

Japanese Language and Literature

Journal of the American Association of Teachers of Japanese

jll.pitt.edu | Vol. 53 | Number 1 | April 2019 | DOI 10.5195/jll.2019.55

ISSN 1536-7827 (print) 2326-4586 (online)

Visible and Invisible Translation: Yu Chin-o's "Lecturer Kim and Professor T"

David Krolikoski

The history of a text's publication is sometimes a story worth noting in and of itself. "Lecturer Kim and Professor T" (hereafter "Lecturer Kim") by Yu Chin-o (1906–1987) is one such example.¹ First released in 1935 in the Korean periodical *Sindonga* (New East Asia, 1931–present), the story is an account of one instructor's difficult tenure at a professional school in colonial Korea. Well received at the time, "Lecturer Kim" continues to enjoy an appreciative audience, with contemporary critics praising it as a searing depiction of intellectual debility.² As is typical for literary works of some renown, it was steadily reprinted in anthologies, textbooks, and collections of Yu's most representative works. But what makes the publication history of "Lecturer Kim" intriguing is a detour that took place in 1937, just two years after its initial appearance in Korean. A new version was featured in the Japanese literary journal *Bungaku annai* (Guide to literature, 1935–37), having been translated and revised by the author himself. This variant of the story was eventually lost in time, excluded from the canons of both Korean and Japanese literature on the basis of its language and the ethnicity of its author respectively. However, this article argues that the Japanese translation of "Lecturer Kim" is significant—not only as an alternative version of a canonical text—but for its marked impact upon subsequent revisions to the story. Yu incorporated a number of changes first introduced in *Bungaku annai* into a second Korean-language version produced for the anthology *Collected Stories by Yu Chin-o* (Yu Chin-o tanp'yŏn chip, 1939). In the comparison of the above-



Articles in this journal are licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 United States License.



This journal is published by the [University Library System, University of Pittsburgh](#) as part of its [D-Scribe Digital Publishing Program](#) and is cosponsored by the [University of Pittsburgh Press](#).

mentioned three versions of “Lecturer Kim,” this article sheds light on how translation shaped the way literature was written in colonial Korea.

Korea in the 1930s was a bilingual society in which intellectuals were expected to be conversant in Japanese, the language in which many first encountered modern forms of literature. This situation enabled self-translation to be an option for writers looking to expand their readership beyond the peninsula. But as the narrative of “Lecturer Kim” itself reveals, translation in everyday life was a persistent burden for its protagonist and other colonial intellectuals. Employed by a professional school where he is expected to seamlessly adopt the culture and language of his Japanese colleagues, Lecturer Kim nevertheless finds himself subject to their pervasive discrimination. The *Sindonga* version of the story foregrounds this demanding relationship with language by presenting sequences of dialog in phonetic transliteration, revealing the protagonist’s remarkable facility with Japanese to be the result of perpetual translation. This feat of interpretation must be performed without fault in order to maintain his delicate position in society. Instances of phonetic transliteration in the text visualize the impossible task confronted by Korean intellectuals in the 1930s, who were expected to straddle the cultural and linguistic realms of Korea and Japan.

The particular case of “Lecturer Kim” raises a number of fundamental questions about the relationship of translation and literature. How has the practice of translation shaped literary history? In what way has translation influenced the composition and revision of literary texts? Although literature has customarily been studied within the boundaries delineated by national borders, translation has long rendered these dividing lines porous, fueling literary exchange across linguistic communities in a way that has affected the production of original texts. In particular, the role of self-translation in literary history has yet to be examined in detail. The process by which a bilingual writer authors a second version of their text in another language, self-translation was an enticing prospect for a writer like Yu, who was compelled to introduce his story to a new community of readers.

“Lecturer Kim” is thus a telling example of how self-translation is often coterminous with revision, in this case leading to changes that were eventually integrated into a later revision of the text in its original language. When its publication history is considered alongside its narrative, the story illuminates the linguistic pressures confronted by colonial intellectuals, and how this history was later forgotten. Yu’s use of

phonetic transliteration in *Sindonga* to make Korean readers experience the strangeness of language in translation stands in ironic counterpoint to how the *Bungaku annai* incarnation of the story has mostly been ignored by literary historians, save for the efforts of a handful of scholars in recent years.³ By overlooking this translation and its impact upon Yu's subsequent Korean-language revision, the process of writing literature during the colonial period—and its entanglement with Japanese—is elided, collapsed into a single, monolingual incarnation of the text whose traces of translation are present, but rendered invisible. As “Lecturer Kim” demonstrates, translation during this era played a critical role in the creation of literature, transforming the way texts were written and rewritten.

Translation and Japanese-Language Literature as Formative Writing

The relationship between translation and the trajectory of modern Korean literature continues to be probed by contemporary scholars because of how closely the two practices have been historically knotted. As Heekyoung Cho notes, translation played a central role in the foundational decades of modern literature in the early twentieth century, but its influence has often been overlooked in favor of presenting the accepted literary canon as the fruit of writers active only within the impenetrable bubble of their own language.⁴ In actuality, Korean intellectuals from the early twentieth century were well versed in foreign literature from nations like France, England, Germany, and Russia, which they encountered first in Japanese translation when studying abroad. Japan has thus been entwined with modern Korean literature since its inception.

Countless Korean writers were coerced or compelled to pen Japanese-language works after the outbreak of the Second Sino-Japanese War (1937–1945) as part of a broader propaganda initiative designed to boost Korean support for the war effort, a history that has irrecoverably tainted the legacy of Japanese-language literature produced by Koreans during the colonial period. After liberation, this corpus of texts was sorted into the category *ch'inil*, a word that literally means “closeness to Japan,” but carries the stigma of collaboration. Due to the sensitivity of the topic, this literature was mostly ignored by academics until the 1980s.⁵ The binary of resistance and collaboration that has often framed studies of these stories, poems, and essays obscures the link between modern Korean literature and Japan, a relationship that Nayoung Aimee Kwon describes as being

informed by the desire to represent the self in a situation in which one's mother tongue is made Other.⁶ The drive to express oneself publicly as a literary figure in the late thirties and forties often led to involvement with media operated under the purview of Japanese authorities.

Given the ubiquity of a Japanese education among Korean intellectuals of the era, it is unsurprising that many chose to write in Japanese for reasons that do not necessarily correspond to collaboration. For many such writers, Japanese, not Korean, was their first literary language. Yi Kwang-su (1892–1950), author of the seminal novel *The Heartless* (Mujōng, 1917–1918), published his first short story in Japanese.⁷ Chōng Chi-yong (1902–1950) likewise contributed to student publications at Doshisha University before going on to a long and celebrated career as a Korean-language poet.⁸ These prominent examples should not be considered deviations from the norm, but are characteristic of the experiences of many intellectuals who came of age during the colonial period. Yu Chin-o's first publication was also a piece written in Japanese that was published in a student periodical.⁹ When recalling this era, Yu has noted that there was no existing infrastructure in Korea to help him grow as a writer when he first took up his pen. As modern literature written in vernacular Korean was still a new practice at the time, there was no canon of texts that could be employed as models, no teachers versed in the latest forms, and no standardized rules for spelling. Writing back then, he observed, meant “using the knowledge that we had acquired from foreign texts we had read in a foreign language in order to try to unearth different facets of our lives and emotions.”¹⁰

Yu is unusual in that he did not study in Japan but instead received his entire education within Korea. He graduated at the top of his class from Keijō Imperial University, where the majority of the student population was Japanese.¹¹ Although after liberation in 1945 he would become involved in politics and education—even playing a role in drafting the South Korean constitution—as a young man his most conspicuous activities as a public intellectual were his contributions to the field of literature.¹² In 1927 he debuted as a Korean-language fiction writer, penning stories as a *tongban chakka* ‘fellow traveler’ that critiqued the current state of society from the point of view of leftist ideology.¹³ Japanese continued to be important to Yu as a writer, and in addition to translations like “Lecturer Kim,” he also wrote five original short stories in the language during the 1940s.¹⁴ He would later acknowledge the

existence of his Japanese writing, but he chose not to include them in collections of his fiction.¹⁵

Revision as Invisible Translation: “Lecturer Kim” from 1935 to 1939

“Lecturer Kim” recounts the ordeals of Kim Man-p’il, the eponymous lecturer, as he enters S Professional School in Kyōngsōng (present-day Seoul) as the only Korean faculty member employed by the institution. The narrative is said to be based on Yu Chin-o’s own difficult experience as an instructor.¹⁶ Given the story’s basis in reality, Sang-ho Ro reads “Lecturer Kim” as autobiographical fiction, arguing that Kim, as an avatar of Yu, is an example of what Homi Bhabha refers to as a “mimic man,” a figure birthed out of the cultural hybridity engendered by imperialism. For Ro, Yu is a prime example of an elite colonial subject who adopted the culture of the oppressor, yet is still not accepted as an equal.¹⁷ But while the narrative of “Lecturer Kim” may certainly be of interest for readers looking to gain insight into Yu’s life as a significant figure in Korea’s modern history, it also effectively recounts the hardships confronted by intellectuals in the 1930s as a standalone literary text, even for those unfamiliar with its author.

The plot of “Lecturer Kim” revolves around the relationship between Man-p’il and Professor T, an enigmatic figure whose motivations are masked behind an ever-present smile. Professor T first approaches Man-p’il with advice as a gesture of friendship that sets him apart from the other instructors, a group of men who coldly distance themselves from the Korean newcomer. This façade of benevolence soon gives way to unobvious threats as Professor T reveals he is aware of Man-p’il’s past as a member of a leftist reading group, a truth that if divulged will result in the immediate termination of his contract. As Man-p’il waffles between giving in to Professor T’s wishes, which would have him take the latter’s side in a political struggle among faculty, he is slowly divested of his ideals about education and the hope of ever being considered an equal in the eyes of the Japanese.

The Japanese translation of “Lecturer Kim” was included in a special issue of *Bungaku annai* that was curated by the *zainichi* writer Chang Hyōk-chu (1905–1988) to showcase the fiction of leftist Korean writers.¹⁸ The text of this version of the story is conspicuously marked as being a translation that was undertaken by the author himself.¹⁹ Although Yu’s personal involvement could be taken as a sign of fidelity to the original

text, a comparison reveals that the story was in fact expanded in Japanese in a way that accords with, but also complicates, Susan Bassnet's observation that the act of self-translation is best understood as a form of rewriting.²⁰ She argues that self-translation is a misnomer in that the process most closely resembles revision rather than the search for linguistically equivalent expressions that typically characterizes translation. Self-translation for Yu took the form of an intricate negotiation with two potential readerships and the possibilities afforded by alternatively writing in Korean and Japanese. Given that Yu chose to bring over many of the changes made for *Bungaku annai* into the subsequent Korean-language iteration of "Lecture Kim" means that the production of this version of the text should be understood as part of a longer revision process.

One might wonder if external pressure in Korea could have prevented Yu from including certain scenes in *Sindonga* that were later inserted into the Japanese-language iteration of the story. The major additions to *Bungaku annai* come in the guise of descriptive passages that alternatively showcase the harsh conditions of colonial Korea as well as the contemptuous attitude with which Japanese characters view the peninsula and its inhabitants. Like all writers who hoped to see their work in print, Yu was undoubtedly careful not to run afoul of censors when he penned each iteration of "Lecturer Kim." Although the enforcement of censorship was arguably less strict in Japan in comparison to Korea, it is difficult to conclude that the sections added to *Bungaku annai* are the result of Yu taking advantage of more relaxed regulation.²¹ The 1939 Korean-language revision of "Lecturer Kim" included in *Collected Stories by Yu Chin-o* would have been subject to a stricter regime of wartime censorship in comparison to the initial *Sindonga* version, and yet, it contains much of the content added to the Japanese translation.²²

Notably, the 1939 Korean revision is not marked as being a translation, despite being based on the *Bungaku annai* text. This case is an example of what might be described as invisible translation, in which the revision of a literary text is informed by a little known intermediary translation, its transformation directly linked to being shepherded across the boundary of languages.²³ For the Korean reader, who in all likelihood would be unaware of the existence of the *Bungaku annai* translation, these changes would simply register as straightforward revisions. Because the Korean and Japanese version of the story existed within separate linguistic contexts—the latter only published once—the bilingual history of the text

is easily overlooked, despite having a significant impact on the text's development.

This past is further obscured by how editors of contemporary anthologies in Korea have inconsistently chosen one version over another without clearly documenting their choices. Several reprints that specifically mention the 1935 *Sindonga* text as their source, for example, are in fact based on the 1939 version from *Collected Stories by Yu Chino*.²⁴ Scholars such as Han Man Soo have noted the difficulty of locating a definitive edition of a literary text produced during the colonial period due to the interference of censorship.²⁵ The publication history of “Lecturer Kim” demonstrates how self-translation likewise muddles the notion of a definitive edition, with Yu’s Japanese translation resulting in the circulation of multiple versions of the same story, each containing unique elements.

The first major addition to “Lecturer Kim” in the *Bungaku annai* version occurs early in the story as Man-p’il waits for the school’s opening ceremony to commence. Unable to reconcile the good fortune that has resulted in his employment and the difficult life of ordinary Koreans, he reflects upon a scene he had witnessed that same morning as he departed from his lodgings:

His past, no, even the surroundings as he left the boarding house after breakfast that very morning: his fellow lodgers gasping and squirming in the squalid back alley of the Korean neighborhood; the film director unable to pay rent or buy cigarettes; the magazine journalist under surveillance, tailed year-round by the XXX; the incessant high-pitched Kyōngsangdo accent of the vegetable vendor; the old woman from the boarding house, squawking at lodgers unable to pay their bills, etc. How were all these things connected to this magnificent building, its radiant curtains, the officer whose medals shimmered atop his chest, the professors in their morning coats? Man-p’il could not fathom how his very own body, which splendidly bridged the gap between these two types of things, was in fact an object that belonged to reality.²⁶

In the *Sindonga* version of “Lecturer Kim,” the assorted details of this passage are completely absent. Instead, in a single line, the reader is informed that for “Man-p’il, everything felt like it had somehow come out of a dream.”²⁷ By sketching in the inhabitants of the Korean neighborhood, the additions provide a concrete basis for Man-p’il’s sense of displacement

within S Professional School. The passage also constitutes a brief spatial departure from the halls of the institution where the majority of the story takes place. Man-p'il reminds himself and the reader that this scene is not a depiction of the distant past, but instead a memory from only a couple hours before. In this way, the contrast between the street and the school is amplified.

The conspicuous ethnographic gaze of the added passage is symptomatic of wider Japanese interest in its colony at the time. As Taylor Atkins argues, curiosity about Korea was motivated by the impulse to look backward toward preindustrial modes of existence bereft of the complications of modern life. This yearning was coupled with the distinct sense that Korea was a primitive reflection of Japan itself, the two ethnic groups one and the same according to the propaganda of assimilation being promoted in the late 1930s and 40s. In the scene above, the romantic resonances of a temporal gap between Korea and Japan are absent, replaced by a sense of disquiet elicited by the impoverished conditions of the colony that conveys backwardness in terms of economic development and social infrastructure. As Serk-Bae Suh notes, during this period, translation between Japanese and Korean—an exchange that was instrumental in sating Japan's appetite for traditional Korean culture—often involved an implicit comparison between the two cultures that played up their mutual differences.²⁸ The above passage connects the image of squalor with Korea, thereby locating the problems it raises abroad in a site removed from readers in Japan.

The second major alteration to “Lecturer Kim” occurs later in the story when Professor T expresses an interest in traditional Korean culture that aligns with Atkins and Suh's observations about how cultural exchanges between Japan and colonial Korea often worked to accentuate difference. Man-p'il has already been made aware of the potential dangers of Professor T's machinations in the school at this point in the narrative, but the full extent of his motivations has yet to be revealed. In the *Sindonga* version of the story, the scene plays out as follows:

After winter was over, Professor T said he was going to study Korean folklore, and he began to lead around a young *mudang* and *kisaeng*, the latter of whom strummed a *yangkūm* and *kayakūm*, as if they were a sounder of pigs. At school, whenever he could grab hold of someone, he would go on and on about the mysteries of a shamanistic ritual that dispersed evil spirits. But no one seemed to know what Professor T was

researching by carting around the *mudang* and *kisaeng*, nor what he was really thinking behind his chitchat and perennial smile.²⁹

The brief passage is narrated from a distance. Although Professor T's actions are portrayed in a negative light with his treatment of the *mudang* (a female shaman) and the *kisaeng* (a female entertainer trained in literature, art, and music) likened to that of a farmer to his livestock, the reader is not specifically told what he is doing or saying to others. Rather, this paragraph chiefly underscores the inscrutability of Professor T as an eccentric character whose motives no one, not even the other Japanese teachers, can ascertain. In the *Bungaku annai* version of "Lecturer Kim," the scene is significantly elongated with the reader positioned in the same room as Professor T as he expounds upon his findings about Korean culture to a captive audience of his Japanese colleagues.

His speech is quoted in full below:

"Happily, I was able to grab hold of a *mudang*. Learning about various beliefs, superstitions, practices like ceremonial rites and the ethnic customs of Korea has been absolutely fascinating. If you want to really know a group of people, looking into these facets is certainly fast and interesting! I heard that in order to cure madness, a *mudang* possessed by a spirit pummels their patient with a branch from an East-facing peach tree. Fascinating! And they force women who go around lying about other people's dalliances to eat shit. Hahaha. How logical! I also found out the secret behind Korean women's beautiful skin. They wash their face with urine before going to sleep! Sooner or later, I'm going to make my wife do the same. Hahaha. Hahaha."³⁰

Professor T's account of the backward practices is supplemented by his bemused commentary best summarized by the contemptuous laugh that acts as a period to cap off his sentences. Because "Lecturer Kim" is told from the perspective of Man-p'il, the reader has been preconditioned to approach these anecdotes with skepticism. In this way, Professor T's attitude, rather than the stories themselves, is framed as the point of interest.

Man-p'il is unsurprisingly offended by the spectacle of Professor T and the other Japanese teachers mocking gross stereotypes of Koreans. His anger is recorded in a succinct rebuke to the intellectual laziness of Professor T's insults:

“In any case, I’ve never heard of nor seen those kinds of idiotic practices. And even if you’re not willing to believe me, don’t pigeonhole the entire Korean people on the basis of one or two ignorant people from somewhere in the remote countryside who do things like that. Superstitions are present in every civilized nation, even after being cleansed.”³¹

The directness of Man-p’il’s critique, alongside the clipped sentence-endings of his impassioned speech, signals a stark break from his usual deferential tone. The shift is a subtle indication that these words are in fact a representation of his inner thoughts, not actual spoken language. Sure enough, the reader learns that Man-p’il ultimately could not muster the courage to deliver the above speech before the crowd disperses at the sound of the bell. Although the lesson could not be conveyed within the world of the story itself, it is provided in the text for the edification of readers and as an expression of Man-p’il’s inner indignation.

As the above two examples make evident, the additions to the *Bungaku annai* translation of “Lecturer Kim” expand the narrative by inserting scenes that were implied in the *Sindonga* version but not directly laid out on the page, creating a bleaker impression of colonial Korea and the tribulations that Man-p’il undergoes. The extended description of the neighborhood where Man-p’il’s room is located does little to contribute to the development of the plot, but rather underlines the sense of disconnect that Man-p’il feels in relation to the privileged environment of the school, displacement that Korean readers were likely expected to intuit from the depiction of Man-p’il’s fish-out-of-water initiation to his duties by imagining themselves in his position. Yu’s potential Japanese-language readership consisted of a more diverse group of people who hailed from throughout Japan’s empire. The added passage ensures that readers with little to no firsthand knowledge of Korea are anchored to Man-p’il’s point of view by explicitly showing the disparity between the school and the poor neighborhood. Meanwhile, the later scene in which Professor T derides Korean culture by expounding upon the backward cultural practices is a vivid demonstration of the discriminatory attitude that Koreans endured from their Japanese superiors. For non-Korean readers who might not have understood the extent to which Professor T’s anecdotes are offensive, Man-p’il’s critique serves as unambiguous clarification. The tone of the original passage from the *Sindonga* version

lacks these incendiary elements and focuses instead on the inscrutability of Professor T as a character, but scenes of undisguised mockery would likely be already familiar for Korean readers and therefore unnecessary to describe in the level of detail provided for *Bungaku annai*.

As previously mentioned, many of the additions that originated in the *Bungaku annai* translation were reincorporated into later Korean-language versions of the story. The retention of these revisions even outside the Japanese linguistic context for which they were produced can be explained by how they generally contribute to the narrative by expanding what was already present. Although Yu may not have believed such scenes to be crucial in 1935 when he first published “Lecturer Kim” in *Sindonga*, integrating the changes to the revision of the story included in his 1939 collection would re-anoint the Korean-language version of “Lecturer Kim” as the most complete edition of the story. The expanded scenes also had the potential to be informative for future generations of Korean readers who might lack firsthand experience of the story’s setting, a consideration that would be more likely to inform his decisions as a compiler of his past work than as a writer contributing a story in its first iteration to a magazine.

Still, Yu did not simply retranslate passages added for *Bungaku annai* into Korean, but instead made further adjustments to better suit a Korean readership. A good example of this fine-tuning can be observed in the scene, discussed above, in which Man-p’il witnesses Professor T share insulting anecdotes about Korean cultural practices to the faculty of S Professional School. Whereas in the *Bungaku annai* version of the story, Man-p’il is unable to completely voice his complaints to Professor T and the crowd, in the subsequent Korean edition, he is able to express one misgiving. The scene concludes with his terse admonition:

“In any case, superstitions exist in every civilized nation.”

Lecturer Kim wanted to say more. But at that moment, the bell rang, and so he hurriedly left the staff room, carrying his box of chalk.³²

Man-p’il is ultimately stifled in both the *Bungaku annai* and subsequent Korean publication of “Lecturer Kim,” his silence a symptom of his vulnerability as the only ethnic Korean present in the room, but he is able to salvage part of his dignity by openly pointing out an inherent flaw in Professor T’s logic. This revision can be read as a concession to Korean readers, for whom Man-p’il’s minor victory might serve as a substitute for their own. As this and the preceding examples demonstrate, the text of

“Lecturer Kim” transformed over time as a direct consequence of being translated into Japanese. Because Yu was in charge of the process himself, he had the leeway to revise the text as he translated in the effort to adapt the narrative to better match the specific readership with whom he hoped to communicate.

Language and Identity: The Imposition of Japanese upon Korean Intellectuals

Yu Chin-o’s curriculum vitae and scholastic accomplishments distinguish him from most of his peers, but the ability to communicate in Japanese was a common skill for Korean intellectuals. Learning the language was a pillar of education policy from the beginning of the government-general’s rule, with the First Education Ordinance (Daiichiji chōsen kyōiku rei) of 1911 identifying the instruction of Japanese as a core element of common education.³³ After a 1922 revision, drafted in response to the March First Movement three years prior, less classroom time was to be dedicated to Korean in an effort to improve Japanese language acquisition.³⁴ By the time of the third ordinance in 1938 after the outbreak of the Second Sino-Japanese War, Korean was relegated to being an elective after being removed from the standard curriculum.³⁵

Although colonial education made bilingualism a standard for those who were privileged enough to attend school, the policies of the government-general make it clear that it was never the intention for this situation to continue into perpetuity. Instead, bilingualism was a symptom of transition. Korean was not to coexist with Japanese in perpetuity, but be replaced by it. Even Koreans who enrolled in colonial schools and strove to become fluent in Japanese were subject to unequal treatment.

In the context of fiction, “Lecturer Kim” explores these circumstances by raising the issue of identity. In its multiple iterations, the story asks how the identity of a colonial intellectual, forced to adopt multiple personalities to match whatever the circumstances require, was affected by the demands of a society transformed by imperialism. This theme is not merely submerged within the story as subtext, but is conspicuous on the surface as a point of conscious concern for Man-p’il. An early passage from the *Sindonga* version, narrated in his voice, begins:

In this society, to be of the intellectual class required one to have not only two, three, or four, but seven, eight, or nine different personalities. Some people clung to their actual personality among the copious

versions. Others, however, lost the ability to tell which of the many was genuine. What type of person was he?³⁶

As Man-p'il himself belongs to the intellectual class, his analysis of this predicament is a reflection of his own anxiety about navigating the political obstacles of the school as its only ethnic Korean lecturer. He believes in the existence of an "actual personality," a kind of original identity that he worries is in danger of being lost as he wades into the miasma of colonial society. Although Man-p'il does not spell out why intellectuals are forced to adopt multiple personalities, the story alludes to a connection with language, a tool that he wields in order to conform to his new workplace. Having received a substantial education, he is expected to be conversant in multiple tongues, which he demonstrates over the course of the story. Languages, like personalities, are framed as an imposition upon the colonized, the one that casts the largest shadow over the story being Japanese.

Japanese appears in the text from the beginning of both the *Sindonga* and *Collected Stories by Yu Chin-o* Korean-language versions of "Lecturer Kim." As Man-p'il is ushered into the administrative office of S Professional School on his first day, he observes his new colleagues responding to orders from their superior with an obsequious *hai* "yes."³⁷ Likewise, students at the opening ceremony, where he is introduced as a new teacher, are told to *keirei* "bow," the direction delivered in Japanese.³⁸ These snippets of speech, either quoted in part or reported in the narration indirectly, are not translated into Korean but presented in the form of phonetic transliteration, the presumption being that readers of the time, equally subject to the demands of colonial society, would be able to easily parse these common phrases without the aid of further interpretation.

From these examples alone, one might be compelled to conclude that "Lecturer Kim" functions as an example of successful linguistic assimilation in which the demands of the government-general have been amply met by a capable colonial subject who has mastered the language of his oppressors. However, the complete narrative paints a starkly different picture. Chōng Paek-su argues that the imposition of the Japanese language upon the peninsula resulted in the newfound perception of Korean as a mother tongue. For its native speakers, he claims, Korean acquired a hitherto absent sense of naturalness and authenticity that stood in opposition to the strangeness of Japanese.³⁹ Although the plot of "Lecturer Kim" does not directly deal with the shift in perspective that

Chōng has identified, in its details the story does recount the psychological stresses that attend the forced adoption of a second language. In addition, the text's strategic use of phonetic transliteration to represent Japanese in Korean allows its readers to directly experience the foreignness of these select words, lending surrounding passages written in a familiar syntax a sheen of naturalness that would have otherwise been absent.

Man-p'il's close attention to the particulars of language is first demonstrated in a brief scene included in every version of the story, in which he fastidiously prepares for his debut as a German instructor:

In order to avoid any mistakes the first time behind the podium, Man-p'il studied late into the night. He would begin teaching German with nothing more complicated than the alphabet, but to avoid any mishaps, he even practiced his pronunciation of "*Ah, beh, che.*"⁴⁰

From the description, it can be inferred that Man-p'il is to be an instructor for an elementary-level German class, a course he is more than qualified to teach based on his credentials. As the passage reveals, he is aware that his late-night review session is unnecessary given the simplicity of the lesson. Even so, Man-p'il forgoes sleep, his anxiety a symptom of the pressure that stems from being an outsider. His position as lecturer is one of privilege but also subject to pervasive discrimination, driving Man-p'il to ensure his performance is not marred by a single mishap that could potentially be leveraged as criticism. His anxiety is linked to language, with pronunciation in particular being referenced. In enumerating the details of his practice session, the scene demystifies how correct pronunciation in a foreign language is not a talent with which he was born, but a skill that he refines with daily effort.

Although in this case the language in question is German, later passages demonstrate that a similar pressure burdens his use of Japanese. Man-p'il later accompanies Professor T on a night of socializing during which they encounter various other Korean characters. His anxiety about Japanese is not directly mentioned in the narration, but his attention toward the facility of other characters with the language may be interpreted as a sign of his concern about maintaining a guise of complete fluency.

In the following passage, Man-p'il notes the Japanese pronunciation of other ethnic Koreans:

Professor T cheerfully moved forward, humming “Die Wacht am Rhein” as he parted the well-kept *noren* of an *oden* house in a back alley of Asamachi (Ukchōng) and stepped inside. He seemed to be a regular here as well by the way he was greeted by around thirty former *kisaeng*, who called out to him in the same manner as the madam of The Serpent. Only their pronunciation of “*sensei*” as “*sensei*” was different.⁴¹

Man-p’il fixates on the pronunciation of *sensei*, the greeting an echo of an earlier encounter with the urbane madam of The Serpent, who is Japanese. Despite being a mere detail, this single word colors his entire perception of the thirty *kisaeng* and constitutes the sole snippet of dialogue to which they are attributed. Professor T’s presence provides the impetus for the encounter and also serves as the unacknowledged barometer against which Man-p’il evaluates the pronunciation. The text does not specify whether or not Professor T takes note of the word, or even if the peculiarity of *kisaengs*’ enunciation is really a symptom of their linguistic shortcomings, rather than a deliberate elongation of the final vowel in an expression of deference. The crucial point is that Man-p’il cannot help but compare the *kisaeng* to the madam of another bar, whose proficiency in her mother tongue is framed as a sign of sophistication. In this way, he has not only adopted the language of his colonizer, but their gaze as well.

Phonetic Transliteration as Visible Translation: “Lecturer Kim” in *Sindonga*

As demonstrated above, language in a colonial environment crops up as a recurring issue in “Lecture Kim,” but the text does not broach this issue directly, instead allowing it to emerge in incidental details. Nevertheless, the *Sindonga* version of the story subtly illustrates the difficulty of negotiating multiple languages in a handful of key moments. In a common conceit, when characters speak Japanese, the dialog is printed in Korean that the reader intuitively understands is a literary representation of the former. However, in key instances, dialog is presented twice on the page, first in phonetically transliterated Japanese, second in Korean, the latter presented as a notation in parenthesis. This peculiar dual presentation of dialog distinguishes these movements from the countless other conversations of the story, acting as a kind of visible translation that illustrates the process of moving back and forth between a foreign

language and one's own. A tense encounter with Professor serves as a prime example:

Behind Man-p'il was Professor T, who carried a package in his arms.

"*Yatteruna.*" (So, you're doing what needs to be done.)

Professor T patted him on the shoulder and smiled as if they shared some secret. Man-p'il immediately intuited the meaning behind that grin.

"*Betsuni yatteru wakedemo arimasenga.*" (I'm not really doing anything.)

"Hoho, you think I'm an oblivious scholar."

Professor T was still beaming.

"As you know, I got this position because of Section Chief H. He is a benefactor of mine."⁴²

In the above scene, Man-p'il is visiting Section Chief H, a man of considerable influence who was responsible for securing him a position as lecturer. On his way after hours to the residence of his benefactor, he is surprised to meet Professor T, who appears with an obvious bribe tucked underneath an arm. Man-p'il carries no such gift himself. The very idea of a bribe is an affront to his idealistic sensibilities, so when Professor T misconstrues Man-p'il's presence as evidence that he too has come to offer a token of his appreciation, he is mortified.

Professor T's opening line is the first of two to be printed in transliterated Japanese in the scene. The Japanese appears first, compelling the reader to make sense of the jumble of phonetic sounds in *han'gūl* before encountering the Korean translation. In both languages, the sentence in question is vague, but heavy with insinuation. Professor T's observation concisely combines the verb "to do" with a gerund and the terminal particle *na* to convey the sense of a rhetorical question. The sentence lacks a defined subject and object, the playful obfuscation no doubt intentional in that it allows Professor T to avoid broaching the subject of a bribe with undue directness, but the implications of the statement are clear. Meanwhile, the provided Korean translation adds a small but consequential piece of information. The vague "it" of the Japanese is expanded into "what needs to be done." Once again, the subject and object of the verb are withheld, but Professor T's opinion that the bribe is a necessary course of action is spelled out in clearer terms.

On the one hand, the dual presentation of the above dialog in both Japanese and Korean could be hypothetically read as positive evidence of Man-p'il's linguistic abilities. According to this interpretation, the Korean version of the line would represent a successful simultaneous translation, a textual manifestation of a common ground between the two languages that Man-p'il as a bilingual intellectual is able to occupy. However, given the way the text implies that Man-p'il is regularly conversing in Japanese throughout the narrative, even when dialogue is not printed twice on the page, the reader is inevitably driven to question the motivating factor behind this unusual presentation. Why is phonetic translation not consistently used throughout the story, but only featured in specific scenes?

Phonetic transliteration in "Lecturer Kim" functions to align the experiences of the reader and character in moments when the latter's sensitivity toward language is heightened. In this case, the unexpected appearance of Professor T puts Man-p'il on edge, compelling him to pay extra attention to what is being said and how he should respond in Japanese. Their exchange as printed is a visual depiction of Man-p'il's translation process, the parentheses that separate the Korean from the Japanese a border that the reader's eye must cross in order to move from one linguistic domain to the other. The transliterated Japanese is printed first—each word an unfamiliar sight in *han'gŭl* that must be processed in order to be decoded—before moving onto the identical line of dialog in Korean, the order mirroring the directionality of deciphering Japanese speech when one's native language is Korean. Despite the way this presentation frames translation as a sequential process—and therefore labor that must be performed—Man-p'il's ability to comprehend Professor T is not thrown into question. If one assumes that the parenthetical Korean translation provided is representative of Man-p'il's own, it is possible to argue that he has comprehended the nuances of Professor T's statement admirably, as the annotation adds nuance that was grammatically absent in the Japanese transliteration.

Man-p'il's own response to Professor T's insinuation is also transliterated, an authorial choice that represents the character's sensitivity to not only what he is hearing, but also his own contributions in the effort not to misspeak. In this case, no new information is provided by the Korean, but deviations in sentence structure between languages are still prominently displayed. As Haun Saussy notes, transliteration can be described as a kind of non-translation in which a given word is simply

carried over into a foreign context in its original form, thereby serving as “an avowal of the incompleteness of translating.”⁴³ “Lecturer Kim” reveals that this incompleteness is not a matter of linguistic prowess or lack thereof, but an everyday reality of subsisting as an intellectual in 1930s Korea.

In the 1937 *Bungaku annai* version of “Lecturer Kim,” this particular exchange is presented in a necessarily different manner. Given that the complete text has been translated into Japanese, it is no surprise to find that the transliterated lines of dialog are absent from this edition. As demonstrated above, displaying both languages in the *Sindonga* version of the story is crucial to capturing Man-p’il’s translation process as he decodes what is being said in a moment of duress. Yu Chin-o compensates for the inability to use the phonetic transliteration of Japanese in this version of the story by affixing additional description to the narration:

The man behind Man-p’il was Professor T. He was holding some kind of square package under his arm. Having run into Lecturer Kim unexpectedly, he suddenly seemed a bit flustered.

“So you’re doing the deed huh.”

Professor T lightly tapped Man-p’il’s shoulder and flashed a vulgar smile, the kind exchanged only by those who share dirty secrets. Of course, Man-p’il immediately intuited the meaning behind the grin.

“I’m not really doing anything...” he responded, his mood soured.

“Anyway, you’re welcome. You are also not really who you seem to be.”

Professor T was still beaming.

“No, honestly, I’m not doing anything. As you know, it was thanks to Section Chief H’s generosity that I was able to secure my current position.”

Man-p’il became flustered as he defended himself.⁴⁴

The first sentence added to this scene for *Bungaku annai* is an external description of Professor T, who, the reader is told, seems to have been caught off-guard by a familiar face. A more telling addition arrives after Professor T’s first line. What had been simply a smile and a secret in the 1935 *Sindonga* version are now a “vulgar smile” and a “dirty secret,” the adjectives plainly pointing to the seedy nature of the bribe as seen from Man-p’il’s perspective. When Man-p’il responds, the reader is explicitly informed that his mood has soured. While the layer of anxiety in relation

to language is missing from the *Bungaku annai* version, the text employs other, more direct methods to express Man-p'il's distress. By slightly drawing out the scene, the reader is able to get a sense of the mounting tension that had been previously achieved through phonetic transliteration. Rather than as a response to Professor T's enigmatic smile, Man-p'il's impassioned defense of himself is mounted in reply to the former's suggestion that the two are both concealing their true identities. Here again, Man-p'il's turmoil is underlined by the narration, which spells out his frustration in no uncertain terms.

The 1939 Korean-language version of "Lecturer Kim" included in *The Collected Stories of Yu Chin-o* largely retains the changes made for *Bungaku annai*, rather than adhering to the same presentation that was employed in *Sindonga*. Professor T's line "Yatteruna," unaccompanied by a parenthetical translation, is now the only instance of phonetic transliteration in the entire exchange.⁴⁵ Although this transliterated phrase serves as a purposeful reminder to the reader of the actual language the characters are speaking, the revised version lacks the original's emphasis on translation as process to instead only foreground Man-p'il's anxiety, as was the case in *Bungaku annai*. In the case of this specific passage, the translation and revision of "Lecturer Kim" into Japanese has resulted in the erasure of visible translation in later iterations of text, the extended use of phonetic transliteration in dialog only appearing in the original *Sindonga* printing.

Conclusion

The dual language presentation of the dialog between Man-p'il and Professor T in the *Sindonga* version of "Lecturer Kim" functions to make translation visible, revealing it to be a process that must be actively performed on an everyday basis for intellectuals like Man-p'il. In order to understand the particular nuances of Man-p'il's plight, one must recognize translation as labor, a burden that Yu Chin-o transcribes through phonetic transliteration in order to force readers to move from Japanese to Korean in a manner that corresponds to the character's experience.

It is therefore ironic that Yu's own translation effort in the creation of the *Bungaku annai* version of "Lecturer Kim" has been forgotten, replaced with a single Korean-language version that conceals its own history of transformation across languages. To overlook this intermediary translation is to remain ignorant about how and why many of the story's revisions first came into being. Much has been written about how the translation of

foreign literature influenced the formation of modern literature in Korea, but “Lecturer Kim” complicates this model by illustrating how movement in the opposite direction—self-translation into Japanese—likewise contributed to the transformation of original literature.

Together, the narrative and publishing history of “Lecturer Kim” tell complementary stories about what it meant to be an intellectual in 1930s Korea caught between languages, accounts that have alternatively been rendered visible and invisible. For Yu, on the one hand, translation was a generative process that not only allowed him to share “Lecturer Kim” with an international audience, but also served as the basis for further revisions in Korean. In the process, he pared down instances of phonetic transliteration, removing the burden of translation from the depicted pressures that Man-p’il must shoulder. Linguistic mixture disappeared from the text, a choice that coincidentally corresponds to how the story’s Japanese-language translation would later be forgotten. The original *Sindonga* iteration of “Lecturer Kim,” however, reveals another side of translation as an imposition upon colonial intellectuals, individuals who were forced to continually shuffle back and forth between languages, never completely belonging to either.

NOTES

I would like to thank my first readers for their advice and support: Michael Bourdaghs, Kyeong-Hee Choi, Sohye Kim, Hoyt Long, and Emily Jungmin Yoon. An earlier draft of this article was presented at the 2018 Association of Asian Studies Annual Conference. Much credit goes to my fellow panelists Faye Yuan Kleeman, Nayoung Aimee Kwon, Cindi Textor, and especially Evelyn Shih for generating this opportunity. Lastly, I would like to express my appreciation to Rebecca Copeland, Hiroshi Nara, and the two anonymous readers for their comments and guidance in bringing this article to print.

¹ A complete English translation of “Lecturer Kim” is available in a dual-language edition. All quotations included in this paper are my own translations from Korean and Japanese. Yu Chin-o, *Lecturer Kim and Professor T*, trans. Sohn Suk-joo (Seoul: Asia Publishers, 2015).

² Cho Nam-hyön, *Han’guk hyöndaesosölsa 2* (Seoul: Munhak kwa chisöngsa, 2012), 211.

- ³ For example, Ebihara Yutaka argues that “Lecturer Kim” in the incarnation published in *Bungaku annai* belongs to the genre of activist literature (*kōdō shugi bungaku*) that appeared in Korea and Japan after the suppression of the Korea Artista Proletaria Federatio (KAPF, 1925–1935) and the Japan Proletarian Writer's League (NALP, 1928–1934). Ebihara Yutaka, “Yu Chin-o’s ‘Kimu kōshi to T kyōju’ Nihongo kaisaku hon kenkyū: Kōdō shugi bungaku to kanren shi te,” *Tongbuga munhwa yŏn’gu* 31 (June 2012): 458. Meanwhile, by comparing the depiction of the story’s characters between multiple versions of “Lecturer Kim,” Shirakawa Haruko argues that the extra detail added for *Bungaku annai* reflects the author’s desire to raise awareness about colonial Korea among Japanese readers and clarify previously ambiguous elements about major secondary characters such as Professor T. Shirakawa Haruko, “Yu Chin-o saku ‘Kimu kōshi to T kyōju’ shōkō T kyōju to sono hoka no tōjō jinbutsu o chūshin ni,” *Shimonoseki shiritsu daigaku ronshū* (January 2004): 80. Finally, Han Chŏng-sŏn identifies a number of changes made to revisions of “Lecturer Kim” and contends that the additions produced for *Bungaku annai* cannot be explained in terms of the clear-cut dichotomy of collaboration or resistance that has been often employed to analyze Japanese-language literature by Korean writers. Han Chŏng-sŏn, “Chayu nosō ūi cheguk ūi ōnō: Yu Chin-o ‘Kimu kōshi to T kyōju,’” *Han’guk Ilbonŏ munhak hoe haksul palp’yo taehoe nonmunjip* (October 2013): 284.
- ⁴ Heekyoung Cho avers that Russian literature provided a model for many prominent Korean writers in the 1910s and 20s, who sought to develop a mode of literature that could help reform society. To this end, Korean intellectuals translated Russian poetry and prose into their own language, oftentimes using Japanese-language translations as a basis, rather than the Russian originals. Heekyoung Cho, *Translation’s Forgotten History: Russian Literature, Japanese Mediation, and the Formation of Modern Korean Literature* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2016), 7.
- ⁵ The problem of collaboration was not thoroughly addressed during the liberation period in South Korea. A government investigation that was initiated in 1947 was forced to end prematurely in 1949, resulting in only twelve prison sentences, five of which were commuted. In the decades that immediately followed the Korean War, collaboration was treated as a taboo subject. The outlier to this trend was Im Chong-kuk, an independent scholar who published *A Study of Collaboration Literature* (Ch’inil munhangnon) in 1966 in response to the normalization treaty signed with Japan in the previous year. More journalists

and scholars began to openly investigate collaboration during the democratization movement in the 1980s. Koen De Ceuster, “The Nation Exorcised: The Historiography of Collaboration in South Korea,” *Korean Studies* 25.2 (2001): 220.

⁶ Nayoung Aimee Kwon’s undertaking is to reframe collaboration literature in terms of the ethically neutral notion of intimacy by examining the role of desire in the relationship between Japanese and Korean during the colonial period. Nayoung Aimee Kwon, *Intimate Empire: Collaboration and Colonial Modernity in Korea and Japan* (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 2015), 12.

⁷ The story in question is titled “Maybe Love” (Ai ka), which Yi published in his school newsletter, *Shirogane gakuhō* of Meiji Gakuin in 1909. The narrative records the longing of a young Korean student in Japan for his Japanese male classmate. John Whittier Treat, “Introduction to Yi Kwang-su’s ‘Maybe Love’ (Ai ka, 1909),” *Azalea: Journal of Korean Literature & Culture* 4 (2011): 315.

⁸ Chŏng Chi-yong’s first original poem to be published was “Silla Pomegranate” in the March 1925 issue of the journal *Machi*, which was run by students at Doshisha University. Chŏng Chi-yong, “Shiragi no zakuro,” *Chŏng Chi-yong chŏnjip 1: Si*, second ed, ed. Ch’oe Tong-ho (Seoul: Sŏjŏng sihak, 2017), 260.

⁹ According to Shirakawa Haruko, Yu’s first publication in 1925 was a translated poem and piece of criticism titled “Enquiring the Muse” (Myūzu o tazunete) that appeared in a student magazine from Keijō Imperial University. Shirakawa Haruko, “Yu Chin-o no Nihongo shōsetsu nitsuite,” *Shimonoseki shiritsu daigaku sōritsu 50 shūnen kinen ron bunshū* (March 2007): 229.

¹⁰ Yu Chin-o, “Hugi,” *Han’guk tanp’yŏn munhak chŏnjip 2: Ch’angnangjŏnggi*, ed. Yu Chin-o (Seoul: Chŏngŭmsa, 1972), 429.

¹¹ Keijō Imperial University was founded in 1924. As an imperial university of the Japanese empire, most of its students were ethnic Japanese despite the fact that the school was located in Keijō (Kyōngsŏng when pronounced in Korean), the name for what would become modern-day Seoul. From 1924 to 1945, the university produced around 2,300 graduates, only 810 of whom were Korean. The institution was closed by the United States Army Military Government in Korea in 1946. Its remnants were combined with other schools, forming Seoul National University. Kim Yong-tŏk, “Kyōngsŏng cheguk taehak ūi kyoyuk kwa chosŏnin haksaeŋ,” *Hanil kongdong yŏn’gu ch’ongsŏ* (May 2007): 129.

- ¹² In 1949, the year after the constitution was penned, Yu published *An Explication of Constitutional Law*, which would become a landmark text in the field. Yu Chin-o, *Honpōp haeŭi* (Seoul: Myōngsedang, 1949).
- ¹³ The appellation “fellow traveler” traces its origin back to the Russian *poputchiki*, which was coined by Leon Trotsky in 1924 to denote writers who did not belong to the communist party but supported the revolution. Likewise, in colonial Korea, the term was used to refer to writers who were not formal members of KAPF, but were nevertheless considered allies to the socialist cause. Not everyone accepted the label. For more information about fellow travelers, see Sunyoung Park, *The Proletarian Wave: Literature and Leftist Culture in Colonial Korea, 1910-1945* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2015), 72–83.
- ¹⁴ As Shirakawa Haruko explains, a number of these Japanese-language stories were printed in Japanese venues such as *Bungei* (Literary arts) and *Shūkan asahi* (Asahi weekly), and the remainder appeared in *Kokumin sōryoku* (National power), which was published in Korea. Yu has claimed that he was coerced into writing the latter, but Shirakawa argues that these texts do not fit neatly into the category of *ch’inil* literature. Shirakawa Haruko, “Yu Chin-o no Nihongo shōsetsu nitsuite,” 237.
- ¹⁵ In an afterword to a 1972 collection of short fiction, Yu acknowledges, “Other than what is present in this volume I have written around ten more short stories, but because most of their content was so underdeveloped I excluded them. In addition, I also have a number of Japanese-language stories, but of course, I did not include them.” Yu Chin-o, “Hugi,” 429.
- ¹⁶ In 1932, Yu was hired as a lecturer at Posōng Professional College (Posōng chōnmun taehakkyo). From then on, education continued to be a central pillar of his life. From 1952 to 1965, Yu served as the president of Korea University. Yu Chin-o, *Yangogi: Posōng Kodae 35 yōn ūi hoego* (Seoul: Koryō taehakkyo ch’ulp’anbu, 1977), 5.
- ¹⁷ The term Sang-ho Ro uses to introduce the story is “diary,” although he later acknowledges “Lecturer Kim” to be a work of fiction. Sang-ho Ro, “Cultural Hybridity and ‘Mimic Men’ in Colonial Korea: The Case of Yu Chin-o (1906-1987),” *Sungkyun Journal of East Asian Studies* 12. 2 (October 2013): 194–195.
- ¹⁸ *Bungaku annai* was founded by the proletarian writer Kishi Yamaji (1899-1973) in the wake of the dissolution of the Japan Proletarian Writer's League

(NALP, 1928–1934). Besides Yu, the other four Korean authors chosen for the February 1937 issue were Yi Puk-myōng (1910–?), Han Sōl-ya (1900–?), Kang Kyōng-ae (1906–1943), and Yi Hyo-sōk (1907–1942). All were leftist writers. Yu was on familiar terms with Chang, and had previously reviewed several of the latter’s Japanese-language works for *Sindonga* earlier in the decade. Yutaka Ebihara, “Ilche kangjōmgi Han’guk chakka ūi Irō chakp’um chaego *Bungaku annai* chi Chōsen gendai sakka tokushū ūl chungsim ūro,” *Hyōndae sosōl yōn’gu* 40 (April 2009): 250. For an analysis of Chang’s literary activities in Japan through a reading of his prize-winning story “Gakidō,” see Samuel Perry, *Recasting Red Culture in Proletarian Japan: Childhood, Korea, and the Historical Avant-Garde* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2014), 145–68.

- ¹⁹ Yu Chin-o, “Kimu kōshi to T kyōju,” *Bungaku annai*, February, 1937, 34.
- ²⁰ Susan Bassnett, “The Self-Translator as Rewriter,” *Self-Translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture*, ed. Anthony Cordingley (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 15.
- ²¹ Since the promulgation of the 1909 Publication Law (Ch’ulp’an pōp), Korean publications were subject to a system of pre-publication censorship that required them to procure permission from authorities before going to print. Publications in Japan underwent post-publication censorship, pre-publication inspections having been discontinued by a revised Publication Ordinance (Shuppan jōrei) in 1875. Richard H. Mitchell, *Censorship in Imperial Japan* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1983), 50. Michael E. Robinson argues that the actual censorship standard was only slightly more restrictive for Korean publishers than for Japanese, but acknowledges the existence of a disparity in the application of the law in which “Korean publications were almost never given the benefit of the doubt in ambiguous cases.” Michael E. Robinson, “Colonial Publication Policy and the Korean Nationalist Movement,” *The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895–1945*, ed. Ramon H. Myers and Mark R. Peattie (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1984), 320.
- ²² Beginning in April 1926, censorship in Korea was handled by the Book Department (Tosōgwa) within the Police Bureau (Kyōngmuguk). The department, which continued to grow in size since its inception, surveyed printed texts, illustrations, films, and records until the end of the colonial period in 1945. Chōng Kūn-sik, “Ilcheha kōmyōl kigu wa kōmyōlgwan ūi pyōndong,” *Singminji kōmyōl: Chedo t’eksūt’ū silch’ōn*, ed. Kōmyōl yōn’guhoe (Seoul: Somyōng ch’ulp’an, 2011), 34.

- ²³ The metaphor of invisibility in relation to translation was memorably invoked by Lawrence Venuti to denote how translation has been typically conceived within Anglo-American culture as a marginal literary practice, secondary to the creation of original literature, that is valued most when it is perceived to be transparent and read naturally in the target language. As is evident from the case of “Lecturer Kim,” translation has been widely ignored in other contexts as well, making invisibility an apt descriptor of its pronounced absence from literary histories around the world. Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 1–9.
- ²⁴ Korean-language reprints of “Lecturer Kim” have alternated between the original and revised edition of the story. For example, the 1958 reprint included in the second volume of *Korean Short Stories* lists the original publication date as 1935 and is indeed based on that version. Yet the 2015 dual-language edition by Asia Publishers also cites the original *Sindonga* version of the story as its source, but is in fact based on the 1939 revision. See Yu Chin-o, “Kim kangsa wa T kyosu,” *Han’guk tanp’yŏn sosŏl chŏnjip*, vol. 2, ed. Han’guk tanp’yŏn sosŏl chŏnjip kanhaeng hoe (Seoul: Paeksusa, 1958), 16; Yu Chin-o, *Kim kangsa wa T kyosu*, 101.
- ²⁵ Han Man Soo observes that it is not clear what would constitute the original version of a text produced under the scrutiny of censorship. Would an original be the hypothetical text that would have been created in the complete absence of censorship and therefore bereft of any choices the author may have made in order to avoid publication trouble? Or should it be the version of the text prior to any erasures? Han Man Soo, *Hŏyongdoen puron: Singminji sigi kyŏmyŏl kwa Han’guk munhak* (Seoul: Somyŏng ch’ulp’an, 2015), 495.
- ²⁶ Yu Chin-o, “Kimu kŏshi to T kyŏju,” 16.
- ²⁷ Yu Chin-o, “Kim kangsa wa T kyosu,” *Sindonga*, January 1935, 223.
- ²⁸ Serk-Bae Suh’s central contention is that translation was a source of anxiety for both Japanese and Koreans. Japanese officials employed by the government-general were continually reminded of their dependence on translation, and hence its power over them, in the everyday administration of their colony. Meanwhile for Korean colonial subjects, differences revealed through translation were registered as deficiencies in their own culture. Serk-Bae Suh, *Treacherous Translation: Culture, Nationalism, and Colonialism in Korea and Japan from the 1910s to the 1960s* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2013), xiv.

- ²⁹ Yu Chin-o, “Kim kangsa wa T kyosu,” 232.
- ³⁰ Yu Chin-o, “Kimu kōshi to T kyōju,” 31.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*, 32.
- ³² Yu Chin-o, *Yu Chin-o tanp’yōn chip*, (Seoul: Paeksusa, 1939), 139.
- ³³ The fifth clause of the ordinance reads: “Common education takes the acquisition of common knowledge, in particular the cultivation of a character commensurate to a citizen of the nation, in addition to the dissemination of the national language, as its goal.” It is important to note that “national language” here means Japanese, not Korean.
- ³⁴ Choi Yong-gi, “Ilche kangjōmgi ūi kugō chōngch’aek,” *Tongak ōmunhak* 46 (February 2006): 17.
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, 20.
- ³⁶ Yu Chin-o, “Kim kangsa wa T kyosu,” 223.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.*, 222.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*, 223.
- ³⁹ Chōng argues that the intrusion of Japanese led to the association of Korean with the family and adolescence in a process that he describes as internalization. Chōng Paek-su, *Han’guk kǔndae ūi singminji ch’ehōm kwa ijung ōnō munhak* (Seoul: Asea munhwasa, 2000), 23.
- ⁴⁰ Yu Chin-o, “Kim kangsa wa T kyosu,” 224.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 227.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*, 225.
- ⁴³ Haun Saussy, *Translation as Citation: Zhuangzi Inside Out* (Oxford, U. K.: Oxford University Press, 2017), 5.
- ⁴⁴ Yu Chin-o, “Kimu kōshi to T kyōju,” 21.
- ⁴⁵ Yu Chin-o, “Kim kangsa wa T kyosu,” 112.

REFERENCES

- Bassnett, Susan. "The Self-Translator as Rewriter." In *Self-Translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture*, ed. Anthony Cordingley, 13–26. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Cho Nam-hyŏn. *Han'guk hyŏndae sosŏlsa 2*. Seoul: Munhak kwa chisŏngsa, 2012.
- Cho, Heekyoung. *Translation's Forgotten History: Russian Literature, Japanese Mediation, and the Formation of Modern Korean Literature*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2016.
- Choi Yong-gi. "Ilche kangjŏmgi ūi kugŏ chŏngch'aek." *Tongak ōmunhak* 46 (February 2006): 9–32.
- Chŏng Chi-yong. "Shiragi no zakuro." *Chŏng Chi-yong chŏnjip 1: Si*, 2nd edition, ed. Ch'oe Tong-ho, 260. Seoul: Sŏjŏng sihak, 2017.
- Chŏng Kŭn-sik. "Ilcheha kŏmyŏl kigu wa kŏmyŏlgwan ūi pyŏndong." *Singminji kŏmyŏl: Chedo t'eksŭt'ŭ silch'ŏn*, ed. Kŏmyŏl yŏn'guhoe, 1–44. Seoul: Somyŏng ch'ulp'an, 2011.
- Chŏng Paek-su. *Han'guk kŭndae ūi singminji ch'ehŏm kwa ijung ŏnŏ munhak*. Seoul: Asea munhwasa, 2000.
- De Ceuster, Koen. "The Nation Exorcised: The Historiography of Collaboration in South Korea." *Korean Studies* 25.2 (2001): 207–42.
- Ebihara Yutaka. "Yu Chin-o's 'Kimu kŏshi to T kyŏju' Nihongo kaisaku hon kenkyū: Kōdō shugi bungaku to kanren shi te." *Tongbuga munhwa yŏn'gu* 31 (June 2012): 457–78.
- Han Chŏng-sŏn. "Chayu nosŏ ūi cheguk ūi ŏnŏ: Yu Chin-o 'Kimu kŏshi to T kyŏju.'" *Han'guk Ilbonŏ munhak hoe haksul palp'yo taehoe nonmunjip* (October 2013): 280–4.
- Han Man Soo. *Hŏyongdoen puron: Singminji sigi kyŏmyŏl kwa Han'guk munhak*. Seoul: Somyŏng ch'ulp'an, 2015.
- Kim Yong-tŏk. "Kyŏngsŏng cheguk taehak ūi kyoyuk kwa chosŏnin haksaeŋ." *Hanil kongdong yŏn'gu ch'ongsŏ* (May 2007): 129–48.

- Kwon, Nayoung Aimee. *Intimate Empire: Collaboration and Colonial Modernity in Korea and Japan*. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 2015.
- Mitchell, Richard H. *Censorship in Imperial Japan*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Park, Sunyoung. *The Proletarian Wave: Literature and Leftist Culture in Colonial Korea, 1910-1945*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2015.
- Perry, Samuel. *Recasting Red Culture in Proletarian Japan: Childhood, Korea, and the Historical Avant-Garde*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2014.
- Ro, Sang-ho. "Cultural Hybridity and 'Mimic Men' in Colonial Korea: The Case of Yu Chin-o (1906-1987)." *Sungkyun Journal of East Asian Studies* 12.2 (October 2013): 193–209.
- Robinson, Michael E. "Colonial Publication Policy and the Korean Nationalist Movement." *The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895–1945*, eds. Ramon H. Myers and Mark R. Peattie, 312–46. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Saussy, Haun. *Translation as Citation: Zhuangzi Inside Out*. Oxford, U. K.: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Shirakawa Haruko. "Yu Chin-o no Nihongo shōsetsu nitsuite." *Shimonoseki shiritsu daigaku sōritsu 50 shūnen kinen ron bunshū* (March 2007): 229–39.
- Shirakawa Haruko. "Yu Chin-o saku 'Kimu kōshi to T kyōju' shōkō T kyōju to sono hoka no tōjō jinbutsu o chūshin ni." *Shimonoseki shiritsu daigaku ronshū* (January 2004): 77–89.
- Suh, Serk-Bae. *Treacherous Translation: Culture, Nationalism, and Colonialism in Korea and Japan from the 1910s to the 1960s*. Berkeley, Calif., University of California Press, 2013.
- Treat, John Whittier. "Introduction to Yi Kwang-su's 'Maybe Love' (Aika, 1909)." *Azalea: Journal of Korean Literature & Culture* 4 (2011): 315–20.
- Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Yu Chin-o. *Yu Chin-o tanp'yŏn chip*. Seoul: Paeksusa, 1939.

- . “Hugi.” *Han’guk tanp’yŏn munhak chŏnjip 2: Ch’angnangjŏnggi*, ed. Yu Chin-o, 429–30. Seoul: Chŏngŭmsa, 1972.
- . “Kim kangsa wa T kyosu.” In *Han’guk tanp’yŏn sosŏl chŏnjip*, vol. 2, ed. Han’guk tanp’yŏn sosŏl chŏnjip kanhaeng hoe, 10–29. Seoul: Paeksusa, 1958.
- . “Kim kangsa wa T kyosu.” *Sindonga*, January 1935.
- . “Kimu kōshi to T kyōju.” *Bungaku annai*, February 1937.
- . *Honpŏp haeŭi*. Seoul: Myŏngsedang, 1949.
- . *Lecturer Kim and Professor T*. Translated by Sohn Suk-joo. Seoul: Asia Publishers, 2015.
- . *Yangogi: Posŏng Kodae 35 yŏn ŭi hoego*. Seoul: Koryŏ taehakkyo ch’ulp’anbu, 1977.
- Yutaka Ebihara. “Ilche kangjŏmgi Han’guk chakka ŭi Irŏ chakp’um chaego *Bungaku annai* chi Chōsen gendai sakka tokushū ŭl chungsim ũro.” *Hyŏndae sosŏl yŏn’gu* 40 (April 2009): 241–69.