

Translator in Power Relationships¹⁾: a Multidisciplinary Analysis of English 'of' into Korean

Lim, Eo Kyung
(Pusan National University)

1. Introduction

Since everybody knows that language is a heterogeneous, variable reality, what is the meaning of the linguists' insistence on carving out a homogeneous system in order to make a scientific study possible? It is a question of extracting a set of constants from the variables, or of determining constant relations between variables [...]. But the scientific model taking language as an object of study is one with the political model by which language is homogenized, centralized, standardized, becoming a language of power, a major or dominant language. Linguistics can claim all it wants to be science, nothing but pure science—it wouldn't

1) Following Venuti's view, any example of language use is regarded as "a site of power relationships"(Venuti, 1998 10).

be the first time that the order of pure science was used to secure the requirements of another order. [...] The unity of language is fundamentally political. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987 100-101)

Taking the multi-faceted characteristics²⁾ of translation into consideration, this paper aims to investigate the complex and dynamic workings present behind the usual scenes of transformation in which the changes of linguistic characteristics or textual impacts are often examined and evaluated. The investigation begins with a methodological question on how to specify the vague and mystified workings of translation that are compared as a mystery in a black box as, whether linguistics-oriented or not, it is a challenging task to identify and analyze the linguistic data in translation studies especially when language is never free from political power relationships and, therefore, the sociocultural context³⁾ in any language use entails a lot more than what a text can indicate in its syntax or semantics. Inspired by the notion of "rhizome"(Deleuze and Guattari, 1987 3-25) and encouraged by the experimentalism of the "eclectic approaches"(Lim, 2004 36-56), this study continues its investigation with selected examples of translations into Korean involving the English word 'of', a lexical item commonly categorized as a preposition (henceforth P when used in a linguistic rule) for its positional salience in phrase formations. In that, a few critical questions⁴⁾ arise on the level of theoretical linguistics, from which point this study gets to consider a new approach of multidisciplinary as an alternative to the trend of disciplinary

2) Due to the factor, there have been various accounts in different scholars' attempts to define 'translation', from as cross-linguistic rendering to as inter-textual work, and to as cross- or intercultural transaction, and, also, to as cognitive processes of decision-making.

3) It refers to "the synchronic (social, societal) and the diachronic (historical) context of language use". It is also called "sociohistorical context"(Kramsch 8; 131).

4) They are to remain unanswered in this study for they are in process of further review and development in the field of linguistics.

fragmentation in the academia: (a) why, when crystal-clear and straightforward examples⁵⁾ of 'of'-contained expressions abound, is it so hard for a linguistic theory to be able to capture the explicit workings of a single lexical form 'of' (let alone the underlying principle(s), if there is any?); (b) given a number of accounts dealing with the problems of 'of'-related polysemy, is it even appropriate to assume the presence of such a comprehensive and integral theory that can hypothetically shed a theoretically insightful light on English 'of' in some universalist sense?; (c) in reference to such theories, can translation studies also expand its theoretical framework in terms of the underpinnings of the related expressions to be rendered into different linguistic and sociocultural contexts? (or prior to that stage, should it follow the academic conventions of certain disciplines dominant in humanities in order to function as an interdiscipline or subdiscipline?)

Seeing the multiple layers of intralingual, interlingual, and cross-/intercultural dynamics of translation as a signal that states that the workings of translation should resemble a rhizome meeting with another rhizome—rather than a battle field of two different dichotomous roots, in which one side's victory simultaneously becomes the other side's defeat regardless of the translator's effort for loyalty and compensation for both, this study principally attempts to apply the principle of "co-operation"(Munday 190) in its holistic (or eclectic at this stage of preliminary research) view seeing translation studies as a multidiscipline. In other words, focusing on the English word 'of', a set of detailed and pertinent information gets withdrawn from various disciplines and their branches and, then, is to be selectively analyzed and employed when any of the 'of'-related phenomena needs a specific description or explanation in the process of a multidimensional investigation. Here, the information varies to the extent that it enables the translations of the related expressions in a text to speak for themselves (e.g. etymology,

5) See Hoffmann(2005) for a good example of a corpus-based study.

morpho-syntactic analyses, cognitive interpretations, semantics, pragmatics, history, theoretical stances as a research topic, creativity as a factor, literary uses, sociological aspects, cultural contexts, aesthetic values, phonological effects, communicative functions, and so forth)⁶⁾. And some translation examples are randomly taken as objective evidence for real language use⁷⁾ (cf. not a quantitative analysis observable in corpus linguistics) and they are analyzed along three lines: first, to see whether they follow any scientific rules in the translated and translating languages (cf. Deleuze and Guattari, 1987; Venuti, 1998); second, if they do, whether such rules are consistent in their actual applications (i.e. in translations), which, then, can be regarded as a potential to introduce a principle; and third, if there is little or no consistency, whether such absence of full constancy can be explained by the rule(s) of the "major language" (with minor exceptions as the reason for such inconsistency) or by other "minor variables"(Venuti, 1998 10)⁸⁾.

Following such empirical and value-free analyses, this study assumes the presence of minor variables and, by showing how they become active and salient in linguistic representations, it argues that (a) it ultimately be the translator that lies in the center of translation and releases minor variables as a translation strategy⁹⁾; (b) any study on translation have to consider the particular sociocultural contexts that the translated and translating texts pertain

6) This eclectic yet holistic approach differentiates itself from other integrated theories in translation studies (e.g. Snell-Hornby 35) in that it does not take any prescriptive measure that forces translated outcomes to fall into a certain category/type in some classification system. That means, instead of functioning as a scientific device that determines and judges every work of translation, a theory in translation studies comes to work as a tool or a road map with which one can obtain a better understanding on translation as a set of acts/phenomena/processes.

7) For its absence, the academic researches in theoretical linguistics have come to get criticisms(Jong-Bok Kim i).

8) For a detailed account on those notions, see Deleuze and Guattari(1987).

9) The conscious and active use of such variables leads not only to creative translations but also to various effects of minoritization(Venuti, 1998 8-30).

to because, as Venuti puts it, what every language use involves is the very site of particular power relationships(ibid.); (c) in further developing the notion of "interdisciplinarity"(cf. Munday 187-90), an eclectic approach to see translation studies (or translatology) as an autonomous multidiscipline should be conducive to the establishment and development of an integrated theory in the emergent discipline. In addition, it also suggests that theoretical developments in translation studies should be able to help other academic fields in humanities and social sciences such as linguistics, literature, cultural studies, sociology, cognitive science, and philosophy with their theories and researches concerning human interactions, particularly in this ever-changing world of globalization and cosmopolitanism.

2. English 'of': a Multidisciplinary Approach

2.1. Statistics and Theoretical Stance

The word 'of', often labeled as preposition, is one of the linguistic elements used mainly in the formation of postmodification structures in English. In all English registers, it is the prepositional phrases that are "by far the most common type of postmodifier" and, in the written non-fiction registers, too, they belong to the group of the highly frequently used expressions(Biber et al. 635). Among the six English prepositions that account for 90% of all postmodifying prepositional phrases, the preposition 'of' is the most commonly used, accounting for 60 to 65% of all the preposition-using situations¹⁰⁾. Based on the concrete figures, general statistical information about the English lexical item 'of' indicates a great deal of significance and usefulness with regard to its theoretical implications and its practicality in its real language use [thus, it is highly relevant both to translation practices and theories].

10) See Table 8.13 for detailed information(Biber et al. 635).

Nevertheless, traditional and current academic researches in textual, discursive, philosophical, and comparative linguistics have shed relatively little light on its nature and characteristics (including its linguistic behaviors and the description(s)/explanation(s) of them) in comparison with other linguistic elements like verb and noun phrases. Even in detailed investigations, 'of' is often considered a sub-item of the grammatical category 'preposition'—owing to its major structural similarities with words like 'to', 'in', 'at', and 'on'—and, with the exception of the semantic properties¹¹⁾, its general linguistic characteristics are seen as non-different¹²⁾ from the other prepositions.

Despite the discrepancy between the actual status of the word 'of' in language use and the general theoretical stance of 'of' as a lexical item/grammatical entity [with the latter homogenized and standardized], the linguistic value of 'of'—whether theoretical or pragmatic—has never been considered small. And its uniqueness¹³⁾ and significance¹⁴⁾ have long been recognized. The importance of undertaking in-depth investigations on the particular English word 'of' has now more increased in the era of globalization. And the time-specific sociocultural implications are to be discussed in section 2.3.

2.2. History: Etymology and Modern Linguistics

Origins of the English word 'of' are observable in Old English, in which 'of' was used as unstressed form of 'æf'. While its phonetic form is likely

11) See Keedong Lee(2006); Andrea and Evans(2003); Kim and Kim(2004) for pertinent studies.

12) For example, see Chomsky(1965), Kweesoon Kim(1998), and O'Dowd(1998) among many accounts.

13) It is more conceptual than spatio-temporal(cf. Keedong Lee 365-96; Kim and Kim 339-43).

14) It can be a clue to finding some fundamental semantic universals(cf. Wierzbicka, 1996).

identical with that of the corresponding unstressed form in Old English, the two words are semantically very distinct¹⁵). The shift in meaning took place in Middle English, at which time the word 'of' was being variously used to translate the Latin words 'de' and 'ex' as well as the Old French word 'de'¹⁶). Societal changes, including the arrival and inhabitation of numerous foreign language speakers (e.g. Old Norse and Old French), greatly affected the English of the time. Some had an enormously diversifying effect on English, and the traces are ubiquitously reflected in current usage¹⁷).

As its background history suggests, 'of' has long been one of the most frequently used linguistic elements, with its basic yet versatile roles working as a main contributor to the common usage. Nevertheless, it has been unsuccessful in drawing a fair share of attention from scholars and researchers in academic fields (e.g. philosophy, linguistics, (foreign) language education, etc.), and academic debates over its grammatical category (or categories) and corresponding functions—syntactic and semantic ones, mainly—still remain controversial.

For instance, having been influenced by the Aristotelean notion that nouns are of central concern in grammatical analyses and linguistic investigations(Dinneen, 1967; Kwang-Jung Lee, 2003), traditional grammarians grouped 'of' (along with 'in', 'at', 'to', 'on', 'with', etc.) into a dependent class, of which each member is generally positioned before a noun element to postmodify its preceding element (a noun, usually). They, thus, chose 'preposition' as a name for members of this then supposedly unified grammatical group. Their classificatory method was widely accepted and taught

15) 'æ' (literally meaning "away, away from"), from Proto-Germanic 'af-', from Proto-Indo-European 'apo-' (literally meaning "off, away")(www.etymoline.com).

16) 'de' in Old French had become the substitute for the genitive case (www.etymoline.com).

17) This is a good example of the expression "a diachrony-within-synchrony"(Lecerle 201-208).

as well as swiftly distributed. Today, despite the still prevalent use of the general label, many acknowledge its limitations in describing the overall syntactico-semantic characteristics of the unique English word 'of', let alone explaining why 'of' sometimes behaves in a fashion other than that of a simple, "pure"¹⁸⁾ preposition (e.g. of course, consist of, in view of, etc.). An example of the controversy on the linguistic status of 'of' involves the positing of a root-shape grammatical unit called "Preposition Phrase" (henceforth, PP), a structurally defined category proposed and commonly employed by linguists in generative grammar. In discussions on PP, major syntax-oriented accounts present a variety of linguistic roles for the 'of'-involved grammatical unit: as a subcategory of verb(Chomsky, 1965), a noun phrase(Ross, 1967), a case marker(Fillmore, 1968), a verb(Lakoff, 1968), an independent PP(Klima, 1965), and a transitive¹⁹⁾ preposition(Emonds, 1972) among others.

Confronted by theoretical questions about the linguistic status and properties of 'of'-like words (e.g. 'in', 'up', 'through', 'to', 'with', 'over', 'down', 'out', etc.), some linguists have turned to semantics (cognitive semantics, in particular) in order to grasp the underlying systematicity—as well as the specific prototypical relations—of such "polysemous" entities (e.g. Tyler and Evans, 2003; K. Lee, 2006; cf. O'Dowd, 1998)²⁰⁾. In related studies, however, the problem of capturing the particular and collective linguistic properties of 'of'-contained expressions does not seem easily solvable, and the situation is further complicated by a lack of terminological consistency [for instance, 'of' is sometimes referred to as a 'spatial particle', a 'verb-particle', an 'adprep', a 'particle prefix', and so on](Kim and Kim 117).

18) O'Dowd, for example, classifies 'of' as "pure" preposition unlike other particle types(O'Dowd, 1998).

19) On the other hand, intransitive prepositions are classified as 'particles'.

20) The proto-scene of 'of' is provided in the Table 7.6.(Kim and Kim 341). The visual conceptualization of the 'of'-related cognitive semantic relationships is illustrated in K. Lee(365-96). For the cognitive grammar using the notion of "trajector(TR)" and "landmark(LM)", refer to Langacker's research(Langacker, 1987) in particular.

Such widespread lack of agreement concerning the status of 'of' should cause us to wonder whether the linguistic properties of P- or PP-included categories can be satisfactorily explained and evaluated within a single theory. For example, Kweesoon Kim(1998) argues that there is no one-to-one correspondence relationship observable between the syntactic and semantic functions of PP's. Instead, Kim suggests that there be multiple relationships at work. In a discourse-functional approach to English prepositions and particles, O'Dowd reaches the same conclusion: she notes that, in spite of the uncontroversial distinction between prepositions and particles, questions remain inevitably in regard to the categorial status and function(s) of each word type(O'Dowd, 1998). While O'Dowd alternatively uses the expression 'P-forms' to refer to both, it still seems problematic not to be able to account for the presence of the two different lexical categories for a single lexical form. And, as a matter of fact, this shows a room for further development in related theories, and it may be more than theoretical linguists' assignment.

2.3. English 'of' in the Era of Globalization

As stressed in the previous sections, an in-depth study on the English word 'of' is required now more than ever. In this era of globalization, acquiring specific and thorough knowledge on this highly frequently used expression and making the most creative use of it must be a definite way to increase "forms of expression" and lead globalization to "enable experimentalism and intellectual adventure"(During 95).

In so doing, another realization is that language studies have surpassed the point of being able to contain and explain everything within a single theoretical territory [: a dominant discipline] and, also, that the emergence and interdisciplinary development of translation studies²¹⁾ have led researchers to

21) The diversification rising within traditional disciplines is another factor. On the importance of in-depth research in general linguistics, for example, refer to Kim's

think that there is, in effect, far more to a language activity than what theoretical linguistic knowledge can alone account for (e.g. translation in cultural studies(Bae and Bae, 2007)). Considering the given situations and related factors, a new multidisciplinary approach in translation studies appears to gain ground and legitimacy in the process of a wide-range investigation.

3. Translation Studies' Turn

3.1. Beyond Fragmentation

Although few would doubt that translation practices have been instrumental in aiding the development of most of the world's great civilizations, neither academics nor other professionals seem to have paid much attention to how long it took for the discipline of 'translation studies' to arise. Unlike other significant practice/discipline pairs (e.g. polis/political science, printing press/literature studies, computers/computer science, etc.), which tend to arrive within relatively short times of one another, translation studies followed its practical predecessor by thousands of years.

Even today it continues to be considered an emergent field and is openly criticized. Some object that translators have been purposefully made invisible in theories of translation practices(Venuti, 1995; 1998); others claim that translation has been easily regarded as subsidiary and derivative(Belloc, 1931; Bassnett-McGuire, 1980 2). There are some, however, who welcome the "success story of the 80's"(Bassnett and Lefevere xi; Venuti, 1998 8). Still, researchers in translation studies have more challenges than ever before for it is not "easy to propose a theory of consistency and [some] do not feel the need of it"(Hyo-Joong Kim 6).

Probably, the biggest reason for its belated emergence is that translation is

comprehensive study(Jeong-Woo Kim, 2001).

indeed scandalous²²⁾ by its nature. According to Venuti, "translation is treated [...] disadvantageously [...] partly because it occasions revelations that question the authority of dominant cultural values and institutions"(Venuti, 1998 1). And the linguistic and cultural impacts of such scandal-free attitude persist and an illustrative example of this is the clear division between linguistics-based orientations and aesthetics-based orientations in theoretical research(Venuti, 1998 8-9) [let us put aside the long history of fragmentation].

Despite all, the remaining question should focus on how to develop the discipline in its own right, passing the stage of asking why it has happened so and who were or are responsible for it. In that sense, it is very noteworthy that a lot of interdisciplinary researches in translation studies are being carried out in varied disciplines worldwide. And this eclectic approach focusing on multidisciplinary is to be considered an experimental attempt to be part of the new currents.

3.2. English 'of' into Korean

3.2.1. Under the Conditions of a "Major Language"²³⁾

At any given time, the linguistic elements of a particular language are generally conceived of as major and present forms. They are thought to follow the major norms derived from or constructed by a set of constants and universals. A close look at the English word 'of', however, shows that categorizing it as preposition(i.e. a major grammatical category) cannot fully provide descriptive and explanatory adequacies in the linguistic theory. It is partly because language is an "essentially heterogenous reality"(Deleuze and

22) Venuti specifically selects the term 'scandal', proposing that "the scandals of translation [be] cultural, economic, and political"(Venuti, 1998 1).

23) In the book *Mille Plateaux* [vol. 2 of *Capitalisme et Schizophr nie*], Deleuze and Guattari pinpoint that "language can be scientifically studied only under the conditions of a standard or major language"(Deleuze and Guattari, 1987 100). In this paper, the English translation by Brian Massumi is quoted.

Guattari, 1987 7)—that is, a potential to retain many variables. At the same time, a brief study on its history suggests that some atypical properties of the word 'of' must have been the major characteristics in the past, which, through the history of power relationships, have turned into minor traits by now. If the current usage of the word 'of' is no exception, the question then becomes, "How much of it is comprised of the major part and how much else is of the minor part?". And, more importantly, does it affect the process of translating?

If one endeavors to answer the questions by resorting to the dichotomy between the major and the minor (or any kind of binarity-based division), it would be very likely to result in a futile trial. It is very so since the notions of the major and the minor, or those of constants and variables are not opposed to each other. As Deleuze and Guattari specify in the chapter called "Postulates of Linguistics," the gist is not whether such two kinds of languages exist but how two possible treatments of the same language are made²⁴). And in that sense, searching for a major rule in linguistics²⁵) could be a way to look more closely at a larger-scale map in analyzing and understanding the inside mechanism of the 'of-involved translations.

For example, generative grammar is one of the major grammatical theories and leading academic camps in linguistics. Since the 1960's, when the American linguist Noam Chomsky published his book *Syntactic Structures*(1957), a single largely-agreed-upon rule has been assumed to explain prepositional linguistic phenomena: that is, $PP \rightarrow P NP$ ²⁶). According to this

24) They also add that it is wrong to think that constants exist "alongside" variables. Simply, "a treatment of the variable [gets] opposed to the other kind of treatment, or continuous variation". Therefore, it is rather two usages or functions of language, than two different languages, that "major" and "minor" qualify(Deleuze and Guattari, 1987 103-104).

25) Although Deleuze and Guattari state that "linguistics in general is still in a kind of major mode"(Deleuze and Guattari, 1987 97), further research is necessary to verify it [and, also, would be worth its implementation].

26) Chomsky, 1965 101-13; Klima, 1965; Chomsky, 1970; 1986a; 1986b; etc. cf. Ross,

rule, all prepositions should behave and can be described²⁷⁾ in such categorial and hierarchical manner; likewise, the linguistic behaviors of any pertinent grammatical element (in this case, any lexical element with prepositional characteristics) are assumed to fall within the rule's scope²⁸⁾.

This seemingly highly restrictive and prescriptive theoretical setting might initially appear to unnecessarily demarcate what is actually said (i.e. speech) from what can or should be spoken (i.e. (formal) language). Indeed, many scholars and professionals in translation practices and theories have expressed a degree of skepticism on this point (e.g. Venuti, 1998 25; Gentzler, 2001 52-59, against the scientific models in linguistics). Still, accepting notions from various disciplines and theoretical frameworks openly yet selectively would be appropriate in an eclectic approach, especially in order to promote a unique and autonomous multidiscipline in which translation plays a central role as an interlingual and crosscultural act of processing—devised and implemented by an individual expert with his or her own unique and optimal translating strategies and background knowledge (e.g. Holz-Mänttari, 1984; Gentzler, 2001 71). In addition to that, if the phrase structure rule $PP \rightarrow P NP$ is a standardized rule for the major language, the corresponding translations of the relevant expressions would possibly provide a clue to finding the kind of treatment that the major mainly perform. Below are some of the examples taken from the first part of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein: or The Modern Prometheus*²⁹⁾(Shelley, 2004 15-36), each followed by the respective translation

1967; Fillmore, 1968; Lakoff, 1968; Jakendoff, 1973 355; etc.

27) Which means 'descriptively adequate'.

28) Which means 'explanatorily adequate'.

29) *Frankenstein: or The Modern Prometheus* is one of the world's most famous literary works and is considered by many to be one of "the greatest masterpieces of all times". It was created roughly a hundred and ninety years ago by Mary Shelley (1797-1851), also known as Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin or Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley, a daughter of Mary Wollstonecraft and William Godwin, who were well-renowned in England and in Western society generally as radical,

into Korean(Sook-Eun Oh, 2002 23-48).

intelligent thinkers. Although the first publication of the work in 1818 has earned her more fame and respect than she would have ever expected, it is very hard to imagine that the typical images of her monstrous character depicted and proliferated in today's popular culture (especially among the fandom of the horror genre) were ever part of her original intention.

In the case at hand, the logic behind the title '*Frankenstein: or The Modern Prometheus*' is critical to understanding the work and its setting. Somewhat surprisingly, the connotations associated with the title today—generally ones of horror or madness—in fact seem very far removed from the author's actual intention. The expression 'Modern Prometheus' was first coined by Immanuel Kant, a well-known German philosopher, in reference to Benjamin Franklin and his experiments with the electricity. The name 'Frankenstein', which Shelley chose for the experimental doctor who ultimately gives life to his monstrous creation by means of electric shock, bears such an obvious phonetic similarity to 'Franklin' that there seems little doubt an association between the two was intended, and also that, in making such an association, she intended to draw attention to the social implications of Franklin's then recent discoveries.

Putting aside all other important and intriguing accounts of the work of Mary Shelley, there, nevertheless, seem to be at least two significant reasons requiring a new (Korean) translation done by a contemporary translator with historical insight and cultural cosmopolitanism. First, past translators seem to have paid too little attention to the fact that Mary Shelley was still a young female, only 19 years old at the time of writing her book. And, to represent adequately the message she endeavored to convey with each written word in the book, the new translator should have a sharp eye, a penetrating wisdom, a great sense of contemporaneity, and a futuristic perspective; these characteristics are needed to help the translator transcend issues of gender, society, and era to which Mary Shelley would have undoubtedly been subject. Second, the possibility of creating a monster such as Frankenstein's has today become a near reality. What the public of her time would surely have thought of only as a horrendous fictionality is today a genuine possibility. Human cloning and other types of genetic manipulation are hot topics that raise very serious ethical issues and question our previous conceptions of identity. Now, more than ever before, seems to be an ideal time to reattempt to take the author's message into account and conduct due translation(s) based on the novel's complex elements.

(1) PP→ P NP as Major Rule

a) of the heavenly bodies

→ 천상의 (chensang-ui)³⁰⁾

b) of my own creation

→ 내 작품의 (nay cakphwum-ui)

c) of our own country

→ 우리 나라의 (wuli nala-ui)

d) of modern poets

→ 오늘날 시인들의 (onulnal siintul-ui)

e) of an enterprise

→ 사업은 (saep-un)

f) of my welfare

→ 나의 안부와 함께 (na-ui anpwu-wa hamkkey)

g) of my early years

→ 어린 시절부터 (elin sicol-pwute)

h) of those icy climes

→ 그곳의 혹독한 기후를 (gugos-ui hoktokhan kihwu-lul)

i) of this time

→ 이 때를 (i ttay-lul)

j) of the various voyages

→ 다양한 항해(tayanghan hanghay-)

k) of Homer and Shakespeare

→ 호메로스와 셰익스피어 (homeylos-wa syeyiksophie-)

l) of their earlier bent

→ 어릴 적 탐닉했던 (elil cek thamnikhayssten)

m) of success

→ 성공에 (sengkong-ey)

n) of a capacious mind

30) The Korean transcripts follow the Yale system.

- 마음이 넓은 (maum-i nelpun)
 o) of his discipline
 → 규율에 (kyuwuywul-ey)
 p) of men
 → 남들이 (namtul-i)
 q) of the traveller
 → 그 나그네가 (ku nakuney-ka)

The translating data and the translated outcomes suggest a few typology-based conclusions while raising some significant question(s). The conclusions are as follows. First, noun phrases generally remain intact in their morpho-syntactic and semantic representations even after the translation; second, whereas the preposition 'of' obligatorily precedes a noun phrase, the corresponding expression in Korean constantly follows its noun-phrase equivalent; and third, despite the invariant and identical linguistic properties of 'of' in English³¹⁾, the translated expressions in Korean display variation, which may indicate the lack of a grammatical entity with corresponding or similar linguistic properties in Korean³²⁾. Interestingly, although the possibility of lacking a corresponding linguistic entity/property in a language raises questions³³⁾, the notions of the major and the minor clearly appear to facilitate the

31) cf. Another functional word 'to' has multiple properties and the differences are salient in the sentences like 'I went to the North Pole', 'He wanted to take a break', and 'She wrote a letter to tell her friends of her news'.

32) For example, the Korean language does not have any corresponding or similar expressions for the French reflexive verbs, and, due to the factor, the French verbs of such kind only result in something that does not present their consistent morpho-syntactic characteristics upon translation, even if the translated outcomes would work in consistency within their language system.

33) For instance, "Is the translating language intrinsically insufficient in relation to the translated language (or vice versa) in such way that the original message is predestined to become misleading and distorted in the translating language?"

discussions on them.

In other words, when the inter-/multidisciplinary approach of this study adopts the notions of 'major' and 'minor' forms, which are proposed by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari and soon applied in translation studies by Lawrence Venuti, the inter-and intralingual power dynamics elaborated by Venuti(1998) start to hold a critical clue to a better understanding of the intricate and ever-dynamic act of translation.

Describing language in a sociolinguistic context, Venuti argues that (a) forms are the constituents of a semiotic regime; (b) they circulate among various cultural constituencies and social institutions; (c) they are "positioned hierarchically," and the standard dialect takes a dominant positions in the hierarchy; (d) the major form, nonetheless, is always "subject to constant variation from regional or group dialects, jargons, cliches and slogans, stylistic innovations, nonce words, and the sheer accumulation of previous uses"; (e) the linguistic variations released by minor variables "do not merely exceed any communicative act but frustrate any effort to formulate systematic rules"(Venuti, 1998 10). Taking into account the sociolinguistic aspect that "a language is a specific conjuncture of a major form holding sway over minor variables"(ibid.), the previous question on the natural inequality or insufficiency of a translating language in regard to its equation with a translated language answers itself. Certainly, it is not the relative inequality or comparative insufficiency of a particular language that prevents a translator from producing a perfect or perfectly good translation. Rather, it is the minor forms and their constant variations—working actively within a particular language—that make all attempts to formulate systematic rules challenging³⁴).

If this is true, can the Korean translations, with their seeming irregularities, provide empirical evidence for the existence of some implicit

34) For instance, in Old English, the standard word order was not Subject-Verb-Object like today and the prepositions were not "pre-"positions but pre- and postpositions concurrently, depending on the structural environment they were put in.

variations (cf. cognitive semantics) working intralingually—in spite of the conformed phonology and morphology of the word 'of—and getting explicitly activated and represented in another language, where the original "site of power relationships"(Venuti 10) somehow loses or dilutes its intensity in a different site? In that sense, translation is not only an interlingual act but also a 'mode' with which one can demonstrate the increase of radical heterogeneity by consciously releasing those minor variables—Lecerclé(1990) calls them the 'remainder'. And further, by making use of his or her own sense of translation strategy and ethics, a translator can be an important contributor in the areas of humanities. In this period of cosmopolitanism, translators can help illuminate varied aspects of particular languages through a variety of translation modes [even those aspects that are difficult to detect by native speakers] and perhaps even lend support to theories of Universal Grammar proposed by Chomsky and his followers. To examine the validity in the above notions and speculations, this study shall re-examine and analyze the given translation examples in greater detail, focussing on minor variations.

3.2.2. Minor Variables in Translation

In the previous section, a linguistic comparison between the translating data (: prepositional phrases in English) and the translated outcomes (: corresponding phrases in Korean) was conducted, using the 'major' structural formation of the formal linguistic rule $PP \rightarrow P NP$ as a guide post. The contrastive analysis immediately revealed that, while the English data show a consistent and regular operation under the grammatical rule of the 'major' language, the Korean translations, surprisingly, present no explicit sign of consistency or regularity, except for a slight inclination towards the ending '-ui (으)'³⁵⁾, which is commonly considered as the Korean equivalent of the

35) Some see '-ui' as the Korean genitive case marker (e.g. Cheong-Soo Suh, 1971; Kwang-Soo Sung, 1980).

preposition 'of' (cf. Seok-Ju Ko, 2004 6).

A conventional contrastive linguistic analysis might present the following conclusions. (1) The English syntactic rule $PP \rightarrow P NP$ attains infinite productivity; (2) for the sake of universality, some morpho-syntactic similarities can be found in the examples, and $\langle PP \rightarrow NP P \rangle$ and $\langle P \rightarrow -ui \rangle$ may be posited as formal linguistic rules in Korean; (3) if the study followed a 'restrictiveness-oriented approach' (e.g. Lim, 2004 18-25), the two languages would be regarded as belonging to very different language families and, as a result, they would be assumed to possess intrinsically independent and dissimilar linguistic characteristics. Accepting such analysis and conclusions would force researchers in translation studies to think that the fundamental differences between particular languages must lead translators into challenging or even impossible situations. This only means the fate of "Traduttore, traditore".

This paper, however, does not stop its investigations here. Its main objective lies not in obtaining principle-oriented conclusions but in applying a multidimensional and multidisciplinary approach as thoroughly as possible towards an integrated, optimal theory in translation studies (akin to the system of "rhizome" in Jin-Kyung Lee, 2002). Then, faced with the age-old dilemmas of "Equivalence, or failure" and "Traduttore, traditore", this experimental paper is instead going to approach the irregularities exhibited in (1)(a)-(q) as empirical evidence of a translator's primary autonomy and "creativity"(cf. Loffredo and Perteghella 1-11)³⁶⁾, which should, in turn, also emphasize the critical significance of having creative and autonomous translators if translations are to attain ultimate optimality. In these examples, a new function of translation may also be discovered, because the irregularities—that is, the 'minor' variations surfaced upon translation—can be considered examples of

36) The term 'creativity' in this study does not touch on its artistic sense per se. Rather, it has the connotation that translator can make creative use of minor variables by choosing not to strictly follow the norms and meanings assigned by the major.

creative translating. Thus, translation would seem to function as a systematic projector of the 'illuminating' signals of heterogeneity and multiplicity that often implicitly reside (or stay dormant) in a language.

Consider the translation examples below: in them the contrastive analysis is re-done in view of notions from literature, cultural studies, philosophy, politics, and categorial grammar. Consequently, an alternative 'minor' rule <x OF y> is employed and the peculiar endings in the Korea-n translations are marked independently (in bold for notational convenience) to get clues on what 'of' can convey and, also, on what the translator seems to want to express in each use of 'of' (cf. syntactical structures are not considered here since translators are assumed to acquire and utilize their linguistic proficiency fully, in regards to both the translating and translated languages).

(2) x OF y ³⁷⁾ as Minor Rule

- a) [x the phenomena] **of** [y the heavenly bodies]
 → [y' 천상]-**의** [x' 현상들] (chensang-**ui** hyensangtul)
- b) [x Paradise] **of** [y my own creation]
 → [y' 내 작품]-**의** [x' 낙원] (nay cakphwum-**ui** nakwen)
- c) [x the celebrated poets] **of** [y our own country]
 → [y' 우리 나라]-**의** [x' 유명한 시들] (wuli nala-**ui** yumyenghan situl)
- d) [x the production of the most imaginative] **of** [y modern poets]
 → [y' 오늘날 시인들]-**의** [x' 작품] (onulnal siintul-**ui** cakphwum)
- e) [x the commencement] **of** [y an enterprise]
 → [y' 사업]-**은** [x' (...) 시작되었다*] (saep-**un** (...) sicaktoyessta*)
- f) assure [x my (...) sister] **of** [y my welfare]
 → [x' (...) 누이를 안심(시키기 위해)*] [y' 나의 안부]-**와 함께**
 ((...) na-ui anpwu-**wa hamkkey**)
- g) [x the favourite dream] **of** [y my early years]

37) Therefore, <PP → NP P> vs. <y'-J x'> (J: Josa) in Korean.

- [y' 어린 시절]-부터 [x' 늘 꿈꿔왔던 것*]
(elin siceI-pwute nul kkwumkkewassten kes*)
- h) [x a foretaste] of [y those (...) climes]
→ [y' 그곳의 (...) 기후]-를 [x' 미리 맛보게 (...)*]
(gugos-ui hoktokhan kihwu-lul mili maspokey*)
- i) [x profited] of [y this time]
→ [y' 이 때]-를 [x' 이용해] (i ttay-lul iyonghay)
- j) [x the accounts] of [y the various voyages]
→ [y' 다양한 항해]-Ø [x' 이야기들(은)]
(tayanghan hanghay-Ø iyakitulun)
- k) [x the names] of [y Homer and Shakespeare]
→ [y' 호메로스와 셰익스피어]-Ø [x' 이름이]
(homeylos-wa syeyiksophie-Ø ilumi)
- l) [x the channel] of [y their earlier bent]
→ [y' 어릴 적 탐닉했]-더-ㄴ [x' 꿈으로 (돌아..)]
(elil cek thamnikhayss-te-n X)
- m) [x the enthusiasm] of [y success]
→ [y' 성공]-에 [x' 열광(할 때)*] (sengkong-ey yelkwanghalttay*)
- n) [x possessed] of [y a capacious mind]
→ [y' 마음이 넓]-은 [x' Ø] (maum-i nelp-un Ø *)
- o) [x the mildness] of [y his discipline]
→ [y' 규율]-에 [x' 엄매이지않(아서)] (kywuywul-ey elkmayicianh(ase)*)
- p) [x the common pathways] of [y men]
→ [y' 남들]-이 [x' 가는 평범한 길*]
(namtul-i kanun phyengpemhan kil*)
- q) [x the rapid progress] of [y the traveller]
→ [y' 그 나그네]-가 [x' 빠른 속도로*] (ku nakuney-ka ppalul soktolo*)

As was previously speculated, translations which supposedly fall within the cases of the 'major-form' formulation in Korean—based on the major rules <PP

→ P NP> and <P→ of > in English—should exhibit firstly the <PP→ NP P> pattern in the structural role (: P as "post-" position), and secondly the <P→ -ui > information in the lexicon of 'major' forms. In the above examples, each translated text in Korean consists mostly of an NP and an "ending"(O'Grady, 1991; 1999) (cf. (2)(l), (2)(n)), which are connected by a hyphen for notational convenience. While a majority of the Korean renderings in Oh(2002) prove such major-form-based predictions to be plausible and reliable, there are also some particular translation examples that appear to go against—or at least in a different direction from—the 'major-form'-involving principles.

Based on the minor-rule-oriented formula of <x OF y> → <y'-J x'> (J: "Josa" in Korean(Ki-Shim Nam et al., 2006)), the proposed alternative analysis should illuminate tokens so as to highlight 'minor' variables if there are any. At this point, the most noticeable diversity involves a variety of "endings", or "Josas". These occur between the two linguistic elements x' and y'. And, by means of inference, this paper proposes that those Josas (other than '-ui') in the translated text examples should be seen as the variant, minor forms that are activated by the minor variables in Korean and optimally and selectively chosen by the translator in order to minoritize her translation (implemented on both the conscious and unconscious levels).

On this basis, this paper also claims that language is not only a "diachrony-within-synchrony"(Lecerle 201-208) but also a set of minor forms within a major dialect frame. Importantly, although major rules and major forms take a higher position in the power relations, it actually is the minor variables and minor forms that permit more freedom and versatility in terms of expressivity and creativity. Traditional grammarians obviously preferred major forms, and their prescriptive norms for minor forms were thought to be far too unpredictable, too vulgar, or too free to maintain control over. For example, a simple test of exchangeability shows how powerful the major forms are and, also, how unpredictable yet versatile the minor forms can get. As a matter of fact, the high exchangeability of '-ui' (the closest corresponding expression in

Korean to the English word 'of') indicates a high acceptability of the major form. But high acceptability does not necessarily entail high creativity.

This study hypothesizes that the Korean translator of the classic English novel must have devised her own translation strategies and "minoritizing" techniques(Venuti, 1998 11): that is, she uses minor forms in the above examples as linguistic representations of the cognitively available minor variables that involve her conception of 'of'. In the same logic, those specific 'Josas' per se can be examples of major forms when they pertain to other major rules (e.g. the '-i/ -ka' Josa pair and the nominative case).

To an extent, the translator's note(Oh 329-335) reflects how zealous and empathetic she³⁸⁾ was in her translating of the novel(Oh 330-331). And, regarding her position as a translator for the Korean audience and as a voice for each character in the book, the activation of minor variables and the use of the related minor forms³⁹⁾ could have played an important and constructive role, particularly in her attempt to convey all of her enthusiasm and effort autonomously and creatively.

This analysis, consequently, proves that the existence of minor variables can actually be found in real translations (that is, in the actual data of natural language use) and that it can be substantiated as part of an integral theory in translation studies. It additionally highlights the benefits of a multidisciplinary research methodology. Below are the examples of preliminary theorizations based on the multidisciplinary approach and the empirical findings. These can be further studied for the possibility of the existence of translator's active (yet rather cognitive) translation strategies for minoritizing translations.

38) For example, a young professional female from Korea who now lives in the era of "postmodern Prometheus"(Oh 334) and is concerned about the contemporary period of science-oriented civilization.

39) 'of' is cognitively so 'polysemous' that such variations in Korean are not only possible but even appear highly acceptable and appropriate instead of being viewed as overly saturated with deep hues of foreignness.

(3) Classification of the Major vs. Minor Translations

a) Type 1: 'Major' Translation

Type 1-1. Major Rule & Major Renditions

ex) of the heavenly bodies 천상-의 (-'s; possessive)

cf. of danger or death 위험과 죽음에 대한 (about)

b) Type 2: 'Minor' Translation

Type 2-1. Minor Renditions with Morphological Variations⁴⁰⁾

ex) of an enterprise 사업-은 (as for)

of my welfare 나의 안부-와 함께 (with)

of success 성공-에 (at, to)

of my early years 어린 시절-부터 (from, since)

of feeling 감정-을 (object case)

of frost and desolation 얼음-뿐인 황량-한 (adjective; modifying)

Type 2-2. Minor Renditions with Categorical Variations⁴¹⁾

ex) the happiness of her life 행복하게 사는 (adverb + verb)

want of sleep 부족한 잠 (reversed order in the modification)

was fond of reading 독서광이었다 (compound noun)

too impatient of difficulties 난관에 닥치면 (temporal/ conditional clause)

4. Translator and Becoming-Minoritarian

Producing high-quality translations is every translator's task and, in view of the above reasoning, doing so requires that a good deal of inter- and

40) Such renditions are not common yet relatively predictable.

41) Such renditions may seem 'natural' and nice in the flow. To theorists and grammarians, however, these are relatively little predictable because they do not necessarily comply with the rules and conditions of major forms.

multidisciplinary research be undertaken by both scholars and professional translators. And considering the significant connections between the thematic significance of the writing and the theoretical implications in the translating and translated texts in a retrospective manner, it appears both legitimate and appropriate to say that the translations are not only the graphical manifestation of translator's thinking but also the visual/textual traces of what kind of power-relationship sites she/he experiences during her/his translating. And as those sites are more political and cultural than one usually imagines or perceives in translation, the strategy of releasing minor variables can function as a useful tool for becoming-minoritarian: to obtain creativity and autonomy(Deleuze and Guattari, 1987 106).

5. Concluding Remarks

Translation, in a "simple and practical" sense, refers to an act (and outcome) of putting a text written in one language into another language. And translator is the title that the person who does 'translation' gets to be granted or gives himself or herself. Because of the simplicity and practicality that superficially represented the delicate and complex interlingual and cross-cultural processing, translation and its related areas have long been put in the position of minority, always marginalized and alienated(Venuti, 1998) with translator made totally invisible in the system(Venuti, 1995). What mattered the most, then, was product-targeted criticism especially on concepts like equivalence and fidelity, and the related philosophical or literary inquiries had a lot to do with translation techniques (unless the author wanted to argue more on the nature of language or the myth of the Babel Tower). While a 'great' age of literature was always a 'great' age of translation, and while it should have been given corresponding credit and prosperity (both in the academic and non-academic world) for that, the reality of translation and for translator consequently has

become an archetype of oxymoron: the notorious catch phrase (for whom?) 'Traduttore, traditore' has followed translators and translations everywhere, labeling them as "illegitimate", or "disqualified", "lacking loyalty and trust", or "defying the authority of its master client (and consequently and ultimately 'never satisfactory')". With this background history, it is little surprising that translation practices and studies have only recently started to have a genuine readership and academic attention (that is, translation written and read as a translation).

It, however, has turned out useful—conducive to the development of not only the field of translation studies but also other academic fields of research concerning human language, cognition, and culture—to have a variety of accounts from different sources for both those who specialize in translation and those who are interested and engage in the field of research as, in spite of the difficulty in finding a theoretical common ground on which translation professionals and researchers can further establish and expand the new field of study called translation studies, it is the inter-/multidisciplinary approaches that have allowed experts from various backgrounds to (be able to) discuss a wide range of topics at the same table, and it is the heterogeneity of such research results that have facilitated the comprehension (and the following theorization) of the multi-dimensional nature of translation processes and activities.

Taking it as a key clue, this paper argues that a(n) inter-/multidisciplinary approach is not only a critical tool to develop and contribute to the discipline of translation studies but also a useful method to examine and re-evaluate theories in its related disciplines and problems that they face. Based on the proposal, it attempts to describe and explain the linguistic behaviors of English 'of' by taking actual examples of language use from a published novel translation(Sook-Eun Oh, 2002; Shelley, 1818; 2004), English into Korean, in order to demonstrate a close, tightly interwound relationship between language, mind, and culture⁴²). In addition, in order to exemplify and substantiate the theoretical claim that, as Venuti puts it, there exist the hidden networks of

power dynamics within a language and that they consist of the 'major' vs. 'minor' formations, this study examines the multiple layers of the linguistic representations using a selectively interdisciplinary and contrastive approach. From the multidisciplinary investigation, this study shows that there are the 'remainders', that is, 'minor' variables, residing in a language and that they get activated and released at the onset point of 'doing translation' for a translator. This implies and supports the validity and importance of creative translation as it is the translator who is capable of and, also, has control in releasing remainders at the most optimal moments of creative translation.

Based on the investigation, this paper would like to propose a few strategic solutions for optimal, creative translation and constructive research in translation studies, which are given as below.

1. Translator to be considered the study target, that is, the central clue to finding both norms and anomalies present in texts.
2. The introduction of a multidisciplinary approach and the development of theories that not only embrace the approach with their descriptive and explanatory power but also situate translation studies as their center discipline (cf. comparative literature or comparative linguistics).
3. As the study mainly involves translator as the subject/agent, cultural studies and culture-related investigations are not only critical but also inevitable for the development of the multidiscipline.

42) It eventually aims to hypothesize their interactive dynamics made possible by translation and, in turn, the significance of empirical data (: actual translations, in this study), which is to provide evidence for the Universal Grammar (UG) and the Principles and Parameters (P&P) theories in linguistics and, also, for the existence of cultural interventions into language made in specific and systematic ways (cf. anthropology, cultural semantics, and cultural studies).

References

- Bae, Yoon-Gi and Man-Ho Bae. "The Soul of the Black (Woman) Translated in Cinelogue: Dreamgirls." *Literature and Film Vol. 8 No. 1*, 177-200.
- Baker, Mona. ed. 2001. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Abingdon and New York:Routledge.
- Bassnett-McGuire, Susan. 1980. *Translation Studies*. New York and London:Methuen.
- ____ and André Lefevere. 1992. "General Editors' Preface" in A. Lefevere. ed. and trans. 1992b. *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook*, London and New York:Routledge.
- Belloc, Hillaire. 1931. *On Translation*. Oxford:Clarendon.
- Biber, Douglas et al.. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow:Pearson Education.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague:Mouton.
- ____. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge: MIT P.
- ____. 1970. "Remarks on Nominalization" in Jacobson R. and P. Rosenbaum. eds. *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*. Waltham, Mass.:Ginn.
- ____. 1986a. *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin, and Use*. New York:Praeger.
- ____. 1986b. *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass.:MIT P.
- Cook, Vivian and Mark Newson. 1996. *Chomsky's Universal Grammar*. 2nd ed. Oxford, Malden and Carlton:Blackwell.
- Cronin, Michael. 2006. *Translation and Identity*. Abingdon and New York:Routledge.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. 1980. *Mille Plateaux*, volume 2 of *Capitalisme et Schizophr nie*. Paris:Les Editions de Minuit.
- Dinneen, F. P. 1967. *An Introduction to General Linguistics*. New York:Hold, Rinehart & Winston.

- During, Simon. 2005. *Cultural Studies: A Critical Introduction*. Abingdon and New York:Routledge.
- Emonds, J. 1972. "Evidence that Indirect Object Movement is a Structure Preserving Rule." *Foundations of Language* 8.4.
- Fillmore, Charles. 1968. "The Case for Case" in Bach, E. and R. Harms. eds. *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. New York:Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Gentzler, Edwin. 2001. *Contemporary Translation Theories: Second Revised Edition*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto and Sydney:Multilingual Matters.
- Grice, H. P. 1975. "Logic and Conversation" in Cole, P. and J. L. Morgan. eds. *Syntax and Semantics, vol.3: Speech Acts*. New York:Academic P. 41-58.
- Hall, Stuart and Paul du Gay. 1996. *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London:SAGE.
- Hoffmann, Sebastian. 2005. *Grammaticalization and English Complex Prepositions: A Corpus-based Study*. Abingdon and New York:Routledge.
- Holz-Mänttari, Justa. 1984. *Translatorisches Handeln: Theorie und Methode*. Helsinki:Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 1973. "The Base Rules for Prepositional Phrases" in Anderson, S. A. and R. P. Kiparsky. eds. 1973.
- Jeon, Seong Gi trans. 2003. *Buleowa Yeongeoui Bigyo Muncheron*. Seoul:Korea U P. (J. P. Vinay et J. Darbelnet. 1958. *Stylistique Compare du franais et de l'anglais*. Paris:Les Editions Didier.)
- Jeong, Yeon-Il and Won-Jun Nam trans. 2006. *Beonyeokhak Ipmun Irongwa Jeokyong*. Seoul:Hankuk U of Foreign Studies P Center. (Munday, Jeremy. 2001. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. New York:Routledge.)
- Kayne, Richard S. 2000. *Parameters and Universals*. New York:Oxford U P.
- _____ and Cinque Guglielmo. eds. 2005. *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax*. Oxford and New York:Oxford U P.
- Kim, Dong-Hwan and Kim Ju-Shik. trans. 2004. *Semantics of English*

- Prepositions: A Cognitive Semantic Approach*. Seoul:Pagijeong. (Tyler, Andrea and Vyvyan Evans. 2004. *The Semantics of English Prepositions: Spatial Scenes, Embodied Meaning and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P.)
- Kim, Hyo-Joong. 2004. *The Paradigm for a New Translation*. Seoul:Pureunsasang.
- Kim, Jeong-Woo. 2001. "Translation and Korean Linguistics' Status" in Lee, Kwang-Ho et al.. 2001. *Theory and Reality of Korean Language Research*. Seoul:Tachaksa.
- _____. 2005. "The Trends and Perspective of Translation Studies in Korea(2000-2005)." *The Journal Of Translation Studies (번역학연구) Vol. 6 No. 2*, 29-57.
- Kim, Jong-Bok. 2004b. *Korean Phrase Structure Grammar*. Seoul:Hankukmunhwasa.
- Kim, Kweesoon. 1998. *A Generative Approach to Prepositional Phrases*. Seoul:Hankukmunhwasa.
- Kim, Seunggon. 2007. *Syntactic Analysis of the Semantics of Adnominal Case Marker 'Ui'*. Seoul:Kyungjin.
- Klima, Edward S. 1965. *Studies in Diachronic Syntax*. unpublished Ph.D dissertation. Harvard U.
- Ko, Seok Ju. 2004. *Study on Contemporary Korean Josas: Based on 'Case' notion and Josa '-ka' and '-lul'* (Hyeondae Hangukeo Josai Yeongu I'Gyeok Gaenyeongwa Josa '-ka'wa '-lul'ul Jungsimeuro). Seoul:Hankuk Munhwasa.
- Kramersch, Claire. 1998. *Language and Culture*. Oxford and New York:Oxford U P.
- Langacker, R. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, Vol. I. Stanford, CA:Stanford U P.
- Lecerclé, Jean-Jacques. 1990. *The Violence of Language*. London and New York:Routledge.

- Lee, Jin Gyung. 2002. *Nomadism I & II*, Seoul:Humanist.
- Lee, Kwang-Jung. 2003. *Research on Korean Grammar I: Parts of Speech*. Seoul:Youkrack.
- Lakoff, George. 1968. "Instrumental Adverbs and the Concept of Deep Structure." *Foundations of Language* 4.1, 4-29.
- Lee, Keedong. 2006. *English Prepositions in Cognitive Grammar*. Seoul:Kyungjin.
- Lee, Seung-Kwon. trans. 2002. *The Theoretical Problems of Translation* by Mounin, Georges. Seoul: Korea U P.
- Lim, Eokyung. 2004. "Historical Reanalysis of Multiple 'KA' Constructions in Korean: from Nominatives to Parametric Event Arguments." Master's Thesis. Busan:Pusan National U.
- _____. 2007. "Haeundae as a Book-Machine and a Site of Translation" (a manuscript at work).
- Massumi, Brian trans. 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P. (Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. 1980. *Mille Plateaux*. Paris:Les Editions de Minuit.)
- Mounin, Georges. 1963. *Les Problèmes Théoriques de la Traduction*. Paris:Gallimard.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2001. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London and New York:Routledge.
- Nam, Ki-Shim et al. 2006. *Why The Theory of Speech Parts Again*. Seoul:Communication Books.
- O'Dowd, Elizabeth M. 1998. *Prepositions and Particles in English: A Discourse-functional Account*. New York:Oxford U P.
- O'Grady, William. 1991. *Categories and Case: The Sentence Structure of Korean*. Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series IV, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory. Vol. 71. Amsterdam:John Benjamins.
- _____. 1999. "Computing Korean". In the Proceedings of The POSCO

- Conference on the Korean Language. U of Texas, Austin.
- Perteghella, Manuela and Eugenia Loffredo. eds. 2006. *Translation and Creativity: Perspectives on Creative Writing and Translation Studies*. London and New York:Continuum.
- Shelly, Mary. *Feu Laeng Ken Seu Ta In [Frankenstein]*. Trans. Oh, Sook-Eun. Seoul: Miraesa.
- Shelley, Mary. 2004. *[Frankenstein: or The Modern Prometheus.]* London:Collector's Library.
- Smith, Adam. 1983. "Of the Origin and Progress of Language." Lecture 3. in Bryce, J. C. ed. 1983. *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*. Indianapolis:Liberty P.
- Snell-Hornby, M. 1988 (revised 1995). *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia:John Benjamins.
- Suh, Cheong-Soo. 1971. "Study on Korean Constructions." *Korean Language and Literature*. Vol. 52. (reprinted in 1978. Seoul:Top.)
- Sung, Kwang-Soo. 1980. *Study on Korean Particles: A Generative Analysis*. Seoul:Hyungseol.
- Tyler, Andrea and Vyvyan Evans. 2003. *The Semantics of English Prepositions: Spatial Scenes, Embodied Meaning, and Cognition*. Cambridge and New York:Cambridge U P.
- Vinay, J. P. et J. Darbelnet. 1958. *Stylistique Compare du franais et de l'anglais*. Paris:Les Editions Didier.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York:Routledge.
- _____. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an ethics of difference*. London and New York:Routledge.
- _____. ed. 2000. *The Translation Studies Reader*. New York:Routledge.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1996. *Semantics: Primes and Universals*. Oxford and New York:Oxford U P.

[Abstract]

**Translator in Power Relationships:
a Multidisciplinary Analysis of English 'of' into Korean**

Lim, Eo Kyung
(Pusan National University)

Upon the realization of the significance of a thorough academic research on the English word 'of' and its modification structure for the development of a descriptively and explanatorily adequate linguistic theory and the specification of human insights into natural human language, this paper conducts an intralingual, interlingual, and cross-cultural investigation in the field of translation studies. In the thorough, multidisciplinary investigation by which it means a set of integral approaches made at every possible aspect with the linguistic element situated at the core, rather than a pre-destined theoretical manipulation to make the "minor" linguistic elements fit into a mainstream framework of theory, it proposes that multidisciplinary approaches be an optimal research method not only for language and literature studies but also for translation studies, a new interdiscipline or even multidiscipline that calls for its autonomy more than anything to gain ground in the fields of humanities and the cosmopolitan contexts of the twenty-first-century world.

Faced with the theoretical and conceptual predicaments regarding the English prepositions and particles, this paper first obtains a hint from O'Dowd (1998) that raises a significant logical question about the categorial status and function of a P-form, a generic term that refers to prepositions and particles. And in this logic, this study puts forward its objective to describe and explain the linguistic behaviors of the English 'of', using a theoretical approach that,

hypothetically and hopefully, works best towards an integrated theory not only in linguistics but also in translation studies.

In this study, thereby, the focus of the investigation is put on research methodology as to how an academic explanation could result in a scientific finding and, for the sake of optimality, an open-ended yet integral approach is adopted.: an inter-/multidisciplinary way. For the proceeding, the English word 'of' is chosen so as to observe the linguistic behaviors in scrutiny, and the British novel *Frankenstein: The Modern Prometheus* by Mary Shelley is used (in part) to have a particular socio-cultural and historical context of the text in that the word 'of' is freely yet strategically employed. And in order to get the possible principles and variables (and other factors and elements explicitly and implicitly underlying the mental transaction and verbal expression in the work) shed light on and unearthed, the actual translation samples are adopted (rather randomly so as to best minimize any value-driven intervention into the translated work) and cross-examined both intralingually (among the translating data) and interlingually (with the translated data). And by means of the detailed exemplification and explication in a contrastive analysis using the notion of the major-minor forms of language, it shows that at the center of the methodology does translation studies (or translatology) lie (supported by other studies on language, mind, and culture) and that further researches in translation studies, in particular (as a multidisciplinary yet autonomous field of study on translation practices and theories), should help develop other disciplines in humanities and natural sciences, too, including linguistics, literature, cultural studies, psychology, cognitive science, and sociology.

This study, subsequently, illustrates and proposes a specific research method as to how a multidisciplinary approach towards an integrated theory in translation studies can help both linguistics-oriented and aesthetics-oriented researches deepen their insights and broaden the perspectives regarding subjects of their own interest.

In conclusion, this multidisciplinary investigation into the linguistic property

of the English word 'of' and the complex yet very dynamic workings of the translating into Korean shows that every kind of data of actual language use contains both the major forms and minor variables of the particular language and that a good deal of solid empirical evidence for such existence should be revealed in the process of translating, especially when translations are implemented by an aesthetically creative and strategically active translator. In addition, it argues that it is translation studies that can allow such multidisciplinary and integral approach to tackle complicated theoretical problems concerning human language, mind, and culture, and that the academic field of translation studies should be further promoted and developed not only for the students and researchers in the field but also for the professionals and scholars in other academic disciplines.

▶ Key Words: English 'of', Translation Studies as Multidiscipline, Korean *Josa* System, Major Language, Minor Variables, Translator as Creative Agent.

**The title and content of this paper are part of the preliminary research of the author for her academic fulfillment for a doctorate in translation studies, which is supported by the Brain Korea 21 Project and the English Language and Literature Department of Pusan National University: under the project title <The Graduate Program for Professional Translation in Film Industry>.

임어경

부산대학교

az1translation@yahoo.com

관심분야: 번역학, 문화연구

논문투고일: 2008년 1월 31일

심사완료일: 2008년 2월 23일

게재확정일: 2008년 3월 8일