Value Tokens and Translativity of Public Signs: A Case Study on Haeundae, Korea

Dhonghui Lim*

1. Introduction
2. Beyond Contrastive Linguistic Analysis
3. Translating(s) and a City Space
   3.1. Translation from a Notion to a Reality
   3.2. Value and Translativity in Globalization
   3.3. Public Signs' Semiosis: Geosemiotics
4. Public Signs of Haeundae Decoded
   4.1. Haeundae, a New Glocal Space
   4.2. Tokens of Value-laden Translating
   4.3. Value-sensitive Analysis of Public Signs
5. Further Implications
6. Concluding Remarks

〈Abstract〉

In quest for the illumination and elicitation of translation as a basically (trans-) semiotic meaning-making process/ activity (Petrilli 2003, Lim 2013) which can work at the heart of the realm(s) of the humanities and redefine the public space as a multilayered translational text full of natural/ cultural

* Pusan National University (formerly, Eo Kyung Lim)

translating practices, this paper primarily aims to rethink and further explore the notion of translation and the features of the Korean-locality-specific translational phenomena by analyzing representative examples of the public signs in a value-rich glocal space in today's Korea. For the case study to re-read and re-write ordinary public signs as the unique empirical evidence for explicitly visible (cf. Venuti 1995; 1998) and purposefully empowered (cf. Tymoczko 2007) translation, this paper first proposes to approach translation in a transdisciplinary way that takes into account not only linguistics and translation studies but also cultural studies, translative semiotics, and geosemiotics (cf. Peirce 1931-1958). From the point of departure seeking to go beyond the conventional concept of interlingual translation, it, then, makes a hypothetical assumption that, because the act of translating takes place in a value-laden conflict-related environment, the translations are actual tokens of value-driven and ideology-laden decision-making purposefully leaning toward selective experimentalism and manipulative optimality. In the analysis, translatively salient examples—selected in Haeundae, Busan, Korea—are examined and interpreted in a value-sensitive, translativity-oriented manner in order to see if the consideration of (non-linguistic) factors like value, space, and translatorial competence would be necessary and even critical for a study on the local public signs (as opposed to the value-free contrastive linguistic analysis). Subsequently, from the value-sensitive and (geo-) semiotically translative examination focusing on the respective public signs' (geo-) semiotic properties as the tokens of value-driven translations, it argues for the usefulness and significance of such a translatively centripetal (that is, translatorial-condition-specific: intrinsically purposeful and value-sensitive) scrutinization, especially, so as to secure an academic account that can not only describe but also explain the transsemiotically subtle and complex meaning-making practices (as multidimensional translation phenomena) in a

contemporary Korean context adequately and successfully.

In conclusion, the transdisciplinary translative analysis of the value-laden public signs in the glocal space of Haeundae in Korea gives rise to some theoretically motivating implications, which include (a) the function of its public signs as the critical tokens of the locals' glocalizing translating; (b) the significance of the translatorial competence of the natural translators in respective local areas in today's Korea; (c) the importance of the new, constructive direction of value-free linguistic investigations toward the alternative roles and potentials of the translative paradigm (with translativity and translatoriality in focus) in this glocalizing era; (d) the value of the transdisciplinary collaboration in investigating the meaning-making activity, viz., Translational Turn in the Humanities, that is, Transhumanities.

Keywords : Public Signs as Translation, Geosemiotics, Translating in Value Conflicts, Power Relations, Tokens, Values, Globalization, Selective Manipulation, Haeundae, Public Space, Value-sensitive Translative Analysis, Translational Humanities.

1. Introduction

As part of the theoretical attempt for the transdisciplinary experimentation on the translative property of the sign, this pilot research aims to scrutinize the local public signs[1], those visually salient signs situated in an outdoor

1) In this account, public signs refer to the visually explicit (trans-) semiotic constructs devised for the purpose of public display and placed in a public space. Therefore, they include the commercial and non-commercial sign (board) examples as well as private and public signals of various sorts (cf. linguistic landscapes, language of the sign boards).

space in contemporary Korea, especially, from a value-sensitive and translativity-oriented semiotic perspective. In order to substantiate the hypothetical argument that even physically solid, biologically inorganic, and linguistically fixed sign forms should be viewed as ecologically and anthroposemiotically animate and semantically—and semiosically—multidynamic (e.g., multimodal, multidirectional, and multidmensional) translations, it takes Haeundae and its main sign examples as geographically random yet semiosically meaningful subject materials. With the assumption that the allegedly value-free and objective method of contrastive linguistic analysis may not always guarantee a satisfactory degree of observational, descriptive, and explanatory adequacy and, more importantly, would not offer the insight to fully decode critical cultural significations[2] in dealing with the purposefully created and situated public signs, this account focuses on and inquires into the two distinct—transdisciplinarily relevant—points[3]: (a) the significance of a value-sensitive analysis of language data for a fuller transsemiotic reading (thus, any sign is and must be 'a value token', rather than the purely physical and semantically transparent representation of the sign itself, due to the purposeful motivation of a sign process) and (b) the indispensable and basic mechanism of the sign itself working as a trans-signs process via the manipulative selection of another sign vehicle (i.e., interpretant) on behalf of the semiotics/ semiosis

2) Such cultural significations are intertwined with, converged with, or fused into the language. The adequacy of a value-free and objective approach to translation is at times criticized by those researchers who argue for the significance of a critical cultural theory of translation/ language. Venuti (1998), for example, pinpoints the limitations of such a value-free method in linguistics-oriented studies by mentioning the philosophically and culturally critical perspectives of Deleuze and Guattari (1987) on that.

3) The importance of prioritizing multimodality in meaning-related processes can be read in the following monograph. Gunther Kress, Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication, London: Routledge, 2010, pp.1-17 & pp.54-78. Also, the transsemiotic view of the sign itself is put succinctly and timely in the following work. Susan Petrilli, ed., Translation Translation, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2003, pp.17-37.

of some other sign, from which the 'translativity', that is, the intrinsically translative nature of the sign comes into being and intervenes in every sign process and its meaning-making activities[4] (so, signs are virtually everywhere and bring about meaning-making phenomena and their open semiosis across multiple dimensions and via multiple modalities). These elements urge researchers to consider not just the linguistic information but all the possible (trans-) semiotic modes (or modalities) available in the given meaning-making process, for which even a public space—often viewed as non-linguistic and little significant in linguistic research—comes to be understood as a (geo-) semiotically essential constituent[5] and a culturally meaningful reality that holds and feeds public signs in its unique, history-specific ways.

In considering the public space as a critical component and variable incessantly working in the (trans-) formation of linguistic and other paralinguistic signs—as well as in the (re-) production of values—in this globalizing society/ world, this account then takes a transdisciplinary approach to the public signs in order to propose and demonstrate that locally situated public signs should (and can) be analyzed in terms of translation (in light of the intrinsically translative nature and, also, in respect of the cognitively translational phenomenon). That is, irrespective of the conventional name

---

4) The translative nature of the sign process is a Peircean idea and further specified in a Petrillian sense. Susan Petrilli, ed., Translation Translation, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2003, pp.17-37. On the other hand, its transsemiotic application can be found in the researcher's dissertation. Eo Kyung Lim, Semiotic Translations of Possession: Multidimensionality of Its Embodiment, Ph.D. Dissertation, Busan: Pusan National University, 2013. Here, the distinction between the translative property and the translational phenomenon is important, even if they can be interrelated as part of transsemiotic processes in the biosemiosphere.

5) "All signs must be located in the material world to exist, and they are classified as indexes" (Scollon, R. and S. Scollon 2003: vii). Any linguistic information and knowledge should be treated as having to do with the space (i.e., indexicality) because every information and knowledge "must be represented by a system of signs" (ibid.).

'public signs' (or, 'sign boards', too, for that matter) and their referential information linguistically realized, presumably and frequently, for a utilitarian function, each example of the public sign is, in effect, a gauge, a token, a trace, a (by-) product, a platform, and a catalyst of/ for (trans-) semiotic translation designed and manifested via value-driven manipulation[6]. Because of this, public signs with different locality and historicity should be treated differentially as real-time translations[7] that are purposefully[8] devised and placed by (natural/ professional) translators, that is, those sign creators with specific interests.

In the instantiation of the new proposal on value involvement and translativity, it decides to choose the specific local space called Haeundae ('해운대' in Korean and '海雲臺' in Hanja[9]) as a random specimen, rather than

6) The term 'manipulation' is not precisely identical to what Lefevere (1992) stresses in his theorization of translation. This should be regarded as being closely linked to the kind of manipulation that Lakoff and Johnson (2003) elaborates on in their discussion of metaphors proposed to be essential for a better understanding of human language and culture. In Lim (2013), this kind of manipulation is described as part of the sign process available across the—biological and cultural—semiospheres for value-laden selective manipulation takes place not only in human cognition and language but also in all life forms and their activities.

7) In this account, translation is not restricted to the sense of interlingual translation. Although Roman Jakobson argued that interlingual translation should be understood as translation proper (Jakobson 1959/ 2000), the gist of the matter is the (microscopic) transsemiotic literacy with which one can discern the sign process itself as a transsigns process—as Petrilli (2003) clarifies—and, therefore, already and always a kind of translation.

8) Nord, for example, views translating work "as a purposeful activity" from a functionalist viewpoint. Christiane Nord, Translating as a Purposeful Activity, Manchester: St. Jerome, 1997. The purposefulness is motivated by the translation theory of 'Skopos' (a goal, aim, or purpose in Greek) proposed and developed by Reiss and Vermeer. Reiss, Katharina and Vermeer, Hans, Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1984. Whether it be a purpose or Skopos, the main force behind it must be the translator's values and interests. Because value cannot represent itself and needs another sign vehicle for its signification of any sort, any sign production cannot help resorting to the translative mechanism and subsequent value-driven translation.

as a representative sample of the standard public signage in today's Korea. Understanding it as a geosemiotically vitalized translational text and a unique transsemiotic complex of its own meaning-making practices, this paper initially assumes that even a randomly selected place should have its own local-global/ internal-external/ causal-conventional/ producer-consumer factors reflected and translated in its public signs in certain specific ways. For example, if the hegemony of English were predominant, the sign typology would be characterized by Englishization due to the anglocentric translation strategy of sign producers. In the same logic, Korean-centered standardization as a factor could lead to the avoidance of the region-specific (Busan) dialect in the signage. By approaching the sign examples for a qualitative analysis, not quantitative examination, it attempts to interpret each example's translative property and value intervention as well as translational characteristics. Now that this kind of value-sensitive and translativity-centered approach is very new (even novel) in the fields of the human/ language sciences, the research begins in the area in which the researcher has observed diverse semiotic transformations for decades on a daily basis, so that the diachronic (and even real-time) changes in the name category, in the design aspect, and in the locational specificity can be, possibly, well connected not only with the empirically explicit information like the linguistic landscapes (LL) but also with the relatively opaque yet decisive factors like translatoriality, social-cultural capital, geosemiotic dynamics, power relations, non-translation as an implicit translation, the function(s) of iconicity, symbolicity, and indexicality, and value orientation. Although this process-sensitive random analysis is subject to falsifiability, it actually comes to overcome the three methodological problems addressed by Spolsky (2009: 29-32), which are (a) that of the state of literacy

9) In simple terms, Hanja is the classical Chinese letters that have been used in the textual tradition of Korea.

in relation to the (quantitative) statistical counts (e.g., literacy vs. language power), (b) that of the process recognition (which counting and photographing cannot help achieve), and (c) that in the counting of the given signs (e.g., where and what exactly). Considering the fact that Haeundae is one of the most talked about spaces in today's Korea, it is anticipated that the globalization-induced values and discourses can be observed and examined at the local, regional, national, and international levels[10] particularly in terms of the value-driven manipulative selection underlying the translative processes of signs.

In the preliminary eclectic analysis[11] based on the value-sensitive and translativity-oriented labeling of public sign examples, the groundedness or situatedness[12] of those signs in the given space can be seen to function as a fundamental variable in—and an important key to—an understanding of the data in focus. Also, it becomes clear that any and every sign can come into being only when it is selected in a value-sensitive manipulative fashion, which is, already, an intrinsically translative process of choosing a sign over others on behalf of another sign that seeks to represent or realize a certain value (e.g., wider and longer recognition, financial profit, transformation of individuals into proactive consumers or citizens, increasing popularity, general

10) This range of the levels does not exclude the economic, political, historical, cultural, ideological, sociological, and anthropological dimensions. They need to be examined more thoroughly and systematically, which will require further in-detail research in the future.

11) Although the research is not to discuss the semiotics of a (glocal) space in detail due to the ambit being an eclectic approach to the public signs as a new kind of multimodal translation influenced by pervasive sociocultural phenomena like globalization, it makes scholarly endeavors to demonstrate the practical significance and the theoretical contribution of a value-sensitive transdisciplinary approach for the (future) investigation into public signs that are created, revitalized, and constantly translated through their interaction with and across a global-local space (cf. 'value practice' in De Angelis 2007).

12) John Brown and Paul Duguid, The Social Life of Information, Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2002 (quoted in Ron Scollon and Suzie Scollon, Op. cit., p. viii).

acceptance of the authority or norms, etc.) (cf. Petrilli 2003; Petrilli 2010; Petrilli 2012; Lim 2013).

Consequently, this paper is going to conclude that, in research on the fundamental nature and sociocultural relationship of (trans-) signs in a glocal space like Haeundae, a value-sensitive and translatively oriented—thus, transdisciplinary—analysis of the public signs should be very efficient and essential in terms of the possible integration of cultural contemporaneity into language study, particularly, in considering the rapidly changing and multidimensionally complex societies and cultures under the great impacts of globalization. Also, by attempting to integrate the category and range of public signs into the vast dimension of translation[13], this paper anticipates that many translation-related fields of research will not only expand farther but also succeed to meet the needs and demands of today's academics and professional practitioners who engage in translation in various ways and pursue the convergence of translation theory and practice in the (trans-) humanities and human sciences.

2. Beyond Contrastive Linguistic Analysis

In the linguistic literature on the public signs of a Korean community, a highly noticeable tendency is to conduct a value-free contrastive analysis in pursuit of the descriptive adequacy (e.g., Cho 2000, Han, H. 2001, Kim, H. 1991, Kim, J. 1983, Kim, Y. 1988, Kwon and Kim, D. 1991, Min 2001, NIKL 1991, Son, J. 1981, etc.). While the contrastive analysis and its description may have been employed as an attempt to conduct a value-neutral

13) Thus, public signs are not to be seen as mundane value-neutral information for linguistics, urban geography, and architectural studies.

scientific investigation[14], it is worthwhile to mention some of the underlying premises that such a descriptive method implicitly abides by and advocates. The predominant features of the premises are, firstly, the presupposition of the absolute legitimacy and permanent existence of a value-free state[15] and, secondly, the primary operation of a language-specific (i.e., glottocentric) analysis based on the linguistic-form-centered ocularcentric method. Thus, whether the signs are placed in the CBD (Central Business District) in Sydney, Australia, or transpositioned and engraved on the rooftops of beachside skyscrapers in Dubai, U.A.E., the linguistic information and value would be estimated to be absolutely identical as long as they share the same alphabetical (i.e., lexicographic) information (e.g., from well-known logos like Hilton, SAMSUNG, SONY, and BMW to common nouns like restaurant, supermarket, bakery, museum, bus stop, etc.). With the paradigm that prioritizes the visual formality of the linguistic information of the target research area, it is likely that extra attention gets paid to the unfamiliar linguistic anomalies and exceptions (e.g., specific grammatical errors in the orthography; translation errors in the loanwords or foreign words[16]; visual

14) For example, the ratio of the Korean and English (or non-Korean) letters/ words to evaluate Englishization, the level-specific classification of the grammatical errors to assess the general translatorial competence or the English proficiency in given signs, etc.

15) What it suggests is that, as long as the researcher does not control or intervene in the process of collecting the linguistic data and so long as the researcher connects the data items to their denotative meanings in the interpretation (rather than other kinds of deeper interpretation), the linguistic analysis can and should be considered to be value-free —even when dislocated and decontextualized—and valid for scientific research in linguistics. For instance, the English word 'mart' is analyzed as the single identical noun even in culturally different expressions like E Mart, Top Mart, Hi Mart, Lotte Mart, Techno Mart, and Wall Mart (cf. semantic typology of polysemy). Researchers, however, should be aware of the underlying problems and limitations of the binarism-based dichotomy (e.g., value-free vs. value-laden, form vs. meaning, etc.) that has long characterized the western thinking and history. For a critical work on the dichotomy, see Mudimbe-Boyi (2002), for example.

incongruities in the physical presentations). Particularly, in the linguistic studies on the public signs in Korea, those formally aberrant signs are thought of as the bad, namely, flawed and unreliable examples caused by the incorrect usages that untrained or less educated laypeople happen to practice against their original intention and plans.

Such an ocularcentric method of analysis has been employed and practiced not only in linguistics but also in translation studies owing to that methodology considered to be scientifically valid and (re-) applicable. The adoption of a value-free method, however, has a lot to do with the predominant positivistic orientations, which tend to accuse the critical and value-sensitive researches of being "unscientific" and too "politicized"[17] for a theoretical work. While it is not easy to define what value really is—subject to many interpretations, neither simple denial (e.g., to label value-sensitive studies as "too unscientific" or "too philosophical") nor overapplication (e.g., non-empirical speculation, philosophical deconstruction, or pedantically abstract conceptualization) would be a solution for any linguistic research to increase its theoretical adequacy and reliability. Although, on the surface, an ocularcentric observation may result in a clean-cut analysis of the collected data —leading to the formation of a new category-specific corpus, the matter of the form-centered value of a linguistic entity and that of the descriptive adequacy therein are rather problematic, especially, when one gets confronted with (a) the possible intervention of translation[18] dynamics in the generation

16) The adoption of loanwords is taken for granted in those cases in which there appears to be no clear correspondent or equivalent in the target language. Despite the common use, this foreignizing policy needs further discussion because it centers on the mythology of equivalence, of which the theoretical reliability and relevance would be problematic in today's translation theory (Leonardi 2000).

17) Halloran, James, "Values and Communication Research", In Kersten, Kevin and Biernatzki, William, eds., Value and Communication: Critical Humanistic Perspectives, Cresskill, NJ.: Hampton Press, 2000, p.14.

of a public sign and (b) the ontological interconnectedness of the respective sign with the particular space in(to) which it gets positioned and grounded in a value-sensitive manner for the effect of skopos-related indexicality (cf. value struggles[19]). Given examples like Busan Bank (부산은행), Busan Biennale (부산 비엔날레), Busan International Film Festival (부산국제영화제), Busan Cinema Center (부산[20] 영화의 전당), Busan City Tour (부산 시티투어), Busan Exhibition and Convention Center/ BEXCO (부산 전시컨벤션센터/ 벡스코), 부산 오뎅 (Busan Fish Cake), and 부산 왕순대국밥 (Busan King Blood Sausage Soup), a contrastive analysis of the positivistic description would claim that (a) the formation of public signs usually follows the order 'a (regional/ proper) name + a topic word' and that (b) the taxonomy for the sign examples above groups them under the same regional/ proper name of the identical referential meaning[21] (i.e., 부산, the city of Busan). Despite the observation that the ocularcentric form-based contrastive analysis is suitable for the extensive application of the statistical and taxonomic[22] information

18) Here, translation refers to the transsemiotic—thus translative—process of the sign itself according to the Peircean notion, which is further developed by S. Petrilli. It involves not only interlingual translation but also intralingual and intersemiotic translation. For the detailed account, see Susan Petrilli, ed., Translation Translation, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2003.

19) Massimo De Angelis, The Beginning of History: Value Struggels and Global Capital, London: Pluto Press, 2007, pp.19-33.

20) In the actual public sign, the Korean title is 영화의 전당 without the mention of Busan whereas the English title is Busan Cinema Center. These exemplify the clear yet implicit intervention of translation dynamics—not always following the principle of equivalence—even prior to and right at the stage of linguistic naming.

21) In the context, while it can be said that 'meaning' is synonymous to 'information,' the latter should be treated separately in the sense that information can become meaningful only when it is specifically situated or grounded according to Scollon and Scollon (2003).

22) Researchers often classify their database according to the regions, industries, main businesses, etc. as in the Yellow Book (e.g., Min 2001). This is helpful for a quantitative analysis, but may fail to capture the implicit meaning networks involving the respective public sign and its peculiar situatedness in a locative and temporal space. Taking the sign

construction, it becomes increasingly self-evident that the sign- and meaning-related epistemology (or, simply, the transsemiotic literacy) in today's academic and professional societies keeps calling for greater descriptive and explanatory power as well as sharper and deeper observation because of the new microscopic and macroscopic changes in the semiotic comprehension and production[23] (e.g., the multimedially developing society/ world, the multimodality-based nature of the meaning-making, the inherently translative —viz., transsemiotic—process of the sign itself, etc.). Once the reality is taken into account and, simultaneously, the data are viewed from the standpoint(s) of the (trans-) humanities[24] (cf. translative human science in Jon 2008), it becomes very challenging to provide a transdisciplinarily satisfactory account on public signs only by means of the glottocentric method of contrastive linguistic analysis, unless humanities-relevant factors like value, translation, locality, and semiosis are studied and reflected. In that context, an in-depth study into the sociocultural and linguistico-semiotic aspects of public signs becomes of great significance. A new keyword that can be practically useful and theoretically insightful is this: space. Space[25] is the least considered

---

부산식당 (Busan Restaurant) for example, the form-centered contrastive analysis cannot capture, interpret, delineate, and explain why this sign (e.g., that in Wien, Austria, that in Düsseldorf, Germany, that in Seoul, Korea, that in Tongdo Temple, Korea, that in Hong Kong, China, etc.) involves different translation tactics, invites diverse locality and historicity, and generates respectively authentic meaning networks in their own spaces (in spite of the same lexicographic information produced as the target text).

23) For the nature of multimodality in/ for meaning, see Gunther Kress, Op. cit., pp. 54-78. For the translative nature of the sign itself, see Susan Petrilli, Op. cit., pp. 17-37.

24) This becomes clearer when self-critical and interdisciplinary disciplines such as Cognitive Linguistics, Cultural Semiotics, and Cultural Studies are considered. In this account, it is suggested that Translation Studies should be the very discipline that has a lot to offer not only to the humanities (and their theories) but also to our understanding of the reality.

25) The definitions and categories of space are more than just a few. It can be interpreted as being polysemous or, more precisely, highly dynamic, so much so that it cannot be fixed as a single concrete entity or concept. While, among many others, there is a

variable in the linguistic studies which employ a value-free contrastive analysis for their research on region-specific[26] public signs. In the hindsight, then, how can such notions (and conditions) as value and space be applied and integrated into a linguistic theory on public signs? Or, even, could the consideration of space as a major component in the constitution and construals of public signs be an alternative tool for a constructively designed and comprehensively described account on language and translation? Based upon the actual samples of the public signs observed in the glocal space of Haeundae in Busan, Korea, this paper is going to attempt to substantiate the new hypothetical argument in the following sections with a value-sensitive translative approach.

3. Translating(s) and a City Space

3.1. Translation from a Notion to a Reality

Speaking of translation, it has been one of the most frequently discussed and interpreted terms in the academic fields of research over the last several decades. Whether it addresses a modern or postmodern paradigm of the world (cf. Jameson 1991), whether it involves an imperialistic violence or a

---

scientifically oriented attempt to make distinction among different kinds of space (e.g., Based on the human senses, Edward Hall's researches (1959, 1969) divide space into five different categories, which are visual space, auditory space, olfactory space, thermal space, and haptic/tactile space), the meanings are expected to remain open-ended and even organismic in this era of uncertainties and transformations. It is one of the important reasons for the urgency and meaningfulness of an in-depth investigation into the relationship between space and the public signs (as multidimensional, pluridirectional, and multidynamic translational phenomena).

26) Regions, at times, may be used as a criterion in the taxonomy of public signs. Strictly speaking, nonetheless, regions are to be distinguished from space as the term 'space' attains and, also, self-generates a variety of significations, gaining a wider range of meaning particularly in this era of globalization.

postcolonial resistance and subversion (Álvarez and Vidal 1996; Bourdieu 1998; Hyun 2004; Robinson 1997; etc.), or whether it concerns a creative decision-making and rewriting process for an experienced and experimental translator (Bassnett 1980, 2002; Venuti 1998), the term translation is unanimously considered to carry useful theoretical implications for the academics and the professionals in this epoch. The establishment[27] of the academic field of Translation Studies, too, has become clearly tangible as a result of the new scholarly and (inter-) disciplinary endeavors made by those who sought to investigate translation as a complex notion worthy of academic research[28] in its own right. In addition, "the increasing push for globalization [...] in the world has put translation at the heart of diverse [...] enterprises"[29] linguistico-culturally and politico-economically. Despite these facts, many of the assumptions of the discipline as well as the major perspectives on the nature of translation processes and products have been relatively limited and idealized[30]. As Tymoczko states, "a local form of knowledge about translation rooted in European languages and dominant European translation history has been promoted broadly and propagated internationally as a universal framework for conceptualizing translation theory and practice" and the international discipline of Translation Studies has been marked by "the primacy of Eurocentric and North American conceptualizations of translation"[31] in

27) It is often quoted as "a success story" of the late twentieth century. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, "General Editors' Preface", In Lefevere, André, ed., Translation/ History/ Culture: A Sourcebook, London: Routledge, 1992, p.xi (quoted in Lawrence Venuti, The Scandals of Translation: towards an Ethics of Difference, London: Routledge, 1998, p.8).

28) Thus, against the history-long mainstream views to see translation as a raw material treated in a subfield of linguistics or as a vocational job conducted by a hired practitioner.

29) Maria Tymoczko, Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators, Manchester: St. Jerome, 2007, p.4.

30) Of course, works on translation have appeared in the active attempts to reveal and aim to overcome such aspects of translation theories (e.g. Liu 1995, Cronin 2003, etc.).

terms of the theory and practice.

If this is the case, a new question arises: would those notions of translation—based on or sensitive to the Western theory—be able to describe and explain the specific socio-cultural situations in Korea adequately and sufficiently with regard to the translational practices and phenomena? Or, at least, is there any transdisciplinarily applicable perspective of translation that can discuss—if not encompass—a new dimension of translation instead of expanding a particular notion[32] embedded in the Western translation theory? In other words, the translation theorist should be ready and willing to move "beyond Western conceptualizations of translation"[33] and explore possibilities to rethink translation in a specific spatio-temporal context where implicit yet strong factors like power relations and values are to be critically observed. And, in order to seek the possibility of finding a materialist clue for the immaterial notion(s) of translation, this paper is going to observe and examine translation-related clues and tokens by implementing a case study on the concrete translation practices designed for and realized in a specific local space called Haeundae[34] in Korea. And in the transdisciplinary study employing a

---

31) Maria Tymoczko, Op. cit., p.4. For the Eurocentrism, there are various historical factors, some of which can be found in Maria Tymoczko, Op. cit., pp. 5-6.

32) For instance, the Jakobsonian typology of translation (and notion of translation proper)—often quoted in the literature in Translation Studies—may not be valid any more in a new context of global history in which the directionality and dimension of translation are always found to be in the plural form, as opposed to the singularity in the A to B form.

33) Maria Tymoczko, Op. cit., p.4.

34) Its population is 423,000 approximately (as of May, 2014) which takes up 12.01 percent of the Busan Metropolitan City's entire population. The area is 51.46km^2 and it is 6.7 percent of the total area of Busan, which is 769.86km^2. Despite the fact that, geo-politically, Haeundae (Gu) is one of the fifteen Gu Districts in Busan, the growing focus on the econo-cultural prosperity of the particular local space—as a global (world-class) tourist destination—as well as on the autonomy of the regional politics has led the Gu office to label it as "an attractive world's first-class city" hoping that it is "being reborn as a city-type tourism resort district" (sources: the official web sites of the

value-sensitive and translatively critical viewpoint (motivated by the Peircean paradigm of translation[35] and compatible with diverse frameworks on translation), it will aim to gain a key perspective and discover empirical evidence[36] for a broader scope of the dimension(s) of translation, viz., as a reality that involves subtle, complex power relations and engages in (every dimension of) everyday life for values and effects.

3.2. Value and Translativity in Globalization

In approaching translation in today's globalizing culture(s) in quest for new(er) voices in (meta) translation theory, three distinct characteristics call for the researchers' attention, which are (a) the value-driven[37] nature of translation (Ho 2005, cf. Jakobson 1959), (b) the act of border-crossing (Cronin 2003), and (c) the translative nature of the sign itself (Petrilli 2003).

Haeundae Gu (District) Office and the Busan Metropolitan City). In October, 2007, Haeundae Gu was selected as one of 'The Top-Ten Best Cities to Live in Korea' in the 3rd Awards of Local Self-Government in Korea, presented by the Korea Journalist Forum. Note that the local space has shifted its status and title (from 'Gu' to 'City,' from 'a regional attraction' to 'world's first-class resort,' from 'misty (운) seaside (해) heights (대)' to 'Haeundae' and to the symbol of 'Sun & Fun') owing to the policy and strategy changes made by those in power, that is, a new kind of translators who have new glocal values and interests.

35) Susan Petrilli, Op. cit., pp. 17-37.

36) If successful, it can be anticipated to make theoretical contribution for further development of the multidiscipline of Translation Studies that is also relevant to particular Korean situations in this century.

37) In his article on translation, Roman Jakobson raises critical questions about values in addressing the century-old metaphor of "Traduttore, traidtore". By asking researchers to answer the questions on the very nature of messages and values instead of imposing ethical and utilitarian burdens exclusively onto the translators, Jakobson argues that translation should be further investigated in terms of the cognitive and semiotic dimensions. Roman Jakobson, "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation", In Reuben Brower, ed., On Translation, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959, pp. 232-239 (Reprinted In Lawrence Venuti, ed., The Translation Studies Reader, London: Routledge, 2000, p. 118).

Given the features to signify the new reality of language, society, and culture today, the "importance of non-literary [and non-professional] translation" viewed in simultaneous consideration of space in a "critical [therefore, value-sensitive] translation studies"[38] has drawn new, great attention. The forces of globalization have definitely and irreversibly transformed the nature and typology of translation today. This paper, thus, focuses its attention on public signs as a kind of empirical non-literary [and non-professional] translation, which are purposefully produced, re-written, transpositioned, and transmutated in a globalizing/ globalized urban space. It is a solid fact that, in the social and human sciences, there have been quite a few studies on the public signs as new signifiers of an urban space in a global age. This research of public signs is motivated by the fact that it is in the material world in which the meaning of any sign gets anchored[39], not solely in the brain/ mind of the language user. Such indexicality is regarded as a universal property of natural human language particularly since the turn of Peircean Semiotics. In this account, the definition/ notion of the sign is to be approached from the perspective of Geosemiotics in that a sign is seen as "any material object that indicates or refers to something other than itself"[40]. Surprisingly, though, not many linguistic accounts spare a line or page for the consideration, not to mention any investigation, of translation as a powerful and invaluable factor, agent, intervener, and mediator in the production and the construals of the public signs. If this point gets taken into account and examined in detail, what kinds of knowledge and awareness can be achieved? And with the commencement of new experimental, empirical, and critical research on public

38) Michael Cronin, Translation and Globalization, Abingdon: Routledge, 2003, p.2.

39) Ron Scollon and Suzie Scollon, Op. cit., p.3.

40) Ron Scollon and Suzie Scollon, ibid. It includes what was conventionally taken to be too trivial to be studied, such as shop names, traffic regulatory devices, graffitti, and roadways.

signs, how much can the contemporary Korean situations (or, at least, those in Haeundae) inform various disciplines like linguistics, translation studies, cultural studies, and (trans-) humanities in this era of globalization? Bearing those questions in mind, the paper is going to study the specifically situated public signs and their translational implications.

3.3. Public Signs' Semiosis: Geosemiotics

In this section, the account approaches public signs from a semiotic perspective. By semiotic, it means 'of an integration of transdisciplinary methodologies centering around and applicable to the comprehensive study of the sign-related aspects of texts and language'. One of the advantages for a linguistic research to gain with a semiotics-based transdisciplinary approach is that it provides researchers with a practical and widely applicable research tool and, also, the possibility to intervene into many problems in reality and to suggest concrete and creative solutions to those problems[41].

Then, what is Geosemiotics? It is defined as "the study of the social meaning of the material placement of signs and discourses and of our actions in the material world"[42]. One of its main objectives is to "capture [the] 'in-place' aspect of the meanings of discourses in our day-to-day lives". What we encounter in everyday life—once thought of as ordinary and even banal—is "a complex array of signs and discourses" (e.g., traffic signs, street lines, graffiti, advertisements, public notices, building identifications, etc.). In the study of them, "insights from a wide variety of fields from linguistics to cultural geography and from communication to sociology" are put together into a coherent perspective[43]. Such transdisciplinarity can be taken as a common key

41) 오장근, 텍스트-기호학적 도시공간 리터러시와 문화브랜딩」, 『언어과학연구』제 43집, 언어과학회, 2007, 229-247쪽.

42) Ron Scollon and Suzie Scollon, Op. cit., p.2.

to the collaborative research on (public) sign networks and the diverse translational dynamics directly and/ or implicitly working in and across open, heterogeneous, and multicomplex sign networks.

4. Public Signs of Haeundae Decoded

If empirical research can help document changes in modes of translation, what could complex factors like value and power tell the researcher in an empirical research? And, how do they actually affect the everyday activity or, rather, simultaneously (un-)conscious human acts of translating[44]? Keeping these questions and key words in mind and taking the specific empirical data from a concrete contemporary local[45] space (e.g., Haeundae in Busan, Korea, in this account), this paper is going to seek the possibilities to explore new dimensions of translating, rethink the term translation, and rewrite the general understanding of translation in the following sections.

4.1. Haeundae, a New Glocal Space

43) Ron Scollon and Suzie Scollon, ibid.

44) Álvarez and Vidal, for instance, view translating as a political act (Álvarez and Vidal 1996: 1-9).

45) When the words like local (as in local culture), locality, and the local become emerging keywords in a field of research, it indicates the expansion and complex transformation of the meanings related to them (e.g., the word culture and its extensive notions in Storey 1999). It demands a great deal of intellectual work in order to figure out what constitutes or generates them and how they are developed into differentiating, wide-scope concepts[1] because there are utterly a countless number of elements and factors as well as their variants in the pertinent processes, which play major or minor roles at every facet and in every phase of each processing. And this is exactly why Foucault (1982) gives the title of archaeology to the work to explore the relationship between discourse and truth, especially such kind of archive work that encompasses the structure of statements and the (trans-) formation of related discourse (Lee 1999, quoted in Kim 2008).

On the ground that the century's general topic has become the degree of distinction (Bourdieu 1984) as a respective selling product/ entity (whether it be an individual, a city, an institution, an enterprise, or a state), individualist autonomy is demanded and required for each entity to acquire both the conceptual (: immaterial) and material value increase in it. The Busan City government is no exception, and, with the new name Busan Metropolitan City, it has vigorously been seeking and conducting "developments to become a world-class" city. It has hosted international events (e.g., the Asian Games, Busan International Film Festival, Busan Biennale, the APEC meeting, etc.), introduced or re-organized local cultural entertainments (e.g., Jagalchi Festival, Gijang Festival, Gwangan Eobang Festival, Haeundae Sand Festival, and many more), and, also, implemented big construction projects (e.g., Centum City[46], Haeundae New Town, Marine City, Blue City, etc.): all in the name of the "world-class" development. In a report anthology published by the Busan Development Institute under the auspice of the Busan Metropolitan City Government, the director of the institute stresses that this century leads and permits a region/ local space to be the very agent of and for international competition and, therefore, that the city constantly tries hard to create itself as "this century's maritime capital" and, at the same time, as a "world-class city that competes and collaborates with other world-class cities"[47]. This may

46) Much to surprise, all the 'city'-containing names that the local government policy makers have created for and imposed on certain 'special-project' areas in Busan have little to do with the definition and nature of the administrative unit called 'city' unless they are devised for some creative or connotative purpose.

47) 박재환, 일상성, 일상생활연구회, 『부산의 신생활풍속』, 부산발전연구원, 2004. If this statement is reliable information, Haeundae is a pinnacle example with which one can study the particular translatings/ translations in detail regarding its personalities as a local space where the two elements—i.e., the logic of hegemonic power and the specific and ordinary dimensions of those who dwell in the area and engage in their everyday lives vis à vis—interact (un-) consciously and (in-) directly through silent conflict friction.

sound like a significant and promising slogan that ensures and confirms the local government's self-determinedness in pursuit of making the city a better place to live and/ or visit with enhanced quality in its "culture" and "everyday lifestyle." But, is it really so?

In "reading spatial changes of Busan with Debord's theory of spectacle"[48], such a slogan comes to reveal the intended message that it has hidden but always hopes to convey and install into the consciousness of the isolated individuals (a.k.a. the public), in a most subtle, manipulative fashion. Closer to the Deleuzean society of control than to the Foucaultian society of discipline by now[49], postmodern Busan has—half forcibly by globalization and half voluntarily for centralization—officially finished the reappointment of its representative symbol of the new era: Nampodong's Busan Tower dethroned; Haeundae's Gwangan Bridge newly 'crowned'; i.e., the victory of the "immanent, mobile, and pseudo-unified vision" over "the transcendent, dissociated, and fixed vision"[50]. Very interestingly but not surprisingly, such socio-cultural transformations that have been made through the processes of development and have become visually explicit in many local points and on various public occasions in the city—currently in and around the Haeundae area particularly—do not say much more than the capitalist logic of, for, and by "the major" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987). Then, a hurried conclusion would be that Busan and Haeundae have long gotten past the point of being what Debord calls the "Society of the Spectacle" (Debord 1995), being fully transformed into the Baudrillardian "Society of Simulation" (Baudrillard 1994). Subsequently, Haeundae would simply and ominously become a successful

48) 김용규, 「기드보르의 스펙타클이론으로 본 부산공간의 변화」, 『인간에게 공간이란 무엇인가』, 새한영어영문학회/ 대동철학회/ 한국건축학회, 2007, 21-31쪽.
49) 김용규, 앞의 책, 21쪽.
50) 김용규, 앞의 책, 26쪽.

example of the re-formation of a community into a mute, subordinate space for the transnational processes of globalization.

Univocally aiming to compete and collaborate with the other 'world-class' cities in the age of globalization, the institutional and commercial participants in the globalizing translating of contemporary Haeundae in Busan, Korea, have been increasingly active and, even, aggressive in being self-expressive—both verbally and visually (that is, materially and immaterially)—about the messages and images that they intend and hope to disseminate in Haeundae and (ultimately) throughout the world. Anywhere with a 'good' view—that is, all the visually desirable vantage-point locations that the haves desire to set their eyes on and see the world from (e.g., the urban designs of the Western modern cities)—is reified/ objectified and rendered into a hybrid creature in a newest form with a newest meaning day in and day out (i.e., particular discourse entities intentionally immersed in and formulated by ideologies, rather than a series of plain texts composed for artistic or technical reason) (e.g., from 'a tourist district in Busan' to 'an attractive world-class city in Korea' and, then, to 'Sun & Fun, Haeundae' in the world). The symbol 'Sun & Fun' along with the colorful mascots 'Sunny' and 'Funny' can be seen literally from every and any angle all across the area and, whether the public whose mother tongues are (not) other than English understand the pictographs or not, the English-speaker-friendly signs that self-declare Haeundae's intralingual, interlingual, and intersemiotic practices are praising globalization and campaigning for the city's membership in it. In sinc with the-state-of-the-art linguistico-ocularcentric mode, the local scenery has been newly decorated (or, violently branded[51]) with various symbols and graphemes which derive from

51) Think of the very question that Young poses in his postcolonial account: "Who translated us?" (Young 2003). Being "translated," particularly without any consent to the practice or any knowledge of the rationale or the process, is analogous to the act of

the Anglo-American culture(s).

The globalizing and majoritizing translations for capitalist orientation in the Sun-Fun City are so proliferating and pervasive that the discourse effects of a few simplified symbols or signs therein appear more powerful and direct. And, taking those majoritizing translation examples into account, this study cannot help questioning some of the postcolonial translation theorists' views on translation and translator (e.g., Venuti 1995, Tymoczko 2007, among many others): are most of the translations in Haeundae the end products of the majoritizing translating?; and, after all, will they continue to promote the globalization by the "Empire" (Hardt & Negri 2000)?

In search of missing links or clues for the questions, this case study first argues that (a) the ocularcentric binarity-oriented approaches (e.g., translating strategies toward majoritizing/ minoritizing, foreignizing/ domesticating, or making homogeneous/ heterogeneous) have become invalid and unsuitable in any discussion on translingual and transcultural practices, particularly in the new contexts of today's glocalizations; (b) any examination on cross-linguistic and/ or cross-cultural phenomena must consider power and value-driven conflict as significant factors (i.e., value-sensitive perspectives); (c) a close multidisciplinary and multidirectional investigation should be able to prove the optimality and experimental creativeness of all translations, possible to be witnessed in Haeundae.

4.2. Tokens of Value-laden Translating

This study now reposes some key questions: once this local space—embodying values through translation—gets analyzed from a translation theorist's point of view, what kind of theoretical information and

violent branding.

culturo-political implications would it offer us? And, when translating and translation are fundamentally inclined to defy the rules of reductionism or prescriptivism and prove themselves not to belong to any mechanizable or predictable transaction format often computed or devised in science, but yet, if it still appears that there exists a noticeable pattern of inclination toward certain translating types/ methods (e.g., excessive transliteration with Chinese, Japanese, or English "loan" words in modern Korea; hyper-adoption or hyper-transplanting of the American English lexicon in postmodern and contemporary Korea), what kinds of extra translation norms and theories should the theorists, researchers, and students in the humanities, especially those in contemporary Korean contexts, be equipped with in order to be able to see through the related phenomena and account for them in an adequate and impartial way? Initially and primarily, it is not an easy question to answer (think about the depth and width of the domain of translative hermeneutics, for example).

However, one thing is evident (and it is one of the premises to establish in this paper): today's ocularcentrism keeps people from becoming capable of reading a text from their own viewpoints[52] (cf. Kim 2008). If contemporary translation practitioners and theorists all regard translations and theories as value-free readability-ensured (i.e., visibility-guaranteed) text products (so that, they are thought to be ready for any kind of analysis and evaluation just like a subject in a science laboratory), they are very likely to perceive the major translating strategies observed on the surface levels of a text as a standard specimen made in a clean, dust-free vacuum. Likewise, the visually evident and pervasive operation of the currently dominating logic of the capitalism-driven economico-cultural politics may be seen as a major norm in

52) In other words, as a slogan, "Seeing is NOT believing!"

Translation Studies and, even, taken for granted insofar as the translation products (including theories) are easily accessible and readable to a majority of people.

On the contrary, according to Venuti (1998), theories in Translation Studies are not a mere collection of value-removed scientific findings and principles on translation as a text-based industrial product, but a set of critical analyses and meaningful investigations of translations as complex and dynamic acts/ activities/ processes designed and implemented by individual translators whose identities are inscribed with major values, ideologies, belief systems, and world views of their society. If Venuti's socio-culturally active and econo-politically conscious approach to the translation/ translator suggested anything constructive to the translation researchers and students at all, it would be the radical activist/ experimentalist insight that enables the conceptual, theoretical, and practical illumination onto translation and translator as socio-cultural and economico-political phenomenon of a new dimension. It is, in Lydia Liu's analogy, an active practice to see translation (not as a colonial submission before the western power and authority) as a site of power relations[53] where subversion is equally or more actively involved before and against the power of western hegemonies (Liu 1995). Once politically and culturally active approaches[54] are made, the translations, especially those in the form of public/ commercial signs proliferating in the local scenes of the Busan City, will turn out to contain a lot of information that is useful for a better, clearer

53) For a language-specific study in relation to the site of subtle power relations and the translators therein, see Lim (2008), for example.

54) Notice that the definitions of translation have varied greatly (subject to changes in terms of time, space, and culture): cf. "Translation is a topic of general interest for various reasons, but inasmuch as those reasons are diverse, there may be less to be said about translation in general than about it as a critical exercise for particular ideas of language, meaning, and interpretation" (Graham 1985:13).

understanding of the nature of value-laden and/ or value-driven translating as well as translation-translator relationships.

Knowing that this case study's purpose is not to jump into a clean-cut binarity-oriented conclusion but to explore and rethink translation and translating from a new culturo-political perspective[55], it is going to put aside the linguistic data and related information at this stage and continue to discuss the public signs of the local space, and this time, on the basis of the premise that there exist power relations in every intralingual and interlingual practice (therefore, to be given the same consideration in the discussion as that on translingual practices) and that such reality drives all the language-involved and culture-related phenomena—including facets of everyday life (i.e., non-academic, non-professional, extralinguistic, and extratextual)—to become value-laden (e.g., ideologies, belief systems, religious views, culture-specific attitudes, etc.) and conflict-involved in both explicit and implicit manners.

As Lydia H. Liu points out in the introduction to Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations[56], "the problem of translation has become increasingly central to critical reflections on modernity"[57]. Any topic concerning translation is not purely linguistic, literary, or cultural[58] any more (ibid.). And not all progressive discussions on notions like "heterogeneity" (Venuti 1998), "hybridity" (Bhabha 2004; Young 2003), "other" (Said 1978), or "difference" (Liu 1999) are regarded completely valid and legitimate[59] in

---

55) In this paper, the reason for making an open-ended multidisciplinary approach and applying certain questions posed in cultural studies to the contexts of translation studies has fundamentally more to do with the current socio-cultural reality that all individuals are obliged to face than with the researcher's fresh, untrimmed spirit of experimentalism.

56) Lydia Liu, ed., Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations, Durham: Duke University Press, 1999.

57) Lydia Liu, Op. cit., p.1.

58) This cultural aspect mentioned in Liu (1999) concerns the anthropological approaches in particular.

relation to translation as such. Although this paper is firm about the premise that there exists room to examine the appropriateness and (im)partiality of the overly frequent use[60] of such notions as "exchange" (Liu 1999), "travel" (Cronin 2000), "hybridity" (Bhabha 2004), and "other" (Said 1978), it also takes an active proponent's position when it comes to staying open and flexible in employing useful and informative conceptual tools from a number of various disciplines and professions. Liu's terminology called "token"[61] is a good example here.

Liu (1999) is "centrally concerned with the production and circulation of meaning as value across the realms of language, law, history, religion, media, and pedagogy and, in particular, with significant moments of translation of meaning-value from language to language and culture to culture". As she describes it using the figurative method of trope, the term "token" "encompasses not only verbal and symbolic exchange but material circulations as well". The gist of the matter it suggests is that objects can constitute representations—as is the case with verbal signs—and that "their tangible material existence participates in its own signification rather than exists outside it". Therefore, Liu takes translation "as a primary agent of token making in its capacity to enable exchange, producing and circulating meaning as value

---

59) Liu's noteworthy remark on the relationship between difference and modernity draws the reader's attention in that (a) "universalism thrives on difference; (b) it [...] translates and absorbs [difference] into its own orbit of antithesis and dialectic" (Liu 1999: 1). It is critical and significant on the ground that her sharp observation questions the "extraordinary faith in the translatability of modernity and its universal ethos" (ibid.). In addition, even radical alternatives can put theories in peril if they aim for another version of totality or universalism.

60) This rather skeptical position derives from the awareness of the significance to have a broad and comprehensive perspective on the nature and characteristics of translation/translating, instead of resorting to a single notion or theory to explain the whole of such complex phenomena.

61) Lydia Liu, Op. cit., p.4.

among languages and markets", arriving at the conclusion that "tokens and their exchange-value represent a [certain, unique] way of talking about the circulation of the sign, text, works of art, commodities, philosophy, science, pedagogy, and social practice"[62].

Here, the trope of tokens, in particular, is going to be adopted to demonstrate what kinds of public signs are created (whether it be an invention or a manipulation) by respective translators (e.g., institutions, corporations, small businesses, individuals, etc.) and how they are covered with values and ideologies as a result of conflict management in asymmetrical power relations.

4.3. Value-sensitive Analysis of Public Signs

With the insightful views on translation kept as this case study's theoretical asset, this paper now needs to focus more on the actual translational reality easily observable but often ignored in the local space of the present-day Busan/ Haeundae. The public and commercial signs are in a sense very 'visual' and 'visible' translation examples (cf. Venuti 1995; 1998) by being rendered into a certain, specific array of semiotico-linguistic items, from the sign composers' particular intention (: a message in idiolect inside the mind/ brain) devised for certain discourse effects that he/ she desires to see being activated in the audience(s), who often read the intralingual translations—with intentions and functions of their own—as natural and useful value-neutral information common in public scenes. The analysis and explanation of such translating, then, need a careful, critical, and multidimensional research work in the first place because, firstly, it involves a multitude of intricately interwoven (thus, multicomplex) socio-cultural and economico-political phenomena; secondly, the notion of "the other" is presupposed in all transactions of this kind[63] (not

62) Lydia Liu, Op. ibid.

necessarily "the other" defined and critiqued in the western theoretical contexts, even if they are related to some extent), indicating the need to give it a fair share of criticism and contemplation before taking for granted such ontology[64] of "the other" target readers.

While leaving the tasks to theoretically scrutinize the postcolonial, poststructural, and globalized worlds in the hands of Cultural Studies theorists, this paper gets a theoretical clue from the notion of "token" (Liu 1999) for an alternative analysis of the data. If public and commercial signs in a local space are, in reality, clear examples of function-specific and discourse-effect-oriented translations (in which, ironically, the translators do not necessarily oppose the idea of being left "invisible" (cf. Venuti 1995, 1998), visually marking the tokens in every translation example will hypothetically yet overtly reveal the translation frameworks in which the artificial constructs are surrounded by and interconnected with (the semio-translative tokens of) values, ideologies and conflicts.

As for the method of analysis, this research is going to rely upon hierarchy-sensitive linguistic categorization (usually at the morphosyntactic level) to indicate the structural hierarchy of the conceptual framing of the respective sign. It, then, will surround each subunit of the sign example with a pair of angled brackets to indicate the hypothetical linguistic or conceptual boundary. Subsequently, between the left bracket and the subunit (i.e., a

63) In this kind of intralingual transaction, the 'target' readers are always an imagined collective group. As a matter of fact, it is very much so in most translatings. If the target readers in interlingual translation (what Roman Jakobson (1959) calls "translation proper") were nothing but the imagined "other," it could explain, in a sense, why some argue for the "core" function of hermeneutics in translation studies: understanding and interpreting "the other" instantly become of major concern in this mechanism (even if it does not necessarily make hermeneutics a new field of study replaceable for translation studies).

64) Refer to postcolonial and poststructural theories in order to be informed of the histories and complexities of the term "the other."

lexical item or a simpler verbal/ non-verbal sign), a make-shift labeling marker —whether the main feature of the subunit is denotative-referential, grammatically functional, numerically specified, or graphically symbolic—will be inserted. After that stage, the capital letter 'T' (to indicate specific 'tokens of value') is to be placed right before the relevant pair of angled brackets. If there is any subunit that is considered to function as a translation text, a lower-case 't' will be employed and positioned in front of all the layers of the related subunits, suggesting its membership in a new, open semiosic network/ web (i.e., the operation of geosemiotics). And, so as to visualize the presence of a possible factor marker that affects the process of manipulatively selecting certain specific signs (over others), a pair of parentheses will be employed for a tentative notation. By inserting an initial letter of the factors (e.g., d for domestication; f for foreignization; f-m for foreignization in terms of the meaning; f-f for foreignization in terms of the form; f/c for foreignization followed by conventionalization; etc.) into the parentheses, the combination of the parentheses (i.e., the existence of contingency/ possibility) and the lower-case letter(s) can help understand the basic ontogenesis of value token(s) (generated through conflicting sign/ power relations as well as manipulatively translativity-based selecting processes). As the lower-case letters are supposed to imply the natural contingencies and flexibility underlying the production process(es) of the pertinent subunit of translation (cf. capital letters for the constants), the task of how they are read and further translated in their actual positioning should be always open to all the (human/ living) beings as potential translating agents (thus, becoming the respective sign experiencer's prerogative as a new translator). Although those angled brackets remind us of the Chomskyan notation of a syntactic analysis, the use of the brackets here is different in that each pair should be seen as working as a hemisphere-like semantic field (thus, a kind of microscopic semiosphere)—generated by

translativity and permeated with values—that constantly invites the general public into the (trans-) semiosic experiences for non-stop translation.

Now, based on the method and notation, the preliminary exemplification of the value-sensitive and translativity-conscious labeling can be made, as is given below. Note, however, that a makeshift labeling system[65] is invented, simply, for the notational convenience. Further systematization is to follow.

[Table 1] Public Signs: Value-sensitive Analysis

1) Employment of Semiotic Value of Regional[66] Names

---

65) The below information is a set of the tentative notations employed to indicate different kinds of sign values. Further interdisciplinary research in Semiotics and Translation Studies is expected to help specify this rough and preliminary device.
T: Token
RE: Referential Expression (as a key word)
RE(obj.): RE for an object
RE(hm.): RE for a human entity
RE(abs.): RE for an abstract entity
LM: Linguistic Modifier (e.g., affixes, determiners, particles, etc.)
NS: Numerical Symbol
GS: Graphical Symbol
LS: Local Space (cf. RE) (separated from RE as LS entails diverse information today)
t: a translation (open to interpretations; an overt phase in the act of translating)
f: foreign element (often, unknown or new information)
f-m: foreign in meaning (e.g., transliteration)
f-f: foreign in form (e.g., adoption)
f/c: foreign and conventionalized
d: domestic (e.g., indigenous expressions)
[ ]: a hypothetical boundary marker
( ): a hypothetical factor marker
cf. lower-case letters: subject to change, thus, flexible and manipulatable with contingencies.

66) In the exemplification, 동백 refers to Camellia Island (a.k.a. Dongbaek Seom) in Haeundae. 수비 refers to the former Suyeong Airport (수영비행장), which has become Centum City.

조방낙지: t[T1{LS(f/c) 조방} + T2[RE(d) 낙지]]
무교동낙지: t[T1{LS(f/c) 무교동} + T2[RE(d) 낙지]]
부산은행: t[T1{LS(f/c) 부산} + T2[RE(f/c) 은행]]
경남은행: t[T1{LS(f/c) 경남} + T2[RE(f/c) 은행]]
서울깍두기: t[T1{LS(d) 서울} + T2[RE(d) 깍두기]]
충남수퍼마켙: t[T1{LS(f/c) 충남} + T2[RE(f-m) 수퍼마켙]]
동백열쇠도장: t[T1{LS/RE 동백} + T2[T2-1{RE(d) 열쇠} + T2-2[RE(f/c) 도장]]]
밀양횟집: t[T1{LS(f/c) 밀양} + T2[T2-1{RE(d) 회-ㅅ} + T2-2[RE(d) 집]]]
수비동물병원: t[T1{LS(f/c) 수비} + T2[T2-1{RE(f/c) 동물} + T2-2[RE(f/c) 병원]]]
해운대 소문난 암소갈비: t[T1{LS(f/c) 해운대} + T2[T2-1{[RE(f/c) 소문} + {LM(d) 난]} + T2-2[[RE(d) 암소} + {RE(d) 갈비]]]]
하노이 (Hanôi): t[T1{LS/RE*(f-m) 하노이} + T2[LS/RE(f-f) Hanôi]]
강가(Ganga): t[T1{LS/RE(f-m) 강가} + T2[LS/RE(f-f) Ganga]]
인도가는길: t[T1{LS/RE(f-m) 인도} + T2[T2-1{LM(d) 가는[67]} + {T2-2[RE(d) 길]]]]

2) Employment of Semiotic Value of Figure Names
정항우 케잌: t[T1{RE(f/c) 정향우} + T2[RE(f-m) 케잌]]
현주 소주방: t[T1{RE(f/c) 현주} + T2[T2-1{RE(f/c) 소주} + T2-2[RE(d) 방]]]
짱구네 포장마차: t[T1{[RE(d) 짱구} +{LS(d) 네]} + T2[T2-1{RE(f/c) 포장} + T2-2[RE(f/c) 마차]]]]
Queen Motel: t[T1{RE(f-f) Queen} + T2[RE(f-f) Motel]]
알렉산더: t[T1{RE(f-m) 알렉산더]]

67) In this tentative analysis, the modifiers are to be considered to go under LM when verbs in Korean go through derivation to become modifiers.

놀부네: t[T[[RE(d) 놀부] +[LS(d) 네]]

U2: t[T1[GS(f-f) U] + T2[NS(f/c) 2]]

3) Employment of Semiotic Value of Foreign Brand Names

3.1) Commercial Trade Marks from Abroad

나이키: t[T[RE(f-m) 나이키]]

리바이스: t[T[RE(f-m) 리바이스]]

엘르: t[T[RE(f-m) 엘르]]

Porsche: t[T[RE(f-f) Porsche]]

Mercedez-Benz: t[T1[RE(f-f) Mercedez] + T2 [GS(f/c) -] + T3[RE(f-f) Benz]]

M (in McDonald's): t[T[GS(f-f) M]]

Starbucks: t[T1[RE(f-f) Star] + T2[RE(f-f) bucks]]

Papa John's Pizza: t[T1[T1-1[RE(f-f) Papa] + T1-2[RE(f-f) John] + T1-3[GS(f-f) 's]] + T2[RE(f-f) Pizza]]

Domino's: t[T[T1[RE(f-f) Domino] + T2[GS(f-f) 's]]]

크라제 버거: t[T1[RE(f-m) 크라제] + T2[RE(f-m) 버거]]

버거킹 (Burger King): t[T1[RE(f-m) 버거] + T2[RE(f-m) 킹]]

피자헛 (Pizza Hut): t[T1[RE(f-m) 피자] + T2[RE(f-m) 헛]]

3.2) Domestic Commercial Trade Marks

GS: t[T1[GS(f/f/m) G] + T2[GS(f/f/m) S]]

SK: t[T1[GS(f/f/m) S] + T2[GS(f/f/m) K]]

Samsung: t[T1[GS(f/m/f/c) Sam] + T2[GS(f/m/f/c) sung]]

LG: t[T1[GS(f/f/m) L] + T2[GS(f/f/m) G]]

EXR: t[T1[GS(f/f/m) E] + T2[GS(f/f/m) X] + T3[GS(f/f/m) R]]

BNX: t[T1[GS(f/f/m) B] + T2[GS(f/f/m) N] + T3[GS(f/f/m) X]]

Homeplus (홈플러스): t[T1[GS(f/f/m) Home] + T2[GS(f/f/m) plus]]

E MART (이마트): t[T1[GS(f/f/m) E] + T2[GS(f/f/m) MART]]

VIPs (빕스): t[T1[T1-1[GS(f/f/m) V] + T1-2[GS(f/f/m) I] + T1-3[GS(f/f/m) P]] + T2[LM(f/f/m) s]][68]

3.3) Other Domestic Signs[69] (Foreignized Purposefully)

부산 아쿠아리움: t[T1[LS(f/c) 부산] + T2[RE(f-m) 아쿠아리움]]

하버타운: t[T1[RE(f-m) 하버] + T2[RE(f-m) 타운]]

오페라: t[T[RE(f-m) 오페라]]

카멜리아: t[T[RE(f-m) 카멜리아]]

4) Employment of Semiotic Value of Neologism

4.1) Indigenous-Korean-derived

누리마루: t[T[[RE(d) 누리] +[RE(d) 마루]]

4.2) Chinese-derived

궁전별장: t[T1[RE(f/c) 궁전] + T2[RE(f/c) 별장]]

송도탕: t[T1[LS(f/c) 송도] + T2[RE(f/c) 탕]]

中古名品: t[T1[T1-1[GS(f-f) 中] + T1-2[GS(f-f) 古]] +

---

68) When the linguistic properties of a particular language other than the domestic ones are 'transplanted' into the domestic language, they generate an upper-level entity T, which attains a larger set of extensive meaning/concept that put together the information of simple individual entities (e.g., T1, T2, T3, etc.). They are differential in terms of the conceptuality or semantic scope, rather than in structure-oriented or structure-specific manners (cf. 'metaphors' in Lakoff and Johnson 2003).

69) This type of examples involves those domestic businesses (thus, with no foreign element in the source text) which intentionally employed the semiotic value of the foreign brand name (resulting in foreignization), even though there are other possible translation options available in Korean (e.g., 항구마을 for Harbor Town, 서양가극 for Opera, and 동백나무 for Camellia). It shows that the power of value is a major factor in translating.

T2[T2-1[GS(f-f) 名] + T2-2[GS(f-f) 品]]

cf. 고은장, 만남 만화, 조선비치, 영화의 전당, etc.

4.3) English-derived

벡스코(BEXCO): t[T[RE(f-m) 벡스코]]

베스타 (Vesta spa): t[T[RE(f-m) 베스타]]

씨클라우드 호텔: t[T[T1[T1-1[RE(f-m) 씨] + T1-2[RE(f-m) 클라우드]] + T2[RE(f/c) 호텔]]]

미스터 피자: t[T1[RE(f-m) 미스터] + T2[RE(f-m) 피자]]

스타 페이스: t[T1[RE(f-m) 스타] + T2[RE(f-m) 페이스]]

비스트로 첸: t[T1[RE(f-m) 비스트로] + T2[RE(f-m) 첸]]

D & U 치과: t[T[T1[T1-1[GS(f-f) D] + T1-2[GS(f-f) &] + T1-3[GS(f-f) U]] + T2[RE(f/c) 치과]]

4.4) Creative Combinations

Sagakin Toast(사각인 토스트), sFUNz, 쉐라메르 제과점, 오르듀, 베네시티, Wa Bar (와 바), Palé de CZ (팔레드시즈), 순대렐라, 엔터피아 PC방, e & e 치과, O MIN B & F (Beauty and Fashion), 노래방 솔 (원래 Mary Jane), Angel-in-us Coffee (엔제리너스 커피), XUMER LY MOTORS, U+, 센텀시티, e 해법수학, olleh avenue, etc.

cf. 이토꾸, 간또, 미나미, 호타루, 밍주, 장퀘, 불이아훠궈, etc.

4.5) Pictograph-based & Symbol-based

The # (더샤프), OPS (옵스) 제과점, ♨ 송도탕, SK, GS, KB, sFUNz, O MIN B&F, KTF, KFC, KJC, EXR, VIPs, BNX, BIFF (cf. PIFF), BEXCO, KJC, e & e, ho☺好, Style Up by 윤다람, T World, personal graffitties

(cf. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 0, etc.)

(cf. e, ♨, ☎, ➡, ♥, †, @, ®, ™, ₩, ❶, ⓘ, ㉿, ㈜, &, %)

(cf. trade marks of transnational corporations (e.g., Nike, Adidas,

BMW, Benz, McDonald's, etc.) and Korea-based corporations (e.g., GS, LG U+, T, SK, KT, etc.))

In the value-sensitive translative analysis of a set of distinctive public signs devised and situated in Haeundae, a good deal of information can be inferred and discovered. Because of the limited space here, only a brief analysis is going to be made now. On the surface, the examples in 1) seem to have a common formula that begins with a regional name. A value-free linguistic analysis would draw a conclusion that the combination of the regional name and the target subject (e.g., 낙지, 열쇠, 갈비, 은행, etc.) is a salient characteristic of the language of public signs. Comparing 조방낙지 with 무교동낙지, the analyzer (if with little semiotic literacy) is quite likely to spot the region name as the only difference. When viewed with an awareness of the transsemiotic literacy and the translativity of the sign, the researcher comes to realize that Busan's 조방 is not, simply, a name but an acronym of 조선방직. The use of the Hanja title (i.e., 朝鮮 紡織) was later replaced by its Hangeul version (i.e., foreignization in using Hanja and, later, conventionalization of the transliteration). Although the area(s) of 조선방직앞 has its own name (i.e., 범일동 from 범천 일동, originally 범내), the historicity-based language use led the locals to refer to it as 조방앞. As the districts of 조방앞 have been well known for the numerous eateries where the labor workers and grass roots would have comfort foods like pork soup (돼지국밥) and stir-fried baby octupus (낙지볶음). For many Busanites, 조방 has its own meanings that are irreducible to one single concept. Younger generations and new visitors would have their own ideas and meanings that are very different from those of the post-war generations. When it comes to the comfort food of the spicy baby octopus, they must have internalized their own unique experiences of stir-frying and sharing the sweet and spicy seafood (i.e., embodied). Even though 조방's

referential-denotative meaning may be said to be clear and specific, what every language user has on his/ her mind must be drastically different from one another because the space (and spice) itself changes (and, so does the linguistic landscape) in its nooks and corners. When one may want to mean something, but he/ she doesn't have the precisely representative member of the semiosis in his/ her inventory, the selection of another sign would be inevitable and useful. And the same old expression, 조방 (from 조방앞), may be an icon (i.e., to resemble the spot). For some others, it would work as a symbol (e.g., for conventional uses and construals). Obviously, for all (i.e., potential experiencers as natural translators), its materiality in a concrete space of the 범일동 area gives birth to the operation of indexicality (i.e., causality at work). If a restaurant owner in Haeundae came to use 조방 for his/ her 낙지, he/ she would easily succeed to evoke all those 조방앞-related meanings in the viewers' bodies that have internalized their own versions of the meanings of 조방 via personal experiences (i.e., cognitive embodiment as a transsemiotic translation).

In this logic, even a simple and common district name like 조방(앞) shows its wide meaning potential and possesses (or, at least, is interconnected with) a set of authentic and multicomplex semiotic or semiosic webs (cf. historicity). From the inception throughout the semantic or semiosic development of a single sign (as a subunit of a public sign), it becomes self-evident that implicit layers of values and meanings are closely and dynamically involved. Here, the major translation strategy is the space-specific and corporeality-sensitive optimization (rather than the binarism-centered dichotomy of the local vs. the global; the domestic vs. the foreign; the ego vs. the other; the sameness/ identity vs. the difference). If this is valid and meaningful, the new approach—with the value tokens and the translative property of the sign in focus—should be able to offer the translation and/ or language researchers and practitioners

a good degree of the translative epistemological awareness and the translational methodological insight. Based on the information, some important theoretical implications can also be made, which are presented in the following section.

5. Further Implications

Upon implementing the value-sensitive and geosemiotically pertinent method with the "token" (Liu 1999) labeling, this case study on the translatings of the globalizing local space of Haeundae in Busan, Korea, appears to see a few intriguing and meaningful implications—both practical and theoretical ones—in regard to the concrete and diverse public signs currently observable in the region, which can be listed as follows: (a) the value-free ocularcentric method clarifies and intensifies the binary dichotomy of domestication vs. foreignization; (b) the quantitative methods (e.g., corpus-linguistics-based Translation Studies) are to provide the information about dominant patterns in language use (e.g., westernizing, majoritizing, eurocentric, foreignizing, etc.); (c) the overall translation of the "regional space" into the "world-class city" of internationalization and globalization seems to be actively under way and gain growing popularity throughout the area (cf. institutions and corporations as initial, self-empowering translators); (d) the globalization and internationalization are taking place at every level of the local hierarchies, from small shops to schools, administrative institutions, and to museums, to hotels, and to public spaces (i.e., the most apparent visual signals are commercial signs); (e) the value-sensitive method in aid of the notion of "tokens" illustrates how particular translations are surrounded by and interwoven with various kinds of ideologies and values; (f) the assumption that public signs can function as the actual evidence for the presence and operation

of power-influenced and conflict-involving intralingual translatings is to help further scrutinize socio-cultural and economico-political phenomena in transhumanities; (g) a transsemiotic translatology-based investigation in collaboration with translation studies, cultural studies, (geo-) semiotics, and linguistics is to provide alternative perspectives for the theorists, researchers, and students working in many pertinent fields; (h) as the sample analysis exemplifies, conflicts in the translatings in Haeundae exist in covert processes and can be resolved, to a degree, in diverse ways by actual/ potential individual translators who adopt and utilize a variety of translation strategies for their own optimal results (even majoritizing, too, if it works out for the translator and/ or readers); (i) the significance of translation ethics is growing rapidly in all glocal contexts because of the (often unconscious) strenuous struggles for stabilized balance in power relations and following conflicts; this applies not only to translators but also to all the other social members who are potential readers of translators; (j) translation practices and theories are interrelated, and both aspects are equally essential in transhumanities (i.e., they can help develop transhumanities by providing each other with sharp perspectives and empirical data, and the discipline-specific division into the academic theories and the vocational practices is never conducive to what translation studies is to pursue); (k) rather than the totalizing and majoritizing translation products, there are distinctively specific and interestingly experimental translating strategies working in the glocal space of Haeundae, in spite of the implicitness to the ocularcentric positivist's eye; (l) as all translators (both the majoritizing for power, value, and profit and the minoritizing in quest for alternatives, as well as all the others in between) have their own positions of enunciation and views on values and ideologies, their translation examples/ tokens should be understood with the space-sensitive geosemiotic information on the precise (locative/ temporal) space positions

taken in the translating processes; (m) whether a translator turns into a conflict-reproducing majoritizing machine with a globalizing eye or exerts himself/ herself to perform optimally creative and experimental translating toward a new alternative translational culture in the space of glocality depends on how culturo-politically critical and socio-linguistically innovative the translators and translatings are.

6. Concluding Remarks

In the translative analysis, the value-sensitive labeling of the ideologies—whether domestic or foreign and whether for majoritizing or minoritizing—visualizes their evident interconnection and melange with the linguistic signs and other pictographs. If the human conceptual system does affect not only languages use but also every human act and thought by means of language and if the human symbols do have the "liberating power" (cf. Habermas 2001) in themselves and continue to expand it through societies and cultures (obviously across and beyond the visual boundaries), then, the translator's task will turn out to be (and needs be understood as) something larger and more empowering than a singular act of interlingual practice. If it is the case, what kind of alternative perspective would this era's translators in a particular glocalizing space need?

As Lawrence Venuti puts succinctly referring to a good translation, it is only a translation-like translation that works optimally instead of a pure, equivalence-perfect translation specimen (Venuti 1998). If this gets applied into the globalizing, government-encouraged context of Haeundae, it instantly becomes evident that, in spite of the aggrandizing power asymmetries—on top of the unavoidable impacts of and related precautions against/ toward the

mainstream trends of globalization—and consequential conflicts, the local space has been metamorphosed and is doing a metamorphosis as a new glocal text/discourse with a distinguishing set of translatings occurring constantly and/or toujours-dèja. In other words, it is the new glocalizing conscious that creates alternative empowering translations, and, with the redirections that the alternative movements give birth to, more creative and experimental strategies can be made possible for optimal translingual and transcultural signifying practices in the world of vast and numerous globalizings. And, with the new perspectives in a wider scope on translation and translator, the academic fields of translation research will be growing into that of solid and fully encompassing Translational Humanities.

| 참고문헌 |

국립국어연구원(The National Institute of the Korean Language), 『상호·상품 이름·아파트 이름 등의 광고에 나타난 국어 사용의 실태 조사 연구』, 국립 국어연구원, 1991.

권재일, 김동식, 「간판 상호에 나타난 국어의 사용 실태」, 국립국어연구원, 『상호·상품 이름·아파트 이름 등의 광고에 나타난 국어사용의 실태 조사 연구』, 국립 국어연구원, 1991, 67-86쪽.

김영삼, 『문화도시 부산 21 콜로키움』, 부산발전연구원, 2007.

김용규, 「지역의 국민화와 근대 부산의 정신분석」, 『오늘의 문예 비평』제51집, 산지니, 2003, 40-66쪽.

-----, 「부산의 근대화 경험과 시각중심적 시선의 탄생」, 『두 도시 이야기: 부산-서울/서울-부산』, 아트북스, 2006, 20-27쪽.

-----, 「기드보르의 스펙타클이론으로 본 부산공간의 변화」, 『인간에게 공간이란 무엇인가』(새한영어영문학회 학술발표회 논문집), 새한영어영문학회, 대동철학회, 한국건축학회, 2007, 21-31쪽.

-----, 「로컬리티의 문화정치학—부산 공간의 변화를 중심으로」, 『로컬, 로컬리티 다시 보기』(HK사업 로컬리티의 인문학연구단 콜로키움 자료), 부산대학교 한국민족문화연구소, 2008.

김윤학, 『가게·물건·상호·상품 이름 연구: 국어순화와 말글정책을 위하여』, 과학사, 1988.

김지권, 『상호에 나타난 우리말 실태에 관한 연구』, 연세대학교 대학원 석사학위논문, 1983.

김혜숙, 「간판언어가 국어생활에 미치는 영향-1990년대 서울지역 조사를 바탕으로」, 『목멱어문』제4집, 동국대학교, 1991, 1-30쪽.

민현식, 「간판 언어의 의미론」, 『한국어 의미학』 제9집, 한국어의미학회, 2001, 221-259쪽.

박재환, 일상성, 일상생활연구회, 『부산의 신생활풍속』, 부산발전연구원,

2004.
손정동,「간판에 나타난 외래어 표기실태 연구: 서울지역을 중심으로」, 이화여자대학교 대학원 석사학위논문, 1987.
오장근,「텍스트-기호학적 도시공간 리터러시와 문화브랜딩」,『언어과학연구』제43집, 언어과학회, 2007.
이정우,『담론의 공간』, 민음사, 1999.
전성기,「번역인문학과 번역비평」,『텍스트언어학』제21집, 한국텍스트언어학회, 2006a. 359-387쪽.
-----,『번역인문학과 번역비평』, 고려대학교출판부, 2008.
조두상,「외국말글 홍수 속에 우리말의 위기-부산대 정문앞 간판말글을 조사 분석해보니」,『한글새소식』제320집, 한글학회, 2000.
한희경,「광고 언어에 대한 국어학적 고찰: 문법현상을 중심으로」, 영남대학교 대학원 석사학위논문, 2001.
Adams, E. M., *Philosophy and the Modern Mind: A Philosophical Critique of Modern Western Civilization,* Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1975.
Álvarez, R. and Vidal, M. C., eds., *Translation, Power, Subversion,* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1996.
Bassnett, S., *Translation Studies,* London: Methuen, 1980.
-----, *Translation Studies,* London: Routledge, 2002.
----- and Lefevere, A., "General Editors' Preface", In Lefevere, André, ed., *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook,* London: Routledge, 1992.
Baudrillard, J., *Simulacres et Simulation,* Paris: Editions Galilée, 1981.
Bhabha, H., *The Location of Culture,* Abingdon: Routledge, 2004.
Bourdieu, P., *La Distinction: Critique Sociale du Jugement,* Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1979.
Brown, J. and Duguid, P., *The Social Life of Information,* Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2002.

Chaney, D., *The Cultural Turn: Scene-setting Essays on Contemporary Cultural History,* London: Routledge, 1994.

Cronin, M., *Across the Lines: Travel, Language, Translation,* Cork: Cork University Press, 2000.

-----, *Translation and Globalization,* Abingdon: Routledge, 2003.

De Angelis, M., *The Beginning of History: Value Struggles and Global Capital,* London: Pluto Press, 2007.

Debord, G., *La Société du Spéctacle,* Paris: Edition Gallimard, 1992.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F., Mille Plateaux: *Capitalisme et Schizophrénie,* Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1980

Dews, P., trans., *The Liberating Power of Symbols: Philosophical Essays,* Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2001 (Habermas, J., *Vom Similichen Eindruck zum Symbolischen Ausdruck,* Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1997).

Graham, J., *Difference in Translaiton,* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Glaser, S. F., trans., *Simulacra and Simulation,* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994 (Baudrillard, J., *Simulacres et Simulation,* Paris: Editions Galilée, 1981).

Hall, E., *The Silent Language,* Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1959.

-----, *The Hidden Dimension,* Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1969.

Halloran, J., "Values and Communication Research", In Kersten, K. and Biernatzki, W., eds., *Value and Communication: Critical Humanistic Perspectives,* Cresskill, NJ.: Hampton Press, 2000, pp.13-37.

Hardt, M. and Negri, A., *The Empire,* Oxford: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Ho, G., *Globalisation and Translation: Towards a Paradigm Shift in Translation Studies,* Ph.D. Dissertation, Auckland: University of Auckland, 2005.

Hyun, T., *Writing Women in Korea: Translation and Feminism in the Colonial Period,* Seoul: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004.

Jakobson, R., "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation", In Brower, R. ed., *On*

Translation, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959, pp. 232-239 (Reprinted in Venuti, L., ed., *The Translation Studies Reader,* London: Routledge, 2000, pp.113-118.)

Jameson, F., *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism,* Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.

Kress, G., *Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication,* London: Routledge, 2010.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, *M., Metaphors We Live By,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Lefevere, A., *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame,* London: Routledge, 1992.

Lim, E. K., "Translator in Power Relationships: A Multidisciplinary Analysis of English 'of' into Korean," Journal of *Translation Studies* 9(1), 2008, pp.309-344.

-----, "Translation Conflicts in a Globalizing Local Space: A Case Study on the Public Signs in Haeundae, Korea," In KATS (The Korean Association of Translation Studies), ed., *The 10th Anniversary of KATS 2009 International Conference Proceedings,* Seoul: KATS, 2009, pp.303-312.

-----, *Semiotic Translations of Possession: Multidimensionality of Its Embodiment,* Ph.D. Dissertation, Pusan National University, 2013.

Liu, L., *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity — China, 1900-1937,* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

-----, ed., *Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations,* Durham: Duke University Press, 1999.

Massumi, B., trans., *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia,* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987 (Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F., Mille Plateaux: *Capitalisme et Schizophrénie,* Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1980).

Mignolo, W., *Local Histories/ Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking,* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Mudimbe-Boyi, E., ed., *Beyond Dichotomies: Histories, Identities, Cultures, and the Challenge of Globalization,* Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 2002.

Nice, R., trans., *Distinction: A Social Critique of The Judgement of Taste,* London: Routledge, 1984 (Bourdieu, P., *La Distinction: Critique Sociale du Jugement,* Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1979).

-----, trans., *Acts of Resistance: Against the New Myths of Our Time,* Cambridge: Polity, 1998 (Bourdieu, P., Contre-Feux, Paris: Editions Liber-Raisons d'Agir, 1998).

Nicholson-Smith, D., trans., *The Society of The Spectacle,* New York: Zone Books, 1995 (Debord, G., *La Société du Spéctacle,* Paris: Edition Gallimard, 1992).

Nord, C., *Translating as a Purposeful Activity,* Manchester: St. Jerome, 1997.

Peirce, C., *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce,* In Burks, A. ed., Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931-1958.

Petrilli, S., ed., *Translation Translation,* Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2003.

-----, *Sign Crossroads in Global Perspective: Semioethics and Responsibility,* New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2010.

-----, *Expression and Interpretation in Language,* New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2010.

----- and Ponzio, A., *Semiotics Unbounded: Interpretive Routes through the Open Network of Signs,* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.

Reiss, K. and Vermeer, H., *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie,* Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1984.

Robinson, D., *Translation and Empire,* Manchester: St. Jerome, 1997.

Said, E., *Orientalism,* New York: Vintage Books, 1978.

Scollon, R. and Scollon, S., *Discourses in Place: Language in the Material World,* London: Routledge, 2003.

Short, J., *Urban Theory: A Critical Assessment,* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Smith, S., trans., *The Archaeology of Knowledge and The Discourse on Language,* New York: Pantheon, 1982 (Foucault, M., *L'archéologie du Savoir,* Paris: Gallimard, 1969).

Snell-Hornby, M., *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach,* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1988/ 1995.

-----, *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?,* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2006.

Spolsky, B., "Prolegomena to a Sociolinguistic Theory of Public Signage", In Shohamy, E. and Gorter, D., eds., *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery,* New York: Routledge, 2009, pp. 25-39.

Torop, P., "Locations in Intersemiotic Space," *Koht ja Paik/ Place And Location* IV, 2004, pp.59-68.

Tymoczko, M., *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators,* Manchester: St. Jerome, 2007.

----- and Gentzler, E., *Translation and Power,* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002.

Venuti, L., *The Translator's Invisibility: a History of Translation,* London: Routledge, 1995.

-----, *The Scandals of Translation: towards an Ethics of Difference,* London: Routledge, 1998.

Young, R., *Postcolonialism: a Very Short Introduction,* New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

-----, *White Mythologies,* Abingdon: Routeldge, 2004.

〈국문초록〉

공공기호의 가치표식과 번역성: 해운대의 기초 사례연구

임동휘
(부산대학교)

본 연구는 기호의 내재적 의미생성 과정/ 활동 자체를 '번역'으로 보는 기호적 '번역' 개념(Petrilli 2003, Lim 2013)을 새롭게 조명하고, 이러한 번역 실체를 기반으로 할 때 인문(학) 영역에서의 중추적 작용 가능성 및 현대 일상공간에 대한 번역적 텍스트로서의 이해 증진 기능을 타진하고 도출하기 위한 번역인문학 프로젝트의 기초연구이다. 따라서 본고는 '번역' 개념 자체를 고찰하고 탐구하는 과정에서, 오늘날 한국사회 내에 존재하는 글로컬적 성격의 공공 공간(public space)에서 관찰되는 공공기호(public signs)의 대표적 예들을 분석함으로써 한국의 로컬리티 성격이 구체적으로 체화되어있는 번역적 언어/문화현상의 특징들을 파악하는 것을 그 일차적인 목표로 둔다. 일상의 공공기호들을 번역자의 가시성(cf. Venuti 1995; 1998)과 권능(cf. Tymoczko 2007)을 내포한 번역행위의 실증적 증거로서 재해석하기 위한 사례연구 실행을 위해서, 본고는 먼저 언어학, 번역학뿐만 아니라 문화연구, 번역적 기호학, 장소기호학 등을 모두 고려할 수 있는 초학문적 접근방법으로 번역을 연구할 것을 주장한다(cf. Peirce 1931-1958).

개별언어간 번역(interlingual translation)을 번역 그 자체로 보는 통상적인 관념을 초월하고자 하는 연구의 출발점에서, 다음과 같은 이론적 가정을 제시하고자 한다. 즉, 오늘날의 전지구화와 관련된 가치개입적, 갈등내포적 상황에서 번역 행위가 발생하기 때문에, 모든 유형의 번역 예들은 가치와 이데올로기가 투영된 의사결정과정의 표식들(tokens, cf. Liu 1999)로

볼 수 있다. 또한 이러한 의사결정은 그 의미생성 과정에서 내재적 목적성에 의해 선택적 실험주의와 조작적 최적성을 지향하는 경향을 가지게 되므로, 공공기호들은 의미가 모두 언어기호화된 최종텍스트라기 보다는 번역적 표식들로 이해할 때 더 깊은 이해를 얻을 수 있다. 공공기호들의 분석과정을 위해서는 번역적 현저성(translative salience)이 높은 실례들을 한국의 독특한 글로컬 공간인 부산 해운대에서 관찰 수집한 후에, 가치, 공간, 번역자적 능력(translatorial competence)과 같은 (비언어적) 요인들을 고려하는 것이—가치 비개입적인 언어대조분석의 입장과는 달리—공공기호 연구에 중요한 (또한, 필수적인) 작업인지 알아보기 위해서 가치 중심적이고 번역성 지향적인 방법으로 주어진 예들을 조사하고 해석하도록 한다. 가치 개입적 번역행위의 표식들로 이해되는 각각의 공공기호들이 지니는 (장소)기호학적 속성들에 주목하여 (장소)기호학 상의 번역적 성격을 가치중심적으로 살펴봄으로써, 본고는 이와 같은 번역적 구심력을 우선시 하는 (즉, 개별 번역자의 구체적 번역조건을 살피고, 번역과정의 내재적 목적성을 고려하며, 번역결과에 대해 가치중심적인 해석의 방법을 취하는) 탐구작업이 가지는 유용성과 중요성을 역설하고자 한다. 이는 특히, 오늘날의 한국사회 맥락 내에서 작용하는 미묘하고 복잡한 (초)기호적 의미생성 실습 (즉, 언어-문화의 다차원적인 번역현상) 예들을 다룰 때에 기술적, 설명적 충족성(adequacy)을 가지고 보다 성공적으로 분석, 이해할 수 있도록 도와줄 수 있을 것으로 기대된다.

결론적으로, 한국의 해운대라는 글로컬한 공간에서 오늘날 관찰되는 공공기호들을 가치와 번역(성) 중심의 초학문적 방법으로 분석함으로써 흥미롭고 고무적인 이론적 시사점들을 도출할 수 있다. 중요한 시사점들은 다음과 같다. 첫째, 공공기호들은 (단순 언어정보가 아니라) 각 번역자가 글로컬한 현실의 장소기호학적 특성을 반영한 번역 과정-행위를 실천했다는 (가치-의미 생성적) 표식들로서 해석될 수 있다. 둘째, 오늘날의 한국사회, 문화에서 각각의 고유한 지역/ 장소에 위치하게 되는 자연적/ 문화적 번역자들이 가지고 있는 독특한 번역자적 능력(translatorial competence)은

학술적 차원뿐만 아니라 일상의 언어-문화적 영역에서도 중요한 기능과 의미를 가진다. 셋째, 가치 비개입적 대조언어(학) 연구라는 인식론과 방법론은 글로컬화(glocalizing)되는 시대를 맞아 (가치와 목적에 민감한 오늘날의 번역성과 번역자성에 집중하면서) 번역적 패러다임(translative paradigm)이 가지는 대안적 기능과 역량에 새롭게 관심을 가지고 건설적인 초학문적 협력을 제공하는 것이 중요하다. 넷째, 다양한 의미생성 활동들에 대한 학술적 탐구에서, 초학문적인 학제간 협력이 그 힘과 가치를 발휘하는 것은 의미 내재적 번역성을 고려할 때 더욱 최적화될 수 있으며, 이는 인문학의 번역적 전환(Translational Turn), 즉, 번역인문학(Transhumanities)을 그 출발점이자 지향점으로 둘 수 있다.

주제어 : 번역으로서의 공공기호, 장소기호학, 가치적 갈등과 번역, 권력적 관계, (번역적) 표식, 가치, 전지구화, 선택적 조작, 해운대, 글로컬 공간, 가치 중심의 번역적 분석, 번역(적) 인문학

논문접수일 : **7.15** / 심사기간 : **7.16 - 8.5** / 게재확정일 : **8.10**