On the Chinese Transcriptions of Northeastern Eurasian Languages
-Focusing on I-mun(吏文) on the Korean Peninsula and Hanliwen(漢吏文) in the Yuan Dynasty-

Kwang Chung(Catholic Univ. of Korea)

1. Introduction

Many civilizations in Northeastern Eurasia, especially those neighboring China, have lived under the influence of Chinese culture and further accommodated it for several thousand years. These civilizations suffered from continuous Chinese invasions and the subsequent enormous inflow of Chinese culture that took place. Even though sometimes these civilizations actually conquered China and assumed political control, their own cultures were assimilated to or absorbed into the powerful Chinese culture.[1] The Korean Peninsula, which is located in the eastern part of Eurasia and neighbors China, was in this exact situation.

China is a country occupying a huge territory in eastern Eurasia. Although this area was habitat of many different civilizations, China built an unified country on this territory a long time ago and formed its peculiar mixture of culture by accommodating the cultures of the other civilizations and blending them with its own. China innovated its own culture by this process of accommodation, and as a result, the Chinese culture of the ancient period became globalized. Thus, in the eastern part of Eurasia, the Chinese culture surpassed other cultures in the ancient period.

The influence of Chinese culture compelled other civilizations to borrow and use the Chinese writing system, 漢字(Chinese characters), to transcribe their own languages. These characters are ideograms and were developed to transcribe Chinese, which is an isolating language. The use of Chinese characters did not cause any problem when it came to transcribing the languages of civilizations in China which are also of the isolating type. Furthermore, since Chinese characters were ideograms, the transcriptions of many languages could be unified even though they may have had a different phonemic system. We use the generic term '漢文(Chinese composition)' to refer these transcriptions using Chinese characters.

2. Chinese language(漢語) and Chinese composition(漢文)

漢文, Chinese composition refers to the transcription of the Chinese language using ideograms called Chinese characters, 漢字. Following linguistic classification, 漢語, Chinese language is a spoken language and Chinese composition is a written language. For all natural languages, it is naturally assumed that a spoken language comes first, and a written language to record it follows. When a spoken language is recorded with a writing system, the transcription commonly shows inconsistencies with the spoken language because of several limitations inherent to writing. Furthermore, since a written language undergoes its own internal changes, further differences also develop with the spoken language over long periods of time. After being born as a written language to record spoken Chinese, Chinese composition also underwent such changes.

One thing to note here is that it is hard to define the identity of Chinese. First, since Chinese underwent historical changes for several thousand years, it has a very different linguistic shape

---

[1] For example, after conquering China, the Mongolian founded the Yuan 元 dynasty and the Manchurian founded the Ch'ing, 清 dynasty. They governed China for a long period and enforced their own culture on the Chinese, but the Chinese culture absorbed only some parts of their culture and the traditional Chinese culture remained intact. However, the Mongolian and Manchurian cultures assimilated into the Chinese culture, and furthermore, in the case of the latter, they assimilated into the Chinese culture even in their mother land.

depending on each historical period. Secondly, Chinese has many regional dialects. In fact, the differences between many of these strains of Chinese go above and beyond regional dialect. Furthermore, the official language, 公用語 used in Zhōngyuán, 中原 area was changed to the language of the ruling race of China or to the regional dialect of a political center at certain times. Thus, the definition of Chinese composition as the written language recording Chinese with Chinese characters is necessarily vague.

When we talk about '漢文, Chinese classics', it usually refers to gǔ wén, 古文 of the 先秦(before Qìn) period. In general, the Chinese writing of early Confucian scriptures including *Sishū Sānjíng* 四書三經 is referred to as an archaic style, Gǔ wén, 古文, and this written language was based on the language of luòyàng, 洛陽, the capital city of Dōng Zhōu, 東周(East Zhōu). The official language of the Zhōu, 周 period, which was called yā yàn, '雅言', had been the language of scholar and literature until before Qìn(先秦), and it was the administrative language of Zhōu, 周 dynasty. Gǔ wén, 古文 was formed as a written language with a simple and suggestible style for the documentation and communication. [2]

However, Gǔ wén, 古文 changed in accordance with the passing of different eras. During the period of Chūnqîu Zhànguó, 春秋戰國時代, the language of each country changed independently, and after the unification of Qìn, 秦 dynasty, the language used in Chàngān, 長安 emerged as a new official language. This new language, which is usually called Tōngyǔ, '通語', challenged the authority of yā yàn, '雅言' that had been the official language of Zhōngyuán, 中原 area of China. Gǔ wén, 古文, which was the language of Confucian scriptures, was used very conservatively (as was common with the scriptures of other religions), so it remained impervious to such changes. Thus, Tōngyǔ, 通語 could not replace the language of Confucian scriptures but progressed to the language of literary works. The newly developed written language based on Tōngyǔ, 通語, which added fanciness to the simplicity and suggestibility of Gǔ wén, 古文, showed increased fanciness during the Liùzhāo, 六朝 period. The Chinese writing of this style is referred to as Biànwén, '變文'.

Some scholars claim that Biànwén, '變文' started from the translation of Buddhist scriptures after the mid-Táng, 唐 dynasty. While translating Sanskrit into Chinese, people were influenced by its very different grammar, and in particular Buddhist monks used Tōngyǔ, 通語 different from yā yàn, '雅言 of Gǔ wén in their lecturing. When the Buddhist doctrines were taught among people, mixed forms of verse to which melody can be added and prose which explains the doctrines were often used. Like this, Biànwén, '變文' has the characteristics of both verse and prose. Whereas Gǔ wén, 古文 is simple and succinct, and has an isolating grammatical structure, Biànwén, 變文' is very fancy and decorative because it was mainly used in poetry, essay, novels etc. developed after the Táng, 唐, Sòng, 宋, and Yuán, 元 dynasties, and they seem all to be different variants of Biànwén, '變文'. [3] However, Biànwén appeared in the Chinese transcriptions of other civilizations in the same era, who tried to transcribe their own language with Chinese characters. The reason for this was because they did not follow the grammar of Gǔ wén, 古文 to transcribe their own languages. This kind of Biànwén, '變文' appeared in the Chinese transcriptions of Northeastern Eurasian Altaic languages. For example, Hóngmài(洪邁, 1123~1201) who went to Huìníng 會寧 (present day Jílín, 吉林) as a diplomatic representative of the Jin, 金 dynasty in the period of South Sòng, 南宋 reported that when the children of Khitan,

---

2 The written language of Archaic Chinese, Gǔ wén, 古文 was formed on the basis of philosophers' scholarly works such as *Lànyǔ*, 『論語』, *Mèngzǐ*, 『孟子』, *Zhuāngzǐ*, 『莊子』, *Xúnzǐ*, 『荀子』, *Hánfēzǐ*, 『韓非子』 written in the before Qín, 先秦 period, and it progressed to theses in *Zhìāncè*, 『治安策』, *Guòzòulùn*, 『過秦論』 written by Gǔ yì, 賈誼, and to descriptions in *Chūnqîu Zuǒ shichuán*, 『春秋左氏傳』 written by Zuǒ qiūming, 左丘明 and in *Shiji*, 『史記』 written by Sīmǎ qiān, 司馬遷 during the Hàn, 漢 dynasty.

3 About twenty thousand books were discovered at stone room in the thousand Buddha' cavern(千佛洞 石室) located in Dùnhuáng, Gānsùshěng(甘肅省 敦煌), China in 1899(淸 光緖 25年). Among them, many copies written in biànwén, '變文' are included, which seem to be textbooks for lecturing Buddhist scriptures. These are so-called materials of Dùnhuáng Biànwén (敦煌 變文), and the latest is those written between the golden age of Táng(盛唐, the late 8th Century) and AD. 977(宋 太宗 2年). Thus, it seems that Biànwén, '變文' developed after the mid-Táng dynasty.

契丹 read Chinese poetry(漢詩), they read it in accordance with the word order of Jurchen, 女眞語, like Korea's Itumun(吏讀文). According to Hóngmài(洪邁)'s anecdote, he could not stop laughing when a vice-envoy Wángbǔ , 王補 who welcomed him read one verse of 'Title of Li's seclusion, 題李凝幽居' written by Gǔ dǎ o, 賈島 in the Táng, 唐 period, namely "鳥宿池中樹 僧敲月下門" as "月明裏和尚門子打 水底裏樹上老鴉坐". Interestingly, there is a record indicating that Wángbǔ , 王補 is a Khitan, 契丹人 born in Jinzhō u, 錦州 (『夷堅志』「丙志」第18 '契丹誦詩').[4]

This kind of Khitan's recite poem(契丹誦詩) is of course not classified as Biànwén, '變文'. Rather, this is more like Korea's Itumun(吏讀文), so even though it was written in Chinese characters, it might have been read in Jurchen, 女眞語. During that period, China and its neighboring races recorded their various languages with Chinese characters, and there seem to be many types of Biànwén, '變文' which did not correspond with the sentential structures of Gǔ wén.

As mentioned earlier, many Biànwén which were developed after the mid-Táng dynasty deviated slightly from Gǔ wén, but their basic grammatical structure is based on the archaic language(上古語) of China, Gǔ wén, 古文. However, since the influence of Tō ngyǔ , 通語 was widespread during the Suí, 隋 and Táng, 唐 dynasties, a new type of written language was developed based on the spoken language, and it is called Báihuà, 白話 or Báihuàwèn, 白話文. This new written style, which is more colloquial, was mainly used for prose, but it also became in part the language of literature. During the Táng, 唐 and Sòng, 宋 dynasties, Confucian scripts written in Gǔ wén were annotated with this colloquial written style.[5]

This situation changed substantially during the Yuan, 元 dynasty. The rulers of the Yuan dynasty used Mongolian, which has agglutinative grammatical structures, and the language of Beijing, 北京 which was very different from the official language of Táng, 唐 and Sòng, 宋, became a new official language of Yuan. This language was a very different Chinese from the traditional language of Gǔ wén and the later language of Biànwén. The spoken language used in the Beijing, 北京 area during the Yuan dynasty was Hànéryányǔ , 漢兒言語 influenced by Mongolian and the written language transcribing this spoken language with Chinese characters was called Hanliwen(漢吏文) by peoples of Goryeo and Joseon who had to learn to use it.

In this talk, I will inquire into the Hanliwen(漢吏文) of the Yuan dynasty, which has yet to receive much scholarly interest and also I will introduce Imun(吏文), which was used from the late Goryeo period on the Korean peninsula. Imun(吏文) is very similar to Hanliwen in the sense that it was used to transcribe the Korean language with Chinese characters in accordance with Korean word order. The study of Korean Imun has been completely neglected, largely because its study specifically requires the comparison with Hanliwen of the Yuan dynasty. Furthermore, the understanding of Chinese Hanliwen is only possible when we admit the existence of Hànéryányǔ which was the official language of the Beijing area during the Yuan dynasty. However, the existence of this language has been ignored by China and by the scholarly pursuits of Chinese linguistics.

3. Hanliwen(漢吏文) of the Yuan dynasty

---

4 While comparing "月明裏和尚門子打 水底裏樹上老鴉坐--while the moon is shining, a Buddhist monk beats a door, and a raven sat on the tree in the bottom of water--" with the corresponding Mongolian sentences "saran-du xooš ang egüde toɤ sixu-du naɤ ur taxi modun-du xeriy-e saɤ umui", Ching(1997) claimed that even though the expressions written in strange Chinese word order sounded very funny to the diplomatic representative to China, Hóngmài, 洪邁, that kind of sentential structure is natural to Khitanes(契丹語), and also, it fits with that of Mongolian. If Korean word order had been identical to that, Korean Itumun(吏讀文) would also have been considered as one of these variant forms of strange Chinese. This aspect results from the difference between Chinese with its isolating grammatical structure and Khitanese compositions, 契丹文 and Itumun with their agglutinative structures.

5 The beginning of this kind of annotation of the Confucian Scripture goes back to Shîsā njingzòushū , <十三 經奏疏> written by Zhèngxuán, 鄭玄 in the late Hā n, 後漢 period, but the annotation of the Scriptures written in the Tō ngyǔ , 通語 of the Táng-Sòng, 唐·宋 period was mainly accomplished by Zhū zǐ , 朱子.

3.1. Hànéryányŭ, 漢兒言語

One of the most notable events in the history of Chinese is that the language recognized as official changed to that of Beijing in the North after the Yuan dynasty was established by Mongolia. When Kubillai Khan(忽必烈汗) founded the capital city in Yenching, 燕京, present day Beijing, 北京, many different languages were used in that area since the Chinese and many other civilizations around Northeastern Eurasia were competing for governance. After Mongolian exercised dominance over this area around early 13th century, Chinese which appears to have been mixed with Mongolian became widely used. This language is Hànéryányŭ, 漢兒言語, which has been called 'directly translated style of Mongolian, 蒙文直譯体' or 'an administrative style of Chinese composition, 漢文吏牘体'.[6] This language was markedly different from yā yàn,' 雅言 and Tō ngyŭ, 通語 to the extent that they were not mutually comprehensible.

Kim et al. (2002/369~370) introduced how this kind of language started to be used by means of citing *The Documents of Ambassador Xŭ's Journey*, 『許奉使行程録』written by Xŭ kángzō ng, 許亢宗 of the North Sòng, 北宋 dynasty, who went to the coronation ceremony of Táizō ng, 太宗, Jin, 金 as a congratulating envoy in 1125(宣和 7年). While reporting that "there is a record saying that when Khitan, 契丹 was a strong country, many peoples from different areas migrated into this area, and as a result, many cultures were mingled and they could not communicate with one another. However, by using 'Hànéryányŭ, 漢兒言語', they started to communicate" (『三朝北盟會編』Vol.20), he pointed out that many peoples who moved into this area communicate with one another using Hànéryányŭ. In fact, many civilizations who gathered around the Beijing area from Northeastern Eurasia used Hànéryányŭ as a kind of Koinē,[7] and this was a very different Chinese from the Tō ngyŭ, which was based on the language used around Chángā n, 長安, the former official language of Zhō ngyuán, 中原.

Hànéryányŭ, 漢兒言語 was not a language, unlike the previously mentioned 'Khitan's reciting poem,' 契丹誦詩', that follows Mongolian word order and uses Mongolian case markers and endings. But in Chung(2004), I treat it as a kind of creole and Kim et al.(2002) also refer to it as 'broken Chinese used as a savage's language, 胡言漢語'.[8] During the Yuan dynasty, this language was used as the official language in the negotiation between Goryeo, 高麗 and China.

---

6. 'Hànéryányŭ, 漢兒言語', which was first introduced to the world by the current author, was a colloquial language of the Beijing area in the Yuan dynasty and also the common language of this area. During the period of the Yuan dynasty, Goryeo set up 'School of Han Chinese, 漢語都監' in which this language was taught (Chung:1988), and *Laoqita*, <老乞大> and *Pŏ tō ngshì* <朴通事> which were the textbooks for this language were edited. Recently, *Laoqita* which is assumed to have been published during the Taejong, 太宗 period of Joseon was discovered, and the author proposed that this book was the textbook for learning Hànéryányŭ, and that it was the original copy (Chung:2002a, 2004). The discovery of the Original *Laoqida*, <原本老乞大> and the claim that it is the textbook for Hànéryányŭ might have come as a great shock to many scholars in China and Japan studying the history of Chinese. In a series of papers (Chung:1999, 2000, 2003, 2004), I made repeated claims for the existence of Hànéryányŭ of Yuan dynasty and its textbook, which was already mentioned by Choi Sejin, 崔世珍 during the period of Jungjong, 中宗 of Joseon, and nowadays, this claim seems to be accepted as truth by many scholars studying the history of Chinese(Kim et al. 2002). Chung (1999) was presented in Tokyo in Japanese, and Chung(2000) was presented in Seoul in Korean, and Chung(2003c) was presented at ICKL in Turkey, and Chung(2004) was presented in Beijing in Chinese.

7. Koinē (κοινή) was the common language of the Greek empire which conquered the Mediterranean area after the period of Alexander the Great, and it is based on the Attica dialect. Since then, the term, Koinē has been used to refer to the common language of an empire.

8. While referring to 'savages' language of Chinese, 胡言漢語', Kim et al.(2002/370~371) wrote that "when people of South Sòng use the terms 'Hànrén, 漢人' or 'Hàner, 漢兒', these always refer to Chinese people under the governance of the northern Jin, 金 dynasty. Thus, 'Hànyŭ, 漢語' also refers to the Chinese used in the north. However, it seems that the language sounded strange to people of South Sòng. In *Xiàngshā nyŭ lù,* 『象山語録』(卷下) written by Lùjiŭ yuā n, 陸九淵(1139~93) who was a famous philosopher of South Sòng and in the article of Rev. Huángbòzhiyîn, ' 黃檗志因禪師' in *Wŭ dē nghuìyuán,* 『五灯會元』(vol. 16) which is a collection of biographies of Buddhist Zen monks, the term ' 胡言漢語' was used to refer to funny and strange speaking styles."

Thus, after the foundation of Yuan, Goryeo set up the school of spoken Chinese, 漢語都監 especially to teach this language.[9]

Although Mongolian ruled the country during Yuan dynasty, this was achieved by means of supervising the Chinese ruling class, the Han race, 漢人, who in turn controlled the common Chinese people.[10] Therefore, the Chinese needed to write reports for the Mongolian supervisors, and the written language used in those reports was not Gǔ wén, 古文 but a newly formed written language based on Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語. This newly formed written language has been called 'an administrative style of Chinese composition, 漢文吏牘体', or 'directly translated style of Mongolian, 蒙文直譯体', and is described by Kim et al.(2002/372) as follows.

"Even though the royalty of Jin, 金 could speak some spoken Chinese(漢語), the royalty or nobility of Mongolia in general did not know Chinese, and indeed they never even considered learning it. Thus, there was a need to record important matters such as the orders of Khan(汗) in Mongolian, which was Khan's language. It seems that for such purposes, 'Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語' was the most simple and accurate means of transcription. If formal Chinese or Chinese classics(古文 or 白話文 etc.) was used to translate it, semantic translation processes would be required and as a result, that would inevitably result in the meaning being distorted. Furthermore, the people who needed to read it were 'Chinese people' such as Khitan, 契丹人, Jurchen, 女眞人 etc., using Hànéryányǔ. Thus, 'Hànéryányǔ' changed from a spoken language to a written language. The Chinese writing, known as '' directly translated style of Mongolian, 蒙文直譯体' refers to this."(Translation author's own)

However, such claims are seriously flawed in that they ignore the fact that the written language reflected Hànéryányǔ, which really existed as a colloquial language during that time. In a series of papers (1999, 2000, 2003, 2004), I argued that a variety of Chinese that was a mixture of Hànéryányǔ and Mongolian really existed as a kind of Koinē, and that 'a directly translated style, 蒙文直譯体' is the documentation of this colloquial language. I also claimed that an administrative style, 漢文吏牘体 refers to a literary style of the written style language mainly used in judicature and administration, which was newly formed based on spoken Chinese at that time.

The second Khan(汗) of the Mongolian empire, Ogotai(窩闊大), gave a royal order[11] that the sons and siblings of Mongolian secretaries learn 'Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語' and its documents, and that the sons and siblings of Chinese public servants learn Mongolian. The purpose of the order was to facilitate communication between Chinese and Mongolian officials possible by the learning Mongolian and 'Hànéryányǔ' to translate it and its written language form.

3.2 Hanliwen(漢吏文)

3.2.1 Hanliwen(漢吏文) and Hànwénlìdútǐ (漢文吏牘体)

9 I refer readers to Chung(1987, 1990) and Park Yong-un(2005) for the foundation and management of 'School of Spoken Chinese language, 漢語都監' and 'School of Administrative Chinese, 吏學都監' in the Goryeo Dynasty.

10 During the Yuan dynasty, Mongolian officials were dispatched to each ministry(省) in order to supervise Chinese officials. For example, there is a record of '中書省 奏過事內 1件' in Yuándiǎ nzhā ng, <元典章> (1320), saying that even though Mongolian officials called 'Zhálǔ huā chì(札魯花赤), Shǒ ulǐ ngguàn(首領官), Liùbùguàn(六部官), Bidū chìrén(必闍赤人)' were supposed to supervise Chinese officials in the Ministry of Capital City(大都省), they were lazy at showing up for work, so the king issued a royal order urging them to go to the office early and to leave work late. Here, the term 'Zhálǔ huā chì, 札魯花赤' refers to "Mongolian Government Official, Duànshìguā n, 斷事官"

11 This royal order of Ogotai Khan is recorded in Xī jī nzhì, 『析津志』 (『析津志輯佚』, 北京古籍出版, 1983) which is a geography of Beijing, and issued in 1233(元 太宗 5年). He ordered to found a school called 'Sìjiàodú, 四教讀' in Yenching, 燕京(the capital city of Yuan), in which 18 siblings of Mongolian Bidū chì, 必闍赤 and 22 siblings of Chinese people were going to live together, and to teach 'the missives written by Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語·文書' to Mongolian siblings and Mongolian and archery to Chinese siblings. It seems that the term 'Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語' refers to a colloquial language of Chinese at that time and 'wènshū, 文書' refers to a written language called Hanliwen(漢吏文). Refer to Kim et al.(2002).

Tanaka(1964) classifies the written style language which is based on Hànéryányǔ，漢兒言語, a spoken language of Yuan dynasty, into 'a direct translated style, 蒙文直譯体' and 'an administrative style, 漢文吏牘体'. He claims in the beginning of his paper that;

"The style of documents included in the *Yuándiǎnzhāng*,「元典章」, that is *The Documents of National Systems and Holy Governments of Great Yuan Dynasty*,「大元聖政國朝典章」in full name, can be mainly divided into two types: an administrative styles, 漢文吏牘体 and a direct translated style, 蒙文直譯体. The former is the literary style for judicial documents which were completed by secretaries working in the legal system and administration. In contrast, the latter refers to a literary style that was used by translators in translating Mongolian judicial documents into Chinese, and it originated in the special situation of the Yuan dynasty in which China was governed by Mongolian. A direct translated style, 蒙文直譯体 was nothing but a temporary name, and it also referred to a type of Chinese composition written with Chinese characters. Unfortunately, people think that the sentences of *Yuándiǎnzhāng*,「元典章」are thought of as very abstruse since the two literary styles are different from normal Chinese compositions, and as a result, in spite of a wealth of historical records, we could not make full use of them(Tanaka:1964/47)." (Translation author's own)

Even though the claims have been made that an administrative style, 漢文吏牘体 originated from North Sòng, 北宋, and that a directly translated style, 蒙文直譯体 was born during the Yuan dynasty, I think that the latter is actually the direct transcription of Hànéryányǔ，漢兒言語, a spoken language of the Beijing area during the Yuan dynasty, and the former refers to a form of written language progressed from the latter. Although Yoshikawa(1953, 吉川幸次郎) was not aware of the existence of Hànéryányǔ，漢兒言語, he accurately described the situation of that period while mentioning the literary style of *Yuándiǎnzhāng,* <元典章>, the representative work of lidúwén, 吏牘文 in the Yuan dynasty:

…かくきわめて僅かではあるが、あたかも元曲の白のごとく、口語の直寫を志した部分が存在する。なぜこれらの部分たけ口語を直寫しようとするのか。それは恐らく、いかなる言語に誘導されての犯罪であるかが、量刑に關係するからであり、その必要にそなえる爲であろうと思われるが、要するに吏牘の文が、必要に**応**じてはいかなる言語をも受容し得る態度にあることを、別の面から示すものである。…-- [in 元典章] Even though they are few, there exist some parts transcribing the spoken language as in the case of 'bài, 白' of 'Dramas of Yuan dynasty, <元曲>.[12] It can be assumed that since what language was used to induce a crime was relevant to the verdict, the actual spoken language needed to be used in preparation for such cases. To make it short, this displays the attitude that the sentences written in lidú, 吏牘 can accommodate any kind of language for any purpose.

This statement indicates that when lidúwén in Yuan was used in legal documents, spoken languages were transcribed as they were, regardless of what languages were used, in order to fully grasp the truth from a criminal's confession or from an accusation at trial.[13] The spoken language mentioned here refers to Hànéryányǔ，漢兒言語, which was used in the Beijing area as Koinē, and this spoken language was temporarily referred to as a direct translated style, 蒙文直譯体 in Lidúwén, 吏牘文 of the Yuan dynasty. However, scholars of later generations have

---

12 Yoshikawa(1953) claimed that in *Yuándiǎnzhāng,* <元典章>, most of the records in which writers tried to record the conversations between involved people as they were are shown in the part of Ministry of Justice, 刑部, but some of them appeared in the part of Ministry of Tax, 戶部.

13 Yoshikawa(1953) presented some examples of cases in which the colloquial language is recorded as it was in Yuándiǎnzhāng, and one of them is as follows. In *Yuándiǎnzhāng,* <元典章>(「殺親屬」 第5, it is recorded that according to the interrogation of a criminal who killed his wife, on June 12th 1312(皇慶 元年), Huòniúér, 霍牛兒 who moved to Chízhōu county(池州路), Dōngliúprovince(東流縣) because of a famine fought with Yuéxiī n, 岳仙 who was his begging partner and Huòniúér, 霍牛兒 was beaten by him. Seeing this, his wife said "**你**喫人打罵。做不得男子漢 。我每日做別人飯食 。被人欺負。--You are beaten by others and blamed. You are not qualified as a man. Since everyday I beg others for food, they call me an idiot--", so he killed his wife. The sentences in this record are written in a colloquial style of writing, so it is different from Gǔwén, 古文 as well as the formal style of an administrative style, 漢文吏牘体. Actually, the style of those sentences is identical with that of the original *Laoqita*,『原本老乞大』which the author introduced as the data of Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語. A direct translated style, 蒙文直譯体 refers to Hànéryányǔ,, which was used in the Beijing area as an actual colloquial language. Refer to Chung (2004)

interpreted these temporary terms used by Yoshikawa and Tanaka as if those literary styles really existed. This misbelieve results from their ignorance as to the existence of Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語.

What I want to argue here is that the administrative style, 漢文吏牘体 which was used for judicature and administration in the Yuan dynasty should be considered as 'Hanliwén, 漢吏文'. That is to say that even though Japanese scholars have claimed that 'an administrative style, 漢文吏牘体' and 'a direct translated style, 蒙文直譯体' are kinds of Chinese Biànwén, '變文', they really refer to transcriptions of the spoken language in liwén, 吏文 of the Yuan dynasty. Especially, the Chinese 'liwén, 吏文' which was developed from the Yuan dynasty, that is 'an administrative style, 漢文吏牘体', has been called 'Hanliwen(漢吏文)' to distinguish it from Korean Imun(吏文) used on the Korean peninsular during the Joseon, 朝鮮 dynasty.[14]

Until now, the fact that the written style language of lidútî, 吏牘体 in Yuan had a different literary style from Gǔ wén, 古文, namely Hanliwen(漢吏文), has been overlooked. However, one of the facts indicating that Hanliwen really existed is that Translation Service Examination of Administrative Chinese, 漢吏科 existed until the early Joseon dynasty, which was an exam system testing Hanliwen. The article of *Sejong's Authentic Records,* 『世宗實錄』(vol. **47, Sejong 12th 庚戌 Mar.**) recorded the guideline for tests which is to recruit government officials issued by Sangjeongso, 詳定所, and this includes precise testing methods of Hanrikwa, 漢吏科. According to the guideline, the texts required for the testing of Translation Service Examination of Chinese, the Studies of Administrative Style of Chinese, 漢吏學 including '*Shū* (書), *Shī* (詩), *Sìshū* (四書), *Lǔ zhā idàxué*(魯齋大學), *Zhijiéxiǎ oxué* (直解小學), *Chéngzhā i xiàojing*(成齋孝經), *Shǎ owē itō ngjiàn*(少微通鑑), *Qiànhòuhā n*(前後漢), *Lixuézhinàn*(吏學指南), *Zhō ngyizhiyan* (忠義直言), *Tòngzixi*(童子習), *Dàyuàntō ngzhi*(大元通制), *Zhizhèngtiàogé*(至正條格), *Yùzhidàgào* (御製大誥), *Pō tō ngshi*(朴通事), *Laoqita*(老乞大), *Registration of diplomatic records* (事大文書謄錄), the other composition(製述 奏本. 啓本. 杏文)', and these texts must have been the textbooks used for teaching Hanliwen(漢吏文).

Among those texts, '*Shū* (書), *Shī* (詩), *Sìshū* (四書)' are written in the Gǔ wén, 古文 of the 先秦 period, and *Pō tō ngshi*, <朴通事> and *Laoqita*, <老乞大> must be the textbooks for learning Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語, and the rest of them must be the textbooks for learning Hanliwen(漢吏文). I will briefly describe each of these textbooks.

First of all, *Lǔ zhā idàxué,* <魯齋大學> refers to *Dàxuézhixiè,* <大學直解> which is the third volume of *Lǔ zhā iyíshū,* 『魯齋遺書』edited by Xǔ héng, 許衡 in Yuan, and this seems to be a translated version of *Dàxué,* <大學> in Hànéryányǔ. *Chéngzhā ixiàojing,* <成齋孝經> refers to X*iàojingzhíxiè,*『孝經直解』 written by Bě itíngchéngzhā i, 北庭成齋 of the Yuan dynasty. [15]

---

14 According to an article in 'The Preface of *Direct Translated Tóngzǐ xí,* 直解童子習序' of Seong Sammun, 成三問, Hanliwen(漢吏文) was taught in Seungmunwon, 承文院 in order to write diplomatic documents in the early Joseon period, and Sayeokwon, 司譯院 took charge of interpretation by learning a colloquial language, namely Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語. According to the introduction of this article, saying that "... 自我祖宗事大至誠 置承文院掌吏文 司譯院掌譯語 專其業而久其任 ...--... Since the time of our ancestors, we have taken diplomacy very seriously, so Seungmunwon, 承文院 was founded to take charge of Liwen, 吏文 and Sayeokwon was founded to take charge of interpretation of languages. Thus, the work became easier and the positions remained for a long time (Translation author's own)...", Sayeokwon took charge of interpretation by learning a colloquial language, and in Seungmunwon, people learned Liwen, 吏文, that is Hanliwen, 漢吏文. The translation of the excerpt is based on Hong(1946).

15 . Since *Chéngzhā ixiàojing,*『成齋孝經』is mentioned in ASK(1986/484) as "The book written by Chénqióng, 陳璚 of Ming, 明. It was written to educate children (Translation author's own)", it was claimed in footnote 3 of Chung et al(2002/18) that "*Chéngzhā ixiàojing,*『成齋孝經』is the translation of *Zhíxièxiàojing* 『直解孝經』 of the Yuan dynasty into the Beijing language of that time achieved by Chénqióng, 陳璚(his pen name, 號 is Chéngzhā ì, 成齋) of the 明 dynasty. ... Refer to ASK(精文研;1986)". However, that claim was found to be incorrect. In fact, *Zhíxièxiàojing,*『直解孝經』was written by Bě itíng Chéngzhā ì, 北庭成齋(小雲石 海涯, 自號 酸齋, 一名 成齋) in the Yuan dynasty, and according to *Xiàojingzhíxiè,*『孝經直解』 which handed down in Japan, the title is '新刊全相成齋孝經直解'. At the end of book, it is recorded as '北庭成齋直說孝經 終', and at the end of the introduction, it is written as '小雲石海涯 北庭成齋自敍'. This represents a mistake made in several papers by the author, that are caused by citing ASK(精文研;1986). I sincerely apologize to readers for this.

Dàyuàntōngzhi, 〈大元通制〉 is a book containing comprehensive records of the judicial system of the Yuan dynasty from the foundation of the dynasty to during Yányòu(延祐年間, 1314~ 1320). In 1312(皇慶 1年), Rénzōng, 仁宗 ordered Āsǎn, 阿散 to edit a book collecting judicial cases taking place from the foundation of Yuan, and this books was completed in 1323(至治 3年). This is the only systematic code of law completed during the Yuan dynasty.

Zhizhèngtiàogè, 〈至正條格〉 is the edited version of *Dàyuàntōngzhi,* 〈大元通制〉 which was complied during 1346(至正 6年) in the Yuan dynasty. Tàizǔ, 太祖 of the Ming, 明 dynasty distributed ' *Yùzhìdàgào,* ' 御製大誥' 74 articles in October 1385(洪武 18年), which was a book of law based on criminal cases committed by officials and people, and this was used for correcting the bad customs of the Yuan dynasty. In the following year, ' The Sequel of *Yùzhìdàgào,* 御製大誥續編' 87 articles(vol. 1) and ' The third of *Yùzhìdàgào,* 御製大誥三' 47 articles(vol. 1) were published for the same purpose. *Yùzhìdàgào,* 〈御製大誥〉 is used as a collective term referring to all of them.

Registration of diplomatic records, 〈事大文書謄錄〉 is a collection of documents detailing communications between Seungmunwon, 承文院 of Joseon, 朝鮮 dynasty and the Chinese royal court(朝廷). According to the articles of Sejong's Authentic Record, 『世宗實錄』(vol. 51, 世宗 13年 1月 丙戌, 同 vol. 121, 世宗 30年 8月 丙辰) and Tanjong's Authentic Record, 『端宗實錄』(vol. 13, 端宗 3年 1月 丁卯), these were transcribed once every five years and printed once every ten years for publication (Chung et al. 2002).

Thus, '*Lǔzhāidàxué(魯齋大學), Zhìjiěxiǎoxué(直解小學), Chéngzhāixiàojing(成齋孝經), Shǎowēitōngjiàn(少微通鑑), Qiànhòuhān(前後漢)*' are translations of the scriptures and history books including '*Dàxué(大學), Xiǎoxué(小學), Xiàojing(孝經), Tōngjiàn(通鑑), Qiànhānshū (前漢書), Hòuhānshū(後漢書)*' into Hànéryányǔ(漢兒言語), and '*Lìxuézhìnàn(吏學指南), Zhōngyizhiyan(忠義直言), Dàyuàntōngzhi(大元通制), Zhizhèng- tiàogè(至正條格), Yùzhìdàgào (御製大誥)*'are written in Hanliwen, which was the new written language of the Yuan dynasty known as an administrative style, 漢文吏牘体. Among these, '*Lìxuézhinàn(吏學指南)*' was a reference book for learning Hanliwen (漢吏文).[16] In addition, '*Zhōngyizhiyan(忠義直言), Dàyuàntōngzhi(大元通制), Zhizhèng -tiàogè(至正條格), Yùzhìdàgào(御製大誥)*' are books similar to the previously mentioned *Yuándiǎn- zhāng(〈元典章〉)*; in other words, books collecting administrative documents such as the laws, the Imperial edicts, the memorial to the Throne of the Yuan dynasty. '*Laoqita(老乞大)* and *Pōtòngshi(朴通事)*' are the textbooks for learning the spoken language Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語, as I mentioned before.

If this is indeed the case, we can figure out what Hanliwen(漢吏文) must have been like by studying the textbooks of 漢文吏牘体 and 蒙文直譯体, that is Hanliwen(漢吏文), such as '魯齋大學, 直解小學, 成齋孝經, 少微通鑑, 前後漢'. To figure out the identity of Hanliwen(漢吏文), I was able to use the text of 〈成齋孝經〉 as my focus.

3.2.2 Directly translated style of Mongolian, 蒙文直譯体 of *Chéngzhāixiàojing,* 〈成齋孝經〉

Chéngzhāixiàojing, 〈成齋孝經〉 is the book that Suǒyúnshì Hǎiyá, 小雲石 海涯 of Yuan translated *Xiàojing,* 〈孝經〉 in Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語 which was the spoken language of the Beijing area, following the case in which Lǔzhài, 魯齋 (Xǔhéng, 許衡 of Yuan) directly translated Dàxué, 〈大學〉 into the Beijing language of that period. The author of this book, SuǒyúnshìHǎiyá, 小雲石 海涯, wrote in *the History of Yuan*(元史)(vol. 143) that;

> "小雲石海涯家世 見其祖阿里海涯傳 其父楚國忠惠公 名貫只哥 小雲石海涯 遂以貫爲氏 復以酸齋自號 ... 初襲父官爲兩淮萬戸府達魯花赤 ... 泰定元年五月八日卒 年三十九 贈集賢學士中奉大夫護軍 追封京兆郡公 諡文靖 有文集若干卷 直解孝經一卷 行于世--Speaking of Suǒyúnshi's(小雲石 海涯) family, his father was Zhōnghuìgōng, 忠惠公 of Chūnation(楚國), and his name was Guànzhǐgē, 貫只哥, according to the biography

---

16 For *Lixuézhǐ nán,* 『吏學指南』, I refer readers to Chung et al(2002). Lixuézhǐ nán edited by Xúyuánruì, 徐元瑞 in 1301(元 大德 5年) was re-published in Kyeongju, 慶州 of Joseon around 1458(世祖 4年)(which is in the collection of Kyujanggak, 奎章閣), and the photoprint version of this book is released in Chung et al.(2002) with detailed explanations and indexes. *Lixuézhǐ nán,* I refer readers to Chung et al(2002).

of his grandfather Ālǐhǎiyá, 阿里海涯. Thus, the last name of Suǒyúnshì Hǎiyá, 小雲石 海涯 was 'Guàn, 貫', and his pen name was 'Suànzhài, 酸齋'. ... He first inherited his father's official job and later became '兩淮萬戶府達魯花赤'. ... He passed away in May 8th, 1324(泰定 元年). At that time, he was 39 years old, and he was conferred a scholar of national academy(集賢學士), a high office(中奉大夫) and a general(護軍), and also posthumously conferred a high office of capital city(京兆郡公). His posthumous title(諡號) is Wènjìng, 文靖, and he left several books and *Zhíxièxiàojing*, 『直解孝經』 which were widely distributed among people."

According to this article, Suǒyúnshì Hǎiyá, 小雲石 海涯(1286~1324) who wrote a volume of *Zhíxièxiàojing*, 『直解孝經』」 and distributed it among people was originally a Uighur and his Chinese name was Guànyúnshì, 貫雲石. He translated *Xiàojing*, <孝經> into Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語, the Beijing language of that period, and wrote *Zhíxièxiàojing,* 『直解孝經』」 in order to facilitate people's understanding of it. He was also widely known by the name of Guànsuànzhà, 貫酸齋 as the author of a musical piece, 樂府散曲.

Zhíxièxiàojing, 『直解孝經』」 seemed to be very popular at that time since we can find articles such as "小雲石海涯直解孝經一卷" in *Yìwènzhì*, 『補元史 藝文志』(vol.1) of Qiándàxìn, 錢大昕 and another *Yìwènzhì*, 『補三史 藝文志』 of Jinménzhào, 金門詔, and "小雲石海涯孝經直解 一卷" in the *Yìwènzhì*, 『補遼金元 藝文志』 of Lúwènzhào, 盧文弨. Also, it is recorded as "成齋孝經說 一卷" in *the Scripture Books of National History*, 『國史經籍志』(vol. 2) of Jiàhóng, 焦 in the Ming, 明 dynasty (Nagasawa:1933).

Considering the sentences " 至大改元孟春既望 宣武將軍 兩淮萬戶府達魯花赤 小雲石海涯 北庭成齋自敍" written in the end of his preface, 自敍, *Chéngzhāixiàojing*, <成齋孝經> of Guànyúnshì, 貫雲石 was completed in January 15th 1308(至大 元年). In the same way as Lǔzhāidàxué, 『魯齋大學』written by Xǔhéng, 許衡, he directly translated *Xiàojing*, <孝經> in Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語, so *Original Laoqita,* 『原本老乞大』(henceforth <原老>; first introduced by myself) and *Xiàojingzhíxiě,* <孝經直解>(henceforth <孝解>) are similar in the sense that they reflect the Beijing language of that period.

The examples showing that <孝解> has the literary style of Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語 in the same way as <原老> are found in the direct translations(直解文) of <孝解>, as shown below.

『新刊全相成齋孝經直解』「孝治章 第八」
Original text: 治家者不敢失於臣妾 而況於妻子乎 故得人之懽心 以事其親
Direct translation: 官人每 各自家以下的人 不着落後了 休道媳婦孩兒 因這般上頭 得一家人懽喜 奉侍父母呵 不枉了有 麼道(Officials do not ignore their inferiors. This should also apply to their wife and children. Subsequently, if one receives happiness through one's family and serves one's parents, this person will be free of evil.)

In this example, ①每, ②上頭, ③呵, ④有, and ⑤麼道 which are all underlined are inserted into Chinese writing under the influence of Mongolian. By inquiring into these expressions, I will show that both <孝解> and <原老> are direct translations into Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語, which was a spoken language of that period.

① 每
In "官人每" shown in the direct translation above, '每[měi]' is used as a plural suffix, and later, it underwent the change of '每 > 們'. Since Choi Sejin, 崔世珍 in the Jungjong, 中宗 period of Joseon noticed that '每' is used in <原老>, he discussed about it in his *Nobakjipram,* 『老朴集覽』(henceforth 『老覽』) as below;

每 本音上聲 頻也 每年 每一箇 又平聲 等輩也 我每 咱每 俺每우리 恁每 你每너희 今俗喜用們字(單字解 1 recto)--Its original sound is rising tone, 上聲 and means 'being frequent'. '每年 – in each year', '每一箇 – one by one. And when it is read in low tone, 平聲, it has the same meaning as '等輩 (same group) as in 我每 (we/us), 咱每 (we/us including listeners), 俺每 (we/us), 恁每 (you-PL), 你每 (you-PL). Nowadays, the letter '們' is preferred.

According to his explanation, '每[měi]' is used as a plural suffix. In a new version of <老乞大>, namely revised version, 刪改本, '每' has already changed to '們'. In fact, '每' in <原老> was replaced with '們' in *Revised Laoqita*, 『刪改老乞大』(henceforth <刪老>) and *Translated Laoqita*, 『飜譯老乞大』(henceforth <飜老>).

別人將**咱**每做甚麼人看(<原老> 2 recto)　　別人將**咱**們 做甚麼人看(<飜老> 上 5 verso)
漢兒小厮每　　頑(<原老> 2 recto)　　　　漢兒小厮們 十分頑 漢兒(<飜老> 上 7 verso)
俺這馬每不曾飲水裏(<原老> 9 recto)　　　我這馬們不曾飲水裏(<飜老> 上 31 verso)

Since the Song, 宋 dynasty, '們' was used to express 'plural' and forms such as '懣(滿), 瞞, 門(們)' were also used. Although '們' was partly used even in the 元 dynasty, '每' was more frequently used. However, from the mid-明 dynasty, the use of '們' increased again. As previously mentioned, the form of plural suffix underwent the change of '們 ＞ 每 ＞ 們' through the periods of Song(宋). Yuan(元). Ming(明), and the cause of that change has not been clearly revealed yet. One thing to note here is that even though '每' was widely used after the northern Mandarin 官話 became the standard language in the Yuan dynasty, '們' was still used in the southern Mandarin, and after the Yuan dynasty, '每' started to disappear even in the northern Mandarin(Lu:1985/54). Thus, it becomes clear that in the same way as <原老>, <孝解> also reflected the northern Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語.

② 上頭
'上頭[shàngtóu]' in the direct translation "因這般上頭" is a postposition which was used only in Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語 of that period, and it later underwent the change of '上頭 ＞ 因此上(because of)'. The annotations in 『老覽』 such as "上頭 견□로 今不用(累字解 **2 recto**)--'上頭' meaning 'because of', but it is not used nowadays--" and "因此上 猶言上頭(累字解 **2 verso**)--'因此上' possessing the same meaning as '上頭'(because of)--" indicate that '上頭' and '因此上' share the same meaning.
'因此上' is a form of connective representing a causal relation, and '上頭' is a compound form of '上' and '頭', which expresses causation. Both forms can be analyzed as postpositions used under the influence of Mongolian. In the comparative translation(對譯文) of *Secret History of Yuan Dynasty*, 『元朝秘史』, it corresponds to '禿剌(tula)', and this can be clearly seen in the excerpt below, quoted from Yu(1992/6);

注 音: 騰格裏因　札阿隣　札阿黑三　兀格　黍貼昆　禿剌(『元朝秘史』 206-567)
對譯文: 天的　神告　告了的　言語 明白的 上頭
意譯文: 天告**你**的言語 明白的上頭(『元朝秘史』 206 recto **013**)

Thus, '上頭' frequently used in <孝解> was inserted as the corresponding element of the Mongolian '禿剌(tula)'. This example makes the claim sound reasonable that the direct translation in <孝解> is directly translated style of Mongolian, 蒙文直譯体.

③ 呵
'呵[hē, ā]' used in "奉侍父母呵" is also a postposition which was inserted under the influence of Mongolian. It later underwent the change of '呵 ＞ 時(if)'. The sentences in 『老覽』 that "時 猶則也 古本用呵字 今本皆易用時字 或用便字(單字解 5 recto)—時' is the same as '則'. '呵' was used in old version, but it is replaced with '時' in new version or '便' is used instead--" clearly reveal that '呵' in old version was replaced with '時' in new version, so we can figure out that it corresponds to '呵' in <原老>. The examples in <原老> are shown below;

身已安樂呵 也到(if the body is in good condition, (I) will arrive. (<原老> **1 recto**)
既恁賣馬去呵 **咱** 每恰好做伴當去(if you are going to go to sell horses, it would be better for us to go together as companions. (<原老> **3 recto**)

Even though '呵[hē, ā]' could be analyzed as a particle, 語氣助詞, the examples suggest that it would be more proper to analyze it as a form of postposition representing the subjunctive. We can find traces of it in the records of Mongolian, and according to *Secret History of Yuan Dynasty*, 『元朝秘史』, '呵' corresponds to '阿速'(-[b]asu/esü) in the comparative translation(對譯文), which expresses the meaning similar to 'if' and '[b]' is used only after vowels(Yu 1992/3).

④ 有

Chung(2004) pointed out that one of the characteristics of <原老> is that 'a-(to be)' and 'bayi-(to be)' which represent a tense and sentence-completion in Mongolian are transcribed as '有[yòu]', and that this fact was mentioned also in 『老覽』 by Choi, 崔世珍. According to the explanation about '漢兒人有' in 『老覽』saying that " 元時語必於言終用有字 如語助而實非語助 今俗不用--' '有[yòu]' was always used at the end of a sentence in the language of Yuan and although it seems like a particle, this is actually not the case. It is not used among people nowadays."(「老集」上 1 recto), even though the sentential final ending '有' which was used like a particle(語助辭) existed in the language of the 元 period, it was no longer used in the time of 崔世珍.

Verbs such as 'bui(is), bolai(is), bülüge(was)', the forms of 'a-(to be)', 'bayi-(to be) which are all finite forms of the verbs, and the verb 'bol-(to become)' are all used as copulas(繫辭) in Mongolian. Thus, the function of '有' used in <原老> is considered as corresponding to the Mongolian forms such as 'bui, bolai, bülüge, a-, bayi-, bol-' which have the grammatical function of completing a sentence, and this is thought of as one of the characteristics of the Beijing language of Yuan(Chung:2004/518~519).

In the direct translation of <孝解>, '有' appears in many sentences, and some of them are quoted, as shown below;

㉠ Original text: 夫孝德之本也, <孝解> 「開宗明義章 第1」
   Direct translation: 孝道的勾當是德行的根本有(Filial piety is the foundation of ethics.)

㉡ Original text: 敬其親者 不敢慢於人, <孝解> 「天子章 第2」
   Direct translation: 存着自家敬父母的心呵 也不肯將別人來欺負有(One who has some respect for his
                      parents does not ignore others)

㉢ Original text: 君親臨之厚莫重焉, <孝解> 「聖治章 第9」
   Direct translation: 父母的恩便似官裏的恩一般重有(Blessings from one's parents are as precious as the
                      blessings from the king)

㉣ Original text: 宗廟致敬不忘親也 修身愼行恐辱先也, <孝解> 「感應章 第16」
   Direct translation: 祭奠呵 不忘了父母有, 小心行呵 不辱末了祖上有(Observing the worshiping ritual is not
                      to forget one's parents. Practicing moral training and keeping proper behaviors are
                      not to dishonor one's ancestors)

Shinmura(1995/:384) made a claim about '有' used at the end of these translated sentences, following Iriya(1973), that it was used from the early Yuan dynasty and it represents a definitive meaning. Meanwhile, Oda(1991:179) pointed out that this usage of '有' is found a lot in a wealth of materials from the 元 dynasty to the early 明 dynasty, and argued that it must have been used in colloquial style writing. Furthermore, he claimed that even though it was not used in Dramas of Yuan, 元曲, idiomatic expressions such as '一壁有者'(waiting at one corner)' found in Yuan Dramas, 元曲, suggest that '有' is a sentential final ending which does not have any lexical meaning.

It is observed that in <原老>, '有' was used frequently at the end of sentences. This fact could be considered as important evidence indicating that the language recorded is that of 大都 during the Yuan dynasty, as explained in 『老覽』. Two examples using '有' from <原老> are shown below;

㉤ 我也心裏那般想著有(I think like that in my mind)(<原老> 3뒤)
㉥ 您是高麗人却怎麽漢兒言語說的好有(You are a person from Goryeo, 高麗; then, how come you can speak
   Hànéryányǔ,, 漢兒言語 so well(<原老> 1 recto)

Considering these examples, '有' seems to be a sentential final ending expressing past perfect tense/aspect.

⑤麽道
'麽道[mádào]' is found in royal orders of the 元 dynasty and inscriptions recording them as

well as in <孝解>. This expression is used to transcribe 'ge'e(saying)' of Mongolian, and '麼道 [mádào]' appeared in the Mongolian and Chinese Inscription written by Hànéryányǔ,(蒙漢對譯 漢兒言語 碑文) is used to transcribe " ge'en, ge'eju, ge'ek'degesed aju'ue' of Mongolian. That is to say that '麼道' is the translation of the Mongolian expression corresponding to '...say that...'. An example is found in a Memorial to the Throne, 上奏文 written on October 22nd 1301(大德 5年), as shown below;

大德五年十月二十二日奏過事內一件
陝西省　官人每　文書裏說將來　"貴(責)赤裏愛你小名的人　着延安府屯田有　收拾贖身放良不蘭奚等戶者　麼道 將的御寶聖旨來有　敎收拾那怎生?" 麼道 '與將文書來' 麼道 奏呵 '怎生商量來' 麼道-- A case reported to the king on October 22nd 1301(大德 5年): A case was reported (**to the king**) that the officials in province Shǎ nxī , 陝西省 sent a report saying that "a person called 愛你(Aini) of 貴赤(archer) who came to a farm cultivated by stationary troops, 屯田 in Yánā nfú city, 延安府 had a royal order(御寶聖旨) saying that 'Borongireu(不蘭奚 or 孛蘭奚, the term referring to a slave captured by the Mongolian army in the former South Song, 南宋 area) who recovered the status of a commoner with some indemnity, return.', so is it proper to let him go?", and then (**the king**) said that "how was the consultation?"--(The underlined parts are the translations of '麼道')

In the excerpt above, there appear three cases of '麼道' underlined, and all of them take the form of introducing a quotation. I think that this literary style of <孝解> reflects the changing phases of Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語 in <原老> to Hanliwen(漢吏文) as a written language. Hànéryányǔ, of *Laoqita* was a colloquial language used in everyday conversions, and the direct translation of <孝解> had the characteristics of a written language and later progressed to Liwen, 吏文.

As mentioned already, in <孝解>, lexical items such as '每, 上頭, 呵, 有, 麼道', which are not used in normal Chinese writings, were frequently used, and the grammatical structure is also quite different from that of Gǔwén, 古文. However, considering that <孝解> was a required textbook for the Examination of Chinese, 漢吏科 starting at the early Joseon, it is certain that people in fact learned Hanliwen and wrote diplomatic documents in Hanliwen.

3.2.3 Hànwénlìdútǐ , 漢文吏牘体 of Yuándiǎnzhāng, <元典章>>

According to the article of Sejong' Authentic Record, 『世宗實錄』(vol. 47, 世宗 12年 庚戌 3月), Sangjeongso, 詳定所 chose Zhō ngyizhiyan(忠義直言), Dàyuàntō ngzhi(大元通制), Zhizhèng-tiàogè(至正條格), Yùzhidàgào(御製大誥) as the texts for 漢吏科, which was used for testing 漢吏文. These texts were similar to Yuándiǎ nzhā ng, <元典章>> in the sense that these represented the collection of administrative documents in the Yuan dynasty including law, Imperial edict, memorial to the Throne. Yoshikawa(1953) studied the literary styles of Chinese writings in 『大元聖政國朝典章』(60卷) and 『新集至治條例』(不分卷). He argues that most of the materials seem to be written in Hànwénlìdútǐ , 漢文吏牘体 even though some are written in Mèngwénzhíyìtǐ , 蒙文直譯体. Let's consider an excerpt from the miscellaneous examples of the Bureau of Criminal,「刑部」' 雜例' in *Yuándiǎ nzhā ng,* <元典章>>(卷42), which has the title of "Killing a person by running him over and then moving the corpse."

看碾子人李鎮撫家驅口閣喜僧狀招. 至元三年八月初八日. 本宅後碾黍間. 有小廝四箇. 於碾北四五步地街南作要. 至日高碾 齒(＋齒). 前去本家. 取墊碾油餅回來. 到碾上. 見作要小廝一箇. 在西北碾槽內. 手脚動但搾揣. 其餘三箇小廝. 碾北立地. 喜僧向前抱出小底. 覷得頭上有血. 抱於西墻下臥地. 恐驢踏着. 移於碾東北房門東放下. 倚定瘋楷坐定. 手動氣出. 喜僧委是不知怎生碾着. 避怕本使問着. 走往阜城縣周家藏閃. 在後却行還家. 干證人殷定僧等三人狀稱. 崔中山於碾內弄米來. 俺三箇碾外要來. 趕碾的人無來. 法司擬. 既是殷定僧等稱. 崔中山自來弄米. 別無定奪. 止據閣喜僧 不合移屍出碾. 不告身死人本家得知. 合從不應爲. 事輕. 合答四十. 部擬三十七下. 呈省准擬

The extract above tells of the interrogation(狀招) of Yànxǐ sèng, 閣喜僧 who was a slave of Lǐ zhènfǔ , 李鎮撫 and worked at a mill. It says that "on August 8th 1266(至元 三年), when he ground millet in a stone mill in the backyard of the house of Lǐ zhènfǔ , 李鎮撫, 4 boys were playing near the southern part of the pathway four or five steps away from the stone mill. When the sun rose high, the stone mill ceased spinning freely, so he went to the house to fetch a lump of oil. When he came back, he saw that a boy had fallen down into the mortar on the northwest side and was not moving, and also saw three other boys standing over the north side of the mill.

When Yànxǐ sèng, 閻喜僧 came forward and took the boy down, he saw blood on his head, so he took the boy and put him under the wall on the west side. However, worrying that the boy might get trodden on by a donkey (probably, the stone mill was worked by a donkey.), he moved the boy to the east side in front of the gate which was located on the northeast side of the stone mill. Since it was obvious that the boy had been killed by being run over by the stone mill, Yànxǐ sèng, 閻喜僧 was afraid of being taken away to the administrative office. Thus, he ran away to the house of Zhō－ujiā，周家 in Fùchéngxiàn county, 阜城縣, and hid there, saying that he did not want to go back. According to the interrogation of the other three boys including Yànxǐ sèng, 殷定僧 who had witnessed the accident, they said that "while Cuī zhō ngshàn, 崔中山(the boy who died) was playing in the stone mill with rice, we were playing outside of it. There was no one spinning the stone mill." The judicial office said that "If this was an accident, as witnessed by Yànxǐ sèng, 殷定僧 and the other boys. While Cuī zhō ngshàn, 崔中山 was playing alone with rice, he was run over by the stone mill and died, and there is nothing much to reinvestigate. However, it is surely a crime that Yànxǐ sèng, 閻喜僧 moved the corpse out of the stone mill, and that he did not inform the boy's family of the accident. Since this is only a minor crime, he will receive 37 lashes rather than 40 when he is flogged."

This Chinese writing contains words indicating that the spoken language is directly transcribed, and there appear many words such that if it had written in Gǔwén, 古文, different words would have been used. For example, 'xiǎ osī，小厮, xiǎ odǐ，小底' replaces 'nànér, 男兒' of Gǔwén, 古文, and 'zuóyào, 作要' is used instead of 'zuóxì, 作戱' for the expression of 'children's playing'. In addition, this writing expresses yùndòng, 運動 with 'dòngdàn, 動但', 'writhing' with 'zhē ngchuàì, 挣揣', 'standing' with 'lìdì, 立地', and also, 'qùdé, 覷得' is used instead of 'jiàn, 見, kàn, 看' for 'seeing' and 'zě nshē ng, 怎生' is used instead of 'rúhé, 如何' for 'whatever you do'.

Based on these examples, I argue that the Chinese writing of Yuan, lìdú, 吏牘, is formed on the basis of the spoken language. That is to say that Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語 is a spoken language and liwen, Yuan period, 元代 吏文 is a written language based on it. Thus, Hanliwen(漢吏文), which is the literary style of lìdú, 吏牘, is still Chinese and its grammatical structure is not much different from that of Gǔwén, 古文. To be more specific, the grammatical structure of 'Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語' follows Chinese even though it is under the influence of Mongolian with respect to lexical items and grammatical elements.

This literary style of Chinese lìdú,, 吏牘 was uniformly used in all kinds of administrative documents which were submitted to the Mongolian supervisor by Chinese subordinate officials. Thus, the Chinese tradition which puts emphasis on the knowledge of the classics collapsed, and instead the emphasis was shifted to knowledge about practical skills. Under this situation, 'xū lì, 胥吏' who had practical legal knowledge were preferred to 'shi, 士(scholars)'. During the Yuan dynasty, the only way for the Chinese to be successful was to obtain practical knowledge about the judicial system, administration and writing documents and also to know Hanliwen(漢吏文) thoroughly (Miyazaki:1987).

Thus, I would like to make the claim that the Chinese literary style of lìdú, 吏牘 which was widespread during the 元 dynasty should be considered as Hanliwen. The reason why 漢吏科 started in the early 朝鮮 was that officials who know Hanliwen well were needed to produce diplomatic documents, so the textbooks for Hanliwen were selected as required texts for testing. In China, learning of Hanliwen was called 'lìdào, 吏道', and even though 'lìdú,, 吏牘' originally referred to documents written in Hanliwen(漢吏文), later it referred to the writing of Hanliwen(漢吏文) itself. Thus, 吏文 written in a certain format for official documents was called lìdú, 吏牘. On the Korean peninsular, with the change of one letter in the Chinese terms, the former is called 'lìtóu, 吏頭' and the latter is called 'Itu(吏讀)'.

4. Imun(吏文) and Itumun(吏讀文) of Korean Peninsular

On the Korean peninsular, Imun(吏文) was developed to be used in official judicial and administrative documents, imitating Hanliwen(漢吏文) developed during the Yuan dynasty.

However, since Imun(吏文) was mingled with Itumun(吏讀文) of the later period, it became impossible to distinguish between them. Furthermore, after the discovery of Old Translated Inwanggyeong, <舊譯仁王經> in the mid-70s, which represented important data regarding semantic reading Kugyeol, 釋讀口訣, the confusion worsened since the difference between Kugyeolmun, 口訣文 and the others was not clear. In this talk, before getting into the inquiry of Korean Imun(吏文), I would like to start with the discernment of these terms.

4.1 Itu(吏讀) and Kugyeol(口訣)

On the Korean peninsular, in the process of accommodating Chinese civilization, people tried to learn Chinese and Chinese characters in order to read all kinds of texts written in Chinese writing, and furthermore, they tried to record the Korean language using Chinese characters. Because Chinese characters are ideograms designed to record an isolating language such as Chinese, when Korean people came to read Chinese texts they had to translate them into the Korean language or had to add case markers and endings following the agglutinative grammatical structure of Korean(Chung:2003a,b). Among these reading methods of Chinese writing, the former is called a Korean semantic reading, 釋讀, and the latter is called a Chinese word order reading, 順讀 or 誦讀, and the Korean grammatical elements inserted in reading Chinese writing such as case markers and endings are called Kugyeol(口訣).

In contrast, when recording Korean language with Chinese characters, one way that was used was translating the text into Chinese first, and then writing the translated contents with Chinese characters. The documents written following this method were not much different from Chinese writing based on Chinese itself. However, using this method, one problem was how to write the names of Korean people, places and official ranks which were very difficult or even impossible to translate into Chinese. Thus, in these cases, such names were translated into Chinese characters or they were transcribed with Chinese characters based on their pronunciation. For example, the name of a Shilla, 新羅 general ‘Geochilpu, 居柒夫’ was recorded as ‘荒宗’, and ‘奈乙’ and ‘舒弗邯, 舒發翰’ was recorded as ‘蘿井’ and ‘角干’ respectively. These examples show cases in which the language of Shilla, 新羅 was first transcribed using Chinese characters based on original pronunciation and then translated in Chinese.

In addition to the method of recording proper names of the ancient Korean in Chinese characters, there was another advanced method of recording Korean in which Chinese characters were ordered in accordance with Korean word order. As is well known, the latter method progressed from the recording method of Imshinseogiseok, 壬申誓記石. Texts in which the Korean language is recorded in Chinese characters in accordance with Korean word order have been called ‘Hyangchalmun, 鄕札文’ or ‘Itumun(吏讀文)’, and the Chinese characters used in those writings were called ‘Hyangchal, 鄕札’ or ‘Ituja, 吏讀字’.[17]

In Itumun(吏讀文) in which Korean is recorded with Chinese characters in accordance with Korean word order, there are some cases in which proper nouns and grammatical elements which do not exist in Chinese were written by borrowing the meanings or pronunciations of Chinese characters. For example, in the sentence “二塔天寶十七年戊戌中立在之-the two towers were built in 17th year of Cheonpo (天寶 十七年, 戊戌)-” recorded in the Document for Building of the Tower at Kalhang Temple(葛項寺 造塔記, 758), the form ‘在之’ is used for the transcription of grammatical elements representing aspectuality(時相) and sentence-completion. The letters ‘在’ and ‘之’ used there are very similar to those in Kugyeol(口訣). However, the most important difference between Itu(吏讀) and Kugyeol(口訣) is that while the former was used for recording Korean with Chinese characters, the latter was usually inserted within Chinese texts in order for Korean people to read them more easily. Thus, the grammatical structure of Itumun(吏讀文) was based on Korean, but Kugyeolmun(口訣文) was Chinese writing following the grammatical structure of Chinese, in which Korean grammatical elements were inserted. The

---

17 Lee(1992/14) distinguished Itumun(吏讀文) from Hyangchalmun(鄕札文) of sentences of literary arts, 文藝文 considering it as practical sentences, 實用文 of creative works, 創作文. Further, he distinguished Kugyeol sentences, 口訣文 from Itu sentences(吏讀文) considering it as translated sentences, 飜譯文. However, Itu(吏讀) and Hyangchal (鄕札) are actually identical, and both of them are called Hyangchal until early Goryeo in order to distinguish them from Chinese writings, 唐文

other difference between them is that whereas the use of Kugyeol(口訣) was limited to writing Korean grammatic elements, Itu(吏讀) was sometimes used to write semantically meaningful units in the case of recording proper nouns.[18]

In addition, the term '吐' needs to be mentioned. This term refers to Korean grammatical elements used in Itu(吏讀) or Kugyeol(口訣). More specifically, 'Tho, 吐' refers to Korean case markers and sentential endings written in Chinese characters, and this is classified into 'Kugeolto, 口訣吐' and 'Ito, 吏吐'. Even though Ito could be easily distinguished from Itu(吏讀) since Itu(吏讀) was sometimes used to represent semantically meaningful units, this kind of distinction is not easy in the case of 'Kugeolto, 口訣吐' since most usages of Kugeol, 口訣 represented grammatical units.[19]

4.2 Imun(吏文) and Itu(吏讀)

I have explained the reasons why Itumun, 吏讀文 needs to be distinguished from Imun, 吏文. On the Korean peninsula, a literary style to transcribe official documents was developed in the same way as Chinese Hanliwen(漢吏文). There has been no research as to when Joseon Imun(吏文)[20] became the official written language for administrative documents. However, based on the assumption that Joseon, Imun(吏文) was formed under the influence of Hanliwen(漢吏文), it can be assumed that it became the official written language around the late Goryeo dynasty or the early Joseon dynasty.

After Imun(吏文) became the official written language, all administrative documents were considered effective only when they were written in Imun(吏文). According to the record "出債成文 ... 諺文及無證筆者 勿許聽理" written in Ministry of Tax,「戶部」of *Sygyojipram*,『受敎輯錄』(1698), bonds were considered void if they were written in Korean alphabet(諺文), or when there was no witness of the contract, or when it was unclear who wrote it.

We can confirm the fact that Imun(吏文) was distinguished from Itumun(吏讀文) considering the article below, quoted from *Sejo's Authentic Record*,『世祖實錄』.

> 吏曹啓 吏科及承蔭出身 封贈爵牒等項文牒 皆用吏文 獨於東西班五品以下告身 襲用吏讀 甚爲鄙俚 請自今用吏文 從之--Ministry of Administration, 吏曹 reported that "the officials recruited through Government Examination for Office, 吏科 all used Imun(吏文) in the documents for bestowing appointment, but the civil and military officials ranked lower than the fifth ranking habitually used Itu(吏讀), so it was considered contemptible and vulgar. Thus, we ask them to use Imun(吏文) from now on." It was granted--

The Imun(吏文) mentioned here refers to the written language used in administrative offices during late Goryeo and early Joseon based on Hanliwen(漢吏文). Itu(吏讀) refers to the recording of Korean with Chinese characters on the basis of their sound or meaning. A typical example of Joseon Imun(吏文) appears in *The Great Teacher of Imun*,『吏文大師』(henceforth <*Isa*, 吏師>) edited by Choi Seijin, 崔世珍 in Jungjong, 中宗 period. This was nothing but a textbook for Joseon Imun(吏文) (comparable with Hanliwen, 漢吏文), which was edited by Choi Sejin, an expert in Hanliwen(漢吏文).

Since the Imun(吏文) of the early Joseon period was based on the literary style of

---

18 Ryu(1983) is a typical example of scholars who confused Itu(吏讀) with Kugyeol(口訣). He claimed that "Kugyeol is a special form of degenerated Itu. Kugyeol is not a writing method recording Korean in a rigorous sense. It is merely a 'fossilized' form of Itu, which was only used to transcribe certain forms of To, 吐 added as a supplementary means for reading Chinese composition in accordance with Korean grammatical structures (Ryu: 1983/31)."

19 Thinking that '口訣 = 漢文 + 吐', Nam(1980) claimed that Kugyeol(口訣) should be distinguished from to, 吐. Furthermore, he argued that "To, 吐 is a type of formative element which is subsidiary to Kugyeol and it does not have its own systematic semantic contents for communication", so 吐 is thought of as being added following the method of Kugyeol

20 It is not confirmed yet whether Imun(吏文) existed in the Goryeo period. Thus, Joseon Imun is tentatively compared with Hanliwen(漢吏文).

Hanliwen(漢吏文), it was different from Itumun(吏讀文). The Chinese writing which was mainly used in administrative documents and which had peculiar formats and used specific idiomatic expressions shown in *Isa*, <吏師> was called Imun(吏文). Interestingly, the specific idiomatic expressions used in Imun(吏文) were borrowed from Itumun(吏讀文).

Most of the idiomatic expressions introduced in the introductory part of *Isa*, <吏師> were written in Itu(吏讀). For example, '右謹言所志矣段' is an idiomatic expression usually used in the beginning of Soji, 所志 (petition or written accusation). That expression is written in accordance with Korean grammatic structure and contains Itu(吏讀) such as 'etan, 矣段', meaning roughly "what I would like to humbly mention is". Also, '右所陳爲白內等 (what I would like to say hereafter is)' is an idiomatic expression used at the beginning of official documents containing Itu(吏讀) such as 'hasapnetan, 爲白內等'.

However, *Isa,* <吏師> mainly followed the literary style of Hanliwen(漢吏文). For example, *Isa* contains many four letter phrase, 四字成句, which were often used in Joseon Imun(吏文), as shown below.

合行牒呈 — 牒呈, that is, it is proper to send an official document
照驗施行 — to execute by comparing.
他矣財穀 — the property and grain of others, that is, the fortune of others
夜間突入 — to trespass on others' house at night
偷取恣意 — 偷取, that is, to steal others' property at (one's) will.
連名資生 — to live just enough to sustain one's own life.
現露辭緣 — clearly revealed circumstance.
依律施行 — to be enforced according to the law.[21]

The Chinese writing style which uses lots of four letter phrase, 四字成句 such as those listed above is a characteristic of Hanliwen(漢吏文), and 朝鮮 Imun(吏文) imitated this style. Yoshikawa(1953) mentioned that a stylistic characteristic of Hànwèn lidù, 漢文 吏牘 of Yuándiǎnzhāng, <元典章> is 'strain', and pointed out two factors which cause that kind of strain, as below.

ⓐ Four letter phrase, 四字句, or rhythm based on its modification.
ⓑ Frequent use of terms which are peculiar to lidù, 吏牘 including certain kinds of colloquial lexical items.[22]

Considering this observation, it seems that Joseon Imun(吏文), in the same way as Hanliwen(漢吏文), also had stylistic rhythm caused by using four letter phrase, 四字句 and used colloquial expressions. Furthermore, it kept the authority of official documents and invoked strain by using frequent idiomatic expressions which were only used in Imun(吏文). This is due to the fact that Joseon Imun(吏文) imitated the literary style of Hanliwen(漢吏文).

The format of Imun(吏文) was still maintained until late Joseon, but the writing style of Itu(吏讀) increased. I came across an old document which confirms this claim, and that is the petition for postponing examination, 陳試 所志 written by Hyeon Kegeun, 玄啓根 which is included in old documents kept by the Hyeon family, 川寧 玄氏家, a reputable family of interpreting officials. According to the content of this petition, 所志 written in October 1744, even though Hyeon Kegeun passed previous examination for interpreters' he could not take the second examination

---

21 In addition to these, Isa, <吏師> includes many four letter phrase, 四字成句 which were frequently used in Imun(吏文). The author discovered over 140 examples of this in the book possessed by the Korea University library.

22 Yoshikawa(1953) summarized the characteristics of Hanliwen(漢吏文) including the following; "元典章中の漢文吏牘の文體は、（1）古文家の文語と文法の基本をおなじくしつつも、古文家の文語のごとく 藝術的緊張をめざさない。（2）しかも吏牘の文をしての緊張をめざす。（3）緊張を作る要素としては ⓐ 四字句 もしくはその變形を基本とするリズム、ⓑ ある種の口語的語彙をふくむ吏牘特有の語の頻用、（4）しかしその緊張は、容易に弛緩をゆるすのであって、往往、更に多くの口語的要素を導入して、緊張をやぶる。（5）さればといつて緊張を全く くずし去ることはない。" These stylistic characteristics can also be applied to Joseon Imun(吏文).

for interpreters, 譯科 覆試 which was going to be held the following year because of the death of his father, so he asked for permission to take the exam at a later date.[23]

Original text:
譯科初試擧子喪人玄敬躋[24]
右謹言所志矣段 矣身今甲子式年譯科初試 以漢學學子入格矣 五月分遭父喪是如乎 依例陳試 事後考次立旨 成給爲只爲 行下向敎是事
禮曹 處分 手決 依法典
甲子 十月 日 所志

Translation:
Hyeon, 玄敬躋 who passed the preliminary examination for recruiting interpreters and also a mourner.
What I want to ask for is that even though I took the preliminary examination for recruiting interpreters of stated examination for Chinese language and passed, I would like to postpone taking the follow-up exam based on the precedents because my father passed away in May. Please make an order to issue a document verifying this to me.
Ministry of Examination, 禮曹 handled this and left his signature.
The petition, 所志 written in October, 1744(甲子)

This Imun(吏文) contains the idiomatic expression " 右謹言所志矣段" used at the beginning of all administrative petition, 所志, and also other idiomatic expressions such as " 矣身, 是如乎, 立旨[25], 爲只爲, 行下向敎是事" written in Itu(吏讀) or Imun(吏文).

Thus, Joseon Imun(吏文) was formed under the influence of Hanliwen(漢吏文). Joseon Imun(吏文) was formed based on Itumun(吏讀文) which progressed from Hyangchal, 鄕札 of Shilla, 新羅 in the same way as Hanliwen(漢吏文) was formed based on Hànéryányǔ , 漢兒言語 which is also known as the so-called the direct translated style of Mongolian, 蒙文直譯体, and it also accommodated the literary style of Hanliwen(漢吏文).

Joseon Imun(吏文) was the only official written language of Joseon until the royal order that Hangeul could be used in official documents was issued. It is frustrating that not many researchers have been interested in the study of Joseon Imun(吏文), which was the only official written language for many years.

4.3 The origin of the term, Itu(吏讀)

As mentioned earlier, Itu(吏讀) does not refer to the translation of Korean into Chinese but the writing style used to record Korean with Chinese characters in accordance with Korean word order. Furthermore, it refers to the use of the sound or meaning of Chinese characters for the transcription of case markers or sentential endings which have no counterpart in Chinese characters. It is unclear just how long the term ' 吏讀' has been used on the Korean peninsula.

The oldest recorded use of the term Itu(吏讀) seems to be in the references of " 吏讀行之數千年而簿書期會等事 無有防礙者--there has been no problem in recording documents and setting up dates etc. for several thousand years since Itu, 吏讀 was used--" included in an appeal to court, 上疏文 for being opposed to Hunminjeongeum, 訓民正音 written by Choi Manli, 崔萬理 and others, which was recorded in Sejong's Authentic Record,『世宗實錄』(vol. 103, 20th, Feb. 1444) and " 薛聰始作吏讀 官府民間至今行之--since Seolchong, 薛聰 started to use Itu, 吏讀, administrative offices and ordinary people have been using it until now--" included in postscript of

---

23 . I refer readers to Chung (1990/210) for explanations of first examination, 初試 and second examination, 覆試 of government examination for interpreter officers, 譯科, and what happened to Japanese interpreter Hyeon, in applying for this examination and postponed him to apply the examination because of his father's death.

24 Hyeon, 玄敬躋 is 玄啓根's childhood name. (Chung:1990).

25 ' 立旨' is an idiomatic expression usually used in documents for slavery or registration of land etc., and it refers to an addition, 附記 saying that an administrative office verifies the petition written in 所志. Examples: 本文段 失於火燒是遣 立旨一張乙 代數爲去乎(the registrational document for land of Kim's family at Andong, 安東 金俊植 宅), 各別 立旨成給爲白只爲 行下向敎是事(海南 尹泳善 宅 <所志>). (Chang:2001/432)

Hunminjeongeum, 『訓民正音』(1446) written by Jeong Inji, 鄭麟趾.
   Ryu(1983/13) defined the term Itu(吏讀) as below;

   "Even though '吏讀' is written in Chinese characters, it is not Chinese writing at all but one type of Korean writings which can be used to record Korean, so it cannot be understood following the way of reading Chinese writing. It is a special type of writing in the sense that even though it is a type of Korean writing recording Korean, it cannot be read well if one does not know Chinese characters. ... The term '吏讀' is related to the history of its progress and also related to the contents and characteristics of its function. the term '吏讀' was written as '吏讀, 吏頭, 吏道, 吏吐, 吏套' etc. or written as '吏札, 吏書' etc. All of the terms written in several ways contain the first letter '吏' which means '官吏(official)'. As for the second letter, it is typical that the letters representing 'character' of 'writing' were used or letters having similar sounds or meanings with those letters were used. This means that all of those terms mean 'writing of officials' or 'writing of administrative offices written by officials' ..."(Translation author's own)

   Regarding the term '吏讀', Ryu(1983) also wrote that "thus, it seems that the term '吏讀' started to be used after the 7th or 8th century. However, the birth and progress of '吏讀' was started long before this period.". It thus seems that the term '吏讀' was already in use during the 新羅 period.
   However, the oldest reference to the term '吏讀(吏讀)' can be found in the articles of Sejong's Authentic Record, 『世宗實錄』, as already mentioned, and there is no record of it in *Samkuksagi,*『三國史記』and *Samkukyusa*, 『三國遺事』 as well as any document of the Goryeo period. Even though there are records saying that there existed ways of recording the language of Shilla using the sound or meaning of Chinese characters during the Shilla period, and that Seolchong, 薛聰 or Prof. Kangsu, 强首先生 tried to systematically organize these methods, these were called 'Hyanchal, 鄕札', not Itu(吏讀). Thus, although the way of recording Korean using the sound or meaning of Chinese characters existed from Three Kingdom period, the earliest period in which it was referred to as '吏讀(吏讀)' was the early Joseon, according to the existing historical documents.
   What can be said at this point is that Joseon 'Imun(吏文)' was born in late Goryeo under the influence of Hanliwen(漢吏文), and after that, 'lidù, 吏牘' which was the peculiar writing style of Hanliwen(漢吏文), changed to '吏讀(吏讀)'. Furthermore, 'Ito, 吏道', which referred to Hanlixué(漢吏學) learning Hanliwen(漢吏文), changed to 'Itu, 吏頭'. Thus, each of the several terms mentioned in Ryu(1983), such as '吏讀, 吏頭, 吏道, 吏吐, 吏套, 吏札, 吏書' could be defined differently as shown below.

   吏讀 – the term corresponding to '吏牘' of 漢吏文, which refers to writing of 吏讀文 itself
   吏頭 – the term corresponding to '吏道' of 漢吏文, which refers to learning of 吏文
   吏吐 – the term referring to 吐, which means grammatical elements inserted within 吏讀文
   吏套 – the term referring to the literary styles of 吏文類
   吏札 – the term referring to 借字(borrowing letters) from Chinese characters used in 吏讀文
   吏書 – the term referring to the documents or writings written in 吏頭

   Therefore, the terms listed and defined above appeared after Imun(吏文) was born on the Korean peninsula under the influence of Hanliwen(漢吏文), and they were firmly established during late 高麗 and early 朝鮮.

5. Conclusion

   In this talk, I have discussed the relationship between Hanliwen(漢吏文) developed after the Yuan dynasty and Imun(吏文) which was the official written language for administrative documents in Joseon. I have claimed that Hanliwen(漢吏文) was a written language formed based on 'Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語' which was a Koinē used by Northern Eurasian races migrating to the Beijing, 北京 area during the Yuan dynasty. Hànéryányǔ, 漢兒言語 was a kind of creole which was the mixture of Chinese with isolating grammatical structures and languages of other races with agglutinative grammatical structures and was mainly used in judicial and administrative documents. Thus, I put

emphasis on the fact that Hànéryányŭ was a written language very different from the well-known Gŭ wén, 古文.

I also argued that on the Korean peninsula, Imun(吏文) was born after the late Goryeo dynasty under the influence of Hanliwen(漢吏文) of the Yuan dynasty and used for the judicial system and administration. Even though Imun(吏文) was formed based on Chinese Hanliwen(漢吏文) and Itu(吏讀) was used for the transcription of lexical items including some special idiomatic expressions and proper nouns, the distinction between them was clear in the earlier period. However, since Korean Imun(吏文) accommodated Itumun(吏讀文) which recorded Korean in accordance with Korean word order just like Hànéryányŭ , 漢兒言語, which was the basis of Chinese Hanliwen(漢吏文), accommodated agglutinative grammatical structures, the distinction between Imun(吏文) and Itumun(吏讀文) became blurred in the later period.

I think the fact that Imun(吏文) accommodated the writing style following Korean word order to such a degree that it is confused with Itumun(吏讀文) even though it was originally formed based on Chinese 漢吏文, renders Imun(吏文) as an important and influential area of Korean study. More interest and more research are surely in demand for Korean Imun(吏文).

<References>

Arisaka, 1936; "About Joseon pronunciations of Chinese characters", *Dialects*(The society of dialects in Japan), V 10(4-5)
　[有坂秀世：" 漢字の朝鮮音について," 1936,『方言』(日本方言**学会**), 第10**号**(4．5月**号**)]
AKS, 1986; The translation of the annotation of ' Gyeonggugdaejeon(Ì經國大典)', The academy of Korean studies-Research center of liberal arts, Seoul
　[精文研: 韓　劢 et al.『經國大典 註釋編』, 韓國精神文化研究院 人文研究室, 1986, 서울]
Bak, 1968; "About the status of Chinese in Korean", *Culture of Korea Univ.*, V 9
　[朴炳采: "국어에서 차지하는 漢語의 위치에 대하여,"『高大文化』,제9집]
Bak, 1983; *The new study of ' Hongmujeonghun yeoghun(洪武正韻譯訓)'*, Korea Univ. Institute of Korean culture, Seoul
　[朴炳采:『洪武正韻譯訓의 新研究』, 高麗大學校 民族文化研究院, 1983, 서울]
Chang, 2001; *A dictionary for reading ' Itu' texts*, Hanyang Univ. Press, Seoul
　[장세경:『이두자료 읽기 사전』, 한양대학교 출판부, 2001, 서울]
Chung, 1987; "The Chinese studies and the textbooks for Chinese study during the Joseon dynasty--Focusing on the examination system for Chinese interpreters during the periods of King Yeongjo and Jeongjo", *Jindanhakbo*(Jindanhakhoi), V 63
　[朝鮮朝의 譯科 漢學과 漢學書--英·正祖時代의 譯科漢學試劵을 중심으로--,"『震檀學報』(震檀學會), 제63호
Chung, 1990; *The study on the examination system for interpreters during the Joseon dynasty*, Institute of Big east-asian culture(Seonggyungwan Univ.), Seoul
　[拙著:『朝鮮譯科試劵研究』, 大東文化研究院(成均館大學附設), 1990, 서울]
Chung, 1999; "The Chinese of the Yuan dynasty and ' ÏÁÜâÒÇË÷ÓÞ'", *Research on the Chinese linguistics*(Waseda Univ.), V 19-3
　[拙稿:" 元代漢語の<舊本老乞大>,"『中國語學 開篇』(早稻田大學 中國語學科), 제19호 3, 1999]
Chung, 2000; "The old editions of ' Nobakjiplam(老朴集覽)' and ' Nogeoldae(老乞大)', ' Baktongsa (朴通事)'", *Jindanhakbo*(Jindanhakhoi), V 89
　[拙稿:" <노박집람>과 <노걸대>. <박통사>의 舊本,"『震檀學報』(진단학회), 제89집, 2000]
Chung, 2002, *The study on the textbooks for interpretation*, J & C Publishing Co., Seoul
　[拙著:『譯學書 研究』, 제이앤씨, 2002, 서울]
Chung, 2003a; "The accommodation of Chinese characters and the changes of Korean transcriptions with Chinese characters on the Korean peninsula", *Gugyeolyeongu* (Gugyeolhakhoe), V 11
　[拙稿:"韓半島에서 漢字의 受容과 借字表記의 變遷", <口訣研究>(口訣學會) 제11호, 2003]
Chung, 2003b; "The establishment and changes of Joseon pronunciations of Chinese characters", The 53rd symposium on ' The contemporary studies on pronunciations

of Chinese characters', Japan

[拙稿:" 朝鮮漢字音の成立と變遷," 日本中國學會 제53회 全國大會 심포지움" 漢字音研究の現在'
主題發表(2003年10月25日 日本早稻田大學 大隈講堂), 2003]

Chung, 2003c; "The Establishment and Changes of 'Nogeoldae(老乞大)'", in *Pathways into Korean Language and Culture*, ed. by Lee Sang-Oak, Iverson Gregory K., Ahn Sang-Cheol and Yu Young-mee Cho, Pagijong Press, Seoul

Chung, 2004; *The translation and annotation of 'Original Laoqita(ê«ÜâÒÇË÷ÓÐ)'*, Kimyoungsa, Seoul

[拙著Ê:『역주 原本老乞大』, 김영사, 2004, 서울]

Chung, 2004; "The textbooks for Chinese and its education during the Joseon dynasty-with the case of 'Lao chita'-", *The situations about teaching Chinese in foreign countries* (Beijing foreign language Univ.), V 5

[拙稿: 朝鮮時代的 漢語教育與教材-以<老乞大>爲例-" <國外漢語教學動態>(北京外國語大學),
總第5期]

Chung, 2005; "About Hanimun(訓民正音)", The 36th symposium of the society of Korean Linguistics, Busan Foreign Language Univ., Korea

[拙稿:" 漢吏文에 대하여," 한국어학회 제36차 전국학술대회 기조강연, 2005년 8월 18일, 부산
외국어대학교 외국어학습관 중강당]

Chung et al., 2002a; *The Original Laoqita*, Translation, Original text and its photoprint and the indexes for pronunciations), The Publishing Co. of The education and study of foreign languages, Beijing

[정광 외: 鄭光主編-編者 梁伍鎭, 鄭丞惠, 『原本老乞大』(解題, 原文, 原本影印, 倂音索引),
外語敎學與硏究出版社, 2002, 北京

Chung et al., 2002b; *Ihakjinam(吏學指南)*, Taehaksa Press, Seoul

[정광 외, 2002b; 정승혜. 양오진 공저,『吏學指南』, 태학사, 2002, 서울]

Ching, 1997; "About the characteristics of Khitane characters", *The characters of Asian races,* ed. by Gugyeohakhoi(口訣學會), Taehaksa Press, Seoul

[清格泰爾:" 關於契丹文字的特點," 『아시아 諸民族의 文字』(口訣學會編º), 태학사, 1997, 서울]

Hong, 1946; *The history of progress of 'Jeongeum(正音)'*, Seoul Newspaper Press, Seoul

[洪起文: 『正音發達史』서울新聞社出版局, 1946, 서울]

Hong, 1956; *The translation of 'Hyangga'*, Science Publication Co., Pyungyang

[洪起文: 『鄕歌解釋』, 科學出版社, 1956, 平壤]

Iriya, 1973; "The introduction of indexes of lexical items in 'Paktongsaeonhae' and 'Nogeolda eonhae'", Că ihuáshū lìn, Taiwan

[入矢義高, 陶山信男:" <朴通事諺解, 老乞大諺解語彙索引," 采華書林, 1973, 동경]

Jiang, 1994; T*he introduction to the studies of modern Chinese,* Beijing Univ. Press, Beijing

[蔣紹愚: 『近代漢語研究槪況』, 北京大學出版社, 1994, 北京

Kalgren(1964): Bernhard Kalgren, *Grammata Serica Recensa,* Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, Stockholm

Kim et al., 2000; *Laoqita--The textbook of Chinese conversations in the mid-Joseon dynasty*, Toyoubunko 699, Heibunsya Press, Tokyo

[金文京 外: 金文京, 玄幸子, 佐藤晴彥. 譯註, 鄭光 解說. 『老乞大--朝鮮中世の中國語誨化讀本--』,
東洋文庫 699, 平凡社, 2000, 東京

Kim· Chung· Chang, 1997; *The history of the Korean linguistics*, Korean Broadcasting and Communication Univ. Press, Seoul

[金完鎭. 鄭光. 張素媛: 『國語學史』, 韓國放送通信大學出版部, 1997, 서울]

Lee, 1992; '*Itu(吏讀)*' *in the Goryeo dynasty,* Taehaksa Press, Seoul

[李丞宰¥: 『高麗時代의 吏讀』, 太學社, 1992, 서울]

Maeda, 1973; *The study of the history of the Yuan Dynasty*, Tokyo Univ. Press, Tokyo

[前田直典; 『元朝史の研究』, 東京大學出版會, 1973, 東京]

Miyazaki, 1987*; History of Government Examination of China*, Heibunsya, Tokyo

[宮崎市定; 『科擧史』, 平凡社, 1987, 東

Nagasawa, 1933; "On the *Chéngzhā ixiàojingzhijié* published in the Yuan Dynasty" *Philology*(Japanese school of philology), V 1-5 (later re-published in 'The study of the editions of the Song and Yuan dynasties', the volume 3 of '*the collection of the essays of Nagasawa*')

[長澤規矩也: " 元刊本成齊孝經に關して," 『書誌學』(日本書誌學會), 1933, 第1卷第5號(이 논문은 후일
　　　　『長澤規矩也著作集』제3권 「宋元版の研究」에 수록됨.)

Nam, 1980; "Gugygeol(口訣) and To(吐)", *Korean linguistics*(The school of Korean Linguistics),
　　　V 9 (later re-published in Nam(1999))
　　　[南豊鉉: " 口訣과 吐," 『국어학』(국어학회), 1980, 제9호, 남풍현(1999)에 재록되었음.]

Nam, 1988; "On the origin of ' Semantic Reading-Kugyeol(釈読Ï¢ÌÁ)", *Korean linguistics and
　　　literature*(The society of Korean linguistics and literature), V 100 (later re-published in
　　　Nam(1999) as ' The origin of Seokdok-Gugyeol(釈読 口訣)')
　　　[南豊鉉: " 釈読 口訣의 起源에 대하여," 『国語国文学』(韓国 国語国文学会), 1988, 제100호.
　　　　　이것은 남풍현(1999)에 " 釈読口訣의 起源"이란 제목으로 재록되었음.]

Nam, 1999; *The Study of ' Kugyeol' for the history of Korean*, Taehaksa Press, Seoul
　　　[南豊鉉: 『国語史를 위한 口訣研究』, 太学社, 1999, 서울]

Oda, 1953; "About the language of Laoqita", *Essays on the studies of Chinese linguistics*, V 1
　　　[太田辰夫; " 老乞大の言語について", <中國語學研究會論集>, 1953, 第1號]

Oda, 1954; "About Hànéryányǔ language", *Kobe foreign language Univ.'s collection of essays*, V
　　　5-3
　　　[太田辰夫: "　　儿　言について," 《神　外大論叢》, 1954, 5-3]

Oda, 1991; *The introductory study on the history of Chinese*, The Chinese edition(The Japanese
　　　original edition 1988), Zhòngqìng Publication co.
　　　[太田辰夫: <漢語史通考 > 中文版(日文原版: 1988), 重慶出版社, 1991]

Oda, 1987; *The historical grammar of Chinese,* The Chinese edition (The Japanese original
　　　　edition 1958), Beijing Univ. Press
　　　[太田辰夫: < 中國語歷史文法> 中文版(日文原版: 1958), 北京大學出版社, 1987]

Oda · Sato, 1996; *The original edition of ' Xiàojingzhijié'*, Tokyo
　　　[太田辰夫, 佐藤晴彦: 『元版孝經直解』, 일본 汲古書院, 1996, 東京]

Poppe(1954): N. Poppe, *Grammar of Written Mongolian,* Otto Harassowitz, Wiesbaden

Rin, 1987; The origin of Beijing Mandarin, *Chinese language and writings* (Chinese language
　　　　and writings Publishing Co.), Beijing
　　　[林燾: " 北京官　溯源," 《中国　文》(中国　文雜誌社), 1987-3, 北京]

Ryu, 1983; *The study of ' Itu' in the period of three kingdoms*, Science, Encyclopedia Press,
　　　　Pyeongyang
　　　[劉烈: 『세나라시기의 리두에 대한 연구』, 과학, 백과사전출판사, 1983, 평양]

Shimura, 1995; *The study on the history of grammar in mid-Chinese,* The Chinese edition,
　　　　Zhōnghuáshū jú, Beijing
　　　[志村良治; <中世中國語法史研究> 中文版, 中華書局, 1995, 北京]

Street(1957): J. C. Street, *The Language of the Secret History of the Mongols,* New Haven

Tanaka, 1961; " About the relation between the style of ' Méngwézhíyìtī ' and ' Báihua', *The
　　　literary style of Yuándiǎnzhāng'*
　　　[田中謙二: " 蒙文直譯体における白話について," 『元典章の文体』(校正本 元典章 刑部 第1冊 附録]

Tanaka. 1962; "The relation between ' Yuándiǎnzhāng' and the sentences of
　　　' Méngwénzhíyìtī '", Touhoukakuho, V 32 (this paper is also included in ' The
　　　literary style of ' Yuándiǎnzhāng')
　　　[田中謙二: " 元典章における蒙文直譯体の文章", <東方學報>, 1962, 第32冊. 『元典章の文体』
　　　　　　(校正本 元典章 刑部 第1冊 附錄)에 재록됨]

Tanaka, 1965; "The organization of the documents of ' Yuándiǎnzhāng'", The literary style
　　　of ' Yuándiǎnzhāng'
　　　[田中謙二: " 元典章文書の構成," 『 元典章の文体 』(校正本 元典章 刑部 第1冊 附録), 1965]

Tung, 1968; *Chinese phonology*, Guǎngwénshū jú, 1968, Taipei]
　　　[董同龢: 『漢語音韻學』, 廣文書局, 1968, 臺北]

Wang, 1958; *Essays on the history of Chinese,* Science Publishing Co., Beijing
　　　[王力: 『漢語史稿』, 科学出版社, 1958, 北京]

Wang, 1985; The history of Chinese phonemes, Social science Publication Co. Beijing
　　　[王力: 『漢語語音史』, 社会科学出版社, 1985, 北京]

Yoshikawa, 1953; "The literary style of Hànwènlidú found in ' Yuándiǎnzhāng'", ' The literary
　　　style of ' Yuándiǎnzhāng'
　　　[吉田幸次郎: " 元典章に見えた漢文吏牘の文体," 『元典章の文体』(校正本 元典章 刑部 第1冊 附録)]

Yu, 1983; "The postposition ‘ xìng, 行’ found in Chinese of the Yuan dynasty, *The study on language and literature,* 1983-3, Beijing
　　[余志鴻:“ 元代漢語的後置詞‘ 行’ ,” 『語文研究』 1983-3, 北京]
Yu, 1988; "The special grammatical features in the secret history of Mongol", *The study on language and literature*, Beijing
　　[余志鴻:“ 蒙古秘史的特殊語法,”『語文研究』 1988-1, 北京]
Yu, 1992; "The genealogy of Chinese postpositions in the Yuan dynasty", N*ational language and literature*, 1992-3, Beijing
　　[余志鴻;“ 元代漢語的後置詞系統,” 『民族語文』 1992-3, ÝÁÌÈ]
Zhou, 1973; *The dictionary of ancient and present sounds of Chinese*, Hongkong Chinese literature Univ., Hongkong
　　[周法高: 『漢字古今音彙』, 香港中文大学, 1973, 香港]