

Retranslation Hypotheses and Three Korean Translations of *The Martyred**

Miae Han **

Dongguk University, Seoul, Korea
hanmarian@dongguk.edu

Euiyon Cho ***

Dongguk University, Seoul, Korea
choey@dongguk.edu

ABSTRACT

This paper is concerned with whether the second and third Korean translations of the novel *The Martyred* by the Korean American writer Richard Kim are retranslation or not based on Chesterman's (2000) retranslation hypotheses. We look at the difference between retranslation and revision and discuss the validity of a descriptive hypothesis, in which retranslations tend to be closer to the source text. The second translated text is claimed to be a retranslation while the third is a revision of the second. There seems a mutual dependency between the second and the third translated text since the third revises only a small part of the second and contains a large portion of the same interpretations found in the second. We also show that Chesterman's descriptive hypothesis is not valid for some retranslation phenomena. It is shown that revisions tend to be rather closer to the source text and to improve the quality of the earlier translations in terms of a semantic and stylistic equivalence.

* An early version of this paper was presented in Korean Association of Translation Studies 2014 Spring Conference at Hankuk University of Foreign Studies.

** First Author

*** Corresponding Author

KEYWORDS

retranslation hypotheses, *The Martyred*, revision and retranslation, interpretive and descriptive hypothesis

1. Introduction

Retranslation is translation of a source text that has been previously translated into the same target language. According to Gürçağlar (2009: 235), there are many motivations and causes for retranslating literary works: modernizing the language of a translated text; correcting mistakes or misinterpretations in an earlier translation; introducing a new interpretation of a source text; targeting a new readership; changes in ideologies or norms in a target culture, to name a few. Retranslation is also closely tied to the status of a classic. According to Venuti (2004: 25), the status of classic works, such as the Homeric epics, Shakespeare's plays, or Cervantes's *Don Quixote*, is likely to promote retranslation, which in turn helps texts achieve the status of a classic in the target culture. Retranslation of literary works may be a positive phenomenon since it can lead to diverse interpretation depending on translators and "represent the translator's perseveringly striving for artistic perfection" (Jianzhong 2003: 193).

With reference to retranslation, Chesterman (2000) proposed two hypotheses. One is an interpretive hypothesis in which a distinction is made between retranslation and revision. The other is a descriptive hypothesis in which retranslations tend to be closer to the source text. In regard to the latter one, there have been debates in recent years. Jianzhong (2003), Venuti (2004), and Dastjerdi (2013) argue for the hypothesis, while Paloposki and Koskinen (2004) and Deane

(2011) argue against it. In support of the latter, we will claim that a descriptive hypothesis is not always valid for retranslation phenomenon by presenting counter-examples in Korean translations.

The novel *The Martyred* (1964) by Richard Eun Kook Kim, a Korean-American writer, was selected as one of Penguin Classic Books in 2011, although it is a modern work.¹ It was first translated in 1964. Later three other translated texts came out: the second in 1979, the third in 1990 and the fourth in 2010.

This study comparatively examines the three translations of *The Martyred* whose translators are different from each other from the perspective of the two hypotheses. First, based on the interpretive hypothesis, we will show that the second translated text is classified as a retranslation that is distinctively different from the first in terms of interpretation, but the third as a revision of the second. Second, we will present examples showing that a descriptive hypothesis is not necessarily valid by comparing and analyzing the source text and the two or three versions of the Korean translations. Before entering into the analysis of the texts, we will look at retranslation hypotheses in detail in the next section.

2. Theoretical Background

Chesterman (2000) puts forward four kinds of hypotheses concerning retranslation: an interpretive, a descriptive, an explanatory and a predictive hypothesis in order to propose a relation between these hypotheses and models of translation. According to him, there are three basic models of translation in translation studies: a comparative model which examines correlation between target texts and source texts or untranslated texts; a process model which

delineates phases of the translation process over time; a causal one where translations are considered both as caused by previous conditions and causing effects on target readers and cultures. Among these models the third can accommodate the hypotheses and it is the most productive model for translation research.

According to an interpretive hypothesis, “retranslation can be distinguished from revision as follows; revision focuses on a previous translation, retranslation on the original” (Chesterman 2000: 22). In other words, retranslation is classified as a new interpretation and new translation of the source text while revision as a modified version based on a previous translation. Koshinen and Paloposki also distinguish retranslation from revision. According to them, revision is “editing, correcting or modernizing a previously existing translation for republication,” and it “has relied heavily on a previous translation” (Koshinen and Paloposki 2010: 294). They discuss the fuzzy area between retranslation and revision through the case studies in Finland since there are few differences among several versions. They raise ethical considerations such as plagiarism and copyright because existing retranslated texts rely heavily on an earlier translator’s work. Koshinen and Paloposki claim, unlike Vanderschelden’s (2001) opinion, that “revising cannot be seen as a first step towards retranslation” (Koshinen and Paloposki, 2010: 46). They emphasize the need to tell retranslation apart from revision.

A descriptive hypothesis on retranslation is that “later translations (same ST, same TL) tend to be closer to the original than earlier ones” (Chesterman 2000: 23). This hypothesis is influenced by Berman.

It [every first translation] is imperfect because the defectivity inherent in translation and the impact of “norms” are manifested most powerfully in a first translation; it is impure because it is both an

introduction and a translation. This is why every “first translation” demands a re-translation (which does not always happen). It is through re-translation, or better, through successive or simultaneous re-translations, that translation develops. (Berman 1995: 32, Flotow trans.)

Berman, as the above quotation shows, argues that retranslation produces more perfect translation since it can use foreignization by maintaining cultural distance while the first translations usually use domestication for target readers to accept foreign culture easily.

There are controversies on the validity of a descriptive hypothesis. Supporting the hypothesis, Jianzhong (2003: 194) says that a second version has more fluent, closer to the original and better recreation than the first version. Venuti (2004: 29) also says “the retranslation may claim to be more adequate to” the original text and “more complete or accurate.” Besides, Dastjerdi (2013: 174) argues that retranslation is more source-text oriented through the comparative analysis of three stylistic features in the Persian retranslations of *Pride and Prejudice*. But, Paloposki and Koskinen show that there are some counter-examples in Finnish translations, in contrast to many examples that support this descriptive hypothesis. They claim that “there are no inherent qualities in the process of retranslating that would dictate a move from domesticating strategies towards more foreignizing strategies” (Paloposki and Koskinen 2004: 36). Deane (2011) also refuted a descriptive hypothesis through case studies of the British retranslations of Flaubert’s *Madame Bovary* and Sand’s *La Mare au diable*. The former is analyzed in the aspect of linguistic closeness and the latter in the aspect of cultural closeness. In this paper, we support Paloposki and Koskinen (2004) and Deane (2011) by proposing counter-examples in the Korean translations of *The Martyred*.

A descriptive hypothesis is related to an explanatory and a predictive hypothesis. An explanatory hypothesis is that “retranslations tend to be closer to the original texts because later translators take a critical stance to the earlier translation, seek to improve on it” (Chesterman 2000: 24). A predictive hypothesis is that “a later translation of a given text will be found to be closer than earlier ones.” (25) Explanatory and predictive hypothesis can be regarded as subcategories of a descriptive one. If a descriptive hypothesis is not valid, an explanatory and a predictive one will therefore turn out not to be valid. Thus we will restrict our discussion to an interpretive and a descriptive hypothesis.

3. An Analysis of the Three Korean Translations

3.1 Overview of *The Martyred* and its Translations

The source text, *The Martyred* published in 1964 is Kim’s first work. It got excellent reviews and was an internationally acclaimed novel. Furthermore, it was a nominee for the Nobel Prize in Literature. This story is about religious faith in Christianity and the suffering of the general public during the Korean War. Twelve of fourteen ministers who were captured by the North Korean Communists were killed and only two survived. A quest for whether the two betrayed their faith is narrated. Its plot is so mysterious and intriguing that readers should go on reading without pause. The setting of the story is Korea and all the characters are Koreans although this novel is written in English.

This work has four translations. The first version (TT1) was translated by Chang Wang-rok and published in 1964 by

Samjungdang. The second (TT2) was rendered by Doh Jung-il, made publication in 1979 by Sisayongo-sa. The third (TT3) was translated by Richard Kim who is the author of the source text, and came out in 1990 by Eulyoomunwha-sa. The fourth which was in print in 2010 by Munhakdongne was a revised one based on Doh's earlier one (TT2), according to his comments in the postscript. Among the four versions, we will cover the first three versions whose translators are not the same and the fourth is excluded from the text analysis.

3.2 Interpretive Hypothesis

An interpretive hypothesis is that retranslation and revision should be distinguished in that revision is a modified or revised translation based on an earlier translated text while retranslation is a fresh interpretation of the source text. There are interpretive similarities and differences among the three versions of translations of *The Martyred*. As a result of comparing the three versions of the translations, we can classify the second version as a retranslation and the third as a revision.²

3.2.1 Retranslation: TT2

In order to show that the TT2 is a retranslation, we will present some examples comparing the ST only with the TT1 and the TT2. In analyzing whether a translated text is a retranslation or a revision, a conjunction 'and' can be a good linguistic phenomenon, according to Cho (2012), since it is found that interpretations of the source text's general purpose link conjunction 'and' sentences are different depending on translators. In example 1, the ways of connecting sentences are different between the TT1 and the TT2.

(example 1)

ST: The war came early one morning in June of 1950, and by the time the North Koreans occupied our capital city, Seoul, we had already left our university, where we were instructors in the History of Human Civilization. [ø] I joined the Korean Army, and Park volunteered for the Marine Corps (11)

TT1: 1950년 6월의 어느 새벽에 전쟁이 일어났다. [ø] 인민군이 우리의 수도 서울을 점령하기 전에 나와 박은 우리가 인류문화사의 강사로 있던 대학을 떠났다. 그리하여 나는 한국 육군에 들어갔고, 박은 해병대에 자원 입대하였다. (10)

(Back translation: At one dawn in June of 1950, the war happened. [ø] Before the North Koreans occupied our capital city, Seoul, I and Park left the university, where we were instructors in the History of Human Culture. So I joined the Korean Army, and Park volunteered for the Marine Corps.)

TT2: 1950년 6월 어느 이른 아침 전쟁은 찾아왔고, 인민군이 수도 서울을 점령했을 무렵 우리들은 문화사 강사로 재직했던 대학을 떠난 뒤였다. [ø] 나는 육군에 들어갔지만 박군은 해병대로 지원했다. (10)

(Back translation: In early one morning in June of 1950, the war came, and by the time the North Koreans occupied the capital city, Seoul, we had already left the university, where we were engaged as instructors in the History of Culture. [ø] I joined the Korean Army but Park volunteered for the Marine Corps.)

In the TT1 of example 1, the first long sentence in the source text is divided into two sentences and interpreted into two independent propositions. On the other hand, in the TT2 the first one sentence remains one and is interpreted into one proposition. The second ‘and’ is interpreted into ‘고 (and)’ in the TT1, while being interpreted into an adversative connector ‘지만 (but)’ in the TT2. Moreover, the second

sentence in the ST is added into a conjunction ‘그리하여 (so)’ in the TT1 and interpreted as an effect of a cause, unlike the TT2.

In example 2, ‘On the other hand’ is interpreted into ‘한편 (on the one hand)’ in the TT1 while it is enriched into ‘아버지와는 반대로 (contrary to his father)’ in the TT2. An idiom ‘be brought up’ is translated into ‘교육받은 (was educated)’ in the TT1 and ‘키워온 (raised)’ in the TT2. Also, ‘abandoned’ is rendered into ‘포기하였다 (abandoned)’ and into ‘내던졌다 (threw away)’ in the TT1 and the in the TT2, respectively. ‘내던졌다’ is semantically stronger than ‘포기하였다.’ After all, two versions render English expressions into Korean ones with different interpretive views.

(example 2)

ST: On the other hand, Park had become a theist after his return from a university in Tokyo, and abandoned the Christian faith in which he had been brought up. (13)

TT1: 한편 박은 동경에서 돌아 온 뒤에 무신론자가 되었으며, 그가 교육받은 기독교 신앙을 포기하였다. (10-11)

(Back Translation: On the other hand Park became a theist after his return from Tokyo, and abandoned the Christian faith which he was educated.)

TT2: 아버지와는 반대로 박군은 동경에서 대학을 마치고 돌아오자 무신론자가 되었고 그를 키워온 기독교 신앙을 내던졌다. (10)

(Back Translation: Park became a theist after his return from a university Tokyo Contrary to his father, and threw away the Christian faith which had raised him.)

Also, in example 3, two interpretations on the same source text is somewhat different from each other.

(example 3)

ST: Park had not waited for my return from Mr. Shin's. The note he had left on my desk said he had borrowed a jeep from the Marine liaison officer and gone out to take a look around the city. (104)

TT1: 박 대위는 내가 신 목사로부터 돌아오는 것을 기다리지 않았다. 내 책상 위에 그가 남겨놓은 쪽지에는 해병 연락 장교로부터 지이프차를 한 대 빌려 타고 시내를 한 바퀴 돌아보기 위해서 나간다고 적혀 있었다. (124)

(Back translation: Captain Park did not wait for my return from Mr. Shin's. In the note he left on my desk it was written that he had borrowed a jeep from the Marine liaison officer and gone out to take a look around the downtown.)

TT2: 박군은 내가 신 목사의 집에서 돌아올 때까지 기다리질 못했다. 내 책상에 남겨 둔 쪽지를 보니 그는 해병대 연락장교한테서 지이프 한 대를 빌어 타고 평양 시내를 둘러보러 나간다는 것이었다. (111)

(Back translation: Park would not wait for my return from Mr. Shin's. As I look at the note he left on my desk I realized that he had borrowed a jeep from the Marine liaison officer and gone out to take a look around the downtown of Pyongyang.)

An inanimate subject 'note' is rendered in a different way. The TT1 interprets it as a place '에는,' translating into '노트에는 (in the note)', which reveals the information in the note to the readers in the same way as the ST does it. However, the TT2 focuses on the action that a character '나 (I)' read the note, and interprets it into '노트를 보니 (as I looked at the note).'

Example 4 shows that the interpretative order of the TT1 are different from that of the TT2.

(example 4)

ST: I might have dashed into the church after him, had not my

companion held onto my arm, begging me to leave him alone. Then I heard the man laughing, (26)

TT1: 나는 그를 뒤쫓아 교회당 안으로 뛰어 가려고 했으나 나의 동반자가 내 팔을 잡고 내버려두라고 간청하는 바람에 그만두었다. 그때 나는 뜻밖에도 그 사람이 소리 내어 웃는 소리를 들었다. (26)

(Back translation: I would have dashed into the church after him but because my companion held onto my arm and begged me to leave him alone I gave up. Then I unexpectedly heard the man laughing loudly.)

TT2: 노인이 내 팔에 매달려 제발 그냥 내버려 두라고 간청하지만 않았어도 나는 그 사내를 뒤쫓아 교회 안으로 달려 들어갔을 것이다. 그러나 뒤이어 나는 사내가 웃어제끼는 소릴 들었고 (24)

(Back translation: Had not the old woman held onto my arm, begging me to leave him alone, I might have dashed into the church after him. But subsequently I heard the man laughing.)

The first sentence of the above ST uses the subjunctive mood. Instead of the subordinate conjunction, the TT1 uses an adversative conjunction (but): ‘나는 그를 뒤쫓아 교회당 안으로 뛰어 가려고 했으나’ (I would have dashed into the church after him but my companion held onto my arm, begging me to leave him alone.) The TT2 uses the subjunctive mood like the ST: ‘노인이 내 팔에 매달려 제발 그냥 내버려 두라고 간청하지만 않았어도’ (Had not the old woman held onto my arm, begging me to leave him alone.) The two propositions can be almost the same but expressive methods or interpretation orders are different between the TT1 and the TT2. Therefore, the TT1 and the TT2 have different ways of interpreting the ST.

As suggested above, the source text is interpreted variously according to the translators. The TT1 and the TT2 are different in

terms of interpretation. It is natural that two different translators produce two different interpretations and two different texts, because they have differing backgrounds, experiences, and perspectives. It can be said that the TT2 is a retranslation, or a reinterpretation which was produced independent of previous interpretation of the source text.

3.2.2 Revision: TT3

In this section we will go on showing that the TT3 by the author-translator, unlike the TT2, is a revision of the TT2, not a retranslation. First of all, look at the reason why the author translated his work himself in “A Note to Readers” of the translation version:

1964년에 미국에서 영문으로 발표된 이 작품은 한국에서 두 차례 번역이 되어 출판되었습니다. 처음은 장왕록 교수님의 번역으로 삼중당에서 출판되었고, 두 번째는 도정일 선생의 번역으로 시사영어사에서 나왔습니다. 두 분 다 심혈을 기울여 번역을 해 주셨으나 군데군데 작가가 전달하고자 했던 뜻과는 약간 다른 번역도 없지 않았습니다. 그래서 두 분의 번역본을 기초로 하여 작가의 뜻이 정확히 전달된 한국판 정본을 갖고 싶었습니다.

This work in English that was revealed in 1964 in America was translated twice and published in Korea. The first one was translated by Professor Chang Wang-rok and published in 1964 by Samjungdang, and the second was translated by Doh Jung-il, published in 1979 by Sisayongo-sa. Both of them put their hearts and souls into their translations, but there were some translations that were different from what the author intended to convey. It is why I wanted to have an authentic version based on the two translations.
(Our translation)

Kim explains that he wanted to have an authentic version

conveying his meanings correctly. So, he challenges some interpretations of the two previous versions, Chang's and Doh's, and justifies his translation by establishing differences from the two versions. This is consistent with Venuti's statement that later translations "typically highlight the translator's intentionality because they are designed to make an appreciable difference" (2004: 29). Although he said that he had referred to both for his TT3, it is found that he revised the TT2 into the TT3 as the result of the analysis of the three translated texts.

The same above examples will be shown with the TT3. First of all, in example 5, the ways of connecting sentences, are the same between the TT2 and the TT3, unlike the TT1.

(example 5)

ST: The war came early one morning in June of 1950, and by the time the North Koreans occupied **our** capital city, Seoul, **we** had already left our university, where we were instructors in the History of Human Civilization. [Ø] I joined the Korean Army, and Park volunteered for the Marine Corps. (11)

TT1: 1950년 6월의 어느 새벽에 전쟁이 일어났다. [Ø] 인민군이 **우리의** 수도 서울을 점령하기 전에 **나와 박은** 우리가 인류문화사의 강사로 있던 대학을 떠났다. 그리하여 나는 한국 육군에 들어갔고, 박은 해병대에 자원 입대하였다. (10)

(Back translation: At one dawn in June of 1950, the war happened. [Ø] Before the North Koreans occupied **our** capital city, Seoul, **I and Park** left the university, where we were instructors in the History of Human Culture. So I joined the Korean Army, and Park volunteered for the Marine Corps.)

TT2: 1950년 6월 어느 이른 아침 전쟁은 찾아왔고, 인민군이 [Ø] 수도 서울을 점령했을 무렵 **우리들은** 문화사 강사로 재직했던 대학을 떠난 뒤였다. [Ø] 나는

육군에 들어갔지만 박군은 해병대로 지원했다. (10)

(Back translation: In early one morning in June of 1950 the war came, and by the time the North Koreans occupied [Ø] the capital city, Seoul, **we** had already left the university, where we were engaged as instructors in the History of Culture. [Ø] I joined the Korean Army but Park volunteered for the Marine Corps.)

TT3: 1950년 6월 어느 이른 아침, 전쟁은 벌어졌고, 북한 인민군이 [Ø] 수도 서울을 점령했을 때 **우리는** 이미 문화사 시간강사로 있었던 대학을 떠난 뒤였다. [Ø] 나는 육군에 들어갔지만 박군은 해병대로 지원 입대했다. (11)

(Back translation: In early one morning, in June of 1950 the war happened, and by the time the North Koreans occupied [Ø] the capital city, Seoul, **we** had already left the university, where we were engaged as instructors in the History of Culture. [Ø] I joined the Korean Army but Park volunteered for the Marine Corps.)

The first ‘and’ is interpreted into an additive conjunction ‘고 (and)’ and the second one is into an adversative conjunction ‘지만 (but)’ in the TT2 and the TT3 in the same manner. It is a different phenomenon from one between the TT1 and the TT2. Moreover, a reference ‘we’ in the ST is implicit information, since readers do not know who ‘we’ are until they read the next sentence. ‘We’ in the TT1 is explicitly rendered into ‘나와 박은 우리가 (I and Park, we)’ while it was implicitly translated into ‘우리들 (we)’ in the TT2. ‘Our’ is translated into ‘우리의 (our)’ into the TT1 and deleted into the TT2.

In example 6, the TT3 seems the same as the TT2 except the position of ‘아버지와는 반대로 (contrary to his father)’. But these two texts have different interpretations.

(example 6)

ST: On the other hand, Park had become a theist after his return

from a university in Tokyo, and abandoned the Christian faith in which he had been brought up. (13)

TT1: 한편 박은 동경에서 돌아 온 뒤에 무신론자가 되었으며, 그가 교육받은 기독교 신앙을 포기하였다. (10-11)

(Back Translation: On the other hand Park became a theist after his return from Tokyo, and abandoned the Christian faith which he was educated.)

TT2: 아버지와는 반대로 박군은 동경에서 대학을 마치고 돌아오자 무신론자가 되었고 그를 키워온 기독교 신앙을 내던졌다. (10)

(Back Translation: Park became a theist after his return from a university Tokyo contrary to his father, and threw away the Christian faith which had raised him.)

TT3: 박군은 동경에서 대학을 마치고 돌아오자 아버지와는 반대로 무신론자가 되었고, 그를 키워 온 기독교 신앙을 내던졌다. (12)

(Back Translation: Contrary to his father Park became a theist after his return from a university Tokyo, and threw away the Christian faith which had raised him.)

In the TT3, ‘아버지와는 반대로’ comes before ‘무신론자가 되었고 (became an atheist)’ and these phrases belong to the same dependent clause, which means that ‘Park became an atheist contrary to his father.’ This interpretation is clearer than one in the TT2. The TT2 places ‘아버지와는 반대로’ on the foremost in the sentence and is somewhat ambiguous. It is because it can mean ‘when Park returned from a university in Tokyo contrary to his father’ or ‘when Park returned from a university in Tokyo and became an atheist contrary to his father.’ Thus, we can see that the TT3 revised and corrected

the TT2 rather than the TT1.

In example 7, interpretations between the TT1 and the other versions are different but ones between the TT2 and the TT3 are exactly the same, although the two translators are different. In other words, the three versions have the same propositional meanings like the ST, but the TT2 and the TT3 has just the same expressive meanings unlike the TT1.

(example 7)

ST: Park had not waited for my return from Mr. Shin's. The note he had left on my desk said he had borrowed a jeep from the Marine liaison officer and gone out to take a look around the city.

The snow was getting heavier, the sky darker. Through the window I saw columns of medium tanks, their guns prostrate, crawl past the ruins, trailed by another column of howitzers, northbound. The snow soon covered the tracks left by the heavy treads. Silence returned to the streets, and with it the brooding afternoon of a dreary northern city. (104)

TT1: 박 대위는 내가 신 목사로부터 돌아오는 것을 기다리지 않았다. 내 책상 위에 그가 남겨놓은 쪽지에는 해병 연락 장교로부터 지이프차를 한 대 빌려 타고 시내를 한 바퀴 돌아보기 위해서 나간다고 적혀 있었다.

눈송이는 점점 굵어만 갔고 하늘은 점점 더 검게 변해 갔다. 창 밖에는 포를 아래로 숙인 탱크의 행렬이, 박격포의 행렬이 뒤따르는 가운데 파괴된 거리를 북으로 향해 기어 가고 있었다. 그 행렬이 남기고 간 자취 위엔 곧 눈이 덮였다. 거리에는 다시금 정적이 찾아 들었고 그와 함께 황량한 북력 도시 평양엔 수십어린 오후가 찾아 왔다. (124)

(Back translation: Captain Park did not wait for my return from Mr. Shin's. In the note he left on my desk it was written that he borrowed a jeep from the Marine liaison officer and went out to take a look around the downtown.

The snow was getting heavier and the sky was changing more darkly. Outside the window columns of tanks, their guns prostrate, was

crawling past the ruined streets, trailed by column of howitzers, northbound. The snow soon was covered over the tracks left by the heavy treads. Silence returned to the streets again, and with it the moody afternoon returned to a dreary northern city, Pyongyang.)

TT2: 박군은 내가 신 목사의 집에서 돌아올 때까지 기다리질 못했다. 내 책상에 남겨 둔 쪽지를 보니 그는 해병대 연락장교한테서 지이프 한 대를 빌어 타고 평양 시내를 둘러보러 나간다는 것이었다.

눈발은 점점 심해지고 하늘도 더 컴컴해지기 시작했다. 창밖으로는 마침 중간형 탱크대가 뺄죽하니 포신을 내민 채 부서진 폐허를 지나가고 있었고 그 뒤를 이어 곡사포들이 북으로 이동 중이었다. 눈발은 탱크며 곡사포들이 남기고 간 깊숙한 흔적들을 이내 덮어버렸고 다시 거리는 침묵에 잠기면서 북방 도시의 음침한 겨울 오후가 몰려왔다. (111)

(Back translation: Park would not wait for my return from Mr. Shin's. As I look at the note he left on my desk I realized that he borrowed a jeep from the Marine liaison officer and gone out to take a look around the downtown of Pyongyang.

The snow was getting heavier and the sky began getting darker. Outside the window columns of medium tanks, their guns prostrate, was crawling past the ruins, and trailed by another column of howitzers, northbound. The snow soon covered the deep tracks left by the tanks and howitzers, and the streets were immersed in science and the dreary afternoon of a northern city drew near.)

TT3: 박군은 내가 신 목사의 집에서 돌아올 때까지 기다리질 못했다. 내 책상에 남겨 둔 쪽지를 보니 그는 해병대 연락장교한테서 지이프 한 대를 빌어 타고 평양 시내를 둘러보러 나간다는 것이었다.

눈발은 점점 심해지고 하늘도 더 컴컴해지기 시작했다. 창밖으로는 마침 중간형 탱크대가 뺄죽하니 포신을 내민 채 부서진 폐허를 지나가고 있었고 그 뒤를 이어 곡사포들이 북으로 이동 중이었다. 눈발은 탱크며 곡사포들이 남기고 간 깊숙한 흔적들을 이내 덮어버렸고 다시 거리는 침묵에 잠기면서 북방 도시의 음침한 겨울 오후가 몰려왔다. (87)

(Back translation: Park would not wait for my return from Mr. Shin's. As I look at the note he left on my desk I realized that he borrowed a

jeep from the Marine liaison officer and gone out to take a look around the downtown of Pyongyang.)

The snow was getting heavier and the sky began getting darker. Outside the window columns of medium tanks, their guns prostrate, was crawling past the ruins, and trailed by another column of howitzers, northbound. The snow soon covered the deep tracks left by the tanks and howitzers, and the streets were immersed in science and the dreary afternoon of a northern city drew near.)

Example 8 also shows that the TT2 and the TT3 have the same in not only propositional meanings but also in expressive meanings which relates to the writer's attitude or feelings, except '웃어 제끼는' and '웃어 제치는.'

(example 8)

ST: I might have dashed into the church after him, had not my companion held onto my arm, begging me to leave him alone. Then I heard the man laughing, and I was . . . yes . . . dumbfounded when his laughter was followed, a moment later, by a wail like that of a hungry, abandoned baby, a piercing cry that mingled with the clanging of the bell. (26)

TT1: 나는 그를 뒤쫓아 교회당 안으로 뛰어 가려고 했으나 나의 동반자가 내 팔을 잡고 내버려두라고 간청하는 바람에 그만두었다. 그때 나는 뜻밖에도 그 사람이 소리 내어 웃는 소리를 들었다. (26)

(Back translation: I would have dashed into the church after him but because my companion held onto my arm and begged me to leave him alone I gave up. Then I unexpectedly heard the man laughing loudly.)

TT2: 노인이 내 팔에 매달려 제발 그냥 내버려 두라고 간청하지만 않았어도 나는 그 사내를 뒤쫓아 교회 안으로 달려 들어갔을 것이다. 그러나 뒤이어 나는 사내가 웃어 제끼는 소릴 들었고 (24)

(Back translation: Had not the old woman held onto my arm, begging me to leave him alone, I might have dashed into the church after him. But subsequently I heard the man laughing.)

TT3: 노인이 내 팔에 매달려 제발 그냥 내버려 두라고 간청하지만 않았어도 나는 그 사내를 뒤쫓아 교회 안으로 달려 들어갔을 것이다. 그러나 뒤이어 나는 사내가 웃어 제치는 소릴 들었고 (23)

(Back translation: Had not the old woman held onto my arm, begging me to leave him alone, I might have dashed into the church after him. But subsequently I heard the man laughing.)

Besides examples 7 and 8, it is found that the TT3 contains a large portion of the same or almost same interpretations found in the TT2. There is a high dependency between the TT2 and the TT3. Unlike the TT2 which is a retranslation, the TT3 by the author-translator is considered as a revision rather than a retranslation, for it corrected or modified only a small portion of the TT2.

Thus, it can be said that the TT2 by Doh is a retranslation with a new interpretation, compared with the TT1 by Chang, whereas the TT3 by the author-translator is a revision produced on the basis of the interpretation of the previous translation TT2.

3.3 Descriptive Hypothesis

According to the descriptive hypothesis, retranslation is more source-oriented and better or more perfect than an earlier one. On this line of thought, Venuti (2004: 36) says “retranslations are often presented as a significant improvement...because they employ a discursive strategy that maintains a more strict semantic or stylistic equivalence.” We will show, however, that rather revisions use a

strategy that maintains a semantic or stylistic equivalence and Chesterman's descriptive hypothesis is not adequate to be used as a retranslation hypothesis. The TT3 is closer to the ST than the TT1 in terms of meanings and forms. But since it is a revision of the TT2 which is a retranslation, we come to the conclusion that revision could be closer to the ST than an earlier translation. Therefore a descriptive hypothesis cannot be always valid. For presenting that the TT3 revision is closer to the ST than an earlier translation TT1, we will show examples comparing the TT1 with the TT3 of *The Martyred* based on semantic and stylistic equivalence.

3.3.1 Stylistic Equivalence

As we look at the above examples, the author-translator revised the TT2 rather than TT1, although he says that he translated based on the two earlier versions. It is expected that the TT2 tends to follow the form, or style, of the ST including paragraphs and sentences.

One long paragraph in the ST of example 9 below is divided into five in the TT1 by the translator's arbitrary decision, and remains one in the TT3.3

(example 9)

ST: "Yes, he did what I hoped he would," he said, when I remained silent. "Only in a different way from the one I had in mind, that is, not as a man with an impeccable conscience but as a sinner." He closed the briefcase with a faint click, then locked it. "It's a strange notion beyond my comprehension that somebody dies for your sins and for your salvation. I don't believe in their god and their doctrines; the notion that those twelve martyrs well, they are martyrs now, aren't they? — that they died for me is meaningless; actually, the notion would never occur to me. But that seems to be the only way these Christians could accept and worship the ministers as their martyrs." (202-203)

TT1: 내가 잠자코 있자 그는 말했다.

『그가 그랬으면 하고 내가 바라던 대로 말했어.』

『단지 내 의중에 있던 것과는 다른 법으로 말야. 그것은 그가 결함이 없는 양심을 지닌 한 인간으로서가 아니라 한 죄인으로서 이야기했다는 거지.』

그는 팔각 소리를 내며 가방을 닫고는 잠갔다.

『어떤 자가 남의 죄를 위하여, 그리고 남의 구제를 위하여 죽는다는 것은 내가 이해할 수 없는 이상한 관념이야. 나는 그들의 신과 그들의 교의를 믿지 않아. 그들 열 두 명의 순교자들, 소위 순교자들이 나를 위해서 죽었다는 것은 실상 나에게 의미가 없는 수작이야. 사실이지 그런 관념은 결코 나에게선 생가지 않을 거야. 그러나 그런 관념이 그 신자들이 그 죽은 목사들을 자기들의 순교자로 받아들일 수 있고 경배할 수 있는 유일한 방법인 것 같기도 해.』 (241)

TT3: 내가 여전히 입을 다물고 있자 그는 스스로 답변하듯 말했다. “그랬어, 그는 내가 바라던 대로 행동했어. 내가 생각했던 것과 방식은 달랐지만 말야. 결점 없는 양심을 지닌 사람으로서가 아니라 죄인으로 행동했으니 말일세.” 그는 찰칵하며 가방을 닫은 뒤 열쇠를 돌려 잠그며 계속했다. “누군가가 사람들의 죄를 위해서, 그들의 구제를 위해서 죽는다는 얘긴, 내가 이해할 수 없는 이상한 생각이야. 난 그들의 신을 믿지도 않고 그들의 교리를 신봉하지도 않아. 그러나 12명의 순교자들—그렇지, 이제 그들은 확고한 순교자들이 된 셈 아닌가. 좌우간 그들이 나를 위해 죽었다 건 내겐 무의미한 얘기일 것이고 따라서 내가 죽었다 깨어난다 해도 그런 생각은 떠오르지 않았을 거야. 한테 교인들한테는 그 길만이 그들이 죽은 목사들을 그들의 순교자로 받아들이고 공경하는 단 한 가지 방법이었던 말야.” (167-168)

Paragraphing may be important in a prose, since “a paragraph is a small group of thoughts” (Boulton 1980: 41-42) and “each paragraph treats of one aspect of the topic and each leads on to the next reasonably; this is the whole area of paragraphing from the point of view of logic.” It is why different paragraphing methods may convey different focus and tone. Long paragraphing methods in the TT3, like the source text, is more suitable for the serious tone and the theme of war and religious faith, since short paragraphs can give light and lyrical impressions to readers.

Also, in the aspect of sentence length, the TT3 is closer to the ST, as is seen in example 10 below. Four sentences in the ST are lengthened into eight in the TT1, and remain the same in the TT3.

(example 10)

ST: I woke up the next morning, around seven, and discovered that some one was sleeping in a bed at the other end of the room. I thought it was the major's orderly. It was dark in the room; the only light shone, flickering, through the vent of the stove. My head ached, I felt weak, and I would have liked to go back to sleep. (270)

TT1: 나는 다음날 아침 일곱시경에 일어났다. 내 병실 한쪽 구석 침대에 누군가가 자고 있는 것이 눈에 띄었다. 나는 그것이 민 소령의 연락병인 줄 알았다. 방안은 어두웠다. 오직 난로의 바람 구멍에서 꺾박이는 불빛이 새어 나올 뿐이었다. 머리가 멍하니 쭈셨다. 기운이 없었다. 또 다시 잠을 자고 싶었다. (316)

TT3: 다음날 아침 7시쯤 눈을 떠 보니 누군가가 방 저쪽에 침대를 펴 놓고 잠들어 있었다. 민 소령의 당번병이겠거니, 하고 나는 생각했다. 방안은 캄캄했고, 불빛이라고는 난로의 구멍 사이로 비치는 석탄 불빛뿐이었다. 머리가 지끈지끈 아팠고 온몸이 나른해서 다시 잠을 청했다. (218)

We can say that the TT3 is almost equivalent to the ST in terms of the form of sentences. However, the TT3 does not follow the length of sentences in the ST unconditionally. Let us take an example below.

(example 11)

ST: It was at such times that I felt an urge to go to see Park's father, though I told myself I had not the slightest excuse for doing so. (14)

TT1: 그러던 중 나는 그렇게 해야 할 이유는 전혀 없다고 생각하면서도 박의 아버지를 만나기 위해서 한 번 찾아가 보고 싶은 충동을 느꼈다. (11-12)

(Back translation: At such times though I thought I had not the

slightest excuse for doing so I felt an urge to visit him once in order to meet Park's father.)

TT3: 박군의 아버지를 만나 보고 싶다는 충동을 느낀 것은 바로 그 무렵이었다. 사실 그를 찾아갈 구실이 하나도 없다는 걸 나는 알고 있었다. (13)

(Back translation: It was at such times that I felt an urge to go to see Park's father. In fact I realized I had not the slightest excuse for doing so.)

In example 11, the interpretive order of the TT1 is just the opposite of the TT3. In the TT1, 'at such times' is first translated, 'though I told myself I had not the slightest excuse for doing so' is next, and the rest finally into Korean. On the other hand, in the TT3 'It was at such times that I felt an urge to go to see Park's father' is first translated and then the rest is done. Although '박군의 아버지 (Park's father)' in the TT1 is more natural than '그를 (him)' in the TT3 because pronoun is not usually used for Korean syntax's sake, the TT3 seems to have the similar stylistic effect to the ST. Considering the format of this novel is a mystery, the way that the TT3 translates can increase excitement and evoke a sense of wonder and curiosity in readers like the ST.

3.3.2 Semantic Equivalence

Since the author-translator can access his meanings and intentions that he wanted to convey to source readers, it is hardly likely that he mistranslates them. Let us take example 12.

(example 12)

ST: "You recall those Christian ministers who were reported missing. We've had a big break. Our CIC was able to round up a few Reds who

had something to do with the missing men.” (17)

TT1: 『자네 행방불명이 된 것으로 보고된 목사들을 기억할 테지. 그런데 우리는 큰 실수를 했어. 우리 CIC는 그 행방 불명된 목사들과 관계가 있었던 빨갱이들을 몇 놈 잡아 냈단 말이야』 (15)

(Back translation: 『You recall those Christian ministers who were reported missing. By the way we made a big mistake. Our CIC rounded up a few Reds who had something to do with the missing ministers.』)

TT3: “목사들이 실종됐다는 얘긴 알고 있지? 그에 대한 확실한 단서를 잡았지. 우리 방첩대가 빨갱이 몇 놈을 체포했는데 이 자들이 목사 실종 사건과 관련이 있다는 거야.” (16)

(Back translation: “You know that Christian ministers missing? We had clear clues for him. Our Counterintelligence Corps. rounded up a few Reds and they had something to do with the accident of missing masters.”)

An idiom ‘a big break’ means significantly good fortune or opportunity. This idiom is mistranslated as ‘큰 실수 (a big mistake)’ in the TT1, which misleads target readers to being confused because the interpretation is not proper for the context in terms of logic. The author-translator corrects the mistake that the earlier translator made, and translates it into ‘그에 대한 확실한 단서를 잡았지 (We had clear clues for him).’ This is interpretation appropriate to the context. The translator of the TT3 is the author of his work, so he can access original meaning better than the other translator.

(example 13)

ST: “He isn’t a sick man. He can go out for a walk, can’t he?” she said as though she were pleading.

I looked at her closely, but her eyes did not meet mine. (29)

TT1: 『그분은 보통 병이 아니야요.』『그러니까 산보하러 나가실 수도 있잖겠어요?』

그녀는 마치 나더러 제발 어서 돌아 가 달라고 간청하는 듯이 말했다. 나는 그녀를 자세히 보았다. 그러나 그녀는 내 눈을 피했다. (28-29)

(Back translation: 『He is very sick.』『That's why he can go out for a walk, can't he?』

She said as though she were pleading with me please to return. I looked at her closely. But her eyes avoided mine.)

TT3: “그 사람, 병자는 아닙니다. 그러니 산보 같은 거야 나다닐 수도 있지 않아요?” 여자는 마치 호소하듯 말했다.

내가 찬찬히 들여다보자 그녀는 눈길은 피했다. (25)

(Back translation: “He isn't a sick man. So he can go out for a walk like that, can't he?” she said as though she were pleading.

As I looked at her closely she avoided my eyes).

The first sentence of the TT1 of example 13 has the proposition meaning ‘He is very sick.’ The meaning is different from that of the ST and the TT3. Also, the second underlined sentence of the TT1 has different meaning from the ST and the TT3. The TT1 is ‘마치 나더러 제발 어서 돌아 가 달라고 간청하는 듯’ (as though she were pleading with me please to return).

In example 14, the expression ‘justice’ is rendered into ‘심판 (judgment)’ in the TT1 instead of ‘정의 (justice)’ like the TT3.

(example 14)

ST: “Yes, justice — oh, how one craves for justice! Yes, justice! The ultimate justice in the name of God!” (257)

TT1: 『물론 심판도 — 사람들이 얼마나 심판을 바라는 줄 아시오? 심판도

있다고 해야죠! 하나님의 이름으로 하는 공정한 심판이!』 (303)

(Back translation: 『Yes, judgment – how much do you know one hopes judgment? There must be judgment ! The just judgment in the name of God!’』

TT3: “물론이오. 정의 — 얼마나 그리운 이름이오? 그 정의를, 하나님의 이름으로 궁극적인 정의를 주어야 하오.” (209)

(Back translation: “Yes, justice – how one craves for justice? The justice, give the ultimate justice in the name of God!”)

The underlined TT1 ‘사람들이 얼마나 심판을 바라는 줄 아시오? (how much do you know one hopes judgment?)’ does not make logical sense. It is because people usually will be afraid of judgment which is involved in determining punishments. Thus, the counterpart of the TT3 ‘정의 – 얼마나 그리운 이름이오? (justice – how one craves for justice)’ is closer to the ST in terms of semantic equivalence.

Examples 15 and 16 are related to translating lexical chains, or ‘lexical cohesion,’ which “refers to the role played by the selection of vocabulary in organizing relations within a text” (Baker 1992: 202). Lexical cohesion is different across languages. Korean language tolerates a much higher level of lexical repetition than English, and lexical repetition is much more frequent in Korean than in English. In *The Martyred*, ‘an old woman who takes care of his sick son’ is described as ‘a nurse,’ ‘the nurse,’ ‘his mother,’ ‘Mrs. Hann’ or ‘Pastor Han’s mother,’ all of whom refer to the same person.

(example 15)

ST: I knocked on the white front door, which was finally opened by an old woman, (27)

TT1: 나는 흰 대문에 노크를 했다. 마침내 늙은 여인 한 사람이 나와서 문을 열어 주었다. (27)

(Back translation: I knocked on the white front gate. Finally one old woman came out to open.

TT2: 흰 칠을 한 현관문을 두드리자 한참 만에 한 노파가 나오더니 문을 열어 주었고 (24)

(Back translation: As I knocked on one front door painted white, after a good while an old woman came out to open the door.)

(example 16)

ST: The nurse met me. (64)

TT1: 그 간호부가 나를 맞아 주었다. (74)

(Back translation: The nurse greeted me.)

TT3: 전에 왔을 때 보았던 노파가 나를 맞았다. (54)

(Back translation: The old woman who I met when I visited here before greeted me.)

In the TT1 ‘늙은 여인 한 사람 (an old woman)’ has few relations with ‘그 간호부 (The nurse)’. So it lacks lexical cohesion and the meaning can be ambiguous to the target readers. The TT3 uses an explicit strategy to translate into ‘전에 왔을 때 보았던 노파 (the old woman who I met when I visited here before)’ respectively. The person that the expression refers to is obvious to the target readers.

As we can see in the previous examples, it is found that the TT3 is closer to the ST than the TT1 in terms of style and semantics and improve the quality and fluency of translation.

4. Conclusion

We have *The Martyred* and its three translations based on two hypotheses with regard to retranslation. One is an interpretive hypothesis in which retranslation should be distinguished from revision. The other is a descriptive one in which retranslation tends to be closer to the ST. The TT2 seems to be retranslated with a different perspective from the TT1 in terms of both form and content. It stands to reason that different translators interpret the same source texts into different ways since they have different cognitive systems. However, there seems to be a mutual dependency between the TT2 and the TT3 since the TT3 revises only a small part of the TT2 and has a large portion of the same interpretations with it. Thus, the TT2 has been found to be a retranslation while the TT3 a revision. Also, it was found that descriptive hypothesis is not always adequate for retranslation hypothesis, for there are counter-examples against it as Paloposki and Koskinen (2004) and Deane (2011) claimed. The conclusion to be drawn here is that the TT3 revision tends to be closer to the ST or to improve the quality of the earlier translations in terms of stylistic and semantic equivalence and the descriptive hypothesis needs to be amended.

Since the descriptive hypothesis is not valid, it turns out not to have an explanatory force about universals or laws of retranslation phenomena. Also, the comparative analysis of the three translated versions can corroborate Antunes' (2011) claim that both translation and self-translation are constrained by an original text although author-translators are considered as privileged translators. There are, however, some problems to be explored. The examples presented in this paper are limited to microanalysis such as conjunctions and adverbials. It remains to see Kim's work at the level of macroanalysis.

NOTES

1. The translated novel, 『순교자』 *The Martyred* is one of series of world literature published by Munhakdongne.
Richard Kim's Korean name is 김은국 (Kim Unkook). He was born in 1932 in Hamhung, Korea and went to the United States to study with scholarship from Middlebury College after participating in the Korean War.
2. The data to be given in the following discussion are exemplars.
3. The back translations of example 9 and 10 are omitted since these examples are related to 'form.'

REFERENCES

- Antunes, Maria Alice G. (2011) 'Self Translation: A History of Practices and of Research Practice,'
<http://www.llc.manchester.ac.uk/ctis/activities/conferences/researchmodels2/papers/fileuploadmax10mb,179102,en.pdf>.
- Baker, Mona (1992) *In Other Words*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Berman, Antoine (1995) *Pour une critique des traductions: John Conne*. (Luise von Flotow (trans.) *Toward Translation Criticism*),
<[https://www.google.co.kr/search?q=Luise+von+Flotow+\(trans.\)+Toward+Translation+Criticism%2C+Antoine+Berman&rls=com.microsoft:ko:IE-SearchBox&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&sourceid=ie7&rlz=117SMSN_ko&gfe_rd=cr&ei=d-wnU63GCceJ8QeY-ICYC](https://www.google.co.kr/search?q=Luise+von+Flotow+(trans.)+Toward+Translation+Criticism%2C+Antoine+Berman&rls=com.microsoft:ko:IE-SearchBox&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&sourceid=ie7&rlz=117SMSN_ko&gfe_rd=cr&ei=d-wnU63GCceJ8QeY-ICYC) g>.
- Boulton, Barjorie (1980) *The Anatomy of Prose*, London: Routledge & K. Paul.
- Brownlie, Siobhan (2006) 'Narrative Theory and Retranslation Theory,' *Across Languages and Cultures* 7(2): 145-170.
- Chesterman, Andrew (2000) 'A Causal Model for Translation Studies,' In Maeve Olohan (ed.) *Intercultural Faultlines*, Manchester: St. Jerome, 15-27.
- _____(2004) 'Hypotheses about translation universals,' In Gyde Hansen et al. (eds.) *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1-13.
- Cho, Euiyon (2012) 'A Study of Translator's Choice of Stylistic Features: Two Translations of J.D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*,' *The Journal of Translation Studies* 13(5): 197-221.
- Dastjerdi, Hossein Vahid (2013) 'Revisiting "Retranslation Hypothesis": A

- Comparative Analysis of Stylistic Features in the Persian Retranslations of *Pride and Prejudice*', *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics* 3, 174-181.
- Deane, Sharon (2011) *Confronting the Retranslation Hypothesis: Flaubert and Sand in the British Literary System*, PhD. University of Edinburgh, <<https://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/bitstream/1842/5494/2/Deane2011.pdf>>.
- Ghymn, Esther Mikyung (1992) 'Richard Kim', In *The Shapes and Styles of Asian American Prose Fiction*, New York: P. Lang, 47-66.
- Grutman, Rainier (2009) 'Self-translation', In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London & New York: Routledge, 257-260.
- Gürçağlar, Sehnaz Tahir (2009) 'Retranslation', In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 233-236.
- Han, Jae-Nam (2001) 'Richard E. Kim', In Emmanuel S Nelson (ed.) *Asian American Autobiographers: A Bio-bibliographical Critical Sourcebook*, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 132-137.
- Jianzhong, Xu (2003) 'Retranslation: Necessary or Unnecessary', *Babel* 49(1): 193-202.
- Kang, Jung In (2007) 'Politics and Truth: An Analysis of Richard E. Kim's Novel', *The Martyred Korea Journal* 47(2): 184-207.
- Koshinen, Kaisa & Paloposki, Outi (2010) 'Retranslation', In Gambier Yves (eds.) *Handbook of Translation Studies* 1, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lee, Kihan (2003) 'The Martyred revisited: challenging the parameters of Asian American literature', *Journal of American Studies* 35(3): 160-177.
- Montini, Chiara (2010) 'Self-translation', In Yves Gambier & Luc van Doorslaer (eds.) *Handbook of Translation Studies* 1, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 306-308.
- Paloposki, Outi & Koshinen, Kaisa (2004) 'Thousand and One Translations: Retranslation Revisited', In G. Hansen et al. (eds.) *Claims, Changes and Challenges*, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 27-38.
- _____(2010) 'Reprocessing texts: The fine line between retranslating and revising', *Across Languages and Culture* 11(1): 29-49.
- Tanqueiro, Helena (1998) 'Self-Translation as an Extreme Case of the Author-Translator-Dialectic', In Allison Beeby (eds.) *Investigating Translation*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 55-64.
- Venuti, Lawrence (2004) 'Retranslation: The Creation of value', In K. M. Faull (ed.) *Translation and Culture*, 25-38.

Yan, Gao (2010) 'A Comparative Study Of Self-translation And Conventional Translation In Literature',
<<http://www.research-degree-thesis.com/showinfo-98-981618-0.html>>.

<Texts for Analysis>

ST: Kim, Richard (1964) *The Martyred*, Seoul: Sisayongo-sa.

TT1: 장왕록 옮김 (1964) 『순교자』, 서울: 삼중당.

TT2: 도정일 옮김 (1979) 『순교자』, 서울: 시사영어사.

TT3: 김은국 (리차드 김) 옮김 (1990) 『순교자』, 서울: 을유문화사.

Received: August 30, 2014

Revised: September 22, 2014

Accepted: September 30, 2014