

## Metatranslative Signs of Dumas and Hamong: Names as Texts and Metaphors Therein

Dhonghui Lim  
(Pusan National University)

### 1. Introduction

This research aims to revisit 'adaptation' and 'translation' from the Peircean perspective in order to test the validity and applicability of Peirce's notion of translation (Peirce 1933, 1934) and assess the possibility and importance of a Petrillian paradigm shift (Petrilli 2003, 2012) in a metasemiotic/ metatranslative way. By employing Peirce's paradigm as a metaepistemological backbone and applying its basic mechanism to the examination of a culture-/ language-/ context-/ skopos-specific 'adaptation', it seeks to answer key questions: (a) if an adaptation is a deviant byproduct of manipulative pseudo-translation (or non-translation) and (b) if an adaptation can be better described and explained with the Peircean view of translativity. Yet, acknowledging the methodology-related

limitation of such a broad notion, this research tries to examine if it is possible to utilize another theoretical device/ notion in a transdisciplinary collaboration. Taking cognition as a new keyword that all the linguistic/ translational/ cultural/ semiotic studies have in common, it, then, proposes that the Lakoffian notion of metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson 1980) can collaborate with the Peircean/ Petrillian theory of translation in a language-specific investigation. Thanks to the similarity-differentiability dynamics of a semiosis as a translative process, it should be practically useful to apply Peirce's sign types/ properties (e.g., icon/ iconicity<sup>1</sup>), symbol/ symbolicity, index/ indexicality) and Lakoff's metaphor to various kinds of ST-TT<sup>2</sup>) pairs (cf. Grady 1997; Kövecses 2002, 2005, 2015).

In the case study, it, then, implements a translator-specific investigation into a significant literary work and its interlingual rendition in Korean: *Le Comte de Monte Cristo* by Alexandre Dumas (Dumas 1844-1846, 1998) (Dumas, henceforth) and *Haewangseong* by Sanghyup Lee (李相協) a.k.a. Hamong (何夢) (Lee 1916-1917, 2007) (Hamong, henceforth). In search of (the signs/ evidence of) metatranslative and metatranslational mechanisms in a so-called *beon-an* (飜案) work created by Hamong, this study pays attention to the names that he devised/ used for the serialized novel. In viewing names as crucial signs (cf. 'representamens') which evoke special meanings in the TC(s) (rather than as unfaithful and aberrant deviations as non- or pseudo-translation), it assumes that even names (e.g., those for the novel's title, main protagonists, and key backdrops) can and do function as unique texts (i.e., sign composites related to text types<sup>3</sup>) as for the TRs in their multisemiotic interpretations.

1) Iconicity is a major theoretical notion/ tool used for an interdisciplinary study on language, literature, culture, and translation (e.g., Nänny and Fischer 1999).

2) In this paper, the acronyms are used in the following way (ST: Source Text; TT: Target Text; SC: Source Culture; TC: Target Culture; SR: Source Readers; TR: Target Readers; SL: Source Language; TL: Target Language; etc.).

3) Text-type-based sign/ text examples can be varied in contexts (Reiss, K. 1997/2000).

Subsequently, it argues that, inferred from the Peircean notion of translation<sup>4)</sup> as the interpretive process(es) as meaning-making, not only Hamong but also Dumas should be considered as a kind of translators whose systematic (embodied-cognition-based) source-target mappings must have had an influence on the actual phases and processes to get certain signs/ names selected or invented as TTs in their production of a new novel (cf. their protagonists, too, as indirect/ implicit/ passive translators). This research applies this core notion of translation to the whole processes and phenomena involving the birth of *Haewangseong* in a modern Korean setting so as to examine each putative translator's metatranslative strategies, which may involve or include metaphors. In exemplifying metaphor-based metainterpretations of translatoriality-specific names as unique signs/ texts, this study proposes that (selectively partial) similarity-based (i.e., iconicity-based) metasemiotic manipulation (as a kind of transmutation) must have been used in each translator's translating of the self and the world (cf. primary metaphors and image schemas in focus).

Consequently, this research suggests affirmative answers to the previously posed questions except for the conventional idea of adaptation as pseudo- or non-translation. In applying the notions of sign-process-centered translation and metaphor-sensitive cognition, all the translators in question are found to be aware of the transsemiotically effective power of the (partial) iconicity-based metaphorical selection and the indexicality-sensitive TT manipulation (thus, skopos-specific intersemiotic translation (cf. Jakobson 1959, Petrilli 2003))

4) If a sign is transmuted and transplanted into a TT to make it function as a particular representamen with/ by which the TR(s) can be moved toward a certain anticipated cognitive/ interpretive/ discursive effect, it is possible to call it a translative process/ activity (thus, the semiotic/ semiotic agent to be viewed as a kind of translator). If so, any/ every semiotic agent should be viewed as having and using translatoriality owing to his/ her inevitably basic condition to be semiotically dependent upon and manipulatively appealing to the embodied/ enacted (i.e., sign-process-based) cognition in an experientialist sense. It is based on Peirce's notion of an interpretive process of a sign as translation and extended to the production stage (cf. Petrilli 2003).

irrespective of superficially observed differences in the lexical realization. In other words, what enabled *Haewangseong* to come into being is TC-centered and iconicity-sensitive strategization (not as an adaptation) of which the key predecessors include Dumas as a translator (rather than as the original author).

This research, then, suggests that the Lakoffian perspective on the human cognition—characterized by metaphorical mappings and (inter-/ intra-/ trans-) corporeal embodiment slash enactment—can make positive and constructive contributions for the development of the metaepistemology and methodology of translation per se in the transdisciplinary transhumanities. Furthermore, it argues that the Peircean/ Petrillian paradigm of the sign's translativity is conducive to the development of a meta translation theory that can bridge the subtle yet substantial gaps among discipline-specific (meta-) translational paradigms in the humanities and sciences in transdisciplinarily constructive and insightful ways.

## 2. Literature Review

In regard to the general research on Hamong's *Haewangseong*, the underlying paradigm/ ideology of translation (or adaptation) is often found to center around the conventional notion of (interlingual) translation. With a focus on binarism-based dichotomy, glottocentrism, and the principle of fidelity/ faithfulness, many scholars take that type to be 'translation proper' (Jakobson 1959) and, subsequently, tend to invalidate and negate the quality of adaptation (as translation). When a metatheoretical analysis is applied, it becomes clear that most or all of the previous studies on *Haewangseong* have examined the domain and direction of adaptation in such a manner (i.e., something that is neither a translation proper nor a creative artistic work). Then, only two factors slash scopes can be analyzed and described: the verbal information (e.g., the names of the characters and chapters, the traits of verbs and particles, etc.) in the text-internal dimension and the nonverbal information in the text-external

dimension (e.g., historico-cultural facts and conditions). On the basis of such a clear-cut division, the respective researchers' ST-TT and/ or SC-TC comparisons have yielded very specific metalinguistic information, especially, as to whether there is a sufficient degree of (dis-) similarity. In such a case, researchers attempt to discover or infer further specificity in order to answer follow-up questions as to in which areas, on which points, and for what purposes such (dis-) similar results must have been made.

Kwon, M. (2014), for example, draws a clear line between the so-called "modern" sense<sup>5)</sup> of adaptation (*beon-an*) and the traditional usages of time- or region-sensitive rewriting (e.g., classical Chinese/ Korean literary works paraphrased or reformulated). In Kwon, M. (2014: 21-27), the concept and nature of a modern sense of adaptation are described in relation to the specific term '*beon-an*', arguing that (a) the Chinese, Japanese, and Korean concepts of adaptation must be partially different from one another; (b) despite a degree of intercultural differentiability in the subsense, adaptation should be employed as a unique type and method of text-based and effect-centered cultural translation to be distinguished from the equivalence-centered translation; (c) the selection and distribution of a serialized adapted novel like *Haewangseong* must have a lot to do with the editorial board's implicit strategization to evade or distract Japan's censorship<sup>6)</sup> and, also, to raise and maximize the size of readership on the local market (Kwon, M. 2014: 52).

Choi, S. (2013) points out the fact that, even in the earlier periods of adaptation in modern Korea, the conceptual and institutional boundaries among creative stories, adaptations, and translations were quite blurry. He/ She, then,

5) This tries to preserve the main plot of the ST as a foreign, to be precise, Western novel while changing the names of the characters, regions, and events in and for the TC (Silver 2008).

6) Other scholars argue that the selection of a serialized adapted novel for the national newspaper *Maeil Shinbo* must have involved the colonialist desire and project to have greater control over the people in colonized Korea.

highlights the first mention of 'adaptation' in a written document: '*beon-an* (翻案)' in an article of *Maeil Shinbo* issued in 1922. This first mention of the term itself is said to have worked as a milestone and helped many other translators become more aware of the concept of adaptation (ibid.). Kwon, M. (2014: 11-20), however, argues that the very first use of the term 'adaptation' (i.e., *beon-an*) in the history of Korean literature and translation can be found in the advertisement of *Haewangseong* (i.e., *yeonjae yego*) published in *Maeil Shinbo* in 1916 and, also, that Hamong should be seen as the very person who first used 'adaptation/ *beon-an*' in a modern sense<sup>7)</sup> and in the Korean context (Kwon, M. 2014: 23-27).

Jun (2012) pays attention to the formal features of the main medium, text type, and channel that (may) have characterized the process and product of translation/ adaptation in the case of *Haewangseong*. Using the notion of being 'translated' and that of being 'adapted' in an interchangeable way, Jun (2012) concludes that Ruiko Kuroiwa's *Gankutsuou* was purposefully selected and adapted-translated by Hamong, particularly, in the specific form of 'a serial novel' via the channel of a daily newspaper simply because *Maeil Shinbo*, the only national newspaper in colonized Korea, was expected to generate greater popularity and better reception in the target culture by following the previous path of Kuroiwa's success story in modern Japan. Approaching adaptation from a historico-institutional perspective, Kwon, J. (2013) claims that the historical birth and cultural establishment of originality-sensitive adaptation in modern Korea was mainly ascribed to the colonialist introduction and application of

7) Kwon, M. (2014) pinpoints that a modern sense of TC-centered adaptation had already been devised and established in the late-nineteenth-century Japan (ibid. 11-13). Its exemplification was noticeable and frequent owing to the culturological circumstances that the then Japanese society was facing (ibid.: 12-20). That being said, it is difficult to rule out the possibility that Hamong must have been exposed to or informed of such a notion slash method of translation even prior to his project of translating Kuroiwa's TT into Korean.

modernized Japan's copyright law, especially, for the category of adaptation, into the then society of Korea.

This kind of sociohistorical information, however, does not provide metaepistemological clues or methodological tools that can help scrutinize both of the notions/ phenomena (i.e., translation and adaptation) in a systematically constructive way. In addition, *Haewangseong's* unique status as a retranslation of an already translated work of the "original creative" work and, also, as a selective adaptation of an already adapted work poses a variety of questions on various levels, which cannot be simply answered in a dichotomous—text-external versus text-internal—description.

Even when the previous studies on *Haewangseong* are examined, the fundamental questions on the nature of translation per se and, also, those on the core idea/ ideology of adaptation are left unanswered. Keeping the question of adaptation open for new investigation, it is still worth extra attention when it comes to the other previous studies on metaphor (and names). Jhee (2012) highlights the significance of a conceptually broader and (meta-) cognitively operative notion slash mechanism of metaphor (e.g., conceptual metaphor) not only in the production/ reception of an intralingual message but also in the interpretive and decoding-encoding processes of/ for interlingual translation. As translation is (and does involve) cognitive processes of/ for systematic problem-solving and decision-making, to use/ interpret a metaphor is already and always a kind of translation (cf. intralingual type). Therefore, even a commercially and professionally well-wrought interlingual translation product may turn out to be inadequately or insufficiently transferred due to the translator's lack of attention to (or decision to disregard) the underlying (conceptual) metaphorical devices present in the ST (e.g., a German translation of H.-G. Eun's novel) (Jhee 2012). But a successful intercultural translation of (conceptual) metaphors is a challenging and complex issue since the literally equivalent or technically identical re-encoding into the TL cannot guarantee culturally appropriate, cognitively relevant, and/ or pragmatically effective/

approximate results in the TC(s). Kim, S.-Y.'s (2008) analysis of literary texts (from Korean into English) in terms of anger- and sadness-related conceptual metaphors shows those cases which preserve the source domain examples in such a way that the ST-specific mappings are kept identical in their TTs. Shin and Park (2011) provide conceptual metaphors' main schema examples by analyzing the Korean TTs of some economy-related English magazine articles. Their analysis concludes that the preservation of the main metaphorical mappings in the TTs is a predominantly used strategy. Lee and Bae (2011) use a set of parallel corpora (26,613 words) that are composed of certain English magazine (cf. *Newsweek*) articles in order to discover a main translation strategy used in the Korean TTs (20,209 words). From their analysis, the linguistic realization of parallel mappings (with the respective source domains kept identical via literal translation) is found to be the most prevalent method. Such product-based descriptivist approaches provide useful information on main translation methods or trends in a subject/ industry/ field. Yet, such formalist descriptivism may not help examine and explain certain important factors/ variables which might have intervened in the translation processes in many intricate yet subtle ways (e.g., a translator's metasemiotic, metalinguistic, meta-cultural, and metacognitive literacy of/ toward metaphor). It, therefore, is not surprising to see many other studies focusing on their metasemantic task to explore the interpretive/ translative processes and expand the notion/ concept of metaphor so as to find out more detailed information on translation strategies. Lee, H.-S. (2004), for instance, argues that metaphor can be treated as an epitome of the translation-related problem(atics). Even in the direction toward a translation (e.g., Russian into Korean), there are many different choices for a translation/ translator to need to consider (e.g., imagery, meaning, modification, combination, etc.), and it is important to have to examine not only the products and results but also the procedures and processes in an integrational way. Song, H.-S. (2015) highlights the importance of cross-cultural communicability (rather than word-for-word transfer) and suggests 5 strategies

for metaphor translations in(to) Korean/ Chinese. Jang, H.-S. (2018), too, proposes a multiple number of translation methods for Chinese metaphors (5 methods in favor of the SC/ TC or an alternative (figurative/ explanatory) expression) while resorting to Gutt's relevance theory. Choi, M.-K. (2010) sees parallelism between the interpretation of a metaphor (in an intralingual environment) and the translation of a metaphor (in an interlingual context). And, then, even between two different languages (e.g., French and Korean), she concludes that the device of literary metaphor can be taken care of by preserving the main imagery or producing an alternative expression of a similar mechanism. Yu, J.-H. (2008) pays attention to the semiotic nature of metaphor to account for metaphor-based expressions in Russian and their interlingual translations into Korean, especially, in referring to Peirce's sign types and general examples of codes. Translations of metaphorical expressions (including idioms and adages) are approached via a series of interpretations in diverse dimensions. Park, J.-W. (2013), on the other hand, adopts a cognitive linguistic perspective and utilizes the notion of 'frame' knowledge and relations. As there can be as many as 12 different patterns of metaphor relations in the translation of metaphors, more detailed and systematic approaches/ strategies are required as well as sufficient metasemiotic literacy of cognition itself (Park, J.-W. 2013). From the metatheoretical information based on the previous studies, the translational approaches to metaphor in broad senses and dimensions are found to have a short history and, also, need further research from a metasemiotic/ metatranslative perspective.

When it comes to the translation projects that are concerned with the nature slash problematics of (personal/ proper) names, new attention has been paid to the functions and effects of (personal/ proper) names, so that translation methods can be further concretized and optimally established. In the case of personal names in the Korean literature, transliteration and literal translation have been found to be highly popular translation methods (cf. 10 ways) when rendered into another language like English (Park, H.-J. 2015; Park, H.-J. and

Park, Y.-H. 2015; etc.). Park, H.-J. (2015) suggests the use of paratexts (결텍스트 in Korean) as an attempt to minimize any meaning loss, especially, by adding the translator's space and voice in the target text. But, it is a fact that transliteration is a more popular method. Kim, S.-M. (2012), too, agrees that, even in non-literary genres/ industries, literal translation and transcription have been used as the most common method(s). In the case of Korean literary works (when rendered into French), transcription is found to be the most popular method (cf. translator's notes) (Kim, K.-H. 2016). Jeanmaire (2008) pinpoints that transliteration/ transcription is inevitable in spite of consequential problems and limitations (cf. standardization). Even though new translation theories argue for further strategization for name translations, such a task has been either reduced to transliteration or interpreted as an optional choice to add notes.

Although it is true that the particular type of translation called interlingual translation has played and is still playing important roles in history, language, culture, science, and civilization (via both of the spoken and written forms) and, also, that adaptation works tend to exhibit some distinct traits (e.g., TC-specific readjustments or manipulations in terms of the main characters, backdrops, lexical items, and plots) that appear to place adaptations somewhere between creative literary works and equivalence-sensitive translation products, today's nonstop development and expansion (or evolution) in the translation-related academia and industries continue to put many intellectuals and laypeople into new challenges in dealing with translation- and adaptation-related questions and phenomena. This issue slash dilemma does not seem to simply go away even when relatively new attitudes and notions are considered.

In the following sections, this research is going to try to tackle these questions/ problems as a new metatranslative problematics slash task, which may call for a fundamental paradigm shift in terms of the metaepistemology, metasemiotic literacy, and metatranslative competence toward translating and translatoriality, especially, by employing the Peircean/ Petrilian perspective on translation and the Lakoffian metaphor-sensitive perspective on semiosis.

### 3. Trans- and Meta-: Semiosis in Cognition

At the main stage(s) of research, Hamong's *Haewangseong* is going to be revisited transdisciplinarily and multidimensionally from a (meta-/ intra-/ inter-) translative centripetal perspective. The major theoretical framework slash methodology proposed as a solution is a Peircean triadic model of the sign, particularly, the open-ended interpretive paradigm of the sign process as a translation (Peirce 1933, Petrilli 2003). On the basis of the triadic (meta-) semiotic view, it argues that the fundamental difference in one's interpretation of a TT lies not in the linguistics and textuality of the concrete TT(s) but in the actual (intra-/ inter-/ meta-) semiotic literacy and the (meta-) semiotic/translative perspective of each meaning-making agent. It is going to see if the Peircean (to be precise, Petrilli's) paradigm of the sign (process) as translation can help systematize a theoretical examination and explication even for a small and trivial example like a name, especially, when explored in an eclectic transdisciplinary way. With Peirce's/ Petrilli's global (i.e., macroscopically/ microscopically dynamic and interactive) viewpoint<sup>8)</sup> applied, even seemingly irrelevant theoretical frameworks like (conceptual/ primary) metaphors (in cognitive linguistics) and skopos-/ text-type-sensitive functional manipulations<sup>9)</sup>

8) In relation to this paradigm, several basic theoretical assumptions can be stated first.

The main points can be stated as follows: (1) anything/ everything that is (and can be) interpreted is a kind of sign, and the dynamics of such a semiosis encompasses not only human culture and communication but also nature and the universe; (2) major premises in cognitive linguistics/ science/ semiotics are to be taken into account (e.g., embodied/ situated/ enactive cognition, signs as prompters/ vehicles, incommensurability of meaning (potential), etc.) when relevant; (3) the notion 'skopos' can be applied not only to the reception-based use of a sign/ text but also to the very birth/ production of a sign/ text itself regardless of the scope(s) of translation; (4) a name can be viewed as a unique example of a sign composite which is related to the language-function-sensitive text type(s).

9) This research agrees on the purposeful function-/ skopos-related nature of a (meta-/ inter-/ intra-) semiotically translative process, as is argued by skopos theory.

can be approached and elaborated in systematic and integrational manners.

Even though Peirce's triadic paradigm of the sign (process) itself constitutes the core<sup>10)</sup>/ platform of the metatranslative theory, it must have been impossible to have a concretized theoretical framework of (meta) translation without the pioneering works by Susan Petrilli (Petrilli 2003, 2012, 2014).

#### 3.1 Translation Per Se: Peircean/ Petrillian View

In this research, the gist of the matter lies in the metasemiotic and metatranslative literacy of the researcher and the translator. Therefore, it proposes to take into account the importance and applicability of the metatranslative process/ mechanism. Then, what is translation per se according to Petrilli? In Lim, E. (2013), a modified version is proposed as is given below.

##### (1) A Quintessential Notion of Translation Per Se

"A translating agent/ sign *z* implements an instance of TRANSLATION (as the translative, transsigns process) by manipulatively selecting another sign *x* to be a sign of some other sign *y*".

(modified from Petrilli 2003 and quoted in Lim, E. 2013: 60)

And, the multidimensional typology of the Petrillian translative process can be found in Lim, D. (2015), which is an interlingual, intralingual, and intersemiotic translation of the schematic diagram rendered into a contemporary Korean academic discourse. Still, there appear two questions that need

Skopos, here, is to be translated in a broad and loose sense rather than in a strict Reissian/ Nordian sense (cf. Reiss, K. 1997/2000, Nord 1997).

10) A well-known principal idea of translation as a sign process reads as follows: "The meaning of the sign is the sign it can be translated into" (Chandler 2007: 31). This rewording (cf. Jakobson 1959) can be construed only when the Peircean paradigm of the triadic mechanism of the sign itself is presupposed and understood fully.

due attention: (1) how can the abstract definition be applied in real (interlingual/ intralingual/ intersemiotic) translation examples? and (2) what kind of practical methodology can this definition provide for translation theorists, translation practitioners, and translation students?

### 3.2 Translativity and Cognition-based Metaphor?

Once the metaepistemological description is concretized in terms of the notion of translation *per se*, the question over the availability of a methodologically systematized conceptual device arises. Knowing that how to apply the Petrillian theory of translation crucially depends on the metainterpretive, metatranslative, and metasemiotic literacy and paradigm of an individual theorist, this research instead proposes to employ a theoretically and methodologically well-established device that is concerned with the fundamental mechanism of cognition. The cognitive-process-centered device slash paradigm to be proposed here is the major theoretical paradigm of cognitive linguistics, especially, the paradigm of metaphor as a quintessential cognitive mechanism and (inter-/ intra-/ meta-/ trans-) corporeal phenomenon (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). Owing to the human being's corporeality-induced multimodal interconnection and verbal-non-verbal dynamics (cf. Lim, E. 2013), which underlie the linguistic ability as the transmedial symbolic capacity (cf. the species-specific primary modeling device proposed by Thomas Sebeok) and result in species-specific cognitive principles (Sebeok and Danesi 2000) (cf. Deacon 1997), the mechanism of the cognitive-process-sensitive metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson 1980) and that of the Petrillian notion of translation *per se* can and should be considered to have, at least, five things in common<sup>11)</sup>:

11) It seems that there is few research on the common points between the cognitive notion of metaphor and the metasemiotic paradigm of translation *per se*. Not because such research is invalid/ impractical but because it is not very popular yet. This study argues that a transdisciplinarily based (non-oculocentric, non-glotto-

(1) the verbally indirect yet cognitively essential intervention of iconicity-based (i.e., similarity- or sameness-centered and/ or motivatedness-sensitive)<sup>12)</sup> sign processes into the production of various forms of semiotic representations; (2) the sign's fundamental "un-"implementability of self representation (i.e., every sign's prerequisite to be stood for by some other sign so as for it to get activated as/ for a sign process also known as semiosis); (3) the universal role and operation of the spatiotemporal specificity often characterized by proximity-related causality in any sign process/ activity (i.e., indexicality related to the pertinent *umwelt*); (4) the default conditions of a source domain and a target domain linked with each other by some kind of cognitive processes (cf. conceptual mapping; meta-/ intra-/ intersemiotic interpretation); (5) the crucial

---

centric, and non-anthropocentric) approach to the cognition-specific interpretive processes of the tripartite sign process can shed new light on the core mechanism and applicability of metaphor and translativity. For its implementation, Peirce's (meta-) cognitively based insight into the nature of the sign and its triadically translative process has to be borrowed and examined far before the consideration of the Petrillian theory of translation and the Lakoffian theory of metaphor. Upon the theoretical practice, it becomes clear that the real scope(s) and operational range(s) of translation itself can be wider and deeper than those of metaphor because life processes (might) coincide with (meta-/ intra-/ inter-) translative phenomena/ activities while metaphor can be made in (inter-/ meta-) semiotically restricted domains where there is (inter-) semiotic similarity/ iconicity in/ for the production of conceptual metaphorical mapping.

12) Notice that the notion of iconicity in cognitive linguistics had actually appeared as a counter-example to the Saussurean claim that the quintessential nature of the sign is arbitrary and conventional in a fixed and closed manner. In referring to Peirce's triadic sign typology, however, it becomes clear that, in a sign process as meaning-making, the sameness/ similarity (a.k.a. iconicity) and the differentiability/ arbitrariness (a.k.a. symbolicity) exhibit themselves as twin sign properties in a mutually interactive and relatively explicit (or implicit) way, particularly, in coordination with *umwelt*-sensitive indexicality. Even in the case of motivated, thus, iconicity-sensitive sign activities, the human cognition's ability to observe and perceive such similarity has a lot to do with the experiencer's (partially) selective interpretation of some (set of) explicit feature(s) or element(s) of a sign (system).

role of the individual agent who engages in a sign process.

Given such information, three new hypotheses can be proposed for a metasemiotic investigation: (1) if the human beings share universally applicable features in terms of their (inter-/ intra-) corporeality and cognitive processes in a variety of semiosis-sensitive environments called *umwelts*, such universal or prototypical properties, categories, and/ or schematic structures can and should be reflected in a set of semiotic or semiosic (e.g., lexical, sentential, textual, discursive, conceptual, multimodal) samples realized via their cognitive embodiment, enactment, and extension (thus, primary metaphors slash iconicity-based translations); (2) if the respective experiencers slash producers of spatiotemporality-specific (i.e., indexicality-sensitive) sign activities (e.g., history and culture) can be said to be involved in various kinds and types of translation in their individual *umwelts* by having engaged in the interpretation, transference, transmutation, and/ or transplantation of specific STs into certain particular TTs, then and only then, such individuals should be viewed as (inter-/ intra-/ trans-/ meta-) semiotically based translators of some sort; (3) if the production of a TT has no choice but to be affected by the concrete or sensitive culturopolitical circumstances, which may affect, determine, or define the respective translators' metatranslational purposes/ goals/ anticipated effects (also known as the translatorial *skopos*), the metatranslatively conscious translators of a certain specific era, region, language, or culture must be highly likely to plan and conduct their own politically multifactorial strategization throughout the processes of translation, which can result in non-equivalence-oriented and cultural- reception-centered metatextual manipulations realized by (meta-/ inter-/ intra-) semiotic transmutations (and if it is true, adaptations will turn out to be an example of metatranslational variations, i.e., a part of translation in a broad sense).

In order to see if all those theoretical premises fit each other, Hamong's *Haewangseong* is going to be taken as the key sample with which the metasemiotic notions of translation and metaphor will be investigated.

#### 4. *Haewangseong*: Translativity and Metaphoricity

In this chapter, Hamong's *Haewangseong* is going to be examined from a cognitively centered metatranslative perspective, particularly, in terms of the unique translatoriality realized via *skopos*-centered strategization. For the general methodological device, Lakoff's metaphor will be applied to test both the species-specific universality and the indexicality-specific diversity of the (cross-) cultural and (trans-) textual meaning-making practices, in which new translativity-based sign/ text examples have come into being. When the global geopolitical historicities and the local culturopolitical dynamics are considered as main metatextual parameters that may have functioned crucially in each translator's construals of some pertinent ST(s), the metatranslative analysis of various kinds of relevant text/ sign examples will be able to shed light on the quintessentially metatranslative mechanisms of the allegedly simple and self-contained names. Based on the analysis results, it will make an attempt to answer key questions as to which iconicity-oriented transemes (i.e., translation units<sup>13)</sup>/ sign components for metaphors) are intersemiotically translated into primarily metaphoric conceptual structures/ scenes/ entities and which symbolicity-oriented transemes are interlingually, intralingually, or inter-semiotically translated into new indexicality-sensitive (thus, *umwelt*-specific, time-specific, and TR/TC-specific) sign/ text examples. In terms of the semio-genesis of major names (i.e., TTs by Dumas and Hamong), the basic mechanism of metaphor is going to be addressed first. And, then, viewing sign examples as interpretive microcosmos-evoking text examples, it will examine

13) The unit of translation is the (minimal) unit of information taken as the (minimal) source text for a single sign-process-based translative process to take place. It can be called a translation unit or, simply, a transeme. Theorists and practitioners in interlingual translation may have a discipline-specific or theory-specific definition of transeme. In this article, following Peirce's paradigm and scope(s) of the sign, it is argued that anything meaningful can be a transeme.



the potential/ putative translatoriality therein/ thereby.

#### 4.1 Metaphor as Metatranslative Iconicity

Once one obtains the metasemiotic comprehension of the Petrillian notion of translation and the cognition-based notion of metaphor (Gibbs 2008), it becomes plausible (and even easy) to reach an important transsemiotic discovery. It is that the (partial) similarity-based metaphor (Gibbs 2008: 7) can be viewed as iconicity-related<sup>14)</sup> intersemiotic translation.

Unlike many studies on *Haewangseong* and other adaptation works, this research focuses on the sign-process-based, transeme-sensitive, and strategy-related investigation into the multidimensional and multifactorial processes involving the transsemiotic realization of *Haewangseong* as a unique transmutational architecture made from implicit/ explicit STs and TTs. In that context, it proposes that the major translators in a Petrillian sense include Alexandre Dumas and Sanghyup Lee (cf. Ruiko Kuroiwa) in the biosemiotic umwelts called the reality or the physical world. And, then, it subsequently argues that translator candidates should include Junbong Jang slash Haewang Baekjak, (cf. Gankutsuou/ Amgulwang slash Monte Kurisuto Hakushaku), and Edmond Dantès slash Count (of) Monte Cristo. The latter ones are different kinds of passive/ indirect/ implicit translators that are to make others further

14) A follow-up meta interpretation of the potential correlation between the two (i.e., iconicity and sign-centered translation) is that symbolicity-based or symbolicity-centered translation (as well as indexicality-sensitive translation) can be proposed to exist (and even prevail), too. Centering around the indexicality-sensitive translative processes/ activities in a given Umwelt, tripartite-sign-typology-sensitive and triadic-sign-property-based translations seem to be divided into two major tendencies conceptually. But, the actual semiotic phenomena of translation must be understood as hypercomplex and hyperevolutive sign composites that can be (re-) translated in various senses and ways depending on the respective translator's (meta-/ inter-/ intra-) semiotic literacy and meta translation competence.

translate the provided translation work for richer construals, and, therefore, live in/ on the hypersemiotic umwelts called the human conception and imagination.

The principal multidimensional translators are those individuals who lived and translated different historical phases, cultural spheres, and spatiotemporal localities. The common property to keep them under the same or similar category is metaphor-friendly cognition: i.e., iconicity-based semiotic operations transmuted and transplanted into various yet cognitively interrelated signs by means of species-specific corporeality and experientiality (cf. ST-TT pairing as selective and purposeful conceptual mappings). If cognition-induced and iconicity-based commonalities found in TTs are examples of metaphors, comparing them with their corresponding signs (and their intersemiotic relationships) in the STs in the pertinent umwelts may help discover the unique or common translative-related strategies—as well as translation methods—of the translators<sup>15)</sup> in question.

#### 4.2 Signs as TTs: Peircean Translators

Now, the major translators in question are going to be revisited: from Alexandre Dumas to Sanghyup Lee via Shuroku (a.k.a., Ruiko) Kuroiwa. As the Peircean/ Petrillian paradigm of translation and translating agent(s) can embrace every and any metasemiotic transaction as a kind of translation/ translating, it can be argued that any and every sign/ representamen should be considered as a

15) On the other hand, if the metacognitive, metalinguistic, and metasemiotic ability of a certain translator is found to be re-translated and realized into symbolicity-based (or symbolicity-centered) sign processes that even include selective manipulation and random creation, then, to compare the aspects and relations of arbitrary differentiation in the TT with the possible factors and the anticipated effects in the relevant umwelts/ environments may help discover the distinctive traits of properties of the pertinent translatoriality. In the same logic, indexicality can be approached and examined in relation to the concretization, development, and evolution of the respective translatoriality.

key TT that attains cues/ clues about the obscure yet detailed translation processes/ dynamics. By scrutinizing the respective translating agents' concrete TTs (e.g., individual names), one can discover a great deal about the respective strategies and cognitive realities that are related to their unique translatoriality.

#### 4.2.1 As For Dumas

In Dumas's case, the first translation specimen to consider is his (second) surname. His family name given by his (grand) father is Davy de la Pailletterie. As is known to many scholars and readers these days, Alexandre Dumas's father was born to a French noble man and a "non-white" female slave of an African origin. Thus, Dumas's father and his son as well as Dumas himself had no choice but to become a mulatto with "colored" skin. Dumas was an alternative surname that Alexandre Dumas's father decided to take when Dumas's grandfather asked him not to go by the noble family name when he had to enlist simply for the reason not to defame the grace and prestige of the family name (Reiss, T. 2012: 90-91). Although Dumas's father had been given the privilege to get educated as a French noble man's son, his genetic inheritance and the consequential physical traits worked against him throughout his life (except for his military performances). As for Alexandre Dumas, taking his father's (or grandfather's) family name for his pen name might have been a wiser choice to represent and advertise his mainstream French legacy as a popular novelist. He, however, kept the new family name that his father started using in the beginning of his military career. Although Dumas's father passed away when Dumas was about four years old, it is said that Dumas's mother continued to educate young Alexandre about his father's life and legacies (Reiss, T. 2012). As for young Alexandre, Dumas was not just a name. As the owner of the surname 'Dumas' was an African female who lived her life as a slave in spite of her relationship with a white French noble man who happened to settle in Saint-Domingue (i.e., today's Haiti), her descendants including

Alexandre had the tell-tale signs of a unique ethno-cultural background in their bodies. Whatever Dumas means literally, taking the non-French maternal name would stand for the users' cultural and cognitive awareness of such distinctive historicity and special self identity. In the era in which to feel comfortable (let alone proud) in his own skin as a mulatto was very hard, the act to keep the name may have represented the user's audacity, integrity, and sense of heritage. As for Alexandre, to take the name Dumas from another source and '*bring it over into*' the semiospheres of his personal and professional life (in order to signify his unique sense of self) must imply his own special metasemiotic, metacognitive, and metatranslative literacy (cf. Notice that 'Alexandre' is quite the same as his father's first name: Thomas-'Alexandre', "protector of man").

The second and most well-known translation example realized by Dumas is, no doubt, his novel *Le Comte de Monte Cristo* as a complex semiotic network into which various metaphors and image schemas had been inserted and integrated. Unlike the general stereotyped idea that the author "creates" his own "creative" text whereas the translator only "transfers" the "original" messages slash meanings of the "original" ST by means of his language, Dumas's novel seems to possess so many cues, clues, props, plots, and contexts (thus, signs as texts) which indicate the conscious and detailed application of metatranslative processes and manipulations. This research suggests that such multifactorial, multidimensional, and multidirectional translating is not a result of Dumas's pure ingenuity but a byproduct of multiple translations of multiple transems that he had experienced either as part of daily/ life experiences or as part of indirectly obtained news or information. Notable transems (that is, translation units that are worth a special mention) include the following: (1) his father's life stories (e.g., ships, sailing, political stances/ adversaries/ conflicts, cargoes and trades, imprisonment, dungeons, remote islands, entire isolation for years, the high rank as a noble man, Napoleon, etc.); (2) his familial and cultural/ religious backgrounds (e.g., France, Christianity, revolution, Napoleon's status and circumstances, etc.) (Reiss, T. 2012); (3) the current affairs and

issues observed in the then French society (e.g., Picaud's story recorded in the crime cases, laws and facilities to fight (against) and keep from crimes, etc.); (4) religion-specific yet universal-metaphor-centered signs (e.g., rocks, sky/heaven versus (under) ground, gates, a father (figure), (invisible) hands, a mountain, Dante's purgatory, Dantès as in Dante, etc.); (5) species-specific primary metaphors in a form of 'Target is Source' (e.g., 'Bad is Small/ Down/ Remote', 'Good is Up/ Big', 'Challenge is Being Distant/ Isolated', 'Freedom is Moving', 'Virtue is (For-) Giving', 'Self is Center', 'To Win a Challenge is To Endure and Break/ Cross an Obstacle', etc.) (Grady 1997). In other words, Dumas had no choice but to take some (partially) iconicity-high signs (for source domains) from the very source culture(s) available to him in order to bring them over into the TT(s) and make them function as new powerful (and familiar/ concrete) representamens in certain predictable/ anticipated ways in efforts to refer to some universally shared/ sharable 'event' schemas and/ or noteworthy 'value' referents. Dumas, thus, should be understood as a real-life translator who possessed his unique translatoriality largely ascribed to his father's historicity-specific career and far-too-adventurous life.

#### 4.2.2 As For Hamong

The next translator and his TTs in focus/ question are directly related to *Haewangseong*<sup>16)</sup>. The first example suggested as Hamong's translation is his pen name ('*ho* (號) in Korean). Hamong (何夢) literally means "what dream", which sounds odd for a classical '*ho*' to represent a notable quality or ideal goal of the owner. When analyzed from a metatranslative perspective, there

16) Although *Haewangseong* and Hamong have been controversial in a political sense, this research only examines the translatoriality in relation to his key TTs in question. This section, thus, focuses on the presentation and analysis of specific translative-related sign examples as empirical clues for metatranslative construals while trying to remain as value-neutral as possible.

seem to be a few clues that imply both the plausible interpretant(s) and the inferable object/ referent. If Hamong is a TT that had the then Hanja users as potential TRs, it is more likely to have verb-phrase-based meta-pragmatic construals to draw their attention implicitly than to have noun-phrase-based semantic meanings only to refer to the 'Ho' owner himself. In that case, Hamong should be translated as "How dare you only (day) dream?"; "How come you have such a (day) dream!"; "How many dreams (will be required)..?", which sound like either his scolding to the Japanese colonialists about their absurd dream or his calling to the (then) Korean people to wake up while keeping their dreams and hopes inside. Or, when the pronunciation [hamong] is examined in Japanese phonetics, there appear, at least, three words of homophony that may have been considered implicitly: Hamong 1 (波紋, "strong ramifications" derived from "ripples"), Hamong 2 (破門, "excommunicaton" and "exile"), and Hamong 3 (刀文, "temper patterns of a sword"). If Hamong had kept the central interpretants (i.e., meanings) of (any of) those construals inside the phonetic representamen [hamong] with the separate orthographic representamen '何夢' purposefully utilized as a visual camouflage to work incognito, he may have meant to proclaim his main objectives "to give huge impacts on the society and the people in his own historicity-sensitive contexts", "to face the culturo-political reality to have to live in exile even in his own nation", and "to be able to create sword-like writings (i.e., razor-like or scalpel-like textuality and discourse effects) via self-determined perseverance and initiatives even in the middle of hardship that is analogous to tempering". Metahistorically and metacontextually speaking, Hamong's life-long contributions for the establishment and development of the newspaper industry and the modern Korean journalism are an undeniable achievement, which now seem quite consistent with what Hamong might or must have signified and pursued via the multifaceted interlingual/ intralingual/ intersemiotic translation.

The second example to be viewed as Hamong's translation is the Korean

title of Dumas's novel: Haewangseong (海王星). While the Korean title is often blamed for the "non-translation" status of Hamong's seemingly far-fetched rendition, it is the very title that plays a crucial role as the main TT (of which the text/ genre type is a serialized novel title in a newspaper) in setting the general tone and providing a big picture for the TRs. While Dumas's TRs would be easily expected to associate 'Monte Cristo<sup>17)</sup>' with the Christianity-based metaphor of a (possibly) strenuously painstaking yet tremendously worthy journey owing to the history-long Christian influences in the Francophone and Western cultures in general, Hamong's TRs would find it difficult to comprehend the cultural connotations and religious/ historical implications of the term 'Monte Cristo' not to mention those of the 'count'. Haewang (seong), on the other hand, can be translated into, at least, two separate yet interrelated interpretants: the verbal sense of Haewang (literally "The King of the Seas") and the physical referent of Haewangseong (i.e., The star/ planet of Neptune). The idea and ideology of Haewang (as the pioneer or leader who rules and travels across the seas) have not been new or strange to Korean people throughout the histories of the Korean peninsula. The idea and existence of Neptune as the remotest planet (associated with the King of the Ocean) were not unknown to many people<sup>18)</sup> in Joseon. From this information, one can infer that 'Haewang' must have been optimally devised and realized by Hamong: for the task to remind the (less educated) Korean people of the potential capacities of the Haewang as a new glocal or international leader in

17) This is an exotic name to the ear of a French (and Korean) reader. The Italian flavor must be Dumas's metasemiotic strategy focusing on the potential power of the source culture and language (i.e., Italian).

18) Percival Lowell (a.k.a. Nowol), an American astronomer, paid his first visit to Joseon in 1883. Then, he already had some acquaintances who happened to be politicians of Joseon (source URL: [https://ko.wikipedia.org/wiki/%ED%8D%BC%EC%8B%9C%EB%B2%8C\\_%EB%A1%9C\\_%EC%9B%B0](https://ko.wikipedia.org/wiki/%ED%8D%BC%EC%8B%9C%EB%B2%8C_%EB%A1%9C_%EC%9B%B0)). He was famous for his research project, which sought to discover a new planet that is farther than Neptune (i.e., Haewangseong) (Park, S.-J. 2008, Park, S.-R. 2011).

the era of the new awareness of the East Asia and the world and, also, of the Haewangseong as a new science-based guiding star in the era of the new paradigm(s) of the world and the universe.

Speaking of Haewang as a source/ target text suitable for an icinicity-based intersemiotic translation, there appears to be a good degree of spatial similarity between Haewang-do (i.e., The Island of Haewang) as in Neptune (i.e., Haewangseong) and the Planet of Haewangseong (called Neptune in English) in the real physical world (i.e., 'Challenge is Being Remote'). This spatial distance is also concretized in Dumas's work by situating the Island of Monte Cristo far away from the main setting of France in a similar manner (i.e., 'Challenge is Being Distant') (cf. l'île d'If). Underneath the lexical difference, there exist a similar conceptual metaphor (i.e., significant iconicity in spite of linguistic symbolicity). And this similarity of conceptual metaphors becomes more evident when Hamong's uses of (Planet/ God) Neptune—as well as Junbong, "Mountain Peak"—are examined along with the theme of Purgatory by Dante Alighieri (which Dumas was well aware of). In Dante Alighieri's *The Divine Comedy II: Purgatory*, the planet of Neptune (i.e., Haewangseong)—which is the ruling planet of Pisces—is depicted as being related to the acts and processes of going through Purgatory<sup>19)</sup> (Sayers 1955). Whether Hamong had known about such astronomical and astrological knowledge is not a major concern here. What matters is the fact that it is worthwhile to pay attention to Hamong's outstanding translatoriality<sup>20)</sup> and metatranslative ability. Speaking of

19) In the purgatory, all the hardships are not the ultimate destinations but the necessary steps to take so as to complete one's duties and pay the prices of responsibility (or even past sins or wrong doings) (ibid.: 73).

20) Note that Hamong could have easily employed 'Amgul (암굴)' from Gankutsuou ("암굴왕" in Korean) as Amgul is also taken directly from a chapter title in Kuroiwa's TT. Hamong also could have quickly resorted to another Japanese version, which is characterized by (partial) word-for-word translations in spite of the editorial cropping. Purposefully selecting one specific representamen over the other sign options so as to make it stand for some other interpretants should be

Haewang (i.e., Ocean King), it is Hamong's decision to use 'King' ('*wang*' in Korean/ Romanization) and 'Count' ('*baekjak*' in Korean/ Romanization) in referring to the main character. Speaking of the King of the Seas, it is interesting to note that Hamong's family comes from Gyeongju, the ancient capital city of the previous Silla Dynasty. As the ocean-based trades and diplomatic connections had had long histories, especially, between the political leaders in the Chinese continent and the Korean peninsula (Connor 2009), Hamong might have felt entitled to using the title of the King of the seas as a descendant of the Gyeongju-based royal Silla people<sup>21)</sup> (with Beijing, Shanghai, and the Yellow Sea depicted as the main settings).

Another example for a metatranslative analysis is Junbong Jang, the Koreanized name of the protagonist. Hamong's pen name 'Baekak Sanin ("man on/ from the white mountain peak")' and his creation of the name Junbong Jang (meaning "a tall, rugged, and lofty mountain peak") imply<sup>22)</sup> the sole independent sovereignty while the title of '*baekjak*' (i.e., 'count' in English)

taken to be a representative semiotic process of a translative operation, and Hamong can be interpreted as an authentic translator in multiple senses.

21) At this stage, this is nothing but an evidence-free speculation. It, however, is an interesting coincidence that the family name of the Joseon dynasty is also, Lee (李). Historically, it is said that the Lees of Gyeongju and the Lees of Jeonju are genealogically related. In fact, one of the main letters (항렬자) for the Lee-based descendants is Hae (海) among the Jeonju-based Lees (cf. Deokheung Daewongun-pa) (e.g., Hae-Chan Lee, a former prime minister of the R.O.K.). Also, the ninth son of King Euichin is Hae-Ryong Lee. Hae-Seok Lee (known for his previous career as a singer) is the tenth son of King Euichin. Interestingly, Won Lee (the person who leads the Imperial Family Association of Daehanjejuk) was given the name 'Sanghyup Lee' (李相協) when he was born. Hamong's name is the same: 李相協 (source: wikipedia on the Imperial Family Association of Daehanjejuk, URL: [https://ko.wikipedia.org/wiki/%EB%8C%80%ED%95%9C%EC%A0%9C%EA%B5%AD%EC%9D%98\\_%ED%99%A9%EC%8B%A4](https://ko.wikipedia.org/wiki/%EB%8C%80%ED%95%9C%EC%A0%9C%EA%B5%AD%EC%9D%98_%ED%99%A9%EC%8B%A4)).

22) Note that both of the names (i.e., 'Baekak Sanin', a pen name of Hamong and 'Junbong Jang', the protagonist's name in Hamong's TT) imply the metaphor of a high mountain working like a chieftain.

indicates the indexicality-sensitive consideration of the then Joseon/ Korean laws of the peerage (조선귀족령) based on the then Japanese peerage system (Kajoku in Japanese, 화족 in Korean).

The order of appearance (i.e., Junbong, a mountain and a cave on the Island of the Ocean King, the Baekjak of Ocean King, and back to Junbong) in Hamong's crosscultural transmutation can be compared with that by Dumas (i.e., Edmond Dantès, Monte Cristo and a cave on the remote island, Count of Monte Cristo, and back to Edmond Dantès). In spite of the superficial contrast between Hamong's naming and Dumas's "original" naming, a metaphor-sensitive investigation produces many crucial clues, which seem to center about or pertain to Dante Alighieri's Purgatory (in which there exist a tall rocky mountain, Peter's Gate, Planet Neptune for the Pisces, the ocean, the island, etc.). And, all the information implies that Hamong must have been the person who had the insight, knowledge, expertise, passion, and capacity for such a metalinguistic, metasemiotic, and metatranslative strategization.

Although it seems that these are nothing but a few lexical examples mentioned here for no relationship present inside/ among them, the paradigm of (primary/ conceptual) metaphors and image schemas can shed light on the text-internal and text-external semiotic dynamics (as a whole) characterized by the iconicity-based/ iconicity-centered sign selection (i.e., by the metasemiotic/ translative processes), which must have been based on Hamong's strategization for the TRs in the then TC of colonized Korea. In that case, the lexical differentiation should—and now can—be analyzed as a superficially symbolicity-based linguistic realization which must have been inevitable and even suitable for the intersemiotic and metatranslative realization of (primary/ conceptual) metaphors and image schemas in indexicality-relevant ways.

In a metasemiotic and metatranslative investigation, *Haewangseong* as Hamong's TT(s) turns out to be of greater significance in terms of the nature and properties of translatoriality of each individual who had made the birth of *Haewangseong* possible. Depending on the respective translator's metasemiotic

literacy and metatranslative competence, the translation units and strategies become drastically differentiated (yet cognitively relevant and interconnected). In brief, there are more than the two interlingual translators. As for them, their unique sets of STs and TTs were far greater and richer than the verbal contents of the serialized novel. If they are superb and sophisticated real-life translators who are good at utilizing (partial) iconicity-based metaphorical translations in their own unique biosemiotic umwelts, they must have prepared for and carried out their own creation and/ or translation of a certain main character in a highly metatranslative manner, too, to the extent that each character would function as a principal (yet passive) translator within the text-internal umwelts in which such an imaginary translator can translate the respective TRs into the anticipated directions and toward the intended effects: the new translators that the actual flesh-and-blood counterparts may have inserted into their texts in highly sophisticated yet greatly implicit ways. If the initial hypotheses were ever plausible, the main character(s) (e.g., Junbong and Dantès) (cf. Gankutsuou) would show certain clear semiotic features as explicit representamens of iconicity-sensitive metaphorical devices, especially, in aiming to appeal to the readership in the TC(s).

#### 4.3 Metaphoric Transmutations: Just a Name?

With the universally powerful ability of iconicity-based metaphors taken into account, a closer look at each character as a new representamen could result in empirical verification of such a theoretically abstract claim.

In Hamong's lexical specification of the main protagonist into Junbong Jang, there seems to be little evidence for the legitimacy of the Korean-specific words as a reliable TT that is equivalent to the ST (i.e., Edmond Dantès as a transeme) in French. And, it is one of the main reasons that scholars and laypeople view *Haewangseong* as an obvious case of adaptation, not translation, that is, due to the arbitrary and irrelevant rendition backed up by

symbolicity-based semiotic naming only. This article, however, argues that it is a conceptual/ cognitive fallacy—mainly caused by a glottocentric and/ or ocularcentric perspective—rather than a sharp observation of a scientist.

According to the cognition-centered metatranslative perspective that this research attempts to develop, Junbong Jang, Haewang Baekjak (cf. Gankutsuou), Edmond Dantès, and Count (of) Monte Cristo should not and cannot be interpreted as all separate, unrelated characters and names. They are, after all, the TTs (that is, new representamens) that are created to function as an ultimate translator who can read, translate, and take each TR's heart. Considering the fact that the human species has no choice but to rely on iconicity-sensitive metaphors<sup>23)</sup> linguistically, conceptually, and situationally, it is possible to predict that the working hypothesis of iconicity-based metaphor can be applied to each character as a unique text-internal translator. If it is plausible, there must exist certain (empirically obtainable) semiotic cues which possess an iconicity-high metaphor (or image schema) so as to strongly and universally attract and move the TRs to a maximal degree.

And, as was discussed earlier, there exist a set of primary metaphors<sup>24)</sup>

23) See Lakoff (2009) for some examples of morality-related primary metaphors (Lakoff 2009: 96-98). In addition, note that even words can imply their correlations to certain basic frames and narratives (Lakoff 2009: 234-235). Even if the degrees and transparency of metaphors may differ from language to language, it is a fact that basic metaphorical properties and figurative meanings are translatable beyond lexical forms (Kövecses 2005: 131-162).

24) Even in the process of producing a TT as a novelist, Dumas is no exception in having to resort to primary metaphors (e.g., 'Good is Up/ Big/ Abundant', 'Bad is Down/ Small/ Distant/ Isolated', 'Self is Center', 'Free is Moving', 'Challenge is an Obstacle', 'To Win a Challenge is To Endure and Break an Obstacle, etc.) and image schemas (e.g., a mountain, ocean, a ship, a parent/ family, vertical hierarchy, Earth as a sphere on which up-down-left-right directionality can apply globally, a rock cave, a gate/ exit, etc.) (cf. see Evans and Green 2006: 178-189 on the basic examples of fundamental image schemas). Empirically speaking, his schematic and thematic utilization of his father's stories as various transemes—which had been

and/ or image schemas in the pertinent intersemiotic translation examples: the mountain-peak-like man (i.e., Junbong<sup>25</sup>), the Ocean King (i.e., Haewang) slash Neptune God (i.e., Haewang) and Neptune (i.e., the Haewang-seong as the planet), the (potential) protector of wealth (i.e., Edmond), and the exile's transformation into a greater noble being with his belief in the Christian morality and virtue (to be) obtained via a long, rough journey full of temptations and hardships (i.e., Dantès, Count (of) Monte Cristo), which seems to have been motivated by Dante<sup>26</sup> Alighieri's *Purgatory* (Sayers 1955).

In the case of Hamong who was experiencing turmoils and injustices as a young Korean man and as an aspiring journalist in colonized Korea, main names in/ for his Hangeul-based translation/ transmutation of a foreign serial novel were not plain lexical grids that can be easily filled with SL-/ST-centered approximate information but metatranslatively and metasemiotically critical textual spaces/ scaffolds which can help Hamong and TRs better accomplish skopos-specific translations on their own. Because of and thanks to

---

transmuted into *Le Comte de Monte Cristo* as his TT—must be considered as a multidimensionally manipulated intersemiotic translation consolidated by the image schemas and/or (primary) metaphors. Furthermore, the globally successful reception of his TT should be seen as a result of the metaphor-sensitive construals of the TRs who, in fact, must have been cognitively translated by the main characters (as passive yet powerful translators fueled by metaphors).

25) In Korean, 'Junbong' usually refers to the mountain peak of a tall, rugged mountain (峻峰). Using different Hanja letters, 'Junbong' also means "to observe and comply with the laws" in a loyal manner (遵奉). While Junbong as the mountain peak does imply a great challenge and tough journey as in the mountain of *Purgatory* (Sayers 1955), Junbong Jang can refer to a big leader-like/ head-like/ parent-like figure, too, owing to the lexical meaning(s) of Jang (張) in Hanja ("long/ progress/ leader").

26) Note that 'Dantès' in Edmond Dantès sounds the same as 'Dante' in Dante Alighieri, the author of *Purgatory*. Dante is also well known for his career abroad because he had to leave his country as a refugee (Sayers 1955). The accent notation and an extra letter seem to have been derived from Dumas's source-text-centered translation as, only with that extra notation, [e] of the source text 'Dante' can be pronounced as [e] in French (cf. Dante's etymology: enduring).

the strategically ingenious names as texts, *Haewangseong's* multiple metaphorical meanings (e.g., the guiding planet of Pisces, the remotest star, the ruler of the seas, etc.) along with Junbong Jang's mountain-peak-like metaphor must have had indirect yet great influences on the TRs' minds and viewpoints as well as on the socio-cultural and historico-political conditions in the then Korean society under Japanese rule (cf. independence movements). While the mountain-peak-like protagonist (i.e., Monte Cristo "the mountain of Christ"; Dantès as in Dante of the Mountain Purgatory; Junbong Jang) is the key metaphor with the steadiest and strongest impression throughout the relay of translation from Dumas through Hamong, it is Hamong's metasemiotically insightful translatoriality that enables the transmutation-like integration of Dumas's main transeme-level metaphors with the universal metaphor/ image schema of the ocean as a significant source domain in the Anthroposemiosphere and the TC-specific metaphorical structure slash image schema of the seas in the unique umwelt of Asia (thus, Shanghai instead of Incheon or Busan).

Therefore, a word-for-word translation from Kuroiwa's 'rock cave king' (巖窟王) might have resulted in conceptual distortion/ distraction in the TRs/ TC. While a strict crosslinguistic contrastive analysis would still claim that Hamong's work is an unfaithful adaptation with a number of mistranslations therein, a cognition-centered metatranslative and metasemiotic investigation into the operational power of the major metaphors and image schemas—illustrated in Hangeul for a maximal distribution and (re-) translation—reveals that, along with the other predecessors and their protagonists, Hamong is, in effect, a skillful translator who possesses the metasemiotic literacy, the metatranslative ability, the crosscultural communication competence, and, most importantly, his own authentic translatoriality, with which he succeeded to translate/ transmute/ transplant some essential elements of Dumas's and Kuroiwa's TTs into the then indexicality-high Korean society (as the TC) via metaphors. Surely, it leads to a debate on the/ each translator's ethics and ideology, but that is to be treated separately in the future (Petrilli 2014, de Saussure and Schulz 2005).

## 5. Conclusion

So far, the quintessentially (intra-/ inter-/ meta-) semiotic mechanism of translation per se has been applied to the indexicality-specific (thus, historicity-specific, translatoriality-specific, and TR-specific) translation case that involves Sanghyup Lee's *Haewangseong* translated from Alexandre Dumas's *Le Comte de Monte Cristo* via Kuroiwa, particularly, in terms of the translation processes and strategies.

With the Peircean/ Petrillian-translativity-based and cognitive-metaphor-centered perspectives taken into account, it becomes clear that, when viewed with a universalist metasemiotic perspective that is concerned with basic image schemas and (primary) metaphors, a good deal of insightful information can be inferred and collected. Even the single example of *Haewangseong* results in a fuller analysis that involves far more than just one translator/ translatoriality. Hamong cannot be translated without Kuroiwa who cannot be translated without Dumas who cannot be translated without his father, colonialist/ revolutionary France, and Dante that cannot be translated without histories, historicities and metatranslations. Therefore, to see Hamong as a translator in a metatranslational analysis, it is mandatory to see Hamong's predecessors—even including Dumas and Dumas's father—as translators with their own unique metasemiotic (namely, translative) competence and strategies. In the same logic, it is necessary to be able to locate and meta-interpret (physically passive yet) potentially powerful translators inside the textual umwelt(s), which are the core STs from the new TRs' points of view in their new translation processes. Such plurality of translatoriality can only be interpreted and analyzed when the broadest notion of translation gets applied to various levels and domains of the related texts and discourses. With such a paradigm that can result in a fuller description and explanation regarding the translative sign (system) in focus, the dichotomous division into translation versus non-translation or that into translation versus adaptation must turn out to be a highly unreliable solution.

And, translation and translatoriality should be studied from the sign within first, particularly, in a Peircean and/ or Petrillian sense.

In the follow-up research in the future, Hamong's metatranslational strategization will need to be evaluated and reexamined further in terms of the meta-level functions, especially, apart from the fixed presupposition about his allegedly pro-Japanese political stance, focusing more on the text-type-sensitive strategies (e.g., inside the pertinent texts).

In conclusion, Peirce's/ Petrilli's metatranslative paradigm is found to be transdisciplinarily compatible and applicable in and for a fuller metatranslation of a given text/ sign. With the cognition used as the critical keyword pertinent to various fields and phenomena in language/ sign/ human sciences, it becomes clear that the Petrillian perspective can be further instantiated and fortified in terms of the descriptive, observational, and explanatory adequacy. According to a new methodology that involves iconicity-based sign examples (as metaphors), Hamong's *Haewangseong* and the multidimensional translatoriality therein can result in a fuller metatranslation which reveals the skopos-specific metatranslative strategization and the hypercomplex semiotic networks of implicit yet powerful translators from Dumas through Hamong.

## References

- Chandler, Daniel (2007) *Semiotics: The Basics*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Cobley, Paul, John Deely, Kalevi Kull, and Susan Petrilli (eds) (2011) *Semiotics Continues to Astonish: Thomas A. Sebeok and the Doctrine of Signs*, Berlin and Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Connor, Mary (ed.) (2009) *The Koreas*, Santa Barbara: ABC Clío.
- Deacon, Terrence (1997) *The Symbolic Species: The Co-evolution of Language and the Brain*, New York: W. W. North.
- De Saussure, Ferdinand (1916/2005) *Cours de Linguistique G n rale*, Paris: Payot.



- De Saussure, Louis and Peter Schulz (eds) (2005) *Manipulation and Ideologies in the Twentieth Century*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dumas, Alexandre (1844-1846) *Le Comte de Monte Cristo*, Paris: Le Journal des Débats.
- Dumas, Alexandre (1998) *Le Comte de Monte Cristo*, Paris: Omnibus.
- Evans, Vyvyan and Melanie Green (2006) *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*, Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gibbs, Raymond (ed.) (2008) *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, New York: Cambridge UP.
- Grady, Joseph (1997) *Foundations of Meaning: Primary Metaphors and Primary Scenes*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Berkeley: University of California at Berkeley.
- Jakobson, Roman (1959) 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation', in Brower, Reuben (ed.) *On Translation*, Cambridge: Harvard UP, 232-39.
- Jeanmaire, Guillaume (2008) 'Étude sur la Traduction en Français des Anthroponymes Coréen', 『프랑스어문교육』 27: 275-307.
- Kövecses, Zoltan (2002) *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Kövecses, Zoltan (2005) *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Kövecses, Zoltan (2015) *Where Metaphors Come From: Reconsidering Context in Metaphor*, Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Lakoff, George (2009) *The Political Mind: A Cognitive Scientist's Guide to Your Brain and Its Politics*, New York: Penguin.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago: Chicago UP.
- Lee, Sanghyup (1916-1917) *Haewangseong*, Seoul: Maeil Shinbo.
- Lee, Sanghyup (2007) *Haewangseong*, Seoul: Hyunsil Munhwa.
- Lim, Eo Kyung (2013) *Semiotic Translations of Possession: Multidimensionality of Its Embodiment*, Ph.D. Dissertation. Busan: Pusan National University.
- Merrell, Floyd (1997) *Peirce, Signs, and Meaning*, Toronto: U of Toronto P.
- Nord, Christiane (1997) *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist*

- Approaches Explained*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Park, Jinyoung (ed.) (2007a) *Haewangseong (Sang Hyeop Lee's Adaptation Novel) 1*, Seoul: Hyunsil Munhwayeongu.
- Park, Jinyoung (ed.) (2007b) *Haewangseong (Sang Hyeop Lee's Adaptation Novel) 2*, Seoul: Hyunsil Munhwayeongu.
- Park, Jinyoung (ed.) (2007c) *Haewangseong (Sang Hyeop Lee's Adaptation Novel) 3*, Seoul: Hyunsil Munhwayeongu.
- Peirce, Charles (1933) *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce (Vol. 4)*, in Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss (eds), Cambridge: Belknap/Harvard UP.
- Peirce, Charles (1934) *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce (Vol. 5)*, in Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss (eds), Cambridge: Belknap/Harvard UP.
- Peirce, Charles (1982) *Writings of Charles S. Peirce: A Chronological Edition Volume 1 (1857-1866)*, Bloomington: Indiana UP.
- Petrilli, Susan (ed.) (2003) *Translation Translation*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 17-53.
- Petrilli, Susan (2012) *Expression and Interpretation in Language*, New Brunswick: Transaction.
- Petrilli, Susan (2014) *Sign Studies and Semioethics: Communication, Translation and Values*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Reiss, Katharina (1997/2000) *Translation Criticism-The Potentials and Limitations: Categories and Criteria for Translation Quality Assessment*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Reiss, Tom (2012) *The Black Count: Glory, Revolution, Betrayal, and the Real Count of Monte Cristo*, New York: Broadway Books.
- Sayers, Dorothy (trans.) (1955) *The Divine Comedy II: Purgatory*, London: Penguin Books.
- Sebeok, Thomas and Marcel Danesi (2000) *The Form of Meaning: Modelling Systems Theory and Semiotic Analysis*, Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Silver, Mark (2008) *Purloined Letters: Cultural Borrowing and Japanese Crime Literature 1868-1937*, Honolulu: U of Hawai'i P.

- 권문경 (2014) 『구로이와 루이코의 수용과 1910년대 한국의 변안소설』, 박사학위논문, 인천: 인하대학교.
- 권연진 (2017) 『인지언어학에서 은유의 보편성과 상대성』, 서울: 한국문화사.
- 권용선 (2004) 「변안과 번역 사이 혹은 이야기에서 소설로 가는 길: 이상협의 『명부원』을 중심으로」, 『한국근대문학연구』 5(1): 137-165.
- 권정희 (2013) 「번역/번안의 분기: 『장한몽』과 번안의 독창성」, 『상허학보』 39: 83-119.
- 김경희 (2016) 「한글문학번역에서의 인명 번역에 관한 고찰」, 『프랑스어문교육』 53: 7-32.
- 김순미 (2012) 「고유이름의 번역방법: 비문학 출판 텍스트를 중심으로」, 『통번역학연구』 16(4): 75-108.
- 김순영 (2008) 「문학작품 속의 감정은유 번역: 개념적 은유 이론의 관점에서 본 ‘슬픔’과 ‘화’의 한영번역 양상을 중심으로」, 『번역학연구』 9(3): 7-26.
- 동아일보 (2000) 『동아일보 민족과 더불어 80년』, 서울: 동아닷컴. Available at [www.donga.com/docs/donga80](http://www.donga.com/docs/donga80).
- 박석재 (2008) 『하늘을 잊은 하늘의 자손: 블랙홀 박사의 천문학 에세이』, 서울: 동아사이언스.
- 박성래 (2011) 『인물과학사2: 세계의 과학자들』, 서울: 책과 함께.
- 박윤석 (2012) 「31만세 전야에 마주 앉은 민족대표와 일본 군사령관: 1920년대 서울」, 『신동아』 5(632): 496-515. Available at [http://shindonga.com/docs/magazine/shin/2012/04/20/201204200500010/201204200500010\\_1.html](http://shindonga.com/docs/magazine/shin/2012/04/20/201204200500010/201204200500010_1.html).
- 박정운 (2013) 「틀지식과 은유의 번역: 인지언어학적 접근」, 『통역과 번역』 15(1): 31-62.
- 박효진 (2015) 『한국 현대 단편소설 작중인물 이름의 영어 번역 연구』, 박사학위논문, 서울: 동국대학교.
- 박효진, 박윤희 (2015) 「한영 문학번역에서의 이름 및 지칭어 고찰」, 『국제어문』 64: 193-214.
- 송현선 (2015) 「한중 은유번역과 번역전략」, 『중국연구』 63: 243-255.
- 신진원, 박기성 (2011) 「경제텍스트에서의 은유 번역 사례 연구: 개념적 은유를 중심으로」, 『번역학연구』 12(2): 129-155.

- 유정화 (2008) 「노·한 은유 번역과 코드」, 『통번역학연구』 11(2): 81-97.
- 이승아, 노상래 (2014) 「변안 소설의 텍스트 변화과정 연구: 이상협 소설 『해왕성』을 중심으로」, 『민족문화논총』 56: 297-328.
- 이승아, 배지연 (2011) 「시사잡지 텍스트에 나타난 개념적 은유 표현의 번역 전략: 영한 병렬 코퍼스에 기반한 분석」, 『번역학연구』 12(3): 169-196.
- 이상협 (1916-1917) 『해왕성』, 서울: 매일신보.
- 이상협 (2007) 『해왕성』, 서울: 현실문화사.
- 이혜승 (2004) 「노한 은유 번역 연구: 과정과 결과의 통합적 고찰」, 『통역과 번역』 6(1): 155-178.
- 임동휘 (2014) 「번역에 대한 메타번역적 접근: 기호, 인지 중심의 번역 개념」, 『코기토』 76: 299-338.
- 임동휘 (2015) 「페트리리의 번역 개념과 유형: 기호기반의 초인문학적 가능성」, 『번역학연구』 16(2): 207-248.
- 장혜선 (2018) 「중한번역에서의 은유 표현 연구」, 『중국어문학논집』 109: 255-277.
- 전은경 (2005) 「1910년대 이상협 소설과 식민지배담론」, 『현대소설연구』 25: 381-405.
- 전은경 (2012) 「근대 계몽기 한일 번역문학과 근대 독자층 비교연구: 『장한몽』과 『해왕성』을 중심으로」, 『어문학』 117: 231-266.
- 지영은 (2012) 「은유의 인지적 처리: 은유 이해하기와 번역하기」, 『독일문학』 124: 55-75.
- 최미경 (2010) 「문학작품 속의 은유의 번역」, 『불어불문학연구』 81: 331-373.
- 최성윤 (2013) 「근대 초기 서사 텍스트의 저작, 번역, 번안 개념에 관한 고찰: 근대 초기 신문 연재 소설을 중심으로」, 『한국문학이론과 비평』 59: 219-240.

[Abstract]

**Metatranslative Signs of Dumas and Hamong:  
Names as Texts and Metaphors Therein**

Lim, Dhonghui  
(Pusan National University)

As a transdisciplinary study to test the validity and practicality of Peirce's/ Petrilli's paradigm of translation (Peirce 1933, Petrilli 2003) in dealing with the problematics of "adaptation", this research seeks to implement a metasemiotic and metatranslative analysis of an "adaptation" (cf. *beon-an*) (翻案) novel that is often viewed as a byproduct of pseudo- or non-translation. Taking Sanghyup Lee's *Haewangseong* as an important example, it makes a translative-centered and translatoriality-sensitive approach to the translative-process-specific (meta-/ inter-/ intra-) semiotic cues/ clues in the related TTs in order to discuss the questions on (i) the applicability of the Peircean/ Petrillian notion of translation and (ii) the inclusion/ exclusion of "adaptation" as part of translation as such.

Knowing that the Peircean/ Petrillian paradigm of translation is a general metaepistemology with few concrete language- and culture-specific instructions, this research proposes to implement a collaboration with a transdisciplinarily significant notion of 'metaphor' (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). When metaphor (cf. primary metaphor) is considered as a main methodological device that functions on the basis of cognition-induced partial similarity between some source domain and target domain, each translator-specific/ agent-specific sign example can be further analyzed (that is, re-translated) in metatranslative/ metasemiotic ways by having it interpreted as a unique TT (cf. representamen) that must have resulted from the pertinent sign user's partial-iconicity-based construction of a triadic sign relation (cf. strategization via skopos-sensitive selective manipulation).

Upon a (meta-/ inter-/ intra-) semiotic and translative analysis of major signs as translation units/ factors/ results via metaphors, it becomes clear that even seemingly irrelevant titles, names, props, and contexts inside and outside of the indexicality-specific textual/ semiotic umwelt(s) can be (re-/ meta-) translated as a set of translator-specific and skopos-relevant TTs (as crucial representamens), which are often realized by means of the unconsciously and/ or purposefully manipulative selection of certain specific signs for them to stand for something else with certain particular interpretants (that is, a set of metatranslative sign processes) (cf. Lim, D. 2015). In particular, concentrating on the critical and effective utilization of metaphors (cf. image schemas) observed in the transactions and transmutations (Jakobson 1959) of Hamong's and other translators' specific signs as transeme-sensitive TTs, the so-called "adaptation" turns out to be an oversimplified and overgeneralized notion/ term, which should be re-examined in such a way that indexicality-sensitive (thus, skopos-sensitive, TC-sensitive, and TRs-centered) strategization gets introduced into the Petrillian meta theory of translation (cf. Reiss 1997, Nord 1997).

In paying due attention to Peirce's triadic model of the sign, Petrilli's (extended) paradigm of translation is found to be able to describe and explain the (inter-/ intra-/ meta-) textual transmutations in adequate and systematic manners, especially, in terms of the cognitive ST(s)-based comprehension/ production phases that Hamong (and other translators) must have undertaken. Speaking of metaphor as a methodological device, too, the translating agent's ST-conscious and TC-sensitive metasemiotic/ metatranslative utilization of (partial) iconicity can be the main reason for such metaphor-rich transmutations (cf. Jakobson 1959, Petrilli 2003). Also, considering the semiotic-/ textual-production-centered meta-translative strategization by which basic metaphorical structures (e.g., 'Good is Up/ Big/ Abundant', 'Bad is Low/ Small/ Remote', 'Challenge is Being Distant/ Isolated', 'Freedom is Moving', 'To Win a Challenge is To Endure and Break/ Cross an Obstacle', 'Virtue is (For-) Giving', 'Self is Center', etc.) seem to have been devised or (re-) adopted, there

appear to be theoretical ramifications: (i) the purposefully fractional utilization of iconicity/ icons can be implemented in non-definitively flexible ways across languages, cultures, epochs, and spaces to evoke certain meanings/ effects among the TR(s) in the TC(s) (e.g., via names, titles, directions, and/or culture-specific archetypes); (ii) the linguistic/ lexical equivalence is a relative variable (that each translator can manipulate or even disregard) rather than the ultimate requirement; (iii) semioethics is a new keyword to consider (Petrilli 2014).

From the ‘meta’ analysis of Hamong's *Haewangseong*, it is argued that Hamong (as well as Dumas) should be considered as a unique translator whose metatranslative strategization is highly optimized in his own indexicality-sensitive *umwelt*(s). And, for a fuller (meta-) translation/ interpretation of Hamong's *Haewangseong*, it becomes evident that the Peircean/ Petrillian view of translation and translator can help shed light on the aspects and mechanisms of cognitively based translatoriality including the TC-sensitive translatorial transparency and manipulatability. To be precise, (in-) visible and/ or (in-) active translators' interventions are found to be implicitly embedded within titles, names, plots, and texts. And, translatorial competence is transsemotically realized in diversely transmuted forms of signs, particularly, as representamens purposefully selected via (primary) metaphors and/ or image schemas.

Taking everything into account, this research concludes that, even if ethics-related questions remain (Petrilli 2014), it is theoretically important and meaningful to view Hamong's *Haewangseong* (as well as Dumas' *Le Comte de Monte Cristo*) as his unique example of translation—with names as key TTs—not only for translation studies but also in sign sciences as transhumanities.

▶ Keywords: translativity, Peirce, Petrilli, Haewangseong, Sanghyup Lee, Dumas, metaphor, cognition, translatoriality

▶ 주제어: 번역성, 퍼스, 페트리리, 해왕성, 이상협, 뒤마, 은유, 인지, 번역자성

임동휘

부산대학교 언어정보학과 시간강사

dhlm@pusan.ac.kr

관심분야: 기호와 번역, 페트리리/퍼스 번역이론, 언어과학의 학제간 연구

논문투고일: 2018년 11월 6일

심사완료일: 2018년 11월 23일

게재확정일: 2018년 12월 5일