Nation (dai kokumin). The teacher’s manual for Unit Eight of SS 3 (1939) also suggests that students observe good manners of comportment (gyōgi 行儀), not only for their own dignity and pleasant social bonds, but also for their designation as an imperial subject (kōkoku shinmin) not to be embarrassing.
More importantly, the value of politeness began to be associated with the Japanese national polity (kokutai). Attempts to Japanize politeness culture can be observed in the replacement of the Korean exemplary figures with Japanese. Starting from the late 1930s, such attempts to reflect native Korean culture and history come to an end when these models are replaced with Japanese figures: e.g., Matsudaira Yoshifuwa 松平好房 (1649–1699) in Unit Eight of SS 3 (1939) and Hosoi Heishū 細井平洲 (1728–1801) in Unit Seven of SS 5 (1944). The earlier version of “Manners of Comportment” (gyōgi) in the morals textbooks for third graders during the 1920s and 1930s dealt with the Korean Confucian scholars Yi I and Hong Sŏkho from Korean history.

Furthermore, colonial morals textbooks now promoted politeness culture as a unique and proud culture of Japanese tradition. As discussed earlier, the custom of paying respect to elders (keichō) or the culture of chōyō no jo was praised as an important custom of the East (Tōyō), including Korea: e.g., JKFGS 3 (1925, 45-50). Likewise, Unit Thirteen of CKS 2 (1936) notes that Chōsen (Korea), as a “time-honored nation of politeness” (korai reigi no kuni 古來禮儀の國), boasted good manners based upon the (hierarchical) order between old and young (chōyō no jo) and between husband and wife, and that the custom of worshiping ancestors was popular. While praising such a culture as a perfectly respectable culture of the “Nation of Propriety in the East” (Tōhō kunshi no kuni 東方君子の國), this unit goes on to say that this same politeness culture brought about many evils because Korean people have stuck so much to form that they squander their fortunes for a funeral (ibid., 77). The critique that the traditional Korean custom has sacrificed spirit (seishin 精神) to formality (keishiki 形式) ends with the following statement: “We should not confuse the beginning and end of propriety (rei no honmatsu), but instead let its spirit [of propriety] shine to its full extent.”
However, it did not take long for the GGK morals textbooks to claim politeness culture as something originally and essentially Japanese. The teacher’s manual for Unit Eight of SS 3 (1940) portrays the combination of a polite mind and behaviour in social relations not only as an attribute expected of colonial citizens of imperial Japan but also as a “unique feature of Japanese morality” (日本道德の特色 Nippon dōtoku no tokushoku) based on self-awareness of the (hierarchical) order between young and old (chōyō no jo) (ibid., 17). Similarly, Unit Seven on “Politeness” in SS 5 (1943) declares that the Japanese have valued etiquette from ancient times to the extent that foreigners came to endorse that “Japan is a polite nation” (Nippon wa reigi no tadashii kuni da). Thus, this unit further requires schoolchildren to strive to live up to the dignity of subjects of a great nation (dai kokumin). As such, the behavioural and moral education of ‘civility’ and ‘deference’ from the earlier period as a means to regulate colonial society in peace had transformed to require imperial subjects to internalize as a part of the core identity of Japanese moral culture by the end of the colonial era.

4.4 Harmonizing Traditional Respect and Modern Civility through Japanese keigo

The premodern tradition of self-cultivation did not die out but was explicitly embraced and continued in the modern educational system. Confucian morals were worth promoting insofar as they served as the moral grounding for an ideal member of society. The purpose of Confucian training switched from accomplishing Confucian ideals to nurturing colonial subjects under the Japanese colonial government (Sŏ Kijae and Kim Sunjŏn 2006; Song Inja 2007). The GGK’s morals textbooks incorporated filial piety into politeness education as the essence of the Confucian legacy. ‘Respect’ for elders and the control of one’s demeanor were ritualized in students’ daily life, particularly through greetings etiquette. In so doing, morals education helped
the colonial authorities in its attempts to rationalize the colonial project and cultivate the moral qualities and duties of its colonial subjects.

Meanwhile, ‘civility,’ the learning of modern ethics such as public morality, emerged as the desirable model of politeness in the course of adopting western ideologies. The new model of politeness in the service of the changing society took root on the Korean peninsula as a necessity for the management and improvement of Korea to advance and join the ranks of civil or harmonious societies. In addition to the cultivation of “loyal and good” colonial citizens, morals education under the GGK aimed to build a modern colonial society, and to stabilize a modern society where the colonized and the colonizer could live in harmony. The new ideals of polite behaviour changed from loyalty and patriotism to filial piety and civility in order to minimize social discord as well as hostility from the colonized group. The best remedy for harmony in the family was a mixture of traditional respect and modern civility (Yi Man’gyu 1994/1941, 119).

In short, the visions of an ideal colonial society and its subjects in response to the demands of the Japanese Empire made politeness an object of value ascriptions. If this was the case, what relevance did the metapragmatic accounts of linguistic norms of politeness have to the socio-political visions of imperial Japan to build and control colonial Korea? The birth of the linguistic sign of deference (i.e., kyŏngŏ or keigo) did not begin in the discourse on etiquette or manners, but was a concomitant result of the modern notion of politeness, civility. Below, Figure 1 summarizes the historical changes in the metapragmatic evaluations of honorific language in Korea:

---

69 Yi Man’gyu’s Kajŏng tokpon (Original title: Hyŏndae munhwa kajŏng tokpon) (1994/1941) supported the Girei junsoku ‘Ceremonial standards’ (儀禮準則) published by the GGK in 1934.
Note that ‘deference’ used to have only peripheral indexical value in discussions of politeness expressed by linguistic means (see Section 2.4). As seen in Section 3.5, linguistic politeness was pre-contextualized within a hierarchical context first marked by those who believed in civility as the ideal model of politeness in interpersonal relations. A political interest in creating a new model of society offered an interpretive anchor from which to judge conventional linguistic practice from a certain perspective, and ascribed a negative value to the linguistic practice (e.g., by denigrating it as flattery). However, the GGK morals textbooks began to support the culture of respect for elders as an authentic attribute originating in the cultural history of “our country,” including the ethnic Korean tradition. The colonial morals textbooks carried over into politeness education the conventional norms of speech as a code of conduct in prudent acts of communication: e.g., Unit Nine on “Language and Attitude” (gengo to taido) in KFGS 1 (1923) and Unit Fifteen on “Language-use” (kotobazukai) in JKF GS 1 (1925).

However, the most interesting change after 1910 was the increasingly commonplace promotion of “polite speech” with elders or others in general in morals textbooks, along with an emphasis on the positive valorization of traditional customs and their potential benefits in social life. For instance, Unit Thirteen on “Politeness” in FGS 4 (1924) disciplines students to use “language politely” (kotobazukai o teinei ni) in social interactions. The teacher’s guide for the same unit gives a more detailed account of the use of linguistic forms. Specifically, it advises teachers to make students practice keigo ‘honorific language’ when discussing the affairs of the
Japanese imperial family (kōshitsu 皇室). Furthermore, appropriate honorifics were encouraged for referring to others by name, while refraining from the use of honorific language with the names of one’s own family members and relatives. This particular usage demonstrates the imposition of the practice of Japanese keigo upon Korean students, insofar as Korean honorification in the Korean language expects children to use honorifics with older members of their families and relatives.

Furthermore, honorifics started to become a linguistic emblem of Japanese national character from ca. 1890, but especially ca. 1920 (Koyama 2004, 416). In this regard, decent language was no exception when it came to the emblematization of (Japanese) national culture during Japanese Imperialization in colonial Korea between the late 1930s and 1945. Unit Sixteen on “Language-use” (kotobazukai) in SS 4 (1943) reminds students to use the utmost careful language in reference to the affairs of the Japanese imperial family, followed by this comment: “Expressing one’s deeply reserved mind through language is an excellent/outstanding point of us Japanese.” The “manifestation of a prudent mind” was metaphorically understood as an excellent and outstanding attribute of the Japanese. However, the use of courteous or polite speech still had to be explicitly taught to colonial schoolchildren. This unit guides colonial schoolchildren to use polite speech out of respect for their superiors (me ueno hito) because indecent speech manifests the speaker’s mind.

As illustrated above, the use of Japanese honorific language was an important part of morals education in schools to cultivate respect towards elders and the Japanese imperial family in the minds of students. Such an approach to the norms of linguistic politeness shows a stark contrast with those aspects of language depicted as polite in the premodern and Enlightenment eras. The Japanese metalinguistic term for “honorific language,” keigo, not only regards linguistic forms themselves as key elements of expressions of politeness but also assigns
‘deference’ as the default pragmatic function to the entire repertoire of linguistic categories. When ‘deference’ came to the center of attention in morals education (whether as a target of criticism or as something to be promoted), linguistic etiquette or manners was contextually presupposed as embedded in power relations. Once the indexical value of keigo was established as an emblem of Japanese tradition, this culture-specific model could be ideologically shared by others (Koreans) who ‘possess’ honorific repertoires (Koyama 1997a).
Chapter 5: Engraving ‘Deference’ in the Korean Language from the 1870s to 1945

5.1 Introduction

This final analytical chapter of the dissertation deals with the question of how honorific registers—systems of linguistic repertoires recognized as a sign of honor or respect (Agha 2002, 21)—became central to the cultural understanding of linguistic politeness in modern Korea. The origins of this deep-rooted belief require a consideration of the formation of modern Korean linguistics as a field of study and research. How did linguistic forms pertaining to politeness finally rise to salience or come into the limelight as one of the main components of what makes speech polite? It has been linguistic experts who have constructed the closed linguistic system of deference in the structural analysis of the Korean language. This section takes a closer look at the form-function construct of honorific registers as illustrated in linguistic studies. The history of linguistic studies of the Korean language allows us to understand how both the linguistic repertoires and the honorific functions effectuated by linguistic forms came to the perception of language users.

Metapragmatic practices are the primary loci for ideological expressions and production that allow us to observe how language users identify certain speech forms and produce language as a culturally distinct icon. I argue that particular judgements of both non-native and native speakers of Korean concerning their perceptions of a “national language” intertwined with Korean society and culture rendered the metapragmatic design of Korean linguistic politeness as

---

70 Our primary sources are drawn from (non-)Korean intellectuals’ analyses and commentaries presented in language references (language manuals, grammar books, textbooks, etc.), and public discourses (writings on Korean linguistic politeness in periodicals and newspapers).
the linguistic manifestation of politeness. I examine how this evaluative ground played out in the formation of honorific registers in the case of Korean. In particular, the linguistic analysts’ underlying views on the local language, society and culture reveal that the evaluators engaged in the analytical process of building honorific registers by accrediting a deferential function honorification so as to regularize the morpho-syntactic forms of politeness.

5.2 The History of Analyzing Linguistic Forms of Polite Speech

Two kinds of metapragmatic activity are worth mentioning in the formation of Korean honorific registers. The first practice was instruction in kugyŏl (口訣), a marking system of vernacular Korean glossing used as a device to help read and understand a Literary Sinitic text. The second genre of metapragmatic practice was reference guides to Korean language and grammar, which began to be produced from the late 19th century.

5.2.1 The Regularization of Honorific Forms in Vernacular Glossing Practice

The study of Korean honorific registers did not spring from the study of politeness; rather, it began with the study of vernacular and colloquial forms of the language. The history of writing on the Korean peninsula reveals natives’ reflections on linguistic forms and structures before the inception of modern grammar. Due to the differences in linguistic structure between Korean and Chinese, speakers of Korean had a long history of textual pointing of texts in Literary Sinitic (漢文) from the Koryŏ Dynasty (918–1932) known as kugyŏl glossing practices which inserted vernacular grammatical elements often written in simplified sinographs (漢字) in Literary Sinitic texts. The term kugyŏl also refers to the vernacular particles and endings attached to texts in Literary Sinitic.
A few kugyŏl manuals—structured instructions on a variety of kugyŏl forms and their meanings—compiled in the 19th century are extant, such as Yi Samhwan’s (李森煥 1729–1813) “Kudu chinam 句讀指南” (n.d.) ‘Instructions for Vernacular Glossing’. A kugyŏl manual like this provides an example of the linguistic analysis of vernacular Korean speech forms. Since the vernacular Korean language had linguistic alternations used with reference to superior interlocutors, the explanations of the vernacular glosses involve linguistic forms pertaining to politeness. Among others, the “Kudu Haepŏp 句讀解法” ‘Vernacular Glossing Manual,’ written by Chosŏn literatus Im Kyujik (任圭直 1811–1854), is virtually the only kugyŏl manual that distinguishes honorific forms and functions from non-honorific or plain forms (Ch’oe Sik 2008). The following table illustrates some examples of kugyŏl glosses along with Im’s notes on the context of their usage, followed by the honorific variants that typically include honorific -si/sy- and polite -ngi- in verbal forms (with ho- ‘to do’ or copula i- ‘to be’):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situations of occurrence</th>
<th>Formal variations</th>
<th>Im’s note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>意相承一人之事 ‘The meaning is mutually respectful; monologue.’</td>
<td>ho-ya</td>
<td>ho-sy-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>此是字上 ‘This goes above the sinograph’</td>
<td>i; i-ni; ho-ni; ho-no-ni</td>
<td>ho-si-ni; ho-si-no-ni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Examples of Im’s accounts of vernacular honorific alternations from the “Kudu Haepŏp”

As illustrated above, Im categorizes the semantic function of a set of vernacular verbal forms used in “addressing kings or parents” or “referring to the affairs of kings, parents or sages” as ‘respectful appellation’ (chonch’ing). Here, the honorific function is a pragmatic result

---

71 “Kudu chinam” (n.d.) is part of Yi Samhwan’s handbook for children, Paekkaŭi 百家衣 (1811). See also Sim Kyŏngho (2002) for a bibliographic note on “Kudu chinam.”
effectuated by deploying a particular alternant with an additional morpho-syntactic element (-si-). Unlike terms of address or lexical expressions, morpho-syntactic elements in honorific alternants are relatively difficult for native speakers to recognize as honorific markers due to their non-referentiality (Silverstein 1981). In other words, the linguistic ability to use the honorific alternant properly does not presuppose the native speakers’ recognition of the particular form as an honorific marker. The honorific function is concomitant with the use of the particular form with a respectable interlocutor, rather than the form-in-use signifying an honorific attitude towards the interlocutor. The lack of referentiality in morpho-syntactic forms can explain why they were not recognized traditionally as a constituent of propriety in speech. Rather, as we have seen in previous chapters, the propriety in one’s message or quality of voice in speech was taken as a definite cue for linguistic politeness at a metapragmatic level, except in the case of a few lexical forms such as terms of address.

Nonetheless, the production of the metapragmatic label chonch’ing in the “Kudu Haepŏp” is a precursor to the modern analysis of honorific registers, the stratified system of ‘deference’ in modern studies of Korean linguistics. The “Kudu Haepŏp” took the morpho-syntactic forms of Korean as an object of linguistic analysis with the purpose of structuralizing the vernacular morpho-syntactic forms and their meanings in a form-function construct. The deferential function was deduced from the context-in-use because the verbal variety in question was used in speaking to superiors or esteemed people or in reference to their actions. As an outcome of this metapragmatic activity, a particular group of linguistic forms was labeled as chonch’ing and understood as denotatively functioning as a deferential marker. With the guidance of this manual, a kugyŏl practitioner could learn to deploy a chonch’ing form as a sign of deference in the pragmatic context of addressing kings, parents or sages or referring to their actions.
The characterization of certain non-referential forms as markers of deference suggests that linguistic politeness began to be drawn into the scope of grammar rules through the language users’ metapragmatic activity of assigning functional meanings to linguistic forms. The metapragmatic practice of regularizing the functional meanings of vernacular linguistic structures extended the scope of metalinguistic analysis from referential forms (e.g., lexical elements) to non-referential forms (e.g., morpho-syntactic structures). The “Kudu Haepŏp” clearly shows the native speakers’ awareness of the indexical function of the morpho-syntactic elements. The cultural norm of interaction whereby deference was expected when a speaker addressed an addressee higher in status or spoke about a referent higher in status seems to have carried the most weight as an indexical anchor to single out the distinctive character of *chonch’ing*. The indexical function was contingent upon presupposing a hierarchical context wherein speakers were expected to pay respect to an honorable referent or addressee. That is, this metapragmatic characterization of honorific registers derived from the application of a typical scenario of occurrence. The functional analysis of non-referential forms grounded in an analyst’s judgement of the appropriate model of normative behaviour entailed a metapragmatic structure which could represent the honorific effect as an inherent function.

However, it should be remembered that honorific registers are not a denotational sign of deference, since the functional meaning is not inherently encoded in the grammatical variants. The deferential function can be assigned to a set of grammatical forms from the inference of the pragmatic context wherein a referent or an addressee is superior to a speaker. A variety of intentions and effects is involved in the actual use of honorific registers. To use language properly in spoken or written communication can mean an act of civility, refinement, gender, or class identity, etc. Toward a referent or addressee, it can indicate intimacy or distance, formality, sacrament, flattery, etc. The pragmatic functions accomplished by non-referential forms are
flexible in actual communicative interactions. However, it was the application of a normative ideology of respect to the functional analysis of linguistic alternants produced honorific registers which encapsulate deference in non-referential morpho-syntactic forms.

5.2.2 The Rise of Korean Honorific Registers: By Non-Koreans

Although premodern Koreans devised several inscriptional practices for marking the agglutinating or inflecting elements of their vernacular language, the history of Korean grammar as a field of scientific study was initiated by foreigners. The first sketches of the characteristics of Korean grammar began with brief introductions penned by Western European missionaries, officers and scholars in China and Japan from the latter half of the 20th century (Ko Yŏnggŭn 2001, 2-15; Yi Namyun 2006). The increasing interest in studying Korean was in line with the growing interest of the great powers in the Korean peninsula from the 1870s. After the Chosŏn Dynasty opened its doors to foreign countries in the wake of the Kanghwa Treaty of 1876, brief accounts of the Korean governmental system and culture soon expanded to the authorship of language manuals, including phrase books, grammatical sketches, and bilingual dictionaries. The first departments of Korean language were opened in universities in Japan and Russia (Ko Kyŏngmin 2012, 50).

Non-Koreans who attempted to master Korean for a wide range of purposes led the way as the pioneers of modern Korean linguistics, adopting Western-European studies of grammar. Due to the lack of native instructors and language manuals for learning Korean, Catholic and Protestant missionaries in Korea were dedicated to studying the local language for mission work. Early Korean language studies were indebted to the systematic approach made first by French
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72 For literature reviews, see Kangu Poksu (1979), Ko Yŏnggŭn (2001), King (2004, 2005), Ch’oe Hoch’ŏl (2005), Chu Hyŏnhŭi and Ch’ae Yŏnghŭi (2016); U Hyŏngsik (2016), etc.
missionaries, then followed by Anglophone missionaries up to the colonial era. German missionaries also published extensive Korean language references during the colonial era.

The Japanese had a longer history of learning spoken Korean than did Westerners. Korean was important for Japan for trade and diplomatic relations from the early 18th century (Chu Hyŏnhŭi and Ch’ae Yŏnghŭi 2016, 80-84). Meiji Japan (1868–1912), which went ahead with its own modernizing project for its “national language” by importing Western European linguistic models, applied these frameworks—filtered and assimilated through Japanese—to analyze the grammatical system of the language of its neighboring country. After the Japanese annexation of Korea in 1910, the study of the Korean language assumed even greater importance for the Japanese. Almost two hundred Korean language manuals in Japanese were published between the 1870s and 1945, targeting a wide range of Japanese learners such as merchants, soldiers, and residents or government officers in colonial Korea (ibid., 85).

As one of the prominent Korean intellectuals in colonial Korea, An Hwak (1915), noted, non-Koreans’ contribution to Korean linguistics laid a monumental foundation for the scientific study of the Korean vernacular. For native Koreans up to the late 19th century, the Korean

73 However, it should be noted that the native Korean assistants helping non-Korean intellectuals lent crucial support for the foundational works on modern Korean language and linguistics: e.g., Yi Ŭngch’ an for Ross, Ch’oe Chihyŏk for Ridel, and Yi Ch’ angjik for Gale. (Ko Yŏnggŭn 2001, 9, 12; Kang Namuk 2009, 208, 215).
74 For instance, see Ko Yŏnggŭn 2001, 22-16; Ko Yejin and Wŏn Yunhŭi (2014), and Cho Wŏnhyŏng (2016) on the contribution to Korean language studies made by German missionaries such as Romer, Roth, and Eckardt.
75 In addition to textbooks for communication with the locals, Japanese scholars from Keijō Imperial University and colonial government officials led early academic research and education in Korean linguistics, a project that often helped rationalize the Japanese colonization of Korea (Yi Chunsik 2002). Furthermore, the Korean Language Research Society (Chosŏnŏ yŏn’guhoe), an organization dedicated to Korean language research and education for Japanese, published magazines and textbooks to spread general knowledge of the Korean language and culture, as well as to help Japanese colonial officials and other Japanese residents in Korea prepare for the Korean language tests for Japanese personnel in the employ of the colonial government in the 1920s and 1930s (O Taehwan 2009).
vernacular had been a “marginal language” without official status as a common or national language (Sŏ Minjong 2009). Modern Korean linguistics was framed as a product of Western knowledge. In order to conceive of this previously unknown and unstudied language, western and Japanese authors used devised systems of spoken grammar that adopted the parts of speech and syntax from traditional Latin grammar (Yi Namyun 2006; Kang Namuk 2009).

Furthermore, the study of Korean grammar generated more than just a list of linguistic rules. The construction of Korean grammar was part of the attempts of outsiders to the Korean language to epitomize and stereotype local culture. Many Western authors approached linguistic differences as the manifestation of different habits of mind (Silva 2002). In the gaze of non-Koreans, Korean ethnic culture was embodied in vernacular Korean. The Korean language was not something separated from the identity or essence of the ethnic group (Yi Sanghyŏn 2013). At the deepest level, non-natives’ descriptions of the Korean language produced important cultural-linguistic knowledge about and for the local community. In particular, Korean linguistic manners required close cultural-linguistic analysis on the part of non-Koreans (Pak Kŏnsuk 2006). One of the memoirs of Canadian missionary to Korea, James Scarth Gale (a.k.a. Ki Il, 1863–1937) vividly describes his perplexed reaction to his experience of the various forms for the same verb ‘go’ (Gale 1926, 10). The complex practice of linguistic alternations stood out to non-native Korean speakers as something particularly “Korean” and challenging. Thus, the first and foremost task for foreign learners in acquiring the local language was to be able to figure out how to use different formal variations in the proper situations.

Non-native speakers’ participation in the analysis of the spoken Korean language was a turning point in the formation of honorific registers in Korean, as they approached Korean linguistic etiquette centering on the phenomenon of formal alternations. In order to analyze the functional meanings of linguistic variants, a superior-inferior relation in communicative
interactions emerged as the most appealing contextual variable. Ross (1877) classified verbal
alternations into three groups of interlocutors: to a superior, among equals, or to an inferior in
terms of rank or age. A similar tripartite classification was most common among Japanese
authors. Hōsako Shigekatsu 寶迫繁勝 (1880), who wrote one of the earliest modern-style
Korean language manuals with grammatical explanations, codified verb endings into “three
levels of common speech” (常語三等之別): high, middle, and low (上等—中等—下等). The
heart of linguistic politeness phenomena in Korean was understood as a class distinction by
means of language. The systematization of the formal elements of politeness was something that
native speakers had rarely paid attention to in their discussions of linguistic politeness.

The linguistic codification of class distinctions in the Korean language derived from the
analysts’ knowledge of local culture. The study of Korean honorifics was in this regard directly
related to the projection of ethnonational culture onto the configuration of a linguistic custom.
Dallet (1874, XCIIV - XCVI) states that the class-oriented norms of politeness induced
grammatical complexity in Korean linguistic etiquette. The number of delicately graduated
honorific forms proves that the Koreans are extremely “ticklish” (chatouilleux) about levels of
respect, according as the individual to whom one speaks is a superior, equal or inferior (Ridel
1881, 99). Hulbert (1905, 103) states that the adoption of a system of honorifics was doubtlessly
due to the idea of social distinction fostered by Chinese influence. He goes on to say that this
linguistic practice would inevitably continue until the gradations in society and pride of caste
became an issue for change. Similarly, Takahashi (1921[2010], 42-43) mentions that the
Korean’s keen sense of social distinctions has given rise to a complex system of honorifics.

Once essentially characterized as a social indexical, Korean honorific registers were put
into use as a cultural icon to support both positive and negative evaluations of Korean culture.
While Westerners negatively assessed Korean honorifics as the sign of a backward or uncivilized community, Japanese authors saw the same phenomenon as a positive tradition. For instance, Hulbert (1906, 302) took “grammatical superiority” as the “luminous collocation of ideas.” However, Griffis (1912, 184) lambasted Korean honorifics as “verbal branding irons.” Noting that the mind of a people is in its speech, Griffis (ibid., 182-183) confesses that what most “troubled the man from the democratic Occident and the freedom of America was the elaborate and perplexing system of honourifics [sic].” According to Griffis, Sinitic Asia in general was built on a hierarchical social structure, instead of on love and affection based upon equality. Such conceptualizations of Korean society and culture led him to understand Korean honorifics as a principle of subordination that verbally bestows honour or shames on the basis of hierarchical lines and the fear of ghosts. Griffis’ judgement of Korean culture, from a sense of (western) superiority, is apparent from his assertion that the “mental freedom, intellectual fertility and general progress of European races” are ascribed to the fact that they left archaic ancestor worship to “savages and the semi-civilised” (ibid., 184).

On the other hand, the Japanese, whose language has a similar linguistic practice of politeness (J. keigo), considered Korean honorific registers worth promoting. During the 1920s in colonial Korea, the alleged breakdown of polite speech required a reform due to a belief in language as the representation of one’s moral character and dignity (Ishii 1925, 31-32). Similarly, Okuyama (1928, 37) praises a speaker’s self-effacement or ‘respect’ towards one’s superior in rank or age in Korean terms of address as the “beautiful custom of respect for seniority” (chōyōyūjo no bifū). Mikajiri Hiroshi (1934, 101) also associates Korean honorifics with one of the major characteristics of Korean culture, that is, the “Nation of Gentlemen in the East” (tōhō no kunshikoku) on the basis of Confucian ideology.
As discussed so far, it was non-native speakers of Korean who brought linguistic forms to the forefront as a central constituent of the linguistic practice of politeness in the Korean language. The grammar of the spoken Korean emerged as an important topic of studies for non-native speakers of Korean since language was an essential means of tapping into local culture. As Carles (1888, 310-311) wrote, “so many ways of saying the same thing depending on different ranks or social positions” drew the non-native speakers’ attention to the theorization of Korean linguistic politeness in terms of linguistic alternations in a hierarchical framework. The Other’s gaze upon local culture in a stratified social structure was applied to make sense of the (cross-)linguistic salience of politeness in Korean.

As a result, the native practice of linguistic politeness was framed as the delicate projection of superior-oriented politeness, which had rarely surfaced in native Koreans’ conceptualizations of linguistic etiquette or manners. Rather, the norms of linguistic politeness in traditional society as the expression of a speaker’s moral cultivation and physical discipline based in virtues like prudence, sincerity, or calmness came to be disregarded in favor of a linguistic model of social norms which was taking shape in the modern field of linguistics. The non-natives’ characterizations of Korean honorific registers reflected their attempts to take language (or linguistic practice) as a manifestation of society and culture that they perceived through language structure. Whether positive or negative, a set of linguistic repertoires pertaining to linguistic politeness was essentially comprehended as an icon of a distinctive national culture.

5.2.3 The Stabilization of Korean Honorific Registers: By Native Speakers
Following the non-native pioneers, native Koreans joined in the project of establishing the theory of a Korean national language galvanized by contact with European-Western models of linguistics through both English and Japanese (see Kang Poksu 1979; Yi Hyŏnhŭi 2015). A
series of manuscripts by Yu Kilchun on Korean grammar written between 1897 and 1909, Chu Sigyŏng (1910), Kim Kyusik (1909), and Kim Hŭisang (1909) are some of the earliest grammatical works by Koreans. All of these early linguists were familiar with European models of modern grammar from studying English. The framework of Western linguistics based on Latin grammar was prominent in the analysis of the Korean grammatical system, typically for parts of speech, although specific terminology and categories varied. The other source of influence was from Japan where Western modern linguistic analysis had taken root a decade or so earlier for the construction of the theory of kokugo or ‘national language’ under the Meiji government.76

The advent of modern Korean linguistics among native Koreans was spurred by the attempt to read and write in the vernacular language as an effective means for mass education. Korean language studies among Koreans were prompted by the demands of the times in the interests of the society and nation, rather than by an interest in studying language per se (Kang Poksu 1979, 61). As an effective means for the masses to attain new knowledge and enhance national power and prestige, the promotion of the simple native phonetic script emerged as the single most salient issue for the public interest (Sŏ Minjŏng 2010a, etc.). The rise in the status of this script—newly renamed as kungmun or ‘national script’ in 1894.77 Thus, the non-natives’ pioneering contributions to modern Korean linguistics were re-appropriated by native Korean

76 Linguistic terminology such as munjŏn ‘grammar of the written language,’ ŏjŏn ‘grammar of the spoken language,’ and munpŏp or ŏbŏp ‘grammar’ originated as translations from Japanese terminology. Kang Poksu (1979, 75) suggests that the title of Yu Kilchun’s first grammar book, printed as Taehan Munjŏn (1908), was likely inspired by the Japanese work with the similar title, Nakane Kiyoshi’s Nihon Bunten (1876).

77 The symbolic change in the language situation is observable from the government documents of the Japan-Korea Treaty (1876) and a government directive on the use of Korean script, the first royal edict immediately after the Reforms of 1894 (King 1998; Ko Yongjin 2008; etc.). The Korean vernacular script (ŏnmun) gained official status as the national script (kungmun) as part of the Kabo Reforms (1894–1896), a state-led overhaul for socio-political modernization.
intellectuals. Due to the lack of experience in using the native language for public purposes, however, the next step was to establish rules for the vernacular language.

Moreover, the establishment of vernacular grammar held a value as the collective identity of the linguistic community as the aspirations for a modern nation-state mounted. The earliest works on vernacular Korean as a national language attempted to disrupt the long-lasting reliance on sinographs and Literary Sinitic so as to accomplish ŏnmun ilch’i or ‘unity between speech and writing’ based on the vernacular language. Ri Pongun (dates unknown) who authored the *Kungmun Chyŏngni* ‘Readjusting Korean Writing’ (1897), one of the earliest attempts to approach vernacular Korean, laments the situation in his country where Koreans worship another country’s language (i.e., Literary Sinitic) without having any knowledge of their own native language.78 Korean nationalists spurred linguistic studies on the vernacular language as an appealing resource for promoting national identity (Schmid 2002, 67-68).

Similarly, the native script and the linguistic structure of the vernacular language were promoted as the national model for the emerging nation-state and the people.79 Yu Kilchun (1856–1914), the first native author of a modern Korean grammar titled *Chosŏn Munjŏn* (ca. 1897-1904, 1) characterizes the significance of the native script and vernacular grammar as none other than the expression and sound of the ideas of the Korean people. After the Japan-Korea Protectorate Treaty of 1905, Koreans’ attention to the vernacular began to transform from the formation of a common and official language for the state into a nationalist movement to unite the ethnic group (Cho T’aerin 2003; Ch’oe Kyŏngbong 2012). Chu Sigyŏng (1876–1914), a
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78 In his preface, Yi attributes the wealth and power of countries and their people to cherishing and learning their own language in administering state and civil affairs.
79 Yu sought to lay the foundation of the grammar (*munjŏn*) of the vernacular language as a set of rules for indigenous people to express their thoughts. Yet, he advocated including sinographs within the scope of *kungmun* or ‘national script,’ noting that the unified grammar of English also came into being through blending with other scripts and languages. For Yu, spoken and written Korean were inevitably related to Sino-vocabulary and the Literary Sinitic writing style.
pioneering Korean grammarian and educator widely recognized as the founder of modern Korean linguistics, had a tremendous impact on the ideology of linguistic nationalism in colonial Korea, by defining language as the foundation of the nation and the identity of the ethnic group as well as encouraging respect for the national script and national language (see Chu Sigyŏng 1907). Chu’s grammatical studies and dedication to education in the Korean language fostered an influential group of Korean linguists of future generations such as Kim Tubong (1889–?), Yi Kyuyŏng (1890–1920), Ch’oe Hyŏnbae (1894–1970), Chang Chiyŏng (1887–1976), etc.

The analysis of linguistic forms and structures of the native language among Koreans was consolidated under specific sociopolitical conditions: the search for pragmatic and values in the vernacular language as a means for mass education and ethnic identity. The introduction of modern linguistics shed new light on speech forms as the core indication of linguistic politeness. One of the earliest notes on honorifics is observable from Yu Kilchun’s manuscript Korean grammars. Yu (ca. 1897–1904, 13-14) distinguished two modes of politeness under the Verb section with the rather mysterious heading, *ch’ejae* (體裁): i) forms that express ‘respect’ (*chon’gyŏng*) for a referent’s behaviour; and ii) forms that express self-deprecation (*kyŏmgong*). The expression of politeness through lowering oneself was uncommon in most Westerners’ analyses of the Korean honorifics system, but common in analyses of Japanese honorifics.

However, native Korean grammarians’ structuralization of vernacular Korean as a national language soon stabilized the gradation of honorific forms. In addition to the humble and
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80 This is not to say that the language ideology underpinning the field of Korean grammar linguistics during the colonial era can be simplified as linguistic nationalism. As noted in Yi Chunsik (2002) and Ch’oe Kyŏngbong (2012), some Korean linguists in the 1920s and 1930s such as Yi Hŭisŭng (1896–1989), Yi Sungnyŏng (1908–1994), and Hong Kimun (1903–1992), pursued linguistic works on Korean as a purely scientific enterprise while problematizing the perspective of language as a reflection of ideas or as a social action. All in all, native Korean grammarians’ participation in the codification of Korean grammar from different perspectives resulted in the production of linguistic knowledge about the national language.
honorific auxiliary verbs, Yu’s revised edition (1909, 58-59, 61-65) classified the honorific levels of the imperative endings into three groups: i) respectful (kyŏngŭi); ‘equals’ (p’yŏnggyo); and below equals’ (p’yŏnggyo iha). The elaboration of the honorific levels in terms of power variables (especially, age or social status) is clear from the language works of native grammarians beginning from around 1910 (Table 2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (year)</th>
<th>Category of levels</th>
<th>Speech levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kim Kyusik (1909, 66-70)</td>
<td>Hadae 下待</td>
<td>-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ch’adae 差待 or panmal</td>
<td>-ney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P’yŏngdae 平待</td>
<td>-wo; -ciwo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chondae 尊待</td>
<td>-wopciwo; -noita; -opoita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Hŭisang (1911, 71-78)</td>
<td>Hadae 下待</td>
<td>-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pan-bandae 半半待</td>
<td>-lsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pandae 半待 or Panmal</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chungdae 中待</td>
<td>-wo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sangdae 上待</td>
<td>apsiwo; -wolsita; -apnita</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Speech levels (Kim Kyusik 1908; Kim Hŭisang 1911)

One of the differences between the linguistic analyses of the Western writers and those of native grammarians is that the latter appear to understand the speech levels as outlined above as a linguistic convention for marking social hierarchy and class rather than as a custom of politeness. As Chu Sigyŏng (1910, 99) shows, the grammar of switching sentence endings boils down to the act of “sorting out a distinction between young and old, and between the upper and the lower classes” (changyu chonbi ŭi tarŭm ŭl karŭnŭn kŏt). The linguistic indication of social hierarchy was gradually taken into account as one of the constituents of linguistic politeness within the category of chonch’ing ‘respectful appellation’ (An Hwak 1917; Ri P’il-su 1922, 1923; Pak Sangjun 1932; Ch’oe Hyŏnbae 1934) or kyŏngŭ ‘honorific language’ (Yi Kyubang 1922). Ch’oe Hyŏnbae (1937, 311) speculated that this aspect of linguistic culture could be attributed to the
culture-specific history of Korea, which implied the Confucian tradition in premodern Korean society. The shared tradition in history among the members of the Korean linguistic community allowed these linguistic signs codified as class distinctions to serve as a manifestation of the collective nature of a linguistic community that valued social hierarchy (Pak Sŭngbin 1935, preface).

Native grammarians who were committed to theorization of and education in the national language certainly created the momentum for characterizing honorific registers. Unlike the way in which linguistic politeness was conceived of in Chosŏn society, the function of honorific registers was confined to the issue of alternations in linguistic forms within the framework of modern linguistics. The linguistic feature of Korean honorific registers was defined as a cultural emblem on the basis of native speakers’ perceptions of Neo-Confucian ideology. This cultural model of behaviour bound to history regularizes the system of linguistic politeness as a system of verbal signs for elevating or lowering interactants. This prescriptive basis for the configuration of Korean linguistic politeness conceptualized the effect of linguistic alternation in a presupposed context of talking to or about an interlocutor superior to a speaker. The functional meanings of the linguistic forms were restricted to the analysts’ evaluations of Korean society and culture.

5.3 The Construction of Korean Honorific Registers

5.3.1 By Non-Korean Speakers

5.3.1.1 Metapragmatic Terms for Honorific Registers
The use of special terms for interlocutors based on social hierarchy appeared copious, important, and regular enough to warrant metapragmatic terms to characterize the linguistic phenomenon of
politeness in Korean. The function of such linguistic alternations was labeled as ‘honorific’ or ‘polite’, that is, speech forms used for a superior (thus respectable) referent or an addressee in rank or age. Variations of categorizations include a binary system (‘honorific’ vs common or ordinary) or a subdivision into three (high-middle-low) or more (Table 2). In comparison to the term *chonch’ing* as seen from the “Kudu haepŏp,” honorific forms or language politeness in non-native’s references to the Korean language involves levels of respect (honor) and/or social position/rank of the persons involved (superior-equals-inferior) to indicate that an honorific effect depends on power variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Form-function terminology</th>
<th>Pragmatic variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dallet (1874)</td>
<td>Honorific verbs or endings</td>
<td>For a superior of greater or less dignity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross (1877)</td>
<td>Three forms of verbs</td>
<td>According to whether the person addressed is superior, equal, or inferior in rank or age, to the speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston (1879)</td>
<td>Honorific forms vs. humble forms</td>
<td>3rd or 2nd person vs. 1st person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacIntyre (1880)</td>
<td>Three forms of civility (common form; middle form; higher form)</td>
<td>Towards inferiors, equals, or superiors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridel (1881)</td>
<td>Honorific terms (formes honorifiques) <em>Panmal</em></td>
<td>Level of respect according to the rank (age, social status) of the person who speaks, to whom is spoken, and/or about whom one speaks (superior, inferior; equal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffis (1882, 1912)</td>
<td>Honorific element; honorifics</td>
<td>The relation of inferior to superior, and <em>vice versa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott (1887, 1893)</td>
<td>Polite conjugation</td>
<td>In speaking of or to one’s superiors, inferiors in rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carles (1888)</td>
<td>Honorific forms</td>
<td>The social positions of the persons speaking, spoken of, and addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbault-Huart (1889)</td>
<td>Honorifiques (‘honorific forms’) Langage de la civilité (‘language of politeness’)</td>
<td>The rank/status of the speaker, of the interlocutor, and of the person being talked about (superior; inferior; equal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwood, H. (1890)</td>
<td>Honorific terms in the order given Polite form among equals Forms used to intimate friends or aged</td>
<td>Three ranks (inferiors, equals and superiors) The person spoken of and spoken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Form-function terminology</td>
<td>Pragmatic variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gale (1894)</td>
<td>The highest honorifics; respectful forms; forms used among friends, equals &amp; c. half-talk forms; low forms</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forms used to servants, children, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird (1898, 1903, 1911)</td>
<td>Low form; middle form; high form</td>
<td>Used to children, among equals, or to a superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodge (1902)</td>
<td>Three forms of speech (the extremely polite; the polite; low form)</td>
<td>When addressing or speaking to the upper classes; one’s equals or inferiors; to people of low standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwood L. (1904)</td>
<td>Honorific endings</td>
<td>When addressing natives of different ranks at the palace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulbert (1905, 1906)</td>
<td>Honorifics</td>
<td>Social distinctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stokes (1912)</td>
<td>“High,” “Honor a person spoken of”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckardt (1923)</td>
<td>The most posh form ([sic] sāngtūngmal); Middle form ([sic] tūngtūngmal); Comradely form ([sic] phỳōntūngmal); Abbreviated or shortened form (panmal); Low form ([sic] hatūng mal)</td>
<td>Used to superiors, subordinates, or between equals or friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romer (1927)</td>
<td>Plain vs. honorific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roth (1936)</td>
<td>Honorific form; three kinds of final forms (low, middle, and high forms); polite nouns; honorific verbs; honorific kinship terms; half word (intermediate form or Panmal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramstedt (1939)</td>
<td>1) A straightforward form (low form); 2) a familiar sociable form (middle form); and 3) a polite or honorific form (high form)</td>
<td>1) Mostly used only downwards to children and servants; 2) Used among civilized people, to friends and equals; and 3) must be used when addressing older, higher or honoured persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pai (1944)</td>
<td>Common forms vs. polite forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Table 3 Variations in categorizations of honorific registers by Western authors** |

Honorific forms were divided into several subgroups to define the gradation of deference, although the specific terminology and classification of forms varied from one analyst to another. Some authors recognized different forms reserved for different groups, but did not quite label the level of politeness other than with the umbrella terms ‘honorifics’ or ‘the language of politeness’ (e.g. Ross 1878; Ridel 1881). The basic division was a binary system. Aston’s (1879) notes on
the comparison between Korean and Japanese classified humble forms used for the 1st person and honorific forms reserved for others (2nd or 3rd person). The most common case was a tripartite system according to inferiors, equals or superiors, either as low/common vs. middle vs. high/higher forms or low vs. polite vs. extremely polite forms (e.g., MacIntyre 1880; Baird 1898; Hodge 1902).

The crucial change made in non-native works on Korean linguistic politeness is that they elicited a set of grammatical and lexical forms that defined the level(s) of deference, intended by a speaker for someone he/she speaks of or to as an expression of respect or recognition of status. The Westerners and Japanese analysts of Korean speech were the first to coin the metapragmatic labels for Korean linguistic practices of politeness such as ‘honorific forms’ (honorifics) or the Japanese term *keigo* (K. *kyŏngŏ* 敬語). Such metapragmatic categories represented honor, respect, or deference as the inherent function. This metapragmatic activity of labeling is different from comprehending the honorific function of a grammatical element from a pragmatic context because here the deferential function is defined by the linguistic form itself. In other words, these terms in and of themselves presupposed the pragmatic condition and effect. Once a group of forms capable of indexing status distinction in certain contexts is designated as a signal of respect (e.g., as honorific forms), the recognized forms come to denote the level/degree of deference/respect—in Agha’s (2005, 2007) term ‘enregisterment’.

According to Baird (1898, 10; 1904, 14; 1911, 16), westerners invented the Korean-language terms to classify important linguistic information such as *kaondae-mal* ‘middle talk’ to aid their language-learning process since certain metalinguistic terms were not readily offered by their native Korean teachers (Table 4):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminology</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Exemplary forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Terminology | Target | Exemplary forms
--- | --- | ---
Low form | Inferiors (e.g. children) | -ta; -la; -ca; -nya
Middle form | Among equals or to a grown person of inferior rank, and known as friend talk | -wo; -swo
High form | Toward a superior or between equals when an unusual degree of respect is indicated | homnoyta; hosiwo; hopsyeyta

Table 4 Metapragmatic terms for speech levels (Baird 1911, 16)

However, it should be mentioned that the use of forms ‘low’ on the ladder of the honorifics system in most of the Western authors of Korean grammars did not necessarily imply a speaker’s disrespect for inferiors in age or rank or among children. The core of polite speech as a language user lay in the ability to distribute proper terms in alignment with each social group. Some criticized the expression of the relation of inferiors to superiors as “verbal branding irons” of subordination, dishonor, or shame (Griffis 1912, 182-184), but mastering the choice of the proper honorific forms for superiors, equals, or inferiors was essential for students of the Korean language to be respected and to avoid giving offense to others—although they may not have desired to acquaint themselves with all these forms (Underwood 1890, 202-203).

#### 5.3.1.2 The Range of Honorific Registers

The characterization of honorific registers became tangible based on a limited number of signs. The functional meanings of formal constituents according to the interlocutor’s rank or status expanded from linguistic variations in verbal forms to other repertoires of forms assigned to different parts of speech. Predicates provided the most numerous and most regularly mobilized and recognizable forms while accounts of lexical expressions and honorific particles were less regular. The main division of honorific forms in Ridel (1881), one of the very first grammar books written by a Francophone missionary, includes the use of two auxiliaries: -si- and/or -wop-. The affixation of -si- to the verb related to the subject in a sentence was described as the primary
means for an inferior speaker’s expression of respect or honor for a superior person. The insertion of -wop- was described as associated with an inferior speaking to a superior listener. These two auxiliaries rendered addressee honorification complex in combination with a variety of sentence endings indicating the social status or age of a speaker or listener, power relations or intimacy between the two participants, and/or the degree of respect for a listener.

In addition to honorific registers formed by morphological changes in verbs, Ridel (1881, 118-119) illustrates a list of honorific terms alongside plain forms. He describes these special verbs and nouns as indicating politeness exclusively for actions performed by a superior. He notes that these expressions are commonly used in conversations or books and in the epistolary style, demonstrating a difference between polished language and plain language. Language references published after Ridel (1881) attempted to give more systematic descriptions of lexical honorific registers. Underwood (1890, 203) classifies honorific verbs in terms of the persons honored. For instance, capsruwo ‘to eat’ indicates the action of an honored subject whereas mwoysiwo ‘to accompany’ refers to a speaker’s action to honor the person who is affected by the action. In addition to honorific nouns that are directly tied to a person honored, Eckardt (1923, 114) distinguishes special terms about people or things connected to an honored person as the qualified recipients of honorific terms. Instead of adding affixes or modifying sentence-endings, honorific forms created by replacing plain forms with special words were another noticeable phenomenon identified in Korean language manuals authored by non-Koreans. Lexical honorific registers usually included honorific verbs and nouns (Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Termes vulgaires</th>
<th>Termes honorifiques</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘plain terms’</td>
<td>‘honorific terms’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mekta</td>
<td>capsruwa</td>
<td>To eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sikhita</td>
<td>pwumpwuha</td>
<td>To order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hyeyalita</td>
<td>thwongchwohota</td>
<td>To reflect, consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termes vulgaires</td>
<td>Termes honorifiques</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>namwulata</td>
<td>skwucywunghota</td>
<td>To scold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siwongnwuta</td>
<td>twuy pwoxita</td>
<td>To go to the toilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talita</td>
<td>mwoysita</td>
<td>To accompany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nil.ota</td>
<td>syangtalhota</td>
<td>To talk (to someone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apaci</td>
<td>elwusinney</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anhoy</td>
<td>noysyang</td>
<td>Spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atal</td>
<td>cotyey</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hyeng</td>
<td>poykssi</td>
<td>Older brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awo</td>
<td>tyeyssi</td>
<td>Younger brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samchwon</td>
<td>wancyang</td>
<td>Uncle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cywok.ha</td>
<td>hamssi</td>
<td>Nephew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne</td>
<td>hyeng or cipso</td>
<td>You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syeng</td>
<td>cwonhwo</td>
<td>Name (of family)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwutem</td>
<td>sanswo</td>
<td>Tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kwokpwul</td>
<td>kamkay</td>
<td>Cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mal</td>
<td>malsom</td>
<td>Speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Samples of lexical honorific registers (Ridel 1881, 118-119)

Western European observers of Korean speech accounted for both morpho-syntactic and lexical honorifics as early as the late 19th century. Verb conjugations were a prominent site for the analysis of speech forms. The analysis of speech forms typically identified modifications of verbs through the affixation of -si- and/or -op/wo-. In particular, the majority of attention was paid to detailed descriptions of a variety of terminations in verbs. Westerners made their contribution here by explaining the pragmatic principle of linguistic alternation in the context of interpersonal communication. Three parties to a conversation, i.e., the speaker, referent (person spoken about), and the listener (person spoken to), are important in order to describe the pragmatic system of polite speech in Korean. The morpho-syntactic elements distinguished in this way were associated with a deferential marker for the persons that speakers were talking to or about.

The range of lexical forms of politeness expanded in language works published over the course of time, even though the specific repertoires of lexical honorific registers enumerated
could vary across individual authors. Above all, a core number of terms of address and reference joined the characterization of Korean honorific registers. Due to the avoidance of personal pronouns in Korean, it was inevitable that Korean language manuals introduced Korean substitutes for personal pronouns such as you, he or she. While Ridel’s (1881) list mostly consisted of kinship terms which could be used as honorific terms of address or reference, another Korean language manual in French written by Imbault-Huart (1889) presented Korean terms made up of a few personal pronouns or kinship terms or general titles that could be used as substitutes for polite personal pronouns or as general terms of address for men or women. In addition, he was one of the earliest observers to remark on the use of the honorific suffix -nim and on the honorific particle skuyse. Baird’s (1897) manual of spoken Korean for beginners notes that (last) names accompanied by sepang ‘Mr.’ or syensoyng ‘lit., born first; teacher,’ or a specific title could serve as proper terms of address to refer one’s language teacher, alongside a few personal pronouns such as tangsin or kwong.

As illustrated above, a variety terms of address and reference constituted a crucial part of essential linguistic knowledge for foreign learners of Korean. Accounts of Korean terms of address and reference included the use of a few personal pronouns, and a variety of kinship terms and titles. As an increasing variety of lexical forms became recognizable, the typification of form-function relations took shape more or less along the lines of a grammar of marking honor or respect according to the social position of the participants. Imbault-Huart (1889, 34-36) presents the equivalent Korean terms in two groups: i) terms of humility used in place of the 1st person; and ii) polite titles reserved for others, as shown below. Driven by the comparative system of terms of address in French (vous, monsieur or madame), a variety of Korean terms in the latter group are subdivided into several social groups according to the referent’s age, rank or status, sex, etc.
E.g.) Samples of personal pronouns and titles in Korean
A. Imbault-Huart (1889)
i) Terms of humility in place of ‘I’ or ‘me’: sywosoyn, hasayng ‘low, little or men of nothing’; sywoin ‘little-man’
ii) Titles used to designate others

(Korean terms) (Equivalent usages in French)
key~keyney, inyek, caney, nimcya ...
(lit. master or boss) ... Vous to equals with respect
hyeng ‘older brother’; ...

Eckardt’s (1923) manual of Korean in German codifies the lexical distinctions of polite forms as either plain forms or polite forms. Although Eckardt’s presentation of verbal and nominal forms appears quite similar to that of his predecessor Ridel (1881), the analysis of the lexical phenomenon of politeness by the early 1920s had been assimilated to the analysis of speech levels and normalized as honorific registers reserved for unknown equals, superiors, exalted persons and elderly persons (Eckardt 1923, 114). The perceived notion of ‘honor’ as the essential function of Korean honorific registers is also clear from Eckardt (ibid., 115) in his attempt to assign the functional character of “honorific prefix” to the Sino-Korean prefix cwon-
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Roth (1936, 35-36, 194-197, 169, 282) offers one of the most comprehensive and elaborate accounts of terms of address and reference. Roth deals with kinship terms in two groups: ordinary words and honorific words. He also classifies the equivalent terms in Korean that can be used as personal pronouns in terms of whether a speaker refers to the 1st person or the 2nd person, which then allows clear distinguishing of functional differences between lowering oneself and honoring others (Table 6):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td><em>i salam</em> <em>i, swoin</em> ‘small man’; <em>pwon.in, swosayng</em> ‘small student’</td>
<td><em>Ich</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>To children or god</td>
<td><em>Du</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With intimate friends</td>
<td><em>ne</em></td>
<td><em>Du, Sie</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With equals</td>
<td><em>kaney, kwun</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With people with higher rank or status</td>
<td><em>kwong</em> ‘general,’ <em>tangsin</em> ‘the body in question’ (can also be used as the 3rd person), <em>yangpan</em> ‘noble,’ <em>sayngwen</em> ‘master,’ <em>nwohyeng</em> ‘older brother,’ <em>yengkam</em> ‘your grace; older man’</td>
<td><em>Sie</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Personal pronouns (Roth 1936, 282)

Terms for the 2nd person are further divided into three groups, echoing the classification of sentence endings for addressee honorification. While terms of address for the 1st person are defined as low forms, Roth identifies *tangsin* (used as both a 2nd- and 3rd-person pronoun) as a polite pronoun which can be replaced by the honorific terms *nwohyeng* ‘older brother’ or *kwong* 公 ‘duke.’ Sino-forms such as *ylene* ‘age’, *isip-sey* ‘twenty years old,’ as well as the vernacular suffix -nim and particle kkeyse when attached to a profession or an official title are also designated as honorific words. Besides, Roth prescribes the use of proper pronouns in agreement with speech levels. For example, the use of *ne* ‘you’ should match with the low interrogative form -nya, not the middle form -wo/swo (ibid, 282). Interestingly, Roth notes that the use of *ne* in
talking to God is the highest politeness form, which appears to be driven by his specific religious ideology (ibid.).

5.3.2 By Native Speakers

5.3.2.1 Metapragmatic Terms for Honorific Registers

Native terms were in use to present the perpendicular configuration of linguistic politeness according to the interlocutor’s status in age or differences in rank between the interlocutors: e.g., sŏbun ‘the division of order’ (Chu Sigyŏng 1910) or ch’arye ‘order’ (Kang Mae 1931), ch’ŭngsa-t’o ‘particles by levels’ (Kim Kyusik 1908 & 1912), tŭnggŭp ‘grade(s)’ (Yi Kyubang 1922), or tŭngbun (Ch’oe Hyŏnbae 1934). The order or level of speech forms was often recognized as ‘discrimination’ (ch’abyŏl) or ‘linguistic distinction of high and low’ (mal ŭi chonbi-jŏk kubyŏl), or seen as indicating the degree of respect for the interlocutor, or as indexing an inferior-superior relation or the relative positions of the interlocutors (Yi Kyuyŏng 1920; Hong Kimun 1927; Chang Chiyŏn 1930; etc.). Honorific terms used to someone high or esteemed in terms of age or status were referred to as chonch’ing 尊稱, chon’gyŏng-sa 尊敬辞, or kyŏngŏ 敬語. These terms refer to the marking of a speaker’s exaltation of his or her superior referent or addressee. In addition to a speaker’s respect, the expression of a speaker’s humble submission (kyŏmgong 謙恭 or kongson 恭遜) was also identified as another mode of expressing deference. Likewise, ‘raising’ or ‘elevating’ speech for a superior referent or addressee was referred to as honorific language (kyŏngŏ) or respectful style (chon’gyŏng-sik) and was contrasted with ordinary or lowering (hadae) or disrespectful (holtae 忽待) speech, flat or lowering speech (p’yŏngch’ing 平稱, pich’ing 卑稱) or non-honorific language (pigyŏngŏ)
towards somebody lower in status or deference. The status of ordinary or non-honorific speech
was still ambiguous between the lower level of high speech or higher level of low speech.

The details of linguistic politeness were conceptualized as a repertoire of speech forms
used to elevate or lower levels in terms of one’s status, the participants’ relationship, or the
degree of (dis-)respect expressed by the speaker. The binary system developed into a
perpendicular line by dividing the levels into three or four parts in most cases. For example, Chu
Sigyŏng (1910) classifies the degrees of deference into high, equal, and low groups, depending
on whether the speaker’s attitude towards the addressee is elevating or lowering. Thus, Chu
explains speech levels as the marking of different social positions in age or rank (changyu chonbi
長幼尊卑), depending on whether the speaker respects the addressee or not by means of
language. As a specific example, the -ta ending used to children bespeaks not only their low
position in the social hierarchy but also a degrading treatment toward children as a whole or
group. Similarly, the tripartite (high-middle-low) system marked by other native authors suggests
power relations (superiors-equals-inferiors) between the interlocutors along three levels, and/or
the speaker’s respectful, neutral or lowly attitude toward the addressee.

Although specific terms and levels varied, the speech level system of Korean honorifics
as described in modern grammars expanded and settled down into three or four grades during the
1920s and 1930s. Four levels or above can be created by adding one or two in-between level(s)
to the tripartite system. What many authors described as Pan-mal ‘half-speech’ (-ci or –a/e
endings) derived from the ordinary or intermediate level (-wo) that indicates mutual respect
between equals. While pan-mal represented less respect than usual for someone equal in status,
the other in-between level represented by the -ney ending indicated more respect for, or an
exalting attitude toward, someone whose status was inferior to the speaker, like servants or
children who normatively deserve the lowest speech forms. In other words, the high and low
speech levels could be subdivided or expanded to make up to five levels, intensifying or expatiating the raising and/or lowering effect signaled by the two ends of the vertical spectrum.

5.3.2.2 The Range of Honorific Registers

Lexical forms in honorific registers did not seem to draw as much attention as did morpho-syntactic forms in the early works on the Korean language written by native intellectuals (Table 7). Yu Kilchun’s manuscripts written between 1897 and 1904 show one of the first accounts of linguistic expressions associated with chon’gyŏng ‘respect.’ Linguistic signs used to honor the actions of others include the honorific affix -si- and the supplicatory sentence-ending -swosye whereas humble expressions are composed of sentence-endings with -nita or -ita: e.g., -opnita or -nonita. Kim Kyusik (1908) first presents the sentence-endings in four ranked levels according to power differences between interlocutors. Functional analyses of morpho-syntactic elements affixed to verbal forms were regularized as a grammatical system of deference or respect. Meanwhile, remarks on lexical forms were uncommon in the majority of natives’ grammar books published during the initial stage of register formation.
Table 7 The linguistic range of honorific registers as described by early Korean grammarians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Morpho-syntactic forms</th>
<th>Lexical forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>Particles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu Kilchun (1897-1909)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Kyusik (1909)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu Sigyŏng (1910)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Hŭisang (1911)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namgung Ok (1913)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Tubong (1916)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Hwak (1917)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi Kyuyŏng (1920)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Wŏnu (1922)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ri P’ilsu (1922)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi Kyubang (1922)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kang Mae &amp; Kim Chinho (1925)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi Sangch’un (1925)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Hŭisang (1927)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kimun (1927)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi Wanŭng (1929)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Chiyŏn (1930)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyŏngsŏng Chosŏnŏ Yŏn’guhoe (1930)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pak Sŭngbin (1931)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Yun’gyŏng (1932)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kang Mae (1932)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pak Sangjun (1932)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin Myŏnggyun (1933)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch’oe Hyŏnbae (1934)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sim Ŭirin (1936)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch’oe Hyŏnbae (1937)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The formation of lexical honorific registers began with the analysis of pronouns and nouns that refer to persons. Morpho-syntactic elements such as grammatical particles or suffixes were the next repertoire of honorifics to be tackled, as they attach to nouns that address or refer to the person honored. By contrast, terms that are less indicative of or less directly related to persons seem to have been relatively more difficult to identify than terms of address or reference such as special honorific verbs and nouns. Lexical variations for ‘yes’ were occasionally introduced as adverbial honorific registers. A few native authors attempted to analyze lexical expressions of
politeness in the 1910s. Kim Hŭisang (1911), who gives one of the first accounts of lexical honorification, associates the classification of pronouns, particles and adverbs with linguistic distinctions of a speaker’s treatment of his or her interlocutors triggered by power differences in age or rank (Table 8). An Hwak (1917) gives the earliest account of social titles in place of pronouns, and distinguishes special honorific verbs (Table 9). An Hwak’s (1927) dual (ordinary vs. honorific) system of honorific registers revolves around the honoring impact on others and excludes terms that might indicate a lowering effect, except for low appellation (pich’ing 卑稱) for the 1st person as a mode of politeness toward others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>High (hoapsiwo)</th>
<th>Middle (howo)</th>
<th>Half (panmal)</th>
<th>Half-half (hokey)</th>
<th>Low (hoyala)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns ('you')</td>
<td>cwoncang</td>
<td>lwohyeng; tangsin</td>
<td>caney; socey</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb ('yes')</td>
<td>yey; ney</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>way ‘why; wonya; wo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Lexical honorific registers (Kim Hŭisang 1911, 60-61, 68)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>1st person</th>
<th>Denigrating</th>
<th>2nd person</th>
<th>Ordinary</th>
<th>Honorific</th>
<th>Pseudo-appellation</th>
<th>Particle</th>
<th></th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Honorific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ce, sayng ‘I’; sywoin ‘little man’; uysin ‘body’</td>
<td></td>
<td>caney, imca, inyek, kutay ‘you’</td>
<td>kwong, tangsin ‘you’; ssi ‘Mr./Ms’; maneym ‘madam’</td>
<td>taykam ‘sir’; syensayng ‘teacher’; nali ‘master’; apeci ‘father’</td>
<td>-keyse (nominative); -key (dative); -(l)ye (vocative)</td>
<td></td>
<td>cvumusita ‘to sleep’; keysita ‘to be’; capswusita ‘to eat’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 Lexical honorific registers (An Hwak 1917, 23, 27-28, 37)

From the 1920s, most grammar books by native authors show more regularized and detailed accounts of lexical honorific registers. Kim Wŏnu (1922) describes the taxonomy of personal pronouns and/or titles in the 1st, 2nd, or 3rd person appellation. An Hwak (1917, 23) and Yi Sangch’un (1925, 42) first distinguish honorific suffixes (e.g., -nim or -ssi) that are attached to personal names, kinship terms or social titles. Terms of address in each category are identified
according to the gradation of a speaker’s high or low treatment toward the addressee’s social status across 3 or 4 levels, more or less following the pattern of addressee honorification (i.e., speech levels). While the majority of natives’ grammar books focused on lexical variations among terms of address, some authors expanded the scope of lexical honorification for the person honored from terms of address or reference to honorific verbs that refer to the actions of the person honored (An Hwak 1917; Yi Kyubang 1922). Interestingly, Kim Hūisang (1927, 72, 77) divides descriptive and processive verbs into ordinary and disparaging speech, attempting to include phonological variations in the vertical range of linguistic politeness: e.g., *ikes* (plain) vs. *yokes* (belittling) ‘this thing’; *pile mekta* (plain) vs. *payle mekta* (belittling) ‘to beg’; etc. Unlike non-natives’ works, accounts of honorific nouns in reference to things connected to the person honored are rare except for Yi Wanŭng’s (1929, 33) Korean grammar textbook for high schools and later revisions by Sim Úirin (1936, 30): e.g., *yakcywu* ‘alcoholic beverage’ (lit. ‘herbal liquor’) and *sywula* ‘meal’ (‘king’s meal (court language)’). Ch’oe Hyŏnbae (1937) distinguishes personal pronouns and terms of address and reference including kinship terms and specific titles more than other grammarians (Table 10):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parts of speech</th>
<th>Extremely High</th>
<th>Usual High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Extremely Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; person</td>
<td>*Uncommon: *taykam, lyengkam, nauli ‘sir’; apeci ‘father’; acesi ‘Mr.’; sensayng-nim ‘master’; lwoin ‘old man’; etc.</td>
<td>*Uncommon: *imca; kwihyeng; lwohyeng</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Non-standard: swoin; swosayng; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; person</td>
<td>*Uncommon: *pwun ‘honorable person’</td>
<td>*Uncommon: *salam ‘person’</td>
<td>*yay ‘kid’ i/ku/ce ca ‘this/that/that’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parts of speech | Extremely High | Usual High | Low | Extremely Low
---|---|---|---|---
taykam, lyengkam or nauli ‘sir’ |  |  |  | over there person’; nwom ‘bastard’; nyen ‘wench’

Suffixes | Honorific | -kwong, -ssi, -nim
Verb | Honorific | cwumusita ‘to eat’; malsumhasita ‘to speak’; phyenganhata ‘to be well’; etc.

Table 10 Sample of lexical honorific registers (Ch’oe Hyŏnbae 1937, 272-8, 274-8, 1077-9)

Korean terms of address are arranged in a semiotic system of levels of honor or respect in general by Koreans. Identifying lexical registers of politeness and conceptualizing their functional meanings had been neither obvious to, nor identical among, Korean native speakers. Even the linguistic analyses by the same author tend to become more elaborated in later publications.\(^8\) Over time, descriptions of the form-function construct of lexical honorification gradually came to align with the representations of a vertical alignment from low to high in respect, just as had happened with the establishment of the morpho-syntactic system of honorific registers according to final verb endings. Except for a few cases such as Yi Kyubang (1922) or Pak Sŏngbin 1931), the majority of natives’ studies of Korean linguistics normalized the structures of the pronominal system by analyzing them into 3 or 4 grades of deference. Although the specific speech forms assigned to each group could vary, the lexical elements of politeness were aligned along perpendicular lines. The labels for the forms in the top line refer to (extremely) honorific or elevating (K. chon’gyŏng, nop’im) language. Terms such as hadae ‘lowly treatment’ or pich’ing ‘low appellation’ at the bottom of the stratum comprise not only the inferior position of the interlocutors but also the (extremely) degrading or downgrading effect expressed by a speaker.

---

\(^8\) For instance, Kim Yun’gyŏng, who had only demonstrated sentence-endings as honorific registers in his earlier publication (1932), extends his presentation of the extensive phenomenon of lexical honorification to other parts of speech (e.g., nouns, particles) in Kim Yun’gyŏng (1948).
Thus, the semiotic range of linguistic signs was expanded from syntactic-grammatical (non-referential) types to lexical (referential) forms. One might expect terms of address, lexical words or phrases to stand out first when inferring the functional meanings of politeness due to the inherent referentiality and segmentality of these signs (Silverstein 1979). By contrast, and as mentioned above, grammatico-syntactic types are low in referential meaning. What is interesting to note is that the establishment of the form-function structure of Korean linguistic politeness played out the other way around. As shown in Table 7, it was the linguistic system of morpho-syntactic elements of politeness in the predicate that served as the precursor to the codification of the Korean lexical honorifics system, probably because the predicate in a Korean sentence structure is more susceptible to formal analysis.\textsuperscript{82}

The morpho-syntactic elements were first analyzed according to the two targets (referent and addressee) of linguistic politeness. The functional meanings of the non-referential forms were assigned by the analyst’s judgement of behavioral norms. Likewise, the construction of the lexical system of honorifics was centered on terms related to a referent and an addressee and the actions of the referent. This led to the form-function construct of lexical honorification as indexing gradations of low or high in terms of respect. The honorific particles and suffixes attached to nouns seem to have been the least salient or recognizable elements among the morpho-syntactic honorifics. Furthermore, the forms of lexical honorification recognized were prescriptively expected to be used in agreement with the honorific levels of the morpho-syntactic elements (Ch’oe Hyŏnbae 1937, 1080).\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{82} While the functional meanings of sentence-final speech forms were categorized according to the relative positions between a speaker and a listener, the identification of certain sentence-finals such as -ci (panmal), -key, or -ywo seemed less regular in the early stages but became more distinctive in later accounts of honorific registers.

\textsuperscript{83} The notions of subject agreement in verb morphology might be related to western European linguistics. Ch’oe Hyŏnbae (1937, 1080) underlines the referent-verb agreement of the honorific
5.3.3 Deconstructing Korean Honorific Registers

The stratified character of honorific registers is mapped onto particular forms by fixing them in a vertical arrangement. The evaluative ground for the construal of the ‘honorific’ effect is backed up by the dominant moral~behavioural norm of the local society that expects inferiors to show respect to superiors. As the functional meanings of linguistic forms attracted attention in the newly professionalizing study of the Korean language, the linguistic system of Korean honorific registers was constructed to match up with the politeness norms in “Korean” culture and the perceived social structure. The relation between a speaker and an interlocutor (referent or addressee) was assimilated to the construction of honorific registers as the presupposed speech context: between superiors and inferiors (e.g., servants, children) or among equals (e.g., friends) in terms of age or rank.

On the basis of the recognized stereotypes of usage, the codification of Korean honorific registers created a denotational form-meaning construct for the non-referential forms as markers of respect or deference. The recognized sign of graded respect or honor made it possible to understand the pragmatic conditions and effects of the form-in-use with this precondition, i.e., ‘speaking-up’ vs. ‘speaking down.’ Such a linguistic system of politeness prepped for verticalized indexicality entails the transparent manifestation of a social-hierarchy-based mentality. At this stage of recognition, social indexicality is expected to be interpretable/readable directly from or through the honorific system. It should be noted, however, that Korean honorification works as more than just a marking system of graduated respect according to social status. As a guide for how to use spoken Korean, the non-natives’ accounts of *panmal* and

levels in a sentence as follows: “Although the law of honorification (*nop‘im ūi bŏp*) is rare in Western languages, it is highlight developed in our language. It is very significant in actual linguistic life to use [honorifics] properly.”
respectful/polite forms in -wo shed light on the ways in which non-honorification in Korean is not merely about downgraded respect for and/or low social status of the interlocutor.

So-called half-talk or *panmal* typically includes verbal endings such as -ci or -a/e, which are abbreviated or shortened forms without politeness endings. Although modern Korean speakers nowadays tend to take it as disrespectful/low speech, *panmal* was originally characterized as casual and colloquial forms among intimate friends or children, by parents to children, etc. The use of *panmal* served as an index of casualness and intimacy which could not be fully satisfied by Low forms. Some authors created extra levels in between the basic three forms for such forms used mostly with friends or in casual conversation (e.g., Underwood 1890; Gale 1894; Roth 1936). In comparison to the “Middle Talk” used among equals, *panmal* indicated comradely speech in intimate relationships or in casual conversations where the expression of respect was not strictly expected. Moreover, *panmal* also counted as politer than “Low Talk” when it was used by superiors to inferiors such as aged servants. The other intermediate form was usually called a ‘polite/respect form’ (except in Eckardt (1923) who calls it a ‘middle form’). This speech level typically consists of forms ending in -wo, -ciwo, or -ywo. While *panmal* stands in between middle and low, respectful/polite forms in -wo evince a level of politeness in between high and middle; that is, they were defined as slightly high colloquial forms for use among equals or by superiors to subordinates.

As illustrated above, *pan-mal* was not initially described or defined as indexing the inferiority of or disregard for the addressee in communications between close friends and equals. Rather, this speech level could function as an expression of intimacy and casualness according to the analyses of both native and non-native speakers of Korea. Similarly, the medium-low speech (e.g., -ney ending) was not initially described or defined as indexing inferiority when used to certain subordinates such as aged servants. Rather, this speech level expressed respect for and
affection toward the addressee. Likewise, speakers to their superiors or equals to equals could use respectful/polite forms in –wo/-swo to signify the speaker’s intention to respect equals or subordinates, by speaking slightly ‘up’ from a Middle or Low form. As such, the non-natives’ accounts of non-honorific registers to equals or to inferiors show a more nuanced appreciation of pragmatic functions other than marking status or deference. A similar observation was made by Dallet (1874, 154-155), who considered different nuances contingent upon a speaker’s intimacy with an equal and upon whether his conduct towards an inferior was executed with cordiality, indifference or scorn.

Even though the grammar of politeness was in principle understood as an indication of power relations, the pragmatic contexts and effects of polite speech were not limited/confined to the level of respect alone in grammatical descriptions penned by non-Koreans. For example, Ridel (1881, 99) writes that a well brought-up person must consider not only respect relations between an inferior and a superior, but also relations of politeness and of familiarity. Ridel’s remarks are noteworthy in two senses (see also Underwood 1890, 106-113, 203). First, he recognizes that deployment of the grammar of politeness comes with certain expectations about one’s own respectability. Second, he distinguishes the expressive functions of politeness and familiarity from deference. Ridel lists a series of imperative endings with the all-purpose verb ho- ‘do’ to give an account of the differences among the forms beyond simply the “level of respect;” other parameters he identifies are familiarity between equals, the polished and elegant image of a speaker, and literary style. Ridel’s list of verbal endings also illustrates the flexible range of respect given to equals. Variations in the level of respect bestowed upon the same person by means of language are a clue that honorific language is not simply about or reducible to social hierarchy, but that speakers consciously or strategically use it to mark social hierarchy:

hayela: a tone of command to an inferior (hala = abbreviation)
**hakey:** less imperative to an inferior; familiar among equals

**hoswo:** polished and elegant but equal; too familiar and out of place with someone older or of a higher status (not respectful); equals

**howo:** polished but more respectful than hoswo; equals respect each other

**hosivo:** respectful (French: polite expressions)

**hapsiwo:** even more respect; equals with lots of respect

**howopsiwo:** more respectful yet again

**hosyosye:** respectful (French: polite expressions)

**hapsiwo:** even more respect; equals with lots of respect

**hosinoska:** same as above; to praise, but only in books (Ridel 1881, 99)

In addition, the more realistic and nuanced accounts of the linguistic practice of politeness show that what the speech forms in use do is not merely mark social distinction but strategically perform politeness. Ridel (ibid., 102) also provides discussion of performative uses of honorifics by modelling honorifics to a younger person: e.g., a grandfather’s talk to his grandson about the speaker’s son (i.e., the listener’s father) with honorifics. As one of his specific examples, Ridel (ibid., 102) advises that, although he has every right to drop honorifics in reference to his own son according to normative practice, a grandfather would be advised to say the following utterance with honorifics as below, “not because the grandfather respects the boy’s father but because the child should use the form”:

```
ney apeci cinci capswusyesnonya
‘Has your father [+HON] eaten his [+HON] meal?’
```

Along with Ridel, whose work also influenced Dallet (1874) and Underwood (1890), Eckardt (1923, 23), a German missionary in colonial Korea, also explained the rules of Korean linguistic politeness in great detail. In his division of speech forms into five sub-groups, Eckardt took a range of speaker-addresssee relations into account as below (Table 11):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of speech forms</th>
<th>Possible speaker-address relations</th>
<th>Basic endings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The most posh form</td>
<td>Subordinate speaks to superior; equals on honorific</td>
<td>ka-p-ni-ta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Groups of speech forms | Possible speaker-address relations | Basic endings
---|---|---
([sic] sāngtŭngmal) | terms with each other; or strangers to strangers | ‘go’
Middle form ([sic] tjŭngtŭngmal) | Equals to equals; usually superiors to subordinates | ka-wo; ka-si-wo
Comradely form ([sic] phyŏngtŭngmal) | Friends amongst themselves; or superior, condescendingly or patronizing to a subordinate | ka-ney; ka-na; ke-sey; ka-key
Abbreviated or shortened (panmal) | Comradely, also from superiors to inferiors; or children amongst themselves *Note: depending on the tone, this form can offend. | ka; ka-ci
Low form ([sic] Hatŭngmal) | Always to children; sometimes to subordinates; used especially in indirect speech; often also for amazement, and as exclamation | ka-n-ta; ka-ni; ka-ke-la; ka-ca

Table 11 Five different speech forms on the basis of endings (Eckardt 1923, 23-24)

Eckardt’s consideration of different speech situations suggests that the use of the same (non-)honorific speech form for one person may come out differently for others. For instance, the indexical function of the High Form between strangers might be different from that when used between equals, or by a subordinate speaker to his or her superior. Similarly, the indexical function of the Middle Form between equals is likely to change when a superior uses the same form to his or her subordinate. In another section, Eckardt (ibid., 214-5) also gives an example of speaking politely to children and subordinates without honorifics when giving a command form in the rhetorical form of a mild suggestion like “It’d be great if you did…” Eckardt (ibid., 213) describes the linguistic rules of etiquette as a sort of speaker’s commodity or expression of self-presentation which can prevent a speaker from being reproached as “uneducated or uncultured” and sees etiquette in East Asia as a shadow cast onto the language.

Even though linguistic studies on Korean language regularized the honorific levels of polite speech, the accounts of pragmatic usages conceded a fuzzy reality. The deferential function assigned to speech forms was neither determined nor constrained by the inherent meaning of language. Native grammarians’ accounts of Korean honorific registers were not limited to people high in status. As noted in Ch’oe Hyŏnbae (1937, 311), the function of verb
endings to index status bleaches when two parties mutually use certain speech levels: e.g., the lowest ending (*hayla*) between children; the low ending (*hakey*) between intimate friends; the honorific ending (*howo*) between strangers on a street; and the extremely honorific ending (*hapsywo*) between men of decent manners. Ch’oe explains this phenomenon as the neutralization of the division of high or low between people reciprocally using the same speech level. What qualifies titles as honorific expressions is not due to their denotational meanings but depends on the pragmatic situation.

All in all, the emblematic value of Korean honorific registers as supposedly centered on power relations is in fact subject to variation and manipulation. Despite such slippage between how language actually works and how language was supposed to work as described in the grammars, the grammarians’ language works later went ahead with solidifying the characterizations of Korean honorifics and linguistic politeness fundamentally as a sign of lowering or raising one’s position. The verticalized form-function construct normalized the representation of what politeness *should* mean and how language *should* work. The metapragmatic construct of honorific registers can disregard or even distort natural usages that may not be consistent with the stereotypically employed scenarios of usage and assumed intentions or predicated effects. A variety of other functions of honorific registers such as affective stances (kindness, anger, intimacy, etc.), formality, or speaker’s distinction of civility that can be recognized on the pragmatic level have been occluded from the codified metapragmatic framework of Korean linguistic politeness as a status or deference marking system.
5.4 Korean Honorific Registers: The Product of Valorized Knowledge

The formation of honorific registers in the formal analysis of language suggests a concomitant systematization of the semantic structure of language in a form-function construct. Where did the conceptualization of Korean linguistic politeness in terms of deference, respect, or class distinction come from? Why did the formation and interpretation of honorific registers occur in a particular way at this particular time? The field of modern grammar on the Korean peninsula from the late 19th century began to approach polite speech by associating linguistic forms of politeness with social stratification. The study of grammar conceptualized a set of linguistic forms as representing a speaker’s high or low stance toward the interlocutors’ status. The formal analysis of the Korean language discovered a culture-specific phenomenon among agglutinative languages in Asia: the verbal distinction of social class.

The socio-cultural conceptualizations of the grammar of Korean linguistic politeness strove to represent a one-to-one relationship between language and cultural identity. The low or high status of the interlocutors as framed in power relations presupposed a speaker’s deference toward the addressee or referent. The isolable form-meaning structures were gleaned from the recognition of social conditions and/or the models of local morals or conduct of propriety. The analysts’ perceptions of the relative status of interpersonal relations led them to link their judgements of the behavioral–moral norms expected of inferior speakers towards superior interlocutors to the theorization of the functional meanings of honorific registers. The identification of this cultural variable prompted the inexorable conviction that the Korean linguistic system of politeness needed to be structuralized according to the degree of deference or respect.

The characterization of the local linguistic practice of politeness was in fact charged with the evaluators’ self-interested take on native language and culture. The presumption that the
habitual ways of speaking politely would or should reflect “Korean” thought or cultural experience played a role as an ideological ground for stipulating the rules of polite speech as a cultural phenomenon. The underlying assumption for a description of polite speech intervened in analysts’ assessments of language from particular vantage points. This socially-positioned perspective rationalized the recognized value of politeness norms, allowing the (non-)Korean analysts to infer the indexical values of non-referential forms of politeness in a vertical context. Therefore, the formation of honorific registers was an evaluative process in the sense that the analysts’ expectations of language as a reflection of perceived culture were predicated on the establishment of an isolable linguistic system of polite speech as the analytical basis. The honorific function assigned to honorific registers is not inherent in the special linguistic forms themselves, but is a feature that has been singled-out on the basis of a presupposed context as its evaluative ground.

As a consequence, the language ideologies of Korean honorific registers restricted the overall interpretive framework for vernacular linguistic politeness in terms of the components and indexical functions of polite language-use in Korean. The salient acknowledgement of the cultural value (highly recognized evaluative concerns) facilitated the creation of honorific registers. So far as concerns the notion of honorific registers, those aspects of honorifics that were either down-played or dismissed in this process became more difficult to fathom or recognize, despite their pragmatically real existence in actual uses of honorifics. The (pre-)judgment of the Korean linguistic practice of politeness as a cultural stereotype thus obscured a variety of functions of speech forms pertaining to politeness. The emblematic function normalized by social and cultural stereotypes constrained the pragmatics in reality.

Once the notion of honorific register is recognized as evidence for a certain cultural phenomenon or experience, it is open for further functional reanalysis. What role does the
linguistic and social knowledge of honorific registers play? The interpretive framework of vernacular linguistic politeness, limited in terms of both its components and effects, can come to function as a cultural form for achieving social desires or political goals. In his discussion of the culturally defining characteristics of Chosŏn, An Hwak (1923, 146-152) offers one of the earliest accounts of Korean honorifics in association with the topos of Tongbang yeŭi chi kuk, associating the unique linguistic convention of linguistic politeness with a linguistic manifestation of the ‘uniquely Korean’ nation of propriety. The values of honorific language came to stand for a national identity as the emblem of a culture-specific tradition.

The perceived function of deference can also be negatively valorized as a discriminatory act and remnant of premodern social hierarchy. Pak Sŏngbin (朴勝彬; 1880–1943), who was a linguist, social activist, educator, and lawyer, led a sociolinguistic campaign in 1921 along with the Enlightenment Club to modernize society through reforming the use of honorific registers. The whole point of his sociolinguistic campaign was to propose using “kyŏngŏ” (敬語; ‘honorific language’) with and to children. Pak critiques the use of Haera Style and ‘mean or base language’ (yabihan ŏnŏ) in general in terms of ‘moral education’ (tŏksŏng kyoyuk). He claims that this low speech style influences children to look down upon others and treat them with abusive language. The proposal also points out that children use mean language among themselves, sometimes ending up in fights. As a solution, the social reformists suggested the reciprocal use of honorifics, especially with children.

Whether valorized positively or negatively, the instrumentalist idea of language for cultural nationalism or social modernization naturalizes the ideologized views of Korean honorific register as an icon of the ethnic nation and culture. Honorific registers as isolable cultural forms can reinforce restrictive views of what honorific registers actually do and mean in society. The knowledge of politeness configured on a vertical scale with simply high to low is
prone to treat the deployment or absence of honorific forms as essentially either respect/polite or disrespect/rudeness regarding the status of the interlocutors. Both panmal and respectful/polite forms in –wo allowed for more fine-grained grades of politeness beyond the three levels of polite language according to the relationship with the speaker (superiors; equals; inferiors). Similarly, once speech forms became the main object of attention in questions of politeness, non-linguistic signs such as gesture, prosody, and bodily comportment were overlooked. The Korean honorific registers framed in social hierarchy inevitably constrained the conceptualization of linguistic politeness as a verbalized system of respect or disrespect.
Chapter 6: Conclusions

The honorific function of honorific registers as embedded in Korean language and culture has been more or less taken for granted in contemporary societies in South and North Koreas. However, the long history of using the elaborate speech forms of politeness in Korean honorific registers is not the same thing as the history of making metapragmatic sense of the linguistic practice. It is one thing to be able to use appropriate language and another to be able to characterize what makes a particular style polite or honorific and why. The semiotic process of the culture-specific models of linguistic politeness have been dynamically constructed along with Korea’s modernizing experiences in language, society and culture. This study has been an attempt to trace the formation of the widely-recognized socio-cultural indexicals of linguistic politeness by examining a variety of discursive activities.

In this dissertation, I probed the cultural emblem of Korean honorification by tracing the process of its history of nationalization. By way of conclusion, this study has argued that “honorific language” or honorific register is not something inherent in linguistic structure or culturally preconditioned, but is rather a socially and ideologically emergent effect of modern linguistics and linguistic nationalism. Human agencies play a mediating role in the expectations of what to discern in order to make sense of language-in-society in the purposeful and systematic analysis of linguistic structures and socio-pragmatic functions. This concluding chapter briefly summarizes the main discussions, contextualizes the contribution of this research, and suggests possible directions for further research.
6.1 Summary

It may be hard to imagine for modern speakers of Korean that the use of different speech forms would not necessarily have come to native speakers’ notice. However, there is little evidence that honorific registers were ever explicitly recognized as an essential element of propriety in speech according to the Confucian model of conduct literature in Chosŏn society. As shown in Chapter Two, the issues surrounding polite conduct by means of language in conduct manuals were primarily concerned with what to talk about or not, and how to behave in verbal communication. Premodern conduct manuals illustrate that prudence, sincerity or certain paralinguistic signs were the salient characteristics of politeness in communication. Letter manuals which circulated in those times were loaded with elaborate sentences with polite or embellished expressions, but even epistolary guidelines like these did not articulate what exactly these expressions do. Instead, the issue of what speech forms to use or not was apparently not a major concern in discussions of proper manners in verbal communication.

The evolution of norms of polite conduct came to play a critical role in the construction of an ideal nation-state starting from the late 19th century. Chapter Three illustrated that both the Confucian model of propriety and the modern concept of civility coexisted in early modern education under the Korean Empire. This hybridity in the understanding of politeness appears to have been more than just a fleeting phenomenon as Korea transitioned from premorden to modern society. It was a strategic move for educational officials to cope with the dual missions of the state under the pressures of modernization and nationalism. The shift in the cultural

---

84 The rules of oral or written communication stipulated specific words to be used in formal situations as patterns of ‘ritualized communication’ in social interaction (2002). The ‘ritualized communication’ through the Chinese tradition of codifying letter manuals called shu-i contrasts interestingly with European guides of language developed as the art of persuasion from classical rhetoric (e.g., theories of literature or oration). A substantial amount of research has been done on Korean letter manuals (ŏn’gandok 論簡牘) and Korean epistolography. However, letter manuals are excluded here because most of them present exemplary samples without authors’ instructions or remarks on their choice of models to explicate or rationalize them.
models of polite conduct was closely related to the two keywords of public sentiment, dubbed here as (capitalist) modernization and nationalism. Among the various traditional Confucian morals, loyalty and filial piety retained their utility in cultivating the moral attitude of a national subject toward the nation and the emperor. At the same time, the reform-minded government and nationalists urged civil manners on other members of the community. These ideological motives spawned cultural models of politeness as a form of cultural hybridity.

Chapter Four discussed that the cultural identification of (linguistic) politeness norms evolved as the embodiment of the Japanese national characteristics. In Japan’s Korean colony, morals education between tradition and modernity shifted toward the cultivation of ideal citizens of colonial society. The characterization of a convention of politeness that centered on ‘respect’ emerged as a quintessential embodiment of politeness rooted in traditional custom, facilitating the promotion of ‘deference’ as the effective model of politeness. The political interest in nurturing “faithful and good” members of colonial society underlay the positive valorization of ‘respect’ as a tradition of “our nation,” an ambiguous term which could refer to both Korea and Japan.” The civility-oriented concept of politeness stressed reciprocity and a sense of respect for humanity as a lubricant in society, while taking a critical stance against excessive politeness. Starting from the 1940s, however, the idea of politeness began to gain a value as the quintessential culture of Imperial Japan based on cultural superiority.

Chapter Five looked into the context of the process whereby the linguistic forms of Korean came to serve as an icon of the collective culture of a supposedly ethnically homogenous people. It is evident from the previous chapters that linguistic forms per se did not gain much attention in discussions of polite manners in premodern conduct manuals and early-modern morals textbooks. It is also clear from the morals textbooks for public schools that polite manners became important for the inculcation of national citizens. It was not until the late 19th
century when linguistic forms pertaining to politeness began to be structuralized as honorific registers. The modern analysis of language paid attention to the formal aspects of polite speech and systematically built up the culture-specific model of Korean linguistic politeness as an embodiment of a collective identity. The identification of honorific function from the use of lexical and morpho-syntactic forms first requires speakers’ attention to the formal elements themselves.

Taken together, all of the chapters demonstrate that the iconic status of Korean honorific registers as the embodiment of the ethnic group of the “Nation of Propriety in the East” is in fact a modern invention, despite the demonstrably long history of the use of honorifics in Korean. Formal aspects of propriety in speech, particularly, the non-referential forms of honorifics, were not obvious or salient to the authors of premodern conduct manuals. Comments on the formal linguistic elements of speech etiquette were restricted to lexical items such as terms of address, personal pronouns, titles, and special words in epistolary practice, depending on the rank of correspondents. Although kugyŏl glossing manuals illustrate that native speakers were able to infer the pragmatic functions of certain forms as deferential indices, instructions about respect and humble submission remained central to the morals and conduct virtues stressed in conduct manuals. What it meant to use language “politely” in social relations was not conceived of primarily as a problem of speaking “up” or “down.”

It is true that conduct manuals stipulated marking an honouring or humbling attitude towards one’s superiors, recognizing a very narrow set of linguistic forms as indexicals of deference. But explicit discussions of using linguistic behaviour to signify a ‘deferential’ attitude in social relations were limited to particular speech contexts wherein a speaker (especially, junior member) addressed or referred to his or her superiors. Concise and efficient speech, harmonization of speech and action, refraining from improper topics and malicious gossip, a
gentle tone of voice and moderate pace of speaking, juncture and pitch were all associated with multiple modes of politeness such as the speaker’s consideration, carefulness, sincerity, gentleness, calmness, and kindness toward interlocutors. In this way, ‘deference’ was by no means uniquely identified as an essential mode of politeness enacted through the proper use of language. The concept of ‘deference’ was just one mode of politeness in the perception of power difference.

Interestingly enough, linguistic forms (particularly terms of address) appear to have drawn the attention of speakers as one of the constituents of linguistic politeness when social status became a socio-political issue in Korea. Indeed, the rise of civility as the new model of politeness, along with the introduction of the Japanese polite terms of address, led to calls for the use of an honorific appellation (kyŏngch’ing) in Korean as a polite 2nd-person pronoun. Yet, the recognition of linguistic forms as a sign of deference remained peripheral in morals textbooks which followed the traditional model of polite speech. It might not have been a coincidence that the KŬ (1908), a Korean translation of a Japanese etiquette textbook, gives one of the earliest accounts of the concept of kyŏngŏ, honorific language as a sign of deference, and negatively evaluates it as an action of flattery.

---

85 The Hwangsong sinmun (1898–1910), a newspaper of moderate Confucian reformers, bluntly reported on September 21 in 1909 a puzzling situation where so-called enlightened intellectuals addressed each other as Kim-san ‘Mr. Kim’ or Yi-san ‘Mr. Yi,’ borrowing the polite Japanese term of address -san ‘Mr./Ms.’ as more Koreans came to be exposed to the Japanese language after Korea became a Japanese protectorate in 1905. This new term of address from Japanese suggested the necessity of a generic polite term of address for mutual respect (sangho kyŏngch’ing) among Korean speakers. Another article in the Tonga ilbo (23 February 1924) carried a reader’s request for a polite term (kyŏngch’ing-ŏ) that could be used generally (including with a person low in status) like “Mr.” in the Western language or -san ‘Mr./Ms.’ in Japanese. In the same article, the writer admits that the polite term of address (kyŏngch’ing-ŏ) in Korean, the suffix “-ssi,” lacks respect towards elders, while the writer of this article was critical of widespread use of the Japanese term ‘-san’ in colonial Korea as a “new-style polite term” (sinsik kyŏngch’ing-ŏ).
Although we might have expected the traditional value of respect or deference to have been on the wane and on the defensive during the modernizing changes of the Korean Empire, we nonetheless find a positive valorization of respect or deference as a proud moral tradition of the nation during this period. The notion of ‘deference’ was summoned into the code of politeness in colonial morals education as one of the crucial moral and behavioural obligations of colonial schoolchildren without ruffling Koreans’ feathers or overtly attempting to invoke loyalty for Japan. The virtue of respecting elders (keichō) paraphrased as “the young must honor their elders” (chōyō no jo) was praised as a “good custom” of the East (Tōyō), which included both Japan and Korea. The GGK morals education for public schools appealed to notion of saving the essentialized and romanticized tradition of Confucian culture to counter egalitarianists’ disapproval of showing respect based on social status.\(^{86}\) The correct use of Japanese honorific language (keigo) regarding affairs about the Japanese imperial family during the colonial morals education was a way to express respect for the Japanese imperial family, a colonial subject’s obligation to the Empire of Japan.

The formation of Korean honorific registers did not take place in an intellectual vacuum simply because the use of Korean honorifics has a long history. While the colonial morals textbooks reveal the Japanese notion of honorific language (keigo) as an expressive means of linguistic politeness, it was the early Korean language works produced by (non-)Koreans where the formal aspect of politeness in Korean drew attention as a perceivable constituent of linguistic politeness. The regularization of the structures and uses of language in modern linguistics provided a critical momentum for the construction of the form-oriented and deference-oriented

---

\(^{86}\) Korean intellectuals led the movement for children’s rights, and most of them were affiliated with a Korean religious group called Ch’ŏndogyo (The Heavenly Way). The Ch’ŏndogyo’s children’s group was the instigator of the children’s movement in 1921. Kim Soch’un (aka, Kim Kijŏn; 1984–1948?), one of the founding members of the Ch’ŏndogyo’s children’s group and leaders of the public movement for children, strove to emancipate youth by changing the evil of the traditional “elders first” hierarchy (Kim Soch’un (Kim Kijŏn) 1920).
conceptualization of Korean linguistic etiquette/manners. The discovery of language as a tool for extracting or mobilizing the cultural identity of the linguistic community helped social actors to systematize honorific registers ingrained in cultural stereotypes. Together with deference which was emerging as a national tradition of Korea, the encodification of deference in the Korean linguistic system was established by Korean grammarians’ studies of Korean as a national language in the first half of the 20th century.

Showing respect for elders usually counts as a constant of good manners throughout history in many societies. However, etiquette/manners as an emblem of national culture does not arise in a vacuum. The value of politeness as a national emblem had an inseparable relationship with the socio-political visions of both Koreans and Japanese. Despite the hundreds of years of history of Confucian propriety in premodern Korea, the nationalization of ‘deference’ in morals education was embedded in visions articulated by the early Korean state and the Japanese colonial government with regard to who they wanted Koreans to be and how they wanted to manage Korean society. The analytical perspective on the metapragmatic attempts to describe the habits of language-use pertaining to politeness gives us clues about the formation of Korean honorific registers as an ideologically-biased product saturated with interests in or assessments of linguistic practice. The role of language ideology in the process of shaping honorific registers considers language as a tool for representing national culture or promoting cultural nationalism. The ideological bias of the study of “Korean” linguistics as connected to a homogeneous and national “Korean” group has influenced the mapping of honorific registers, creating a hierarchically conceived relation or rank-based linguistic system of deference or respect. The icon of cultural identity that represents a supposedly homogeneous culture is the outcome of a linguistically and pragmatically limited assessment of linguistic politeness in the formation of the national language.
6.2 Implications

Once the indexical value of *keigo* was established as an emblem of Japanese tradition, the linguistic system of politeness characterized as a sign of ‘deference’ later informed the desire to re-imagine their nation. Although morals education by the end of the colonial period propagated politeness culture as a “unique feature of Japanese morality” as a “polite nation,” it is worth highlighting that the post-colonial legacy of the GGK’s construction and advocacy of the deference-oriented notion of politeness as an essential tradition of Korea was reproduced by Koreans for cultural nationalism and modernization. The perception of deference as the core of a Korean cultural identity served as an interpretive anchor for the assessment of linguistic norms of politeness.

For instance, An Hwak (1886–1946), nationalist scholar and grammarian and one of the most influential Korean intellectuals of his time, described seven national characteristics of the Korean people in his book *Chosŏn munmyŏn̄gsa* (*History of Civilization in Korea*, 1923, 146-152). Below is the summary of the discussion where he presented language as the embodiment of “manners” (*yejŏl* 禮節) and as one of the culture-specific features of Koreans:

“Korea has been referred to as the ‘Nation of Propriety in the East’ 東方禮義之國 because politeness and code of conduct (*yeui chakpŏp* 礼儀作法) have been highly developed. Greetings and receptions among Westerners are extremely simple […] Korean people have thought much of social intercourse and strove to distinguish the virtue of kindly feelings (*injŏng uii michŏm* 人情의 美點); thus politeness is highly developed […] In terms of meanings expressed through language, [Korean language] has plenty of honorific expressions (*kyŏngŏ* 敬語) and humble expressions (*kyŏmŏ* 謙語)[…] One might say that they originated from social hierarchy (*kvegūpchê* 階級制), but they came to exist as the expressions of endearment (*ch’inae* 親愛) and graceful affection (*umii chŏng* 優美의 情).”
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As indicated above, linguistic politeness, conceptualized in a specific way, came to stand for a cultural identity peculiar to Korea. To be precise, it was the projection of the cultural model of ‘deference’ onto linguistic politeness which allowed specific linguistic registers and forms to become, or be newly interpreted as, a sign of one’s respect towards others and modesty towards oneself.

Similarly, the Japanese accounts of Korean honorifics portrayed ‘deference’ as an intricate and delicate projection of superior-oriented politeness onto language-use. Mikajiri Hiroshi (1934, 101) presents Korean honorifics as one of the major characteristics of Korean culture, describing the nature of Koreans and the social characteristics of Korean society as the “Nation of Gentlemen in the East” (tōhō no kunshikoku) on the basis of Confucian ideology. While the recognition of Korean honorific language denoted the high standard of morality of the language community from the perspective of cultural nationalists, the distinctive and refined feature inherited over generations from time immemorial also legitimized the moral duties of a “faithful and good” citizen for the management of colonial society.

However, the concept of ‘civility’ and the emergence of modern ideology challenged the deference-oriented conceptualization of Confucian tradition contextualized in a hierarchical society. The cultural model of ‘deference’ was under negative valorization in a rapidly modernizing society among “enlightened Korean intellectuals.” The unnecessary use of honorifics came to be seen as an expression of flattery. As ‘civility’ came to constitute the key element for the modern concept of politeness, it was possibly the case that the politico-cultural ideologies of modernity (egalitarianism), and more specifically the belief that the personal identities of individuals should be constructed independently from pre-supposable power- or status relations (i.e., ‘agentive individualism’) led to a shift and a reformed usage of terms of
address and addressee honorification to serve rather as a sign of mutual respect (Koyama 2004, 417).

For instance, the promotion of civility through the mutual use of *kyŏngŏ* was one of the frequent agendas for socio-cultural reform movements in the 1920s and 1930s. Pak Sŭngbin (1880–1943), a well-known intellectual in colonial Korea, is a good example. As a grammarian, a member of the Enlightenment Club (Kyemyŏng Kurakpu; 啓明俱樂部), and an educator, Pak led the campaign to use honorifics for children for over ten years (Pak Sŭngbin 1921, 16; cited in Mitsui 2013, 297). Ch’oe Hyŏnbae (1894–1970) was one of the prominent Korean grammarians who wrote the “Chosŏn minjok kaengsaeng ŭi to (The Way to the Rebirth of the Korean Race)” in the *Tonga ilbo* (25 October 1926), a series of columns on why ethnic Koreans were struggling and how they could revive their fortunes. In his column, Ch’oe criticized as unreasonable treating children who were unmarried, and therefore not adults, disrespectfully without using *kyŏngŏ*. Pang Chŏngghwan (1899–1931), a writer of juvenile literature and an activist for the children’s movement, also wrote a magazine article about the use of *kyŏngŏ* with children as one of the reforms necessary for doing away with old conventions and moving forward toward a new life (Pang Chŏngghwan 1927). As addressed in the *Tonga ilbo* (4 July 1929), the use of *haera* Plain Style verb forms was negatively valorized as a form of contemptuous treatment of children through linguistic discrimination. The writer attributes this particular social and ethical problem to the traditional superior-oriented moral custom. While respect for elders is fine, the writer treats the use of *kyŏngŏ* regardless of social status as a public issue for the future of children. Cultural movements like this with a particular vision for the construction of a civil society fortified the image of *kyŏngŏ* as a premodern norm of linguistic politeness.

As illustrated above, then, public discourses reveal that both Korean and Japanese ideologues interpreted Korean honorification as evidence of the cultural identities of speakers
and their linguistic societies. Whether seen positively or negatively by the different groups of ideologues, kyŏngŏ became a linguistic emblem of Korean tradition; whether one took pride in it or was mortified by it depended on one’s ideological position. The birth of the linguistic sign of deference (i.e., kyŏngŏ) did not begin in the discourse on etiquette or manners, but was a concomitant result of the modern notion of politeness: civility. Linguistic politeness was pre-contextualized within a hierarchical context first marked by those who believed in civility as the ideal model of politeness in interpersonal relations. That is, a political interest in creating a new model of society offered an interpretive anchor from which to judge conventional linguistic practice from a certain perspective, and ascribed a negative value to the linguistic practice (e.g., by denigrating it as flattery). At the same time, those who desired to cultivate deference or respect tried to verify the authenticity of the cultural attribute in the long history of linguistic practice, and in the traditional/authentic culture of the ethnic nation of those who ‘possess’ honorific repertoires whose values are ideologically shared by the speech community (Koyama 1997a). Once the indexical value of kyŏngŏ was established as an emblem of Korean tradition, progressive cultural nationalists reanalyzed it as an instrument for building a civil society (i.e., social modernization) through linguistic reform.87

Despite the hundreds of years of history of Confucian propriety in premodern Korea, the symbolic association of kyŏngŏ as a cultural icon of “Korean” tradition is in fact a modern invention embedded in different visions articulated by different groups who ideologically mediated certain social phenomena. The production of certain features of language use as a form of ‘national’ knowledge suggests how both Korean nationalists and the colonial government

87 The Japanese authorities legitimized the colonization of the Korea peninsula in a similar vein. The theory of “civilization and enlightenment” gave license to critique of traditional Korean culture. Discussions of the romantic view of the “Nation of Gentlemen in the East” were often followed by a critique of empty rituals and formalities, portrayed as the evil influence of Confucian tradition on the Korean peninsula, which then granted imperial Japan the legitimacy to step in and lead the modern reformation of Korean colonial society.
identified who Koreans were (or who they wanted Koreans to be) and what form their society should take; what was at stake was the ideological socio-historical configuration of group identities within the modern nation-state. When ‘deference’ came to the center of attention in morals education (whether for criticism or promotion), linguistic etiquette or manners was contextually pre-supposed as embedded in power relations.

6.3 Contributions of the Study

The significance of this research can be summarized in four perspectives.

Firstly, this dissertation provides a historicized understanding of modern-day conceptualizations of linguistic politeness in Korean by examining a wide variety of metapragmatic sources. Studies on the history of Korean honorifics so far have been deeply dependent upon modern structuralist linguistics. The ahistorical analysis of the linguistic structures of honorifics has neglected what it meant to be linguistically polite among Korean speakers in historical reality, confining the concepts of linguistic politeness to the area of formal linguistics. Besides, the modern-day linguistic salience of Korean honorifics in conjunction with the modern-day normative awareness of “Korean” culture has led to a presumption that the modern-day perception of Korean linguistic politeness has persisted throughout history. However, this dissertation is one of the first attempts to contextualize the historical understandings of Korean linguistic politeness in a critical metapragmatic history of linguistic politeness against the backdrop of a modern structuralist linguistics. This comprehensive and interdisciplinary examination of metapragmatic discourses of linguistic politeness in Korean can contribute to broadening the understandings of the topic beyond formal linguistics.

Secondly, this dissertation offers a means of reconsidering the relations between language and culture with a focus on linguistic etiquette or manners involving subjective judgements and
justified views. The roles of language ideology are foregrounded as a crucial mediator that invokes a meaning of language in society and rationalizes socio-cultural values in relation to language, speakers and community. The understanding of Korean honorifics as a simple vehicle or mirror for explaining certain cultural characteristics fails to recognize the ideological nature of language. However, this study presents the culture-specific concepts of language not merely as an outcome of obligatory socio-linguistic norms but as an outcome of social actions that discovered and strategically exploited language as an indexical resource. In this regard, this dissertation overcomes the normative approach to cultural concepts.

Another contribution of this research concerns the field of pragmatic studies. As a study of metapragmatics, this dissertation serves as a stepping-stone to a better understanding of the pragmatic performance of language users. The actual uses of language occur on the basis of judgements of social or linguistic norms, regardless of whether the choices are for normative or strategic uses (Terkourafi 2011). Although pragmatic performance is not the goal of this study, this study has examined how the norms that language users deal with come to exist as a judgmental ground for the appropriateness of language in pragmatic situations. The analysis of speakers’ stylistic variations can benefit from taking into consideration metapragmatic conceptualizations of language. Although reductive in pragmatic functions, the emblematic characteristics of language in relation to speakers, society and culture lead to implications for the evaluation and negotiation of speakers’ position and for their strategies in deploying honorific registers in explicit interactional communication (Siegal 1994, 1995; Du Fon 1999; Brown 2010).

Finally, as an anthropological linguistic study in Korean language and culture, this study can provide compelling evidence for a cultural concept that conjointly emerges from discursive practice in society, rather than being presumed to be inherent in linguistic forms or to arise naturally after social change. While most of the professional and popular conceptions of Korean
honorifics have taken for granted the essential function of deference as a form of culture-specific tradition originated from Korean culture, this study sheds light on language as a shared belief and value system tied to and indexing culture, society, and history. In this regard, this research challenges the idea of seeing language in society as a transparent, natural outcome of cultural identity and offers instead, through the examination of language ideology underlying as a driving force, a model whereby the culture-specific character of language is an enacted performance.

6.4 Directions for Future Research

As a direction for further research, a more in-depth analysis of vernacular models of Korean honorifics in popular culture would definitely be worth pursuing (see Wetzel and Inoue 1999 for discussion along these lines for Japanese). A limitation of this dissertation is that, for the most part, discursive practices at the professional or institutional level have received more attention than lay speakers’ metapragmatic practices, meaning that my focus has been skewed toward “official” models. To a certain extent, this has been unavoidable, since the focal point was the formation of the socio-cultural “frames” of Korean linguistic politeness. Questions that remain to be explored include: how does the folk or lay members’ metadiscourse react to the professional or standard models? And what does it take into consideration when it considers what it means to be polite?

One additional problem that requires further research involves the changing notions of linguistic politeness. A close examination of the Japanese language works about the Korean language from the 19th century up to 1945 is another area that this dissertation was unable to cover in detail. The understanding of Korean honorific registers would certainly benefit from a closer examination of Japanese evaluations of Korean linguistic politeness values, because the Japanese language with its honorific registers so similar to Korean had a great impact on the
evaluations of Korean honorification through the active studies of the Korean language by the Japanese (and vice versa) during the colonial period.

Since the Korean language was not the official language of instruction in public education in colonial Korea, the construction of the values of Korean linguistic politeness in post-colonial South and North Korea is another promising topic for research in the future (e.g., Kim Tongsu 1983; Yi Ongnyŏn 1996; Kang Posŏn 2014). It would be also worth examining the social and/or political motivations and ideals underpinning the public interest in politeness through publications on manners/etiquette and ceremonial proprieties in post-colonial Korea. Furthermore, Korean grammarians and linguists played a pivotal role in building up the standard linguistic system, through their participation in promoting linguistic nationalism and education in the national language. In a similar vein, a further point needs to be made with regard to the range of constituents as well as the functional views of politeness in the current era of ‘globalization.’

As noted in Kaplan (2018), the recent attempts to rebrand modern Confucian values have reframed the notions of Confucianism as a kind of cultural marketing, coupled with the desires to boost heritage tourism and re-discover unique cultural identities in an era of globalization.

---

88 Yejŏl ‘manners’ appears as a necessity for the nation soon after the liberation of the Korean peninsula (e.g., Ko Ponggyŏng (1947)). The following list of publications show that individual writers, publishers, and public organizations published numerous reference works on manners/etiquette or ceremonial standards between 1945 and 1960 before the Ministry of Education under the South Korean government published its official guidelines for daily etiquette/manners, *Saenghwal yejŏl* ‘Daily life manners’ in 1972:

- *(Hyŏndae ch’ŏngnyŏn p’iltok) yeŭi-pŏp kwa sagyo sangsik* ‘(A must-read for the modern youth) Common sense in rules of politeness and social interactions’ (Sangho Ch’ulp’ansa 1947)
- *Yebŏp* ‘Decorum’ (Cho Kihong and Kwŏn Ch’ŏngja 1954)
- *Silch’ŏn kungmin yebŏp* ‘Practical decorum for citizens of the nation’ (Kungmin toŭihoe 1954)
- *Yejŏl* ‘Manners’ (Yŏwŏnsa 1958)
- *Hyŏndae ŭirye* ‘Modern ceremonial rules’ (Yi Han 1958)
- *Yebŏp* ‘Decorum’ (Hwang P’ilyŏn 1959)
- *(Hyŏnt’o) ŭirye chunch’ik* ‘(Annotated) ceremonial rules’ (Pak Honggyu 1960)
- *Ŭirye immun* ‘An introduction to ceremonial rules’ (Yang Sŭnghun 1960)
Likewise, Korean politeness ideology is not a static concept and requires constant re-negotiation in new situations. Korean linguistic politeness will remain as an ideologically charged issue in the new era of cultural diversity in South Korea and with the efforts to globalize the Korean language.
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Appendices

Although the bibliography provides a rich list of works of conduct literature (particularly works including sections on language), it does not pretend to be comprehensive. Materials are listed in order of publication year (subsequent editions listed below the earliest edition), followed by other works by the same author. The earliest date given is when the work is known to have been first created or printed, but extant versions may be later. Some of the dates are best guesses. Materials with unknown dates are provided in order of publication year or the author’s year of birth.

Appendix A  Conduct Literature with Discussions of Language from Traditional Korea

A.1 Conduct Manuals for Children, Beginning Students, and the General Public

Myŏngsim pogam 明心寶鑑 ‘Precious Mirror for Enlightening the Heart’ (1454) *Originally compiled in 1393 by Fan Liben 范立本

Tongmong suji 童蒙須知 ‘Essential Knowledge for Children’ (1517) *Originally written by Zhu Xi (朱熹, 1130–1200)

Tongmong sŏnsŭp 童蒙先習 ‘Primer for Children’ (1543) by Pak Semu (朴世茂, 1487–1564) and Min Chein (閔齊仁, 1493–1549)

Kyŏngmong yogyŏl 擊蒙要訣 ‘Essentials to Dispel Ignorance’ (1577) by Yi I (李珥, 1536–1584)

“Haeju Hyangyak” 海州鄕約 ‘Haeju Village Compact’ (1577) by Yi I (李珥, 1536–1584)

Hakkyo mobŏm 學校模範 ‘Model for Schooling’ (1582) by Yi I (李珥, 1536–1584)


Yangjŏngp’yon 养正篇 ‘A Book for the Rearing of Moral Rectitude’ (1604) by Chŏng Kyŏngse (鄭經世, 1563–1633)

“Kahun” 家訓 ‘Family Precepts’ (1455) by Pak Yŏn (朴堧, 1378–1458)

“Soyodang kahun” 遡遙堂家訓 ‘Family Precepts of Soyodang’ (n.d.) by Pak Hadam (朴河淡, 1479–1560)

“Susin siphun” 修身十訓 ‘Ten Precepts for Self-cultivation’ (n.d.) by Yi Hwang (李滉, 1501–1570)

“Chŏnhun” 庭訓 ‘Family Precepts’ (1559) by Yu Hŭich’un (柳希春, 1513–1577)

“Chagyŏngmun” 自警文 ‘Words of Self-admonition’ (n.d.) by Yi I (李珥, 1536–1584)

“Mun’gan kong chagyŏng susinhun” 文簡公自警修身訓 ‘Lessons for self-cultivation by Mun’gan kong Yi Su-gwang (李辭光, 1563–1628)’ (1633)
“Kahun” 家訓 ‘Family Precepts’ (1672) by O Kukhŏn (吳國獻, 1599–1672)
“Yŏngga kahun” 永嘉家訓 ‘Family Precepts of Yŏngga’ (1692) by Kwŏn Yang (權讓, 1628–1697)
“Kyeyu kajung” 戒諭家眾 ‘Admonitions and Advice for Family Members’ (1744) by Pak Pilchu (朴弼周, 1680–1748)
“Chŏng Kan’gong kahun” 貞簡公家訓 ‘Family Precepts of Chŏng Kan’gong’ (n.d.) by Yu Ch’oe (俞最基, 1689–1768)
“Kahun” 家訓 ‘Family Precepts’ (n.d.) by Pak Yungwŏn (朴允權, 1734–1799)

Sasojŏl 士小節 ‘Elementary Matters of Etiquette for Scholars’ (1775) by Yi Tŏngmu (李德懋, 1741–1793)
“Chŏng Unwa sŏnsaeng 36 hun” 呈芸窩先生物训 36 訓 ‘36 Precepts of Master Chŏng Unwa’ (n.d.) by Chŏng Honggyu (鄭弘規, 1753–1836)

A.3 Conduct Manuals for Women
Naehun 内訓 ‘Instructions for Women’ (1475) by Queen Sohye (昭惠王后, 1437–1503)
Kyujung yoram 閨中要覽 ‘Manual for the Inner Quarters’ (1544) by Yi Hwang (李滉, 1501–1570)
Uam sŏnsaeng kyenyesŏ 尤庵先生戒女書 ‘Admonishments for Women’ (n.d.) by Song Siyŏl (宋時烈, 1607–1689)
Hoyŏnjae chagyŏngp’yŏn 浩然齋自警篇 ‘Self-Admonitions of Hoyŏnjae’ (n.d.) by Kim Hoyŏnjae (金浩然齋, 1681–1722)
Han-ssi puhun 韓氏婦訓 ‘Lady Han’s precepts for ladies’ (1712) by Han Wŏnjin (韓元震, 1682–1751)
Ôje yŏsasŏ ŏnhae 御製女四書誡解 ‘Royally Composed Vernacular Exegesis of the Four Books for Women’ (1736) by Yi Tŏksu (李德壽, 1673–1744)
Maehun 妹訓 ‘Precepts for [my] Sister’ (n.d.) by Yi Tŏngmu (李德懋, 1741–1793)
Ryuhandang ŏnhaeng sillok 柳閑堂言行實錄 ‘Veritable Records of the Words and Deeds of Lady Kwŏn’ (1795) by Ryuhandang Kwŏn ssi (柳閑堂權氏 (a.k.a. Lady Kwŏn), ?–?)
Yŏja ch’ohak 女子初學 ‘Elementary Learning for Women’ (1797) by Kim Chongsu (金宗壽, 1761–1813)
Yŏsohak ŏnhae 女小學誡解 ‘Vernacular Exegeses of the Elementary Learning for Women’ (1182) by Pak Munho (朴文鎬, 1846–1918)
Kyenyŏ yagŏn 戒女略言 ‘Brief Remarks to Admonish Girls’ (1860) by Cho Chun (趙焌, 1819–1889)
Appendix B  Modern manners and/or Morals Textbooks for Public and Private Schools and for the General Public from 1905 to 1945

B.1 1905 to 1909
Chungdŭng susin kyogwasŏ 1-4 ‘Middle School Self-cultivation Textbook 1-4’ (Hwimun Academy, 1906)
Yullihak kyogwasŏ 1-4 ‘Textbook in Ethics 1-4’ (Sin Haeyŏng, 1906)
Ch’odŭng yullihak kyogwasŏ 初等倫理學教科書 ‘Elementary Ethics Textbook’ (An Chonghwa, 1907); Originally authored by Wu Shang 吳尙 (?–?)
Kodŭng sohak susinsŏ 中等修身敎科書 ‘High School Self-cultivation Manual in the Style of the Elementary Learning’ (Hwimun Academy, 1907)
Ch’odŭng sohak susinsŏ 初等小學修身書 ‘Elementary Self-cultivation Manual in the Style of the Elementary Learning’ (Yu Kŭn, 1908)
Kodŭng sohak susinsŏ 高等小學修身書 ‘Advanced Self-cultivation Manual in the Style of the Elementary Learning’ (Hwimun Academy, 1908)
Pot’ong kyoyuk kungmin ŭibŏm 普通教育國民儀範 ‘Models for National Etiquette in Common Education’ (Chin Hŭisŏng, 1908)
Ch’odŭng susin 初等修身 ‘Elementary Self-cultivation’ (Pak Chŏngdong, 1909)
Ch’omok p’ilchi 樵牧必知 ‘Required Knowledge for Shepherds and Woodcutters’ (Pak Yunsu, 1909)
Sŏrye p’yŏng’go 西禮便考 ‘Handy Study of Western Propriety’ (Yi Ch’ŏlchu, 1909[1896])
Pot’ong kyogwa susinsŏ 普通敎科修身書 ‘Common School Self-cultivation Manual’ (Hwimun Academy, 1910)
Pot’ong hakkyo susinsŏ 1-4: hakkoyong 普通學校修身書 1-4: 學徒用 ‘Self-cultivation Manual for Use by Pupils in Common Schools 1-4’ (Hakpu, 1910/1907-1908)

B.2 1910 to 1918
Futsū gakkō shūshinsho: seitōyō 1-4 ‘Self-cultivation Manual for use by Students in Common Schools’ (GGK, 1918/1913-1915)
Futsū gakkō shūshinsho: kyōshiyo 1-4 ‘Self-cultivation Manual for Use by Teachers in Common Schools’ (GGK, 1913-1917)
Kōtō shūshinsho 1-4 ‘Advanced Self-cultivation Manual’ (GGK, 1917); Originally written by Kanō Jigorō 嘉納治五郎

B.3 1919 to 1936
Joshi kōtō futsū gakkō shūshinsho 1-3 ‘Self-cultivation Manual for Girls’ High School 1-3’ (GGK, 1919-1923)
Futsū gakkō shūshinsho: jidōyō 1-6 ‘Self-cultivation Manual for Use by Students in Common Schools 1-6’ (GGK, 1923-1924/1922-1924)
Futsū gakkō shūshinsho: kyōshiyō 1-6 ‘Self-cultivation Manual for Use by Teachers in Common Schools 1-6’ (GGK, 1923-1924)
Kōtō futsū gakkō shūshinsho 1-5 ‘High School Self-cultivation Textbook 1-5’ (GGK, 1923-1924)
Joshi kōtō futsū gakkō shūshinsho 1-4 ‘Self-cultivation Manual for Girls’ High School 1-4’ (GGK, 1925)
Shihan gakkō shūshinsho 1-3 ‘Self-cultivation Manual for Teacher’s Colleges 1-3’ (GGK, 1925-1927)
Futsū gakkō shūshinshō 1-6 ‘Self-cultivation Manual for Common Schools 1-6’ (GGK, 1930-1934)
Futsū gakkō shūshinshō: kyōshiyō 1-6 ‘Self-cultivation Manual for Use by Teachers in Common Schools 1-6’ (GGK, 1930-1934) *Note: Vols. 4-6 are unconfirmed.
Chūtō kyōiku shūshinsho 1-2, 4 ‘Self-cultivation Manual for Middle School Education 1, 2, 4’ (GGK, 1935-1938)

B.4 1937 to 1945
Chūtō kyōiku shūshinsho 1-4 ‘Self-cultivation Manual for Middle School Education 1-4’ (GGK, 1938-1941)
Shotō shūshin: jidōyō 1-6 ‘Elementary School Self-cultivation for Use by Children 1-6’ (GGK, 1939-1941)
Shotō shūshin: kyōsiyō 1-6 ‘Elementary School Self-cultivation for Use by Teachers 1-6’ (GGK, 1939-1940)
Tongsŏ yebŏp taeyo ‘Outline of Codes of Decorum, East and West’ (Son Chinju (a.k.a. Margo Lewis Lee), 1939)
Chūtō kyōiku shūshinsho 1-3 ‘Self-cultivation Manual for Middle School Education 1-3’ (GGK, 1940)
Yoi kodomo 1-2 ‘Good children 1-2’ (GGK, 1942)
Shotō shūshin 3-6 ‘Elementary School Self-cultivation 3-6’ (GGK, 1943-1944)
Chūtō kyōiku shūshinsho 5 ‘Self-cultivation Manual for Middle School Education 5’ (GGK, 1943)
Appendix C Linguistic Works on the Korean Language by (Non-)native Korean Speakers from the 19th Century to 1945

C.1 Notes on Korean Linguistic Politeness and Language Manuals by Speakers of Western (English, French, and German) Languages (in Chronological Order)


Underwood, Horace Grant. 1890. An Introduction to the Korean Spoken Language (Hanyŏng munpŏp). Yokohama: Seishi Binsha.


Baird, Annie Laurie Adams. 1898. *Fifty helps for the beginner in the use of the Korean language.* Place of publication not identified: publisher not identified.


11. 1906. Taehan kugŏ munpŏp (Kungmung kangŭi) [Grammar of the National Language of the Great Han (Lecture Notes on the National Language)]. Manuscript.


