Review of: "Literary Discourse Analysis of Honorifics and Speech Levels in Korean and English Translations of "Le Petit Prince""

Trent Newman[1,2]

1 University of Melbourne, Australia
2 Federation University, Ballarat, Australia

Gamze, your paper presented an interesting and novel inquiry topic: what different translations of honorifics and speech levels in a seminal and widely translated fictional text may reveal about - as you put it - 'the impact of culture on translation studies.' This topic has great potential, but in my view, there needs to be much more careful conceptualisation and articulation of the central problem or issue that you are trying to address. You say in your introduction that your study 'presents how respect and courtesy can change in societies where different languages are spoken,' but this is hardly new knowledge. Similarly, in your conclusion, you state that 'the fact that both languages are different from each other has led to differences in translations into both languages,' which is almost tautological in formulation and doesn't appear to offer a valuable contribution to knowledge about translation as a discipline.

Perhaps the most problematic aspect of your paper is that you don't clearly define what you mean by 'culture' or (linguistic) 'community' and seem to conflate these with the target language reading audience. What actually characterises the respective reading audiences is, arguably, practically impossible to define for either Korean or English, and *especially* so for English, since so many readers of *Le Petit Prince* in English may have English as an additional language, not to mention the fact that L1 speakers and readers of English vary significantly across the *extremely* diverse range of national contexts in which English is an official or dominant language. I believe the key question is: what conceptualisations do the respective *translators* hold with regard to their target reading audiences? The fact that translation is done by human agents, with particular, ideologically and culturally informed notions about who their target audience is and how best to represent the original author's narrative in and through language - this pivotal recognition was missing from your paper.

In my view, where your study holds the most promise is in two distinct kinds of analysis that you are yet to do regarding the incidences of particular honorifics and speech levels that you identified in each translation:

1. how the different uses of these language elements in Korean and English affect the representation of the original narrative in the translated versions (i.e., the *implications* of using certain honorifics and speech levels for communicating meaning in these languages and how that meaning compares with the original intent of the author, Antoine de Saint-Exupéry), and -

2. what the use of honorifics and speech levels reveals about each translator's perception (even anticipation?) of how the

target audience will engage with the narrative and overall message of *Le Petit Prince.*