Rectifying Names:

Ideographs, Phonetics, and Identities

Jocelyn Clark, Ph.D. (조세린) Pai Chai University

Ⅰ. Introduction

As relationships between South Korea and China, in particular, and between East Asia and the West, in a broader sense, evolve over time, the balances of power embedded in language are persistently contested. Transliteration, Romanization, *hangeulization*, and translation are all determined more by social and geopolitical factors than by internal domestic linguistic systems. In today's global society, who should be given control over a name or the right to settle issues surrounding pronunciation and phono-semantic matching? Given today's rapidly evolving (or, some might argue, devolving) linguistic landscapes, it is getting harder for language educators to instruct on the basis of conventions. What is conventional today may become unconventional tomorrow, or at least challenged. In the current absence of hard and fast naming rules, the best we may be able to do as educators is to grasp and communicate to our students some of the dynamics that underlie today's naming conflicts and ever-shifting conventions. To that end, this article briefly reviews historical and philosophical perspectives on connotative vs. denotative naming systems and explores some American and East Asian examples of the ways the tension between the

two systems mirrors shifting power relationships in today's global and increasingly multilingual world.

In particular, the article considers some of the emerging geo-political implications of transliterative naming, using three notable examples: 1) the renaming of Seoul in Chinese in 2005 from Hancheng to Shou'er; 2) South Korea's shift away from using Sino-Korean pronunciations for Chinese names to its *hangeulization* of Chinese pronunciations—the shift from Bukgyeong to Be-yi-jing; and 3) evolving norms surrounding foreigners' adoption and residents' assignment of "native" names in East Asia.

Ⅱ. Background: Eastern Connotative vs. Western Denotative Naming Conventions

To begin to wrestle with the complex world of naming today, students should be provided with some of the major historical moments and philosophical views from past writings that brought us to where we are today. Recognizing the importance of a society's naming conventions, back in the 5th century BCE, Confucius declared that, in conducting state affairs, a first order of business was to rectify names (正名). (Confucius himself was only one of two Chinese philosophers on whom the West would confer a Latin name, in essence, rectifying his name for the West's convenience.) To rectify a name, asserted Mr. Kong Fuzi (孔夫子) (the philosopher's name in Chinese), is to apply a proper label, since labels, i.e., names, carry immense power. For a society to flourish, both the government and the governed must properly name the individual to denote his place in it and his relationship to the

surrounding world. Where proper naming fails, recorded Confucius's followers in the *Analects*,

> language is not in accordance with the truth of things. If language be not in accordance with the truth of things, affairs cannot be carried on to success. When affairs cannot be carried on to success, proprieties and music will not flourish. When proprieties and music do not flourish, punishments will not be properly awarded. When punishments are not properly awarded, the people do not know how to move hand or foot. Therefore a superior man [a "gentleman"] considers it necessary that the names he uses may be spoken appropriately, and also that what he speaks may be carried out appropriately. What the superior man requires is just that in his words there may be nothing incorrect.[1] (13: 3, Legge, trans.)

As the quote reveals, Confucius and his followers gave quite a bit of thought to the matter of naming. Now, as then, discussions surrounding naming tend to take place less frequently in the realm of linguistics than in the realm of philosophy—at least in the West, as found in the writings of philosophers such as John Wilkins (1668), John Stewart Mill (1843), Gottlob Frege (1892), and Bertrand Russell (1905), all of whom lived 22–25 centuries after Confucius.[2] As Nikola Bobrić (2010) writes, the question that Western philosophy is interested in answering is not whether names have meaning or not (a matter for the linguists) but "what is denoted by a name both in a speaker's and the hearer's mind and in the real world and how does that process of denotation function?" (2010: 135–136)

Confucius was particularly interested in a name's, or title's, *con*notation—what it signified (in terms of who the person was thought

---

1 名不正, 則言不順; 言不順, 則事不成; 事不成, 則禮樂不興; 禮樂不興, 則刑罰不中; 刑罰不中, 則民無所措手足。故君子名之必可言也, 言之必可行也。君子於其言, 無所苟而已矣

2 In East Asia, to philosophy we can add the realm of geomancy (風水: *fengshui* in Chinese, *pungsu* in Korean, *fūsui* in Japanese) when it comes to place names.

to be and destined to become)—and, over the post-Confucian centuries, many naming traditions in the Sinitic sphere (China, Japan, S. Korea, Vietnam, etc.), at least until recently, continued to carry these kinds of direct connotations.

In contrast, in modern-day Western cultures, age-old naming systems that, while never Confucian in attributing essential qualities or mapping a person's destiny, once signaled an individual's familial or geographical roots (as with the "famous warrior from the beet field region," a translation of the name Ludwig van Beethoven) seem to have all but been forgotten. In explaining the traditions of the West, contemporary philosopher Geoffrey Klempner (2000), writes, "If the term is a name, its denotation is the bearer of the name. But what about its connotation? Mill, as noted by Klempner, claimed that proper names do not have a *con*notation" (emphasis added). John Anderson (2007) agrees: "[N]ames do not have meaning but only perform the function of denoting items once they become *inactive*" (quoted in Dobrić, 2010: 135; emphasis in original). Following Anderson and Mill (as much of the world does today), the fact that I carry the name Jocelyn, from the Latin "happy" or "joyful," does not suggest to anyone on the side of the earth on which I was born that I am a happy and joyful individual. Someone first hearing about me through my first name assumes to learn nothing *about* me from it. In contrast to the modern Western norm, for Confucius, names were imbued with the power to map a person's future. Once upon a time, my parents' naming me Jocelyn might have therefore been determinative, propelling me along the path to, if not a happy and joyful life, at least a happy and joyful disposition.

Dobrić (2010) has whittled down today's Western philosophical debate on the theory of naming to two concerns, both occasional: 1) "what the speaker denotes upon a particular occasion of using a name," and 2)

"what the name itself denotes upon some particular occasion" (2010: 135). In his opinion, the philosophical debate does not "shed light on the linguistic and cognitive motivation of people when creating names" (2010: 137). Rather, he asserts, that is the realm of cognitive linguistics, a discipline more aptly concerned with the nature and dynamics of how humans construct meaning—how we encode and decode meaning and what concepts we form and express about our world through language.

The function of metaphor, in this field, is seen as transferring meaning from a "source conceptual domain" to a "target conceptual domain" (Dobric, 2010: 138). One example Dobric cites is the personal name "Lion,"[3] which he describes as "the concrete source domain whose conceptual structure (such as strong, proud, fierce, independent) is transferred to the abstract target domain of a human being" (2010: 138). Alina-Andreea Dragoescu, in her 2012 piece "Cocktails as Metaphors: An Inquiry into Drink Names," also makes the point that metaphors play an inherently cognitive function: "The *Gentleman* cocktail, the *Modernista*, or the *Cosmopolitan* are examples of . . . drink names . . . that stand for desired qualities to be associated to the consumers of those respective drinks" (2010: 272). Here, Dragoescu would seem to be aligning with Confucius' ideas about naming—though Confucius, who, when it came to public inebriation, was more likely to raise a moral objection than a glass—would perhaps disfavor the association.

For Confucius, what mattered even more than the question "What's in a name?" was that of "What's in a title?" A given title carried even more power than a personal name; i.e., in calling a noble man a noble

3 Common American derivatives include the masculine name "Lionel" and the feminine Leona, both from the Latin "little lion."

man, he should behave nobly.[4] The title "gentleman," or "ruler," or "father" was thus conferred appropriately only on people who satisfied, as Zhongying Cheng (1991) writes, "not only the conditions of occupying a position of authority or standing, but also . . . conditions of possessing appropriate virtues . . . If these conditions are fulfilled, then social harmony and political order will follow" (1991: 224).[5]

In other words, rectifying a name requires not only that natural facts correspond to the name, but that values associated with it also be present. "To rectify names is to recognize certain truths about nature and humankind and avoid misrepresenting these truths," writes Cheng (1991: 223). The gentleman must behave like a gentleman. When he does not, either his own, or an outsider's, culturally prescribed understanding, be it true or misconceived, must be rectified.

Ⅲ. Discussion

1. A question of power: indigenous connotation vs. colonial denotation

Deciding whose vision must be rectified—the difference between what the speaker denotes and what the name itself denotes—is, in the real world, a question of power. In his book *Caliban's Voice: The*

4 君子名之必可言也、言之必可行也. "The noble man needs to have his terminology applicable to real language, and his speech must accord with his actions." *Analects* 13:3, Muller, A.C., trans. http://www.acmuller.net/con-dao/analects.html. Accessed 31 October 2015.

5 君君臣臣父父子子: "There is government when the prince is prince, and the minister is minister; when the father is father, and the son is son" (12:11, Legge trans.), or in the translation of Im Manyul (2008), "A lord should lord, a minister should minister, a :father should father, and a son should son."

Transformation of English in Post-Colonial Literatures, Bill Ashcroft writes:

> The use of translation as a means of domination occurs in many ways in imperial discourse . . . The issue of Naming . . . comes to prominence in imperial cartography . . . Names of places are names *in* language and are the most powerful means of cultural incorporation. Names invoke ownership, because to have the power to name is to have the power of possession. Naming is a form of translation because it inserts the named object or location—translates it—into a particular cultural narrative . . . This power of language to appropriate the physical environment is one with which post-colonial peoples must always contend. (2009: 164)

In the hierarchy of culturally prescribed naming, institutions rank closely behind geographical place names. The institution may be a university or a building on its campus. It may be a business or some property of the business—as in the case of a sports franchise. Take, for example, the current controversy surrounding the name of the American football team the "Washington Redskins."

As Native Americans gain influence in the United States through the ability to use social and other media to disseminate information quickly and broadly, bringing what the mid-20th century Native rights movement termed "Red Power" to bear on traditional power within American institutions, questions like "What does this name denote?" "Who may decide what it denotes?" and "For whom is it denoted?" are being lain at the feet of non-Native fans who over the years have come to equate "their" team with its name. To these fans, to change the name would do more than devalue multi-generational collections of team artifacts and closets of expensive team swag.[6] In their minds, it would virtually erase the franchise, destroying the entire complex of its human and

6 Slang for clothing and other items bearing a team's logo.

institutional assets and forcing its wholesale reinvention (and almost certain relegation to last place in the standings).

The managers, coaches, and players whom the owners of the Washington Redskins literally "possess" are not Native Americans (but for the occasional exception), so to change the team's name would not disturb any literal relationship between signifier and signified. But, while local fans do not "possess" what they routinely call "their" team, in today's sports' world, a franchise is only as valuable as its fans' attachment to it. The fans' "constructed meaning" of the name therefore continues to stand as one of the main bars to its changing.

In reality, in a business where players and teams are routinely sold to the highest bidder and subsequently relocated and renamed, it is not difficult to predict that the Washington franchise will sacrifice little whenever its owners finally decide to abandon the racist name—and any privately owned relics of the franchise's unenlightened past will no doubt only increase in value in subsequent years.

To understand this example fully in light of Ashcroft's central point regarding the power politics of naming, one must ask why the National Football League, which regulates the franchises, has not yet banned racist team names. It is here where we see most vividly how, in Ashcroft's words, "[n]ames of places are names in language and are the most powerful means of cultural incorporation." The growing movement by Native Americans to effect the name change arises out of their recognition of the oppressive role naming plays in the *system* of racism under which they live, near to and far away from FedExField.[7] The

7 The stadium's name does not enjoy the same sacred status as the team's. Built in 1994 to replace the teams' former home, the John F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium, the building was named after the owner at the time "Jack Kent Cooke Stadium" and soon came to be called "Raljon" (a portmanteau of Cooke's sons' first names "Ralph" and "John"). In 1999, a new owner licensed the name to FedEx for a reported $7.6 million

owners' resistance to rectifying the name thus signals their reluctance to rectifying underlying Native/non-Native power relationships in the U.S.

Other American examples may be cited where such rectification is occurring, though. Alaska Natives in my home state (who, not coincidentally, last summer initiated a national boycott of FedEx to persuade the company to pressure the Redskins' owners to change the team's name[8]) have in recent years enjoyed some success in convincing local, state, and federal lands administrators to restore to their indigenous geographical forms the place names given by non-Native explorers. Through this reclamation process, the overlain place names denoting colonist explorers and dignitaries are being peeled back to restore connotative indigenous descriptors. In a widely publicized recent example, the name of the tallest mountain in North America, located in interior Alaska, was restored from the denotative "McKinley," given to it by a 19th century gold prospect or in honor of an Ohio politician, to the connotative "Denali," the old Athabascan name, which is based on a Koyukon Native verb theme associated with the descriptive words "high" and "tall" (Martinson, 2015: 1).

The cogent point to locate in these American examples involves the tug-of-war between connotative and denotative conventions. In her article 2014 "Knowing Linguistic Conventions," Carin Robinson defines a linguistic convention as "a principle or norm that has been adopted by a person or linguistic community about how to use, and therefore what the meaning is of, a specific term" (2014: 167). Because a culture's socioeconomic underpinnings are constantly in flux, the power dynamics

---

a year, an increasingly common naming arrangement for American sports fields. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/FedExField.

8 *See* Slager, B. (2015). Alaska's largest tribe vows FedEx boycott until Redskins sponsorship revoked. *The Sporting News*. June 29.

affecting language are always shifting. When teaching or learning a language and the conventions that rule a language's "proper nouns" (i.e. its names), it is important for students to keep in mind this threshold tenet.

It will not be long now before the growing economic and political clout of Native Americans gained over the past 50 years in the United States will force the renaming of offensive sports franchise names and mascots. In 1992, Washington Post columnist Tony Kornheiser wrote that it was "only a matter of time until 'Redskins' is gone." At that time, he suggested the team change its name to the "Pigskins." Ten years later, in 2012, when a Washington City Paper poll asked readers to vote for a new team name, "Pigskins" won with 50 percent of the vote (Connolly & Gordon, 2013).

2. Territorial linguistics and identity—Asian trends

Once armed with the history and philosophy of naming, and made freshly cognizant of the interplay of political power and naming conventions, students will be ready to venture onto the world stage, where the growing extensity, intensity, and velocity of internationalism continue to blur the boundary between domestic matters and global affairs. As states become embedded within regional and global regimes, they must, as Held et al. (1999) write, "deploy their sovereignty and autonomy as bargaining chips in negotiations involving coordination and collaboration across shifting transnational and international networks. The power, authority and operations of national government are, accordingly, altering" (1999: 1). In this context, in which, increasingly, "cultural flows are transforming the politics of national identity and the politics of identity more generally" (Held et al.), naming has moved to the

center of linguistic power struggles occurring in East Asia, in particular in the switch from connotative meanings in naming (in this case, the use of Chinese characters), to denotative naming (using a phonetic system or phonetic characters); that is, the switch from a society in which a bordered nation possesses the power to confer names and control naming conventions to one whose names (place names, in particular) become imposed on the nation's people from outside. In the process, citizens who once understood the original meaning of their society's names (and common nouns) lose these linguistic strands and, with them, elements of their history and national identity. One need not be teaching a language-related course to find oneself caught up in the confusion being caused by today's linguistic politics, especially in East Asia, where nations, like Native Americans in the U.S., attempt to rinse the sour taste of colonialism off of the local tongue.

3. Modern Korean naming: "A *ro-jeu*[9] by any other name . . ."

When teaching Chinese History in Korean today,[10] one must render various Chinese proper nouns into Korean. Not so long ago this was a fairly straightforward exercise that involved finding the "Sino-Korean" traditional pronunciation for the Chinese character in question. Beijing would become *Bukgyeong* ("northern capital"), Nanjing, *Namgyeong* ("southern capital"), Mao Zedong, *Mo Taekdong* ("hairy, kind landlord,"

9 From Shakespeare's *Romeo ans Juliet*: "A rose by any other name would still smell as sweet." 薔薇. Korean: *jangmi* 장미, *rojeu* 로즈; Mandarin Chinese: *qiangwei*; Japanese: *bara*.

10 During the colonial period, the Japanese introduced Sino-Japanese words into the Korean vocabulary (with their accompanying Chinese characters), where they became pronounced as Sino-Korean words by Korean speakers. One of these words is the word for "communism": *kyosanshugi* in Sino-Japanese (共産主義), *gongsangjuui* in Korean (Tranter, 1997).

among possible translations, or, the more likely intended "Mao of East of the Marsh"), etc.—in essence, forming Korean traditional one-to-one renditions of a "Chinese" logosyllable into Sino-Korean pronunciation—a process that retained the original (connotative) semantic meaning of the terms and preserved the Korean language.

This changed definitively a few years ago, however, when, in 2005, then Mayor of Seoul Lee Myung-Bak suggested to the Chinese government, along with the governments of Taiwan and Singapore, that they find a way to transliterate "Seoul" (Seo-ul being a "pure" Korean name indicating "Capitol") into Chinese instead of continuing to call Seoul "Hancheng" (漢城), a term meaning "the fortress city on the Han (漢 "man or hero; vast or large") [River]" a name for Seoul that had its origins in the Baekje Kingdom (百濟, 18 BCE-660 CE).[11] Baekje's Hanseong (漢城) indicates the Sino-Korean pronunciation of the Chinese Hancheng. While the city was known by several names in between, the Korean King Yi Seonggye (李成桂 r. 1392-1398) had Seoul renamed Hanseong at the start of the Joseon Period (朝鮮 1392-1910). For Lee Myung-Bak (李明博) the problem with the Chinese continuing to use the old name was the possibility of misunderstanding "Hancheng" in Chinese

11 The Han River is a site of various renamings according to who was in power and where the capital was located over time. The Han Commanderies and the early Three Kingdoms called it Daesu (대수; 帶水; "belt water," as it flowed like a belt across the land), Goguryeo called it Arisu (아리수; 阿利水; "gainful or beautiful waters," now the brand name of Seoul's water supply), Baekjae called it Ungniha (욱리하; 郁里河; "fragrant li river"), while Silla termed it the Iha (이하; 泥河; "muddy river"). https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Han_River_(Korea). Some of these titles are Sino-Korean, others, like Arisu, seem to be pure Korean overlain with Chinese. In "Musicology characteristics and international analyses of *Arirang*," Kwon Oh-sung (2012) notes that "*Ari*" means "beautiful," or "lovely," and is also used to mean "big." It also means "beautiful and big." The original name of the Han River, for example, is "*Arisu*," meaning "beautiful big water." We can trace the origin of "*ari*" to the modern Korean word "*ariddaun*" (*ari*+*ddaun*: beauty+ful). In the Mongolian language, "*ari*" means "sacred and clean."

as the "Walled Fortress of the Han" (漢) on the Han River (漢江), indicating (perhaps to too many) the fortress of the Han Chinese, the largest ethnic group in China, as opposed to the Han (韓) Koreans, indicated with a different homophonous character.[12] Moreover, to allow China to continue to use "Hancheng" (漢城) could lead to the legitimization of Chinese territorial claims on parts of what is today North Korea (Chen, 2012).[13] In other words, Lee was worried about the connotative semantic implications of continuing to use Hancheng *in China*, particularly in light of the other territorial disputes in the region, which themselves are fueled quite often by questions of historical naming.

In January of 2005, the mayor of Seoul formed a special committee of Chinese-language experts in Seoul to prepare Chinese speakers for the change.[14] Perhaps as part of a new strategy in Beijing that "posits 'humane authority' (*wangdao* 王道 ["king way"])—namely establishing international authority by way of concessions and moral suasion—as key to pulling neighboring countries away from their reliance on the US military umbrella" (Kim et al., 2012: 2), China thus actually quietly complied with the unusual request by shifting from "Hancheng" to the Chinese transliterative phono-semantic match "Shou-er" (首爾/尔), which

12 A character that also has a Chinese city named after it: "Hancheng" (韓城)—the birth place of the famous Han (漢) Dynasty historian Sima Qian (司馬遷) in Shaanxi (陝西) Province, China.

13 One wonders the implications of leaving the name of the Han River, which runs through the heart of Seoul, untouched, or North Han Mountain (北漢山) on its northern border.

14 The committee comprised professors of Chinese and Korean, historians, representatives of the sister city of Seoul in China, Chinese authorities present in Korea, Chinese students in Korea, media people. Ordinary citizens were heard through the metropolitan Seoul homepage. (Antti Leppänen, Academy of Finland Postdoctoral Researcher in Social and Cultural Anthropology, University of Helsinki: http://hunjang.blogspot.kr/2004/04/korean-language-renaming-seoul-in.html.)

in Chinese sounds more like "Seo-ul" and translates *roughly*[15] (though translation is not necessarily intended)[16] to "first city."[17] The Koreans reciprocated with their own phono-sematic transliteration Be-yi-jing (베이징), thus severing the meaning "northern capital" (*Buk-gyeong* 北京) from the sound while bringing it closer in line with the two-syllable Chinese Mandarin pronunciation of Bei-jing. In other words, there was a shift from Sino-Korean to "Standard" Chinese. Or to put it another way, the process of metaphorization described in cognitive linguistics was put into reverse. Instead of a semantic and conceptual structure being

---

15 It is interesting to note that the Koreans used the old Sino-Korean/pre-Mao version of the character *er* (爾) in choosing the new name, rather than the simplified *er* (尔) character-style that have been promoted on the Mainland since the mid-1950s, and now in Singapore. By using the traditional character, the Koreans were not only asserting themselves but also aligning themselves politically with Hong Kong, Macau, and Taiwan where the traditional form is still official.

16 That is to say, translation is not intended any more than it is in the case of *Ke-kou-ke-le* [Coca-Cola] 可口可樂 (very-mouth (i.e. good to eat) very-happy).

17 First runner up: 首午尔/首午爾
Other Runners up included:
Proposals using both the pronunciation and meaning:
- 首兒 (Shou3 Er2)
- 首屋 (Shou3 Wu1)
- 首塢 (Shou3 Wu4)
- 首沃 (Shou3 Wo4)
- 首兀 (shou3 wu4/wu1)
- 首塢爾 (Shou3 Wu1 Er3)
- 瑟塢爾 (Se4 Wu1 Er3)
- 首兀爾 (shou3 wu4/wu1 er3)
- 首沃爾 (shou3 wo4 er3)
- 首屋爾 (shou3 wu1 er3)

Proposals using only the meaning
- 韓京 (Han2 Jing1)
- 中京 (Zhong1 Jing1)
- 首京 (Shou3 Jing1)

See Antti Leppänen. (2004). Blog, April 7. Accessed 29 October 2015. http://hunjang.blogspot.kr/2004/04/korean-language-renaming-seoul-in.html.

transferred from one conceptual domain (fortress of the Han) to another (Korea's capital city), it was instead being stripped of that meaning. In the process, the name of Korea's capital in Chinese went from having a connotative meaning to having a denotative one, finally concurring with the Western idea that names do not have meanings because everyone has forgotten them. The new naming convention thus rendered meanings inactive. Words would now be but sounds.

4. Phonetic branding of *Hangeul*'s Sino-Korean remnants

Keeping in mind the relationship between linguistic conventions and socioeconomic power, one must wonder *Why is this happening now?* When it comes to naming, as Richard Coats reminds us,

> Borrowing will not take place at all without the prospect of "projected gain" for the borrower, and equally borrowing will be avoided in situations where the unconscious use of borrowed material will result in stigma for the borrower. Borrowing must be socially and culturally risk-free in situations where something more than need-driven communication is at stake. (2004: 2)

The Korean rejection of connotative Chinese meaning-based characters (in this case on *behalf of the Chinese*) to sound-based denotative characters is different in the Korean context than in the Chinese context. In the Korean context, Chinese characters are a lexical borrowing to begin with. At the time of their borrowing, they came with "gain" (both linguistic and socio-cultural) for the Koreans. Today, much as in the North, aside from their relative difficulty of use with texting and computers, characters have turned into things socially and culturally fraught with peril and, increasingly, marked by stigma (though this may change with China's changing geo-political station).[18] For now, they do

carry geo-political risk, which has resulted in the politicization of the use or non-use of "Chinese" characters.

Kim Chang-jin (2011) argues that Chinese-character based words in Korean are not loaned words but rather long-established Sino-Korean and therefore "cannot be a subject of loanword orthography" (2011: 80). When they are treated as foreign, suggests Kim, a doubling down of miscommunication tends to occur. In his view, 20th century ideologists such as Choi Hyun Bae[19] (崔鉉培 (artist name Oe Sol 외솔 1894-1970), in devising "loanword orthography [for] Japanese in order to promote the exclusive use of Hangeul, are promoting nothing other than a vestige of Japanese colonial imperialism. The same fallacy is true of loanword orthography of [the] Chinese-character cultural [sphere and] must be discarded" (2011: 80).[20]

Again, Ashcroft describes translation as "the movement of text from a source language to a target language" (2011: 1).[21] With the new

---

18 A 2015 public opinion poll found that Koreans do not respond to foreigners in equal ways and that the foreigners they view most negatively are Chinese. http://thediplomat.com/2015/10/multicultural-korea-and-its-discontents/.

19 Choe advocated using *only* hanguel to express Korean. He thought that Sino-Korean vocabulary, with its endless homonyms, was essentially elevating a foreign culture, China, in Korean society. Given that in the Sinitic cultural/linquistic sphere, Korea could only be a "junior member," he argued that continuing participation in that sphere was no longer necessary in modern Korea. Hannas (1991) writes of this view, Choe sees the homonym "problem" as a reflex of a broader social problem, namely, Korean worship of foreign culture. Had it not been for Koreans' sorry habit of revering China and slighting everything indigenous, there would have been no massive influx of Sinitic loanwords, and no problem with phonetic indistinctiveness. Instead, Koreans could have maximized use of their own rich stock of morphemes, which have more phonetic shapes and unlike Chinese can be polysyllabic. At minimum, there would be a better balance between the indigenous part, and Sinitic part of the lexicon, which accounts for 75% of present-day Korean. He goes even further to claim that this "unnatural" phenomenon hinders the development of Korean thought." (pp. 89-93)

20 Kim, Chang-jin 金昌辰. (2011). 日本語.中國語 外來語表記法의 廢棄 必要性 (Abolition necessity of loanword orthography of Japanese and Chinese). 語文硏究. *Eomun yeon'gu (The Society for Korean Language & Literary Research)* 39(4): 24.

21 An example of the kind of hazard language may encounter on that journey is found in

anti-Sino-Korean orthography, we are talking not about translation, but *transformation*—what he terms "the reshaping of text in a target language by the cultural nuances of a source language." He goes on to argue that "[t]he point about transformation is not simply that it transforms the writer's original medium of communication into [another language], but much more importantly it transforms [the other language] itself. This is significant because the connection between language and empire has always been critical in the imperial civilizing mission" (2011: 1).

In Korea, until the first half of the 20th century, written Chinese, which had been being used to express versions of Korean since the 5th century (*see* Hannas, 1991),[22] was considered to embody everything from social order to civilization to good Confucian moral government. This changed with the collapse of the Qing Dynasty and the coming of the missionaries with their schools and Western education. The Japanese occupation soon followed, but, by then, "Chinese" had already become embedded in Korean usage, as "Sino-Korean" (as opposed to "Chinese") (*see* n. 19, supra). For the Chinese, it is another story. That the government allowed the South Koreans to dictate the Hancheng-to-Shou-er shift *for* the Chinese language is remarkable. Chinese characters are not lexical borrowings, whereas the denotative "marked-as-foreign" Shou-er is. Ashcroft writes, "Whatever the sense of

---

the global eyebrow raising taking place over Seoul's new crowd-sourced city slogan (recently adopted by the government to attract foreigners): "I.Seoul.U." This rather awkward saying means, in Korean, 나와 너의 서울, which better translates as "Seoul, Yours and Mine" or "Seoul You and Me," instead of the way the government has chosen to render it in Korean: *a-yi Seoul yu* (아이 서울 유). For an overview of the process of creating the new slogan, *see* Backe, C. (2015). "A look at Korea's newest slogan – and a story I've never publicly told before." Oct. 29. http://www.oneweirdglobe.com/a-look-at-koreas-newest-slogan-and-a-story-ive-never-publicly-told-before/. Retrieved 31 October 2015.

22 *See* Hannas (1991) for an historical discussion of the evolution of the use of Chinese characters, *Idu*, mixed-script, and pure *hangeul* on the peninsula.

inherent or cultural 'belonging' to place indigenous inhabitants may have, it is clear that place may be 'controlled,' by being familiarized and domesticated through language" (2011: 4). In this case, the change was not one of a name on native soil, but of a place that the Chinese consider within their cultural sphere. Even if Koreans view Chinese as having low social standing, for the Chinese, Korea is still culturally an imperial subject and Koreans are simply a Chinese minority.[23] As Gordon C. Chang (2015) writes in "Will China Colonize North Korea?" "For centuries, the Chinese have viewed the Koreans as vassals, and they have ruled the northern part of the peninsula, either directly aspart of China or through tributary relationships. The border between China and Korea has moved hundreds of miles in both directions over time, and both the Chinese and the Koreans know it can move again."

The change to Shou-er from Hancheng has been difficult for many Chinese. A blogger for "Good Characters" (2006) wrote that, given that *han* (漢) also means "man" and "hero," "Shou'er . . . just doesn't sound as strong or as brave as Hancheng" and noted that the name could just as easily be taken to mean the homophones "hand" and "ear" (手耳, *shou er* in Chinese, *su yi* in Sino-Korean). As Zhao Rixin, a Beijing Language and Culture University professor, was quoted in the *China Daily* in 2005, "'I feel the pronunciation is very bizarre, as if I'm talking about an unfamiliar city."[24]

---

23 *See* Gordon G. Chang (2015) "Will China Colonize North Korea?" *The Daily Beast*, Oct. 29.
http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2015/10/29/will-china-colonize-north-korea.html

24 Other blog reactions include:
< Anonymous> 26.1.05:
"Shouer" has become somewhat of a running gag among us Chinese literates here at [Seoul National University]. I guess, the new name will generate a lot of bad feeling against Koreans. It's hard to explain, but combined with the already existing image of Koreans as a bunch of (somehow cute) loonies, "Shouer" might well become a symbol for the trouble Koreans seem to cause all the time in China. (Just ask taxi drivers in

That may very well have been the intention of the former mayor, who no doubt had in mind the thought "*Our* city is not *your* city." In the case of Shou-er, in the wake of China's rise, it is hard to fault the desire to discard remnants of the old tributary relationship, if only perceived mistakenly in the old Korean name. After all, "the character Han 漢 composing 'Hancheng' could be potentially misrepresented as suggestive of ethnic-Han ownership of Seoul" (Kim et al., 2012: 2).

5. *Katakana*—Japan's complementary approach

Japan's *katakana* deserves mention here. Instead of trying to

---

Beijing what they think about Korean expats . . .)
(http://hunjang.blogspot.kr/2005/01/seouls-new-chinese-name-for-itself.html)

< Anonymous> 22.1.05:
You want some Chinese comments? I can give you some. I am Chinese, and I read many Chinese comments on Chinese forums. Most of us think it is ridiculous and stupid, to be frank. You can not throw us a new name and make us to use it. After all, it's us who use Chinese language, not you. As to the Hancheng means "Chinese city", that's pure stupidity. 'Han' has many meanings in Chinese. I used the word 'Hancheng' for so many years and it never occured [sic] to me it means 'Chinese city'. One thing I do remember about the name is a riddle game we played in middle school. 'Which city has no women?' The answer is 'Hanghceng', because it can mean 'men's city'. This riddle always goes together with another one. 'Which city has no men?' The answer is 'Wuhan', a city in central China. Because it can mean 'no men'.
(http://hunjang.blogspot.kr/2004/07/renaming-seoul-in-chinese-final.html)

<Antti Leppänen> 27.1.05:
The mayor Lee Myung-bak says that "in foreign diplomacy, the practice (*kwallye*) has been to use the original pronunciations of city names." Mayor Lee should tell this immediately to European diplomats and others who use all kinds of weird pronunciations and forms of each other's cities. When the Seoul administration has managed to persuade Chinese to use 首尔/Shouer for Seoul, the next tasks should be to order the Finnish Foreign Ministry not to pronounce Seoul söul (쇠울) . . . but to use a pronunciation comfortable for the Finns' speaking organs, soul (소울). (The official Finnish spelling is "Soul".)
(http://hunjang.blogspot.kr/2005/01/seouls-new-chinese-name-for-itself.html)

superimpose one language onto another as occurred in the Shou-er/Seo-ul example, around 700 CE, people on the Japanese islands created a complementary third writing system expressly for the purpose of keeping imported transliterations separate from "pure" Japanese. *Katakana*, meaning "fragmentary *kana*" (*kata* 片, "partial, fragmented"), describes a secondary phonetic syllabary used to transliterate mostly foreign words, which is placed next to the main *hiragana* syllabary (*hira* 平, "smooth, flat, peaceful") used to write "pure" Japanese.[25] (Japanese does not use letters like English and Korean, but rather each phonetic symbol contains a complete syllable formed of a consonant and vowel).

Today, *katakana* is used as a kind of italics in Japanese; students will find it often used for emphasis and for foreign words. But there was never any requirement that *katakana* be used for imported words. For instance, throughout the period of Japanese colonial rule over the Korean peninsula, Seoul was known as Keijō (京城) in Japanese (or Gyeongseong in Korean pronunciation), meaning "walled capital," a *connotative* translation. When authorities of the American occupying force in Korea after World War II declared that the capital's name was subsequently to be "Seoul," a word without Sino-Korean characters, the Japanese (themselves under U.S. occupation and in a relatively charitable mood towards the Americans in Japan) abandoned the use of Chinese characters and moved to phonetic *katakana*, so that the sounds of the South Korean capital became approximated as So-u-ru (ソウル) (Kim et al., 2012).

Katakana, with its whole separate syllabry, provides a means of avoiding connotative metaphorization—or at least metaphorization that

25 "Pure Japanese" is also grafted onto Chinese characters. It is marked through the system of pronouncing a character in the "sound" 音読み (*onyomi*, the Japanese version of the Chinese way) or the "meaning" 訓読み (*kunyomi* the pure Japanese way).

might seem native—and thus might be seen as a kind of linguistic prophylactic that has the potential to protect the national lexicon from crossover. However, during times in which anti-western sentiment was ascendant, *katakana* was dispensed with in favor of a strategy of translation (remember Bill Ashcroft's "translation as domination" above). For example, during the 1880s, in reaction to the rapid pace of westernization following the Meiji Restoration in 1869, the use of foreign languages in higher education, with the exception of foreign languages classes themselves, was forbidden in 1882. Foreign words were instead translated. Kevin Heffernan (2011) gives examples of Meiji loan words:

- Democracy — *minshushugi* 民主主義 (people+primary+ism)
- Camera — *shashinki* 写真機 (copy+reality+machine)
- Locomotive — *kasha* 汽車 (steam+vehicle)
- Science — *kagaku* 科学 (branch of+study)
- Telephone — *denwa* 電話 (electricity+speak)
- Humanity — *jinbun* 人文 (human+culture) (2011: 484)

Heffernan goes on to point out that with the Taisho era and Japan's ascendency onto the world stage between 1912 and 1930—with Japan's defeat of China and Russia, its entry into the League of Nations, and its Anglo-Japanese Alliance from 1902 to 1923—western culture started to once again appeal to young middle-class Japanese. English words along with their original pronunciations became sexy again. *Katakana* was used to transliterate 95 percent of loan words in Arakawa's 1931 dictionary. Heffernan's examples include:

- Science — *sa-i-en-n-su* サイエンス
- School — *su-ku-u-ru* スクール
- Telephone — *te-re-ho-o-n* テレホーン

- Christmas — *ku-ri-su-ma-su* クリスマス
- Thrilling — *su-ri-ri-n-gu* スリリング
- Ice cream — *a-i-su ku-ri-i-mu* アイス•クリーム
- Home run — *ho-o-mu ra-n* ホーム•ラノ (2011: 485)

During World War II and its lead up, English and romanized Japanese words were once again banned from newspapers, magazines, and public places, and the government implemented a policy of imposing sematic translations on existing transliterations:

- Piano — *koukin* 鋼琴 (steel+string instrument)
- Record — *onban* 音盤 (sound+disk)
- Track — *kyousouba* 競争場 (compete+struggle+place)
- Golf — *dakyuu* 打球 (hit+ball)
- Ski — *sekkotsu* 雪滑 (snow+slide) (2011: 486)

Finally, during the period of the post-war U.S. occupation of Japan from 1945 to 1952, all things American became once again in vogue, English procured many social advantages such as access to the black market, and katakana transliteration came back into favor as the convention of the day (2011: 486). Meanwhile in China, words that had been transliterated from English during the early part of the 20th century were translated/reborrowed from Japanese translations of Western words, as China's Communist Period commenced. A good example is telephone, which goes from *delüfeng* 德律風 (virtue+rule+wind) to *dianhua* 電話 (denwa in Japanese) (electric+speak) (2011: 483)—the word still used for "telephone" in South Korea today, albeit in its *hangulized* version.

6. A tool for missionaries and liberators: *Hangeul*'s double-edged sword

In Korea, the decision to essentially *kana*–ize, if you will, the entire realm of modern written language conventions gained momentum in the 19th century when Korea came into sustained and close contact with the Roman alphabet-using cultures of England and the U.S. The Anglo missionaries who arrived in Korea at the end of the century were no fans of *hanja* (and nothing has changed). In *Korea in Transition* (1909): the missionary James Gale writes,

> We think we see a providence in the matter of Korea's written and spoken languages . . . As for written languages, she has no less than three: pure Chinese, pure *Un-mun* ["dirty language," i.e. pure *hangeul*], and mixed script . . . The teacher, in explaining the ideograph to the pupil, says: "Now listen. When you have 'heart' to left and 'blood' to right, the character means 'to pity'; but when you have 'heart' on one side and 'star' on the other, it means 'wake up'. When there is 'hand' on one side, and 'foot' on the other, it means 'to take hold'. When 'water' is on one side, and 'stand up' on the other, it means 'to cry'. When it has two 'speeches', and 'sheep' standing between them, it means 'good'. When 'grass' is on top and 'name' is down below, it means 'tea'," and so on and so on, till the brain grows dizzy, and two thousand characters and more are learned. Then they must be read from the string along which they are strung. "For father-thing-do-one-son-also-do-father-love son-so-already-every thing-do-one-make-know." This represents the struggle of China, Korea, and Japan after thought through the medium of the character. How labored and shadowy, but how simple when run out in native script: "For the thing the Father does, the Son does also; the Father loves the Son, and shows him all he does."
>
> Korea's native script is surely the simplest [of the three systems] . . . By one of those mysterious providences it was made ready and kept waiting for the *New Testament* and other Christian Literature. Up to this day these have had almost exclusive use of this wonderfully simple language. This perhaps is

> the most remarkable providence of all, this language sleeping its long sleep of four hundred years, waiting till the hour should strike on the clock, that it might rise and tell of all Christ's wondrous works.
>
> They call it *Un-mun*, the "dirty language," because it is so simple and easy as compared with proud Chinese picture writing. God surely loves the humble things of life, and chooses the things that are naught to bring to naught the things that are. Tied in the belts of the women are New Testaments in common Korean; in the pack of the mountaineer on his brisk journeying; in the wall-box of the hamlet home; piled up on the shelf of the livingroom are these books in *Un-mun* telling of Yesu (Jesus), mighty to save. The writer counts it among his choicest privileges that he has had a share in its translation, that to him were assigned John, Acts, Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, and Revelation. (1909, 136-139).

Hangeul thus conveniently provided Roman alphabet users one-to-one sound-based elements that could be linked directly to the Roman characters. Moreover, in order to propagate Christianity among the masses, a writing system was needed that would be easy for "illiterate" Koreans—a sizeable group at the time, as schooling remained restricted by class at the end of the Joseon period—to learn.

Heo Eung (1918-2004), former professor of linguistics at Seoul National University and president of the Hangul Society, well known for his reformist publications "Chinese Characters Must Be Abolished" (1971), "For Our Language and Script of Tomorrow" (1974), and "Hangul and the National Culture" (1974), reinforces the missionary's argument, noting that

> Christianity, despite the recentness of its introduction, gained more favor among the common people than Confucianism, because the Bible was translated into all-*hangul*, which everyone understood. Grant that current all-hangul translations of classic Korean texts contain some errors, but this is hardly an indictment of the enterprise. If experts have trouble, how can

school children be expected to understand them in the original? (quoted in Hannas, 1991: 85, 93)

Hangeul became a symbol of enlightenment, democracy, the future. Later, it would become a tool for independence from Japanese colonial rule, which established its pedigree as a force for independence and a protector of national identity.

By 1968, the Korean government had launched the first *hangeul*-only policy, explicitly against the use of Sino-Korean characters,[26] starting the process of severing Korea's connection with its past relationships not only with Japan but with China. This was partly due to earlier language conventions that eventually restricted the usage of Chinese characters in mixed-script to Chinese loanwords in Korean. Koreans were left feeling disconnected from characters that came to seem more Chinese than Sino-Korean.

Eventually, this led to Sinitic words themselves becoming targets for replacement by indigenous words, real or contrived, in language purification campaigns that periodically surface (Hannas, 1991: 87). Language purification advocates of the time, such as Choe Hyeonbae and Heo Ung, certainly thought about the implication of their approach—in particular the resulting regional isolation that would come from it and the inability of future generations to read earlier texts. But, ultimately, at least Choe and Heo decided that, in light of the history of the first part of the 20th century (and earlier), it would be far from tragic for Korea to lose the community of its neighbors. As Hannas (1991) writes, Heo "asks if Koreans, one and all, should suffer for the sake of

26 Shim, Jae-kee 沈在箕. (2004). "國漢混用論의 歷史.文化的 背景" (A theoretical background to the Hangul-Hanja mixed script), 漢字敎育과 漢字政策에 對한 國際學術會議 (International conference on the education and policy of Chinese characters), 韓國語文敎育硏究會, Seoul, National University of Education (2004: 246).

the tourist industry. He also wonders why the same people who want Sinitic loans written in Chinese characters do not clamor for English loanwords to be written in romaja and mixed in directly with the hangeul and everything else. More to the point, [he argues] 'Korea's foreign contacts are no longer limited to East Asia, nor should they be. Koreans need to absorb ideas from all over the world, and the writing system they choose should facilitate this' (quoted in Hannas, 1991: 2; citations omitted). Choe (1946) goes on to say,

> We must regard the future as more important than the past. Besides the direct benefits to be gained by using a more efficient writing system, there are important psychological side-effects to writing in all-hangul. European progress began only after Latin was abandoned as the medium of written discourse. Writing in their own "vulgar" languages, Europeans of various nationalities were able to infuse their countrymen with a new vigor that had been stifled by the old and crusty conventions. Thus, the move to all-hangul is more than an effort to rid the system of Chinese characters. By decreasing dependence on foreign borrowings, the movement fosters attitudes of national pride and self-reliance that will spill were into all areas of society. (quoted in Hannas, 1991: 92; citations omitted)

While, certainly, the questions faced by China and Korea were different, the Communists, in trying to break from a past in which less than 20% of the people were literate, struggled with similar questions as the Koreans, if for different reasons. The Chinese Communists came close to dropping Chinese characters in favor of Roman script in the 1930s, but did not. As Mao explained to the American journalist Edgar Snow in 1936,

> In order to hasten the liquidation of illiteracy here we have begun experimenting with Hsin Wen Tzu [Xin Wenzi 新文字]—Latinized Chinese. It is now used in our Party school, in the Red Academy, in the Red Army, and in

> a special section of the Red China Daily News. We believe Latinization is a good instrument with which to overcome illiteracy. Chinese characters are so difficult to learn that even the best system of rudimentary characters, or simplified teaching, does not equip the people with a really rich and efficient vocabulary. *Sooner or later, we believe, we will have to abandon characters altogether if we are to create a new social culture in which the masses fully participate*. We are now widely using Latinization and if we stay here for three years the problem will be solved. (quoted in DeFrancis, 2006: 2; emphasis in original)

Four months later, Mao Zedong decided, rather, that reform "should not be divorced from reality or make a break with the past." As Zhou Enlai later told a former French education minister, "All those who had received an education, and whose services we absolutely needed to expand education, were firmly attached to the ideograms [sic]. They were already so numerous, and we had so many things to upset, that we have put off the reform until later" (quoted in DeFrancis, 2006: 4).

7. Reworking Sino-Korean forms

In 2013, President Xi Jinping announced China's New Silk Road project, which seeks to restore the country's old maritime and overland trade route. In Korea, Sungkyunkwan University Professor Lee Hee-ok points out that China's ambitions for hegemony and its rapid rise in economic and military power, coupled with the country's stigmatized image, have led to suspicions over Beijing's motivations. To many, "win-win cooperation" and "common Asian community" sound all too familiar.[27] Linguistically, Korea has thus chosen to distance itself from China and the Sinitic linguistic community (insofar as it has not already

27 Han Woo-duk. (2015). The Chinese Paradox: We must try to solve complexities and awkwardness though diplomacy. *JoongAng Ilbo*, June 1, pp. 1–2.

been dismantled from all directions including its center), choosing *hangeul* as its national brand. To the extent characters are being reintroduced—an effort to rejoin the East Asian "global" community—they are showing up in mainland China-style simplified form as opposed to Sino-Korean-style "complex" style characters, keeping "Chinese" characters an arm's length from Korean. "We never had anything to do with China" seems to be the message. In any event, the shift that occurred in 2005 around the name of Korea's capital has now spread from "Shou-er" to every other field. The name of the "Diary of a Madman" author No Sin 노신 (Lu Xun 魯迅) has become the transliteration Ru Swin 루쉰, a phonetic Korean rendering of the Chinese pronunciation of the Chinese characters, an event Lu Xun himself, one of the primary advocates for the use of Chinese vernacular in literature as part of the May 4th Movement, could only approve.

8. Encoding bloodline in personal names

How does this affect those studying in an East Asian academy here in the golden age of internationalism? As an exchange student in Japan in the late 1980s, I came to be known as "Jyo-se-rin" (ジョセリン)—a *katakana* transliteration of my English name. After moving to China in 1990, I became Ke Jialin (柯嘉琳)—*Ke* for Clark and *Jialin* for Jocelyn. While the choices were based on the pronunciation of my English name, the name assigned (by my teacher) was a perfectly normal Chinese name meaning something like "helve" for *Ke*, "auspicious" for *Jia*, and "beautiful jade" for *lin*. Several years later, arriving in Korea, one of my "boarding house brothers" noticed that my given name, Jocelyn, particularly when pronounced with the *katakana* spelling, sounded just like a Korean name. Given that "my Chinese name" sounded less like

my English name when pronounced in Korean—Ga Ga-lin (가가린)—we picked out Sino-Korean characters for Jo Selin 조세린 (趙世麟), wherein the first syllable of my given name became my Korean surname (Jo). Again, "Jo Selin" follows the rules for a standard Korean name in which "Jo" indicates clan, "Se" indicates generation, and "Lin" indicates a personal name with a meaning something like "the state of Zhao" for *Jo*, "noble" for *se*, and a mythical "unicorn" type auspicious beast for *lin*. At the time, in the early 90s, to give a foreigner an easy-to-remember and pronounce (and write in the three spaces provided on any form) Korean name was not at all unusual. (The assignment of a clan name was completely arbitrary and did not indicate adoption.)

Traveling with my ensemble IIIZ+ for a concert in Taiwan not too long ago, I sent my name to be listed in the program booklet in English followed by "Ke Jialin," the Chinese name I had been using already for 20 years. However, my Chinese name came out in the program booklet as Jiao-shi-lin Ke-la-ke—in other words, a Chinese transliteration of the English much akin to the switch from Hancheng to Shouer. In Korea today, though I always hand reporters my name card where Jo Se-lin is clearly spelled in Korean letters (hangeul: 조세린), my name comes out variously as Jo-sel-lin (조셀린), Jo-seul-lin (조슬린), Jo-sol-lin (조설린), Jyo-se-rin (죠세린), or Jyo-shye-rin (죠셰린) according to the (obviously not very well defined) "rules" for the spelling of foreign words in Korean.

Regardless of a metaphorization of these names that confers the qualities of gem stones and unicorns on me, there is a second process related to metaphorization going on here—to wit, with such names, Jocelyn is not only a gem, but a Chinese *person*, or not only a unicorn but a Korean *person*. It is possible that the formal allowance, and even encouragement, of the name[28]—in a way, indicating a kind of adoption of

a white American "scholar"—provided some kind of "projected gain" to the host culture, a gain that is now rejected either as stigma, or at least something that is not "socially and culturally risk-free."[29] Conversely, it could have been an "honor" for me to have a name bestowed on me in the same way that the "honor" of a Latinized name was conferred on Confucius. In either case, all that has changed today.[30]

---

28 Good Characters, Inc., a mainland Chinese company that helps enterprises choose a Chinese name for their company, explains why you should take a Chinese name on its website,

> When you do business with Chinese, your name plays a role in making a first impression, conveying an image, and expressing the quality of *guanxi* [關係 "relationship"] you will establish. If you don't have an official Chinese translation of your name, Chinese business associates as well as reporters may create names for you. There are hundreds of different ways an English name can be translated into Chinese. But only a carefully selected Chinese name will win respect. When more than one person writes about or refers to you, you can end up with several versions of your Chinese name. The different versions will confuse your clients. Once people start to associate you with a name, it is difficult for you to ask them to change the name without offending them. It's better to take charge and intelligently design your Chinese name than allow it to evolve from one Chinese to another, resulting in names and connotations over which you have no control . . . When you take action by developing a good Chinese name, three positive outcomes result: You help your Chinese associates remember your name; You save people face. When people don't know how to pronounce your name in English, they can always call you by your Chinese name without feeling embarrassed; You demonstrate that you are passionate about the Chinese market and culture. (Good Characters, 2006).

29 Interestingly, as fast as it is working to remove Sino-Korean characters from its language, Korea is filling it with new English terms. This is particularly true in academia as Seoul National University Korean Professor Robert Fouser wrote in the *Korea Herald* on October 14, 2014:

> Korea has embraced globalism and the notion of a "global standard," particularly since the economic crisis of 1997. Today, Korean universities rank scholarship produced in English higher than that produced in Korean. Since the mid-2000s, Korean universities have turned to classes taught in English and, more recently, to hiring foreign professors as part of the "globalization push." The problem with this approach is that it devalues Korean as a language used to produce new knowledge. The act of ranking academic activity in English higher than Korean sends a powerful message that Korean doesn't really count. That message, however it is sent, is the first step in the long process of undermining the vitality of a language.

30 *See* http://askakorean.blogspot.kr/2009/03/you-dont-have-korean-name-unless-you-do.html and http://enseoulment.tumblr.com/post/94434033278/re-foreigners-getting-korean-names.

The naming convention again must give way to global political tensions; as Korea finds its culture being subsumed to iTunes and fast food, it has begun to reconstruct its boundaries by reiterating bloodline values and dialing back what was once seen as advantageous inclusiveness. Names must now be recognizable as imported in print, distinguishing inside from outside, insider from outsider. The renaming of Seoul in Chinese accomplishes the same aim—Seoul becomes something foreign in Chinese, not remaining something familiar, or "ours," in Chinese. Seoul becomes the sole property of the Koreans, erasing all vestiges of the old world order in which China was actually "the central kingdom" (中國)—at the very moment it is moving to the center again.

IV. Conclusion

Loanwords in Korea, Japan, and China—romanized, *hangeulized*, sinicized, and translated—are employed "to create an image of sophistication and modernity, to manage social distance, and to make subtle value judgments" about their places of origin, writes Kevin Heffernan. He continues: "Linguistic code choice has been shown to be influenced by not only interpersonal relationships, but also by the economic and political factors associated with macro-level group relationships. Thus, the choice between transliteration and translation should also be subject to macro-level factors such as . . . political relationship[s]" (Heffernan, 2011: 487).

Given the gentrifying effects of the global digital age, it is no wonder Seoul now wants to remove itself culturally from the Sinitic area of influence—what K.C. Chang (1999) calls the "Chinese interaction sphere" (1999: 59).[31] But today, as always, names circumscribe more than

nations and cities: they mark the boundary between the past and present; between young and old; and between native and non-native ways of being and believing. If there is one message to leave with our students as they perpetually chase after linguistic conventions that endlessly succumb to their socioeconomic circumstances, it is this: it is the changing nature of linguistic conventions that allows us to locate ourselves in the present. Language roots us to our past and the land on which that past occurred. A name is never just a name. Even simple phonetic systems that are thought to be solely transcription tools encode identity.[32] Each embodies its own universe. Nikola Dobrić (2010) writes,

> The process of metaphorization is actually so very important in the way we describe and comprehend the world around us that it is to be expected that it found such an important role in the creation of names. Hence, besides structuring and restructuring the physical world, conceptual metaphors actually structure who we are through the way we chose to mark ourselves when our forefathers decided to give us our designations in the world, our true names, and as we still do when we create new ones. (2010: 145)

With my Chinese name comes the world of Chinese aesthetics,

---

31 As Kim et al., (2012) write,

> Korea was-for very many centuries-unashamedly Sinocentric. When Koreans spoke of *sadaejui* (師大, or serving the great), they spoke of serving China. Indeed, Koreans went so far as to label their own society "little China," and after the fall of China's "legitimate" Ming dynasty and its takeover by the "barbarian" Manchus in the 17th Century, the Yangban elite of the Joseon dynasty considered Korea to be the sole bastion of Chinese civilization (or rather, neo-Confucian civilization) . . . It was within this Sinocentric setting that the capital city of Hanseong/Hancheng emerged and thrived; there is every reason to believe that the Koreans themselves readily adopted a name connoting "Chinese city" (or Hancheng/Hanseong) for their own capital city in order to infuse it with an air of high [Chinese] civilization (2012: 6-7).

32 *See* Li, W.C. (2012).

philosophy, music, and movement. With my Korean name comes the whole history of the Korean peninsula in the 20th century—a tribal and social class system, the Korean War, Korean-American politics. My English name tells you of my part-Irish-Catholic heritage and my parents' breaking with that tradition with my first and middle names.

Each name comes with a language, a history, a sound, a system of etiquette, personal mannerisms, preferred shapes, cuisines, weaves of cloth, religions, biases, beliefs, castes, cosmologies . . . land inhabited and land lost. As Confucius taught, each naming confers a whole new universe and way to see oneself in it. In these global times, the same might be said of one's language: in each oral intonation or written character resides a universe in which a nation or a person may be found or lost.

Submitted: 2015.11.02.
First revision received: 2015.12.02.
Accepted: 2015.12.02.

REFERENCES

Anderson, J. (2007). *The Grammar of Names*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ashcroft, B. (2009). *Caliban's Voice: The Transformation of English in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London and New York: Routledge.

Ashcroft, B. (2011). Translation and Transformation. In Oriana Palusci (ed.) *Traduttrici: Female Voices Across Languages* Trento: Tangram Edizioni Scientifiche, 25-46.

Backe, C. (2015). A look at Korea's newest slogan - and a story I've never publicly told before. Oct. 29. http://www.oneweirdglobe.com/a-look-at-koreas-newest-slogan-and-a-story-ive-never-publicly-told-before/. Retrieved 31 October 2015.

Cao, D. (2005). "Seoul" morphs into Chinese "Shouer." *China Daily*, January 20.

Chang, G. (2015). Will China Colonize North Korea? Oct. 29. http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2015/10/29/will-china-colonize-north-korea.html. Retrieved 29 October 2015.

Chang, K. C. (1999). China on the Eve of the Historical Period. In The *Cambridge History of Ancient China*. Loewe, M. & Shaughnessy, E.L. (Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 37-73.

Chen, Z. (2012). Embracing the Complexities in China-ROK Relations: A View from China. *Asian Perspectives* 36(2), 195-218.

Cheng, Z. (1991). *New Dimensions of Confucian and Neo-Confucian Philosophy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Chinese Text Project. (2014). http://ctext.org/analects/zi-lu.

Coates, R. (2004). Invisible Britons: the view from linguistics. Paper circulated in connection with the conference *Britons and Saxons*, April 14-16. University of Sussex Linguistics and English Language Department. http://www.sussex.ac.uk/linguistics/documents/rc_britons.pdf. Accessed 3 December 2014.

Connolly, M., & Gordon, I. (2013). Timeline: A Century of Racist Sports Team Names. *Mother Jones*, November 1.

http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2013/10/timeline-history-offensive-sports-mascots-redskins-snyder. Accessed 8 December 2015.

Dobrić, N. (2010). Theory of Names and Cognitive Linguistics—The Case of the Metaphor. *Filozofija i društvo (Philosophy and Society)* 1(21), 135-147.

Dragoescu, A. (2012). Cocktails as Metaphors: An Inquiry into Drink Names, in Georgeta Raţă, Ioan Petroman and Cornelia Petroman (Eds.), *The English of Tourism*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 263-274.

Fouser, R. (2014). Preserving the vitality of Korean. *Korea Herald*. October 14.

Good Characters, Inc. (2006). goodcharacters.com newsletter. Summer.

Han Woo-duk. (2015). The Chinese Paradox: We must try to solve complexities and awkwardness though diplomacy. *JoongAng Ilbo*, June 1, 1-2.

Hannas, W. (1991). Korean Views on Writing Reform. Mair, Victor H., ed., *Schriftfestschrift: Essays in Honor of John DeFrancis on His Eightieth Birthday*. Sino-Platonic Papers #27, 85-94.

Heffernan, K. (2011). Questioning the primacy of linguistic factors in Chinese and Japanese loanword adaptation trends (汉语与日语借词策略与语言系統的相关性之释疑). *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, 39(2), 478-491.

Held, D., McGrew A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). Global Transformations. https://www.polity.co.uk/global/whatisglobalization.asp. Retrieved 20 October 2015.

Im, M. (2008). Rectification of Names. *Manyul Im's Chinese Philosopy Blog*. (zhengming, 正名)" https://manyulim.wordpress.com/2008/01/28/rectification-of-names-zhengming-正名. Retrieved 20 October 2015.

Japan Times. (2002). Katakana system may be Korean, professor says. *The Japan Times*, April 4.

Kelly, C. (2014). Alaska becomes the second state to officially recognize indigenous language. www.ktoo.org. April 21.

Kim, C. (金昌辰) (2011). 日本語.中國語 外來語表記法의 廢棄 必要性 (Abolition

necessity of loanword orthography of Japanese and Chinese). 語文硏究 *Eomun yeon'gu (The Society for Korean Language & Literary Research)* 39(4), 57−80.

Kim, H., Mauch, P., & Horesh, N. (2012). Seoul searching: the history, politics and prejudice behind the re-naming of the Korea's capital in Chinese. *Provincial China* 4(1), 1−26.

Klempner, G. (1999−2000). Ask a Philosopher: Questions and Answers 3 (1st series). *Pathways to Philosophy*, 1st series. http://www.philosophypathways.com/questions/answers3.html.Retrieved28 October2015.

Kwon, O. (2012). *Musicology characteristics and international analyses of Arirang. Korean Musicology Series 5: Korean Folksong Arirang*. Yoo Eun-seon, (Ed.). Seoul: The National Gugak Center.

Legge, J., trans. (2011). *The Analects* [of Confucius] (論語), "Zi Lu (子路)." In Sturgeon, Donald (Ed.), *Chinese Text Project*. http://ctext.org/analects/zi-lu. Retrieved 30 October 2015.

Legge, J. (2011). Yan Yuan (顔淵). In Sturgeon, Donald (Ed.), *Chinese Text Project*. http://ctext.org/analects/yan-yuan.

Li, W. C. (李文肇) (2012). "羅馬拼音與注音符號：記音工具或認同指標？ Romanization and the Mandarin Phonetic Symbols: Transcription Tool or Symbol of National Identity? Taiwan. *Central Daily News*, November 6.

McMahon, A. (1994). *Understanding language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martinson, E. (2015). McKinley no more: Alaska's tallest peak to be renamed Denali. *Alaska Dispatch News*, Aug. 30. http://www.adn.com/article/20150830/mckinley-no-more-north-americas-tallest-peak-be-renamed-denali. Accessed 28 October 2015.

Muller, A. C. (2008). Wonhyo and Logic. http://www.acmuller.net/articles/tgu-kiyo-2008-wonhyo-logic.html. Accessed 29 October 2015.

Muller, A. C., trans. (2015). *The Analects of Confucius*. 論語.

http://www.acmuller.net/con-dao/analects.html. Accessed 31 October 2015.

Robinson, C. (2014). Knowing Linguistic Conventions. *South African Journal of Philosophy*, 33(2), 167–176.

Rosen, Y. (2013). Century after peak first scaled, Alaska mountain's name still disputed. *Reuters*, April 27, 2013.

Shim, J. (沈在箕) (2004). 國漢混用論의 歷史.文化的 背景 (A theoretical background to the Hangul–Hanja mixed script), 漢字敎育과 漢字政策에 對한 國際學術會議 (International conference on the education and policy of Chinese characters) 韓國語文敎育硏究會, Seoul, National University of Education, 246.

Swagel, W. (2012). Spanning far beyond the borders of its region. *Alaska Business Monthly*, October 1. The Free Library. http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Spanning+far+beyond+the+borders+of+its+region.-a0306857109. Retrieved 4 December 2014.

Textetc.com. (2014). Bakhtin. http://www.textetc.com/theory/bakhtin.html.

Tranter, N. (1997). Hybrid Anglo–Japanese Loans in Korean. *Linguistics* 35, 135.

Winter, W. (1973). Areal Linguistics: some general considerations. In Tohomas A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Current trends in linguistics 11: diachronic, areal and typological linguistics*. The Hague: Mouton, 135–48.

ABSTRACT

Rectifying Names:

Ideographs, Phonetics, and Identities

Jocelyn Clark, Ph.D. (조세린)

As the relationships between South Korea and China, in particular, and between East Asia and the West, in a broader sense, change over time, power structures embedded in language are also changing. This article explores dynamics surrounding the question of who gets to decide issues of proper naming (or un-naming), pronunciation, and phono-semantic matching and approaches for orienting students to the ever-changing terrain of linguistic conventions when teaching language and other courses. After laying some historical and philosophical groundwork and illustrating the effects of fluid power relationships and socioeconomic conditions on linguistic conventions through two American examples, we cross the Pacific to explore linguistic and naming shifts taking place in Asia.

Cases examined include the renaming of Seoul in Chinese in 2005 from Hancheng to Shou'er, as well as the shift in Korea from using Sino-Korean pronunciations for Chinese names to the *hangeulization* of the Chinese pronunciation—for instance, from Bukgyeong (Sino-Korean) to Be-yi-jing (*hangeulization* of Chinese) for China's capital, Beijing, in contemporary Korean. The article also explores foreigners' practice of adopting "native" names in East Asia and how that is changing as nations endeavor to reinforce their linguistic and cultural borders against ongoing effects of globalization.

KEYWORDS romanization, hangeulization, transliteration, kanaization, phono-semantic matching, kana, Sino-Korean, zhengming, jeongmyeong, rectifying names, Alaska Native languages, Hancheng, Hanseong, Shou'er, Bukgyeong, Be-yi-jing, Chinese names, Korean names, language and power, Washington Redskins, Denali, Mt. McKinley