

The Art of Quoting in Pak Chiwŏn's Writings

Marion Eggert

Pak Chiwŏn 朴趾源 (1737–1805) was among the most famous authors of pre-modern Korea. Unlike many other writers who are nowadays deemed Korean ‘classics’, he was extremely influential during his lifetime and has not been forgotten since: his fame did not subside during the 19th century and was steadily on the rise during the 20th century. A considerable quantity of research literature in Korean dealing with his work has been written. Much of it is devoted to the peculiarities of his writing style, marked by the admixture of the beautifully classical with the colloquial and even Koreanized modes of the use of Literary Chinese—a style which was designated with a term of its own (*Yŏnam ch'e* 燕巖體 or ‘Yŏnam’s style of writing’, Yŏnam being Pak Chiwŏn’s studio name) already during Pak Chiwŏn’s lifetime, and was so controversial as to generate a ‘literary rectification movement’ (*munch'e panjŏng* 文體反正) conducted by the court and aimed at eradicating Pak Chiwŏn’s notorious influence on younger writers. However, this fact has led scholars to unilaterally concentrate on the palpable idiosyncracies of Pak Chiwŏn’s style, to the detriment of looking at his mastery of Literary Chinese in what might be regarded as more ‘traditional’ terms. It is here that the present study wishes to chime in by looking at Pak Chiwŏn’s use of one of the very common techniques of writing in East Asia: quotes and allusions. While this aims mainly at adding some heretofore rather neglected aspects to existing scholarship on Pak Chiwŏn’s craftsmanship and literary excellence, the ways in which techniques of quoting are connected to culturally-held ideas about text production and authorship will be an implicit *leitmotiv* to the present study.

My main material will be Pak Chiwŏn’s unchallenged masterwork, the China travelogue *Yŏrha ilgi* 熱河日記, which was written after a journey to Beijing and Jehol (Rehe 熱河) undertaken in the year 1780.¹ However, I will first introduce some

1 I refrain from claiming that *Yŏrha ilgi* is a ‘document’ of this journey, for although it is of course closely based on direct experience, it consciously weaves a fabric of fact and fiction in its narrative parts. See

poetological writings by Pak Chiwŏn that may help to understand the issues at stake for him in regard to quoting, and only then look at his actual handling of intertextuality in his prime literary work.

1 *Views on Language, Literature, and Quoting Among sirhak Scholars of the Late Chosŏn Period*

In a letter addressed to an old acquaintance from a befriended family, Pak Chiwŏn discusses the use of quotes:

You have sent me a selection of your compositions. I read them after rinsing my mouth and washing my hands, sitting respectfully on bent knees. I venture to say: The texts are all marvelous. But in the appellation of things you make too much use of loanwords, and the allusions you use often do not exactly fit the context. These are flaws in the jade. I ask for your permission to expound this for you.

The composition of literature has to follow a certain Way, just like a plaintiff needs to bring forward evidence, similar to the selling cries of itinerant traders: even if the words uttered are sensible and clear, if there is no evidence on which they can be based, it is difficult to win the upper hand. This is why those who compose texts make manifold allusions to the greater and minor classical writings in order to clarify their intentions. What could be more trustworthy than the text which the Sage created and a Wise Man transmitted!^[2] But still it quotes the *Shujing* in stating »in the announcement to Kang 康, it is said: “He was able to make his virtue illustrious”«, as well as »in the Canon of the Emperor Yao, it is said that “he was able to make illustrious his lofty virtue”«.«^[3]

But official titles and place names may not be exchanged for one another. Somebody who has loaded firewood but cries »buy salt!« will not sell a single bundle of firewood, even if he wanders around all day. If one calls all the emperor’s abodes and capitals nothing but Chang’an,^[4] if one designates the high ministers of all times without exception as *chengxiang* 丞相,^[5] then name and reality become mixed up, and the text will finally become vulgar and filthy. This is no different from Lord Jin 金, who could avail himself of the authority of a

M.E., »Methodological Issues in Using Chosŏn Travelogues as a Historical Source: The Question of Factuality«, *Korean Histories*, ed. by Boudewijn Walraven and Remco Breuker (Leiden, forthcoming Autumn 2010) <www.koreanhistories.com>.

- 2 This refers to the *Daxue* 大學 or Great Learning, originally a chapter from the Book of Rites (*Liji* 禮記) which was isolated and canonized as a text of its own in Song times. It is said to have been composed by Confucius and transmitted (or commented upon) by his disciple Zengzi 曾子.
- 3 These are the first and third sentences of the Commentary (*zhuan* 傳) to the Great Learning, translation according to James Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, 5 vols. (London; Hong Kong: s.n., 1861–72), 1: 268. They are quotes of the »Kang gao« 康誥 and »Yao dian« 堯典 chapters of the *Shujing* 書經, respectively.
- 4 The capital of various, but certainly not all, Chinese dynasties since the Qin dynasty.
- 5 A title of great significance, but with varying concrete implications throughout Chinese history.

famous man with the same name, or from the ugly women who wanted to gain Xi Shi's 西施 beauty by aping her way of knitting her brows. Therefore, one should in writing not shrink back from the real names for things one regards as filthy, nor erase the traces of the vulgar. Mengzi 孟子 said: »Surnames are shared with others, but the personal name is what one has for oneself.« This is like saying: we all share the characters, but the text one produces from them is something individual.

This rather curious, if not corrupt⁶ letter to Yu Hanjun 俞漢儁 (1732–1811)⁷ makes two propositions that may seem contradictory, but are shown to be in fact complementary. On one hand, the quote appears as a most essential feature of serious texts. Especially the comparison with evidence in a lawsuit lets the quote appear not as a rhetorical device among others, but rather as a basic rule of communication; without reference to a common ground, which is marked by the quote, meaning cannot be transmitted. On the other hand, this commonality must not obscure the particular and individual; otherwise, the specific things one has to say cannot be completely comprehended. The tension between the two propositions is both beautifully resolved and turned in another direction in the last sentences with the quote from *Mengzi*.

I speak of »resolving« because this passage in its own treatment of the quote gives a revelatory example of what Pak Chiwŏn was aiming at poetologically. For his bold interpretation of the quote actually turns its original intention around. In Legge's translation, the *Mengzi* passage in question reads:

1. Mencius said, »Tsang Shih was fond of sheep dates, and his son, the philosopher Tsang, could not bear to eat sheep dates. 2. Kung-sun Ch'ow asked, saying, »Which is best—minced meat and roasted meat, or sheep dates?« Mencius said, »minced and roasted meat, to be sure.« Kungsun Ch'ow went on: »Then why did the philosopher Tsang eat minced and roasted meat, while he would not eat sheep dates?« Mencius answered: »For minced and roasted meat there is a common liking, while that for sheep dates was peculiar. We avoid the name but do not avoid the surname. The surname is common, the name is peculiar.« (*Mengzi*, »Jinxin xia« 盡心下, 36).⁸

In *Mengzi*, the personal name is adduced as an example for that which is so individual that it cannot be touched upon; the common ground of communication in the original clearly rests with the surname. Yŏnam, in adducing only the last eight characters of the Mengzi passage, puts it to his own completely different use of claiming the right to

6 One might surmise so because of the tenuous connection between what is in my translation in the second and third paragraphs. However, Pak Chiwŏn's style (in his miscellaneous writings, not so much in YI) tends to some degree to be seemingly disjointed.

7 »Tap Ch'angae« 答蒼厓 no 1, *Yŏnam chip* 燕巖集 kw. 5, 3b–4a, in (*P'yojŏm yŏngin*) *Han'guk munjip ch'onggan* (標點引用) 韓國文集叢刊, ed. by Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe 民族文化推進會, 252: 96. Nine of these notes directed at Yu Hanjun were put together by Pak Chiwŏn himself in his Overplus Writings from the Pavillon of Shed Lustre (*Yŏngdaejŏng ingmok* 映帶亭臆墨, compiled 1772).

8 Quoted from Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, 2: 373.

individuality in writing. Thus he provides at once an argument that writing can combine grounding itself in authoritative texts with expressing one's individual mind (and circumstances), and he demonstrates how it can be achieved by creatively re-interpreting tradition.

I speak of »turning around« the tension because this last passage broadens the scope of the topic to include the nature of language. We are able to express individual ideas by virtue of commonly shared words: language itself possesses the double aspect of conventionality and originality. Pak Chiwŏn's demand to the writer to employ the conventional and create the original at the same time is thus shown to be firmly grounded in the conditions of language use itself.

This letter, which by the way turned his erstwhile friend into an arch-enemy, thus points us to two concerns which, as I see it, form the background of Pak Chiwŏn's thoughts about and practice of quoting: first, the (literary) issue of 'old' versus 'new', transmitting versus creating; and second, the (philosophical) issue of the nature of language, which for Pak is mainly a question about the relationship of language and truth. The first of these topics, and the desire for a fresh style adequate for one's own time which it usually expresses, is of course a rather well-known phenomenon in Chinese literature at least from Song times onward; one of the peculiar traits that this train of thought developed in Korea, especially at the hands of Pak Chiwŏn and his literary friends, was probably an insistence on the right to use Korean language materials in *hanmun* writing. The implications of the latter for our topic are probably less evident, but they deserve our attention all the more urgently.

For understanding these implications, it is useful to look at a statement by another equally famous Korean scholar who also considered the question of indiscriminate quoting in writing. Tasan Chŏng Yagyong 茶山丁若鏞 (1762–1836), one generation younger than Yŏnam and often hailed as the one who perfected the movement of 'empirical studies' in Korea under which Yŏnam and his friends are subsumed as well, had the following to say about the relationship of word and text:

In ancient times, primary education concentrated on the study of the script. Every character was analyzed in terms of whether and why it was pictographical (*xiangxing* 象形), composite (*huiyi* 會義) or a phonetical compound (*xiesheng*/ *baesŏng* 諧聲). Only when understanding of the characters was completely internalized did they turn to writing. In composing their own texts, they assembled all the characters individually, using each according to its meaning. Thus their texts do not tread in each other's footsteps, but are fresh and dignified, arouse and make manifest. *Zuo* 左傳, *Meng* 孟子, *Zhuang* 莊子 and Qu Yuan 屈原 each produced their own style. But in our late times we no more study the script but immediately turn to reading the old texts. Therefore, what we have internalized are series of two, three or four characters, or even some dozen characters, and the individual meaning of each character becomes obscured. When learning is put forth in composition, complete sentences of the old texts come in handy. The meaning of some characters among them doesn't fit the actual

circumstances, but this goes unnoticed. Therefore, the writings are all stale and don't go to the heart of matters.⁹

Chŏng Yagyong here expresses a concern quite similar to Pak Chiwŏn's: that a certain gap between words and meaning may result from purely following convention in writing. This concern even led Chŏng Yagyong to author a dictionary of frequently misused terms, the *Aŏn kakpi* 雅言覺非 (preface 1819). But while for Pak Chiwŏn this shared concern does not *per se* discredit »unmarked intertextuality«, Chŏng Yagyong seems to take a more radical (and unrealistic) stance against the habit of quoting. Where does this difference result from and what does it imply? It seems to me that the short notes of both authors about (the nature of) Chinese characters provide an answer. First, let us have a look at a discussion by Tasan about the character *cheng/sŏng* 誠:

The significance of the [word] radical of the character *sŏng* ['sincere'] is not explained clearly in *Sancang jiegu* 說文解字 (in the *Guopu* 說文解字) or *Shuowen jiezi* 說文解字. I submit that sincerity is the beginning and end of all things. Beginning with cultivating the self, and up to the governing of men, without sincerity, there is nothing. Therefore, I call it the beginning and end of things. The *Yijing* says: »At the end and the beginning of things, nothing is more perfect than [the trigram] *gen* 艮.«^[10] It also says: »Utterances are completed in *gen*.«^[11] Sincerity *cheng* 誠 is the completion of utterances *chengyan* 成言. The completion of utterances is the beginning and end of things. This is the significance.¹²

This randomly picked example for Chŏng Yagyong's concern with the meaning of characters reveals his view on language as being based unquestioningly on what I understand to be the common assumptions of Neo-Confucianism on (Chinese) language and writing: language in general is not only fully able to transmit truth, it is actually the prime (if not only) reservoir of truth (the cardinal virtue of sincerity is nothing else but the completion of utterances/language); and specifically the Chinese script is based not on convention but on the ultimate essence of the things they refer to.

Pak Chiwŏn may not have been completely beyond a view of the Chinese script containing deeper truths; his uses of the term *chinsŏ* 真書 ('true writing') for Chinese in contradistinction to the Korean vernacular and a number of utterances in *Yŏrha ilgi* point to a conviction that Chinese writing indeed contains a certain form of truth to which other forms of writing cannot possibly aspire. But as far as I can see, the truth he speaks of refers to historical memory, including perhaps ethical principles that have formed as result of historical experience, rather than ultimate metaphysical truth. Another short letter to Yu Hanjun reads as follows:

9 »Cha sŏk«, *Yŏyudang chŏnsŏ* 1, kw. 10, 1 a–b (*Munjip ch'onggan* 281: 217).

10 *Yijing* 易經, »Shuo gua« 說卦, in *Zhouyi qianshu* 周易淺述, comp. by Chen Menglei 陳夢雷 (b1651), *juan* 8, 12a (repr. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1983), 4: 275.

11 *Ibid.*, 8b (4: 268).

12 »Sŏng cha sŏk«, »Yŏyudang chŏnsŏ« 與猶堂全書 part 1, kw. 10, 5b (*Munjip ch'onggan* 281: 214).

A boy in our village who was taught the Thousand Character Classic^[13] protested that he hated reading it. He said: »When I look at the sky, it is wide and blue; but the character *ch'ŏn* (sky) is not blue at all.« This boy was intelligent; he brought Cang Jie^[14] into trouble.¹⁵

Both Chŏng Yagyong and Pak Chiwŏn protest against stale conventionality in the *hanmun* writings of their day and regard parroting habits as the root of evil. But different from his younger contemporary, Pak seems to have understood the fact that language itself is the result of convention (as this is the only alternative to viewing it as the creation of utmost wisdom); uttered as part of a discussion of quoting, his saying on the commonality of words seems to mean just that. From this point of view, no fixed line between 'original' utterance and quote can be maintained; if we share words, we also share phrases as material for saying what we have to say.

2 *Quoting Practice and Discourse on Quoting in Yŏrha ilgi*

As mentioned above, *Yŏrha ilgi* was written as a record of a diplomatic mission to China and Manchuria undertaken in 1780 in which Pak Chiwŏn had taken part in a minor position. It is a massive work of about 500 pages in a modern edition which he completed some years after his return, probably in 1783; although it was never printed until the 20th century, it seems to have circulated widely in manuscript form right after its composition and gave rise to the so-called Yŏnam style mentioned above. The opposition against this style which soon arose in conservative circles at court was obviously spurned by the unconventional ideas on language and writing that we could trace in the discussion above. In fact, the recipient of the letters quoted above, Yu Hanjun, was instrumental in indicting Pak Chiwŏn for his bad influence on the literary scene and it is widely surmised that this was due to his resentments because Pak had not acknowledged his own ancient style writing.

Thus, it may be appropriate to see Pak Chiwŏn's views on quoting and their reflection in quoting practice in *Yŏrha ilgi* as the source of the scandal that his work represented to part of his contemporaries. Indeed, the fact that *Yŏrha ilgi* was criticized for being composite in style, incorporating elements of novels and *xiaopin* writings, expresses clearly enough that it was the work's inclusiveness in its textual borrowings which irritated the literati elite at court.

To give some illustration, I have prepared the following list of texts referred to in the entry for the first day of the journey. This list is by necessity not complete, as I have

13 *Qianzi jing* 千字經 is the most widely used primer for teaching reading and writing. In the most common edition, it starts with the words: »The sky is dark blue, the earth is yellow.« (*ch'ŏn chi hyŏn hwang* 天青地黃).

14 Cang Jie 倉頡 (tr 3rd mill. BCE) is the mythical creator of Chinese characters.

15 »Tap Ch'angae« no 3, *Yŏnam chip* kw. 5, 3b–4a, in (*P'yojŏm yŏngin*) *Han'guk munjip ch'onggan*, 252: 96.

included only more or less explicit references; at least, some kind of literary interplay with certain earlier China travelogues would have to be added to the list, most notably with a travel diary written in Korean by his older friend Hong Taeyong 洪大容 (1731–1783)—a fact that would have escaped notice of all readers but the most intimate friends of the Yŏnam group, as Hong Taeyong's *han'gŭl* 諺文 diary, written in the Korean vernacular, certainly did not enjoy a wide circulation at the time.

- *Xin Tangshu* 新唐書 (New History of the Tang Dynasty, 1060)
- *Shanhaijing* 山海經 (The Book of Mountains and Seas, ca 3rd c. BCE)
- *Huangyukao* 皇輿考 (An Inquiry into Imperial Territories, 1601) by Zhang Tianfu 張天復 (fl 1522)
- *Liangshan motan* 兩山墨談 (Notes on Two Mountains) by Chen Ting 陳霆 (fl 1515)
- A poem by his friend Yu Tükkong 柳得恭 (b1749)
- *Shiji* 史記 (Historical Records, 1st c. BCE)
- *Shijing* 詩經 (Book of Songs), in the Zhu Xi reading (詩集傳)
- *Shangshu* 尚書 (Book of Documents, TR 4th c. CE)
- Buddhist canon (probably *Hwaŏmgŏng* 華嚴經)
- *Jihe yuanben* 幾何原本 (Elements of Geometry), i.e. *Stocheia* (ca 325 BCE) by Euclid, books 1–6 tr. by Matteo Ricci (1552–1610); or *Jihe yaofa* 幾何要法 (Principles of Geometry, 1631) by Giulio Aleni (1586–1649)
- *Shuibu zhuan* 水滸傳 (The Water Margin, 16th c.)
- A character from the *Hou Han shu* 後漢書 (History of the Later Han, 5th c. CE)

I have grouped together texts used in the same context. Even without a look at the details, this probably illustrates both the range of writings Pak thought fit to serve as a frame of reference and a certain lack of precedence between different sources. For example, *Shangshu*, a 'Buddhist saying' (佛氏曰) and books on Western geometry are quoted, one after the other, to provide 'evidence' for the very same point Pak Chiwŏn wishes to make (the sublimity of the border-line). This results in a rather paradoxical movement: the texts are adduced to give authority to a statement the author himself wishes to make, and thus authority is accrued to the quoted texts in the usual manner; but as the three quotes are taken from three sources of rivalling systems of interpreting the world, only to be found to amount to the same idea, authority is distributed between them in a way so as to even rob each of these systems of the kind of authority it actually claims for itself, which again must reflect on the texts that represent these systems. Thus, the author in the final analysis avails himself of the authority of the texts he adduces: their voice is subsumed to and made to serve his own auctorial voice; the authority

established is that of the author. I will try to demonstrate the effects this has by a closer look at two of the examples of the first diary entry.

A traveller has just exited the city wall of Üiju 義州, a border city. Looking »eastward«, i.e. in the direction of home, he falls into something like an inner monologue, starting with a poem:

I parted from the girl [Mochou 莫愁] in her boudoir;
 Riding on the autumn winds, I crossed over the border.
 No news of the painted boat, of flutes and drums;
 How much I long for the most beautiful city south of the Ch'öngch'ön river!

This poem was made by Hyep'ung 惠風 [Yu Tükkong] during his journey to Shenyang. I recited it a few times, then laughed loudly about myself and said: »These are only idle words by someone who went over the border. Where is the need for painted boats and music? When in older times Jing Ke 荊軻 was about to cross the river Yi, he didn't set out for a while. The prince [of Yan, who had sent him] wondered whether he had changed his mind and asked him to send Qin Wuyang 秦舞陽 first.« Jing Ke retorted angrily: »The reason I'm still here is that I'm waiting for my retainer to come with me.« [so far an abridged quote of the *Shiji* account].

These were nothing but idle words by Jing Ke. To believe that he had changed his mind really means not to know him, but the retainer for which Jing Ke was waiting was also not necessarily a man with a name. For one who »entered the inscrutable strong Qin country with a dagger« [quote from the *Shiji*], even one Qin Wuyang was superfluous; what for would he have needed another retainer! Just for »singing to the lute« about »cold« »wind«, and idly exhaust the pleasure of the day. But the author wrote: »That man lived far away and had not yet arrived.« How befitting that he lived far away! This man must have been one of the closest friends; the situation was one which necessitated the greatest trustworthiness. Can a closest friend at the time of »leaving with no return« possibly not arrive in time? Thus, this man did not necessarily live as far away as Chu, Wu or the Three Jin, and there was not necessarily an appointment to meet again this day upon entering Qin, to shake hands and exchange words of comfort. Only Jing Ke's mind suddenly was set upon waiting for this retainer.

The author then expanded upon this retainer within Jing's mind and called him »that man«. »That man« is said of an unknown person; to say about such an unknown person that he »lived far away« provides solace for Jing Ke; and again fearing that this man might arrive after all, he says »he had not yet arrived«, to provide good luck for Jing Ke. But if there had actually existed such a man on earth, I have seen him. He is seven feet two inches tall, has thick eyebrows and a shining black beard, with broad chin and narrow forehead. How do I know that? I know it from reading this poem by Hyep'ung.¹⁶

16 »Togangnok« 渡江錄, 1: 516–517. Here as in the following, I quote *Yörba ilgi* from the original Chinese text concluded in (*Kugyök*) *Yörba ilgi*, 2 vols., ed. and tr. by Yi Kawön 李家原 (Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe, 1989).

The poem by Yu Tükkong and the story of the would-be assassin of Qin Shihuangdi from the *Shiji* both serve to illustrate the hesitation before crossing the border into an unknown land, as the narrator himself feels upon crossing the Yalu. This is a rather common procedure, and perhaps even the fact that he treats with the same attitude both the unknown contemporary poem and the famous classical text would not be too unusual. But he does not leave it at recounting these earlier texts as evidence for the existence of these feelings (as for the *Shiji*, the second paragraph of the original would probably have fulfilled the function), but dissects and reassembles them so as to make them fit his own needs. This can be seen in an analogy of turning from writing commentary to just quoting the source text in the religious sphere, with ‘author’ and ‘commentator’ seemingly switching roles.

Yönam does more than provide a reinterpretation, i.e. commentary: His deconstruction (I cannot help using the word) of the Jing Ke story does not only deny Sima Qian 司馬遷 (ca 145–90 BCE) sovereignty over the meaning of his text, it in fact suggests (or even presupposes) that Sima Qian did the very same with the sources he had as Pak Chiwön was doing with his text: reconstructing facts according to his narrative needs. This amounts to denying factuality to historical narrative, which is shown to be in no fundamental way different from creative writing. The source text (as an authoritative entity) disappears; only authorship remains. This then justifies, or makes possible, the concluding anachronistic intertwining of *Shiji* and the recent poem: if the textual universe is nothing but one huge quarry from which the author may take his materials as he pleases, nothing can hinder him from explaining the former by the latter.

This remarkable take on authorship is mirrored and reinforced in a passage that occurs when the traveller is about to cross a last side-arm of the Yalu river.

The mooring place was very marshy. I called a barbarian: »wei!«, for I had just learned this from Sidae [a Korean servant fluent in Mandarin]. The man willingly let down his oars and approached me. I jumped on his back, and he laughingly carried me into the boat, then deeply exhaled and said: »If Li Kui’s 李愷 [455–395 BCE] mother had been that heavy, he would have had a hard time mounting Jinfeng pass.« Secretary Cho Myönghoe [who also was good at Chinese] laughed loudly. I said: »These guys know nothing about Jiang Ge, only about Li Kui.«¹⁷ Mr Cho said: »His words contained deep meaning. He said, if Li Kui’s mother had been that heavy, even someone with Li Kui’s extraordinary strength would not have been able to carry her over the pass. But Li Kui’s mother has been bitten by a tiger; so he actually said that a piece of flesh like yours would serve well to feed a tiger.« I laughed loudly and said: »How can he upon just opening his mouth produce such literariness?« Cho answered: »These people are meant by saying “knows not even the character for *ding* 丁”«,

17 Jiang Ge 江革 (*trad.* 2nd c. CE) was a man who carried his mother on his back away from danger (see *Hou Hanshu*, *juan* 39, »Liezhuan« 列傳 29).

but the novels and stories of marvel provide the phrases of common usage they have constantly on their lips. This is what is called Mandarin.¹⁸

As far as Chinese is concerned, quotes are here said to be the raw material not only of literary writing, but also of everyday speech. The greater unity of written and spoken languages in China results in an undissoluble intertwining of literature and common utterance; no line of demarcation between the two can be fixed. And this is again illustrated by the procedure of quoting: The subordination of source text to auctorial voice, which in the earlier passage Pak Chiwŏn had done with regards to Sima Qian (and Sima Qian with regards to his own sources in writing), is now done to *Shuibu zhuan* by the 'barbarian' and to the 'barbarian' by Secretary Cho in (presumably) spoken language. Speaking is quoting, and quoting is an act of establishing one's own voice.

However, it would be wrong to produce the impression of Pak Chiwŏn as an iconoclast. While he does in fact stress the authority of the auctorial voice to a hitherto unknown degree, he is far from wanting to destroy or undermine the authority of tradition; rather, to him the latter is the fundament on which to build a literary existence of his own. I shall demonstrate this briefly with the help of two passages much later in the diary in which quotes play an outstanding role.

The first passage occurs when somewhere between Liaodong and Shanhaiguan he tries to enter brush-conversation with a shop-keeper at the road-side. But although the »brush and ink-stone were most elegant«, the shop-keeper is obviously illiterate and turns for help to a youth from the shop next door who »busily filled a page with Manchu characters«—unintelligible, of course, to the narrator. Attempts at conversing in spoken Chinese are thwarted by their pronunciation being mutual unintelligible, except for the following exchange:

When the youth wrote in Manchu script, the shop-keeper said: »Is it not delightful to have friends coming from distant quarters?« [*Lunyu* I, 2]. I said: »I can't read Manchu.« The youth said: »Is it not pleasant to learn with a constant perseverance and application?« [*Lunyu* I, 1] I said: »If you two are able to recite the *Lunyu*, how come you don't know [Chinese] characters?« The shop-keeper answered: »Is he not also a man of complete virtue who is not angered by not knowing?« [*Lunyu* I, 3]¹⁹ I wrote down and showed them the three sentences they had uttered, but they just stared at the writing and could not at all discern what words these were.²⁰

This could be seen as just poking fun at the poorly educated Manchu and their crude, if not absurd, use of the *Lunyu*. However, if we look at the context, the narrator does not

18 »Togangnok«, 1: 518.

19 I have given the Legge rendering for the first two quotes but provided my own more literal translation for the last; James Legge translates this as: »[...] who feels no discomposure though men may take no note of him.« (*The Chinese Classics*, 1: 116).

20 »Ilsin sup'il« 駟汎隨筆, 1: 580.

seem intent on putting himself above the barbarians; the three of them are rather equal, and even united, in their mutual inapprehension:

[...] this was really what is called »not deaf but unable to hear, not blind but unable to see, not dumb but unable to speak«; the three of us, sitting together like the feet of a tripod, assembled the disabilities of the world; we made up for it by laughing loudly together.²¹

What Pak Chiwŏn is pointing to here, then, is the reverse side of language as quote, namely quote as language: a common language of its own. The common textual resources provide in this case not merely a tool for easing communication, they are the only basis for communication and, by extension, community. This sense of community through texts is expanded on in a climactic later passage where, certainly no coincidence, one of the *Linyu* sentences used here reappears.

The traveller has at last arrived in Peking and is now visiting the book store lane, Liulichang, which serves as the cultural center of the capital. Overwhelmed by its size, he conducts a long inner monologue (which concludes not only the chapter but the first, larger part of the trip as a whole):

If one can find one real friend in the world, there is no reason for remorse. Ah! It is a human feeling to always want to see oneself, but as this cannot be gained, at times one gets out of one's mind. If I look at myself with the eyes of another, then I am no different from the myriad things. For the moving body there is plenty of room.^[22] The wise men used this Way to »hide from the world and not be depressed, stand alone and not be afraid« [*Yijing* quote]. Confucius said: »Is not he a man of complete virtue who feels no discomposure though men may take no note of him?« Laozi also said: If few know me, this means that I am precious. This is the manner in which they declined to let people know them. Some changed their clothes, some changed their appearance, some changed their name; this is how the holy and Buddha-like, the wise and brave took their liberty with the world, and would not exchange their pleasure for reigning over it [allusion to *Mengzi*: the *junzi* has three pleasures, and to reign the world is not among them]. At such a time, if there is a man in the world who knows them, their traces would be ruined.

But in their inner heart they would actually wish that one person in the world knows them. Therefore, when Yao went out on the streets in common clothes, he had [the old man singing] the Song of Knocking the Earth; when Shakyamuni changed his appearance, he had Anan [who recognized him], when Taibo 太伯 tattooed his body [and went south], he had [his brother] Zhongyong 仲雍 [who followed him], when Yuyang 鬻鬻 painted his body with lacquer [in order to kill the murderer of his king], he had his friend [who recognized him], when Qu Yuan had aged from grief, he had the fisherman, when Fan Li 范蠡 took refuge between the lakes, he had Xi Shi, when Zhang Lu 張祿 [i.e. Fan Ju 范雎 from the period of the Warring States] walked leisurely in the travelers' abode, he had Xu Jia [who regarded him

21 »Ilsin sup'ik«, 1: 580.

22 Quote adapted from *Zhuangzi*, »Yangsheng zhu« 養生著, from the story about Bao Ding.

as poor and gave him gifts], when Zhang Liang composedly walked the bridge, he had his Huangshi gong [a Daoist who transmitted a secret formula to him].

Today I »stand alone« in the midst of Liulichang 琉璃廠, and these garments and hat are strange to this world, this beard and these brows are seen the first time in this world, the name Pak 朴 of Pannam 潘南 has never been heard in this world; at this, I become a holy man, a Buddha, a wise and brave man. My being out of order is like that of Kija [who pretended to be a madman] and Jieyu 接輿 [Lu Tong 陸通, an earlier madman of Chu, who sang a song to arouse Confucius, but when the latter sought contact, he evaded him], but with whom can I talk about this extreme joy? Somebody asked what kind of hat Confucius wore when he passed the [hostile] country of Song. I laughed loudly and said: »Well and granary, bed and lute;[23] looking at them before me, they suddenly seem to be behind«[24] »changing into fish's cloth« [like a dragon, see Zhang Heng 張衡 in *Wenxuan* 文選] and »the *junzi* changing like a leopard, his stripes are finer [than the tiger's, *Yijing*]«, who can discern the reasons behind it? Therefore [it is said in the *Lunyu* that Yan Hui 顏回] said: »As long as the Master exists, how could I dare to die?«, thereby making clear that the one who knew Confucius was Yan Hui.²⁵

What basically seems to happen in this passage is that Pak Chiwŏn advertises himself as a cultured man, someone who belongs to the cultural center as much as anybody else, even though he may look foreign and strange to Chinese eyes. But as I myself have bitterly experienced my own exclusion from Sinitic culture when trying to translate this passage, I got the impression that quoting here changes from a basic means of communication to a secret language, understandable only to the esoteric circle of the initiated. This passage still is about establishing one's own individual voice, but this time very clearly as part of a linguistic community which expands over space and time to include a chosen few and which is firmly based on a corpus of texts, the authority of which is reinforced by defining them as the common reference ground.

Much more comparative research into the quoting habits of his contemporaries would be necessary in order to establish how far Pak Chiwŏn's methods of quoting are actually exceptional or whether he can just serve as one example of a specifically *literary* treatment of the quote of the latter's potentials and of the ambivalences concerning the authority of quoted text versus final text. My analyses presented above may be taken to suggest that Pak Chiwŏn stood at the threshold of rather modern concepts of language and authorship. However, claiming 'modernity' for what we recognize as something commensurable to our contemporary sensibilities may be nothing else than a form of

23 An allusion to *Mengzi* 9.2, »Wanzhang« 萬章 1 (see Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, 2: 221–223). Here we find the story that even the best ruler, i.e. Shun 舜, was subject to assassination attempts.

24 Cf. *Lunyu* 9–10, where Yan Yuan 顏淵 is talking about the teachings of Confucius (see Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, 1: 170). The passage can be understood to suggest that Confucius' teachings were evasive.

25 »Kwannae chŏngsa« 關內程史, 1: 607.

patronizing appropriation of the past for our own ends. Rather, we should acknowledge that *Yŏrha ilgi* with its sophisticated, variegated and multifaceted utterances on and uses of the language of quotes may be as remote to us as Pak Chiwŏn felt from the Manchu street vendors, but it still is a text with which we may sit today, »laughing loudly together«.

Ruhr University of Bochum, Faculty of East Asian Studies