

TRANS- HUMANITIES

Title : *East Asian Modern Knowledge and the Topography of Translation*

Author(s) : Heekyoung CHO

Source : *Trans-Humanities*, Vol. 9 No. 3 (2016), pp. 235–40.

Published by : Ewha Womans University Press

URL : <http://eiheng.ewha.ac.kr/page.asp?pageid=book10&pagenum=060600>

Online ISSN : 2383-9899

All articles in *Trans-Humanities* are linked to the Homepage of KCI and
Ewha Institute for the Humanities and can be downloaded:
www.kci.go.kr & <http://www.trans-humanities.org/>



이화여자대학교
EWHA WOMANS UNIVERSITY

***East Asian Modern Knowledge and the Topography of Translation.* Edited by Ewha Institute for the Humanities, Somyung Books, 2015.¹**

Heekyoung CHO (University of Washington)

This edited volume, which includes fifteen articles on translation and related topics, resulted from the international conference titled “(Re)translate Knowledge: The Mapping of Korean, Chinese, and Japanese Translation in the Early 20th Century,” organized by Ewha Institute for the Humanities (이화인문과학원) and held at Ewha Womans University in 2013. Some of the articles in the volume are revised versions of the conference presentations while others are newly added. It is very meaningful that the discussion that took place at the conference has been crystalized in book form. This book is the first volume of a book series of the Institute, which are planned to be published onward.

The book consists of three sections, each of which has five articles. The articles are grouped together by shared topic, but one can also draw many thematic connections across different sections of the volume. Part One, titled “The Imagination and Intellectual Horizon of Modern Literary Translation” (근대 번역문학의 상상력과 사유의 지평), begins with an article by Komori Yōichi (小森陽一), titled “Translated Style and the Formation of Modern Japanese Novelistic Style” (일본 근대 소설 문체의 성립과 번역 문체). It discusses

1. 『동아시아 근대 지식과 번역의 지형』, 이화인문과학원 엮음, 소명출판, 2015. 양장본. ₩35,000.

late 1880s–90s Japan when Japanese intellectuals attempted to create a new style distinguished from existing novel forms while learning the styles and structures of Western novels. The writer emphasizes that the specific styles that each intellectual tried to create (for instance, whether it is the *genbun itchi* style or something else) should not be the main focus in the discussion on this era in Japan. What is more significant for him is the shared experiment of searching for a new style through which writers desired to express their ideas, and he stresses that this shared experiment was mediated by the translation of foreign texts. JinYoung Park (박진영)’s “The Historicity and Imagination of Modern East Asian Literary Translation” (근대 동아시아 문학 번역의 역사성과 상상력) addresses the symptomatic phenomenon that Chinese and Japanese literatures were hardly translated in colonial Korea, notwithstanding their obvious significance to Korean society. This helps us reconceive what “world literature” and “world” meant (and means) to Korea. Park points out that the concept of “world literature” as something that excludes East Asian countries, which persisted for some time and in the age of post-liberation as well. Jinhee Kim (김진희)’s “Translation and the Original Form of Modern Lyric Poetry: Kim-eok’s Translation of Foreign Poems and the New Understanding of Tradition” (번역과 근대 서정시의 원형: 김억의 외국 시 번역과 번역의 재인식) discusses Kim So-weol and Han Yong-un in order to describe the process of inventing a new type of lyrical poetry in the Korean language. Kim compares traditional Korean lyrical form, western poetry, its Korean translation, and the innovations by Kim So-weol and Han Yong-un to give an understanding of the interweaving layers that shaped the creation of new literary form. JiYoung Park (박지영)’s “The Abyss of ‘Untranslatability’: Kim So-un’s Japanese Translation of Traditional Korean Children’s Songs” (‘번역불가능성’의 심연: 식민지 시기 김소운의 전래동요 번역[日譯]을 중심으로) deals with Kim So-un’s translation of traditional Korean children’s songs into Japanese during the colonial period, speculating on the untranslatability of those songs. She argues that the children’s songs that include many onomatopoeia, mimetic words, and proper nouns, were particularly untranslatable because they were far from a modern, standardized language that is more suited to delivering modern knowledge than oral literary forms. EunJu Song (송은주)’s “Rethinking Comparative Literature Through Untranslatability” (번역불가능성을 통한 비교문학의 재사유) outlines a variety of scholars’ discussions on the direction comparative literature should take in light of its relation to translation (untranslatability). She draws on her own Korean translation of Salman Rushdie’s text for an example.

Part Two, titled “The Reception of Discourses of the Modern and the Emergence of New Knowledge” (근대담론의 수용과 새로운 지식의 출현), begins with SeonHee Kim (김선희)’s chapter, “The Movement of Knowledge and Perspectives on Borders: Choe Han-gi’s Reception of Western Science” (지식의 이동과 경계에 관한 시선들: 최한기의 서양과학 수용을 중심으로). This chapter introduces Choe Han-gi’s use of Western scientific knowledge in the process of developing his own theories. The author argues that evaluating how accurately Choe Han-gi understood Western science misses the point of his endeavor, which was not to learn and introduce Western science but to use parts of Western knowledge to supplement his own theories. IlMo Yang (양일모)’s “Translating the Figurative Language of the Theory of Evolution into Chinese Characters” (진화론적 비유의 한자어 번역) examines the process by which the terms appearing in the evolutionary theory were translated in Chinese and uncovers the sociopolitical meanings that these neologisms activated in modern Chinese society. The author argues that the translation process was not merely linguistic but involved social practices in specific cultural contexts. Youn-ho Oh (오윤호)’s “Evolutionary Imagination and the Formation of the Naturalist Novel: Yeom Sang-seop’s *Mansejeon*” (진화론적 상상력과 자연주의 소설의 형성: 염상섭의 『만세전』을 중심으로) discusses the impacts that Darwin’s theory of evolution and Social Darwinism had on modern East Asia and reinterprets Yeom’s literary work to reveal the incorporation of such theory into naturalist fictional narrative in colonial Korea. Yeon-Soo Kim (김연수)’s “Translation and the Spread of Modern Culture: A Comparative Study of the Reception of Ibsen’s *A Doll’s House*” (번역과 근대적 문화전이: 입센의 『인형의 집』 수용 양상 비교를 중심으로) compares the reception of Henrik Ibsen in nineteenth-century Europe (particularly Germany) and early twentieth-century Korea, finding both commonalities and differences that speak to the respective social and cultural context. Youngju Oh (오영주)’s “The Translation of Ibsen and Changes in Theater: 1890s, France” (입센 번역과 연극장(場)의 변화: 1890년대 프랑스를 중심으로) explains the reason why Ibsen was popular in Germany, the UK, and France in the 1880s and 90s. Ibsen was a person who incorporated many of the elements they thought should define a modern play. Although they shared their enthusiasm about Ibsen’s new type of play, specific cultural demands played a critical role in the interpretation and use of Ibsen’s texts.

Part Three, “The Modern Reception and Consumption of Travelling Texts” (이동하는 텍스트의 근대적 수용과 소비) starts with SunYoon Lee (이선윤)’s article,

titled “The Translation of a Traditional Text and Its Mode of Consumption” (고전의 번역과 소비의 양상) takes as its example the Japanese translation of the traditional Korean text *Chunhyangjeon* (춘향전, The Story of Chunhyang). The author argues that the Japanese translator adjusted the text to meet Japanese readers’ expectations by emphasizing Confucian values and removing or trimming the significant amount of Korean cultural specifics. Sun Kyung Jung (정선경)’s “The Translation of Traditional Chinese Novels and Their Modern Reception: *Romance of the Three Kingdoms* as Serialized in the *Daily News*” (중국 고전소설의 번역과 근대적 수용: 『매일신보』에 연재된 『삼국연의』를 중심으로) addresses the place of Yang Geon-sik’s Korean translation of *Romance of the Three Kingdoms* in modern Korean literary history and its relationship with the newspaper as a modern medium. Tae-Hyeon Song (송태현)’s “Voltaire’s *The Orphan of China* and Orientalism” (볼테르의 <중국 고아>와 오리엔탈리즘) agrees with scholars who argue that Edward Said’s concept of Orientalism cannot explain all the approaches Westerners took toward others. Through the example of Voltaire’s rewriting of a Chinese novel, the author examines an example of “positive” Orientalism. InWon Park (박인원)’s “Nation-Building and the Story of a Female Hero: Schiller’s *The Maid of Orleans* and Chang Ji-yeon’s *A Biography of a Patriotic Woman*” (네이션 빌딩과 여성영웅의 서사: 쉴러의 『오를레앙의 처녀』와 장지연의 『애국부인전』을 중심으로) compares Schiller’s use of Joan of Arc in his novel *The Maid of Orleans* (1801) and Chang Ji-yeon’s representation of Joan of Arc in his novel *A Biography of a Patriotic Woman* (1907). Rather than reading direct connection between these two rewritings, the author shows how Joan of Arc was connected to nation-building projects in Germany and Korea, and how we can interpret the female hero in relation to gender discourses at the time. Sooja Kim (김수자)’s “Sin Chae-ho’s ‘New Citizens’ and *Three Heroes who Made Modern Italy*” (신채호의 『이태리건국삼걸전』과 영웅, 그리고 ‘신국민’) looks at Sin Chae-ho’s ideas on nation-state, national heroes, and new citizens as expressed in his book *Three Heroes who Made Modern Italy*, a translation of Liang Qichao’s Chinese text. Unlike the source text, Sin Chae-ho focused on the character who promotes a republican government (rather than a constitutional monarchy)—which, Sin imagined, would enable new citizens to participate in the governing their country.

Although the volume is divided into three parts, some of the most interesting connections are to be found across those divisions. One of the most frequently researched writers in relation to the impact of Western literatures

on Korean society is Ibsen, and this volume also includes two chapters, both approaching the question through comparative reception studies: Yeon-Soo Kim compares Germany and Korea while YoungJu Oh focuses on France and Western Europe. The book also includes two articles that articulate some of the many ways that modern translation practice became part of the nation-building process. One example is the translation of and discourse on heroic figures. InWon Park's article discusses German and Korean writers' use of Joan of Arc, while Sooja Kim examines the case of Sin Chae-ho who expressed his desires for a future Korea and its people through his adaptive translation of a story about Italian heroes. The immense influence that the theory of evolution and Social Darwinism exerted on East Asia is also reflected in this volume more than once. IlMo Yang research on the translating process of the terms used in the theory of evolution and its impact on Chinese society and Youn-ho Oh's analysis of the connection between the discourse of evolution and Yeom Sang-seop's works, reveal new aspects of the theory of evolution's development in modern East Asia. Some articles in the volume also deal with the translation and utilization of premodern texts. Jinhee Kim shows how Korean poets translated various forms (Western texts, its Korean translations, and traditional Korean poetry) into their own form. Sun Kyung Jung suggests the complexity of the process whereby a Korean intellectual set out to find a way to respond to the modern era through the translation of premodern Chinese texts. Both JiYoung Park and SunYoon Lee's articles provide examples of the translation of traditional Korean texts into Japanese, which involved the problematic process of repackaging traditional Korean culture in order to make it speak to Japanese imperial culture. Another intriguing issue that two chapters in this volume deal with is untranslatability. EunJu Song approaches untranslatability conceptually in its relation to comparative literature while JiYoung Park's article provides a more specific case study that shows why certain Korean texts and their language were untranslatable into Japanese. This volume also exercises a broad focus, addressing translations that took place in the cultures outside East Asia, including Youngju Oh's research on the reception of Ibsen in France and Europe and Tae-Hyeon Song's analysis of Voltaire's rewriting of a Chinese novel. These interconnections enrich the volume by providing multilateral perspectives on particular aspects of translation and transculturation.

The volume deserves special attention not only because it is one of the few books on translation published in Korea but because it goes beyond simple comparisons between source and target texts, which is still quite prevalent in

the field of comparative literature in Korea. The volume focuses on translators' creative appropriation, changes made to the texts in the specific sociocultural contexts, and the way these register the collisions and negotiations between the texts and contexts. Thus, the volume as a whole reveals the multiple textual layers and cultural interventions that can be observed in the process of translation and highlights the movement (literally and figuratively) of texts and the discourse created around those texts. This enables us to imagine diverse and unexpected webs of cultural connection through the lens of translation.

The volume is obviously full of rich analyses on a wide range of topics and approaches related to translation. However, as it is almost impossible to avoid inconsistency in themes and quality in edited volumes, the book also has some minor issues. A few articles either never touch upon the issue of translation or deal with it only tangentially. Many articles successfully go beyond the simple comparison of texts to connect the broader issues raised by the discussed texts but some of the articles need further elaboration on their topics and arguments.

Nonetheless, this volume is a significant achievement in the field of translation studies in Korea, and one can hope that it will inspire further research on related topics and promote continued interest in studies of translation in East Asia and beyond.