

# Approaching the Korean Language and Script through Cultural Heritage: On the Role of *Tongŭipogam* 東醫寶鑑 in Julius Klaproth's Writings on Korean and His Correspondence with the Humboldt Brothers\* \*\*

Sven Osterkamp\*\*\*

## Contents

1. Introduction
2. Klaproth's glossaries of Korean
  - 2.1. untitled glossary (1823: 333-343), 524 word forms in 368 entries
  - 2.2. "Vocabulaire de la langue coréenne" (1829: 42-48), 295 word forms in 196 entries
  - 2.3. "Vocabulaire Coréen" (1832a: 123-144), 681 word forms in 465 entries
3. Klaproth's accounts of the Korean script
4. A letter to the Humboldt brothers
5. Conclusion

---

\* This paper was supported by BK21plus <Research and Education Program on Culture-based Korean Language and Literature in the Yeongnam Province> Department of Korean Language and Literature, Kyungpook National University.

\*\* The author would like to thank Professor Choi Dong-Ju 崔東柱 of Yeungnam University for his valuable comments on the original version of this paper as presented at the 1st International Conference "The UNESCO *Memory of the World* Programme and the Korean Culture" (Kyungpook National University; October 13-14, 2014).

\*\*\* Ruhr University Bochum, Faculty of East Asian Studies, Chair for Japanese Language and Literature / sven.osterkamp@rub.de

## 1. Introduction

Julius Klaproth (1783–1835) was neither the first to introduce specimens of the Korean language to European scholarship in the form of word lists, nor was he the first to introduce the Korean script or even to give an account of Korean grammar. He was, however, the first Western scholar to publish both on the Korean language and script, drawing upon Western as well as East Asian sources. Furthermore, as will become apparent in the following, his work on the language cannot be properly understood in isolation but only in conjunction with a consideration of his work on the script, and vice versa.

Up to Klaproth's time Western knowledge of Korean was largely confined to the same set of words ultimately going back to Hendrik Hamel (1630–1692) and his companions, which had been put into use time and time again for more than a century already.<sup>1)</sup> Things change to some extent with the voyages of discovery by William Robert Broughton (1762–1821) and later Basil Hall (1788–1844), but East Asian sources – be they of Korean provenance or of Chinese or Japanese origin – were still entirely untapped. Also, all these glossaries up to the early 19th century consisted of entries that never went beyond the level of isolated words, most typically nouns: They did not even contain short phrases, let alone actual sentences so that the structure and grammar of the language was, as it were, invisible to early Western observers. While the latter is still largely true of Klaproth's work, it was at the same time a step into a new direction as he made extensive use of East Asian sources.

The Korean script on the other hand started to become known to several scholars – chiefly Louis-Mathieu Langlès (1763–1824), Lorenzo Hervás (1735–1809), Joseph Hager (1757–1819) – during the 1790s on several routes. It was however only in 1820 with the work of Jean-Pierre Abel-Rémusat (1788–1832), based on what Langlès had earlier received from the missionaries in Beijing, and especially during the 1830s – with scholars such as Philipp Franz von Siebold (1796–1866),

---

1) See Osterkamp (2010) for an overview of Western knowledge of Korean up to the late 18th century.

Karl Gützlaff (1803–1851), Walter Henry Medhurst (1796–1857), as well as Klaproth himself – that more or less reliable accounts of the scripts became widely available. What distinguishes Klaproth here from those preceding him is the fact that he was for the first time dealing with an actual text containing a number of phrases in Korean as early as circa 1811.<sup>2)</sup>

In an earlier (as of now however unpublished) paper this author has already drawn attention to the medical encyclopedia *Tongŭi pogam* 東醫寶鑑 – more specifically: a Chinese reprint of the same work – as one of Klaproth's sources on both the Korean language and script.<sup>3)</sup> Several years later it turned out that a letter from Klaproth which provides us with further evidence in this direction is preserved among the linguistic papers of Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835), which are nowadays in the possession of the Jagiellonian Library in Krakow. We take this occasion to introduce this letter, which is of some interest to the early history of Western studies of Korean, to scholarship and at the same time to reconsider Klaproth's work on Korean in general in more detail than was possible in the earlier paper.

---

2) Out of the scholars preceding him he was most likely merely aware of Hager and his "Alphabet of Corea". In his Dissertation on the newly discovered Babylonian Inscriptions Hager (1801: 56) explicitly refers to his account of the Korean script in Ouseley's Oriental Collections, and it was none other than Klaproth who translated this work into German. The reference to Hager's earlier publication is found intact in the translation (see Klaproth 1802a: 522 and 1802b: 86).

Langlès on the other hand had not published anything concrete on the script and Hervás's work (namely his *Paleografía universal*, preserved in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid, Mss. 8496–8498, a detailed study of which by this author will be published in the nearer future) never made it beyond the manuscript stage and was therefore virtually unknown for long.

3) Osterkamp (to appear). The paper was entitled "Klaproth's Korean kmis, or: On the manners of distortion of the Japanese and Korean scripts seen in some early foreign sources" and was presented at the 7th The Idea of Writing conference (Einsiedeln, Switzerland; June 9–10, 2010).

## 2. Klaproth's glossaries of Korean

Korea had been a country of interest to Klaproth from early on, as evidenced by the fact that one of his very first publications is concerned with the same country (see Klaproth 1800). As far as the language and script of Korea is concerned, the earliest plans for a publication appear to date from about 1814: According to a German-language journal (*Morgenblatt* 1814: 332) he was planning to include a chapter on Korea and the language of that country in the account of his travels through Siberia etc. However it does not appear ever to have been published according to this plan.

Between 1823 and 1832 Klaproth eventually published no less than three glossaries of Korean, drawing upon a greater variety of sources than anyone before him in Europe. Most of the sources for these glossaries are explicitly named in the accompanying explanations, albeit not necessarily in the same way on all three occasions.

### 2.1. untitled glossary (1823: 333-343), 524 word forms in 368 entries

“Es ist dasselbe aus mehreren Quellen zusammen getragen. Den Grund dazu legt ein Chinesisch-Koreanisches Vocabular, das in der grossen Encyclopedie *Ku-kin-t'u-mu*, abgedruckt ist. Die aus demselben entlehnten Wörter sind nicht besonders bezeichnet worden. Aber die aus der Japanischen Encyclopedie genommenen sind durch † unterschieden; die aus einem in Korea selbst gedruckten medizinischen Werke durch \*; und die aus *Broughton* oder *Witsen* entlehnten durch (b) und (w).” (Klaproth 1823: 335)

[It [= the glossary] has been gathered from several sources. The foundation is laid by a Chinese-Korean glossary found in the large encyclopedia *Ku-kin-t'u-mu* [= *Gujin tushu jicheng* 古今圖書集成]. The words borrowed from this one are not specially marked. However, those taken from the Japanese encyclopedia [= *Wakan Sansai zue* 和漢三才圖會] are distinguished from the rest by means of †; those from a medical work

printed in Korea herself [= Tongŭi pogam] by means of \*; and those borrowed from Broughton or Witsen by means of (b) and (w).]

We are therefore dealing with five different sources here: Two European ones, namely Witsen (1692/1705) and Broughton (1804); one source each of Chinese and Japanese provenance, namely the glossaries found in *Jilin leishi* 雞林類事 and *Wakan Sansai zue* (which was commonly known in Europe simply as “the Japanese encyclopedia” at the time) respectively; finally an untitled medical work, allegedly printed in Korea. This is where *Tongŭi pogam* comes in, as will be demonstrated below.

Klaproth's first glossary is the only one of all three that makes use of several symbols to explicitly indicate the respective sources of the Korean words. The distribution of these symbols is as follows. Note that the medical work, i.e. *Tongŭi pogam*, ranges as the second most important source here.



## 2.2. “Vocabulaire de la langue coréenne” (1829: 42–48), 295 word forms in 196 entries

The second of Klaproth's glossaries was published as an appendix to his “Mémoire sur l'introduction et l'usage des caractères chinois au Japon, et sur l'origine des différens syllabaires japonais; suivi d'un vocabulaire coréen”, or “Notes on the introduction and use of Chinese characters in Japan and on the origin of the Japanese syllabaries; followed by a Korean vocabulary”. This time the information provided regarding his sources is extremely vague (and accordingly no attempt at all is made to mark the respective sources of the Korean words, as was the case in the 1823 glossary):

“Il est extrait de livres chinois et japonais, ainsi que d'un ouvrage de

médecine imprimé dans le pays même. Les mots d'origine chinoise y sont imprimés en lettres romaines.” (Klaproth 1829: 44)

[It [= the glossary] was extracted from Chinese and Japanese books, as well as from a medical work printed in the country itself. The words of Chinese origin are printed in Antiqua type.]

Despite Klaproth's claim that all sources are of East Asian provenance, we still find a number of words deriving from Witsen or Broughton as before. In effect, the list of sources is therefore the same as it was back in 1823.

### 2.3. “Vocabulaire Coréen” (1832a: 123–144), 681 word forms in 465 entries

The third and last glossary forms part of Klaproth's French adaptation of Hayashi Shihei's 林子平 (1738–1793) *Sangoku tsūran zusetsu* 三國通覽圖說 (which had earlier already served as Joseph Hager's only source on the Korean script in 1800). The following pieces of information are provided here:

“La liste des mots coréens que je fais suivre ici, est double; les mots de la première colonne sont ceux du Vocabulaire de cette langue, intitulé *Ki lin lui szu*, ou Collection de mots des *Ki lin* (ou *Ghirin*), rédigé par *Sun moï* et inséré dans la grande Collection intitulée *Kou kin thou chou* (Section des Sciences, Philologie, vol. 144, fol. 21 et suiv.) J'ai rangé ces mots dans un meilleur ordre qu'ils ne l'étaient dans l'original, la prononciation est la chinoise, et par conséquent elle ne se rapproche pas toujours beaucoup de celle des indigènes. Ce défaut est en partie corrigé par la seconde colonne, qui contient les mots coréens, extraits d'un ouvrage original en caractères coréens, de la grande Encyclopédie japonaise, et des Vocabulaires donnés par Witsen et par M. le docteur de Siebold.” (Klaproth 1832a: 123)

[The list of Korean words I let follow here is twofold: The words in the first column are those of the vocabulary of that language entitled *Ki*

*lin lui szu* [= *Jilin leishi*], or Collection of words from *Ki lin* (or *Ghirin*) [= *Jilin* / *Kyerim*], written by *Sun moŭ* [= Sun Mu 孫穆] and included in the great collection entitled *Kou kin thou chou* [= *Gujin tushu jicheng*] (section on science, philology, volume 144, leafs 21ff.). I have arranged them in a better order than in the original; the pronunciation is Chinese, and therefore it does not always come too close to the native one. This defect is partially remedied by the second column, which contains Korean words extracted from an original work in Korean characters, from the great Japanese encyclopedia and from the vocabularies provided by Witsen and Dr. von Siebold.]

The only real addition is thus the glossary compiled by Siebold mentioned at the very end. As this author has demonstrated elsewhere, this derives from an article on the origin of the Japanese people written by Siebold during his time in Japan in the 1820s, which Klaproth had to review in Paris (see Osterkamp 2009: 189–191).

While words from *Jilin leishi* are placed in a column of their own and are thus readily identified in this glossary, all words taken from the remaining sources lack an indication as to where exactly they derive from.

---

For all three glossaries Klaproth therefore refers to a medical work allegedly printed in Korea, however without providing its title for reasons unknown. The same work is also alluded to in his correspondence with Philipp Franz von Siebold, which touches upon the Korean language and script several times. In a letter dated September 2, 1832 he thus writes:

“Übrigens habe ich in Petersburg ziemlich viel Koreanische Wörter gesammelt, besonders Namen von Arzneistoffen, die ich in einem chinesischen Medizinischen Buch in koreanischen Originalcharacteren abgedruckt fand.” (Walravens 2002: 106)

[Besides, I collected a considerable number of Korean words in St. Petersburg, especially names of drugs, which I found printed in a Chinese medical book in original Korean characters.]

This provides us with one important hint, namely that while all three glossaries were published during Klaproth's time in Paris (1815–1835), the acquisition of one important source on Korean actually dates back to his time in the services of the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg. It was in early 1811 that he left St. Petersburg for good, so that he must have compiled a list of Korean words based on some medical work by that time at the latest – possibly without noting down the work's title.

To the best of this author's knowledge there has only been a single attempt to pinpoint the exact source used for the glossaries. Ogura (1929: 55) already assumed that Klaproth had either *Tongŭi pogam* or *Chejung sinp'yŏn* 濟衆新編 (1799) in mind, while he later explicitly names *Tongŭi pogam* as Klaproth's source, without further discussion however (Ogura 1938: (2)). Now if we take a number of words – such as those in table 1A below – marked by means of an asterisk \* as being taken “from a medical work printed in Korea herself” in Klaproth's 1823 glossary and check whether they are present in *Tongŭi pogam* (or rather in its “t'angaek-p'yŏn” 湯液篇 volumes to be more specific) or not, the result is obvious: They are found in the latter work without exception, so that the correctness of Ogura's assumption can be confirmed.

1A	meaning	Klaproth 1823 <sup>4)</sup>	<i>Tongŭi pogam</i>
1	millet (Kl.: wheat)	<i>Dso-bsâl</i> 'Weitzen'	粟米 조밭 (I/17v)
2	garlic	<i>manal</i> 'Knoblauch'	大蒜 마늘 (II/31v)
3	wild duck	<i>Moi ol chi</i> 'Ente, wilde'	野鴨肉 뉘올히 (I/36r)
4	quince	<i>Mo-kua</i> 'Quitte'	木瓜 모과 (II/20v)
5	hail	<i>Mu-lui</i> 'Hagel'	雹 무뤼 (I/15v)
6	louse	<i>Ni</i> 'Laus'	蝨子 니 (II/16r)
7	urine	<i>Odsom</i> 'Urin'	人尿 오줌 (I/32r)
8	alcoholic drink (Kl.: wine)	<i>Sur</i> 'Wein'	酒 술 (I/27v)
9	pomegranate	<i>Illek-niu</i> 'Granate'	石榴 석뉴 (II/23v)
10	walnut	<i>Tang-ču-dsa</i> 'Walnuss'	胡桃 당쥬즈 (II/24v)
11	swamp eel (Kl.: eel)	<i>Telengheli</i> 'Aal'	鱧魚 드렁허리 (II/3v)
12	melon	<i>Tzam-oy</i> 'Melone'	骷瓜 춤외 (II/28v)
13	vinegar	<i>Tzo</i> 'Essig'	醋 초 (I/29v)



14	pond snail (Kl.: slug)	<i>Ulongy</i> 'Schnecke, nackte'	田螺 우롱이 (II/12r)
----	---------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------

Besides such cases with regular correspondences we also find several instances of what appears to be the result of misreadings committed by Klaproth. In all cases quoted below in table 1B we are dealing with pairs of letters or letter combinations of similar shape (at least to someone with only a limited knowledge of the Korean script and next to no knowledge at all of the Korean language, so that reading errors were almost impossible to correct based on prior knowledge or context). As will become clear below these are, at least in part, not necessarily his errors however – but rather valuable indicators of the real nature of the *Tongŭi pogam* Klaproth had access to in St. Petersburg.

1B	meaning	Klaproth 1823	<i>Tongŭi pogam</i>	errors
1	tadpole (Kl.: frog)	<i>Alzangy</i> 'Frosch'	活師 울창이 (II/16v)	을→을
2	scorpion	<i>Dsain-kal</i> 'Skorpion'	蝎 전갈 (II/15r)	ㅋ→ㅇ
3	radish	<i>En-mu-u</i> 'Rettig'	蔓菁 권무우 (II/27v) 萊菔 댐무우 (II/27v)	권/댄→언 (?)
4	saltpeter	<i>Jet-šo</i> 'Salpeter'	焰硝 염소 (III/48v)	ㅍ→ㅊ
5	frog (Kl.: toad)	<i>Kiokoli</i> 'Kröte'	蝦蟇 개고리 (II/10v)	(ㅏ=)ㅏㅏ→ ㅏㅏ
6	large spider	<i>Melkemei</i> 'Spinne'	蜘蛛 물거미 (II/13v)	ㅏ→ㅏ

- 4) For the transcription of the various languages treated in his *Asia Polyglotta* Klaproth had devised his own standardized system to represent speech sounds in a uniform way (outlined in Klaproth 1823: [xiii]–xv). In this system – in a sense a forerunner of the International Phonetic Alphabet – every symbol (chiefly Roman and Cyrillic letters, sometimes combined into ligatures, with or without diacritical marks added to them) has a constant sound value. Klaproth's original transcriptions have been imitated here as faithfully as possible, including his use of the Cyrillic letters <ш, ж, ч> (for [ʃ], [ʒ] and [ʧ]). The only exceptions are his ligatures <ng, ds, dʒ> rendering [ŋ], [dʒ] and [dʒ], which are rewritten here as the digraphs they derive from. Further note that his <с̄> renders simple voiceless [s] and <z> the affricate [ʧ], the latter as in German for instance.

7	millet (Kl.: rye)	<i>Nidkingbšal</i> 'Roggen'	黍米 기장밭 (I/24r)	ㄱ→ㄴ ㅏ→ㅑ
8	carp's gall bladder (Kl.: carp)	<i>Niéndselkio</i> 'Karpfen'	鯉魚膽 니어발게 (II/1r)	ㅂ→ㅍㅈ ㅑ→?
9	alum	<i>Niī-pan</i> 'Alaun'	礬石 빅번 (III/45r)	빅→ㄴ     ㄱ →ㅏ
10	kingfisher (Kl.: sea gull)	<i>Oi-siai</i> 'Möwe'	魚狗 쇠새 (I/39v)	쇠→외 새→새
11	hemp	<i>Sampni</i> 'Hanf'	麻子 삼베 (I/21r)	ㅅ→ㄴ
12	ginger	<i>Seng-kang</i> 'Ingwer'	生薑 싱강 (II/25v)	싱→성 (?)
13	ginseng	<i>Sip</i> 'Ginseng'	人參 심 (II/37v)	ㅍ→ㅂ
14	chestnut	<i>tiam</i> 'Kastanie'	栗子 밤 (II/18v)	ㅂ→디
15	marten	<i>Ton-koe</i> 'Zobel'	貂鼠 돈피 (I/58v)	ㅍ→고

Apart from such cases with single words in Klaproth's glossary corresponding to entries likewise consisting of single words in *Tongtŭi pogam*, there are also a number of cases of words extracted from originally much longer entries. In order to extract single words out of such longer entries, Klaproth had to parse the entire phrase and try to figure out the word boundaries in Korean based on the corresponding Chinese. Consider the words from Klaproth's glossary and the corresponding phrases in *Tongtŭi pogam* given in table 2A below. In several cases Klaproth obviously noticed that the original Korean phrase contains an attributive particle (i.e. *ŭi* 의) in between two nouns.

2A	meaning	Klaproth 1823	<i>Tongtŭi pogam</i>
1	egg	<i>Al</i> 'Ei'	鷄子 둥의알 (I/35r)
2	snake	<i>Baijam</i> 'Schlange'	烏蛇 거문빅압 (II/12v) (etc.)
3	soft-shelled turtle (Kl: other kind of turtle)	<i>Dxa-la</i> 'Schildkröte, ander Art'	龜甲 자리등굽질 (II/6v)
4	sheep	<i>Jang</i> 'Schaaf'	羴羊角 수양의של (I/47v) 羴羊角 산양의של (I/48v) [cf. 2A.23]
5	autumn	<i>kā,āl</i> [!] 'Herbst'	秋露水 ㅁ을이슬물 (I/15v)
6	skin, hide	<i>Kadsok</i> 'Fell, Haut'	豹皮 승냥의기죽 (I/57r) 敗鼓皮 메워오라ㅎ여던기죽 (I/58v)

7	goose	<i>Ke-ju</i> 'Gans'	白鵝肉 흰거위 (I/35v)
8	winter	<i>Kie-äl</i> 'Winter'	冬霜 겨울에온서리 (I/15v)
9	grease (Kl.: claw [指 ←脂]) <sup>5)</sup>	<i>Ki-lem</i> 'Tatze'	熊脂 곰의기름 (I/43r)
10	meat	<i>Koki</i> 'Fleisch'	驢肉 나귀고기 (I/54v) etc.
11	bear	<i>Kom</i> 'Bär'	熊脂 곰의기름 (I/43r)
12	black	<i>K'omen</i> 'Schwarz'	烏雄鷄肉 거믄수돚 (I/33v)
13	musk deer	<i>Kuk-nol</i> 'Moschusthier'	麝香 국놀의비쑤 (I/41r)
14	horse	<i>Mal</i> 'Pferd'	白馬鬃 흰몰음강 (I/45r) 馬刀 몰십쑤개 (II/11v) etc.
15	dried excrements (Kl.: excrements)	<i>Malenstong</i> 'Unflath'	人屎 사름의믄른쑤 (I/32v) [cf. 2A.22]
16	wax	<i>Myl</i> 'Wachs'	蜜蠟 누른밀 (II/5v) 白蠟 흰밀 (II/5v)
17	freshwater tortoise (Kl.: turtle)	<i>Namtieng</i> , 'Schildkröte'	龜甲 남성의등갑질 (II/6r)
18	tooth	<i>Ni</i> 'Zahn'	牙齒 싸던니 (I/31r) 齒涎 니예브튼적 (I/31r)
19	dragon	<i>Niong</i> 'Drache'	龍骨 뽕의쑤 (I/41r)
20	foot	<i>Pal</i> 'Fuss'	人爪甲 손뚝발뚝 (I/33r) [cf. 2A.24/26]
21	red	<i>Pelken</i> 'Roth'	丹雄鷄肉 붉은수돚 (I/33r) [cf. 2B.10/11]
22	human	<i>Saram</i> 'Mensch'	人屎 사름의믄른쑤 (I/32v) [cf. 2A.15]
23	horn	<i>Sbel</i> 'Horn'	殺羊角 수양의쑤 (I/47v) 羚羊角 산양의쑤 (I/48v) [cf. 2A.4]
24	hand	<i>Son</i> 'Hand'	人爪甲 손뚝발뚝 (I/33r) [cf. 2A.20/26]
25	iron	<i>Soy</i> 'Eisen'	生鐵 무쇠 (III/54r) 銅鐵 시우쇠 (III/54r) 鐵屑 쇠쑤 (III/54r)
26	nail	<i>T'ob</i> 'Nagel, am Finger'	人爪甲 손뚝발뚝 (I/33r) [cf. 2A.20/24]
27	stone	<i>Tol</i> 'Stein'	滑石 곱돌 (III/46r) 方解石 촛돌 (III/47r) 水泡石 속돌 (III/51r)
28	tea	<i>Tza</i> 'Thee'	苦茶 작설차 (III/35r) [cf. 3.2]

As might be expected from the above, there are also cases reflecting correct parsing of phrases, but containing misreadings and sometimes semantic misinterpretations. A number of such cases are given in table 2B below.

2B	meaning	Klaproth 1823	<i>Tongŭi pogam</i>	errors
1	earth, soil	<i>Chli</i> 'Erde'	西壁土 선덕히딜제찌는 번름흙 (I/19r) etc.	흙→ㅎ리
2	milk (sth. pressed out) (Kl.: breasts [乳])	<i>Dsa-ni</i> 'Brüste'	人乳汁 젓짜니 (I/31v)	짜→즈
3	mouse	<i>Dsuei</i> 'Maus'	牡鼠肉 수쥐고기 (I/58r) 鼯鼠 두디쥐 (I/58v) 鼠婦 쥐머느리 (II/16r)	쥐→?
4	first month [正月] (Kl.: spring [春])	<i>Dxenguyŭl</i> 'Frühling'	春雨水 정월 처업온반믈 (I/15r) [cf. 3.7]	월→일
5	dog	<i>Ka-hi</i> 'Hund'	牡狗陰莖 수가희음강 (I/51v)	희→히
6	milk	<i>Kmiš</i> 'Milch'	人乳汁 젓짜니 (I/31v) 牛乳 쇠젓 (I/44r)	젓→ㄱㅁ   ㅅ
7	sulfur	<i>Liu-cheang</i> 'Schwefel'	石硫黃 석류황 (III/46v)	황→향
8	donkey	<i>Nele</i> 'Esel'	驢肉 나귀고기 (I/54v)	ㅏ→ㄱ 귀→러
9	oil	<i>Nilem</i> 'Öhl'	白油麻油 흰층빼기름 (I/21r) vs. 白油麻 흰층빼 (I/20v)	ㄱ→ㄴ
10	male	<i>Sek</i> 'Männchen'	丹雄鷄肉 불근수닭	수→숙
11	rooster	<i>Sek-târk</i> 'Hahn'	(I/33r) etc. [cf. 2A.21]	
12	roe deer	<i>Sol</i> 'Reh'	麋骨 돌의씨 (I/47v)	ㄴ→ㅅ
13	pine (Kl.: spruce)	<i>Soma-mo</i> 'Fichte'	松脂 소나무진 (III/25v) 松蘿 소나무우희송낙 (III/37v)	ㄴ→ㅁ

In parsing such longer Korean phrases Klaproth's only option was to rely on the corresponding Chinese phrases preceding them, which however sometimes led him astray in his analysis. In a number of cases he therefore ended up with non-existing Korean words, based on the false assumption that

5) Klaproth's translation of his *Ki-lem* as 'claw' suggests that he misread 脂 as 指 here.

the Chinese and Korean phrases are structurally identical, consisting of the same number of words or morphemes with more or less identical meanings. Consider the following examples in table 3, all of which are ghost words resulting from various parsing errors:

3	intended meaning	Klaproth 1823	<i>Tongŭi pogam</i>	errors
1	copper	<i>Dsi</i> 'Kupfer'	銅鐵 시우쇠 (III/54r)	ハ→ス
2	bitter (vs. sparrow's tongue [雀舌])	<i>Dxakmiél</i> 'Bitter'	苦茶 작설차 (III/35r) [cf. 2A.28]	—
3	summer	<i>E</i> 'Sommer'	夏氷 여름 (I/15v) [cf. 3.6]	—
4	camel	<i>jak</i> 'Kameel'	野駝脂 약대기름 (I/57v)	—
5	spring	<i>Kotzan</i> 'Quell'	冷泉 맛시펄고춘물 (I/17v)	—
6	ice	<i>Lem</i> 'Eis'	夏氷 여름 (I/15v) [cf. 3.3]	—
7	rain	<i>Pŭt</i> 'Regen' <sup>6)</sup>	春雨水 정일처엄온뵈물 (I/15r) [cf. 2B.4]	—
8	frost	<i>Sel</i> 'Thau'	秋露水 마을이슬물 (I/15v)	—
9	salt	<i>So</i> 'Salz'	食鹽 조곰 (III/49r)	—

While most of the various parsing errors can be attributed to a too strong reliance on the Chinese equivalents of the Korean phrases, the tremendous amount of gross misinterpretations of the Korean script (tables 1B, 2B) is however startling for a scholar such as Klaproth, who was acquainted with a large variety of languages and scripts. As will be demonstrated below a significant number of these errors can be explained by assuming a Chinese reprint rather than a Korean edition as Klaproth's immediate source. At this point it seems advisable however to have a closer look at Klaproth's publications on the Korean script first – as these provide further and even more obvious evidence for the involvement of a non-Korean reprint.

6) While the form with final -t is, strictly speaking, a ghost word, it is needless to say rather close to actual Korean pi 'rain'. This case therefore stands out among the rest in table 3.

### 3. Klaproth's accounts of the Korean script

Klaproth's two published accounts of the Korean script are not only largely identical in content, they also both date to the year 1832.<sup>7)</sup> They thus set in only much later than his work on the Korean language in form of the aforementioned glossaries. Nevertheless they contain materials that were collected considerably earlier, as Klaproth writes in the letter to Siebold referred to above:

“Das Koreanische Syllabar das ich in meiner Übersetzung des *San kokf tsu ran* beigefügt habe, ist aus einem in Peking gedruckten genommen, welches ich 1810 in St. Petersburg erhalten, und von dem H. Langlès (S. dessen Catalog n° 4282) ein ganz ähnliches besaß.” (Walravens 2002: 106)

[The Korean syllabary I have included in my translation of *Sangoku tsūran zusetu* [= Klaproth 1832a] is taken from one printed in Peking I had received in 1810 in St. Petersburg and of which Langlès (see his catalogue, no. 4282) had a very similar one in his possession.]

This must refer to the chart of syllable combinations (or *panjöl* chart) that was prepared by the Christian missionaries in Beijing with the help of later martyr Yun Yuil 尹有一 (1760–1795) at the same time as the multilingual (Latin, Chinese, Manchu and [Sino-]Korean) Lord's Prayer.<sup>8)</sup> Both of these were sent to various addressees, including Langlès<sup>9)</sup> – whose exemplar also served as Abel-Rémusat's main source on the Korean script for his account published in 1820. It is therefore unsurprising that the Romanization of the

---

7) See Klaproth (1832a: 19–21, note 1 & plate to page 19; 1832b: 25f. & plate IV).

8) For references to documents making explicit reference to Yun Yuil's authorship for both items see Osterkamp (2009: 198, note 22).

9) See items 4239 and (as Klaproth already mentions) 4282 in the *Catalogue* (1825: 519, 523) of Langlès's library for the Lord's Prayer and syllabary chart respectively.

Korean script employed by Abel-Rémusat and Klaproth are by and large identical, including notably the transcription of both *ŏ* ㅜ and *ŭ* ㅡ as <e> (partly plus accent marks, thus yielding <é, è>).<sup>10)</sup>

Now the two accounts of the script basically consist of a chart giving the letters in isolation as well as the basic combinations of consonant and vowel letters into syllable blocks as well as several examples of more complex combinations. In our context two portions of the charts are of special importance:












1) Immediately following the chart proper is a note saying “La **ㅍ** ou **ㅑ** B n'entre pas dans la Serie du Syllabaire”, i.e. that a certain letter <b>, written either **ㅍ** or **ㅑ** is not part of the arrangement of the syllabary chart. As this author has pointed out earlier (Osterkamp, to appear) this pseudo-letter is nothing else than a distorted version of the letter <p> ㅍ, which is often met with in foreign sources containing specimens of Korean writing: see e.g. Hō Kyun's 許筠 Chinese poem with reading in *han'gŭl* as reproduced in *Yishi jiyu* 譯史紀餘 (17th cent.; IV/1v-2r) or *Chōsenjin raichō gishiki* 朝鮮人來朝義式 (1711; 8r, 8v).<sup>11)</sup> This is therefore merely another indicator that some non-Korean source had been available to Klaproth.

2) The eleven more complex combinations of letters into syllable blocks in part include the above-mentioned letter <b>, while some other examples are graphotactically impossible.

---

10) In his charts Klaproth renders *ŏ* ㅜ as <è> and *ŭ* ㅡ as <é>, but this distinction is not strictly observed in the transcriptions of Korean words in either of the three glossaries.

11) The only other suggestion concerning Klaproth's letter <b> this author is aware of is Lee's (2000: 120) assumption that **ㅑ** is meant here. This is however neither graphically plausible enough nor is there anything to suggest that Klaproth had ever seen any text containing this letter.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
a	 <i>mdz̄el</i>	 <i>kte</i>	 <i>peŋk</i>	 <i>hw̄il</i>	 <i>paŋl</i>	 <i>hli</i>
b	 <i>sh̄iē</i>	 <i>bd̄s̄ā</i>	 <i>km̄is̄</i>	 <i>tal̄k̄<sub>au</sub></i> <i>Turk</i>		 <i>sh̄el</i>

As with the words marked with an asterisk in Klaproth's 1823 glossary, all these syllable blocks are found in the Korean portions of text in *Tongŭi pogam*, mostly in words that are also found in the tables provided above. We will confine ourselves to the following four cases, which all involve syllables that are and were impossible in Korean – but which are in fact all related to the Korean words listed in Klaproth's glossaries:

- 1a = *mdz̄el* is part of the word *Niēmdselkio* (1B.8) for **니어뜰게** 'carp's gall bladder' (*Tongŭi pogam* II/1r).
- 2a = *kte* is part of the word *theng kte dzil* (found in Klaproth's third glossary, 1832a: 128) for **등껍질** '(turtle) shell' (II/6r, 6v).
- 3b = *km̄is̄* is the same as *Km̄iṣ̄* (2B.6) for **젓** 'milk' (I/31v).
- 6a = *hli* is the same as *Chli* (2B.1) for **흙** 'earth, soil' (I/19r).
- 

Especially the latter three cases obviously involve significant problems with the structure of the respective syllable blocks, but a closer look at the Chinese reprints – here and in the following we will chiefly use an 1766 edition (cf. below) – reveals what is really behind these gross misinterpretations. At closer scrutiny it becomes apparent that we have to add an important qualification to Ogura's assumption: It was certainly *Tongŭi pogam*, but without doubt a non-Korean rather than a Korean edition of that work Klaproth had access to.



	<i>Tongŭi pogam</i> (1613)	1766 edition	Klaproth 1832
1a	鯉魚膽 니어뜰게 (II/1r)	 (II/1r)	
2a	龜甲 남성의등결질 (II/6r)	 (II/7v)	
3b	人乳汁 젓떡니 (I/31v) 牛乳 쇠젓 (I/44r)	 (Ib/2r)	 (1832a)
		 (Ib/18r)	 (1832b)
6a	西壁土 선녁히달제 뛰는브 림흙 (I/19r)	 (Ia/23v)	

It is therefore necessary to reconsider the “medical work printed in Korea” Klaproth draws upon for his glossaries as well as for his examples of syllable blocks. Following its initial publication in 1613, *Tongŭi pogam* has seen both several new editions in Korea as well as numerous reprints outside of Korea from the 18th century onwards. In Japan it was first printed as a government publication in the year 1724 in Kyōto; it was reissued in 1799 in Ōsaka using the same printing blocks. In China, it saw countless editions starting with one dated 1763. At least one of these, dated 1890, is in turn based on the Japanese edition of 1799. Also, a comparison of the 1831 edition with the 1766 edition for instance suggests that the former is in turn already based on an earlier Chinese reprint, so that the portions of texts in Korean fare even worse here. This may also well apply to other non-Korean editions.

Now most exemplars of *Tongŭi pogam* to have reached European collections

are in fact not Korean editions, but reprints of Chinese provenance. A copy of the 1763 edition is said to be among the Chinese books collected by Robert Morrison (1782–1834), which came to the University College London after his death and are now at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London (shelf mark “RM c.400.t.4”).<sup>12)</sup> The Royal Library in Berlin (today’s Berlin State Library) was likewise among the first in Europe to obtain a copy for their Chinese collection (shelf mark “Lib. Sin. 575–579”), namely during the 1830s. It is a copy of the 1766 edition carrying Ling Yu’s 凌魚 preface and derives from the vast collection assembled by Karl Friedrich Neumann (1793–1870) in Canton.<sup>13)</sup> A Fuchuntang 富春堂 edition of 1831 was acquired for the Chinese collection in Vienna (shelf mark “Sin 222–B”) during the course of the 19th century.<sup>14)</sup> The most important collection for the present paper is however that of the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg, which comprises two different editions of *Tongŭi pogam*: An exemplar of the Korean print of 1613 as well as a Chinese reprint said to date from the late 18th century (shelf mark “B 1 (Д 147)”; cf. Petrova 1963: 126–128 on both). The latter had originally been in the possession of Pavel Ivanovič Kamenskij (1765–1845) who first went to China in 1794. — For the time being this is mere conjecture, but it seems likely that this is the exemplar of *Tongŭi pogam* Klaproth had access to back in St. Petersburg. At the very least it is certain that he was working with a Chinese reprint, apparently from the end of the 18th century.

If we now go back to some of the striking errors in the entries deriving

---

12) However, this might also turn out to be a copy of the 1766 edition (which retains the reference to the year Qianlong *gui-wei* 乾隆癸未, i.e. 1763, on its title page). Cf. how the 1766 edition kept at the National Diet Library of Japan (shelf mark “特1-2498”; digitally available under <http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/2606000>) is listed as having been published in 1763 – despite the presence of the preface dated 1766.

13) First catalogued and described in *Index librorum* (1836: 9, #34) and Schott (1840: 99).

14) Cf. “Nachtrag zum Verzeichniss der Chinesischen Bücher der K. k. Hofbibliothek” [Additions to the catalogue of Chinese books in the Imperial–Royal Court Library]: 12a–13, entry CCCXII; included in Austrian National Library, shelf mark “Han 397091–C”.

from *Tongŭi pogam* in Klaproth's glossaries, we likewise find numerous corresponding forms in the Chinese reprints. To give just a few examples:

<i>Tongŭi pogam</i>	1	2	3	(1766)	4	(1831)
1 丹雄鷄肉 (I/33r) 블근수돝						
2 松脂 (III/25v) 소나모진						
3 鋼鐵 (III/54r) 시우쇠						
4 驢肉 (I/54v) 나귀고기						
	(Ib/4v)	(IIIa/2r)		(Ib/31v)		(Ib/31v)

In cases 1 and 2, *su* 수 and *na* 나 are erroneously turned into *silk* 슌 and *ma* 마 respectively, which is exactly what Klaproth gives: *Sek* 'male' (2B.10) and *Soma-mo* 'pine' (2B.13). An especially telling case is no. 3: The 1766 reprint not only has *chi* 지 for what should rather be *si* 시, which provides an explanation of Klaproth's word form *Dsi* (3.1) – in fact the Chinese character 鋼 as found in the Korean print of 1613 is also erroneously given as 銅 in the 1766 (and also 1831) reprint. Without this error in the Chinese editions there would be no explanation for Klaproth's interpretation of the alleged word *Dsi* as meaning 'copper' (銅). Finally, case 4 may serve to illustrate that Klaproth was in all likelihood not working with the 1766 edition as such, but rather a somewhat later one introducing new errors. For 'donkey' Klaproth gives the form *Nele* (2B.8), which is difficult to reconcile with *nagwi* 나귀. The chief question is why he rendered the initial consonant of the second syllable as <I> here. The 1766 edition gives no explanation for this, even if *kwi* 귀 is turned into the (as far as common Korean usage is concerned: non-existing) combination *\*kua* 꺨 here. The Chinese edition of 1831 however has something much closer to *ra* 라 here, which may explain Klaproth's <I>, even though the vowel correspondences are not straightforward here. We will come back to such

cases suggesting an edition somewhere in between the 1766 and 1831 ones further below.

#### 4. A letter to the Humboldt brothers

Browsing through Wilhelm von Humboldt's linguistic papers, which are nowadays kept at the Jagiellonian Library in Krakow, one notices a letter from Klaproth to Alexander von Humboldt (1769–1859) dated Paris, April 18, 1832.<sup>15)</sup> It was written in reply to a letter dated April 5, 1832, in which Wilhelm von Humboldt apparently expressed his interest in what Klaproth had written about the Korean script in his newly published *Aperçu de l'origine des diverses écritures de l'ancien monde* (An Outline of the Origin of the Various Scripts of the Ancient World; 1832b).<sup>16)</sup>

Slightly more than two decades earlier, his brother Alexander had already mentioned the Korean script in passing in a passage treating on the Aztec document nowadays known as Codex Vaticanus B. Here he briefly discusses several types of writing, ending with “real alphabets, which offer the highest degree of perfection in the analysis of sounds, and of which some, for instance the Corean, according to the ingenious observation of M. Langles [i.e. Norden/Langlès 1795–1798, III: 296], seem still to indicate the transition from hieroglyphics to alphabetical writing” (Humboldt 1814, I: 148f. [originally 1810: 58]). It is important to recall at this point that around 1800 the prevalent view concerning the origin of the Korean alphabet was still that it was somehow derived from parts of Chinese characters, with Langlès apparently having been the first to suggest so. From such a perspective concerned with

---

15) See “Ms. Berol. coll. ling. fol. 56” (Jagiellonian Digital Library: <http://jbc.bj.uj.edu.pl/dlibra/docmetadata?id=47>); the letter is found on leafs 185–187 here (= images 377–382 in the djvu file).

16) Preserved in St. Petersburg, Academy of Sciences (F. 783, op. 2, no. 34, fol. 13f.; see the following entry in the database on Wilhelm von Humboldt's correspondence: <http://telota.bbaw.de/wvh/detailsicht.jsf?num=687>). This author did not yet have an opportunity to see the original.

the evolution of writing systems, especially the development of phonographic writing based on logographic writing, the Korean script attracted considerable interest in the early 19th century – however unjustified this may be from our modern perspective, the idea of a Chinese derivation of the script having long been abandoned. Be that as it may, it seems reasonable that Wilhelm was very much interested in what Klaproth had to say on the script, as after all hardly anything substantial had been published on the topic since 1810; it was only during the course of the 1830s that this situation changed considerably owing to the publications of Siebold and Medhurst for instance, to whom we have already referred in the beginning.

Coming back to the letter itself now, it begins as follows:

“Ich bin so frei Ew. Excellenz für Ihren Herrn Bruder eine Liste Coreanischer Wörter in Original characteren zu überschicken. Wie ich aus seinem Schreiben vom 5<sup>ten</sup> dieses Monats ersehe, hat ihn in meiner Abhandlung über die Alphabete, besonders das interessiert, was ich über das Coreanische gegeben habe. Leider bin ich gezwungen gewesen, diese Abhandlung, die einen Theil von Courtin's Encyclopédie (Grammaire générale) ausmacht, auf sechs Bogen einzuschränken. Hätte ich freie Hand gehabt, so würde sie bei weitem vollständiger und gehaltvoller geworden seyn. So aber habe ich sehr vieles, was selbst schon gesetzt war weglassen müssen, und mich nur darauf einschränken können, was zur Erklärung der Kupferplatten, die anfänglich auf einen ausgedehnteren Text berechnet wurden, nothwendig war.”

[I take the liberty to send your Excellency [= Alexander von Humboldt] a list of Korean words in original script for your brother [= Wilhelm von Humboldt]. As I see from his letter of the 5th of this month he was particularly interested in what I provided on the Korean one in my treatise on the alphabets. To my regret I was forced to limit myself to six sheets<sup>17)</sup> for this treatise, which forms part of Courtin's *Encyclopédie moderne*

---

17) I.e. six sheets of paper each containing 16 pages (8 on each side) and thus a total of 96 pages. This fits well with Klaproth's "Grammaire générale" as published, which has exactly 96 pages (plus plates) and is in octavo format.

([namely the entry on] “Grammaire générale”). Had I been given a free hand, it would have become much more complete and richer in content. Under such circumstances however I had to leave out much that had already been typesetted and could merely confine myself to what was necessary to explain the copper plates, which had originally been devised for a longer text.]

Apart from these first few lines the contents of the letter itself is less of interest in the context of Korean. Luckily however the “list of Korean words in original script” – which bears directly on the topic at hand – is preserved together with the letter. It is exactly this list which provides with ultimate proof that:

- a) *Tongŭi pogam* was definitely Klaproth’s source. — While the list contains mostly single words, there are also several longer phrases, all of which are found intact in *Tongŭi pogam*. This cannot possibly be explained as the result of mere chance.
- b) It was a Chinese reprint rather than a Korean one of that work. — The errors in terms of letter shapes and combinations seen in this list are in many cases identical with those seen in Chinese reprints. This again goes way beyond what chance similarities might yield.
- c) Klaproth not only succeeded in parsing some phrases correctly (while failing in other cases), but indeed also identified the function of ŭi 의 correctly. — It is explicitly glossed here twice as “Genitivendung”, or genitive ending.

As Klaproth most likely copied the list in 1832 from his own papers dating back to his time in St. Petersburg, the items on the list are not directly based on some edition of *Tongŭi pogam*. Due to repeating copying we thus have to reckon with some minor deviations in form. Nevertheless the connection is apparent at first sight. Consider the examples in the following table. A comparison between items from Klaproth’s list and the corresponding ones

in the 1766 edition of *Tongŭi pogam* leaves no doubt that many of the irregularities – chiefly confounded or otherwise erroneous letter forms and unnatural arrangements of letters within syllable blocks – are not at all the fault of Klaproth but of the source he copied from. Further examples of this kind are easily found among the other items on the list.

<i>Tongŭi pogam</i>	(letter) 1 (1766)	(letter) 2 (1766)	(letter) 3 (1766)
1 春雨水 (I/15r) 정월처엄온빈물			
2 冷泉 (I/17v) 맛시떨고춘물			
3 秋露水 (I/15v) 가을이슬물			(Ia/19r)
4 焰硝 (III/48v) 염소		(Ia/21v)	
5 寒泉水 (I/14v) 춥심물			
		(Ia/19r)	(Ia/18v)
		(letter) 4 (1766)	(letter) 5 (1766)

We likewise find further evidence here for our earlier assumption that Klaproth’s source was most likely a Chinese reprint *in between* those of 1766 and 1831, both chronologically speaking and in terms of the distortions observed in the portions of text given in *han’gŭl* in the original. Consider the following examples:

<i>Tongŭi pogam</i>	1	(1766)	(1831)	2	(1766)	(1831)
1 碧海水 (I/16v) 바다쁜물						
2 石榴 (II/23v) 석뉴					(II/28v)	(II/28v)
3 天鵝肉 (I/39v) 곤이						
		(Ia/20v)	(Ia/20v)		(Ib/12v)	(Ib/12v)
				3	(1766)	(1831)

### 5. Conclusion

In this paper we have argued that Ogura was indeed correct in assuming the “medical work printed in Korea” Klaproth relied on for his glossaries of Korean to have been an exemplar of *Tongŭi pogam* – albeit certainly a Chinese reprint showing considerable distortion in the portions of text in Korean. In fact the same source is also what underlies part of his accounts of the script (especially the non-existing letter <b> and the various examples of complex syllable blocks) and the list appended to his letter to the Humboldt brothers.



These circumstances finally explain the unexpectedly large number of errors observed in Klaproth's writings on Korean, but at the same time they also underline the general paucity of reliable materials on both the Korean language and script available to European scholars in the early 19th century.

Klaproth was incidentally not the only scholar outside Korea in pre-modern times to take his examples of Korean words from *Tongŭi pogam*. The same is also true of several Japanese works, such as Naomi Ryu's 直海龍 adaptation of Uno Meika's 宇野明霞 (1698-1745) *Wakan yōji-shiki* 和漢用字式 (appendix to *Hankei kantan* 班荆問譚; see Lee 1984: 83) or Kushida Hokusho's 櫛田北渚 (1815-1872) *Chōsen bunken zokuroku* 朝鮮聞見續錄 (ms., Fukuoka Prefectural Library) for instance. Such cases neatly illustrate another potential use of the great cultural heritage that is *Tongŭi pogam* beyond its significance in the field of medicine, which naturally has hitherto attracted most attention: Namely as an early means by which to approach the Korean language and script abroad.

## References

- Abel-Rémusat**, Jean-Pierre (1820): *Recherches sur les langues Tartares, ou mémoires sur différens points de la grammaire et de la littérature des Mandchous, des Mongols, des Ouigours et des Tibetains. Tome I.<sup>er</sup>*. Paris: Imprimerie Royale.
- Broughton**, William Robert (1804): *A voyage of discovery to the North Pacific Ocean*. London: T. Cadell & W. Davies.
- Catalogue** = (1825): *Catalogue des livres, imprimés et manuscrits, composant la Bibliothèque de Feu M. Louis-Mathieu Langlès*. Paris: J.-S. Merlin.
- Hager**, Joseph (1800): "Alphabet of *Corea*—Extracted from a Japanese Book, and explained by Dr. *Hager* of Vienna". In: *The Oriental Collections* 3: 88-93.
- (1801): *A Dissertation on the newly discovered Babylonian Inscriptions*. London: A. Tilloch.
- Humboldt**, Alexander von (1810): *Vues des Cordillères, et monumens des peuples indigènes de l'Amérique*. Paris: F. Schoell.
- (1814): *Researches, Concerning the institutions & monuments of the Ancient Inhabitants of America*. 2 vols. London: Longman etc.
- Index librorum** = (1836): *Index librorum manuscriptorum et impressorum quibus Bibliotheca Regia Berolinensis aucta est anno MDCCCXXXVI*. Berolini: Typis

Petschii.

- Klaproth**, Julius (1800): “Über die östliche Küste von Korea”. In: *Monatliche Correspondenz zur Beförderung der Erd- und Himmels-Kunde* 2: 514-522.
- (1802a): “Ueber die vor kurzem entdeckten Babylonischen Inschriften”. In: *Asiatisches Magazin* 1: 245-256, 292-317, 478-531.
- (1802b): *Ueber die vor kurzem entdeckten Babylonischen Inschriften*. Weimar: Verlag des Landes-Industrie-Comptoirs.
- (1823): *Asia Polyglotta*. Paris: A. Schubart.
- (1829): “Sur l’introduction et l’usage des Caractères chinois au Japon, et sur l’origine des différens Syllabaires japonais”. In: *Nouveau Journal Asiatique* 3: 19-48.
- (1832a): *San Kokf Tsou Ran To Sets, ou aperçu général des trois royaumes*. Paris: J. Murray.
- (1832b): *Aperçu de l’origine des diverses écritures de l’ancien monde*. Paris: Librairie orientale de Dondey-Dupré père et fils. [Originally as “Grammaire générale. Théorie des signes. Aperçu de l’origine des diverses écritures de l’ancien monde”, in: *Encyclopédie modern. Planches. Seconde livraison*, Paris 1832.]
- Lee Ki-Moon** [Yi Kimun] 李基文 (2000): “19 segi sögu hakchadür-üi han’gül yön’gu” 十九世紀 西歐 學者들의 한글 研究. In: *Haksurwön nonmunjip (immun, sahoe kwahak-p’yön)* 學術院論文集 (人文·社會科學篇) 39: 107-155.
- Lee Won-sik** [Yi Wönsik] 李元植 (1984): “Chösen tsüshinshi-ni zuikö-shita wagaku yakkan-ni tsuite” 朝鮮通信使に隨行した倭学訳官について. In: *Chösen gakuho* 朝鮮學報 111: 53-117.
- Morgenblatt** = (1814): [anonymous correspondence from Berlin]. In: *Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände* 1814.83 (7.IV.1814): 331f.
- Norden**, Frederik Ludvig; **Langlès**, Louis-Mathieu (ed.) (1795-1798): *Voyage d’Égypte et de Nubie, par Frédéric-Louis Norden. Nouvelle édition*. 3 vols. Paris: Pierre Didot.
- Ogura Shinpei** 小倉進平 (1929): “Seiyōjin-ni yotte shūshū-serareta hayai jidai-no Chösen goi” 西洋人によつて蒐集せられた早い時代の朝鮮語彙. In: Tabohashi Kiyoshi 田保橋潔 (ed.): *Chösen Shina bunka-no kenkyū* 朝鮮支那文化の研究. Tōkyō: Tōkō shoin, pp. 43-91.
- (1938): *Chōsen-go-ni okeru kenjōhō, sonkeihō-no jodōshi* 朝鮮語に於ける謙讓法・

尊敬法の助動詞. (Tōyō bunko ronsō 東洋文庫論叢; 26). Tōkyō: Tōyō bunko.

- Osterkamp**, Sven (2009): "Selected materials on Korean from the Siebold Archive in Bochum – Preceded by Some General Remarks Regarding Siebold's Study of Korean". In: *Bochumer Jahrbuch zur Ostasienforschung* 33: 187–216.
- (2010): "A Brief History of Western Knowledge about the Korean Language and Script—from the Beginnings to Pallas (1786/87–89)". In: *Studia Orientalia Slovaca* 9.1: 7–43.
- (to appear): "Klaproth's Korean *kmis* and the way thither, or: *Han'gŭl* and the manner of its distortion in some early foreign sources". In: *The Idea of Writing*, vol. 3. Leiden: Brill.
- Petrova** = Петрова, О.П. (1963): *Описание письменных памятников корейской культуры. Выпуск II*. Москва: Издательство восточной литературы.
- Schott**, Wilhelm (1840): 御書房滿漢書廣錄 / *Verzeichniss der Chinesischen und Mandschu-Tungusischen Bücher und Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*. Berlin: Druckerei der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Walravens**, Hartmut (2002): *Julius Klaproth (1783–1835). Briefwechsel mit Gelehrten, größtenteils aus dem Akademiearchiv in St. Petersburg*. (Orientalistik Bibliographien und Dokumentationen; 18). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Witsen**, Nicolaes (1692): *Noord en Oost Tartarye, Ofte Bondigh Ontwerp Van Eenige dier landen, en volken, zo als voormaels bekend zyn geweest*. 2 vols. Amsterdam.
- (1705): *Noord en Oost Tartarye, Ofte Bondig Ontwerp Van eenige dier landen en volken, Welke voormaels bekend zijn geweest. Tweede Druk*. 2 vols. Amsterdam: François Halma.

■ Abstract

Approaching the Korean Language and Script through  
Cultural Heritage: On the Role of *Tongŭipogam* 東醫寶鑑  
in Julius Klaproth's Writings on Korean and His  
Correspondence with the Humboldt Brothers

Sven Osterkamp

In this paper we will reconsider Julius Klaproth's (1783–1835) writings on the Korean language and script as well as the role the medical encyclopedia *Tongŭi pogam* played in this context.

For the first time in European scholarship on Korean, Klaproth drew heavily upon East Asian sources besides Western ones. We will argue that Ogura Shinpei (1929, 1938) was indeed correct in assuming the unnamed “medical work printed in Korea” Klaproth relied upon for his glossaries of Korean to have been an exemplar of *Tongŭi pogam*. The same source is then also what underlies part of his accounts of the Korean script. However, it can be demonstrated that Klaproth's immediate source must have been a Chinese reprint rather than an actual Korean edition of that work, thus providing a ready explanation for a number of errors found in his writings.

Under close scrutiny Klaproth's publications alone already suggest such a conclusion. Additional evidence – for both the role of *Tongŭi pogam* in general and for the involvement of a non-Korean reprint in specific – now comes from a hitherto largely unnoticed letter among his correspondence with the Humboldt brothers, appended to which is a list of Korean words and phrases obviously extracted from the same medical work.

**Keyword**

Korean language and script, *Tongŭi pogam* 東醫寶鑑, Julius Klaproth,

Humboldt brothers

접 수 일 : 2014년 11월 10일

심사기간 : 2014년 11월 18일 ~ 11월 28일

게재결정 : 2014년 12월 15일 (편집회의)