

**DANCES WITH WORDS: ISSUES IN THE TRANSLATION OF
JAPANESE LITERATURE INTO ENGLISH**

By

Richard Ninian Donovan

A thesis
submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington
in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Literary Translation Studies

Victoria University of Wellington

2012

Abstract

Keywords: translation studies, literary translation, Japanese literature, linguistic analysis of literary texts, corpus studies, database, qualitative data analysis software (NVivo), stylistics, disambiguation, game theory

Chapter One: Literary Translation Studies, Japanese-to-English Translation, and *Izu no odoriko*

This introductory chapter explores aspects of Translation Studies relevant to Japanese-to-English literary translation. I employ extended metaphors from the case study, Kawabata Yasunari's novella *Izu no odoriko*, to re-illuminate perennial TS issues such as equivalence, 'style' and disambiguation, contrasting the translating approaches of Edward G. Seidensticker and J. Martin Holman. The chapter concludes with an outline of the investigative path I followed in analysing the source text (ST) and comparing it with the target texts (TTs): the English translations. I explain the thesis's systematic corpus approach in using an NVivo database to establish a set of potentially problematic translation issues that arise out of the interaction of source language-target language (SL-TL) features.

Chapter Two: A Taxonomy of Japanese Paradigmatic Features and the Issues Arising for Translation into English

The Japanese and English languages have significant lexical and morpho-syntactic differences, which I contend give rise to potentially problematic translation issues. The chapter begins by differentiating cultural and linguistic features and explaining why the thesis will focus on the latter. The rest of the chapter presents a detailed analysis of ST exemplars of the most significant of the paradigmatic (lexical) features. Seidensticker and Holman's translations are analysed to determine how they have addressed the translation issues arising from these features.

Chapter Three: A Taxonomy of Japanese Syntagmatic Features and the Issues Arising for Translation into English

This chapter continues the analysis of linguistic differences between Japanese and English in the context of literary translation. Here the focus is on the syntagmatic (structural) features of Japanese in comparison with English, again examining examples from the ST and comparing how the translators address the issues arising in their translating decisions.

Chapter 4: ‘Shall We Dance?’ Translation Acts in the English Translations of *Izu no odoriko* and Beyond

The focus moves to the features of the translators’ overall translation strategies, and how they apply these strategies in their translating decisions: so-called ‘translation acts’. Conducting a close reading of the ST and TTs of a pivotal scene in *Izu no odoriko*, I draw on previous academics’ frameworks to create a simple rubric for categorising the manifestation of these strategies at the discourse level. The chapter concludes by drawing together the theoretical and empirical strands of the thesis and demonstrating the relevance of this discussion to the English translation of Japanese literature. While acknowledging the necessarily subjective nature of the translational act, and the sophisticated techniques the translators employ to deal with complex issues, I propose that my analytic framework urges more care in the preservation of semantic and formal elements than can be observed in aspects of the translations examined.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the following people for their contribution to this thesis:

My supervisors, Stephen Epstein and Yushi Ito, for their insightful and good-humoured guidance through the sometimes rough and uncertain terrain.

My sister, Sarah, for walking the path before me and smoothing it out a bit.

My parents, Jo and Peter, who always provide a warm and welcoming haven at Pitfure for rest and reflection, hearty meals, and kind words.

Charlie Fox, for his ebullient companionship and full-flowing discussion of translation issues (and other matters) at our local ‘inn’.

Nagoya University of Foreign Studies, for their active support of my travels for research and presentations.

Masami Murata, who also helped to blaze the trail and kindly pointed out some signposts for me to follow.

Bob and Wakana: for the books, bike rides and bonhomie.

Jane and Rewiri, who gave me board, lodging and hospitality at the start of my journey in Wellington.

Jon and Gemma, Anthony and Carrissa, who always give me a memorable send-off in Auckland.

03 Slow Café, my ‘teahouse at the pass’ over many long Kyoto lunchtimes.

And finally, I would like to acknowledge my constant travelling companions on the highways and shortcuts: Kawabata Yasunari, Edward G. Seidensticker, and J. Martin Holman.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Abstract | 2 |
| Acknowledgements | 4 |
| Table of Contents | 5 |
| Abbreviations and Textual Conventions | 8 |
| Reference Translations..... | 10 |
| Chapter One: Literary Translation Studies, Japanese-to-English Translation, and <i>Izu no odoriko</i> | 12 |
| 1.0 Introduction..... | 12 |
| 1.0.1 The field of Japanese-to-English Literary Translation Studies | 12 |
| 1.0.2 The objectives and limitations of the thesis | 26 |
| 1.0.3 Outline of the thesis | 30 |
| 1.1 Japanese-to-English Translation in the Context of Literary Translation Studies | 31 |
| 1.2 Highways and Shortcuts: Different Approaches to Translation..... | 39 |
| 1.3 Dances with Girls: Cultural and Linguistic Issues in Translating Kawabata's <i>Izu no odoriko</i> | 54 |
| 1.4 The Quandary of Disambiguation in Japanese-to-English Literary Translation | 62 |
| 1.5 Case-study Translations and Analytical Methodology..... | 74 |
| 1.5.1 My translations | 74 |
| 1.5.2 Categorisation of the ST-feature/TT-issue taxonomy | 78 |
| Chapter One Conclusion | 83 |

Chapter Two: A Taxonomy of Japanese Paradigmatic Features and the Issues

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Arising for Translation into English..... | 85 |
| 2.0 Introduction..... | 85 |
| 2.0.1 Cultural and linguistic features of language..... | 87 |
| 2.0.2 ST features..... | 93 |
| 2.1 Paradigmatic Features..... | 94 |
| 2.1.1 Ambiguity..... | 97 |
| 2.1.2 DIFFERENT LEXICAL IDENTITY | 119 |
| 2.1.3 No Plural Marker | 163 |
| 2.1.4 Passive Voice | 166 |
| 2.1.5 SOUND-SYMBOLIC LANGUAGE | 174 |
| 2.1.6 VERB MORPHOLOGY..... | 194 |
| Chapter Two Conclusion | 203 |

Chapter Three: A Taxonomy of Japanese Syntagmatic Features and the Issues

| | |
|--|------------|
| Arising for Translation into English..... | 205 |
| 3.0 Introduction..... | 205 |
| 3.1 Syntagmatic Features..... | 206 |
| 3.1.1 ANAPHORA..... | 208 |
| 3.1.2 Clause Extent Marker 程 <i>hodo</i> | 224 |
| 3.1.3 Double Subject; Topic and Subject..... | 228 |
| 3.1.4 MULTI-CLAUSE SENTENCE | 232 |
| 3.1.5 PREMODIFIER..... | 248 |
| 3.1.6 QUOTATIVE MARKER と <i>to</i> | 278 |
| 3.1.7 REPETITION | 283 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 3.1.8 Sentence-length Difference | 301 |
| Chapter Three Conclusion | 304 |
| Chapter Four: ‘Shall We Dance?’ Translation Acts in the English Translations of <i>Izu no odoriko</i> and Beyond | 306 |
| 4.0 Introduction..... | 306 |
| 4.1 Translation Acts..... | 307 |
| 4.2 Textual Comparison: the ‘Bathing Scene’ (§209-218)..... | 316 |
| Thesis Conclusion: ‘Shall We Dance?’ The Future of Japanese-to-English Literary Translation..... | 328 |
| Bibliography..... | 338 |

Note: The **Appendices** are found in the attached CD-ROM, and are comprised of:

- Part 1: Parallel text of *Izu no odoriko* and its published English translations
- Part 2: Tables 1-4: Information related to the ‘Bathing Scene’ in Chapter Four

Abbreviations and Textual Conventions

‘JE Translation’ refers to Japanese-to-English literary translation.

‘TS’ refers to translation studies.

ST: source text (the case study 『伊豆の踊子』 *Izu no odoriko*, unless otherwise noted).

TT: target text (either Seidensticker’s or Holman’s translations).

SL: source language (Japanese, unless otherwise noted).

TL: target language (English, unless otherwise noted).

S: Seidensticker’s translation *The Izu Dancer*, mainly in tables and before in-text quotations. ‘S1’ and ‘S2’ refer to Seidensticker’s first and second (revised) translations respectively.

H: Holman’s translation *The Dancing Girl of Izu*, mainly in tables and before in-text quotations.

§: sentence (usually followed by the number of a sentence (either from the source text or the corresponding target text section) as it appears in the **CD-ROM Appendices** table **Source Text and Parallel Translations of *Izu no odoriko***).

¶: paragraph break in the source or target texts.

Dir.: direct translation.

Lit.: literal translation.

Tr. orig. syn.: translation preserving original Japanese syntax. (See p. 10 **Reference Translations** for details.)

In the context of the case study, single quotes (‘ ’) indicate my translations, double quotes (“ ”) those of the professional translators. In all other cases, single and double quotes are employed for their usual emphatic and citational purposes respectively. I leave a space between nested single and double quote marks (‘ “...” ’) for clarity.

*: (before an example sentence) grammatically or stylistically impossible or inappropriate.

?: (before an example sentence) grammatically or stylistically questionable.

N: noun or nominal element.

V: verb or verbal element. Vt: transitive verb; Vi: intransitive verb.

Adj: adjective or adjectival element; Adv: adverb or adverbial element.

S: subject; O: object; C: complement.

In Tables and Example Sentences (mainly in Chapter Four)

P: paradigm/paradigmatic, S: syntagm/syntagmatic

A: addition; M: modification; O: omission; R: retention.

→: transforms to (in translation).

≈: is approximately equivalent to.

Ø: null (no translation).

Bold text within parallel translation tables: an added element in the TT with no direct counterpart in the ST.

Romanisation of Japanese text follows the modified Hepburn system throughout.

Reference Translations

Three types of reference translations are employed throughout the thesis. These translations are meant to complement the professionals' versions and offer alternative perspectives.

Where I simply provide an explanation of a Japanese expression for the reader unfamiliar with the language, there is no marking. By '**direct translation**' (abbreviated as 'dir.') I mean ST-orientated translation, mainly at phrase-rank level,¹ preserving the original diction and syntax as much as TL grammar rules allow, with little concession to TL stylistic nicety. I give '**literal translation**' ('lit.') a more limited definition than Catford's (1965: 25; see footnote 24, p. 33); 'literal' means non-idiomatic, so my literal translations preserve ST idioms without employing cultural conversion (hence a direct translation would read 'shower' for 雨脚 *ama-ashi*, while a literal translation would read 'rain-legs'). Finally, a **translation preserving original syntax** ('tr. orig. syn.') follows the word order of the ST, even if it violates TL grammatical norms.

Each of these translation types has its place in providing reference translations and elucidating elements of the ST that may be obscure, especially when they are presented out of context. None of my reference translations is meant to be the optimal translation for any given ST sentence, nor even the optimal translation for its translation type. My hope is that the guide translations will help highlight the issues the translators face in rendering acceptable literary prose in English by revealing in the translations' discordances some of the 'substructure' of the Japanese language, while at the same time providing a tacit counterpoint for some of the extreme semantic and formal

¹ See 1.1 for an explanation of technical terms.

divergences that sometimes appear between ST and TT.

Chapter One: Literary Translation Studies, Japanese-to-English Translation, and *Izu no odoriko*

1.0 Introduction

1.0.1 The field of Japanese-to-English Literary Translation Studies

I first started thinking about literary translation in 1998 when I took two extramural postgraduate courses in Japanese studies at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand. While I was living in London I visited the library of SOAS, the School of Oriental and African Studies. There I found a book on Japanese onomatopoeia—which can be more accurately termed ‘mimetics’—and realised that it was very different from English onomatopoeia. For one of my courses I decided to compare two English translations of a famous children’s novella (『銀河鉄道の夜』 *Ginga tetsudō no yoru* ‘*Night Train to the Stars*’ (Miyazawa 1989)), focusing on how the translators had dealt with mimetics, and made a list of all mimetic expressions and their corresponding English renderings (Donovan 2000, 2001).

During this work, I also discovered Kawabata’s 『伊豆の踊子』 *Izu no odoriko* (1926) and its three English translations. Kawabata’s first translator Edward G. Seidensticker published an abridged version in the *Atlantic Monthly* magazine in the mid-1950s (Kawabata 1954), calling it *The Dancer of Izu*, which Tuttle republished unedited (Kawabata 1974). No further English translation appeared until the late 1990s when, like two buses arriving at the same time, Seidensticker published his heavily revised version (Kawabata 1997), and the next year J. Martin Holman released a version titled *The Dancing Girl of Izu* (Kawabata 1998).

Near the end of the millennium, I took the two Seidensticker manuscripts, put them side by side, and systematically highlighted differences. The most obvious was that Seidensticker had restored almost all the text missing in his first version; but it was also apparent that he had updated the language for a new readership. The idea that the original Japanese text remained static, while translations changed with the tides of linguistic, cultural and literary convention, fascinated me. As for Holman's translation, I only read the first paragraph at the time, noting simply that it was very different to Seidensticker's.

Several years later I returned to the texts when I realised that comparing the versions might help to shed light on key issues facing translators of Japanese literature into English. This topic has received surprisingly little attention in academia. I shall outline below what research does exist, and why it does not do justice to the field.

Translators have made the majority of contributions to the study of Japanese-to-English literary translation (hereafter 'JE translation'). From the 1950s translators such as Seidensticker (1921-2007) and Donald Keene (born 1922) began to popularise Japanese literature in the West with their translations. Both men had shifted from their World War II role as military translators and interrogators to literary translators and cultural interpreters in academe.

Seidensticker published his first major translation of Japanese literature in 1953,² but made a name for himself by translating Kawabata's *Izu no odoriko* (1954) and the Heian-period novel 『源氏物語』 *Genji monogatari* 'The Tale of Genji', written by Murasaki Shikibu around 1000 CE (Murasaki Shikibu 1976), which followed Arthur Waley's (1889-1966) ground-breaking translation (Murasaki Shikibu 1960).

² 『羞恥』 *Shūchi* by Niwa Fumio, translated as *A Touch of Shyness*, later anthologised in Niwa (1965).

Seidensticker became a translator of choice for many contemporary Japanese authors, befriending such iconic figures as Mishima Yukio, Tanizaki Jun'ichirō and Kawabata Yasunari.

Jay Rubin (born 1941), Alfred Birnbaum (born 1955) and Holman (born 1957) represent the subsequent generation of Western translators of Japanese literature, with the former two particularly associated with author Murakami Haruki, himself a translator of Western texts into English. Holman has distinguished himself as a *bunraku* (traditional puppetry) exponent in Japan, and has published translations of both Japanese and Korean works.³

The first type of translation commentary common to all these translators is the frequent inclusion of paratexts (Hermans 1999: 85) such as a translator's note or foreword at the beginning of a translation, particularly in the case of anthologies of shorter works. Such extratextual elements serve several purposes. First, in momentarily foregrounding the translator, they remind readers that they are reading a translation. Second, such elements typically highlight cultural or stylistic issues in the text that the translator feels should be dealt with in a summary way, eliminating the need for intratextual explication, which may disrupt the flow of the text, or footnotes, which distract in their own way.⁴ Third, extratextual notes present an opportunity for the translator to opine on Japanese-to-English translation in general. However, given the relative brevity expected of such a preface, the discussion is necessarily limited.

Take, for example, Holman's four-page Editor's Note in *The Izu Dancer and Other*

³ An example of the latter is the collection *Shadows of a Sound* by Sun-Wong Hwang (1990), which Holman edited and thirteen of the stories of which he translated.

⁴ Seidensticker makes occasional use of footnotes. One example is in Tanizaki (2009: 232), where he provides a description of sushi, which, with the passing of time, now seems quaint in its superfluity: "Balls of vinegared rice, highly seasoned and usually topped with strips of raw or cooked fish."

Stories, and Seidensticker's eleven-page introduction to Tanizaki's novel *Some Prefer Nettles*. Holman's note consists mainly of biographical information about Kawabata. The only allusions to translation—couched in terms of source-text stylistics—constitute these few lines:

In the 1920s Kawabata emerged as a proponent of the Shinkankakuha, the “New Perception” School. Although his puzzling ellipses, abrupt transitions, and occasionally jarring juxtapositions of images suggest the influence of European modernism, all of these features are also to be found in the classical literature of Japan, which Kawabata held in great reverence. [...] I am grateful to be able to offer this first unabridged English translation of Kawabata's “The Dancing Girl of Izu” [...]. (Kawabata 1998: viii-ix)

Unfortunately, Seidensticker's unabridged version pre-empted Holman's, as noted above, but Holman's claim tacitly registers the incompleteness of Seidensticker's original version and sets the two works in counterpoint. None of Holman's other widely available translations, however, contains comments on translation per se.⁵

Seidensticker himself included no translator's preface to *The Izu Dancer*, nor does he in many of his translations, apart from a recurring note on the pronunciation of Japanese names, and a few minor exceptions.⁶ His preface to Tanizaki's 『蓼食う虫』 *Tade Kuu Mushi* ‘*Some Prefer Nettles*’, however, explicitly refers to translation issues:

It is easy to argue that Japanese is a hopelessly vague language from which it is impossible to translate, but the argument usually comes down to an unreal notion of what even the best

⁵ His translator's note to *Palm-of-the-Hand Stories* (Kawabata 2006: xii-xiv), for example, describes Kawabata's preferred literary forms and the translator's first attempts at translation, without characterising the process.

⁶ For the note on names see, for example, in *Snow Country* (Kawabata 1996). Other exceptions are a brief explanation of the tea ceremony in Kawabata's *Thousand Cranes* (1996), and a biographical note on Kawabata preceding the short story ‘House of the Sleeping Beauties’ (2004), which is simply Seidensticker's translation of Mishima's introduction.

translator can accomplish. No two languages make quite the same distinctions, and every translation is a makeshift insofar as this is true.

It is undeniable, however, that the refusal of the Japanese language to make distinctions often seems scandalous, and the problems one faces in trying to make Japanese literature understandable in translation grow accordingly. [...] [I]f Japanese is vague, its vagueness must be made a virtue of. (Tanizaki 1995: *xiv*)

Seidensticker continues a commentary on translation and comparative literature for another page, before returning to the story. His above comments are sufficient, however, to point to a kind of ‘translation philosophy’, to which I shall return later.

Second, many of the abovementioned translators and cultural commentators eventually publish memoirs or similarly autobiographical works that contain impressionistic comments on the translation process, usually in the form of an anecdote. For example, Seidensticker in his *Tokyo Central: A Memoir* considers the Japanese reception for his translation of the opening sentence of Kawabata’s novel 『雪国』 *Yukiguni* ‘*Snow Country*’. Here is the original novel’s opening sentence, a direct translation, and Seidensticker’s first translation, followed by his comments:

国境の長いトンネルを抜けると雪国であった。夜の底が白くなった。

(Kawabata 2006b: 1)

Dir. ‘After coming out of the long tunnel at the provincial border, it was snow country. The bottom of the night became white.’

S: The train came out of the long tunnel into the snow country. The earth lay white under the night sky.” (Kawabata 1996: 3)

I give as a piece of advice to aspiring translators: “Be careful about opening and closing passages.” These are the passages people will notice and find fault with. I think if I had formulated the principle earlier, I would have translated the beginning of *Snow Country* more literally. A train comes out of a long tunnel that passes the border between two provinces, and it is the snow country. Outside the train windows “the bottom of the night” lies white. My translation, according to unfriendly scrutinizers, is guilty of two serious delinquencies: I did not

state that the mountain range through which the long tunnel passes is the provincial boundary; and I failed to include Kawabata's trope.

I do not even now think the matter of the boundary worth worrying about, but I think they are right about the bottom of the night. It is a striking image and the chief reason for the great fame of the passage, and it should be there. My reason for omitting it seems to me now wholly inadequate. I did not like having "night" and "white" in such intimate juxtaposition. (Seidensticker 2002: 124-125)⁷

Third, while neither Seidensticker nor Holman has written one, another occasional sign of a translator's maturation is the publication of a handbook that provides his or her perspective on dealing with certain linguistic and cultural issues related to the Japanese language. While such works can be insightful, drawing as they do on the translator's wealth of experience in negotiating between Japanese and English, they again tend to be subjective, pragmatic and unsystematic, focusing on certain 'pet' concerns without any overall approach or grounding in translation studies.

Indeed, many translators would appear to eschew translation theory entirely. Rubin, for example, although a scholar of Japanese literature, pointedly avoids a theoretical approach in his overview *Making Sense of Japanese: What the Textbooks Don't Tell You* (2002). His title unambiguously pitches the work at the average student of Japanese, the content mainly concerning reading and listening comprehension but also touching on issues relevant to translation, such as perceived vagueness, subjectless sentences and inverted syntax. Seidensticker goes further in practically dismissing outright the utility of academic treatment of translation:

⁷ Seidensticker later updated his translation to "the bottom of the night", as he writes above, but only in a limited-edition publication unavailable to most readers.

I find grand philosophical treatises on translation, such as those by George Steiner and Walter Benjamin, very interesting and they can be good for the morale of the translator by telling him what a profound sort of work he is at. But they do not seem to me very useful. (Richie 2000: 20)

Fourth, translators sometimes produce biographies of authors they have translated, within which space is devoted to their translatorial relationship with the author. Seidensticker (1990) produced *Kafu the Scribbler: The Life and Writings of Nagai Kafu, 1879-1959*. Rubin (2005) wrote *Haruki Murakami and the Music of Words*, which, as the title implies, among other things considers stylistic aspects of the source texts and relates these to how he has translated Murakami.

Fifth, one-off collections of writings on literary translation and academic journals occasionally present papers focusing on Japanese. In Biguenet and Schule's *The Craft of Translation*, for instance, one finds Seidensticker's essay 'On Trying to Translate Japanese', which largely consists of generalisations about the differences between Japanese and English and specific textual examples thereof (Biguenet and Schule 1989: 142ff.). Seidensticker feels no need to provide references to translation studies, and one has the impression that he wishes to know little about it; I have been unable to locate any such writings by Holman on the topic of translation.

While some academics have published papers referring to concepts in JE translation studies (e.g. Araki's (1976) references to translation-studies theoretician Nida in 'Japanese Literature: The Practice of Transfer'), the pieces remain at the level of general discussion, serving to illuminate literary and social issues rather than to provide their own detailed analysis of aspects of JE translation per se.⁸

⁸ See also Ryan (1980): 'Translating Modern Japanese Literature'; and Fowler (1992): 'Rendering Words, Traversing Cultures: On the Art and Politics of Translating Modern Japanese Fiction'.

Finally, one finds proceedings of translation conferences and symposia, such as Donald Richie's *Words, Ideas and Ambiguities* (2000).⁹ Herein Western translators and academics such as Howard Hibbert, John Nathan and Seidensticker discuss a wide range of JE translation issues, but again the depth and breadth of the discussion is determined by the speakers' and questioners' interests rather than a systematic consideration of particular points of language.

It is to some extent understandable that JE translation has escaped sustained academic treatment. On the one hand, as Seidensticker's dismissive comments on Steiner and Benjamin suggest, the translators, who surely are the most familiar with how the characteristics of Japanese and English interact in the act of translating, are, almost without exception, at best bemused and at worst repelled by theory. It appears to them either "grand" and abstract, and hence unhelpful when one is battling with an intractable sentence, or rigid and overly prescriptivist in its delineation of what is acceptable or unacceptable. Perhaps the greatest fear of the literary writer, in general, is of criticism, in general: it seems to be the antithesis of creative intuition.

On the other hand, while in recent decades translation researchers have carried out systematic corpus studies (Laviosa 2002), most TS academics have been more concerned with the study of translation in general than with the specific interaction of two particular languages, and furthermore until recently have focused most of their analysis on European languages. One barrier to research is the Japanese orthography, consisting of three distinct character sets: the ideographic 漢字 *kanji* (with approximately 2000 core characters), and phonetic ひらがな *hiragana* and かたかな

⁹ See also 『日本文学 翻訳の可能性』 *Nihon bungaku: honyaku no kanōsei* 'Japanese Literature: The Possibilities of Translation' (Ii 2004), which was actually published in Japanese with some English originals. The symposium that preceded this publication is mentioned below.

katakana, with about fifty characters each. This complex orthography makes it difficult to read the language without a long period of study.

At the same time, academic interest in JE or EJ translation among Japanese researchers themselves has largely been confined to literary studies and praxis until very recently, as Wakabayashi notes:

In Japan the study of translation is generally regarded as belonging to the field of comparative literature, and it has not yet achieved the independent status it has today in the West. Moreover, Japanese writers are largely unaware of Western writing on translation theory, particularly recent developments, so that Europe has not played a major role in passing on ideas about translation. The explicit discussions that have taken place are often little more than superficial reflections on actual practice [...]. (1996: 900)

Thus, for example, one sees that writer/translator Murakami Haruki and Tokyo University professor Shibata Motoyuki have collaborated on two books about translation which are largely transcripts of their workshops with Tokyo University students (Murakami & Shibata 2000, 2003) and treat Murakami's approaches to and conceptions of the translation process particularly in relation to the authorial process.

While more academically orientated symposia on translation have been held in Japan in recent years, it is notable that the speakers are mostly foreigners. This was true of a symposium on Japanese literature entitled 「日本文学の魅力/翻訳の可能性」 *Nihonbungaku no miryoku / Honyaku no kanōsei* 'The Attractions of Japanese Literature / The Possibilities of Translation', held in Osaka in 2003, and its proceedings turned into a book (Ii 2004). The dominance of foreign speakers was again evident at the first full international conference on translation studies in Japan, held at Ritsumeikan University in 2010 ('Translation Studies in the Japanese Context').

Since Wakayabashi wrote, there have been isolated examples of more comprehensive approaches to translation studies from the Japanese side, such as 『英日 日英 翻訳入門』 *Einichi-nichiei honyaku nyūmon* ‘Introduction to English-Japanese/Japanese-English Translation’ (Naruse 1996). Section III of this work (1996: 17-28) explores some of the major structural differences between Japanese and English with reference to literary examples. However, despite its bidirectional title, most contrastive examples throughout the book consist of English originals and Japanese translations, and where the book does refer to TS theory, it largely remains of the older type, such as that of Nida.

The following year brought a collection of essays on the translation of Japanese literature entitled 『翻訳の方法』 *Honyaku no hōhō* ‘Methods of Translation’ (Kawamoto & Inoue 1997). This again tends to focus on translation issues from English to Japanese, but it does contain two essays analysing English translations. The first, 「正しい翻訳とは」 *Tadashii honyaku to ha* ‘“Correct” translation’, by Ōsawa Yoshihiro (1997: 129-142), contrasts Japanese and English sensibilities with examples from several Japanese works of literature (including Kawabata’s *Yukiguni*) and their English translations. The second, 「映し合う2つのテキスト 英訳された『雪国』」 *Utsushiau futatsu no tekusuto: Eiyaku sareta Yukiguni* ‘Two Mutually Reflecting Texts: Yukiguni translated into English’ (1997: 231-245), considers the relationship of original text and translation as exemplified by excerpts from *Yukiguni* and Seidensticker’s translations thereof, addressing such specifically literary issues as rhythm and texture.

Returning to the Western side, there are two main sources of JE translation analysis that make use of TS concepts. First are general student handbooks on translation such as Mona Baker’s *In Other Words: A Handbook on Translation* (1992), which, while

referring to numerous source languages, contains several examples of Japanese texts and comments briefly on some of the issues relevant to JE translation, for example the lack of necessity to distinguish between singular and plural noun forms in Japanese versus the requirement in English (1992: 84). Japanese does now have its own dedicated translation handbook in the form of the recent *Translating Japanese Texts* (Refsing and Lundquist 2009), but while this draws on translation-studies theory and deals with some of the differences between Japanese and English, it is not specifically focused on literary translation. Further, at the time of writing, Yoko Hasegawa was set to publish *The Routledge Course in Japanese Translation* in September 2011, its online description claiming that it “brings together for the first time material dedicated to the theory and practice of translation to and from Japanese”.¹⁰

Second, what one finds of systematic scholarly analysis of specific linguistic issues in JE translation consists of a few papers that I shall now briefly treat. Seemingly the most relevant is Alexander Woodburn’s Master’s thesis entitled *Translating Modern Japanese Prose: A Theoretical Approach*. However, this work relies heavily on a general introduction to TS theory with little relation to JE translation issues. When Woodburn at last comes to compare English and Japanese, he provides only a six-page overview of “structural differences” (2000: 43-49), juxtaposing such disparate issues as English’s variety of pronouns and Japanese’s expression of social relationships through verb endings (2000: 43).

Despite its limitations, Woodburn’s work at least represents a rare attempt to bring together JE translation theory and practice, and for that it should be commended. What is still lacking is a more systematic and in-depth approach to the specific JE translation

¹⁰ Routledge Books, accessed online on 10 August 2011 at www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415486866/.

issues.

James Hobbes's online paper 'Bridging the Cultural Divide: Lexical Barriers and Translation Strategies in English Translations of Modern Japanese Literature' (2004) concerns itself mainly with issues of differing cultural lexical items (see 2.1.2 in the current work for an in-depth analysis of linguistically distinct lexicalisation) and a basic taxonomy of translation strategies. In the course of some 6,000 words, Hobbes draws upon four Japanese works of literature and their English translations, providing a considerable corpus from which to draw examples. However, his analysis is confined to lexical issues and is unable to compare multiple translators' responses to the same source text, which would be particularly revealing.

Shani Tobias does make such a comparison in 'Culture-specific Items in Japanese-English Literary Translation: Comparing Two Translations of Kawabata's "Izu no odoriko"' (Tobias 2006). Her use of the same source text and translations makes her paper most obviously relevant to this thesis. Tobias convincingly situates her analysis of the two translators' translation strategies within the socio-economic normative framework of Toury¹¹ and Chesterman,¹² deeming Seidensticker's overall approach 'domesticating' (i.e., TL-orientated) and Holman's 'foreignising'¹³ (SL-orientated)¹⁴ and providing historical rationale for their different stances. However, she focuses only on

¹¹ Toury: "[S]ocio-cultural constraints have been described along a scale anchored between two extremes: general, relatively absolute rules on the one hand, and pure *idiosyncrasies* on the other. Between these two poles lies a vast middle-ground occupied by intersubjective factors commonly designated norms." (1995: 54; original emphasis)

¹² Chesterman: "Expectancy norms are established by the expectations of readers of a translation (of a given type) concerning what a translation (of this type) should be like. These expectations are partly governed by the prevalent translation tradition in the target culture, and partly by the form of the parallel texts (of a similar text-type) in the target language [...]. They can also be influenced by economic or ideological factors [...]." (1997: 64)

¹³ See Venuti (1995) for a book-length discussion of domesticating versus foreignising in translation.

¹⁴ See Newmark (1988: 45-47) for a description of SL- and TL-orientated translation.

the culturally bound lexical elements in the work (namely, physical objects, customs, levels of politeness and terms of address, idiomatic and metaphorical expressions, and mimetics), and even so at nine pages the paper can hardly be considered comprehensive in its treatment of these items. Further, like Hobbes' work, by focusing largely on lexical items it does not address structural cultural issues such as different attitudes to class and gender, which are an aspect of JE translation studies that would require its own PhD thesis.

Tobias favourably compares Holman's 'modern-era' attempts to retain Japanese cultural elements through such techniques as transliteration and intratextual explanation to Seidensticker's 'old-fashioned' domesticating strategies such as cultural conversion and generalisation of specific ST terminology (which she terms "neutralisation"), but makes little attempt to assess the literary merits of the resulting prose apart from observing where Holman preserves idiomatic and metaphorical allusions (2006: 32). This deficit is telling in her final summation:

Overall, Seidensticker's translation approach is one of 'fluency', smoothing over CSIs [culture-specific items] to enable TL readers to relate to the story according to the terms of their own culture and literary norms. His sentence structure, syntax and style also depart significantly from the ST so as to be more 'readable' from an English language point of view. Consequently, the story reads smoothly and easily but its imagery and rhythm is [*sic*] flattened. Holman's more foreignizing approach, by contrast, exposes the cultural differences in more detail and by so doing caters for readers who are interested in Japanese society, and promotes cultural understanding. Holman's translation adheres much more closely to the wording and sentence structure of the ST [...], which means that Kawabata's unique style, such as his bold metaphorical imagery and the beauty and sorrow inherent in the simple but lyrical descriptions of the dancing girl and autumn scenery are [*sic*] preserved to a greater extent." (2006: 33)

Tobias assumes that since "Holman's translation adhered much more closely to the

wording and sentence structure of the ST”, this “means that Kawabata’s unique style [...] [is] preserved to a greater extent.” Although Holman indeed retains idiom and metaphor more faithfully,¹⁵ this fidelity does not necessarily extend to Kawabata’s ‘style’ as a whole, with which it is being conflated—particularly the issue of rhythm, which in my estimation is a demonstrably weak point in Holman. Nor under close examination does Holman prove to retain as much of the original “wording and sentence structure” as might seem the case at first glance. The translators’ stylistic choices will be considered throughout the following chapters to address my counter-assertions.

In her final remarks, beyond advocating the preservation of cultural elements in the TT where possible, to facilitate intercultural communication, Tobias draws no wider conclusions about the implications for Japanese literary translation. Nevertheless, her paper on the cultural aspects of the translations is generally sound, and provides an instructive contrastive analysis of Seidensticker’s and Holman’s general attitudes towards and treatment of culture-specific items in Japanese, an approach that I have employed to some extent in the present work, albeit with a different focus (see **2.0.1**).

¹⁵ For example, 若桐のように足のよく伸びた白い裸身を眺めて *wakagiri no yō ni ashi o yoku nobita shiroi rashin o nagamete* dir. ‘gazing at the naked white body with legs well-extended like a young paulonia tree’; Holman: “When I gazed at her white body, legs stretched, standing like a young paulonia tree”; Seidensticker: “I looked at her, at the young legs, at the sculpted white body”. Clearly Holman retains more of the original simile, while Seidensticker converts it to a metaphor with a different referent. But the point is less clear with another of Tobias’s comparisons: 渡り鳥の巣 *watari-dori no su* dir. ‘migratory birds’ nest’; Seidensticker: “shelter for migratory species”; Holman: “temporary roost for these birds of passage”.

1.0.2 The objectives and limitations of the thesis

The above précis of the extent of academic analysis of JE translation to date demonstrates the lack of a thorough-going and detailed survey of aspects of Japanese literary translation into English. It is my hope that this thesis will provide, along with other more culturally and perhaps literarily orientated studies, the groundwork for such an examination, which seems long overdue.

The present work takes the form of systematic contrastive analysis (Chesterman 1997: 79-80) of the linguistic features of Japanese and English as manifested in the case text *Izu no odoriko* and its published English translations, followed by an overview of translation decisions in the context of these features. The Japanese of *Izu no odoriko*, first published in 1926, remains clearly modern in most of its aspects,¹⁶ despite the ongoing influence of Western languages in shaping the general usage¹⁷ and perhaps literary style¹⁸ of Japanese. Further, the translations are recent enough to be likely to sufficiently represent contemporary translation. Thus I believe my case study provides a reasonable microcosm of linguistic issues in JE literary translation, though of course it does not encapsulate every aspect of the field.

Next I shall explain what this thesis does not do. First, it does not attempt to relate every textual reference to current trends in translation studies, but rather, taking a

¹⁶ Exceptions are largely orthographic, in the form of older forms for common *kanji*, most of which are updated in the Horupu Shuppan edition of the text that I have used in this study. However, some archaic forms such as 云う for 言う *iu* ‘say’, and the use of *ateji* for loan words such as *tabako* (煙草), are preserved even in this modern edition.

¹⁷ Martin (1975: 1075): “Two modern pronouns, *kare* ‘he/him’ and *kano-zyo* ‘she/her’ were created originally to translate the sex-insistent pronouns of English.” (Italics added.)

¹⁸ The current generation of Japanese writers is sometimes said to exhibit signs of ‘translationese’. Wakabayashi: “Murakami [Haruki]’s writing style is very aware of European syntax. For instance, he uses long sentences, expressions that seem to be literal translations from English, and many personal pronouns, differentiating between the singular and plural first-person pronouns *boku* and *bokutachi*.” (2009: unpaginated)

process-orientated approach¹⁹ it uses certain aspects of the discipline to inform a discussion of the source text and its translations and draws on this case material for exemplars for the practice of modern translation. Thus the thesis is more text-driven than theory-driven, and more descriptive than prescriptive. Hermans notes that

[t]he ‘positive heuristic’ of descriptivism redefines the aims of studying translation by claiming legitimacy for research which is ‘of light’ rather than ‘of use’ [...]. It wants to study translations as they are, and to account for their occurrence and nature. These endeavours may yield insights that turn out to be of practical use to translators and to translation teachers and critics, but such benefits are incidental.” (1999: 35)

Nonetheless, he cautions one to avoid a purely descriptive approach for the following reasons:

The empirical bias of the descriptive approach [...] has meant that questions surrounding the production, reception and historical impact of translation—especially literary translation—have been prominent. Relatively little attention has been paid to such aspects as the linguistics or philosophy of translation, or the mental and cognitive operations of the translation process itself.” (1999: 44).

By taking a generally descriptive approach that is enhanced by some of the insights accessible with the tools of comparative linguistic analysis, I hope to draw general conclusions about some observably effective approaches to such translation, although these are by no means exclusive of other approaches.

Second, while this thesis necessarily touches upon literary stylistics, it does not address authorial ‘style’ so much as the manifestation of semantic value in formal

¹⁹ Namely, one involving problems of linguistic equivalence and literary poetics (Bassnett 2002: 16-17).

textual features. Given that style is such a fraught and multivalent term, I choose to confine my discussion to clearly identifiable textual features that are seen as complementing the content of the story. The most useful definition of style in the present context may be Crystal's: "the (conscious or unconscious) selection of a set of linguistic features from all the possibilities in a language" (1994: 66). This definition embodies three germane considerations: (1) style is a (paradigmatic and syntagmatic²⁰) selection of linguistic features; (2) this selection is a conscious or unconscious process; and (3) the linguistic possibilities of a given language delimit possible style selections. These considerations apply whether the writer is the ST writer or the TT re-writer (translator).

That said, it is probably worthwhile spending a moment to address the issue of Kawabata's 'style' to illustrate further why I shall generally avoid the term. While Kawabata's stylistic elements varied greatly over his career as he explored by turns naturalistic, impressionistic and expressionistic approaches to narrative fiction, he is nonetheless often described as a quintessentially 'Japanese' writer. Starrs, for example, goes so far as to coin the interlingual term "Kawabataesque" (1998: 85, 180) to betoken such qualities:

Among the major Japanese fiction writers of the twentieth century, Kawabata is often perceived as one of those who were most deeply rooted in the native literary tradition—and therefore, one might think, most immune to Western influence. His exquisitely imagistic or impressionistic style reminds many of *haiku*. The associative leaps in his narrative structures are frequently said to resemble those of the medieval poetic form of *renga* or linked verse. (1998: 69)

²⁰ Saussure introduced the terms 'paradigm' and 'syntagm' in the linguistic context (Saussure 1916: 122). The former refers to individual lexical selections, and the latter to the combination of such lexical items to form a concatenation of such items in a given order.

Starrs goes on to characterise Kawabata's formal characteristics as a reflection of such traditional Japanese poetic forms, describing him as "elliptical", his style "pervaded by an air of mystery and ambiguity" (1998: 157). However, paradoxically perhaps, Starrs turns to a Western counterpart to provide one rationale for Kawabata's 'Japanese' concision: "[l]ike Hemingway, he believes in the power of the 'thing left out'" (1998: 144).

Kawabata's *Izu no odoriko* indeed can be seen to demonstrate a *haiku*-like brevity and the occasional associative leaps of *renga*; much of consequence is to be found in the unsaid, in the ambiguously resonant moments of silence between the main characters and the seemingly uncommented-upon, yet 'telling', juxtaposition of incidents. Yet as Starrs' allusion to the arguably equally 'quintessential' American writer Hemingway illustrates, these are neither necessarily exclusively Japanese stylistic elements, nor ones unique to Kawabata.

Thus I believe it is more fruitful for the present discussion to frame issues of style as questions of form at the discourse level, and treat these formal manifestations as they arise in the example sentences. Such formal elements present themselves as micro-level stylistic devices as well as some more overarching narrative issues of organisation. For example, the question of ambiguity that Starrs introduces above manifests itself at once at the level of individual words, phrases, sentences, paragraphs and even entire chapters. This is why I treat ambiguity both at the lexical (**2.1.1 a-d**) and structural (**2.1.1 e**) level.

There is a salutary role, too, for both a wide and a focused analytical approach to translation itself in this thesis. My own position as both a translator of literary and other texts and an academic with a background in linguistic analysis of literature means that I employ both theory and empirical analysis to guide my research in this area. In so doing

I hope to find a middle ground between the writer and the critic, where the results of close reading inform theory in a ‘hermeneutic circle’ in which intuition and analysis are mutually reinforcing. As Bassnett says,

[t]he need for systematic study of translation arises directly from the problems encountered during the actual translation process and it is as essential for those working in the field to bring their practical experience to theoretical discussion, as it is for increased theoretical perceptiveness to be put to use in the translation of texts. To divorce the theory from the practice, to set the scholar against the practitioner as has happened in other disciplines, would be tragic indeed. (2002: 16)

1.0.3 Outline of the thesis

The progression of my thesis is as follows. In the following sections of Chapter One I shall introduce important issues in Japanese-to-English literary translation, using examples from the source text and placing the discussion within the context of translation studies as a whole. Then I shall conclude the chapter with an explanation of the methodologies I have employed in preparing the thesis.

Chapters Two and Three are the heart of the thesis, consisting of discussion of the key linguistic features that emerged during my research, how they are manifested in the source text, and how the translators deal with them in their translations. I relate these features to important TS issues such as disambiguation, foreignising/domestication, and lexical identity where appropriate. In the final chapter, Chapter Four, I shift the focus to the translators’ overall strategies and how their specific techniques both underline, and undermine, these strategies, ending with some observations about the translation process that I hope may aid translators in their future renderings of Japanese literature, and theoreticians in their analyses of such translations.

1.1 Japanese-to-English Translation in the Context of Literary Translation Studies

Let us imagine for a moment that to translate literature from one language to another, all one need do is substitute one word for another. This is so-called word-for-word translation.²¹ Let us apply that to the first sentence of the subject of my case study, Kawabata's novella *Izu no odoriko*. Here is the original Japanese, a romanised transliteration, and the word-for-word translation.

道がつづら折りになって、いよいよ天城峠に近づいたと思う頃、雨脚が杉の密林を白く染めながら、すさまじい早さで麓から私を追って来た。

Michi ga tsuzuraori ni natte, iyoio amagitōge ni chikazuita to omou koro, ama-ashi ga sugi no mitsurin o shiroku somenagara, susamajii hayasa de fumoto kara watashi o otte kita.

Road kudzu-bending-to-becoming, “finally Amagi Pass-to approached” think time, rain-legs cedars’ dense woods whitely while-dyeing, terrible-speed-with (mountain) foot-from me chasing came.

Is the translator's job done by providing equivalents for each utterance? Can we have a machine do the switching of vocabulary items throughout the remainder of the text, and then call it a day? No—obviously there are significant problems with the English here.²²

²¹ Catford (1965: 25) identifies word-for-word translation as being “essentially *rank-bound* at word-rank” (original emphasis), where ‘rank’ means morpheme-level, word-level, sentence-level, paragraph-level discourse, and so on, upwards in scale. If a translation is rank-bound, it means it stays within a certain rank, in this case substituting one word for one word rather than trying to shift the meaning into part of a longer utterance (higher rank).

²² And the state of literary machine translation may be even more parlous than the opaque sentence above suggests: when I ran the original Japanese through the Google online translation algorithm in 2008, the following was the result:

“Ammo is the way, finally 天城峠 feel closer to the time, while the dense forest of bleached cedar shower, I came from the foot-step in a tremendous speed.”

The fact that the algorithm could not even produce grammatical English (‘while’ heading a nominal phrase, and ‘in a tremendous speed’) showed that the software had a long way go with parsing even a target-text sentence that it generated itself. When I re-ran the translation in 2011, this was the result:

“Ammo is the road, think about approaching 天城峠 finally, with a dense forest of cedar, dyed white

First, the word order is so confused we can barely make sense of many parts, even by taking the liberty of adding typographical aids such as hyphens and quotation marks, and, indeed, *spaces*, to help us delineate distinct semantic chunks. Second, while we can at least distinguish some discrete terms in Japanese, which allows us to insert spaces between their *rōmaji* transliterations, there are simply no English equivalents for some of the terms, such as the subject marker が *ga* and the object marker を *o*, and we must either omit them or insert awkward grammatical markers like ‘S’ and ‘O’ to stand for them (which I have chosen not to do here). Third, the word ‘word’ itself is problematic. Japanese and English word breaks do not necessarily correspond. For example, 雨脚 *ama-ashi*, literally ‘rain legs’, consisting as it does of two *kanji* with their own discrete meanings ‘rain’ and ‘leg’ respectively, is taken as a single ‘word’ compound in Japanese,²³ which can perhaps be represented by the single word ‘shower’ in English. But the English ‘shower’ is not made up of two smaller word-units, so no one-to-one conversion is even possible. The two-word phrase ‘passing shower’ would actually be closer to the original sense, but ‘passing’ is hardly an equivalent for *ashi*. Fourth, and perhaps most damningly, as the sentence is ungrammatical, we can not even begin to see literary merit in it.

If word-for-word substitution is too problematic, then perhaps a literal translation would suffice. By ‘literal’ what is often meant is retaining the form and content of the

shower that came to me from the bottom step at a furious pace.”

The grammar and overall accuracy are slightly improved, with the correct attribution of who or what is moving quickly, but there is clearly still a long way to go before the machine overtakes the human on the steeply winding path of Japanese literary translation.

²³ Phonological evidence for this is that 雨 is normally pronounced *ame* but has been modified because it is fused in a compound with 脚 *ashi*, hence making the combination 雨脚 *ama-ashi* ‘passing shower’ (though the reading *ame-ashi* is also possible, if less common). Further, two distinct words would often be written as 雨の脚, with the の *no* acting as the equivalent of ’s (lit. ‘rain’s feet’).

original (the source text or ST) as much as English grammar (the target language or TL) will allow.²⁴ These days there is a kind of ethnological emphasis on preserving the nature of the original.²⁵ Rather than ‘dumbing it down’ for a monolingual and monocultural audience by making compromises in the ST, translators are exhorted to bring the reader to the text and present the original work without cultural and linguistic dilution or substitution. Below, then, is a ‘literal’ translation of the first sentence, preserving word order as much as English grammar will allow:

The time the road became winding like a kudzu, and I thought finally I approached Amagi Pass, a shower, while dyeing the dense cedar forest white, with terrible speed came and pursued me from the foot of the mountain.

It is true that our TL sentence is now grammatical, which is a huge step forward, but that is about all we can say for it. Owing to its awkward clausal structure and multiple adverbial phrases, which bury the main subject—the shower—in the middle of the sentence, the text’s meaning is still fairly unclear, and it remains hard to read. Further, the simile ‘winding like a kudzu’ is inaccessible to many English readers, excepting those familiar with the infestation of the hardy vine in parts of the United States.

Perhaps we could try making more of a concession to the TL reader, tidying up the style so that it is more palatable and removing culturally obscure elements, but

²⁴ Catford says “[l]iteral translation [...] may start, as it were, from a word-for-word translation, but make changes in conformity with TL grammar (e.g. inserting additional words, changing structures at any rank, etc.); this may make it a group-group or clause-clause translation. One notable point, however, is that literal translation, like word-for-word, tends to remain *lexically* word-for-word, i.e. to use the highest (unconditioned) probability lexical equivalent for each lexical item.” (1965: 25, original emphasis.) I have problems with such a definition of literal translation, and will substitute the term ‘direct translation’ in due course.

²⁵ Cf. Hibbet in Richie (2000: 46). This is probably partly a reaction to Venuti’s call for greater foreignisation in translations (1995).

preserving the ST as much as possible. Let us call such a translation an *ST-orientated translation*:

At the time he road became winding and I thought I was at last approaching Amagi Pass, the passage of the rain, turning the dense grove of cedars white, pursued me from the foothills with terrible speed.

This is starting to sound like real English, but it remains stilted.²⁶ Few people would bother continuing beyond this tortuous sentence if they assume that the rest of the book is going to read similarly. So let us tweak it further, again without fundamentally altering the structure. This sentence would approach what pioneering translation theoretician Eugene Nida calls “formal” or (later) “functional equivalence”:²⁷

About the time the road began to wind and I realized that I was finally near Amagi Pass, a curtain of rain swept up after me at a terrific speed from the foot of the mountain, painting the dense cedar forests white.

Some people may be happy with this sentence, particularly (based on my personal observations) Japanese native speakers, but others will bridle at the following features:

(a) the vagueness introduced by the first word ‘about’; (b) the awkward nested-verb structure ‘I realised that I was’; (c) the length of the adverbial clause ‘About the time the

²⁶ I use ‘stilted’ in this thesis to mean ‘awkward to the native ear’. Also, the connection between the road’s winding and the narrator’s awareness of approaching the pass is weakened because the Japanese relies on grammatico-syntactic rules to link the two, a device that is lost when the English simply follows the ST clause order.

²⁷ Nida (1964: 165): “[A]n F-E translation attempts to reproduce several formal elements, including: (1) grammatical units, (2) consistency in word usage, and (3) meanings in terms of the source context. The reproduction of grammatical units may consist in: (a) translating nouns by nouns, verbs by verbs, etc.; (b) keeping all phrases and sentences intact (i.e. not splitting up and readjusting the units); and (c) preserving all formal indicators, e.g. marks of punctuation, paragraph breaks, and poetic indentation.”

road began to wind and I realized that I was finally near Amagi Pass’, which suspends delivery of the main subject and verb ‘a curtain of rain swept up after me’; and (d) the mixed metaphor ‘a curtain of rain ... painting the dense cedar forests white’.

Putting the clauses into an order that is more comfortable in the TL and trimming the verbs might alleviate those concerns, and sound more literary. Nida would call such concessions to the TL “dynamic equivalence”:²⁸

With alarming speed, a shower swept toward me from the foot of the mountain, touching the cedar forests white as the road began to wind up into the pass.

Surely now there can be no complaints about the translation? The sentence reads smoothly, and leads us up the pass with great narrative impetus. Except that—in the original sentence the narrative sequence runs the *opposite* way to this. The scene begins at the pass, and then shifts to the rain-shower threatening the narrator character. By reordering the clauses to make them sound more natural in English, we have altered the narrative flow and changed the emphasis.

Does this matter? Given that Japanese and English are such different languages, in terms of sound values, lexis, cultural associations, history, and word/clause order, is there any hope at all of preserving literary form?²⁹ Is literary form an essential part of a story, or can—indeed, *must*—it be dispensed with in the translation process, allowing the story to be told in a different form that nevertheless is effective in the TL, so as to

²⁸ Nida (1964: 159): “In such a translation one is not so concerned with matching the receptor-language message with the source-language message, but with the dynamic relationship [...], that the relationship between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message.”

²⁹ As indicated earlier, I will generally try to avoid the vague and loaded term ‘style’.

convey the story with a similar ‘illocutionary force’ (function) to the original, i.e., true to the author’s intention? Even if we put aside the fraught issue of authorial intention, what about preserving the *effect* on the TL reader—Austin’s ‘perlocutionary force’? (Austin 1975: 101ff.) Is the effect more important than preserving formal qualities of the original, or are the two in fact inseparable? Such issues are addressed in the thesis.

I should now reveal that the last two translations above are not my own. The former is J. Martin Holman’s version (published in 1998 as part of *The Dancing Girl of Izu and Other Stories*); the latter is Edward Seidensticker’s second version (published in 1997 as part of the *Oxford Book of Japanese Short Stories*). In other words, these are professional, published translations, with Seidensticker acknowledged as one of the greatest literary translators of his day. Yet Holman’s version, it can be argued, sounds vague, awkward, wordy, and confused in its imagery, while Seidensticker’s ignores the interiority of the original (by omitting 思ふ *omou* ‘think’) and inverts the narrative structure. Imagine if a Japanese translator had done similar things to the complex first sentence of an English classic such as *Pride and Prejudice*. (Indeed, I shall consider that very notion at the end of Chapter Four.)

A question encapsulating the above concerns is, given the two translators’ great differences in their approach and their respective problems, can an English-language readership really presume to be reading anything approaching the original work when it reads a translation from Japanese? A corollary is, if the answer is no, then can anything be done about this, or does the vast lexical, syntactic and cultural gulf between the languages dictate that the presentation of Japanese literature be left to the vagaries of individual translators’ proclivities? Are Japanese and English ‘orphan’ languages, with a ‘mother’ common proto-language at some point in the distant past who has been dead so

long that it is pointless to invoke philological commonalities, and instead should one pragmatically focus on what each language does well, transferring basic semantic content like the story and narrative structure, but ignoring issues of form?

A balanced approach, the hermeneutic circle of empirical observation contextualised by theory, may help to illuminate a middle way between some slavish attempt to formally reproduce the original, and a well-meaning distortion of the original that takes it far from its source in an attempt to satisfy TL narrative norms. Naturally, no translators ever consistently take either of these extreme positions in practice—but this is precisely my point. What they are more likely ‘guilty’ of is the inconsistent application of translation techniques leading to extreme positions being taken at the micro level. These tactical missteps could be seen as undermining the literary integrity of a translation, if not egregiously, then at least insidiously.³⁰ Cluynaar cautions that

[t]he failure of many translators to understand that a literary text is made up of a complex set of systems existing in a dialectical relationship with other sets outside its boundaries has often led them to focus on particular aspects of a text at the expense of others. (In Bassnett 2002: 80)

A possible middle way emerges from a close reading of the exemplar Japanese literary text *Izu no odoriko* and its English translations, examining where potential translation issues exist, what merits my labelling them so, and how the translators have dealt with them. It is hoped that such an examination may suggest how a translator can (a) take a more balanced approach to a Japanese literary text by being conscious of the issues rather than becoming bogged down by them; (b) make choices that reinforce an

³⁰ Van Leuwen Zwart’s detection of “flatness” in a translation of *Don Quixote*, which she attributed to “the accumulation of micro-level differences produc[ing] a qualitative difference at the macro-level”, led to her development of the concept of the ‘transeme’ (“a comprehensible textual unit”). (Hermans 1999: 58.)

overall strategic approach rather than simply achieving tactical, isolated success; and (c) ultimately produce a translation that is sufficiently close enough to the original, while doing what is necessary to make the TL reader care about it as a work of art. At the same time, it is not my intention in this work to prescribe how translators should achieve (a)-(c), but rather to observe the outcomes of doing and not doing so.

1.2 Highways and Shortcuts: Different Approaches to Translation

I draw upon a range of allusive images throughout this thesis in my discussion of translation and translating, and it will become clear that they all in some way stem from incidents in the narrative of the case-study text *Izu no odoriko*. This set of related vignettes is intended to demonstrate how both a literary work and the act of translation itself may resonate beyond their language-bound origins in detectably consistent patterns. This imagistic approach also reflects my belief that criticism can be as intuitive and organic a process as the creation of the literary works it describes.

Kawabata Yasunari, Japan's first Nobel prize-winner for literature, published his first major work of fiction 『伊豆の踊子』 *Izu no odoriko* in 1926, when he was in his mid-twenties. It is a coming-of-age tale and a largely innocent love story, based on the author's real-life wanderings among the spa towns of Izu Peninsula in central Japan as a student.

At the beginning of the story, the student narrator unexpectedly comes across a troupe of travelling entertainers in a teahouse—a group that he has met earlier in his journey—and has an awkward encounter with the dancing girl who is the focus of his interest. On a pretext he takes up with the troupe and travels with them down the centre of the Izu Peninsula, befriending the dancer's elder brother. He is attracted to the dancer, but when he sees her naked in a communal outdoor bath, he realises she is younger than he had thought, and suddenly feels nothing but pure affection for her. They share a number of experiences together, though conversing little, and her attachment to him grows. When he has to return to Tokyo on a ferry from Shimoda, she forlornly sees him off at the wharf, waving a white cloth until she has disappeared from view.

Early in the story, the narrator character is asked by his travelling companions, the itinerant entertainers, to make a choice between taking a steep shortcut over a mountain, or the easier, but naturally longer, highway route. He chooses the former, and in so doing comes to learn more about the character of the dancing girl with whom he is infatuated.

The act of translating—as with writing in general—is all about choices (constrained or otherwise), which at the discourse level are paradigmatic (choosing among potential words) and syntagmatic (choosing among potential word orders and then combining these word selections),³¹ and through these choices the ‘character’ of the text is formed. A direct spatial analogy is the Cartesian grid, with lexical choices lined up vertically on the *y*-axis—the paradigm—and combination choices arranged horizontally on the *x*-axis—the syntagm. Every word choice renders moot—and mute—all other potential lexical choices; every concatenation or ordering of multiple word choices closes off other potential avenues of development, and emphasises some lexical elements at the cost of others. There are many paths to the same nominal end in literary translation—the “desirable result”, as Newmark phrases it, being the reproduction of the “equivalent effect” of the original in the mind of the target-language reader (1988: 48).³²

One may gain the impression that many professional translators are probably not greatly concerned about how they get from A to B—from source text to a translation—as long as the paths they find or construct prove sound enough for the purpose. In fact, they may feel that spending too much time looking down at their footwork (i.e.,

³¹ See Lidov (1999: 53-55) for a discussion of Saussure’s, Barthes’ and Jakobson’s uses of these terms. Jakobson replaced Saussure’s ‘paradigm’ and ‘syntagm’ with ‘selection’ and ‘combination’.

³² See also Landers: “The prevailing view among most, though not all, literary translators is that a translation should reproduce in the TL reader the same emotional and psychological reaction produced in the original SL reader.” (2001: 49)

engaging in textual analysis) could lead to a stumble and a step off the path into blind alleys. Added to that, the possible paths that one can take between Japanese and English are potentially more numerous than those between two much more closely related languages such as French and English, simply because the linguistic and cultural ‘distance’ is greater.

Let us consider this issue of difference for a moment. English and Japanese are alike in that they are magpie languages, borrowing extensively from others, although these days it is probably truer of Japanese than of English. English has largely switched to providing shiny objects, as it were, for other languages to collect. However, beyond this eclectic linguistic acquisitiveness, the similarities between English and Japanese dissipate significantly.

The greatest syntactic difference is that English verbs follow the subject (SVO), whereas Japanese verbs follow the object (SOV). The effect such different orders have on literary style should not be underestimated. In English, the object or complement is anticipated, whereas in Japanese, the verb is. Hence, because of the differing channels of thought of their languages, the English reader is constantly encouraged to guess *that which something is being done to* while the Japanese reader anticipates *what is being done to it*. Compare ‘I kissed ... a frog’ to 蛙に...キスした *kaeru ni ... kisu shita* tr. orig. syn. ‘(I) frog to ... kiss did’.³³ Leech and Short describe this phenomenon as “end-focus”, whereby

there is a general tendency for given information to precede new information: that is, for the speaker to proceed from a starting point of information which is assumed to be shared by the hearer, to information which is assumed to be ‘news’ to the hearer, and therefore

³³ Japanese can rephrase to more closely match the English order, but this so-called cleft structure (Martin 1975: 863) is marked: キスしたのは蛙だ *kisu shita no wa kaeru da* dir. ‘what (I) kissed was a frog’.

communicatively more salient. (1981: 212)

Martin (1975: 37) confirms the same principle operates in Japanese—“novel or critical information is saved for the end of a Japanese sentence”—but as the verb (or predicate) always comes at the end of a Japanese sentence, the reader/listener will still have to wait for the *action* (and any temporal or modal characterisations of that action, as well as whether it *did* or *did not* happen) till the end of the sentence,³⁴ while this is not the case in English. Furthermore, Leech and Short consider the reader’s expectation of end-focus an important normative stylistic issue: “writing is less successful (all other things being equal) to the extent that it frustrates this expectation” (1981: 214). Thus there is likely to be pressure on the translator to satisfy the expectation of end-focus, even when this goes against the ST syntax.

Seidensticker makes his own observations on comparative syntax:

An English sentence hastens to the main point and for the most part lets the qualifications follow after. A Japanese sentence prefers to keep one guessing. The last element in the sentence reveals whether it is positive or negative, declaratory or interrogative. “I do not think that ...” begins an English sentence; “... this I do not think” ends a Japanese sentence, having coyly held off the fact of belief or disbelief to the end. (1989: 143)

Related to the grammatical ordering of lexical elements is the frequent, much-remarked absence of a subject in Japanese.³⁵ Repetition of pronouns, being

³⁴ Compare the following sentences, in which modality, tense and negation are marked at the end of the sentence in Japanese and in the middle of the sentence in English. 彼女と話す。 *Kanojo to hanasu*. ‘(I) (will) talk to her.’ 彼女と話すだろう。 *Kanojo to hanasu darō*. ‘(I) may talk to her.’ 彼女と話した。 *Kanojo to hanashita*. ‘(I) talked to her.’ 彼女と話しただろう。 *Kanojo to hanashita darō*. ‘(I) may have talked to her.’ 彼女と話さなかった。 *Kanojo to hanasanakatta*. ‘(I) didn’t talk to her.’ 彼女と話さなかっただろう。 *Kanojo to hanasanakatta darō*. ‘(I) may not have talked to her.’

³⁵ Martin: “The frequency with which a subject is NOT explicitly stated [...] may be as high as 74 percent of the sentences in a discourse [...]” (1975: 185; original emphasis.)

grammatically unnecessary in Japanese, would appear unjustifiably marked (i.e., foregrounded) and clumsy in literary writing, and hence the Japanese author either largely dispenses with a subject marker, uses some epithet (such as 踊子 *odoriko*, ‘the dancing girl’), or synthesises a combination of the two.

All these choices have implications for the English translator concerning *comprehension* and *rendering*. If the subject is absent, the translator must deduce it from the context and whatever verbal markers (such as in-group/out-group markers) may be present (a question of comprehension). Sometimes the Japanese writer wants to leave the subject deliberately vague, and then the poor translator is forced to make what could be seen as a ‘vulgarly explicit’ attribution, emphatically closing off one possible pathway (a question of rendering). On the other hand, if the Japanese makes frequent use of epithets, this has the effect in English that multiple pronouns have in Japanese—namely, it sounds clumsy in its repetitiousness. No matter how delightful a character the ‘dancing girl’ may be, and no matter how important the ‘dancing girl’ may be to the plot, there are only so many times the English reader wants to hear about the ‘dancing girl’ in the same sentence. Martin sums up the situation thus:

In English we avoid repeating a noun once it has been mentioned, substituting an anaphoric pronoun after the first mention. In Japanese there is no stricture against repeating the noun any number of times; on the other hand, obvious elements [e.g., pronouns] are freely omitted from a sentence. (1975: 1075; my interpolation)

Thus the translator needs to come up with alternative epithets that can be cycled through to provide ‘elegant variation’³⁶ (the dancing girl, the dancer, the girl, the young woman,

³⁶ Leech and Short (1981: 244) call such an English cohesive device “elegant variation”, presumably after Fowler and Fowler (1922), although ironically the Fowlers call the device a “vice” (1922: 211), stating

etc.), and/or replace some with pronouns, which are unmarked in English. The moment one reaches for English's marvellous grabbag of synonyms, however, the form of the original is put at risk. If an author uses repetition deliberately, say for rhythmic or euphonic accentuation, swapping some words for synonyms will attenuate the effect. Thus the translator might be prudent not to convert something deliberately marked into something smoother to read, unmarked—and anodyne.

Returning to our metaphorical fork in the road, one can say that a translator like Seidensticker has an instinct for the shortcut: he likes to translate by omission. He readily acknowledges that in three of his translations of Kawabata's works he translates the polysemous verb 思ふ *omou* 'think' in "nineteen instances [...] by nothing at all. I do not feel apologetic about the nineteen." (Seidensticker 2002: 123.) He is interested in elegance, concision, and, above all, rhythm, for he senses these qualities are what marks literature:

Explanation takes time, and taking time slows down the rhythm, and when you are concerned with a literary work, the rhythm is extremely important. (Richie 2000: 21)

Thus it is natural for him to relocate the source literature in such a familiar linguistic landscape as English rhythmic patterning, rather than trying to 'explain' it through additions or superficially imitating its ST form. One can again use Nida's term 'dynamic equivalence' to approximate Seidensticker's agenda. He is more concerned with capturing the spirit of the original, both in terms of content and style, than paying obeisance to the letter of it. He looks for cultural equivalents where available, and uses

that " 'elegant variation' is generally a worse fault than monotony [...]." (1922: 217.) Seidensticker himself was aware of the term (2002: 123), although "not [...] when I was at work on the translations".

linguistic shortcuts where they are not.

However, the biggest potential weakness of Seidensticker's selective approach can be observed in his first translation of *Izu no odoriko*, which appeared in volume 195 of *The Atlantic* magazine in December 1954. Large sections of text have been excised, ranging from entire scenes to single adjectives.³⁷ Seidensticker claimed that the cuts were due to space limitations, but only restored the missing text in his 1997 version—and even then, not completely. Seidensticker is on record as regretting both the omissions and his not signalling the cuts, but for decades this bowdlerised version was the only representation of *Izu no odoriko* available to English readers, and when they read it, they were hardly viewing Kawabata's work in anything like its entirety.³⁸

Contrast this with Holman's inclusive, arguably 'pedestrian' approach, where he hews more closely to the path of the original, tending to produce longer, more comprehensive sentences that may at times, however, sound bland or otiose. In Nida's rather overgeneralising terms, Holman translation makes greater use of 'formal equivalence', tending to preserve the form, lexical and syntactic, as much as possible. Ironically, however, his title for *Izu no odoriko*, *The Dancing Girl of Izu*, is longer, more expansive and more explanatory than the original.

With Seidensticker's title *The Izu Dancer*, the going, as it were, is harder, with a steeper learning curve required of the reader to grasp that 'Izu' is a place name, while it is relatively clear in Holman's formulation. Similarly, the gender of Seidensticker's dancer is ambiguous, whereas it is clear in Holman's. But arguably the *dancer* is svelter,

³⁷ See footnote 65, p. 77, for a list of sentence-rank omissions.

³⁸ Watson (1991) imputed more sinister motives to Seidensticker's omissions, claiming that he worked with the CIA to censor elements of the text that might run counter to US propaganda in the early years of the Cold War, but Seidensticker, though Richie (2000b), denied this, saying "the cuts were solely for reasons of layout".

smaller, purer, and carries herself with more propriety than the worldly and potentially seductive ‘dancing girl’. And, ironically again, the title is closer in syntax to the original than Holman’s.

I shall next update Nida’s categorisations of translation approaches and apply them to Seidensticker’s and Holman’s overall translation viewpoints. Nida’s binary pair of dynamic and formal equivalence has grown increasingly unsatisfactory as translation studies has developed and widened its own perspective through sociological and historical contextualisation to include such macro-level approaches as intertextuality,³⁹ but it still remains an important starting point, and, further, a ‘weigh-station’ to which to return from time to time to test the viability of theories that emerge from such top-down polysystem approaches.⁴⁰

In his ambitiously titled book *Towards a Science of Translating* Nida explains dynamic equivalence as creating an equivalent effect for the TL reader to that induced in the SL reader when reading the ST:

One way of defining a D-E translation is to describe it as ‘the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message.’ This type of definition contains three essential terms: (1) *equivalent*, which points toward the source-language message; (2) *natural*, which points toward the receptor language; and (3) *closest*, which binds the two orientations together on the basis of the highest degree of approximation. (1964: 166; original emphasis)

³⁹ Hermans: “Apart from the relation between source and target texts there [are] other relations to be explored: between different versions of the same or similar originals, between translations and non-translated texts, and between translation and discourses about translation. [...] Lefevere used system concepts to point up literary “control mechanisms”. These he described in terms of poetics, patronage and ideology, which he regarded as more important constraints on translation than linguistic differences.” (1999: 42-3.)

⁴⁰ “The polysystem concept, which views literature as a network of elements which interact with each other, is meant to serve as a tool for investigating why translators behave in this or that way, or why some translations prove more successful than others.” (Hermans 1999: 32.)

Let us examine those three key terms more closely. The term ‘correspondence’ is often preferred to ‘equivalence’ since the latter can be misleading or unhelpful.⁴¹ People may consider equivalence “as a statement to the effect that a particular meaning, form or structure in language A is the same as (or can be equated with) a particular meaning, form or structure in language B” (Shore 2001: 251). However, what, or who, determines what is “the same” and what is not? As Pym points out, a circular logic is at work: “translation equivalence is what is observed to be equivalent” (Baker and Saldana 2008: 99). Correspondence, on the other hand, does not imply some sort of mathematical equivalence, and allows for multiple possible correspondences that are equally valid (Shore 2001: 252). Furthermore, there is an implication in Nida’s explanation that “*equivalent* [...] points toward the source-language message” that a given word in the SL has a fixed, unnegotiable meaning, yet we know that lexical meaning is ever-evolving. Moreover, determining whether one term in the TL is ‘equivalent’ to the ST term is so context-dependent that we cannot achieve this determination simply by working out what the SL message is.⁴²

Second, Nida says “natural [...] points toward the receptor language”. ‘Natural’ is of course as vague a term as ‘equivalent’: is the degree of ‘naturalness’ determined by how ‘invisible’ (unobtrusive) the translator is, how un-translation-like the text reads, or how fluent, artistic, or convincing it appears? Venuti considers Nida’s use of the term

⁴¹ Hermans: “The more closely one looks at what constitutes ‘equivalence’ in translation, the more problematical the notion becomes. [...] A strict application of the concept as it is used, say, in mathematics, is obviously unworkable. It would imply reversibility and interchangeability, and we know that translation is a one-directional event involving asymmetrical linguistic and cultural worlds. Weaker definitions suggesting similarity rather than synonymy led to the use of terms like correspondence, congruence or matching.” (1999: 47-48.)

⁴² Venuti: “Meaning is a plural and contingent relation, not an unchanging unified essence, and therefore a translation cannot be judged according to mathematics-based concepts of semantic equivalence or one-to-one correspondence.” (1995: 18.)

problematic for a more serious reason, namely cultural hegemony:

[W]hen Nida asserts that “an easy and natural style in translating, despite the extreme difficulty of producing it [...] is nevertheless essential to producing in the ultimate receptors a response similar to that of the original receptors” [...], he is in fact imposing the English-language valorization of transparent discourse on every foreign culture, masking a basic disjunction between the source- and target-language texts which puts into question the possibility of eliciting a “similar” response. (1995: 21)

Finally, ‘closest’ is another vexed modifier, for, like ‘natural’, it is extremely difficult to quantify what might constitute Nida’s ideal “highest degree of approximation”. Thus his succinct and superficially attainable “closest natural equivalent to the source-language message” transpires to be a highly problematic definition of a so-called dynamic-equivalent translation.

To alleviate such problems, I shall refer to what Nida labelled ‘dynamic-equivalence translation’ as ‘TL-orientated translation’ (Landers 2001: 51). This term has the advantage over ‘dynamic equivalence’ of, first of all, foregoing the vexed noun ‘equivalence’. Such a translation does not seek equivalence so much as capturing the ‘spirit’ of the original—and spirit is a purposely vague, yet lively, term. It implies a reinvigoration of the original text in a form that chimes with the language, culture and era of its new audience. That Seidensticker’s translation is orientated towards his native language is evidenced in the many changes he makes in his updated translation of 1997. These range from subtle shifts in punctuation to alterations in phrasing and word choice (see footnotes 64-67, p. 77, for examples). At the same time, he remains unafraid of omitting elements of the original text where he feels they impede his vision of the text for the non-Japanese reader. Further, ‘natural’ is replaced by ‘effective’, where the effect

and affect of the original are conveyed so as to produce a corresponding (but never entirely equivalent) response in the TL reader. In a TL-orientated translation, the idea of a ‘closest’ translation is antithetical to the *skopos* (Vermeer’s term for a ‘goal’)⁴³ of an effective translation.

How, then, does Nida’s contrasting definition of ‘formal’ or ‘functional equivalence’ hold up to similar examination? Formal equivalence, he says,

attempts to reproduce several formal elements, including: (1) grammatical units, (2) consistency in word usage, and (3) meanings in terms of the source context. The reproduction of grammatical units may consist in: (a) translating nouns by nouns, verbs by verbs, etc.; (b) keeping all phrases and sentences intact (i.e. not splitting up and readjusting the units); and (c) preserving all formal indicators, e.g. marks of punctuation, paragraph breaks, and poetic indentation. (1964: 159)

The term ‘reproduce’ has held up better over time than other earlier terms such as ‘mimic’, ‘copy’ or ‘mirror’, because it embodies the possibility of (organic) renewal as well as imitation. One must be constantly reminded that formal equivalence is never identity. Given that caveat, a translation can indeed find similar grammatical units (using a verb for a verb, for example); keep multi-word structures intact; and preserve formatting. Looking at Holman’s translation, we see he has made a considerable effort to match the lengths of his sentences to those of the original; he has tended to retain lesser adverbial phrases where Seidensticker has often apparently deemed them unimportant; and he retains proper nouns such as place names, no matter how obscure. One example from the ST and its translations serves to illustrate all of these contrasts:

⁴³ “Collaborating in the communicative act in such a way as to promote the achievement of the *skopos* is the main and foremost task of the translator.” (Vermeer 1994: 11; original emphasis)

| ST (Numbered by Sentence) | Direct Translation | Seidensticker Translation Version 2 | Holman Translation |
|--|--|--|---|
| 3. 一人伊豆の旅に出てから四日目のことだった。 | Dir. 'It was the fourth day since (I) had set out alone on my journey of Izu.' | I had spent three nights at hot springs near the center of the peninsula, and now, my fourth day | It was the fourth day of my solitary journey down the Izu Peninsula. |
| 4. 修善寺温泉に一夜泊り、湯ヶ島温泉に二夜泊り、そして朴歯の高下駄で天城を登って来たのだった。 | Dir. '(I) had stayed at Shuzenji Spa for one night, at Yugashima Spa for two nights, and had climbed up Amagi in high-slatted <i>geta</i> .' | out of Tokyo, I was climbing toward Amagi Pass and South Izu. | I had stayed at Shuzenji Hot Spring one night, then two nights at Yugashima. And now, wearing high clogs, I was climbing Amagi. |

Seidensticker combines the two ST sentences into one, while Holman retains them. Seidensticker conflates the two spa-town stays into one, omitting the names of both places, while Holman faithfully enumerates them. Where Seidensticker omits the adverbial descriptor 朴歯の高下駄で *hōba no taka-geta de* 'in high *geta* with (magnolia-wood) supports', Holman includes it relatively intact, if culturally converted ("wearing high clogs").

Consistency of word usage has been the subject of translation fads in the West. In Seidensticker's translatorial prime in the mid-twentieth century, under conventions such as the aforementioned 'elegant variation', reusing the same word, especially in close textual proximity, was deemed a stylistic infelicity. Instead the translator was to translate a recurring ST term with a number of different synonyms: clearly a TL-orientated approach. On the other hand, Holman's generation is apparently more concerned with using the same expression consistently, assuming that the original author kept using it for a reason.⁴⁴ This can, of course, lead to a certain awkwardness in

⁴⁴ Literary translator of Japanese Howard Hibbet (in Richie 2000: 46): "The other fault or virtue which is nowadays much more fashionable is failing to improve the work, or trying not to eliminate whatever in it might seem strange. [...] It is not merely a question of fidelity in the sense of putting everything in, or mirroring the structure or lack of structure, or faithfully rendering the tone, but it is also a question of fidelity to the source language."

the TT.

The third point, reproducing “meanings in terms of the source context”, echoes the “*equivalent*, which points toward the source-language message” in Nida’s definition of dynamic equivalence, though presumably such ST semantic reproduction is thought to be privileged in formal equivalence. Perhaps this focus on the source context amounts to avoidance of ‘cultural equivalence’, whereby obscure cultural references are replaced by something more familiar to the TL reader, or its attenuated manifestation, a kind of generalisation in which superordinates replace culturally specific terms. For instance, in translating a section of *Izu no odoriko*, where Seidensticker renders obliquely (“Their instruments put away tidily in a corner, the performers started a game on another board. It was the simpler game of lining up stones.”), Holman is more explicit about both instruments and games: “The girls placed their drums and shamisen in the corner of the room, then started playing a game of “five-in-a-row” on a Chinese chess board.” (§ (sentence in the ST) 256.)⁴⁵

The term ‘SL-orientated translation’ clearly privileges the source text in each translating decision. In this case, it seems that Nida’s formal equivalence is closer to SL-orientated translation’s *skopos* than dynamic equivalence is to that of TL-orientated translation. But one must be careful that formal equivalence is not used as an excuse for failing to interpret the “meanings in terms of the source context”. If a translator is uncertain of the meaning beneath an author’s utterance, the easy and ostensibly reasonable choice is simply to translate the superficial form. But if the result is opaque rather than dense, vague rather than richly ambiguous (polysemous), neither the original

⁴⁵ The ST reads 女達は太鼓や三味線を部屋の隅に片づけると、将棋盤の上で五目並べを始めた。Dir. ‘When the women (and others) had put away such things as the *taiko* drum(s) and shamisen(s) in the corner of the room, they began *gomokunarabe* (five-in-a-row) on a *shōgi* board.’

text nor the TL reader has been well served.

Can we say one approach is better than the other? The translators' methodology can reflect personal taste, or, as Toury (1995: 54) terms them, "idiosyncrasies", but this is insufficient to assess their techniques. Paraphrasing Newmark (1998: 48) above, an effective translation could be defined as one that conveys the essence of the original text while remaining accessible to the target reader. But what does 'the essence of the original' mean? Surely it comes down to the degree of success in reconstructing content and form, or, in other words, the subject matter and the author's (purposive) presentation of it.

Frank, Kittel and Greiner appositely sum up the dilemma, or necessary compromise, underlying TL- and SL-orientated approaches to translation:

In the TL oriented translation, perlocutionary effects on the TL audience are considered more important. In order to efficiently communicate an intended message, the translator has to resort in such cases to remodelling of the original locution and the original message and make them subordinate to the intended communicative effect. In consequence, then, the source-centered translation may contribute towards sustaining the original SL semantics but limit the intelligibility of the original by the TL reader, while the target-orientated translation may be more communicatively efficient with the TL readership, but at the price of losing the semantic identity of the original message. (2004: 306-307; original punctuation)

Given the fundamental morpho-syntactic differences of Japanese and English, it would be easy to abandon detailed consideration of form, and rather focus on content, and that is what many translators appear to do, largely allowing the rules of English syntax and their own 'voice' to determine the presentation of the original content, and presumably losing something significant in the process. At the same time, slavish reproduction of formal characteristics is no substitute, as noted above, for capturing the

essence of the original. Despite their evidenced respective orientations towards the ST and TL, Seidensticker's and Holman's translations appear in the case study to be examples, albeit disparate ones, of a kind of 'middle way' between Nida's two poles of extremity. Comparing their approaches reveals useful insights into the translation process.

To conclude this section, I shall return to an earlier motif. One way to view translators is as guides along unknown paths. They have trodden the ground before us, and those with no maps (i.e., lacking facility in the original language) must implicitly trust their guidance. The route they lead us along gives an impression of the territory. The territory always remains the same, but a different guide will give a different impression of it. According to the sensibilities of our guide, sometimes the highway is the best route; other times it may be the shortcut. What matters is whether the route chosen does justice to the terrain. For when it comes to *literary* translation, it is not just getting us from A to B that counts, but also, to paraphrase Seidensticker in *The Izu Dancer*, the 'flavour of the journey' (§25).

1.3 Dances with Girls: Cultural and Linguistic Issues in Translating Kawabata's *Izu no odoriko*

I have outlined some of the broad-brush differences between Japanese and English, and between Seidensticker's and Holman's approach to translating *Izu no odoriko*. Next I shall expand the TS discussion to take a wider view of the translation issues addressed in this thesis.

It is remarkable how many academic papers have titles like that of this section: a punning or otherwise striking image ('Dances with Girls') lures the reader, while a more sober explanation follows the colon or dash ('Cultural and Linguistic Issues in Translating Kawabata's *Izu no odoriko*'). Academic writers try to achieve several things with such a title. First, they wish to catch one's attention. In this case, I have spared the reader a pun, instead deploying an arch cultural reference. One may be unfamiliar with Kawabata Yasunari's novella *Izu no odoriko*, one of whose title translations is *The Dancing Girl of Izu*; however, many readers will know the Oscar-winning movie *Dances with Wolves* (1990) starring Kevin Costner as a Civil War-era soldier who is assimilated into Sioux culture and adopts the name 'Dances with Wolves'. Someone familiar with both these works is likely to draw the conclusion that this section, unwontedly, will compare these two cultural artefacts, the jokey juxtaposition conveyed by the verbal parallel. However, unless one knows both sources, the combination of allusions is lost, so is it of any value in such a case?

One can argue convincingly that it is, because even without knowledge of its pop-cultural baggage it is still an intriguing title, especially when read in counterpoint with the subtitle. A question is evoked in the mind of the reader regarding the connection

between ‘dancing with girls’ and translation, even if one has no knowledge of either of the works referenced. The strength of an image or metaphor, and why so many paper titles contain one, is that a metaphor anchors the abstract in the concrete, giving one something physical on which to hang one’s ideas, and hence drawing the reader into the discussion at hand. Further, in acting as a conceptual link between two things, usually the concrete being the familiar and the abstract less familiar, the metaphor allows one to appreciate the unfamiliar better.

In a way, a translation does the same things. Metaphor, after all, comes from the Greek word *metaphora*, made up of *meta*, meaning ‘over’ and *pherein*, ‘to carry’ (Lux 1993: 683). Metaphor thus literally means carrying over something from one location to another, and we can regard translation—itself meaning ‘carried across’ in the Latin—as a similar act of transfer. Translation is often described, metaphorically, as a bridge between the known and the unknown language and culture.⁴⁶ In fact, a translation is itself an extended metaphor, because it sets up a close analogy to the ST that is acceptable to the TL reader. Being too literal simply gets in the way of transmission and may prevent one from being faithful to what Vermeer (1994: 11ff.) calls the “meta-meaning” of the text, or the way the text is intended to be received by the target audience. Peter Newmark might as well be talking about literary translation when he discusses metaphor in his paper ‘The Translation of Metaphor’:

[T]he main and one serious purpose of metaphor is to describe entities (objects or persons), events, qualities, concepts or states of mind more comprehensively, concisely, vividly, and in a more complex way, than is possible by using literal language. The second purpose of metaphor is to please, sometimes aesthetically, to entertain, to amuse, often to draw attention to a technical and ‘physical’ subject (to ‘humanize’ matter), therefore to clarify, often conceptually.

⁴⁶ Cf. Round (2005: 56). His work is an overview of the many metaphors that have been used to characterise or explain translation.

(1985: 295)

Metaphor is replication of the essence of something by using a repository with at least a superficial similarity to the original. Sometimes this may be formally similar—that is, similar in terms of form—but often it is rather similar in sense, i.e., metonymically (something associated) or synecdochically (a part standing for the whole). Thus by employing an overriding metaphor in this section—dances with girls—that uses a play on words to draw an analogy between a non-Western and a Western fictional work, I simultaneously demonstrate one interpretation of how literary translation works. It is not a perfect metaphor, because there is no one-to-one correspondence of structural and thematic elements between the translation of *Izu no odoriko* and the storyline of *Dances with Wolves*, and if I tried to take the parallels too far, it would be nonsense. But there are neither perfect metaphors, nor perfect translations; there are only workable ones.

An advantage to using the image of the translation as metaphor is the promise inherent in the prefix *meta*-. A metatext is not an imitation; it is at once a re-enactment of and a commentary on the original text (Bassnett 2002: 102). This removes the stigma of translation as some kind of inferior knock-off of the original that can only achieve validation if it is ‘faithful’ to the original; indeed, such stigma is likely to lead only to inferior translations that fail to capture the essence of the original, instead slavishly following its formal aspects. We recognise that a good metaphor, far from betraying the signified, enlightens us about it; in a similar way, a good translation provides access to the original’s ideas in a way that has not previously existed.

Here then are the instructive allusions I intend in the title ‘Dances with Girls’. First,

the plural element of ‘Dances with Girls’—multiple dances, multiple girls—bespeaks the plural translation identities of the original work: the translations are metatexts (Bassnett 2002: 102, 105) that create multiple dimensions in which the same characters are involved in the same events, but mediated by a different language, both linguistically and culturally speaking. They are not so much an illusion of the original as they are an alternate version of the original in a different culturo-linguistic dimension.

Next, translators, like the main character in *Dances with Wolves*, who enters Sioux territory, must adopt aspects of the world they access and bring them back into their own domains, inevitably changing both worlds in the same act. The world of the ST is changed because it cannot remain intact in the translation process; the world of the TL is changed because it receives a new text that contains traces of the ST world, culturally and linguistically (Bassnett 2002: 6; 48; 57), the latter at the very least in terms of phonetic representations of names. For centuries, translations have influenced their host culture (European translations of the Hebrew Bible being a salient example), and this continues to the present day.

But there are inherent risks for both source text and translator. The text risks being co-opted by the host culture and misrepresented (much as the protagonist of *Dances with Wolves* unwittingly draws the attention of the Union army towards the Native Americans that harbour him).⁴⁷ Translators, on the other hand, risk being misunderstood by their TL audience, and further risk losing their own creative identity and being labelled as ‘only’ a translator, a marginalisation that Venuti (1995) criticises at length in his aptly named *The Translator’s Invisibility*. The difference between the film’s

⁴⁷ Indeed, the conflict between coloniser and colonised in *Dances with Wolves* enacts something like what Venuti imputes to (domesticising) translation: “The ethnocentric violence of translation is inevitable: in the translating process, foreign languages, texts, and cultures will always undergo some degree and form of reduction, exclusion, inscription.” (1995: 310)

protagonist and translators is that they have a *skopos*, making a conscious decision from the outset to sojourn in the other culturo-linguistic world and bring back artefacts for their own domains to mull over and perhaps assimilate.

A third element contained in the title ‘Dances with Girls’ is the potential for misunderstanding, misattribution and misidentity on the part of translators and/or TL readers. ‘Dances with Wolves’ is short for the nominal relative construction ‘*One who dances with wolves*’, rather than the straightforward plural noun phrase it appears to be—and this misidentity is caused by the attempt to carry a grammatical structure from an indigenous language of the Americas into English, combined with the English reader’s non-contextualised interpretation of this via ‘normal’ (and normative) English grammatical parsing. Comparably, instances of ‘translationese’ betray either (a) an over-faithfulness to the form of the ST, which interferes with TT style (exemplified by awkward sentence structures, repetitiousness, contradiction, over-foreignisation, misrepresentations due to *faux amis*, and so on),⁴⁸ or (b) excessive fidelity to the form of the TL, which attenuates ST style and/or content (exemplified by lack of authorial voice or tone (the ‘flavour’ of the text), extreme homogeneity, flatness, over-domestication, and loss of detail).⁴⁹ Additionally, the more translators identify with the SL and ST, the less they may be able to empathise with the TL readers. This situation is personified in *Dances with Wolves* in the form of the white woman who is kidnapped by Sioux Native Americans as a child, and is so acculturated that she has virtually forgotten her cultural background and native language.

Let us revisit the word ‘style’ in this context. At the textual/discourse level, literary

⁴⁸ Cf. Newmark (1991:78-86). Nida (1964) originated this usage of the term.

⁴⁹ Baker uses the term ‘normalisation’ for how translation tends to “exaggerate features of the target language and to conform to its typical patterns” (1996: 183). See also Venuti (1995: 1ff.) and Laviosa (2002: 58-73).

style is sometimes a manifestation of what Fowler terms “defamiliarization” (1986: 37): formal foregrounding through parallelism such as rhythmic patterning that tends to promote cohesion in a text. Fowler borrows Jakobson’s “poetic principle” to avoid the term style and explain the power of formal patterning:

Two or more linguistic units, of whatever kind, which have some paradigmatic relationship, are placed in the sequence of the text in such a way that this relationship is clearly perceptible in addition to whatever syntagmatic relationship the items may have. In this way an extra layer of structure is created over and above the structure of the text as ‘sensible communication’. (1986: 75-76)

In the case of sound-related textual features such as rhythm, alliteration and euphony, “[t]he foregrounded sounds are not just a palpable musical texture; they are also an invitation to make meaning” (1986: 76). The semantic content not only of form but also function is more likely to be overlooked in prose than poetry translation,⁵⁰ yet as Fowler indicates here, form is part of the meaning of the ST and therefore should be addressed in the TT. However, as the two poles of translationese show, this is a difficult task, one made trickier the further apart two languages are philologically and culturally.

Fourth, one can take the concept of ‘dance’ further in this conceit by seeing it as a metaphor for semantic negotiation at various levels. While it may have been uncustomary, or even semi-taboo, for the viewer to interact directly with the dancer in the world of *Izu no odoriko* by physically dancing with her, neither would it have been the ‘done thing’ to engage with her and her family to the extent of travelling with them, which is exactly what the protagonist does. Because of this boundary-challenging

⁵⁰ Bassnett: “[L]ess research on translating prose as opposed to poetry exists, probably due to the widespread erroneous notion that a novel is somehow a simpler structure than a poem”. (2002: 110.)

relationship, the I-narrator and dancing girl are, one could say, engaged in a complex semiotic choreography: a negotiation of social norms and personal interests, a volatile mix of status, sexuality, desire, respect, curiosity, and so on, in a culture of its time and place—early 20th-century Japan—that still particularly values the unsaid.

When the dancing girl offers her cushion to the student narrator at the teahouse; awkwardly serves him tea; keeps the same physical distance between herself and the narrator on the steep path, no matter how fast he walks; dusts off his robe on the mountain peak; searches out a spring for him; fetches him a walking stick; waves to him while bathing; serves him tea; plays *go* with him; sulks silently in front of him when her mother denies them a trip to the movies; and finally when she farewells him mutely at the ferry, waving her poignant white rag—these key moments define their relationship, and yet the verbal element is minimal. Indeed, the very act of attempting to articulate their tentative relationship would have precluded it, which is in fact foreshadowed in the thwarted movie-going incident.

In a way, the source text and the target-language reader have a similar tentative but good-natured relationship, and the translator is acting like a 仲人 *nakōdo*, or go-between, attempting to guide the two without being either too vague or too overt about it, for whichever of these extremes would lead to rupture of the discourse. The go-between initiates the relationship between the dancing partners, but must make it seem like they came together on their own. (Nida (1964: 167), as mentioned earlier, described the translator successful when s/he is “invisible”, such comments against which Venuti is reacting.) Only rarely can a word of explicit guidance (i.e., supplementary exposition or commentary in the text) be permitted, for if too overt it will break the suspension of disbelief on the part of the reader, and bring the artfully fictional dance to an abrupt stop.

A fifth and final aspect of translation that can be gleaned from ‘Dances with Girls’ is the duality of predetermination versus improvisation. Like a dance, translation is a process that combines convention with idiolect, rote method with extemporisation, conscious and unconscious choices. To expand: first, a translation is an artefact of the translator’s cultural, linguistic and temporal background. Translators follow or ignore their culture’s norms and conventions, but in either case respond to them. Second, translators almost mechanically make certain ST→TT transformations such as adding articles to nouns, but when faced with a novel translation problem, they are forced to be creative. Third, to look at this process in another way, translating is a combination of unconscious (conditioned) and conscious (conditional: i.e., a response to particular circumstances) choices. Thus the translator is barely aware of adding articles, but is all too aware of having to deal with the peculiar challenges of a particular text.

1.4 The Quandary of Disambiguation in Japanese-to-English Literary Translation

Having in the preceding sections established some ways to look at the case texts through the lens of translation studies, and having considered some of the challenges of Japanese-to-English translation, it is time now to focus on the act of translating itself, and how this informs the translation process (which is, of course, considerably more than just the act of translating). Disambiguation is at the heart of the translating act, deeply embedded as it is in the paradigm–syntagm relationship, and disambiguation is doubly important when translating out of a language that discourages explicit grammatical subjects and objects into one that positively demands them. Game theory has a helpful role to play in situating the issue of disambiguation⁵¹ in JE translation in a sociolinguistic context.

Another image from *Izu no odoriko* may help to set the scene for this context. Halfway through the story, the student narrator is spending the evening at an inn playing the Japanese board game *go* with an elderly merchant. At one point, the troupe of travelling entertainers comes into the room, and immediately he begins to lose concentration on his game, and soon loses the game itself. (Most likely this is on purpose, so that he can turn his attention to the visitors, in particular the dancing girl.) Eventually the merchant retires for the night, and the student ends up using the *go* board to play a simpler game, *gomokunarabe*, or five-in-a-row, with the entertainers.

Within this scene we can descry a further metaphor relevant to translation studies. There is the transition from one *game* to another, with a corresponding change of rules, but the *board* remains the same—a nineteen-by-nineteen matrix of lines with 361 points

⁵¹ Disambiguation is dealt with more fully in **2.1.1 Ambiguity**.

of intersection at which pieces, or stones, can be placed. This immutable board provides the context for and regulates the moves of both games.

We can view the student narrator as a translator of sorts, a mediator between the two cultures of the well-off merchant and the impoverished entertainers, represented by the games *go* and *gomokunarabe* respectively. And we can equally use the image of the uniting element, the *go* board, to stand for a sociolinguistic aspect of translation studies: what sociologist Pierre Bourdieu referred to as a *textual grid*. Gentzler sums up this notion as “the collection of acceptable literary forms and genres in which texts can be expressed” (Bassnett & Lefevere 1998: *xiii*).⁵² This grid thus represents the overall system of interdependent structures that constitute what is commonly accepted as ‘literature’. No matter what game—in other words, culturo-linguistic duality—may be played out on the grid, a similar set of universal human expectations about literary norms applies. Thus whatever language it may appear in, *Izu no odoriko* can be uncontroversially described as a first-person coming-of-age novella, divided into seven sections.

While the board-as-textual-grid analogy begins to break down when pressed further—after all, the way the second game is played bears little resemblance to that of the first, whereas it is expected that any translation will bear some resemblance to the original story—it is a useful opening gambit, as it were, for considering game theory itself in the analysis of the translating process.

In his 1966 paper ‘Translation as a Decision Process’, the Czech theoretician Jiří Levý drew upon the branch of applied mathematics called game theory to elucidate the

⁵² Gentzler goes on: “For example, Chinese novels have their own set of rules, rules which differ from the ways in which novels in Europe tend to be constructed. These ‘grids’ cause patterns of expectations in the respective audiences, and both practising translators and in particular literary historians need to take into consideration such grids in order to better produce and/or analyse translations.” (Bassnett & Lefevere 1998: *xiii*.)

decision-making process that translators enact at the moment they choose within the possible set of word choices relevant at a particular point in the translation. It is worth quoting Levý directly on his rationale for this approach:

From the point of view of the working situation of the translator at any moment of his work [...], translating is a DECISION PROCESS: a series of a certain number of consecutive situations—moves, as in a game—situations imposing on the translator the necessity of choosing among a certain (and very often exactly definable) number of alternatives. (Levý 1966: 1171; original emphasis)

The possible alternatives delimited by the textual grid are what he calls “definitional instructions”. The criteria the translator employs to make a choice from within this set he calls “selective instructions” (1966: 1173). These criteria may be linguistic, cultural or in some cases personal. Reinvoking the central image, one can state that the definitional instructions indicate all *possible* moves at a given moment in the game, while the selective instructions suggest the *optimal* moves based on the context.

Another way to define definitional and selective instructions is as linguistic *rules* and *conventions* respectively. Merton talks of the “four modalities of normative force”: “prescriptions, proscriptions, preferences and permissions” (Hermans 1999: 83)—in other words, what you must do/say; what you must not do/say; what you can or are recommended to do/say; and what you may or are tolerated to do/say. Prescriptions and proscriptions define the rules of a language (for example, set grammatical structures that cannot be altered), while preferences and permissions form a loose set of conventions, which *may* be ignored, but probably should not be, depending on one’s audience. Paradigmatic and syntagmatic examples from Japanese and English serve to illustrate the distinction:

Table 1: Rules of the ‘games’

| Japanese | English |
|---|---|
| Paradigmatic | |
| No explicit grammatical subject required. Example: 昨日鹿を見た。 <i>Kinō shika o mita.</i> *‘Yesterday [...] saw [...] deer.’ | Explicit grammatical subject required. Example: Yesterday <u>I</u> saw a deer. (The ambiguity must be resolved in English.) |
| Syntagmatic | |
| In hypotactic (subordinate) sentences or clause sequences, the subordinate clause must precede the main clause. Example: 昨日鹿を見たから嬉しかった。 <i>Kinō shika o mita kara ureshikatta.</i> ‘Yesterday I saw a deer so I was glad.’ *嬉しかったから昨日鹿を見た。 * <i>Ureshikatta kara kinō shika o mita.</i> *‘I was glad so yesterday I saw a deer.’ | In hypotactic (subordinate) sentences or clauses, subordinate and main clauses may appear in either order. Example: Yesterday I saw a deer so I was glad. I was glad because I saw a deer yesterday. |

Table 2: Conventions of the ‘games’

| Japanese | English |
|---|--|
| Paradigmatic | |
| <i>Keigo</i> polite language (such as nominal prefixes <i>go-</i> and <i>o-</i> and verbal suffix <i>-masu</i>) is used to indicate level of civility and social distance. Example: これはお風呂でございます。 <i>Kore wa ofuro de gozaimasu.</i> ‘This is the bath.’ (But it would not be <i>grammatically incorrect</i> to say これは風呂だ。 <i>Kore wa furo da.</i> ‘This is the bath’, only rude in certain circumstances.) | No verb suffixes or nominal prefixes indicate politeness level. (However, the modal verb ‘would’ can sometimes be used to indicate politeness.) Example: This is the bath. (‘This would be the bath’ would have another meaning entirely.) |
| Syntagmatic | |
| Paratactic (coordinate) syntax acceptable in expressing causal relations. Example: 昨日鹿を見て嬉しかった。 <i>Kinō shika o mite ureshikatta.</i> ‘Yesterday [I] saw a deer and was glad.’ (But one could also say 昨日鹿を見たから嬉しかった <i>Kinō shika o mita kara ureshikatta</i> , as above.) | Paratactic (coordinate) syntax not always desirable in expressing causal relations Example: ?Yesterday I saw a deer and (I) was glad. (But it would be more acceptable to say the following: ‘Yesterday I was late for work and I had to run.’) |

When we recreate an utterance in the act of translating, and move from one set of rules and conventions to another, the evaluation process must be re-enacted, under a new set of prescriptions, proscriptions, preferences and permissions. The treatment of the title 『伊豆の踊子』 *Izu no odoriko* is an example. I shall ignore the possibility of replacing the original title with something entirely different—a type of cultural-conversion strategy common enough in itself⁵³—and imagine that we are attempting to recreate the original in some form. 伊豆 *Izu*, being a place name, is invariant, and thus the corresponding English translation paradigm set is practically limited to its transliteration, or its omission (Ø).⁵⁴ の *no* is a possessive marker, and hence the translation paradigm set contains ‘s’ (apostrophe-s), ‘of’ and Ø. 踊子 *odoriko*’s translational paradigm set contains, as its most obvious members, ‘dancer’ and ‘dancing girl’. On top of this, English’s set of definitional instructions includes the probable necessity of an article, an irrelevance in the original Japanese language, which does not use articles. The paradigm for articles is (at least) ‘the’ (the most likely choice in the title of a work), ‘a’, and Ø (unlikely with a singular countable noun such as ‘girl’ or ‘dancer’, although titling conventions sometimes allow a zero article for brevity’s sake).⁵⁵ Finally, another English selective instruction is the convention of capitalisation of the first and main words in titles. These paradigms combined with the relevant selective instructions hence present us with a finite set of combinations, namely:

⁵³ For example, Seidensticker’s translation of Tanizaki’s novel’s title 『細雪』 *Sasameyuki* ‘light snow’ as *The Makioka Sisters* (1995a).

⁵⁴ Occasionally one might observe the substitution of a better-known place-name that is either more specific (hyponymic) or general (superordinate) to the area.

⁵⁵ Of course, we could widen this set, with a good enough reason, to include ‘this’, ‘that’, ‘those’, ‘a certain’, ‘some’, and so on, but such deictics are more likely to mark the title in a distracting way, and without good reason in this case.

- Dancer, A Dancer, The Dancer
- Dancing Girl, A Dancing Girl, The Dancing Girl
- Izu Dancer, An Izu Dancer, The Izu Dancer
- Izu's Dancer
- Dancer of Izu, A Dancer of Izu, The Dancer of Izu
- Izu Dancing Girl, An Izu Dancing Girl, The Izu Dancing Girl
- Izu's Dancing Girl
- Dancing Girl of Izu, A Dancing Girl of Izu, The Dancing Girl of Izu

Our set of syntagmatic permutations of possible lexical concatenations has generated a paradigm set for the title, governed by the definitional instructions listed above. Now the translator must use his or her set of selective instructions to make a final choice from within this. Most possibilities will be immediately rejected for their awkwardness or inapplicability to the context of the work as a whole. For example, the selective instruction that is the convention of using “The” in eponymous titles immediately culls the possibilities down to just eight: *The Dancer*, *The Dancing Girl*, *The Izu Dancer*, *Izu's Dancer*, *The Dancer of Izu*, *The Izu Dancing Girl*, *Izu's Dancing Girl* and *The Dancing Girl of Izu*. I have already considered the possible rationale for the professional translators' final choices of *The Izu Dancer* (Seidensticker) and *The Dancing Girl of Izu* (Holman).

Crucially, such a decision-making process not only affects that discrete point in the translation, but also consequent decisions, creating a decision chain in much the same way that a move one makes in many board games influences all subsequent moves. In other words, one particular translation decision shuts out all other potential alternatives at that point, and further eliminates myriad subsequent choices that could have flowed

from the alternatives. The main reason for this ongoing process of exclusivity is the simultaneously multilayered and linear way in which language works: the paradigmatic and syntagmatic process of selection and combination discussed above. Without a paradigm, one would have nothing to articulate, and without a syntagm, one would have no way to articulate.

The grid, or board in my conceit, is a matrix of possible progressions, but in practice, of course, as the above example illustrates, it is not so much the board as the game (that is, a specific language and culture) that determines the realisation of those possibilities into the definite patterns that constitute ‘play’: that is, (re-)writing. A further complication, which Levý sidesteps in his paper by confining the concept of the game to a one-player decision process, is that a game often implies competition: losers and winners. In terms of game theory, the classic example is the zero-sum game, with a polar combination of win (value +1) and loss (-1) in which the sum always comes out to zero. But should one, in fact, view translation in this way? Can there be said to be winners and losers?

Well, if one is to retain conventions and standards—in other words to view translation from a normative point of view—then the answer is yes. If ‘anything goes’, and all that counts is participating (i.e., creating a text for consumption), how can one judge whether or not a translation is a fair representation of the original?

A set of consequential questions follows. If translation is a competitive game, who is the translator playing against? The original author, who is competing with the translator for recognition of authenticity? Other translators of the same text into the same language, who are competing in the same marketplace?⁵⁶ The original text itself (Levý’s

⁵⁶ It can hardly be regarded as a coincidence that Seidensticker chose to publish his retranslation of *Izu no odoriko* the year before Holman’s version; and, as Holman’s earlier comments suggest, it is exceedingly

‘prototext’), which competes with the translation (the ‘metatext’)?⁵⁷ The language and culture in which the text appears, which may resist the ‘intrusion’ of a text that has extra-linguistic and extra-cultural origins? Literary critics, who may take a translation to task for inadequately representing the original? Perhaps members of the target-language readership, who are ready to reject the translation if it does not appeal to them? Or are translators in fact playing against themselves, fighting the unconscious tendencies and tendentiousness that could colour or even distort the style and content of the original to an unacceptable degree?⁵⁸ The answers to most of these questions depend on the norms within which translators operate.

Among the moves that the translator must make in the translating process, the act of disambiguation is a crucial one. The varying degrees of “lexical segmentation” (Levý’s (1966: 1175) term for range and demarcation of shades of meaning) in the two languages ensure that at certain points in the translating process translators must choose among several lexical choices in their target vocabulary,⁵⁹ or, even more likely, among several *strings* of lexical elements. This means they must reduce the readers’ range of possible interpretations in a way that was unnecessary for the original ST readers.

likely that he was spurred to do a new translation because he thought he could better represent Kawabata’s work to TL readers.

⁵⁷ See Hatim (2001: 57ff.) for a description of metatexts in translation.

⁵⁸ While such normative issues are significant in shaping both translators’ metatexts and readers’ reactions to them, another productive perspective is to view translation as a so-called coordination game rather than a zero-sum game. In a coordination game, the players work together to achieve a mutually beneficial outcome. If we consider that authors are usually not in an antagonistic position regarding someone who wishes to interpret their work in good faith, then it makes sense to see the translator and original author as collaborators in the creation of a pan-linguistic, pan-cultural work in re-presenting it to a new, otherwise inaccessible audience, where the goal of their coordination game is simply to complete the decision-making process in a way that observers—bilingual and monolingual readers, critics, and so on—consider acceptable.

⁵⁹ When the lexical segmentation of a SL term is narrower than that of the equivalent TL paradigm set, then the translator will need to select among more elements than were available to the original author, which has the potential for mischaracterising the ST.

Ambiguity complicates Levý's assertion that the translating decision process can be defined as a "GAME WITH COMPLETE INFORMATION" (1966: 1172).⁶⁰ As we shall see with the excerpts from *Izu no odoriko*, translating is not in fact a game with complete information. The reason is that, although the original text is invariant, and thus in a sense all the 'moves' have already been made and are there for anyone who can read Japanese to see, the original text presents instances of lexical and sequential ambiguity that make it impossible to ascertain the purpose of the move (i.e., authorial intent) that the original player (the author) made.⁶¹ In this sense, translation differs from a game like chess, where the purpose of certain moves may be ambiguous at a *particular moment* of play, but subsequent moves resolve this ambiguity. Some textual ambiguities are never resolved, remaining what one might term 'opaque fossilised nodes' in the text.

Another reason why translation is not a game with complete information is that some of the information on both the ST and TL sides changes with time. The original text comes to be viewed differently even in its own cultural context as time passes, and equally the expectations of the target domain change periodically: thus too do the rules and conventions on both sides.

Hence we need to revisit Levý's characterisation of the translator's decision-making process in the light of the literary text's sociolinguistic and temporal contexts, issues that were not as prominent in the 1960s when he wrote. Several points must be considered here that extend the definition of the game from that of the activity simply of

⁶⁰ I retain here Levý's original emphasis: "[T]he process of translating has the form of a GAME WITH COMPLETE INFORMATION—a game in which every succeeding move is influenced by the knowledge of previous decisions and by the situation which resulted from them [...]."

⁶¹ Here one should distinguish between constructive ambiguity (polysemy) and destructive ambiguity (indeterminacy). The former is likely intended (though as indicated earlier, not all semantic or formal patterning may be conscious on the part of the author), the latter unintended. See 2.1.1 for a detailed discussion of ambiguity in the ST.

translating the words on a page to the players (translators in their context) engaging in the ‘game’ of translating a text (with both the act of translating and the text itself embedded in their own cultural contexts). Hermans notes that Holmes expands Levý’s conception of the decision-making process to include wider issues:

In considering the relation between a translation and its source Holmes elaborates Levý’s idea of translating as decision-making into a two-plane model. His argument is that translators proceed not only serially, making one decision after another as they work through a source text, but also structurally, on the basis of a mental map of the prospective target text. Discussions of translation issues should therefore take into account the interplay between a whole set of factors comprising language, literary tradition or ‘literary intertext’ (the term is Julia Kristeva’s), and socio-cultural situation [...]. (1999: 25)

The moment a translator fixes a translation in place actually only marks the mid-point of a decision-making chain that began when s/he agreed to take on the translation project, and continued with the translator’s research into and cultural contextualisation of the text, including reading and re-reading of the text prior to rewriting it.⁶² The translating process itself is still in the middle of the chain, because conscientious translators are likely to revisit their versions multiple times to ensure that the translation both closely corresponds to the ST and is readable in the TL. Then of course the text passes to the editor and/or publisher, who are likely to revise it again based on their perception of target-culture expectations.

The decision-making in the first rewriting is informed by a number of factors—Chesterman’s ‘expectation norms’. First, through the process of reading the original and possibly perusing biographical information about the writer and his or her national and

⁶² On rewriting, see Lefevere (1992), e.g.: “Translation is, of course, a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way.” (1992: vii.)

cultural context, the translator has probably decided the genre of writing that is involved. The editor/publisher may also have characterised the writing, and encouraged the translator to view it within this framework. The simple classification of the writing as literature binds the translator to a higher level of ‘respect’ for the original form of the writing than might be expected if the work were of some other kind (say, a formulaic page-turner or, more distantly, a computer manual), and constrains his or her diction choices accordingly (Munday 2009: 34). Further, in reading the original text, the translator will have picked up on certain formal cues that might be seen to characterise the original author’s prose (‘idiolect’). S/he will have come to certain conclusions about the feasibility of conveying these characteristics in the rewriting. If any features are deemed untranslatable *in toto*, a number of choice pathways will have already been occluded before the first phrase is rewritten in the target language. The translator will have assessed the best way to render the remaining ‘translatable’ features, and will attempt to achieve this in his or her first rewriting act. At the same time, however, the translator will be conscious of the expectations of the new audience: that the text ‘read’ well, that it come across as as worthy of consideration as the genre ‘literature in translation’ implies.

In the first translating ‘pass’, translators are likely to focus on choices that nail down the superstructure of the whole, constructing a solid base that can be more finely sculpted in subsequent passes. Less attention to formal details, or, at least, their *consistency*, will be paid at the early stages, unless the style of the original is overtly unorthodox, and hence crucial to conveying the prose. One can posit that as translators lock in the form, they close off alternatives at the microlevel that can contradict the macrolevel (though this may not be fully achieved).

This section has considered how the ‘moves’ the original writer and the translator make are circumscribed, and to some extent constrained, by the “interplay” (Hermans 1999: 25) of rules (‘definitional instructions’) and conventions (‘selective instructions’) of the literary ‘game’ peculiar to each language and culture within which the (re)writer operates (Levý 1966:1173). The issue of disambiguation is particularly germane when working from Japanese to English, due to the different linguistic expectations. (The examination of ambiguity continues in **2.1.1.**)

In the next and concluding section of Chapter One I examine how I have attempted to analyse the translation process, beginning by translating *Izu no odoriko* myself under various sets of such selective instructions as outlined above and then moving to a comparison of Seidensticker’s and Holman’s versions using qualitative data analysis.

1.5 Case-study Translations and Analytical Methodology

1.5.1 My translations

Several objectives led me to translate the entire ST myself, and in three different ways, in preparation for my analyses. First, I wanted to put myself in the position of the professional translators, observing how my mind was working as I processed the original work and then attempted to render it in English. Second, having noted, as Tobias does, a distinct difference in Seidensticker's and Holman's approaches, roughly corresponding with Nida's ideas of dynamic and formal equivalence, I felt it useful to attempt to recreate their approaches by adopting first a ST-orientated and then a TL-orientated stance.⁶³ Third, a 'literary' translation represents my intuitive response to both their approaches, a kind of 'middle path' incorporating aspects that appealed to me.

The texts of these translations themselves are not a part of the thesis because of length limitations, but the process of working on them has significantly informed my identification and analysis of SL features and TL translation acts. Thus the present work can be regarded as its own response to the ST and TTs, wherein Chapters Two and Three are a micro-level, ST-orientated analytical response, and parts of Chapter Four a macro-level, TL-orientated analytical response, culminating in my conclusions and arguments for more conscious application and care in translation approaches.

In undertaking each translation I established different translation criteria (what Levý called "selective instructions" (1966: 1173)). My first translation, an ST-orientated one, attempted to retain as much of the form and semantic content of the original text as

⁶³ Not SL-orientated, for that would be too broad to consider; and not TT-orientated, because at the point of translation no target text existed, and instead I was imagining the target readership and feeling the constraint of the attendant "expectancy norms" (Chesterman 1997). I describe Holman's approach as SL-orientated because I assume he brings the same fundamental approach to other works he translates.

possible while abiding by the rules of English grammar and syntax. I adopted the following set of protocols as my selective translating instructions:

1. Preserve ST word and clause order to the extent that TL syntax allows.
 2. Use any readily available TL dictionary definitions (i.e., do not limit translations to just the most frequent terms), but do not freely interpret beyond that (including shifting features to other lexical items).
 3. Preserve ST Japan-specific vocabulary, where there is no specific TL equivalent.
 4. Preserve idiomatic forms and imagery as much as possible, but use dictionary equivalents where they exist (i.e., use culturally equivalent TL expressions where the ST idiom is used in a standard way).
 5. Preserve pronunciations of Japan-specific vocabulary using romanisation (including macrons for long vowels).
 6. Preserve ST punctuation and paragraphing.
- (Most of the above approximates Nida's 'formal (functional) equivalence'.)

My second translation was a TL-orientated translation, wherein the *skopos* was to write sentences that read as naturally and fluidly in English as possible, as long as I did not distort the overall meaning of the original. Here are the protocols I adopted:

1. Focus on readability and fluency in the TL.
2. Aim to reproduce the effect on the TL reader that the ST has on the SL reader (Nida's 'dynamic equivalence').
3. Render foreign idioms, concepts and objects in cultural equivalents where possible.
4. Alter sentences and paragraphing where this helps (1).

The ‘literary’ translation attempted to balance the objectives of fidelity to the content and form of the ST and to the conventions of English literary prose. My guiding protocol was to replicate the form and content of the ST while maintaining TL literary conventions—without excessively favouring one orientation over the other.

Each translation was an opportunity to dwell on the vast series of decisions that translators must make in the act of translating. Among the differences between my process and that of professional translators were (a) that I focused specifically on how one cognitively approaches potentially problematic nodes in the text, and the transformation decisions that attend this process, and (b) that I was not constrained by the expectation norms around later publication for a wider public.

Early in the translation process I observed that—when working between Japanese and English, at least—it appeared clearly easier either to locate a formally similar expression (i.e., to conform to the original) or to elide and conflate (i.e., to diverge formally from the original) than it was to identify an expression that straddles both formal and semantic elements (i.e., a compromise). While I had moments of intuitive lucidity in which form and function melded at first attempt, such a commingling often required several ‘passes’ at fashioning the expression, with the conscious intent to achieve compromise. This cognitive tendency towards the SL or TL pole in the initial moment of response to the ST utterance might be one reason why the translations of Seidensticker and Holman, working as professionals, have come to rest at distinctly divergent points on the $SL \leftrightarrow TL$ -orientated continuum despite many respective moments of seeming reversal of approaches or conflation of techniques, as shall be exemplified in the following chapters.

One unusual feature of the case study—Seidensticker’s retranslation, which

attracted my attention to the work in the first place—also contributed to my analysis of the translation process. The circumstances of this retranslation have been outlined above, but their implications for textual analysis extend well beyond my earlier comments. First, by noting the changes that Seidensticker makes to his text, one learns about his relationship both with the ST and with the TL audience. He not only corrects typographical errors,⁶⁴ restores whole scenes and individual sentences that he had excised from the original,⁶⁵ and puts back smaller, but significant, modifying elements such as adjectives and adverbial phrases,⁶⁶ he also updates the language.⁶⁷ But his translation is also notable for what he does not change: some modifiers remain absent, and some textual liberties left unconstrained.

Focusing on Seidensticker's revisions could constitute a complete study on its own, but that is not the focus in this work. Furthermore, Seidensticker, apart from making up for the initial egregious omissions, largely maintains his TL-orientated approach in his retranslation. Thus I only allude in my analysis to Seidensticker's first translation ('S1') where it raises an important point about Seidensticker's approach to the ST; at other times, I reference his second translation by default. (When both translations appear

⁶⁴ §35, 70, 297, 504. Also, in §135 the meaning is reversed: "I felt the excitement [...] begin to mount." → "I felt the excitement [...] subside." §211-212 "six or seven" people is corrected to "seven or eight"; 222-223: the dancing girl's age is revised from "fifteen or sixteen" to the actual (adjusted for the old Japanese counting system) "sixteen or seventeen".

⁶⁵ §37-49, 51-52, 71-72, 87-88, 126, 136-147, 154, 156-162, 166-167, 214, 233, 236-237, 239-249, 251-254, 334-335, 341-349, 352, 354-356, 366-368, 378-379, 434, 435, 466-477, 479-481, 487, 499, 526-530, 579-595, 604, 628.

⁶⁶ E.g., §1: S1: "A SHOWER swept toward me from the foot of the mountain, touching the cedar forests white, as the road began to wind up into the pass." (Original emphasis.) → S2: "With alarming speed, a shower swept toward me from the foot of the mountain, touching the cedar forests white as the road began to wind up into the pass."

⁶⁷ Some lexical examples: S1 "tea-house" → S2 "teahouse" (*passim*.); §128 "straw carpeting" → "straw matting"; §179 "harmlessly gay" → "harmless merriment"; §191 "who would be with her the rest of the night?" → "who would be sullyng her through the rest of the night?"; §206 "Natives." → "Locals."

together, they will be differentiated as ‘S1’ and ‘S2’.)

1.5.2 Categorisation of the ST-feature/TT-issue taxonomy

The categories themselves coalesced over many hours of engagement with the source text while writing the three translation variants, and then through multiple readings of the professional translations. During this long process I processed my observations into sets of features accompanied by comments on the issues I perceived in the ST and TTs as I engaged with them.

By ‘feature’ I mean an element of the SL, as manifested in the ST, which is markedly different in form and/or usage to a corresponding element in the TL, as manifested in the TT. In other words, the features confine themselves to aspects of the Japanese language that contrast with analogous aspects in the English language (and the English language only), and are limited to those exemplified in *Izu no odoriko*. My criteria in establishing a feature were that it must both be linked with a problematic translation issue and recur within the ST. (While I logged all examples of the features that I could identify, I did not consider all instances necessarily problematic per se.) By ‘issue’ I mean a potentially problematic consequence of this feature for JE translation.

Further, the use of such negatively phrased feature categories as ‘No Plural Marker’ is not an imputation of some lack or deficiency to either language, rather merely an acknowledgement of difference in structure and inflection between Japanese and English. However, since I am working in English I am naturally employing English-centric grammatical terms, some of which understandably have no direct equivalent in Japanese, and conversely there are some features of Japanese for which no appropriate grammatical term exists in English. Having said that, many part-of-speech categories

remain analogous between the two languages. As Miller notes, trying to force Japanese to adhere to Euro-centric grammar is nonsensical (1986: 78); but at the same time, one can leverage these terms to expedite comparative analysis.

At the end of my translation work and scrutiny of the ST and TTs, I had compiled a list of more than 80 features, both linguistic and cultural, divided further into paradigmatic and syntagmatic categories. I came to theorise that the more features from my list that appeared in any given sentence in the source text (what I term its ‘density of co-occurrence’), the more problematic it might be to translate.

I used the qualitative-data-analysis software package ‘NVivo’, designed for organising the features of large and multiple texts, to encode the features and display them so that I could see where they co-occurred with the highest level of density. The manufacture QSR International created NVivo (originally ‘NUD*IST’’) to help researchers process data obtained in the field, particularly interview transcriptions, as well as related texts. One imports key text files (in my case the table of parallel texts of *Izu no odoriko* and its translations that appear in the attached CD-ROM Appendices) and then creates a set of Nodes (which can be arranged, as I did, hierarchically in a tree structure) that represent the particular labels one wishes to impose on parts of the text file(s). NVivo keeps track of such node encoding, allowing the user to generate lists of all such encoded features.

I found the categorisation process itself dynamic, with every encoding challenging each category choice I had made, inevitably leading to many changes that rippled throughout the structure and reconfigured it. The process of sub-categorisation, and hence the establishment of perceived hierarchies of features, interrogated these categories again, resulting in further alterations. Ultimately I ended up with 80 features,

the sum of independent features plus sub-categories under the rubric of more general categories. (See **Appendices Table 1** for the features arranged alphabetically and hierarchically with frequency data.)

The overall biaxial rubric of syntagm versus paradigm overlaid with linguistic versus cultural features imposes an approach that is necessarily both limited in scope and subjective, as it is entirely based on an individual's responses to a small number of texts, and hence a relatively small corpus. Further, despite double-checking, I have almost certainly overlooked and/or miscategorised examples of features in the text due to its length and the difficulty of maintaining vigilance across the 80 categories.

80 categories is also too many to consider in depth in a work of this length. I have had to prioritise my selections; only those features marked in bold in **Appendices Table 1**—nine paradigmatic and 10 syntagmatic, a total of 19—are detailed, although I refer to a few more in passing. Nonetheless, those presented here are among the highest-frequency linguistic features (see frequency counts in the same table), or especially difficult to render in the TL, arguably making them as a whole responsible for the majority of translation problems, and thus are an excellent starting point for such an interlingual analysis. Furthermore, having identified 80 categories and logged most examples of them from the ST, I have created a corpus database that could provide a resource for future research into those aspects of JE translation that fall outside the scope of the present work.

Some people may question my placement of certain features, and, indeed, the schema itself, noting, for example, that 'Ambiguity' straddles both paradigmatic and syntagmatic axes; wondering why 'No Plural Marker' is considered paradigmatic, while the presence of clause-final particles is not; and debating whether 'Passive Voice' is a

linguistic or cultural phenomenon. My response is that, first, ambiguity can take both lexical and structural forms, and thus is relevant to both axes, but, from the analytical standpoint of this work, most other features play a predominantly paradigmatic or syntagmatic role. Second, my rule of thumb for categorising features is that if an item is part of a set of word- or phrase-rank lexical alternatives (for example ‘the dancing girl’ and ‘the dancer’), then it is an instance of a paradigmatic feature; if, however, it is manifested as a fixed item that has semantic value only when attached to other words (like Clause Extent Marker *hodo*), or is a textual phenomenon that cannot be defined without reference to more than one lexical item (like Repetition) then it is a syntagmatic feature. (Naturally, all context-bound features such as conjunctions and hedges fall into this category.) As for the last concern, I make a distinction between linguistic and cultural features in the introduction to Chapter Two before proceeding to focus on linguistic features.

Whatever the limits of this analytical framework, it remains, at least, *systematic*, its corpus covering as it does an entire, substantial and well-known literary text and its translations. In that respect this taxonomy remains, as far as my research indicates, unique in Japanese-to-English literary translation studies to date.

The **Appendices Parallel Text** arranges the ST, Seidensticker’s translations and Holman’s translation in columns. I have divided the ST into 632 sentences and numbered them. Sentences within quotation marks (「 」) standing by themselves are considered separate sentences, and quoted sentences embedded within a regular sentence are considered part of the one larger sentence. All examples taken from the ST or TTs contain the ST sentence number (§*n*) for ease of reference.

I have used the sentence as the base unit for analysis—what Catford calls ‘sentence

rank' (1965: 25)—because (a) it contains more information than a phrase, and is less unwieldy than a paragraph; (b) it allows for a manageable number of textual divisions in the corpus; (c) it is the smallest unit allowing proper consideration of the syntagm; (d) it is the smallest unit realistically allowing assessment of stylistic/formal prose features; and (e) it has a clear TT counterpart (though this may shift a little depending on whether the translator splits or combines ST sentences), allowing for ready comparison of break points in the text.⁶⁸

⁶⁸ Many paradigmatic features, however, are isolated within a word or phrase in a given sentence, so the rest of the sentence may not always be relevant to the analysis.

Chapter One Conclusion

At the beginning of this chapter I outlined the sources of inspiration for this thesis: the seeming lack of academic investigation of JE translation issues and the unusual translatorial legacy of Kawabata's *Izu no odoriko* that renders it a fertile ground for exploring such issues. Next I delimited the objectives and scope of the thesis, and outlined what each chapter treats.

Section 1.1 provided a background to JE translation, using the first sentence of *Izu no odoriko* as a touchstone for some of the major issues and pieces of terminology.

In 1.2, I employed the image 'highways and shortcuts', drawn from the ST itself, to compare Seidensticker's and Holman's approaches to translating the ST and to situate them within the broader terrain of translation studies. I interrogated translation-studies concepts such as 'equivalence', correspondence and SL-/TL-orientated translation, attempting to locate their relevance both to the case study and to JE translation in general.

1.3, with its signature phrase 'Dances with Girls', expanded the discussion to include sociolinguistic TS issues, viewing translation itself as a kind of metaphor, and treating the problematically nebulous term 'style'.

1.4 drew on another image from the ST—the game board, site of two different games in the story—to introduce Levý's TS application of game theory in the context of textual disambiguation, a particularly significant issue in JE translation.

1.5 outlined my thesis methodology, beginning with a description of the three types of translations of the ST I undertook to better understand the translating process and to establish a list of recurring textual features that would seem to merit investigation. I

followed this with a discussion of the taxonomy of features and the analytical elements that constitute it.

Having established a wide-ranging context for my study and outlined the form it has taken, I shall next in Chapters Two and Three provide an in-depth investigation of the linguistic features of the Japanese–English language set, paradigmatic and then syntagmatic, that raise potential issues for literary translation into English.

Chapter Two: A Taxonomy of Japanese Paradigmatic Features and the Issues Arising for Translation into English

2.0 Introduction

I have organised the list of features around the paradigmatic/syntagmatic axes in order to emphasise that the features on which I focus have developed out of a close observation of the results of this process of selection and combination in the text on the page. Another aspect of my analysis that reflects its empirical origins is that, as mentioned in **1.5.2**, the choice of features to highlight is based on (a) their frequency in the ST and (b) the relative degree of difficulty they appear to present for the translator. The former I have established by counting the number of occurrences in the NVivo database; the latter is usually evident in the extent to which the translators retain the semantic and formal characteristics of the ST in their TL translations, often with an apparent inverse relation between degree of difficulty and extent of retention in the TT.

Some features overlap to a certain degree: for example, certain aspects of lexical identity create ambiguity, thus one will find exemplars in both the Different Lexical Identity and Ambiguity categories. I have attempted to prevent duplication, but I think it important to highlight where issues overlap,⁶⁹ and have cross-referenced them where appropriate. Further, in such empirical research there is a tension between the desire to provide an exhaustive taxonomy of features and the need to focus on the most significant features. Since many of the subcategory distinctions within features have probably never been made before in an academic context, I have erred on the side of

⁶⁹ This is because features within which several different issues intersect are ipso facto likely to be the most significant for JE translation.

retention of fine distinctions for the sake of documenting them. There is thus in these two chapters an emphasis on detailed description of features *in situ* in the ST and discussion of how these are reflected, or otherwise, in the TTs, more than an attempt at ‘big-picture’ SL–TL, or, indeed, translation-studies, contextualisation. While I occasionally locate certain ST features and TT transformations within literary and TS discussions, the overall approach is inductive, intending to build up a comprehensive picture of potentially problematic features through the accretion of ‘snapshots’ of them. Chapter Four presents a more global, deductive (i.e., top-down) and coherent analysis of features, issues and translation strategies.

I have limited my analysis to linguistic features only, omitting cultural features, for three main reasons. First, as mentioned earlier, Tobias (2006) has provided an overview of culturally bound features of the ST in her paper on *Izu no odoriko*’s translations. Second, while the identified features, being mainly lexical rather than structural, clearly constitute only part of the cultural analysis of literary translation, the scope of this present work allows for an in-depth analysis of only one pole of the axis, namely the linguistic one. Third, I wish for this thesis to add to the discussion of literary translation from this mostly linguistic viewpoint since linguistic aspects of Japanese-to-English literary translation have been neglected in scholarship, as outlined in the introduction to Chapter One, whereas cultural issues have been more extensively addressed. Having said that, it is important to spend some time now outlining the fundamental connections between cultural and linguistic issues in translation studies before going on to focus on the latter.

2.0.1 Cultural and linguistic features of language

The Saussurian terms *signifier* and *signified* (Saussure 1916/1974: 66-67, 120), together forming the ‘sign’ (Holdcroft (1991: 50ff.)), and Pierce’s *referent*, also called the ‘object’ (Pierce 1991: 239ff.) are useful to distinguish different phenomena relevant to the present discussion. Under Saussure’s and Pierce’s schemata, a referent means a specific object or action (i.e., something physical and discrete) that exists in the ‘real world’. (This is necessarily confined to concrete things—concepts cannot be referents in this sense, because they are human constructs, and hence mediated.)⁷⁰ The referent is represented synechdochically by a given signified, which is an *unarticulated* concept evoked in the individual mind (hence different for each individual) that represents the physical, real-word item.⁷¹ Finally, relating the ideational and the linguistic realms is the signifier, which Saussure argues is an arbitrary utterance—a collection of phonemes and/or graphemes bearing no organic relationship to the signified (1916/1974: 67)—that stands for the signified. The signifier’s form is only noteworthy in that its distinguishability from other signifiers is what makes language possible.⁷² But, crucially, what researchers such as Sapir and Whorf contend is that difference not only occurs at

⁷⁰ Yet one can distinguish another category of signified, for example abstract nouns, which is a concept that has no physical counterpart but which humans nevertheless regard as an entity in its own right. A specific example would be ‘love’.

⁷¹ I choose to discount the comprehensiveness of Saussure’s assertion that signifier and signified, together constituting the *sign*, are inseparable from each other, like two sides of a piece of paper (Saussure 1916: 114). I would suggest that there is plenty of evidence to support the idea that, in many cases, rather than a certain graphological/phonological sequence being inextricably linked with a single signified, on the contrary each signified has a lexical ‘stable’ of signifier synonyms, any one of which the mind may call up to represent the concept. Such a multiplicity of signifier-signified associations might explain the ‘tip-of-the-tongue’ phenomenon whereby a locutor is aware of the concept to which s/he wishes to refer, but cannot call up the appropriate signifier. (This suggests that signifier and signified are not always interdependent.) Further, the fairly high level of semantic interchangeability (phonetic values are another matter) of such synonyms as ‘start’ and ‘begin’ also renders problematic Saussure’s concept of the signifier/signified interdependent pair.

⁷² Saussure 1916: 120-121. Onomatopoeic expressions present a challenge to this assumption of arbitrariness (cf. Donovan 2000: 183-184).

the formal, signifier, level but also migrates back down to the ideational, signified level (Thomas and Wareing 1999: 21ff.). Formal difference enables—indeed, effectively compels—humans to identify discrete referents as exemplars of a particular concept (signified) and then label them with signifiers that represent what comes into being when an object is thus identified. As the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis postulates, disparate groups of humans perceive, categorise and label the world in different ways, partly due to the different ways in which their languages are formed and, hence, can be divided up intralingually, thereby creating different signifieds (and hence signifiers) from the same referents (Senft, Östman and Vershueren 2009: 32ff.).

The distinction of these three terms is important for translation for three main reasons. First, one must separate *how* a concept is represented—its phonology/graphology—from the concept itself (signifier vs. signified). Translation is a balancing act between capturing the meaning and form of the ST (admittedly with the former dominant over the latter in many cases). This issue is particularly important for literary translation, because the *discours* (formal manifestation; discourse level), not just the *histoire* (story), is an intrinsic aspect of narrative prose.⁷³

Second, one must be aware that some physical phenomena (referents), because they stand independent of articulation (and even ideation), may not exist in the target culture. If we regard culture—in contrast to what we could call its subset, language—as consisting of a set of physical characteristics and constraints that inform and are in turn informed by human responses to them, then the presence or absence of referents in a language becomes primarily a *cultural* issue, not a linguistic one. Just because a source

⁷³ Cf. Schmid (2010: 186-188) for a discussion of these terms in narratology. Venuti (1995: 6) argues that the privileging of ‘transparency’ and fluency in Western translation has led to an emphasis on the story at the expense of the form, and therefore many translators may not give both equal weight in practice.

language uses a particular sign to describe something does not mean that the referent behind it necessarily exists in the target culture in a different form; it could be the case that there is simply no cultural/physical equivalent (for example, 納豆 *nattō* ‘fermented soy beans’, regarded as a quintessentially Japanese food item within Japan, remains unknown to most westerners), therefore we cannot *merely* say that the referents always remain the same and that, as Sapir and Whorf argue, (linguistically evoked) differences in human perception create differences in signifieds/signifiers. Where no concrete referents, and hence no representing signifieds, exist in the target culture (TC), the translator must do one or more of the following: (a) omit the element, (b) insert a more generic element (perhaps a superordinate that expresses a concept or item common to both cultures), (c) provide explanation in the form of intra-textual exposition or a footnote to the text, or (d) insert an ad hoc transliteration, leaving the TL reader to ascertain the meaning. All of these choices except the last significantly disturb the integrity of the ST, and the last two disturb the integrity of the TT.

This brings us to the third and potentially most significant implication of applying the three terms—signifiers, signifieds, referents—to translation: the distinction between cultural and linguistic features of the SL-TL pair. Cultural features could be said to arise primarily from the referent,⁷⁴ while linguistic features arise primarily from the signified and its relationship with the signifier. With cultural features, the physical/social manifestation precedes and dominates its linguistic representation; with linguistic features, the signified/signifier override any contributing physical/social elements, delineating as they do their own set of rules of interaction.

⁷⁴ Given that language is a subset of culture, culture requires a physical starting point—and even in this era of dematerialisation, digitalisation and virtual reality, cultural consumption, not just cultural commentary, continues.

This is not to say that cultural and linguistic elements are not instrumental in shaping each other (see the example below). Rather, my approach focuses on the dominant shaping force to allow us to make use of the instructive contrast between the two. If we do not bother to distinguish between language and culture in this analysis of translation, we lose the benefit of a more finely honed tool for determining what translators can do something about and what they cannot (an element of the strategy for maximising the efficiency of effort outlined below). Examples of the items translators have options about include words with different nuances requiring linguistic compensation, and culturally distinct elements perhaps requiring cultural equivalence. Examples of those over which they have little control are, on the syntagmatic axis, the meaning inherent in a specific ordering of words and clauses (not just the words themselves), and, on the paradigmatic axis, unique cultural references with no TL equivalents. ‘Doing nothing’ means washing one’s hands of translating a specific item, which ironically takes TL-orientated and SL-orientated extremes: omission on the one hand or transliteration on the other.

The following are two contrasting examples that demonstrate cultural versus linguistic primacy in the context of Japanese. In the Japanese ST the cultural need to differentiate social status precedes its linguistic manifestation: *keigo* honorifics are the signifiers of a set of signifieds that are generalisations of real-world referential relationships. On the other hand, the customary positioning of adverbial phrases at or near the head of a clause and verbs at the end in the Japanese ST cannot be said to have an overweening cultural basis; rather, it is a linguistic convention. The first example is of a predominantly cultural feature, the second of a predominantly linguistic feature. The first manifests itself on several levels, one of which is linguistic, with a plethora of

verb forms and honorific affixes at one's disposal; but these have not brought about the social stratification, but rather reflected, then codified, and eventually reinforced it. In the second example, linguistic convention means that a typical Japanese sentence begins with supplementary (adverbial) details and ends with grammatically necessary (predicate) information, which could have cultural ramifications (for example, as suggested in **1.2**, encouraging the listener to guess at, or even attempt to complete, the speaker's sentence and hence engage actively in the meaning-making process).⁷⁵

Another way to regard my approach is to see it as analogous to the 'minimax' strategy that many translators use, consciously or not.⁷⁶ This pragmatic (good-enough), rather than normative (optimal), approach amounts to putting in the minimum amount of effort to achieve maximum effect. Most linguistic items can be considered to have originated from a cultural referent, but if that referent is no longer explicit in the signifier/signified then one should consider it more a linguistic than a cultural feature, because it is unhelpful to go back to the origins of every feature just for the sake of it. For example, does it help the translator of the contemporary English expression 'good-bye' to know that it comes from 'God be with you'? In almost all cases, no, because the signifier has been stripped of its religious origins through the process of syncope and is used by non-believers and believers alike. Similarly, at the level of textual analysis, by focusing on the dominant aspect of the feature, be it linguistic or cultural, one is better able to avoid distraction.

Finally, the signifier/signified/referent triad offers an instructive image for

⁷⁵ Cf. the characterisation of Japanese as a 'listener-/reader-responsibility language' in **2.1.1**.

⁷⁶ Levý: "Translation theory tends to be normative, to instruct translators on the OPTIMAL solution; actual translation work, however, is pragmatic; the translator resolves for that one of the possible solutions which promises a maximum of effect with a minimum of effort. That is to say, he intuitively resolves for the so-called MINIMAX STRATEGY." (Bassnett 2002: 42; original emphasis.)

translation itself, one that again reveals parallels with metaphor. An original work is simultaneously a synechdochical signifier of the language and culture from which it comes (a kind of ‘super-signified’), and a referent in its own right (a ‘work of art’, a ‘book’, a ‘play’, a ‘painting’, etc.). If the work of art is a novel, and it is translated, that translation is a signifier of the original, and that original referent then becomes a signified. Much as a rose is used as a symbol for love, as well as a signifier for the signified ‘rose’ (which is itself a synechdochical representation of all real referent roses), a translation represents the original work; and while we are aware it is not the original, we ‘suspend disbelief’ just as we do when we imagine a rose as a symbol for love, because we apprehend the access this gives us to the original, similar to the way in which a potent metaphor enlivens a generic concept (a signified). But in the same way that we discard a metaphor, particularly an extended one, if it distorts the signified too much, we reject a translation if it seems inauthentic. Of course, the converse potential exists that, much as the seductive quality of the extended metaphor may make us overlook the flaws in the analogy, a fluent translation may paper over its semantic inadequacies (Venuti 1995: *passim*).

2.0.2 ST features

In preparing this section I have taken a text-led approach, working through all instances of a particular feature that I had identified as being of importance in *Izu no odoriko*, choosing representative examples, and sub-categorising them where appropriate. Given space limitations, I have endeavoured to keep examples to two or three per sub-category (and fewer when there is only one point to be made), but in many cases I am drawing from a repository of anything up to several hundred examples, as **Appendices Table 1** indicates. To offer the reader the opportunity to compare other examples of the same features, I often provide a list of the sentence reference numbers for the other examples I have identified. Some example sentences appear several times with different features highlighted; this recurrence usually has more to do with the ‘thickness’ (feature-richness, and hence relevance for analysis) of the sentence than with a dearth of examples.

I have ordered the sections alphabetically for convenience, but the relative importance of a given section is generally proportional to its length. The usual format for each section is: (1) an introduction to the SL feature; (2) division into sub-features where appropriate; (3) presentation of one or more ST examples and their connected TT renderings; (4) an analysis of the features and their translations, occasionally including my own suggestion for treating an outstanding issue; and (5) a brief section conclusion. Some of the issues that repeatedly appear will be addressed in Chapter Four.

2.1 Paradigmatic Features

These are lexical features where the selections from within a given paradigm set in Japanese and English differ significantly. For convenience, the term ‘lexical’ is synonymous with ‘paradigmatic’ unless noted otherwise. Below is the list of features divided into its main sections (ordered alphabetically for ease of reference) and subsections and indented to indicate feature hierarchies. Group categories are in SMALL CAPITALS. Further divisions (indicated with italicised lower-case Roman numerals) are made within various sections in the body of the text.

2.1.1 Ambiguity (p. 97)

- a. spatio-temporal ambiguity (p. 104)
- b. lexical segmentation and multiple meanings (p. 106)
- c. set polite expressions (p. 111)
- d. inclusive nominal sets (p. 113)
- e. structural ambiguity (syntagmatic) (p. 115)

2.1.2 DIFFERENT LEXICAL IDENTITY (p. 119)

2.1.2.1 Different part of speech (p. 122)

- a. premodifying adverb+verb (p. 122)
- b. clause+(time/causation) nominal (p. 124)
- c. *こと koto* / *の no* nominalisation of verb (p. 126)
- d. adverb+verb (p. 127)
- e. nominal concatenation (adverbial) (p. 129)
- f. nominal+verb (p. 130)

g. nominal compounds (p. 137)

h. verb+noun (p. 138)

i. *te*-verbal concatenation (p. 140)

2.1.2.2 Different lexicalisation (p. 142)

a. noun (p. 143)

b. verb (p. 152)

c. deictic (p. 154)

d. utterance (p. 156)

2.1.2.3 Different lexical connotation (p. 158)

a. verb (p. 158)

b. modifier (p. 160)

2.1.3 No Plural Marker (p. 163)

a. indeterminacy of singular/plural forms (p. 163)

b. pluralisation of loanwords (p. 164)

2.1.4 Passive Voice (p. 166)

a. general passive (p. 167)

b. 'suffering' passive (p. 169)

c. interiority; sensation (p. 171)

2.1.5 SOUND-SYMBOLIC LANGUAGE (p. 174)

2.1.5.1 Mimetic (p. 174)

a. sound representation (擬音語・擬声語 *giongo/giseigo*) (p. 176)

b. action/manner representation (擬態語 *gitaigo*) (p. 177)

c. combined sound and action representation (擬音擬態語 *gion-gitaigo*) (p. 180)

d. state representation (擬態語 *gitaigo*) (p. 182)

e. mood / mental representation (擬情語 *gijōgo*)⁷⁷ (p. 184)

2.1.5.2 Utterances (p. 186)

2.1.6 VERB MORPHOLOGY (p. 194)

⁷⁷ Martin calls (a) “phonomimes”, (d) “phenomimes” and (e) “psychomimes”. (1975: 1025.)

2.1.1 Ambiguity

Ambiguity in literature can be placed into two major and conflicting categories: indeterminacy and polysemy.⁷⁸ Indeterminacy often entails destructive, entropic, and/or inadvertent ambiguity, wherein something undetermined in the writing, be it in form or content, works to obscure meaning. Polysemous ambiguity, on the other hand, enriches writing by offering multiple possibilities for interpretation, alternate levels on which to read the work. This polysemy may not always be consciously determined, but the key difference to the first term is that it adds to the cohesion and cogency of the work rather than detracting or distracting from it.

The potential for destructive ambiguity is rife in translation: not only can it mislead the translator him/herself, who is a proxy SL reader, but even once it has been correctly understood, if its transition is handled inadequately it can go on to mislead the TL reader as much as, if not more so, than it may have misled the SL reader. Furthermore, the Japanese language's tendency to suppress explicit subjects/objects and their corresponding pronouns, against English's opposite leanings,⁷⁹ increases not only the possibilities for misinterpretation, but also the potential need for 'forcible' disambiguation. Thus sometimes what is 'benign', elegant ambiguity in the ST, inviting the reader to determine meaning, becomes problematic when it must be resolved in the ST.

Polysemy is too complex a topic to be dealt with here at length, although the issue

⁷⁸ My binary division.

⁷⁹ Suppression as seen from the perspective of users of the language into which it is to be translated. Martin: "In English we avoid repeating a noun once it has been mentioned, substituting an anaphoric pronoun after the first mention. In Japanese there is no stricture against repeating the noun any number of times; on the other hand, obvious elements are freely omitted from a sentence." (1975: 1075.)

of how to preserve constructive ambiguity is of course central in literary translation. It is possible that by addressing its negative counterpart here, some light may be shed on how to deal with polysemy as well, but such discussion could form the basis of an entire thesis in its own right.

Indeterminacy can be further divided into *lexical* (word-rank) and *structural* (clause-rank-or-higher) ambiguity sub-categories (Catford 1965: 24-25), which clearly correspond to the paradigmatic and syntagmatic axes respectively. Therefore, strictly speaking, structural indeterminacy should be dealt with in Chapter Three, **Syntagmatic Features**. However, to preserve the integrity of the overall feature category Ambiguity, as well as to facilitate a comparison of the two types, I have chosen to make structural indeterminacy a subsection within this section (**2.1.1 e.**).

I begin by returning to the earlier discussion of game theory and disambiguation. First I shall demonstrate the divergent moves that the two translators Seidensticker and Holman make when the ‘rules’ of English grammar force them to disambiguate the original Japanese. To reiterate, by ‘disambiguate’ I mean make something explicit that is not so in the original.⁸⁰

Kawabata Yasunari was Japan’s first Nobel laureate for literature, partly owing to the popularity of *Izu no odoriko* in Seidensticker’s first English translation, and his 1968 acceptance speech was famously titled (again through Seidensticker’s translation) ‘Japan, the Beautiful, and Myself’. When Ōe Kenzaburo became the next Japanese literary laureate a generation later in 1994, he pointedly titled his speech ‘Japan, the Ambiguous, and Myself’. The Japanese language is often described as ambiguous or

⁸⁰ The situation is complicated by the fact that Seidensticker revised his original translation, in effect taking his moves back, replaying them, and altering some, with various implications for the flow of play (i.e., the narrative).

vague,⁸¹ and just as often experts will counter that it is not ambiguous to its native speakers, because context and linguistic cues elucidate meaning.⁸² I agree in general (exceptions will present themselves shortly), and point to a parallel tendency in the use of irony in English, something that native speakers are apparently more adept at identifying (although not infallibly so) from context and tone than non-native speakers, often with embarrassing consequences for those who fail to do so. However, a strong case can be made for the contention that Japanese is grammatically more ambiguous than English in certain respects, and this ‘semantic gap’ is the source of a variety of potential translation issues.

A particularly salient feature of the SL is the lack of necessity in many cases for a sentence to have an explicit grammatical subject marker. Speakers imply subjects (and sometimes human objects) through certain grammatical elements such as verb endings (though the co-text—surrounding utterances—is also important). Thus, 本を買ってあげた *hon o katte ageta* can, in one context, clearly mean ‘I bought the book for him’, and 本を買ってくれた *hon o katte kureta* ‘he bought the book for me’, even though the clauses contain no subject (the buyer of the book), nor any indirect object (for whom the book was bought). One can make these determinations with confidence in a given context, because (a) the preceding sentences often provide nominal antecedents for the ‘absent’ pronouns and (b) the underlined donatory verbs (Martin 1975: 352-354, 598)

⁸¹ See, for example, a critique primarily of Oe Kenzaburo’s, but indirectly also of Kawabata’s, ambiguity, arising from the inherent subjectivity of the Japanese language, in Kumakura (1995). See also Donald Keene and Ivan Morris quoted in Miller (1986: 98).

⁸² Miller, for example, severely criticises Western translators and theorists for characterising Japanese as vague and lacking in clarity, claiming in Ivan Morris’s case that he ‘has not considered that the grammar—or the grammatical and syntactic inter-relationship—of the language plays any significant role in the ‘literal meaning’ of the text’ (1986: 98ff.). Thus Miller argues that the grammar of Japanese plays an important role in disambiguating its lexical elements, something one can readily observe in the use, for example, of ‘donative’ verb forms such as *ageru/kureru*, as outlined in this section.

are selected depending on whether the implied subjects and objects are members of the in-group (within the speaker's own family, work or social domain: *ageta* 'I/we gave) or out-group (outside the speaker's domain: *kureta* 'he/she/they gave').

However, when contextual and grammatical cues become contradictory or insufficient, we enter more tortuous territory, where even native speakers may become disorientated. Such ambiguities may be less problematic when native readers or listeners of Japanese are left to determine (or leave undetermined) in their own mind the provenance of the subject; but translators into English do not have that luxury. English demands an explicit grammatical subject. To extend the earlier metaphor, when playing the English 'game', one must make an unambiguous move with one's piece when it is time to make a 'subject' move. And once one has committed to the move, not only can it not be retaken (except in a retranslation), it directly affects subsequent moves—in other words, the concatenation of lexical choices from then on—until some clear point of separation is reached and the cascade is brought to a halt.⁸³

One sustained excerpt from the ST will serve to elucidate the problematic aspects of ambiguity for JE translation. In this scene, the entertainers call on the narrator in his inn room. The key point of ambiguity is who the speaker of the words is in §314 and 315:

⁸³ The immediate cascade effect may be localised, often petering out within a few sentences or paragraphs, and does not necessarily spread throughout the entire text—but then again, it may have an insidious global effect, particularly when a given word choice is consistently repeated.

| ST | Seidensticker 1 | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|--|---|---|
| 309. ¶間もなく栄吉が私の宿へ来た。 | ¶A short time later Eikichi appeared. | ¶A short time later Eikichi appeared. | ¶Before long Eikichi came to my room. |
| 310. ¶「みなは？」 | ¶“Where are the others?” | ¶“Where are the others?” | ¶“Where is everyone?” I asked. |
| 311. ¶「女どもはおふくろがやかましいので。」 | ¶“They couldn’t get away from mother.” | ¶“They couldn’t get away from Mother.” | ¶“The old lady is so strict with the girls.” |
| 312. ¶しかし、二人が暫く五目並べをやっていると、女たちが橋を渡ってどんどん二階へ上って来た。 | ¶But the three of them came clattering across the bridge and up the stairs while we were playing checkers. | ¶But the three of them came clattering across the bridge and up the stairs while we were at the Go board, playing the simpler game. | ¶However, we had been playing “five-in-a-row” only a [19] short while when the girls came across the bridge and upstairs. |
| 313. いつものように丁寧なお辞儀をして降下に座ったままためらっていたが、一番に千代子が立上がった。 | After elaborate bows they waited hesitantly in the hall. ¶Chiyoko came in first. | After elaborate bows they waited hesitantly in the hall. [139] ¶Chiyoko came in first. | They bowed politely as always and hesitated, kneeling in the hallway. First, Chiyoko, the oldest, stood up. |
| 314. ¶「これは私の部屋よ。」 | “Please, please,” she called gaily to the others. | “Please, please,” she called gaily to the others. | ¶“This is my room. |
| 315. さあどうぞ御遠慮なしにお通り下さい。」 | “You needn’t stand on formality in [38] <i>my</i> room.” | “You needn’t stand on formality in <i>my</i> room!” | Don’t be so formal. Come on in,” I said. |
| 316. ¶一時間程遊んで芸人達はこの宿の内湯へ行った。 | ¶An hour or so later they all went down for a bath. | ¶An hour or so later they all went down for a bath. | ¶The entertainers stayed about an hour, then went down to the inn bath. |

Seidensticker decides the speaker is Eikichi’s young wife Chiyoko, while Holman opts for the narrator. The evidence supporting Seidensticker’s decision partly lies in the propinquity of Chiyoko’s action at the end of the preceding §313. He interprets 立上がった *tachiagatta* ‘stood up’ as “came in”, which is not a direct translation (while Holman’s is), but rather an apparent conflation of “stood up” and “entered”, based on the context and on the echo of the socially formal base verb 上がる *agaru* ‘enter someone else’s place of residence’. In Seidensticker’s interpretation, Chiyoko enters the room ahead of the others, and this initiative is immediately followed by her monologue.

Further, absence of the copula *だ* *da* before the particle *yo* at the end of §314 suggests a female speaker in Japanese sociolinguistic convention (Shibatani 1990: 373).

Moreover, the mere fact that the speaker feels the need to indicate whose room it is supports the notion that the girl is speaking. There would be little need for the narrator himself to point out such a thing, as the entertainers have called on him where he is staying, and thus are quite aware whose room it is. If Chiyoko wished to make a joke, pretending to take possession of it, which Seidensticker suggests with his archly italicised “*my room*”, she could have done so in just such a fashion.

Other linguistic elements are unhelpful for disambiguation. The 私 *watashi* ‘I’ subject in §314, while formal, is appropriate for either a male or female speaker in this situation. 御遠慮なしに *go-enryo nashi ni* ‘without reserve’ is perhaps suggestive of Chiyoko in the sense that 御遠慮なく *go-enryo naku* is the more common, educated form, but this characterisation is by no means definitive. Seidensticker is so sure of his attribution that he injects the phrase “she called gaily to the others”, not only providing an explicit subject but furthermore indicating to whom the subject is talking, and in what tone of voice.

Holman, on the other hand, chooses as his subject the narrator rather than the girl. There is no indication in the story as a whole that Chiyoko is the playful sort; indeed, she is largely portrayed as subdued, weighed down by the burden of the death of her child during the journey. However, the narrator treats the entertainers well throughout their acquaintance, thus it would be in character for him to ask them to abandon formality and enter his room. He is aware that many people have a low opinion of such itinerant performers, but he is charmed by them, and no matter what other guests at the inn may think of his inviting them in, it is, after all, his room, and he can welcome them unreservedly. But none of this entirely explains why the narrator would feel the need to mention that it was his room. In addition the absence of the copula だ *da* in これは私の

部屋 [...] よ *kore wa watashi no heya [...] yo* suggests either a feminine or, paradoxically, very rough masculine voice, the latter unlikely to be followed with the polite どうぞ御遠慮なしにお通り下さい *dōzo go enryo nashi ni o tōri kudasai* ‘please enter without inhibition’.

Both translators thus have rational arguments to support the conflicting disambiguation moves they make here. However, perhaps one should ask whether there is any need to disambiguate in the first place. I believe not. First, although the source text does not attach a subject to the monologue, in this case there is no requirement in English to do so either, as stand-alone quotations with no quotative verb or subject are acceptable in (modern) English prose. The translators are perhaps so used to inferring subjects from context and adding them to subject-demanding English that even in a case where it is not necessary they have done so, consequently creating a new problem for themselves.

One can see from this example that the selection/combination process of translating involves the translator’s making decisions based on the immediate linguistic and wider cultural context. Where the Japanese rulebook and English rulebook—what Levý calls the definitional instructions—differ, translators must make use of the personal playbook, or set of selective instructions, that they have assembled over the years, to find a way to harmonise the two. But when English requires a subject that is absent in the original, the translators’ first impulse (prompted by expectation norms) is to make an unambiguous move. That has more immediate implications than the original move, and exposes the translator to the danger of creating a succession of further moves that carry the translation too far away from the original.⁸⁴

⁸⁴ Again this echoes Venuti’s comments on the imposition of TL norms on the ST: “the violence that resides in the very purpose and activity of translation: the reconstitution of the foreign text in accordance

At the same time, disambiguation is an unavoidable part of the JE translation process, and the translator should not be afraid to resolve ambiguity where it helps to preserve the overall integrity of the original by presenting it in a form more acceptable to the target language. Occasionally translators may need to resolve an ambiguity in a way that cannot be justified solely by linguistic and contextual cues in the source text, for the greater goal of textual cohesion in the target text.⁸⁵

Now it is time to examine the subcategories individually to see what forms of ambiguity arise and what the translators' responses can tell us about dealing with ambiguity in translation.

2.1.1 a. spatio-temporal ambiguity

i. issue: ambiguity of temporal locus

Example: 頃 *koro* 'about the time/as'

This is a common expression in general use. I shall juxtapose the two ST instances:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|--|--|
| 1. 道がつづら折りになって、いよいよ天城峠に近づいたと思う頃、雨脚が杉の密林を白く染めながら、すさまじい早さで麓から私を追って来た。 | Dir. ' <u>About the time</u> the road became twisting, and I thought at last I approached Amagi Pass, the shower, dyeing the dense cedar forest white, with terrible speed pursued me from the foot of the mountain.' | With alarming speed, a shower swept toward me from the foot of the mountain, touching the cedar forests white <u>as</u> the road began to wind up into the pass. | <u>About the time</u> the road began to wind and I realized that I was finally near Amagi Pass, a curtain of rain swept up after me at a terrific speed from the foot of the mountain, painting the dense cedar forests white. |

with values, beliefs and representations that pre-exist it in the target language." (1995: 18.)

⁸⁵ Venuti resists such fluency strategies as cohesion, instead calling for translators to employ a strategy of "resistancy", using foreignisation to highlight formal and cultural aspects of the foreign text rather than erase them (1995: 20, 41-42, 305ff.), but in practice this seems to amount to little more than suggesting that "contemporary translators of literary texts can introduce discursive variations, experimenting with archaism, slang, literary allusion and convention to call attention to the secondary status of the translation and signal the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text." (1995: 310-311.)

121. 萩乗や梨本なぞの小さい村里を過ぎて、湯ヶ野の藁屋根が麓に見えるようになった頃、私は下田まで一緒に旅をしたいと思切って云った。

Dir. ‘Passing small villages like Oginori and Nashimoto, around the time the thatched roofs of Yugano came into view at the foot of the mountain I wholeheartedly said that I wanted to travel together as far as Shimoda.’⁸⁶

In both these cases, 頃 *koro* means ‘(about) the time’ or ‘during the period’, in contrast to the more specific 時 *toki* ‘(point in) time’. English does not tolerate this kind of imprecision without a good reason. In §1, Seidensticker does well to substitute the conjunction “as”, since it is concise yet retains the temporal expansiveness of the original without sounding overly vague. Holman’s “[a]bout the time”, while semantically accurate, as the direct translation suggests, launches the story on an uncertain footing, placed as it is at the head of the sentence with ‘about’ immediately attenuating the clause it begins. Interestingly, these choices are replicated exactly in their translations of §121: again, Seidensticker uses “as”, and Holman “[a]bout the time”. (The issue of consistency in translating repeated terms is dealt with in detail in **3.1.7 Repetition.**)

ii. issue: ambiguity of spatial locus

Example: 傍へ *soba e* ‘near’

In §11, ambiguity arises more from the author’s choice of words, but nevertheless it only exists because Japanese allows such an adverbial phrase to be used without an indirect object:

⁸⁶ While most parallel-text examples are presented in columns in the thesis, I have juxtaposed some longer sentences horizontally to make them easier to compare.

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|---|--|
| 11. ¶突立っている私を見た踊子が直ぐに自分の座布団を外して裏返しに <u>傍へ</u> 置いた。 | Dir. ‘The dancing girl, seeing me standing there, immediately pulled out her own <i>zabuton</i> , turned it over and placed it <u>nearby</u> .’ | ¶The girl turned over the cushion she had been sitting on and pushed it politely <u>toward me</u> . | [4] ¶As soon as the dancing girl noticed me standing there, she pulled out the cushion she had been kneeling on, turned it over, and placed it <u>near her</u> . |

English cannot say *‘The dancing girl put the cushion next to’, but Japanese can say something to this effect: 踊子が座布団を傍へ置いた *odoriko ga zabuton o soba e oita*. Native readers would expect the object to be specified in such cases (e.g., 踊子が座布団を彼女の傍へ置いた *odoriko ga zabuton o kanojo no soba e oita* ‘The dancing girl placed the cushion next to her’; or 踊子が座布団を私の傍へ置いた *odoriko ga zabuton o watashi no soba e oita* ‘The dancing girl placed the cushion next to me’), but as it is not grammatically necessary, Kawabata has omitted the indirect object. Once again, the translators opt for different interpretations, Seidensticker choosing “me” and Holman “her”. The direct translation offers a possible compromise that preserves the ambiguity, though it is a little detached: the adverb ‘nearby’.

2.1.1 b. lexical segmentation and multiple meanings

Ambiguities arise where the assignment of denotative and/or connotative value(s) to a dictionary-equivalent term differs between the SL and TL.

i. issue: highest-frequency meaning overshadows base meaning

Example: やはり、やっぱり *yahari, yappari* ‘always/again/still/as expected’⁸⁷

⁸⁷ Instances in the ST: *yahari*: §115, 416, 597; *yappari*: 16.

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 16. やっぱり私は黙っていた。 | Dir. ‘ <u>Still</u> I was silent.’ | <u>Still</u> I said nothing. | <u>Naturally</u> , I did not speak. |

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|--|--|---|
| 416. 踊子が話しかけた時に、追いつかせるつもりで待っていると、彼女はやはり足を停めてしまって、私が歩き出すまで歩かない。 | Dir. ‘At the time the dancing girl started speaking, when I waited with the intention of letting her catch up, she <u>always</u> came to a halt and did not walk until I started walking.’ | When she spoke I would pause, hoping that she would come up even with me, but <u>always</u> she waited until I had started off again and followed those same two yards behind. | When she spoke to me, I waited, to give her a chance to catch up. But <u>I should have known that</u> she would stop short and refuse to take a step until I did. |

It is clear from these two examples that *yahari* presents a considerable translation problem. Seidensticker apparently appreciates the primary meaning ‘still’, as he translates it as “still” and “always” in the two cases above, while Holman seems fixated on its derivative, but now dominant, meaning ‘as expected’ and tries to force the text to conform to this, hence his injection of “I should have known that”, which has no direct antecedent in the ST.

ii. issue: consecutive uses of the same term with different meanings

Example: 湯 *yu* ‘hot water/bath’

Below are two contrasting meanings for *yu* in consecutive sentences in the ST:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|------------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| 193. また湯には入った。 | Dir. ‘[I] again got into the bath.’ | I went down to the <u>bath</u> again and splashed about violently. | I went down again for a <u>bath</u> . |
| 194. 湯を荒々しく掻回した。 | Dir. ‘[I] violently churned the hot water.’ | | I thrashed the <u>water</u> . |

While the Japanese term 湯 *yu* remains the same, §193 refers to the act of getting into

the inn “bath”, but §194 focuses on the narrator’s treatment of the “(hot) water” within it, which Holman’s distinctions reflect. Seidensticker combines the sentences, allowing him to use the one reference “bath” to cover the two notions. Both translators feel the need to explain the context (going down for a bath), indicating they consider the original Japanese (また湯には入った Lit. ‘(I) again got into the hot water’) too elliptical, particularly in combination with the ambiguous term.

iii. issue: SL lexical segmentation of a term covers a wider span than that of the TL equivalents

Example: 女 *onna* ‘woman/female’

Though 女 *onna* is often translated as ‘woman’, it covers the gamut of ‘female’, and thus it may be an ambiguous term to translate, especially in the plural form 女たち *onna-tachi*. The translators translate it variously as “woman”, “girl”, “female” and “she” (as well as the respective plural equivalents), with Seidensticker favouring “woman/women” and Holman “girl/girls”. See **2.1.2.2. a. i.** for a detailed investigation.

iv. issue: a set expression used in a non-standard context

Example: 今晚は *konban wa* ‘good evening/?good night’

235. 私がそわそわしているうちに芸人達はもう帰り路らしく、男が庭から、¶「今晚は。」と声を掛けた。

Dir. ‘While I was restless, the entertainers appeared to be about to leave, and the man said from the garden, “Good evening”.

今晚は *konban wa* is a basic set greeting in Japanese, and it seems that it need only be

translated as ‘good evening’; however, in this case the English translation conflicts with the context of departure rather than arrival, although one can easily argue that the greeting is appropriate as the narrator and entertainers have not had contact since the entertainers’ arrival at the inn. Seidensticker retains “good evening”, but Holman prefers “good night”. This is an interesting example of interpreting the illocutionary force or authorial intention in the ST: here, uncharacteristically for both translators, Seidensticker privileges the pragmatic, formal level, while Holman privileges the functional level of the utterance.

v. issue: coexisting meanings of a SL term are equally valid

Example: 笑う *warau* ‘laugh/smile’

Shibatani notes that, compared to English, “many Japanese verbs have very general meanings. [...] This lack of specificness [*sic*] of the verb meaning is compensated by the presence of onomatopoeic words.” (1990: 155.) *Warau*, for example, means both ‘laugh’ and ‘smile’, but as it is often supplemented by an adverbial mimetic, the distinction is often drawn (e.g., *nikoniko (to) warau* ‘smile’; *geragera warau* ‘guffaw, giggle’). Context may also make the clarification. However, there are several instances in *Izu no odoriko* where either interpretation seems plausible. Here is one example (overleaf):

| ST/Direct Translation | Seidensticker 1 | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|--|---|
| 359. それから彼女は花のように笑うのだった。 Dir. ‘Then she <u>laughed/smiled</u> like a flower.’ | And her <u>laugh</u> was like a flower’s <u>laugh</u> . | And her <u>laugh</u> was a flower’s <u>laugh</u> —the expression does not seem strained when I think of her. | Next was her flowerlike <u>smile</u> . |
| 360. 花のように笑うと云う言葉が彼女にだけほんとうだった。 Dir. ‘The words “ <u>laugh/smile</u> like a flower” were true only for her.’ | A flower’s <u>laugh</u> —the expression does not seem strained when I think of her. | | In her case, the word “flowerlike” was absolutely accurate. |

The translators diverge on laugh/smile, suggesting there are no textual cues as to which the author intends.

I conclude this section with an example of the rare occasion on which ambiguities of lexical segmentation appear to coincide in the source and target languages:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|
| 485. 暫く低い声が続いてから踊子の云うのが聞えた。 | Dir. ‘After low voices had continued for a time, I heard the dancing girl speak.’ | The conversation was <u>subdued</u> for a time. ¶‘He’s nice, isn’t he,’ the girl’s voice came again. | They continued their <u>conversation</u> for a time. Then I caught the dancing girl’s voice again. |
| 486. ¶「いい人ね。」 | Dir. ‘“He’s a good person, isn’t he.”’ | | ¶“He’s a nice person.” |

低い声 *hikui koe* means ‘low voice’, and 低い *hikui* means ‘low’ both in the sense of deepness and softness of sound.⁸⁸ Hence this would seem a perfect opportunity to preserve the ambiguity and use the semantically analogous ‘low’—and yet neither translator does. Seidensticker substitutes “subdued”, while Holman omits the reference.

Both are justifiably confident that their interpretation of *hikui* as ‘soft’ rather than ‘deep’

⁸⁸ Compare the antonym 高い *takai* ‘high/loud’ in §334: 歌う声が少し高くなる度に dir. ‘Whenever (her) voice got a little high’; S2: “When her voice rose even a little”; H: “Whenever the girl’s voice rose as she was singing”. Again, both the Japanese and English are ambiguous, but here the ambiguity in the English arises from the conversion from ST adjective to the verb “rose”.

is appropriate in this context, since the preceding text makes it clear that two of the girls are talking. Perhaps, in fact, the coincidence of lexical segmentation is not as close as it may initially appear, with a rendering such as ‘they continued to speak in low tones’ sounding lifeless in English.

2.1.1 c. set polite expressions

The first example is a multipurpose word, どうも *dōmo*, with a base meaning of ‘quite’ or ‘really’, which is usually used as a polite intensifier in conjunction with set expressions such as *arigatō*, but can be used on its own in various senses.

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--------------------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| 146. 『「へえ。尋常五年とはどうも——。」』 | Dir. ‘“Oh. Normal fifth grade: really....”’ | 『‘Oh?’ | “Oh, you have a fifth grader?...” |

The long dash in the ST indicates speech that trails off, similar to the English ellipsis dots we see in Holman’s translation, leaving it to the reader to complete the speaker’s sentiment, although if one interprets *dōmo* in the way the direct translation above does, it may be sufficient as it is, as a kind of phatic communion. Indeed, neither translator considers that an equivalent is needed in his translation, with Seidensticker excising the repetition of the reference to the grade in §145 with a brief utterance—“Oh?”—and Holman petering out to ellipsis dots.

The second representative example is a set phrase that is as commonly heard in Japanese as it is vague (the convenience of this vagueness likely contributing to its ubiquity):

299. [「] 妹にだけはこんなことをさせたくないと思いつめていますが、そこにはまた
 いろんな事情がありましてね。」

Dir. [‘I’ve thought constantly that I didn’t want my younger sister of all people to have to do
 something like this, but again there are various reasons for that, you see.’

The brother agonises over making his sister work as a dancing girl, but does not reveal any of the ‘reasons’ for this necessity. 事情 *jijō*, which can be translated as ‘circumstances/conditions/considerations/the situation’ and so on, can be summoned on any occasion to excuse or at least mitigate the speaker’s action, or lack thereof. If an English speaker were similarly to say “There’re reasons for that,” s/he would forthwith be requested to explain; the Japanese version is practically its own explanation, as, given the in-group/out-group dichotomy, it may be impolite to enquire further.⁸⁹ Compounding this nebulosity is the incomplete verb form that the man employs at the end of the sentence: *ありまして arimashite* ‘[there] are [various reasons] and ...’, followed by the clause-terminal particle *ね ne* ‘aren’t there/right?/you see’, which invites the agreement of the interlocutor, hence absolving the speaker of the need for further explanation, despite the fact that he has signalled that something is to follow with the *-te* ‘and’ verb form.

It is interesting to observe the translators’ approaches. Seidensticker substitutes one Japanese set phrase for another: the stoical “it couldn’t be helped” is a standard translation of *仕方なかった shikata nakatta*, which is another, even more common, set phrase used as a summary explanation, and which in this case fails to foreshadow the man’s emotion, which manifests itself in near-tears in §302. Holman in contrast uses the English idiom “it’s a long story”, which perhaps better represents the essence of *iron na*

⁸⁹ See, for example, Hendry (1998 : 244) for a discussion of 建前 *tatemae* ‘polite façade’ and 本音 *honne* ‘one’s real feelings’ and how these modes of speech relate to the in-group/out-group divide in Japanese society.

jijō ga arimashite, suggesting a set of circumstances that is too complex to go into, rather than emphasising the necessity of the current situation.

2.1.1 d. inclusive nominal sets

When it comes to nominal sets, Japanese places greater value on inclusion than on delimiting, evidenced by the frequent use of conjunctive particles that do not limit the members of the set they create: ~や~(など) ... *ya* ... (*nado*) ‘such as ... and’, ~とか ... *toka* ‘... and so on’, ~でも ... *demo* ‘even ...’, etc. In speech in particular, it sometimes seems to be almost rude to one’s interlocutor to limit the members of a particular lexical set that one mentions in certain situations.⁹⁰ But even in written prose, nominal sets are often left open-ended, as in this example:

| ST/Direct Translation | Seidensticker 1 | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|---|---|
| 119. 峠を越えてからは、山や空の色までが南国らしく感じられた。Dir. ‘After going over the pass, even the colour of <u>things like the mountains and sky</u> felt like something from a southern land.’ | <u>The mountains</u> had taken on the look of the South from the moment we descended the pass. | <u>The mountains and even the sky</u> had taken on the look of the south as we came down over the pass. | On this side of the pass, <u>even the mountains and the color of the sky</u> began to look more southern. |
| 120. 私と男とは絶えず話し続けて、すっかり親しくなった。Dir. ‘The man and I continued talking ceaselessly, and became very close.’ | <u>The man and I</u> became firm friends, and as the thatched roofs of Yugano came in sight below us I announced that I would like to go on to Shimoda with them. | <u>The man and I</u> were now friends. | As <u>the man and I</u> continued our conversation, we took a liking to each other. |

⁹⁰ For example, お茶でもいかがですか *o-cha demo ikaga desu ka* ‘How about some green tea (or something)?’ Martin calls the *ya* (... *nado*) (and (verb-equivalent) *~tari*) forms “representative” forms (1975: 153, 566).

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| <p>121. 萩乗や梨本なぞの小さい村里を過ぎて、湯ヶ野の藁屋根が麓に見えるようになった頃、私は下田まで一緒に旅をしたいと思切って伝った。 Dir. ‘(We) passed through such small villages as Oginori and Nashimoto, and when the thatched roofs of Yugano came into view at the foot of the mountain, I said with conviction that I wanted to travel together as far as Shimoda.’</p> | | <p>We skirted <u>a village or two</u>, and as the thatched roofs of Yugano came in sight below, I summoned my courage to announce that I would like to go on to Shimoda with them.</p> | <p>We passed <u>tiny villages with names like Oginori and Nashimoto</u>. About the time the thatched roofs of Yugano came into view at the foot of the mountain, I ventured to tell the man that I wanted to travel with them to Shimoda.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|

In §119, with the expression 山や空 *yama ya sora* ‘things like the mountains and sky’, the particle *ya* marks the items *yama* and *sora* as members of a set of which they are the explicit representatives, but which they do not in themselves exhaust. Similarly, in §121, the two villages Oginori and Nashimoto are at once linked and appointed representatives of the ‘villages’ noun set by the double construction *ya ... nado* ‘both ... and ..., for example’, the full structure of which the first *ya* is an abbreviated form. One can conveniently contrast these non-exhaustive sets with the exhaustive set of 私と男と *watashi to otoko to* ‘both I and the man’ in §120. In this case no other members of the set are assumed by the reader to exist (thus, for example, the narrator’s friendship with the other members of the troupe is not at issue).

There is a corresponding contrast in how both translators treat these sets. In §119, S1 even omits ‘sky’, leaving only “mountains”, although he restores and emphasises it in S2 (“The mountains and even the sky”). Holman chooses to use “even” as a deftly analogous way to indicate the open-endedness of the set, implying that other things

might also be starting to look “more southern”.⁹¹ Additionally, in §121, S1 removes the entire reference to passing through villages, while S2 gives them only a summary mention: “We skirted a village or two”. Holman again preserves the open set with “tiny villages with names like Oginori and Nashimoto” (though “with names like” is an interpolated explanation). Moreover, he separates them off from the town of Yugano, which he gives its own sentence. However, when it comes to the closed set in §120, the translators are in agreement: “The man and I” is the only option, it seems.

2.1.1 e. structural ambiguity (syntagmatic)

i. issue: attribution with no preceding antecedent

Example: こんなになった *konna ni natta* ‘have become like this’

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|---|---|
| 55. ♪「そうかねえ。この前連れていた子がもう <u>こんなになった</u> のかい。 | Dir. ‘Really? This child you had with you last time has already <u>become like this</u> , has she?’ | ‘Well now. So this is the little girl you had with you before, <u>so big</u> already. | “So this is the little girl you had with you before. |
| 56. いい ^{あんこ} 娘 ^{もん} になって、お前さんも結構者だよ。 | Dir. ‘She’s become a good girl, and you’re a lucky person too!’ | Why she’s practically a grown woman . Isn’t that nice. | She’s turned out to be such a nice girl. That’s good for you. |

The deictics of §55 and §56 are very vague. Particularly bamboozling is *konna ni natta* dir. ‘have become like this’. Both translators feel that the attribution cannot be left as undetermined as it is. Seidensticker assumes the antecedent is “(so) big”, while Holman employs Seidensticker’s common technique of omitting the reference entirely, relying on the similar expression in §56 to carry the sentiment (“such a nice girl”).

⁹¹ This echoes the other meaning of *demo* in the expression *o-cha demo*: lit. ‘“even” [how about] a cup of green tea’.

ii. issue: referenced verb is omitted

Example: 女の子は早い *onna no ko wa hayai* ‘girls are fast/early’

A common pattern in Japanese prose is subject+complement(+copula), where in English one would prefer subject+verb+adverbial.⁹² This noun-centred phraseology effectively introduces an ambiguity, leaving it to the SL reader to infer the sense (‘Girls are fast or early when they do what?’):

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|----------------------|--|---|---------------------------------|
| 58. 女の子は早いもん だよ。」 | Dir. ‘ <u>Girls are fast/early</u> , aren’t they.’ | <u>Girls do grow up in a hurry</u> , don’t they.’ | <u>Girls grow up so fast.</u> ” |

Here this inference is slightly complicated by the ambiguity of the adjectival complement *hayai* itself. Generally 早い means ‘early’ and its homophone 速い means ‘fast’, but Kawabata prefers to use 早い even where the meaning seems closer to ‘fast’ than ‘early’.⁹³ The context of the preceding §55-56 makes it clear what kind of verb is missing, which is why both translators have no hesitation in supplying it (“grow up”).

Would the translation have been compromised if it had retained the original parts of speech, simply using the copula as in the Japanese (cf. the direct translation above)? ‘Girls are fast’ would of course insert a new ambiguity, containing, among others, the unfortunate connotation of sexual eagerness. On the other hand, ‘girls are early’ is a near-meaningless phrase that would need to be extended to ‘early bloomers’ or something similarly explicative to make any sense. Thus one can appreciate the translators’ rationale for resolving the ambiguity as they do, injecting dynamism with a

⁹² See, for example, Nakajima (1987: 13) on the static nature of noun-dominant Japanese sentences versus the dynamism of verb-dominant arrangements in English.

⁹³ Cf. also §94 (早い); adverbials: §84, §434, §556, §628 (早く). In fact, Kawabata never uses 速い (速く) in *Izu no odoriko*.

verb other than the copula.

iii. issue: non sequitur

Dialogue in Japanese sometimes produces what to Western ears sounds like a non sequitur when it is rendered out of Japanese. This may partly be due to the reliance on what is *not* said to convey information, with a mutual expectation that it is up to the listener to make the link (cf. Hinds (1987) on Japanese as a ‘reader/listener-responsibility language’). It may also have something to do with the pragmatics of the actual words: a locutionary act may convey an illocutionary force that is present in the Japanese for cultural reasons but absent in the English (much as irony may in the reverse situation, as suggested earlier). In either case, the result in the TT is an ambiguity that results from this apparent disjuncture.

In the following sequence there appears to be a mismatch between the question in §144 and the answer in §145:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 144. ¶「 <u>どこの学校</u> です。」 | Dir. ‘“ <u>Which</u> (*where’s) school.” ’ | ¶‘Where is he in <u>school</u> ?’ | ¶‘What kind of <u>school</u> ?’ |
| 145. ¶「尋常五年なんです。」 | Dir. ‘“It’s normal fifth grade.” ’ | ¶‘The fifth grade.’ | ¶‘Elementary school, fifth grade.’ |
| 146. ¶「へえ。尋常五年とはどうも——。」 | Dir. ‘“Oh. Normal fifth grade is, well——” ’ | ¶‘Oh?’ | “Oh, you have a fifth grader?...” |

The question seems to concern the geographical location of the school, while the answer appears to reference the school grade. A first glance would indicate that Seidensticker makes the better rendering, retaining the “where” of the original but by sleight of hand transferring it to an intramural setting, so that the narrator ends up asking a question about the child’s academic level (“ ‘Where is he in school?’ ”). Holman abandons any

pretence of an imitation of the original question, unpacking⁹⁴ what he sees as being the question's intention (“ “What kind of school?” ”). As a consequence he has to make explicit the school level—elementary—which 尋常五年 *jinjō gonen* ‘normal fifth grade’ merely implies, as an historical artefact of an outmoded education system. Neither translator makes any attempt to convey the ‘normal’ of *jinjō*, as it would make no sense outside of its historical and cultural context.

2.1.1 Conclusion

Japanese, as a ‘reader-responsibility language’ (Hinds in Ikegami 2000: 261), leaves a considerable amount of (inferable) information unexpressed at times, and does not require pronouns or subjects for sentence-level cohesion. English, however, as a ‘writer-responsibility language’ (2000: 261), and one requiring subject and object markers, at least pronominally, demands considerable disambiguation, or at least explicitation, in its translations of such Japanese. The different disambiguation ‘moves’ of translators on occasion reveal that multiple readings are possible. Taking a cue from Venuti, it may sometimes be salutary to consider leaving ambiguities as they are where grammatically possible, rather than feeling the need to disambiguate whatever the consequences.

⁹⁴ In other words, ‘extracting the implied meaning of’. Cf. Kussmaul (1995: 89) and Nida (2001: 56) for TS-centric explanations of the term ‘unpacking’.

2.1.2 DIFFERENT LEXICAL IDENTITY

Lexical identity refers to the complex of paradigmatic meanings associated with a given expression at both denotative and connotative levels, as well as the morphology of the expression and its different inflections across the gamut of potential parts of speech that the expression can occupy. It is clear that most SL–TL lexical differences are dealt with by an adjustment in the expressions chosen and the form that they take in the TT, but the question is whether or not that adjustment results in a significant shift away from the original.

Three distinctions can be made under the rubric of Lexical Identity: among **Part of Speech (2.1.3.1)**, **Lexicalisation (2.1.3.2)**, and **Lexical Connotation (2.1.3.3)**. One can envisage them on a sliding scale of size of semantic unit, from the coarsest, part of speech, to the finest, lexical connotation.

First, when, for example, a concept exists primarily in noun form in one language, and verb form in another, we are talking of a difference in part of speech. As a general example of formal difference, the base form of lexical sets in English, particularly of Latinate words such as *develop—development—developmental—developmentally*, is the *verb*. That is, the verb form is usually the shortest lexical unit within the set for Latinate words, from which all other members are formed. While this length difference may not be so pronounced with Germanic-origin words, where nouns and verbs are often homonyms (e.g., *taste (v.)—taste (n.)—tasteful—tastefully*) or cognates of similar length (e.g. *sell—sale—saleable—saleably*), the adverb is still almost always the longest unit because it is formed by the addition of (Germanic) *-ly*.

However, in Japanese, the shortest unit is the *noun* (at least for Sino-Japanese

compounds). Adverbs, which are formed simply by changing the ending of *i*-adjectives to *-ku* (e.g., 白い *shiroi* ‘white’ to 白く *shiroku* ‘whitely’) or *na*-adjectives to *ni* (e.g., 静かな *shizuka na* ‘quiet’ to 静かに *shizuka ni* ‘quietly’), are resultantly the same length as the original adjective, different from English. Thus I have observed in the case study a shift between parts of speech, presumably either to match the length of the original utterance, to follow the general TL literary convention of concision,⁹⁵ or both. As this commonly results in a more compact and/or simpler element than the direct part-of-speech equivalent in the TL would have been, I term this technique ‘downshifting’.⁹⁶ An example is how both translators convert 白く *shiroku* ‘whitely’ in the opening sentence of *Izu no odoriko* to “white”.

Second, when we consider the various denotative meanings attributable to words within the lexis of a particular part of speech, we are talking of a difference in lexicalisation. For example, ‘girl’ and ‘woman’ are both nouns describing females, ‘female’ being the superordinate term of which they are overlapping subsets (or hyponyms), but they have different lexical delineations, and these delineations in turn differ from their corresponding forms in Japanese—女の子・娘・少女 *onna no ko/musume/shōjo* and 女（の人） *onna (no hito)* respectively.⁹⁷

Third, and most subtly, when two languages possess terms that are analogous both

⁹⁵ Cf. George Orwell’s so-called “rules” of good writing in his 1946 essay ‘Politics and the English Language’, among them: “(ii) Never use a long word where a short one will do. (iii) If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out.” (1970: 170.)

⁹⁶ Laviosa refers to “simplification” (along with explicitation and normalisation) as one of “the three principal universals” of translation studies (2002: 43ff.).

⁹⁷ The fact that Japanese often uses the derivative term for girl 女の子 *onna no ko* lit. ‘woman child’, a hyponym of *onna*, at least as often as the synechdochical kinship term 娘 *musume* lit. ‘daughter’, 少女 *shōjo* ‘maiden’, and the more formal 女子 *joshi*, and has a seemingly redundant form like *onna no hito* lit. ‘woman person’ as an alternative to *onna*, bespeaks the wide lexical field of the term *onna*. See also 2.1.2.2 a. i. for a discussion of lexical segmentation and ambiguity in regard to 女 *onna*.

morphologically and semantically, but differ slightly in their applications, boundaries and/or associations (for example ‘maiden’ and *shōjo*), we are talking of a difference in lexical connotation.

While at first sight it would seem that the part-of-speech differences pose the greatest challenge (considering issues of length, among others), shifting among different parts of speech, as the above *shiroku*/“white” example suggests, is relatively straightforward; in fact it is often the most subtle lexical incompatibilities that cause translators the most difficulty, since they may defy ready replacement and thus are likely either to be lost, or rendered awkwardly. Returning to the example introduced in **2.1.1 Ambiguity**, the word 女 *onna* may be translated as ‘woman’ in English without a moment’s thought, but when the ostensible plural form 女たち (also 女達) *onna-tachi* is used to mean ‘women and girls’, as it is in *Izu no odoriko* on occasion,⁹⁸ it becomes clear that lexicalisations differ in their denotative semantic boundaries (let alone those of lexical connotation).

Lexical connotation is in effect a question of stylistic choices. Presented with a ST in which the same term is repeated many times within a short space of text, many translators avoid reusing the same term in the TL, as if to do so would be a stylistic faux pas.⁹⁹ At times this avoidance is likely to reflect the different literary conventions of the TL, which may not tolerate repetition as much as the SL; but it may simply amount to a reluctance on the part of the translator to use the same words in quick succession.

⁹⁸ Cf. §23, 92, 98, 229, 246, 312, 454, 457, 476, 555. Martin notes that “the meaning of the [plural] suffixes [e.g., *-tachi*] is not plurality of the noun itself; but rather the reference is to a COLLECTIVE that includes—or centers on—the noun.” (1975: 145; original emphasis; my interpolations.)

⁹⁹ See the earlier discussion of ‘elegant variation’. Indeed, when I revised this sentence I changed my second use of “repeat[ing]” to “reusing” to avoid the repetition.

2.1.2.1 Different part of speech

Below is a representative sample of part-of-speech differences in the SL and TL as exemplified in *Izu no odoriko*. In some cases I have suggested the types of transformation (indicated with an arrow) that most often occur in the TTs.

2.1.2.1 a. premodifying adverb+verb

i. premodifying adverb+verb→verb+postmodifying complement

| ST | Literal Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|--|---|
| 1. 道がつづら折りになって、いよいよ天城峠に近づいたと思う頃、雨脚が杉の密林を白く染めながら、すさまじい早さで麓から私を追って来た。 | Lit. ‘ <u>while whitely dyeing the dense wood</u> ’ | With alarming speed, a shower swept toward me from the foot of the mountain, <u>touching the cedar forests white</u> as the road began to wind up into the pass. | About the time the road began to wind and I realized that I was finally near Amagi Pass, a curtain of rain swept up after me at a terrific speed from the foot of the mountain, <u>painting the dense cedar forests white</u> . |

While the adverbial ‘whitely’ is not an impossible form in English, colours that modify transitive verbs are usually rendered in the complementary (postmodifying) adjectival form, as both translators do here, along the lines of the causative ‘make+O+C’. (The ‘make+O+Adv’ structure does not exist in English.) In sum, the TT transformation consists of part-of-speech shift plus syntactic shift (premodification becomes postmodification)—lit. ‘whitely dyeing’ becomes S: “touching ... white” and H: “painting ... white”.

ii. premodifying adverb+verb→verb+postmodifying adverbial phrase/adverb

| ST/Dir. Trans. Excerpt | Seidensticker 1 | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|---|--|
| 18. 私には分らない古風の不思議な形に大きく髪を結っていた。Lit. '[Her] hair was arranged *bigly in an old, fantastic shape I did not know.' | Her hair was swept up <u>in mounds</u> after an old style I hardly know what to call. | Her hair was swept up after an old style I did not recognize. | Her hair was arranged <u>elaborately</u> in an unusual old style unfamiliar to me. |

Another option for translators where a one-word adverbial is inappropriate, as in this case, or awkwardly lengthy, is to convert the one-word adverbial into an adverbial phrase. Here S1 replaces 大きく *‘bigly’ with the adverbial phrase “in mounds”, which S2 omits (maybe on the rationale that “swept up” implies a large-enough quantity of hair to be able to sweep it up). Holman retains the adverb in “elaborately”, but the nuance is different (probably influenced by the adjective 不思議な *fushigi na* ‘fantastic’, which neither translator renders directly), although considerable size is perhaps implicit. Overall the transformation is rephrasing plus syntactic shift.

iii. premodifying adverb+verb→verb (+complement)

It is interesting that in the very next sentence after 大きく *ōkiku* ‘big(ly)’, Kawabata uses the antonym 小さく *chiisaku* ‘small(y)’ as a stylistic device evidently contrasting the dancing girl’s hair and face:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|--|---|--|
| 19. それが卵形の凛々しい顔を非常に小さく見せながらも、美しく調和していた。 | Dir. ‘Though it showed her oval, dignified face extremely [?]small-ly, it <u>beautifully harmonised</u> .’ | Her solemn, oval face <u>was dwarfed</u> under it, and yet the face and the hair <u>went well together</u> [...]. | Although it <u>made</u> her striking oval face <u>look quite small</u> , it <u>created a beautiful harmony</u> . |

We have already established that the ST construction of O+Adv+V is, superficially and with altered syntax, available in English ('I held her tight(ly)'), but for this particular ST conversion, lexical transformation would not work because the verb 'show' is not typically amenable to Vt+A/Adv (transitive verb plus adjective/adverb) structures when the adjective/adverb expresses a physical quality. (Vi (the intransitive) is possible, e.g., 'A light showed pale(ly) in the distance.')

However, the translators' choices adduce the preference in the TL for adverbial phrases/clauses or adjectives+nouns instead of straight adverbs postmodifying the verb, or adjectives complementing it—for example: 'A pale light shone in the distance' rather than 'A light shone palely in the distance'. (Such semantic redistribution was termed 'downshifting' in the introduction to **2.1.2**.)

This time Seidensticker uses a passive construction ("was dwarfed"), which transfers the sense of smallness to the past participle; Holman converts the structure to causative V+O+C ("made her striking oval face look quite small"), which at least is similar to the original form.

In the second example in the same sentence (§19), 美しく調和していた *utsukushiku chōwa shite ita* 'beautifully harmonised' is rendered "went well together" (retaining an adverbial, postpositioned) by Seidensticker, and "created a beautiful harmony" by Holman (the adverbial again downshifted to a premodifying adjective).

2.1.2.1 b. clause+(time/causation) nominal

While the corresponding structures in the SL and TL are substantially different, they are consistently analogous, making straightforward transformation possible. In §23, for example, 私が湯ヶ島へ来る途中 *watashi ga Yugashima e kuru tochū* would come out in an original-syntax translation as 'I [subject marker] Yugashima towards come on-the-

way’, indicating that the original consists of a SOV clause premodifying a nominal element (‘on-the-way’). In English, ‘on the way’ is an adverbial phrase which conversely modifies the connected clause. Thus one must convert it to something like *i.* an SVC structure, or *ii.* an adverbial structure:

***i.* clause+nominal→subject+verb+complement**

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|---|---|
| 23. 最初は私が湯ヶ島へ来る途中、修善寺へ行く彼女たちと湯川橋の近くで出会った。 | Dir. ‘The first time I <u>was on the way to Yugashima</u> , and met her and the others going to Shuzenji near Yukawa Bridge.’ | Once I passed her and the other women by a long bridge <u>half-way down the peninsula</u> . | The first time I encountered them, near Yukawa Bridge, <u>I was on my way to Yugashima Hot Springs</u> while they were going to Shuzenji. |

Seidensticker omits the reference to Yugashima, but leaves a vestige of the grammaticalised noun *tochū* ‘on the way’, albeit geographically recontextualised, in the added exposition “half-way down the peninsula”. Holman faithfully retains the place names, but reconfigures the structure into SVC so that it reads naturally.

***ii.* clause+nominal→adverbial**

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| 182. 太鼓の音が聞える度に胸がほうと明るんだ。 | Dir. ‘When the sound of the <i>taiko</i> could be heard, my heart brightened up.’ | <u>At each drum-beat</u> I felt a surge of relief. | I felt some consolation <u>every time I heard the drum</u> . |

Seidensticker converts the underlined clause 太鼓の音が聞える度に *taiko no oto ga kikoeru tabi ni* from a clause+nominal to the adverbial phrase “At each drum-beat”,

while Holman uses an adverbial clause: “every time I heard the drum”, which is closer to the clausal structure of the ST.

While there are no such examples in the case-study translations, it would be reasonable to expect that this structure would also sometimes be represented in the TT by a conjunction+clause (e.g. ‘while I was on the way to Yugashima’ / ‘when I heard the sound of the drum’).

2.1.2.1 c. こと *koto* / の *no* nominalisation of verb

Koto and the more informal *no*¹⁰⁰ are a convenient way of nominalising verbs and clausal structures in Japanese, akin to the gerund in English (e.g., ‘I was surprised at their seeing me off at the station’ rather than the nested subordinating structure ‘I was surprised that they saw me off at the station’). However, the gerund has a stiff formality that translators are likely to avoid.

i. clause+*koto*+verb→clause+‘that’+clause

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|--|---|--|
| 482. ♪私の噂らしい。 | Dir. ‘It was apparently a rumour about me.’ | ♪They were obviously talking about <u>my crooked teeth</u> . Chiyoko | [27] ♪I gathered they were talking about me. |
| 483. 千代子が私の歯並びの悪いことを云ったので、踊子が金歯を持出したのだろう。 | Dir. ‘Chiyoko talked about the fact that <u>my teeth arrangement was bad</u> , so the dancing girl probably mentioned a gold tooth.’ | <u>must have brought the matter up</u> , and the dancer suggested a gold tooth. | Chiyoko had <u>probably commented that my teeth were crooked</u> , so the dancing girl had suggested gold teeth. |

Here in the ST the first two *nos* are not nominalisations: rather, the first is the possessive *no*, and in the second case the subject particle が *ga* becomes の *no* because it

¹⁰⁰ They are not always grammatically interchangeable.

premodifies the actual nominalisation *koto*: 千代子が私の歯並びの悪いことを云った *Chiyoko ga watashi no hanarabi no warui koto o itta* dir. ‘Chiyoko talked about the fact that my teeth arrangement was bad’. Seidensticker deals with the nominalisation by splitting the sentence across two sentences, isolating “my crooked teeth” in the first, and “Chiyoko must have brought the matter up” in the second, wherein the abstract noun “the matter” corresponds to the nominalising *koto* ‘matter/thing’. Holman keeps the original sentence division, and converts the structure to nested clauses linked with ‘that’: “Chiyoko had probably commented that my teeth were crooked”. Another solution would be to substitute the gerund: ‘Chiyoko had commented on my teeth(’s) being crooked’, which does not sound so stiff with reported speech.

2.1.2.1 d. adverb+verb

i. adverb+verb→(phrasal) verb

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|--|--|--|
| 11. ♪突立っている私を見た踊子が直ぐに自分の座布団を外して裏返しに傍へ置いた。 | Dir. ‘The dancing girl, who saw me standing there, immediately pulled out her own <i>zabuton</i> and <u>put it upside down</u> next to (her).’ | ♪The girl <u>turned over</u> the cushion she had been sitting on and pushed it politely toward me. | [4] ♪As soon as the dancing girl noticed me standing there, she pulled out the cushion she had been kneeling on, <u>turned it over</u> , and placed it near her. |

The ST 裏返しに...置いた *uragaeshi ni ... oita* dir. ‘put it ... upside down’ becomes “turned [...] over” in both translations. One reason Kawabata has not used the verb 裏返す *uragaesu* ‘turn over’ here is that he is indicating two adverbial modifications together (裏返しに傍へ *uragaeshi ni soba e* ‘upside down near to’). But English does not like a sequence of adverbials, as evidenced by the translators’ choosing to verbalise the adverbial to create a sequence of verbs instead (S: “turned over ... and pushed it ...

toward me”; H: “turned it over, and placed it”).

ii. adverb+*suru*→adverbial

The verb *suru* often serves simply to verbalise an adverbial, i.e., to act as a placeholder verb, similar to the way English uses ‘go’ and ‘do’ in the examples ‘go *bang*’ or ‘do badly’. In §294 there are two examples in one sentence:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|--|---|---|
| 294. あなたより一つ下、十九でしてね、旅の空で二度目の子供を早産しちまって子供は <u>一週間ほどして息が絶える</u> し、女房はまだ体が <u>しつかりしない</u> んです。 | Dir. ‘[She] is a year younger than you, eighteen, right, and on the journey she has given birth to a second child prematurely, and <u>after about one week</u> the child drew its last breath, and my wife’s body <u>is not yet sound.</u> ’ | She’s a year younger than you. She lost her second baby on the road this summer. It only lived <u>a week</u> , and she <u>really isn’t well</u> yet. | She’s a year younger than you—nineteen. Our second baby was born prematurely, on the road. It lived just a week . My wife still <u>hasn’t recovered her full health.</u> |

子供は一週間ほどして息が絶える *kodomo wa isshūkan hodo shite iki ga taeru* could be directly translated as ‘As for the child, about one week passed and then its breath ended.’ Both translators choose to replace the clause 一週間ほどして *isshūkan hodo shite* ‘about one week passing’ with the adverbial “a week”, suggesting the verb has very little active sense in its role of adverbial auxiliary. It is interesting that both translators feel the need to characterise the length of time (S: “It only lived a week”; H: “It lived just a week.”), something the ST does not do.

The second instance shows two ways to deal with a combination of (mimetic) adverbial *shikkari* ‘sound(ly)’ and placeholder verb *suru*. S1 converts it to copula+complement “she isn’t really well” (which gains a different emphasis with the syntactic exchange to “really isn’t well” in S2). Holman uses a present-perfect verb+object: “hasn’t recovered her full health”. This transformation demonstrates how

English avoids structures in which most of the semantic weight is placed on adverbials, with verbs ‘merely’ fulfilling a grammatical, placeholder role; instead English prefers to use nuanced verbs which encapsulate both a grammatical and expressive role.

2.1.2.1 e. nominal concatenation (adverbial)→verb+nominal adverbial

Much as with prenominal clauses, Japanese makes extensive use of nominal premodifiers, whereas English again finds them unwieldy. The below example shows the challenge of concision that a high-density block of nominal compounds in the ST can raise in the TT rendering:

| ST/Direct Translation | Seidensticker 1 | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|---|---|
| 410. 落葉で滑りそうな 胸先上りの木下路だっ た。Dir. ‘Made slippery by <u>fallen leaves</u> , it was an <u>under-tree path rising steeply at chest-height</u> .’ | ¶The road wound up through a forest, so steep now that climbing it was like climbing hand-over-hand up a wall . <u>Dead leaves</u> laid it over with a slippery coating. | ¶The road wound up through a forest, so steep that climbing it was like scaling a wall . <u>Dead leaves</u> made a slippery coating. | ¶It was an <u>abrupt climb through the trees</u> . I feared we would slip on the <u>fallen leaves</u> . |

Seidensticker’s first attempt is about twice the length of Holman’s. It uses a cultural conversion for the SL idiom 胸先上り dir. ‘rising up ahead at chest-level’, replacing it with the extensive simile “climbing it was like climbing hand-over-hand up a wall”. This also divides the long sentence into two, separating “dead leaves” from the rest of the descriptive passage. S2 retains these features, but is a little shorter, due to a scaled-down simile with the repetition of “climbing” eliminated (“climbing it was like scaling a wall”). Holman’s translation is concise, but still divided into two sentences. He preserves the nominal concatenation+copula structure of the ST (“It was an abrupt climb through the trees”), but the idiom is lost, generalised to “abrupt”. Further, he feels the need to interpolate the explanatory “I feared” in the second sentence, apparently

considering 滑りそう *suberi-sō* dir. ‘looks like (one) would slip’ too cryptic in a straightforward rendering.

2.1.2.1 f. nominal+verb

i. nominal+verb of existence (ある *aru*)→passive verbal

32. 平常用はないらしく戸障子がなかった。

Dir. ‘There was no regular use apparently, and there were no shōji doors.’

Nouns plus a verb of existence are frequently used in Japanese in place of more active noun-verb combinations.¹⁰¹ Direct translation as a noun plus the copula usually sounds turgid in English. In this case what appears to be a cluster of two nouns, 平常 *heijō* and 用 *yō*, is actually the nominal *heijō* being used as an adverb ‘regularly’ plus the noun *yō* ‘use’. Seidensticker translates the underlined as “another room ... not much used”, while Holman writes “it was not used regularly”. In both cases the passive allows the focus to remain on the non-human subject while converting the nouns to a verb structure, but it would not be difficult to retain some of the original noun structure in an acceptable way: ‘The room did not appear to get much use.’

ii. (noun+verb)→(noun+)verb

This combined structure is the result of Japanese’s hybrid Sino-Japanese grammar, consisting as it does of a Chinese-character compound plus verb, with no intermediate object or subject marker (を・が *o/ga*). The example below is 早産する *sōzan suru* ‘give birth prematurely’, not **sōzan o suru*, with an object marker. (The object marker *o*

¹⁰¹ This is similar to the above S+C(+copula) structure in 2.1.1 e. ii.

moves before the N+V unit to operate on a concrete noun, as in 子どもを早産する *kodomo o sōzan suru* ‘give birth to a child prematurely’.) It seems logical to usually render such integrated noun-verb units as a straight verb in English, with the only caveat being that Chinese compounds in Japanese are often the equivalent register of the Latinate, ‘prestige’ form in English. An unproblematic example is 勉強する *benkyō suru* → ‘(to) study’ (hence, for example, 日本語を勉強する *nihongo o benkyō suru* ‘study Japanese’). In the below case, Japanese and English structures coincide. Since ‘give birth’ consists of a placeholder verb plus noun, the lack of article increases the similarity of structure with *sōzan suru* (the sense that it is too early, however, is pushed into the adverb ‘prematurely’):

294. [...] 旅の空で二度目の子供を早産しちまって [...].

Dir. ‘(my wife) gave birth prematurely to (her) second child on the journey’

The Japanese is complicated here by the fact that the verb form is emphatic (しちまって *shichimatte*, an informal variant of してしまつて *shite shimatte*, which expresses regret). Despite the fact that English has a fairly similar structure in ‘give birth prematurely’, neither translator uses this form. Seidensticker conflates the premature birth and the subsequent death of the child: “She lost her second baby”. Holman follows the original more closely, with an appropriately Latinate adverb—“Our second baby was born prematurely”—but it moves the subject of the clause from the wife Chiyoko to the baby. Both translators thus again convert the nominal element of the ST to a verbal one.

iii. object noun+verb→verb+adverb

Some sentences with this structure can employ the same parts of speech in the TL, but

many need to be transformed into V+Adv, because often O+V sounds awkward in English (for example, ‘I felt afraid’ is more likely a translation than ‘I felt fear’ for the Japanese 恐怖を感じた *kyōfu o kanjita*). Even in the SL, one could regard this structure as slightly marked when compared to the more regular Adv+V (see below):

416. 踊子が話しかけた時に、追いつかせるつもりで待っていると、彼女はやはり足を
停めてしまって、私が歩き出すまで歩かない。

Lit. ‘When (she) started speaking to me, and I waited for her to catch up, she always stopped
her feet, and did not walk until I started walking.’

Seidensticker translates the underlined 足を停めて *ashi o tomete* ‘came to a halt’ with the indifferent “waited” (having translated the earlier 待っている ‘waited’ as “would pause”). Holman’s “would stop short” is closer to the original *ashi o tomete* in that it retains its two-element structure, though as noted this takes the form of V+Adv rather than O+V. Here is a second example:

556. 私は素早く寂しさを感じた。 Dir. ‘I rapidly felt loneliness.’

Here 寂しさを感じた *sabishisa o kanjita* is a slightly marked form of the more usual 寂しく感じた *sabishiku kanjita* ‘felt lonely’, emphasising the emotional content through the use of the nominal and hence rendering the abstract as something almost palpable. Seidensticker does well perhaps to employ a slightly less common synonym of ‘lonely’ in his translation: “I was suddenly lonesome”. This time, however, it is Holman whose translation seems indifferent: “I felt sad”. Perhaps an interesting compromise between ST and TL would be ‘I felt a **sudden sadness**’, where the noun form is retained and adjective (converted from the original adverb) and noun reinforce each other with their similar phonetic patterning (consonance).

A notable sub-group of ‘O+V’ is ‘O+o+*suru*’. This differs from N+*suru* above (e.g., *sōzan suru*) in that there is a clear object-transitive verb (O+Vt) relationship between the nominal and adjacent verb,¹⁰² but it is similar in that *suru* is a placeholder verb, its semantic moment coming almost entirely from the attached object:

341. そこへ、この木賃宿の間を借りて鳥屋をしていると云う四十前後の男が襖を明けて、御馳走をすると娘達を呼んだ。

Dir. ‘A man in his forties who was said to be working as a poulterer’

Both the ‘working’ and ‘as’ parts, as well as the person, are implied, as the literal translation of 鳥屋をしている *toriya o shite iru* would be ‘doing a chicken shop’. The suffix 屋 *ya* ‘shop’ is often used metonymically to mean ‘shop owner’ or ‘someone who runs the shop’ (something reversed in English: e.g., ‘the grocer’s’). Seidensticker thus more closely approaches the origins of the term with his “was said to be in the poultry business”, while Holman uses the more TL-domesticated “who said he was a poulterer”.

Overall, then, the translators tend to de-emphasise the nominal element of the ST in the above examples and reconfigure it as another part of speech, particularly a verb (another manifestation of ‘downshifting’).

iv. subject noun+verb(+object)

The two most salient general exemplars of this group are subject+*ga+mieru* ‘... [be] visible’ and subject+*ga+kikoeru* ‘... [be] audible’. 見える *mieru* is translated in a wide variety of ways in the TTs (overleaf):

¹⁰² Note that while 日本語の勉強をする *nihongo no benkyō o suru* ‘do (one’s) Japanese study’ is possible, *子どもの早産をする **kodomo no sōzan o suru* ‘do the premature birth of a child’ is not.

Table 3: Comparison of translations of 見える *mieru*

| ST | Seidensticker Translation | Holman Translation |
|-------------|--|---|
| 90. 見えた | Ø (were) | I could make out |
| 239. 見え出した | It had ... become clear | It ... became apparent |
| 336. 見えた | S1: seemed; S2: We could see | From where I watched, it looked as though |
| 370. 見えた | Ø (She knelt beside the drum, her back toward us.) | I could watch her back from the window as though she were in the next room. |
| 404. 見えるんです | Ø (It's so big!) | See how big it looks. |
| 459. 見えた | Ø (were) | we saw |
| 555. 見えない | Ø (were not) | There was no sign of |
| 591. 見えていた | I could see | I could see |

Two points are salient in this table. First, Seidensticker ignores *mieru* in most instances, while Holman acknowledges it in all: a clear case where the translators observe their overall SL-/TL-orientated strategies. Second, the translators find a wide variety of ways of dealing with *mieru*. The gamut of renderings ranges from Seidensticker's omitting the mediating concept of 'seeing' by using another verb, usually the copula,¹⁰³ through to Holman's strong focus on the watching viewer (§336, 370).

§90 exemplifies their disparate approaches:

90. この模型のような展望の裾の方に芸人達の姿が見えた。

Dir. 'At the foot of this model-like prospect the figures of the travelling entertainers could be seen.'

S: Near the bottom of the jagged figure were the dancer and her companions.

H: I could make out the itinerant entertainers down at the bottom.

Seidensticker focuses on the presence of the entertainers, Holman on the viewer; *mieru* contains elements of both, and thus both focuses are valid.

¹⁰³ §90, 370, 404, 455, 459, 555; 370 simply describes the dancing girl's action with "knelt".

The closest we get to a common rendering is “could see”, which Seidensticker uses twice and Holman once (S§336, S591; H591). Formally we could consider “(Eikichi) seemed” (S§336) and “(it) looks” (H§404) to be the closest to the original subject+*mieru* pattern. *Mieru*, with similar idiomatic uses to English ‘look/see’, covers such a wide range of lexical segmentations that it seems inevitable that its translations be so disparate.

In contrast, the translations of *kikoeru* do not demonstrate such variety.¹⁰⁴ Seidensticker and Holman consistently translate it as “I could hear” or “I heard”, the only exceptions being where Seidensticker again replaces the verb entirely (§174, 175, 182). This lack of variation suggests that the lexical segmentation for *kikoeru* is much more limited than for *mieru*, despite sharing with the English verb ‘sound’ various idiomatic uses.

v. subject+nominal predicate

Martin labels this structure ‘propredication’:

In a propredicational sentence the copula is used to mark an ellipsis of some specific predicate either alone or together with any number of its adjuncts. This is a device that lets you be as vague, or unexplicit [*sic*], as you like about the verbal element. (1975: 239)

Kawabata appears to favour this structure, given its relative commonness in *Izu no odoriko*. It can be seen as an extreme manifestation of the previously posited tendency of Japanese to downplay the semantic importance of verbs and shift this to nouns and adverbials.

¹⁰⁴ §173, 174, 175, 182, 204, 205, 231, 412, 419, 485, 551.

This is particularly obvious in representations of spoken language:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 260. ♯「 <u>今晚は徹夜ですぞ。打ち明すんですぞ。</u> 」 | Dir. 'Tonight <u>is all night!</u> We'll play till morning!' | ' <u>It's an all-night match</u> tonight. We'll play the whole night through.' | " <u>It's all night</u> tonight! We're going to play until morning." |

Here both translators demonstrate the awkwardness of retaining the S+V structure in the TL.

A second such structure exists in the next sentence, but this time both translators perform a transformation:

| ST | Literal Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| 261. ♯ <u>私もまた非常に好戦的な気持ちだった。</u> | Lit. 'For me too again <u>it was an extremely aggressive feeling.</u> ' | I <u>felt invincible.</u> | ♯Now I, too, <u>felt ready for a good battle.</u> |

The Japanese employs a topic+subject double-subject (私 *watashi* 'I' and 気持ち *kimochi* 'feeling'), while the translators resolve the double subject into "I (...) felt", hence shifting the noun *kimochi* to the verb 'feel'.

This is followed immediately by yet another example of the copula structure:

| ST | Literal Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 262. ♯ <u>その次の朝八時が湯ヶ野出立の約束だった。</u> | Lit. 'The next morning at eight was the Yugano departure promise.' | <u>We were to leave Yugano</u> at eight the next morning. | <u>We had agreed to leave Yugano</u> at eight o'clock the next morning. |

This time the grammatical subject of the ST is その次の朝八時 *sono tsugi no asa hachi-ji* 'The next morning at eight'; both the translators replace this with the personal subject 'we', which they consider to be implied. Further, the long nominal

concatenation 湯ヶ野出立の約束 *Yugano shuttatsu no yakusoku* lit. ‘[t]he Yugano departure promise’ is shifted into active verb form in English (S: “We were to leave Yugano”; H: “We had agreed to leave Yugano”). Clearly English prose does not well tolerate the noun+copula structure: translators will be strongly drawn to transferring the lexical value from the subject to the verb. (For more on this issue, see **3.1.7 Repetition**.)

2.1.2.1 g. nominal compounds

i. concatenated nominal compound → nominal conflation (modified noun)

Another feature of Chinese compounds is a lack of need for paratactic connectors between adjacent nominals. This includes equal-status items from the same lexical field (as in the below example); opposites that combine to form a synthetic lexis (so-called ‘dvandva compounds’ (Kurusu 2005), e.g. 遠近 *enkin* ‘perspective’ (lit. ‘far (and) near’) in §164); and complementary pairs (e.g. 親子兄弟 *oyako-kyōdai* ‘parents, children and siblings’ (lit. ‘elder brother/younger brother’).¹⁰⁵ English, however, requires a grammatical connector:

32. 平常用はないらしくと戸障子がなかった。

Dir. ‘(It) was apparently not regularly used, and there were no doors and shōji.’

‘Doors and shōji’ or ‘doors or shōji’ are potential solutions in this case; however, neither translator has chosen them. Seidensticker omits the expression, while Holman goes for a modified noun—“sliding paper doors”—which clearly is a conflation of ‘sliding panels’ (an unpacked translation of *shōji*) and ‘doors’. This denies the presence of the more

¹⁰⁵ Backhouse calls these “coordinating compounds” (1993: 82).

solid doors, but has the advantage of relative concision in explicating *shōji*.

2.1.2.1 h. verb+noun

i. ~まま ~*mama* ‘((leaving something) done) as it is’

Mama is technically a noun, originally represented by the character 儘, but now almost exclusively written in *hiragana* and grammaticalised. There is no close nominal equivalent in English, although ‘state’ may approximate it in some cases. Here is the first example of its use in the ST:

41. 到底生物と思えない山の怪奇を眺めたまま、私は棒立ちになっていた。

Dir. ‘Remaining staring at the mountain of mystery that could not be considered a living thing, I stood stock still.’¹⁰⁶

Here *mama* has an intensifying effect, chiming with 棒立ちになっていた ‘stood stock still’, and is not really semantically necessary. This redundancy is reflected in the translations: Seidensticker omits the latter expression (“I stared at this apparition”) while Holman includes something of it, but does not directly translate *mama* (“I stood stiff, staring at him”), though the alliteration (and perhaps the rhythm of the interposing comma caesura) can be seen as performing the intensification phonetically.

Staring is of course a cultural faux pas in both Western and Japanese culture, but even more so in the latter, where sustained eye contact is considered rude in many contexts (Plotnik and Kouyoumdjian 2010: 522). Furthermore, being rooted to the spot through embarrassment appears to be a particularly Asian trope. It is therefore interesting to see both cultural phenomena not only appear together in the same

¹⁰⁶ While ‘stock still’ is an idiom, this is still effectively a literal translation, as the original 棒立ち idiom means ‘stick standing’, and ‘stock’ is of course a cognate of ‘stick’.

sentence, but also linked by the use of *mama*. Moreover, in fact, this expression also performs an important characterisation role in implicating the narrator and dancing girl in a mutual awkwardness that can be seen as presaging incipient romantic feelings. Here the dancing girl is not so much avoiding eye contact as trying to prevent the narrator from seeing her ‘morning face’, which had been her first instinct when the narrator arrived in §266, but there is an element of instinctual politeness in her action as well. Let us examine the various manifestations of *mama* in the scene.

271. 彼女は眩しそうにくるりと寝返りして、掌で顔を隠したまま布団を滑り出ると、廊下に座り、¶「昨夜はありがとうございました。」と、綺麗なお辞儀をして、立ったままの私をまごつかせた。

Dir. ‘She turned over in the bed as if dazzled, and, with her palms continuing to hide her face, slipped out of the futon, sitting in the hallway, said “Thank you very much for last night,” gave a beautiful bow, and made me, still standing there, feel flustered.’

S1: Abruptly, still hiding her face, she rolled over, slipped out of bed, and bowed low before me in the hall. I stood dumbly wondering what to do.

S2: As if dazzled by the morning light, she rolled over and slipped out of bed, her hands still against her face. Then she knelt on the veranda and thanked me for the evening before. I stood over her uncomfortably.

H: She turned away as if to avoid the light. Hiding her face with her hands, she slid out of the covers and knelt in the hall. ¶“Thank you for last night.” She gave a pretty bow. I felt awkward standing over her.

The original presents a complex sequence in a single sentence. S1 makes two sentences of it, and S2 three. Holman divides it into all of five sentences. Seidensticker has ‘improved’ his translation by adding in the explicative simile “As if dazzled by the morning light” in S2, but strangely has reduced the explicitness of 顔を隠したまま *kao o kakushita mama* (dir. ‘with her palms continuing to hide her face’) from “still hiding her face” (S1) to “her hands still against her face” (S2), diffusing the power of ‘hide’.

Holman retains this (“Hiding her face with her hands”), though makes no attempt to indicate that it is a continuing action. While S1 conveys something of 立ったまま *tatta mama* dir. ‘still standing there’ with his “I stood dumbly”, neither S2 nor Holman retain the element of continuation, which suggests the difficulty of effectively rendering *mama* in translation.

2.1.2.1 i. *te*-verbal concatenation

Japanese often uses verbs adverbially by stringing them together in their *-te/-de* or gerund form (Martin 1975: 484, 491). While this is also possible in English (for example, ‘I hurried and cleaned the apartment’, ‘I hurried to clean the apartment’, or ‘hurrying, I cleaned the apartment’ rather than ‘I hurriedly cleaned the apartment’, the former three arguably emphasise ‘hurry’, which is not true of a comparable structure in Japanese. This verbal concatenation can occur before the main verb or after it. For example, in §329, 慌てて湯から上る *awatete yu kara agaru* lit. ‘(they) hurried and rose from the hot water’, *awatete* ‘hurrying’ premodifies *agaru* ‘rise (get out)’. On the other hand, in §598 うなずいて見せた *unazuite miseta*, *miseta* ‘showed’ postmodifies *unazuite* ‘nodding’, combining to mean ‘gave a nod’.¹⁰⁷

As this concatenated structure is potentially marked in English, it is likely that translations will either consist of Adv+V or single-verb structures. For the first of two instances in §329, the translators choose a single verb that conveys both elements simultaneously:

¹⁰⁷ See Martin (1975: 545) and also **2.1.1 Ambiguity** for more on the concatenated *-te miseru* verbal form in §598.

| ST | Literal Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|--|--|
| 329. 千代子と百合子も あわてて湯から上ると、 [84] 二階へは上って来 ずに <u>逃げて帰った</u> 。 | Lit. ‘Chiyoko and Yuriko too, <u>having hurried and risen from the bath</u> , without coming up to the second floor, <u>escaped and went home</u> .’ | Chiyoko and Yuriko <u>clattered out of the bath</u> downstairs at almost the same moment and <u>retreated</u> across the bridge without saying good-bye. | Chiyoko and Yuriko <u>rushed out of the bath</u> at my inn and <u>hurried back</u> <u>to their lodging house</u> without coming upstairs. |

Seidensticker’s “clattered out of the bath” has the merit of a strong onomatopoeic quality, reflecting the hurried state and echoing the rapid double ‘t’ of *awatete*. One wonders, however, how likely it is for girls to ‘clatter’ out of a bath (unless one infers their use of wooden slippers; ‘clambered’, perhaps?). Holman’s “rushed out” is serviceable if colourless, the base verb ‘rushed’ conveying the celerity, the particle ‘out’ an expression of the motion of *agaru*. In fact, he preserves the “hurried” verb, shifting it to later in the sentence, but here it is linked to the second verbal concatenation 逃げて帰った *nigete kaetta* lit. ‘escaping went home’. The phrasal verb “hurried back” again allows Holman to combine both verbal elements of the original, but it is not sufficient to convey that the girls are going back to their current place of residence, so he adds “to their lodging house”. Seidensticker ignores the second verbal element, simply retaining *nigete* ‘escaping’ in “retreated across the bridge”.

Overall, phrasal verbs, with a particle modifying the base verb, appear a good match for verbal concatenations in the SL, because they echo the bipartite structure; but such phrasal verbs need to be carefully chosen to convey the power of the original double-verb concatenation.

2.1.2.1 Conclusion

Based on the part-of-speech divergences we have seen above, one can posit that the

semantic ‘centres of gravity’ of Japanese and English are different. In Japanese, verbals are often relegated to the role of place-holders, grudgingly included for their necessary grammatical clincher at the very end of sentences, while adverbials glitter enticingly at the head of the sentence, drawing in the viewer. Yet the ‘meat’ in the middle of the sentence is usually the nominals, often in stolid, self-sustaining blocks, around which the main point of the sentence accretes. This configuration chimes with Nakajima’s portrayal of Japanese as a “static”, “planar and descriptive” language (1987: 13; my translation: see footnote 108 below).

English, on the other hand, craves action. Prose stylists such as Orwell enjoin us to shun the ponderously dull adverb- and adjective-laden copula (“It was a dark and stormy night....”) and strike out boldly with vibrant verbs. Correspondingly, Nakajima portrays English as “dynamic”, “three-dimensional and explanatory” (1987: 13).¹⁰⁸

Reconciling these differing centres of gravity will inevitably entail problems, and some elements—probably those with the least ‘mass’—are likely to be ejected from the semantic orbit when the centres are momentarily brought together in the translation process.

I believe that the fundamental difference in noun/verb emphasis summarised above helps to explain many of the transformation decisions in JE translation. I shall return to Nakajima’s characterisations of Japanese and English in Chapter Four.

2.1.2.2 Different lexicalisation

This section examines the major lexicalisation differences between Japanese and

¹⁰⁸ Nakajima uses the English words ‘static’ and ‘dynamic’, but the rest of the quotations are my translation from the original Japanese: 「日本語の表現が平面的・描写的であるとすれば、英語の表現は立体的・説明的であると言えよう。」 “We can say that if Japanese expression is planar and descriptive, then English expression is three-dimensional and explanatory.” (Nakajima 1987: 13.)

English observed in *Izu no odoriko*.

2.1.2.2 a. noun

i. different lexical segmentation

Example 1: 女 *onna* ‘woman’

Perhaps the single biggest issue of lexical difference arises with this term. Certainly, one can find examples where the Japanese and English senses, and the translators’ choices, coincide:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 180. 女の金切声が時々稲妻のように闇夜に鋭く通った。 | Dir. ‘ <u>A woman’s</u> shrill voice sometimes pierced the dark night like lightning.’ | Now and again a shrill <u>woman’s</u> voice came across the darkness like the crack of a whip . | Occasionally a <u>woman’s</u> high, piercing voice rent the night like a thunderbolt. |

However, such agreement is rare. In the majority of instances, SL and TL usage differs, and more often than not so do the translators’ choices, hinting at the difficulties involved in reconciling those differences with the demands of the text. Here is a key example:

213. ♪仄暗い湯殿の奥から、突然裸の女が走り出して来たかと思うと、脱衣場の突鼻に川岸へ飛下りそうな格好で立ち、両手を一ぱいに伸して何か叫んでいる。

Dir. ‘From out of the dim bathroom, suddenly a naked woman came running, and, at the edge of the changing area stood in a pose as if to jump down to the riverbank, stretching both hands all the way and yelling something.’

S: ♪One small figure ran out into the sunlight and stood for a moment at the edge of the platform calling something to us, arms raised as though for a plunge into the river.

H: ♪Suddenly a naked woman ran out from the rear of the dark bathhouse. She stood at the edge of the changing area as if she might come flying down the bank. She was shouting with her arms outstretched.

The treatment of *onna* is especially sensitive since, in what can be seen as the crux of

the novella, the author is creating an emotive sketch from the narrator's reaction to the sudden appearance of the naked dancing girl. At this moment the narrator realises that the girl is younger than he thought, fundamentally changing his attitude towards her. By using the word *onna*, Kawabata cleverly signals the ambiguity of their relationship. *Onna* means 'woman', but this is not a womanly figure waving at him artlessly, rather that of a child. However, for a moment of psychological confusion she represents a primal female figure, resolving at last into a girl. Seidensticker latches onto the ambiguity, rendering *onna* as the androgynous and neutral "figure" and erasing subsequent deictic markers by using compressed forms ("and [~~she~~] stood" ... "[~~she was~~] calling" ... "[~~her~~] arms raised") that would otherwise have established the gender within the sentence. Holman translates *onna* directly as "woman", and reinforces the gendering with two uses of "she", which begin the following two short sentences.

Another example provides further clues to the semantic boundaries of *onna*:

441. すると踊子は唐突に女の名前を二つ三つあげて、私に見当のつかない話を始めた。

Dir. 'Having done this, the dancing girl suddenly cited two or three women's names, and began a talk that I could not follow.'

S: She mentioned two or three girls' names that meant nothing to me, and rambled on with a string of reminiscences.

H: The dancing girl mentioned two or three girl's [*sic?*] names and began talking about something I could not follow.

Here it is particularly interesting that Kawabata uses 女の名前 *onna no namae* 'women's names' in a situation where the dancing girl is evidently talking about her school friends, who are girls rather than women. This suggests how the Japanese concept of 'girl' can at times be seen as a diminutive of 'woman' rather than a separate concept, in the same way that 男の子 *otoko no ko* 'boy' is a diminutive of 男 *otoko*

‘man’.¹⁰⁹

§441 above provides a rare example where the translators agree on how to treat *onna*. A comparison of the lexical spread of Seidensticker’s and Holman’s renderings of *onna* across the complete list of instances¹¹⁰ reveals the extent of overall divergence :

Table 4: Instances of 女 *onna* in the ST and their translations

| ST | Seidensticker | Holman |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|
| 15. 女 <i>onna</i> ‘woman’ | women | female [as modifier] |
| 21. 若い女 <i>wakai onna</i> ‘young women’ | young women | older girls |
| 24. 若い女 | Ø | girls |
| 54. 女 | travelers | female [as modifier] |
| 61. 女の <i>onna no</i> ‘woman’s’ | women | woman’s |
| 92. 女達 <i>onna-tachi</i> ‘women’ | the women | the women |
| 98. 女たち <i>onna-tachi</i> ‘women’ | women | women |
| 112. 女 | woman | girl |
| 115. 女 | woman | her companion |
| 140. 女 | Ø | girls |
| 174. 女の | women’s | women’s |
| 177. 女の | women’s | women’s |
| 180. 女の | woman’s | woman’s |
| 213. 女 | figure | woman |
| 229. 女達 | the two of them | they |
| 246. 女達 | the performers | the girls |
| 311. 女ども <i>onna-domo</i> ‘women’ | they | the girls |
| 312. 女たち | the three of them | the girls |
| 317. 若い女 | young women | girls |
| 322. 女 | women | girls |
| 441. 女の | girls’ | girl’s |
| 454. 女達 | the women | the girls |
| 455. 女 | women | women |
| 457. 女達 | the women | the women |
| 476. 女達 | the other women | the other women |
| 529. 女 | women | women |
| 555. 女達 | the women | the women |

¹⁰⁹ A completely separate issue, which will not be addressed in this work, is why 女の子 *onna no ko* only appears twice in the ST (§58, 590), while *musume* (see below) is used 18 times to mean ‘girl’.

¹¹⁰ I exclude here the set epithet 四十女 *yonjū-onna* ‘woman in her forties’, which both translators render consistently as “woman (in her forties, etc.)”. (Nine instances: §100, 103, 117, 123, 132, 136, 226, 274, 276.) This expression is considered in detail below.

Note that many instances of *onna* are explicit plural forms, with the suffixes *-tachi* or *-domo*, adding another level of complexity to their lexicality, although plurality is the only area in which the translators tend to be in agreement on their renderings. There is considerable use of “woman”/“women” as a translation for *onna(tachi)*, but this does not necessarily match the singular/plural markers in the ST, and the translators rarely use the same form, except for the nine cases in which they both use “women”. Seidensticker uses the term “woman”/“women” 18 times out of 27 occurrences in the ST, and Holman only 12 times. Holman appears to favour ‘girl’ much more than Seidensticker, using it 11 times to Seidensticker’s one. Let us now compare the translators’ treatment of the companion term 娘 *musume*.

Example 2: 娘 *musume* ‘daughter/girl’

Musume differs from *onna* in that it has two main denotations, the base meaning ‘daughter’ and the derived sense ‘girl’ (with both reflected semantically in the *kanji* character 娘, whose lefthand component is the 女偏 *onna-hen* ‘woman radical’). In fact, the former meaning does not appear at all in *Izu no odoriko*, though the older woman is referred to as the mother of the girl Chiyoko. Once again, the translators lexicalise the term across the range of girl \leftrightarrow woman, as this juxtaposition of representative examples shows:

104. ¶ 「高等学校の学生さんよ。」と、上の娘が踊子に囁いた。

Dir. ‘ “He is a high-school student!” the oldest girl whispered to the dancing girl.’

S2: ¶ ‘He’s a high-school boy,’ one of the young women whispered to the little dancer, giggling as I glanced back.

H: ¶ ‘He’s an upper-school student,” the oldest girl whispered to the dancing girl.

126. 娘達は一時に私を見たが、至極なんでもない顔をして、少し羞かしそうにしていた。

Dir. ‘The girls once looked at me, but, making a face of extreme indifference, were acting a little embarrassed.’

S: The younger women looked at me silently and a little shyly, as if the matter were no concern of theirs.

H: The girls all glanced at me at the same time. They stopped talking, their faces seemingly indifferent. Then their gaze turned to embarrassment.

267. 彼女は中の娘と一つの床に寝ていた。

Dir. ‘She was sleeping with the middle girl in one bed.’

S1: The dancing girl lay almost at my feet, sharing a quilt with the youngest of the women.

H: She was sharing a futon with the middle girl.

301. もう一人の百合子と云う十七の娘だけが大島産れで雇いだとのことだった。

Dir. ‘Only the other girl called Yuriko was Ōshima-born and was an employee.’

S: The other girl, Yuriko, was a sort of maid. She was sixteen, and the only one among them who was really from Oshima.

H: The other girl, Yuriko, seventeen years old, was the only native of Oshima. She was employed by them.

Let us compare Seidensticker and Holman’s diction across the complete set of translations of *musume* (overleaf in its entirety for ease of reference):

| ST | Seidensticker | Holman |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| §20. 娘 <i>musume</i> ‘girl’ | beauties | girls |
| §101. 上の娘 ... 中の娘 <i>ue no musume ... naka no musume</i> ‘eldest girl’ ... ‘middle girl’ | the two younger women [conflated] | The oldest girl The middle girl |
| §104. 上の娘 | one of the young women | the oldest girl |
| §126. 娘達 <i>musume-tachi</i> ‘girls’ | the younger women | the girls |
| §155. 芸人の娘 <i>geinin no musume</i> ‘entertainer girls’ | one of the women | the entertainers ... one of them |
| §223. 娘盛り <i>musume-zakari</i> ‘girl in her prime’ | girl | young woman in her prime |
| §224. 上の娘 | the older of the two young women | the oldest girl |
| §229. 上の娘 | the younger woman | girl |
| §238. 娘が三人 <i>musume ga sannin</i> ‘three girls’ | S1 the younger women S2 they | the three girls |
| §249. 娘たち ‘girls’ | the women | the girls |
| §251. 娘達 ‘girls’ | the women | the girls |
| §267. 中の娘 | the youngest of the women | the middle girl |
| §272. 上の娘 | the older of the young women | the oldest girl |
| §293. 上の娘 | the older of the young women | the oldest girl |
| §301. 娘 | girl | girl |
| §341. 娘達 ‘girls’ | the women | the girls |
| §347. 生娘 <i>kimusume</i> ‘maiden’ | no one has touched her | an innocent virgin |
| §389. 娘達 | S1 the girls S2 the three younger ones | the girls |

Out of the total of 18 instances there is a high level of consistency within each translator’s set of lexical choices. The clear difference between them—Seidensticker’s ‘woman’ (12 uses out of 18) vs. Holman’s ‘girl’ (16 out of 18)—indicates not only how the translator chooses to lexicalise *musume* in the context of this story, but also perhaps its lexical relationship to *onna* in the same context. One wonders whether Seidensticker is influenced by the lexical range of *onna-tachi* elsewhere in the text and has decided to preserve the connection between the older woman and the other females by putting them all on a continuum of ‘woman’: hence the girls are in effect defined by the presence of the older woman in their midst. On the other hand, Holman continually assigns the normal equivalent ‘girl’ to *musume*, effectively ignoring those cases where

he translates *onna* as ‘woman’ when it refers to the girls. Hence in summary there is apparently a strong relationship between the terms *onna* and *musume* in Seidensticker’s mind, but not in Holman’s.

§21 gives us another way of looking at the lexicalisation of *onna* when the group is referenced:

21. 踊子の連れは四十代の女が一人、若い女が二人、ほかに長岡温泉の宿屋の印半纏を着た二十五六の男がいた。

Dir. ‘The dancing girl’s companions were one woman in her forties, two young women, plus a man of twenty-five or twenty-six who wore the livery of a Nagaoka spa inn.’

S2: Two other young women were with her, and a man in his mid-twenties, wearing the livery of a Nagaoka inn. A woman in her forties presided over the group.

H: The dancing girl was accompanied by a woman in her forties, two older girls, and a man of about twenty-five, who was wearing a jacket with the insignia of Nagaoka Hot Springs on it.

We can view the females of the group on a continuum of age, from the dancing girl at the lowest-age end of the range, to the woman in her forties at the other end. In §21 it appears that Seidensticker’s point of reference is the oldest female: not only does he refer to this woman as a “woman in her forties”, but also characterises the others as “young women”, and in fact minimises the dancing girl’s presence in the sentence to “her”. On the other hand, Holman appears to make the dancing girl his point of reference when referring to the group as a whole, as he contrasts the “woman in her forties” with the “two older girls”, the deictic ‘older’ referring back of course to contrast with the “dancing girl” who is mentioned at the beginning of the sentence. Thus if one may continue to talk of lexical ‘centres of gravity’, in reference to the females as a group, Seidensticker’s is the oldest female, while Holman’s is the youngest. In keeping with the unstable nature of the translations of *onna*, this pattern is not consistent across

all examples (cf. §92, 98, 457, where both translators use “women”).

Further, the far greater range of translations of *onna* above compared to those of *musume* suggests that *onna* is much more problematic for the translators, at least within the context of this text, with its unwieldy grouping of one adult woman and three post-adolescent or pubescent females. One could posit as a general rule of thumb that longitudinally consistent translations suggest that a given term is relatively easy to translate, while great variation may indicate a problematic term.

The analogy of a semantic ‘centre of gravity’ could be extended to incorporate the image of an atom about which electrons are flying. Electrons seek the lowest possible ‘shell’ within which they can spin in a stable orbit, but when excited by the application of energy, they jump to higher shell levels, before eventually returning to the stable level. Similarly, if a term has many potential shells or levels of representation (i.e., lexicalisations), it may be more likely to be unstable and oscillate between them when energised by its placement among other atoms of meaning (i.e., words or expressions). This image thus lends even greater resonance to the application of the term *multivalent*¹¹¹ (i.e., polysemous) with regard to translation.¹¹²

Given that the ‘woman/girl’ \approx *onna/musume* lexical sets are a touchstone for lexical issues in the present discussion, it is worth looking at one more particularly involved example to finish this section:

¹¹¹ *OED*: “Having or susceptible of many applications, interpretations, meanings, or values.”

¹¹² One might similarly be able to apply the Heisenberg uncertainty principle to the issue of ambiguity.

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|--|---|---|
| 100. 四十女は子犬を抱いていた。 | Dir. ‘ <u>forties woman</u> ’ | The <u>older woman</u> held a puppy, the two <u>younger women</u> carried large | The <u>woman in her forties</u> was holding a puppy. |
| 101. 上の娘が風呂敷包、中の娘が柳行李、それぞれ大きい荷物を持っていた。 | Dir. ‘ <u>oldest girl</u> ... <u>middle girl</u> ’ | bundles, one wicker, the other wrapped in a kerchief . | The <u>oldest girl</u> was toting a cloth bundle. The <u>middle girl</u> also had a wicker trunk. |
| 102. 踊子は太鼓とその杵を負っていた。 | Dir. ‘ <u>dancing girl</u> ’ | The <u>girl</u> had her drum and its stand. | The <u>dancing girl</u> had a drum and frame on her back. |
| 103. 四十女もぼつぼつ私に話しかけた。 | Dir. ‘ <u>forties woman</u> ’ | The <u>older woman</u> presently joined in the conversation. | Little by little, <u>the woman, who seemed to be in her forties</u> , began to talk to me. |

If the ‘woman in her forties’ plays a slightly forbidding, proscriptive role in the story of *Izu no odoriko*, acting as she does as a representative of societal mores in the way she chaperones the dancing girl, and is bluff rather than effusive in her dealings with the narrator’s class-hopping interloper, her presence looms equally in a linguistic sense. Not only does the character influence Seidensticker’s approach to the rendering of the non-epithetic *onna*, as we have seen above; it also presents something of a translation conundrum in the mouthful that is ‘woman in her forties’. In a clear editing oversight that reflects this awkwardness, Holman first refers to her as the “woman in her forties” (§100) and then only three sentences later notes redundantly “Little by little, the woman, who seemed to be in her forties, began to talk to me.” But from this point on in the text, Holman relegates 四十女 *yon-jū onna* lit. ‘forties woman’ to “the older woman” or “the woman”. Seidensticker, characteristically, expunges the age reference, referring to her exclusively as “the older woman” or “the woman” after introducing her approximate age in §21. Holman’s more frequent use of ‘girl’ for *onna* may be to emphasise the age gap between the females.

Seidensticker also has little time for the middle females, conflating ‘oldest girl’ and

‘middle girl’ into “the two younger women” and thereby deeming the “older woman” to be the lexical determiner of the set ‘female’. Holman keeps “oldest girl” and “middle girl”, allowing him to shade smoothly into “dancing girl” in the next sentence and thereby characterise her position in the age hierarchy.

Thus the overall contrast to be drawn between the translations is Seidensticker’s focus on ‘woman’ and Holman’s on ‘girl’, which, as indicated above, sets the tone for the rest of the text in their dealings with *onna* particularly.

ii. countable/uncountable nouns

Some nouns may be countable in the SL while not so in the TL, and vice versa. In *Izu no odoriko*, we encounter this issue with 煙 *kemuri* ‘smoke’:

459. ¶ その山を下りて下田街道に出ると、炭焼の煙が幾つも見えた。

Lit. ‘When (we), descending the mountain, came out on the Shimoda Highway, many charcoal-burning *smokes were visible.’

S2: ¶ At the foot of the slope we came out on the Shimoda highway. Down the highway, sending up clouds of smoke here and there, were the fires of charcoal-makers.

H: ¶ When we rejoined the Shimoda highway at the foot of the mountain, we saw several threads of smoke from charcoal-burning huts.

Given that ‘smoke’ is not a countable noun in English (at least in this usage), both translators need to add a counter of some kind. Seidensticker’s deployment of “clouds” and Holman’s “threads” seem innocuous enough, but these are both uses of metaphor, thus subtly adding an extraneous element to the description.

2.1.2.2 b. verb

Much like their English counterparts, Japanese verbs often perform double or triple

semantic duty, bearing two or more distinct meanings. They may theoretically exist in differentiated *kanji* forms but, being homophones, are often represented by the same *kanji* as homonyms.¹¹³ An example is the verb 聞く *kiku* (to hear/to listen to/to enquire about). We can differentiate with the following *kanji*—聞く ‘to hear’; 聴く ‘to listen to’; 訊く ‘to enquire about’—but these may all be represented by 聞く. Here is an example from the ST:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|--|--|---|
| 47. 爺さんは峠を越える旅人から聞いたり、新聞を広告を見たりすると、その一つをも洩らさずに、全国から中風の医療を聞き、売薬を求めたのだそうだ。 | Dir. ‘When the old man did such things as <u>heard</u> from travellers who came over the pass and read advertisements in the newspapers, without missing one, he would <u>ask about</u> palsy treatments from around the country, and request the patent medicine, apparently. | He would <u>hear</u> about palsy cures from people who came over the pass and he would read advertisements, never failing to <u>give his attention to</u> each piece of advice and to order each medicine. | Whenever he <u>heard</u> of a treatment from travelers who came over the pass or saw an advertisement in the newspaper, he never failed to send for it. |

Two different uses of *kiku* clash in this sentence: the first has the basic sense of ‘hear (from)’, the second ‘ask’, and both are represented by 聞く. Both translators render the former as its base meaning (S: “would hear about”; H: “heard of”), and neither translates the latter at all, skipping over this to lay emphasis on 求める *motomeru* (“order”; “send for”) instead. One may assume that the reason the predicate 全国から中風の医療を聞き *zenkoku kara chūfū o kiki* dir. ‘ask about palsy treatments from around the country’ is omitted is that it is not sufficiently strongly defined to justify its inclusion in a sentence that is already rather long. Even though the base meanings of (1) 聞いたり・(2) 聞き (1) *kiitari*/ (2) *kiki* are distinct—(1) ‘hear (from)’ / (2) ‘ask’—the

¹¹³ Note that modern Japanese has no homographs, i.e., words with the same spelling but different pronunciations and meanings (such as English ‘wind’), since its phonology is entirely unambiguous once written in phonetic *kana* script.

mere fact of the repetition of the verb in the ST is likely to have influenced the translators' decision here.

2.1.2.2 c. deictic

Japanese use of deictics is in some ways more limited than that of English, because there are no articles, but it has one more distinct form of demonstrative spatio-temporal orientation than English, namely three. The categories are pronouns: これ・それ・あれ *kore/sore/are* 'this', 'that', 'that one over there'; adjectives: この・その・あの *kono/sono/ano* 'this', 'that', 'that ... over there'; group-representative pronouns: こんな(の)・そんな(の)・あんなの *konna (no), sonna (no), anna (no)* 'such a (one as this)', 'such a (one as that)', ('such a (one as that one over there)'¹¹⁴; and adverbs: こう・そう・ああ *kō, sō, aa* 'in this way', 'in that way', 'in such a way').

The first point of difference is obvious in the above triads of demonstratives: Japanese makes spatial distinctions between 'this' (speaker-orientated), 'that' (interlocutor ('you')-orientated) and 'that over there' (distant from both interlocutors).¹¹⁵ This spatial distinction is extended into the ideational sphere, so that *kono* 'this' can be used in speaking of the topic at hand (このこと *kono koto*), *sono* 'that' in reference to that topic just mentioned (そのこと *sono koto*), and *ano* 'that one' in reference to a topic that both parties are aware of from a previous discussion (hence distanced by time) (あのこと *ano koto*). Thus the last is a complete section of lexical segmentation that has no direct counterpart in English.

Secondly, Japanese usage of even the seemingly analogous elements often differs

¹¹⁴ Also こういう・そういう・ああいう *kō iu, sō iu, aa iu*.

¹¹⁵ Martin refers to the triad members as 'proximal', 'mesial' and 'distal' respectively (1975: 1066).

significantly from English usage. I shall focus on *これ kore* and *kono* in the ST. In the example sentence below, the narrator is about to cede a *go* game to the paper merchant:

240. 「これじゃ仕方ありません。

Dir. ‘This cannot be helped.’

S2: ‘It’s all over.

H: “There doesn’t appear to be any way out.

This is an example of Japanese terseness and communication through contextual clues that typifies it as one of Hinds’ ‘listener-responsibility’ languages (Ikegami 2000: 261). *仕方ありません shikata ga arimasen* ‘it cannot be helped’ (or one of its variants) is a set expression in Japanese and can be applied to any case in which one is perceived to have no choice but to accept the current situation. It can be used as an excuse; an expression of mild irritation; a token of consent, given grudgingly or just apparently so; an indication of stoic acceptance, and so on. Here it is more a prelude to accepting defeat, thus Seidensticker’s “It’s all over.” is perhaps a little strong. Holman’s is closer in sense, but lacks the emphatic brevity of the original.

The *kore* here adds little semantically, but has the effect of intensification: ‘(Being) this (situation), it cannot be helped’. But if an English speaker heard a game-player say “This cannot be helped”, he or she would likely expect the player to be about to make a (forced) move rather than be commenting on the state of the board. Thus orientation is an issue, which explains why neither translator renders *kore*, both instead using dummy subjects: H: ‘it’; S: ‘there’.

The next example treats the issue of temporal orientation. When the action is set in the past, English speakers expect temporal demonstratives to be distanced accordingly.

But Japanese is more flexible:¹¹⁶

330. この日も、栄吉は朝から夕方まで私の宿に遊んでいた。

Lit. ‘This day too, Eikichi was playing at my inn from morning till evening.’

S2: Eikichi spent the day at my inn again [...].

H: Again Eikichi stayed at the inn with me from morning until late afternoon.

Seidensticker converts the demonstrative *この kono* ‘this’ to “the day”, while Holman excises the temporal reference. ‘This’ sounds awkward in the context of past-tense narrative, though is occasionally seen in English prose. (See **3.1.1. a. ii.** for a fuller exploration of this example in the context of anaphora.)

2.1.2.2 d. utterance

It is amazing how troublesome an apparently straightforward word such as the informal ええ *ee* ‘yes/yeah’ or polite はい *hai* ‘yes’ can be to translate into English. Again, different lexicalisation is the cause. The register gap between the two can be accommodated by the use of the slightly formal ‘yes’ in some cases and the informal ‘yeah’ or ‘yep’ in others (although anachronism must be avoided, hence these latter forms may be inappropriate in rendering the 1920s ST). More problematic are cases where the ‘yes’ means not so much assent as ‘I understand’ or ‘I’d like to’, a common usage in Japanese but not in English. The latter is the situation in the first ST case, where the narrator invites the dancing girl to visit him at his inn:

¹¹⁶ Cf. also §628: 明日の朝早く婆さんを上野駅へ連れて行って、水戸まで切符を買ってやるのも、至極あたりまえのことだと思っていた。Dir. ‘Early tomorrow morning I would accompany the old woman to Ueno Station, and buy her a ticket for Mito too, this being an extremely natural thing, I was thinking.’

305. 「遊びにいらっしやい。」 Dir. ‘“Come over to play.”’

306. 「ええ。でも一人では——。」 Dir. ‘“Yes. But alone....”’

S2: ‘Come on over,’ I called [...].

‘I couldn’t very well by myself.’

H: “Come on over,” I said.

“But, by myself, I...”

Both translators omit a rendering of *ee*, suggesting they believe there is too great a risk of ‘yes’, ‘right’ or so on being misinterpreted as the dancing girl’s assent. (‘Hmm’ or ‘Mmm’ might have been sufficiently ambiguous—but perhaps excessively so?) What is lost in this omission is an indication of the dancing girl’s being torn between desire and duty, making her reply, at least in Seidensticker’s version, sound a little brusque.

In an earlier case, when the narrator meets the dancing girl for the first time within the story, the translators apparently feel they cannot forego a direct rendering of *ee*:

12. 「ええ——。」とだけ云って、私はその上に腰を下ろした。

Dir. ‘Yes—,’ I merely said, sitting down on it.’

S2: ‘Yes,’ I murmured stupidly as I sat down.

H: “Yes.” That’s all I said before I sat down.

The main issue for translation is that ‘yes’ sounds like a non sequitur here. ‘Thank you’ would be much more appropriate in the TL (although in this case it is ruled out because in the next sentence the narrator states that he was unable to say ‘thank you’). Even for Japanese native speakers, the *ee* here is rather unusual, but given the wider lexical range of *ee* compared with ‘yes’, including the verbal filler ええと *ee to* ‘well ...’ (which may have influenced the above usage), it is more acceptable than any direct translation appears to be.

2.1.2.3 Different lexical connotation

Examples that are left to put in this category have successfully cleared the first two hurdles of lexical compatibility in the translator's mind: first, the SL and TL use the same parts of speech to convey the expression; second, their lexical segmentation is similar. The direct translation thus bears a striking resemblance to acceptable English—and yet, something is still not quite right. The translator may feel compelled to tweak the expression despite the apparent point of compatibility between languages. This need one can ascribe to subtle differences in lexical connotation that are very difficult to discern, but can make the difference between a passable translation and a strong one.

2.1.2.3 a. verb

The SL idiomatic structure modifier+*kao* 'face'+*o*+*suru* has its counterpart in the TL make/do+a+modifier+face, as in, for example, がっかりした顔をする *gakkari shita kao o suru* 'make a disappointed face'. Naturally, one can paraphrase this in the TL with the more regular 'look disappointed', but the original is probably acceptable.

344. おふくろが恐ろしい顔をした。

Dir. 'The mother made a terrible face.'

S2: 'You're not to touch her,' the older woman said, frowning fiercely.

H: The woman glared at him.

Why does neither translator preserve the 'face' idiom? Perhaps there is a certain childish quality to the expression 'made a terrible face' that dissuades them. In other words, this is a stylistic issue, one of nuance rather than denotation. The translators decide to unpack what the features of a 'terrible face' are, with Seidensticker focusing on the brow with "frowning", and Holman on the eyes with "glared". To be sure, these are

important elements of a scary face, but they are synecdochical, and hence to select among them is effectively to editorialise.

As indicated in **2.1.2.1 j.** there is often a degree of congruence between SL compound verbs (i.e., those with a base verb and modifying verb stem) and TL phrasal verbs, both in terms of nuance of meaning and dual structure. Occasionally, however, this congruence falters, as the following example demonstrates:

159. ¶ 「これで柿でもおあがりなさい。二階から失礼。」と云って、私は金包みを投げ
た。

Dir. ‘ “With this, please buy persimmons or something. From the second floor, rude of me.” So saying, I threw a money packet.’

S2: ¶ I threw down some money in an envelope. ‘Get yourself some fruit or something. Excuse me for throwing it.’

H: ¶ “Buy yourself some persimmons or something. I’m sorry. This is such a rude way to give this to you, from the second floor.” I tossed down a packet of money.

Given that the narrator is clearly throwing something from the second floor down into the garden, we might expect Kawabata to use a verb with a spatially orientating suffix like 投げ下ろした *nageoroshita* or 投げ落とした *nageotoshita* ‘threw down’, but he simply uses 投げた ‘threw’. Neither translator is content with the bare verb, perhaps because of its lack of spatial orientation. Seidensticker adds the particle “down” to the base verb “threw”, while Holman both adds “down” and changes the base verb to the more casual, or (almost literally) condescending, “tossed”. It is fascinating to observe what happens when the verb appears again three sentences later:

162. 私がもう一度投げると、男は持って帰った。

Dir. ‘When I threw it again, the man took it home.’

S2: I tossed it down again. This time he took it.

H: When I threw it down a second time, he took it with him.

Now the translators have swapped diction: this time Seidensticker uses “tossed down” and Holman “threw ... down”. Thus not only were they apparently uneasy with the bareness of the verb *nageru*, they further did not allow the repetition of the same verb in the space of a few sentences, opting to introduce synonyms instead—another apparent manifestation of ‘elegant variation’.

This is echoed in their treatment of the verb 落ちた *ochita* ‘fell’ in the intervening §161:

161. それが藁屋根の上へ落ちた。

Dir. ‘That fell on the thatched roof.’

S2: ¶It came to rest on the thatch of the roof.

H: It landed on the thatched roof.

Again, neither translator accepts the baldness of ‘fell’ on its own, though in this case there is no question of a compound form with the base verb. Seidensticker uses the possibly overly dignified “came to rest”, while Holman captures the punctuated action well with “landed”. There appears to be some connotation of instability about ‘fell’ that makes the translators opt for expressions that emphasise that the money packet is not going anywhere once it falls.

2.1.2.3 b. modifier

Modifiers are particularly susceptible to differences in lexical nuance between

languages because most represent a quality or degree that has no real-world referent to which one can turn for confirmation, and the moment a given term is applied to a noun or clause, that noun or clause, paradoxically, colours the meaning of the very modifier that purports to describe it. This is simply demonstrated by choosing a common adjective such as 細かい *komakai*, listing its dictionary definitions, and then observing whether any of them are acceptable as-is when translating a given case.

When one checks *komakai* in *Kenkyūsha's New Japanese-English Dictionary* (5th edition), the following main definitions with example phrases appear:

- (1) (of size) fine (e.g. “a fine rain”);
- (2) (of movement) small (“small fluctuations in the market”);
- (3) (monetary) small (“small change”);
- (4-6) detailed (“a detailed description”);
- (7) trifling (“trivial defects”);
- (8) stingy (“He’s very careful with his money.”).

I shall now contextualise *komakai* through its use in §244. In the following scene, the narrator has just conceded his *go* game with the paper merchant, but the latter is reluctant to end it, appealing to his opponent with a vague statement about how equally matched they are:

244. どっちにしても細かいです。 [...]

Dir. ‘Whichever one chooses, it’s trifling.’

S2: It’s close, either way.

H: Either way, it’s close.

Both translators have captured the meaning with “close”, but there is no sign of this

word in the list of definitions above. Actually, ‘close’ does appear as a sub-definition of (4), among a list of synonyms of ‘detailed’: “[詳しい {*kuwashii* ‘detailed’}] detailed; minute; particular; circumstantial; [精密な {*seimitsu na* ‘thorough’}] close; nice; [厳密な {*genmitsu na* ‘strict’}] strict; exact; close; searching (examination).” The problem is that this is a different sense of ‘close’ (e.g., ‘close attention to detail’) to the one the translators choose. Naturally translators must negotiate meaning between set dictionary definitions and real-world contextual usage, yet it is telling that such an unremarkable usage is not readily found in the main list of denotations. This point illustrates how important in-depth experience of real-world usage in both languages is for the translator, and bespeaks the improbability of one-to-one lexical equivalents.

2.1.2.3 Conclusion

‘Lexical identity’ can refer both to the characteristics of a particular language and to how its users—including translators—perceive these. As the sliding scale of lexicalisation shifts from denotative to connotative meaning, the translator’s decisions increasingly come down to personal decisions about stylistic felicity. At the same time, however, the lexical segmentation of a particularly pervasive term such as *onna*—which is, uncoincidentally, an aspect of characterisation in the ST—can reveal translators’ assumptions about the characterisation both of the term and the person it represents in the story, assumptions which involve personal reactions to the text in that they are likely to be more unconsciously than consciously determined.

2.1.3 No Plural Marker

Introduction

The Japanese language indicates plurals less than English does, because there is no grammatical necessity to do so (Martin 1975: 143). Again, in a Japanese text, context will resolve most cases in which it may be unclear whether one is talking about a single or plural noun. However, the ambiguity remains in a small set of such cases, in many of which we see the translators making different choices in the ST.

2.1.3 a. indeterminacy of singular/plural forms

While context often establishes singularity or plurality, some cases, such as the following, are less susceptible to disambiguation:

430. 私が急に身を引いたものだから、彼女はこつんと膝を落した。

Dir. 'I suddenly pulled my body back, so she dropped a knee/knees with a thud.'

S2: I drew back in surprise, and she fell to one knee.

H: I jerked away, and she dropped to her knees with a thud.

As the translators' divergent renderings indicate, there is no way to know whether Kawabata meant "one knee" or "knees" here. The images they present us with are distinct, though surely equally valid, with the latter being more dramatic (even excluding Holman's translation of the mimetic こつんと *kotsun to* as "with a thud").

A second example shows the complications that can ensue with multiple nouns:

500. 途中で、ところどころの村の入口に立札があった。

Dir. 'On the way, here and there at a village entrance was a sign.'

S1: Now and then, on the outskirts of a village, we would see a sign: [...]

S2: Now and then, at a road into a village, we would see a sign: [...]

H: Here and there along the way stood signs as we entered villages: [...]

The translations give three different quantity readings. S1 begins with the technically plural “outskirts”, which has a singular application, and both “village” and “sign” are singular. S2’s “road”, “village” and “sign” are all singular. Holman, however, opts to make the nouns “signs” and “villages” plural, while verbalizing 入口 *iriguchi* ‘entrance’ to “entered”. In fact, potentially acceptable permutations, with both definite and indefinite articles, are numerous.¹¹⁷

Whether one describes a particular location as having one sign or many is significant because the presence of more than one would intensify the ostracism of the travelling entertainers. On the other hand, speaking of multiple villages, as Holman does, risks diffusing the impact of the sign(s). Thus this is a particularly salient example of how sentences with countable nouns require the translator to assign singular/plural status to them in a constant, low-level act of interpretation that most likely occurs on the edge of consciousness, at least during early translating ‘passes’.

2.1.3 b. pluralisation of loanwords

If a transliteration of a ST noun is used in the TT, and the context indicates it is plural, should one follow SL or TL pluralisation rules? Here is the single example in the ST:

¹¹⁷ ‘At roads into villages, we would see a sign’; ‘at a road into a village, we would see signs’; ‘at a road into the villages, we would see a sign’ and so on. ‘Along the way stood a sign as we entered the village’; ‘[a]long the way stood signs as we entered a village’, and so on.

238. 男の後から娘が三人順々に、¶「今晚は。」と廊下に手を突いて芸者のようなお辞儀をした。

Dir. ‘After the man came the three girls in order, saying “Good evening” as they bowed putting their hands on the floor of the hallway and bowing like geisha.’

S2: The man came in first. In order of age they offered formal greetings from the veranda, like geisha.

H: “Good evening.” After the man, the three girls each bowed to the two of us, kneeling on the floor like geisha.

‘Geisha’ has, at least typographically, been fully integrated into English. (Its meaning in the TL is another matter.) It need not be italicised. If it has become an ‘English’ word, one would expect it to be declined like an English word, yet few people would say ‘geishas’. The established choices are either ‘geisha’ or the rather outdated ‘geisha girls’. Both translators take the former option. (Dictionaries such as the *Oxford English Dictionary* first suggest the non-inflected form for Japanese loan words such as ‘geisha’ and ‘tsunami’, followed by the option of adding an –s.)

2.1.3 Conclusion

The ambiguity that the SL creates with its frequent lack of specification of singular or plural noun status can usually be resolved by context, but in those cases where it cannot, it opens up two or more equally valid interpretations in the TT, and could occasionally lead to misrepresentation of the ST if taken to an extreme.

2.1.4 Passive Voice

It would be difficult to attribute the more prevalent use of passive constructions in Japanese compared to English (Yamada 2010: 69) directly to cultural forces. One cannot argue, for example, that the oft-cited effacement of the self embodied in the concept of 遠慮 *enryo* ‘restraint’ (Johnson 1995: 83-84) is behind this difference, for in fact the passive construction encourages us to focus on the object of an action, the agent having been removed or shifted to a less salient position in the sentence. The ‘suffering’ passive in particular (e.g., 財布を盗まれてしまった *saifu o nusumarete shimatta* ‘My wallet was stolen / I had my wallet stolen’) emphasises the victim and eliminates the agent of the offence. Nevertheless, the use of the passive construction in *keigo* (without a passive sense) suggests a softening, distancing effect, which could be said to have cultural origins in the association of politeness with indirectness. Further, its use may enact a blurring or shifting of ascribed agency or responsibility for given actions, as in §327 and 135 below.

Since the connection between the SL passive voice and cultural factors is tenuous at best, I have chosen to identify this feature as being primarily linguistic. This also makes sense in terms of style, for the formation of the passive in Japanese is simple and economical, involving the addition of one or two morae ((ら)れ *-(ra)re-*) to the verb stem, whereas the English use of a form of the copula+past participle is more involved. Thus two reasons why Japanese favours the passive over English may be linguistic convenience and concision.

As for English, George Orwell’s famous remonstrance to avoid the passive¹¹⁸ is

¹¹⁸ “Never use the passive when you can use the active.” (Orwell 1970: 170.)

symptomatic of a general dislike of the form, at least in general and literary circles. It is regarded—sometimes unjustly, of course—as anything from sly, deflective, confusing or vague to downright mendacious. One can see it as stylistically awkward in some circumstances due to its more involved structure.

In the ST, the passive verb structure—actually the spontaneous form—seems to be used particularly to emphasise that the narrator is the focaliser: that we experience events through his eyes. Thus often it is not so much that people are doing things to him as that things are being done to him. But secondly, the passive is used to intensify the expression of this interiority, and used so often in this way that we can establish a separate sub-category for such a use.

Out of the 27 cases documented in the ST,¹¹⁹ Seidensticker renders these in the passive 9 times (in one case only in S1; and in another case an active form in the ST is converted into a passive). Holman on the other hand uses it 11 times (including one case where an active form is converted to the passive, and once where the sentence does not exist in the ST). In sum, the passive is retained in the TT only about one-third of the time.

2.1.4 a. general passive

First let us look at an example where preserving the ST passive would not work well in the TL:

¹¹⁹ §62, 70, 89, 113, 119, 131, 135, 168, 176, 177, 196, 202, 211, 220, 225, 275, 317, 327, 336, 378, 386, 409, 472, 563, 619, 627, 629.

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|---|--|
| 317. 一緒には入ろうとしきりに誘われたが、若い女が三人もいるので、私は後から行くところまかしてしまった。 | Dir. 'I was strenuously <u>invited</u> to get in together, but there were three young women, so I avoided it by saying I would go later.' | I must come along, <u>they insisted</u> , but the idea of a bath with three young women was somewhat daunting . I said I would go later. | <u>They begged me</u> to come along, but I put them off. I said I would go later since there would be three girls in the bath. |

The passive with its adverb would sound awkward in the TL ('I was strenuously invited to get in'), so the translators have both made it active and conflated the senses of the verb and adverb into an emphatic verb: S: "they insisted"; H: "They begged me".

Next is an example where the translators' decision to remove the passive is more questionable:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|
| 211. 彼に指ざされて、私は川向の共同湯の方を見た。 | Dir. 'Directed by his <u>finger</u> , I looked in the direction of the communal bath across the river.' | <u>He pointed</u> over at the public bath, where seven or eight naked figures showed through the steam. | <u>He pointed</u> across the stream toward the public bath on the other side. |
| 212. 湯気の中に七八人の裸体がぼんやり浮んでいた。 | | | I could distinguish seven or eight bodies through the steam. |

The use of the passive in the ST quickly sidelines 'he' and highlights the narrator, 'I'. It also allows the author to have us follow the gaze of the narrator across the river as if we ourselves were there, our own heads turning, and thus helps us identify with him and imagine his (literal) point of view. When Seidensticker converts the passive to active with "[h]e pointed" and then erases the first-person presence, he shifts the focus from the narrator viewer in the original to the scene itself. Holman too uses the active verb "[h]e pointed", but re-establishes the presence of the first-person narrator in the following (manufactured) sentence opener: "I could distinguish". There is no 私 *watashi*

‘I’ in §212: Holman has shifted it from §211.

The third example demonstrates where maintaining the passive contributes to preserving formal aspects of the original. As is noted in **2.1.2.1 e.** and elsewhere, ST prenominal modifiers present a considerable translation issue because English must either convert them to a relative clause, which often sounds awkward, or rework the structure, which erases the original clausal syntax. However, the passive in the TL allows use of collapsed relative clauses, where the relative pronoun and finite verb are suppressed. While the relative clause must still follow the noun it modifies, its structure is similar to the prenominal clause in the ST and has a comparable economy of length:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 196. 雨に洗われた秋の 夜が冴え冴えと明るん だ。 | Dir. ‘ <u>The rain-washed autumn night</u> shone glisteningly.’ | <u>The autumn sky</u> washed by the rain, shone crystalline in the distance. | <u>The autumn night</u> was bright, <u>washed clean by the rain</u> . |

Seidensticker and Holman differ in their clause order, but both agree on the use of a collapsed passive relative clause (“[having been] washed (clean) by the rain”) to render 雨に洗われた *ame ni arawareta* ‘rain-washed’. The result is a concise, lyrical phrasing that aptly captures the original.

2.1.4 b. ‘suffering’ passive

Here, as stated above, the passive focuses on the victim of the agents that act upon it, as in the following:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|---|--|
| 472. 「駄目だよ、太いのは盗んだんだと直ぐに分って、 <u>見られる</u> と悪いじゃないか。」 | Dir. ‘ “It’s no good, a thick one, (they)’ll soon know that (you) stole it, and if <u>(it’s/you’re) seen</u> it’ll be bad, won’t it?” ’ | ¶“You can’t do that. <u>They’ll spot</u> the biggest one. | ¶“You can’t do that. If <u>someone sees him</u> with the thickest one, they’ll know we stole it. We don’t want to get caught. |

Seidensticker converts the passive verb 見られる *mirareru* ‘to be seen’ to the active “They’ll spot”, while Holman moves the verb “see” earlier in the sentence to replace 分って *wakatte* ‘know’, then creates a sentence absent in the ST that contains an informal passive modelled on *mirareru*: “We don’t want to get caught”.

Apart from converting them to active forms, English commonly avoids passive verbs through nominalisation:

| ST/Direct Translation | Seidensticker 1 | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|--|---|
| 327. 突然、ぱっと赤くなって、¶「御免なさい。叱られる。」と、石を投げ出したまま飛出して行った。Dir. ‘Suddenly, she went red, and saying “I’m sorry. I’ll be scolded,” with her stones left scattered, flew out.’ | Suddenly, she flushed crimson.¶“Excuse me. (I’ll) be scolded for this ,” she exclaimed, and ran out with the game half finished. | Suddenly, she flushed crimson.¶“Excuse me. I’ll get a scolding for this ,” and she ran from the room with the game half finished. | Without warning, she blushed. “Please forgive me. I’ll get in trouble.” Tossing down her stones, she fled the room. |

S1 retains the passive with “I’ll be scolded for this”, though the addition of “for this” suggests Seidensticker considers the verb on its own too abrupt. Also noteworthy is that S2 removes the passive, nominalising instead—“I’ll get a scolding for this”—though at least here he retains the dancing girl’s position as recipient of a scolding. Holman also reduces the role of the verb with the idiom “I’ll get in trouble”: “get” again implies

someone's passive reception,¹²⁰ and is more suitably juvenile in its register than “be (scolded)”.

2.1.4 c. interiority; sensation

A third SL use of the passive structure, particularly prevalent in the ST, is focalisation of the interior thoughts or sensations of an observer. Sometimes English offers a simple equivalent:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|----------------------|---|---|---|
| 220. 頭が拭われたように澄んで来た。 | Dir. ‘(My) head became as clear is if it <u>had been wiped.</u> ’ | It was as though a layer of dust <u>had been cleared</u> from my head. | My head was clear as though <u>wiped clean.</u> |

Seidensticker adjusts by introducing “a layer of dust”, but the sentence remains in the passive (“had been wiped clean”). Holman is close to the original with “My head (was) wiped clean”, the collapsed relative clause preserving its concision (“as though [it had been] wiped clean.”).

However, in some cases Japanese uses what appears to be the passive in a way inappropriate in English:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|
| 629. 何もかもが一つに融け合って感じられた。 | Lit. ‘Everything melted together, <u>it was felt.</u> ’ | Everything sank back into an enfolding harmony. | Everything <u>seemed to</u> melt together into one. |

The use of 感じられる *kanjirareru* ‘to be felt’ and 思われる *omowareru* ‘to be thought’ (cf. §113) are actually examples of the spontaneous form, which reflects the filter of the character’s mind through which the events are passing, but such a device

¹²⁰ Note that in §225, both translators render 叱れる *shikareru* as “would be scolded”.

does not work in English in this context, as the literal translation suggests, sounding as it does more like the minutes of a meeting ('it was felt'). Thus Seidensticker ignores the verb, while Holman converts it to the active, if similarly abstract, "seemed to".

Greater difficulties await the unwary translator when complex verb aggregations appear:

| ST/Literal Translation | Seidensticker 1 | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|--|---|--|
| 135. 峠の婆さんに煽り立てられた空想がぽきんと折れるのを感じた。 Lit. '(I) felt the fantasy aroused by the mountain-pass old woman break with a crack.' | I felt the excitement aroused by the old woman at the tea-house begin to mount. | I felt the excitement aroused by the comment of the woman at the tea-house subside. | The daydream that the old woman at the pass had sparked in me had been dashed. |

First, S1 incorrectly translates 空想...が折れる *kūsō ga oreru* lit. 'the fantasy ... break[s]' as "begin to mount", which is corrected in S2 to "subside", its opposite. S2 is fairly close to the ST. Holman's version is notable for two things. First, he shifts the passive from the original 'fantasy [that had been] aroused' to "daydream ... had been dashed". In other words, he retains the passive but uses it in a different verb. Secondly, he has not kept track of the metaphors in the double-barrelled structure: a "daydream" that had been "sparked" could not then be "dashed", but rather would be 'doused', 'snuffed out', etc. Seidensticker's and Holman's solecisms here may illustrate a risk of using a passive construction, along with other complex structures, in English—the conversion of subject and object into passive subject and agent and its attendant syntactic inversion can obfuscate, making mixed metaphors and misrelated structures more likely. In such cases heeding Orwell's words of caution may indeed be wise.

2.1.4 Conclusion

The passive has more varied uses in Japanese than in English, and where there is a lack of an analogous usage in the TL, the translator may locate a reasonable equivalent that retains focus on the (passive) subject. Furthermore, the translator should probably bear in mind that both the concision of the Japanese passive and its use in establishing point of view are relevant to preserving some of the more subtle manifestations of the original's form.

2.1.5 SOUND-SYMBOLIC LANGUAGE

Sound-symbolic language encompasses words whose pronunciation and/or phonemic patterning imitate a physical, mental or psychological phenomenon. ‘Onomatopoeia’ is inadequate to describe such language, as this term usually only covers sound imitation.

‘Mimetics’ refers to an attempt to represent a semantic value phono-mimetically. Utterances are ‘simply’ the representation of unarticulated vocalisations, with little inherent meaning beyond verbal filler; context sometimes invests them with semantic value. I shall spend a considerable amount of time discussing them because they prove to be an inordinately important textual element in the literary realm.

2.1.5.1 Mimetic

Japanese mimetics are both sophisticated and wide-ranging. Not only do they cover virtually every tangible and intangible state, phenomenon and quality, they also allow for various temporal inflections, as will be explained below. Further, their use is not confined to the juvenile and poetic spheres, as largely the case in English. They appear in literary works as much as daily conversation, being absent only from formal speech or documents. If the expressive idiom of English can be located in metaphor, the same can perhaps be said of mimetics for Japanese. Indeed, Japanese arguably uses fewer true metaphors (a *wa/ga* b ‘a is b’), relying mostly on similes (a *wa/ga* b *no yō* ‘a is like b’) where necessary, and, overwhelmingly, mimetics when what is required is closer to a visceral effect or affect (Donovan 2000: *passim*).

This earlier research suggests that a key lexical disparity defines much of the difference in expressive power between Japanese and English mimetics: Japanese

mimetics are usually adverbial, and hence occur near the beginning of the sentence; English mimetics are usually verbal and sit near the middle. The clause-initial position in Japanese tends to highlight the mimetic. But further than that, because English mimetics fulfil both an expressive and grammatical function (the verb usually being grammatically essential), the expressive function is muted by this dual role. In Japanese, however, the mimetic is foregrounded by having a solely expressive role. An exception occurs when the mimetic is attached to a placeholder verb (such as *suru*), where the verb itself has little semantic value and thus meaning resides in the mimetic. There are ten such instances in the ST.¹²¹

The common use of reduplication (doubled forms) in Japanese mimetics, such as §433 かさかさ *kasakasa*,¹²² further highlights their presence, and besides emphasises the visceral quality of such expressions. Japanese mimetics have a quotative quality that is rarer in English. Where a Japanese person would think nothing of saying 「太鼓がとんとん響いていた」 *taiko ga tonton hibite ita* ‘A taiko drum was reverberating “ton-ton”’, an English speaker would be more likely to reference rather than recreate the sound: “A taiko drum was beating” instead of “A taiko drum was going *bang-bang*”. In the above example I have in fact simplified the mimetic that appears in §168. The actual form is even more challenging to translate because of its temporal inflections, by which I mean verbally indicating time-specific elements such as repetition and duration:

¹²¹ §8 *hotto suru*, 61 *iraira shite ita*, 84 *yoroyoro shita*, 96 *hotto shite*, 113 *dogimagi shite*, 235 *sowasowa shite iru*, 294 *shikkari shinai*, 387 *muttsuri shite ita*, 537 *guttari shite ita*, 568 *jitto shite ita*.

¹²² Not **kasagasa*: the initial consonant of the reduplicated segment is never voiced in a mimetic, although it is in other reduplicated forms (e.g. さまざま *samazama* ‘various’). (Donovan 2000: 185-186.)

168. とんとんとん、激しい雨の音の遠くに太鼓の響が微かに産れた。

Dir. ‘To-ton-ton-ton, distant in the sound of the heavy rain the reverberation of a taiko drum faintly arose.’

S1: Then, distant in the rain, I heard the slow beating of a drum.

S2: Then, distant in the rain, I heard the beating of a drum.

H: “Ton, ton, ton, ton.” In the distance beyond the clamor of the rain, the vague reverberations of a drum arose.

The mimetic とんとんとんとん *totontonton* contains two temporal inflections: first, the repetition implied by the twofold reduplication of *ton*, and secondly the clipped, unstressed initial *to-*, an anacrusis that corresponds to its musical equivalent, a beat coming in prior to the main stress. Literary English perhaps has more flexibility to render such sounds directly than other types of language, but even so Seidensticker chooses to paraphrase the mimetic with “(slow) beating”. Holman is indeed more ST-orientated in his attempts to replicate the ST with his quotative “[t]on, ton, ton, ton”, but note that he converts the short anacrusis *to-* to the regular *ton* in the ST, his translation thus failing to convey this aspect of temporal inflection.

Having sampled some of the complexities of rendering mimetics, we shall now survey the main categories of mimetics and their TT renderings, beginning with representation of the most concrete phenomena (sounds) and ending with the most abstract (states of mind).

2.1.5.1 a. sound representation (擬音語・擬声語 *giongo/giseigo*)

§168 above clearly presents an example of *giongo* or onomatopoeia. (There are no examples of *giseigo* (animal or human) vocal representations, in the ST, but see below for human utterances.) The above-referenced §168 is a fairly extreme case of quotative

representation; the majority of *giongo* is more straightforward to translate, as in the following:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 432. 腰掛けの直ぐ横へ小鳥の群が渡って来た。 | Dir. 'A flock of small birds came over right next to the bench.' | ¶A flock of small birds flew up beside the bench. | ¶A flock of small birds appeared beside the bench. |
| 433. 鳥がとまる枝の枯草がかさかさ鳴る程静かだった。 | Dir. 'It was so quiet that the dry leaves on the branch the birds had landed on made the sound <i>kasakasa</i> .' | The dead leaves <u>rustled</u> as they landed, so quiet was the air. | It was so still I could hear the dry leaves on the branches <u>rustle</u> when they alighted. |

The ST mimetic structure is the normal adverb+verb pattern, *kasakasa+naru* ('rustle-rustle'+ 'make a sound'), where the sense of the base verb *naru* is amplified by the adverb *kasakasa*. If *kasakasa* were omitted, the phrase would simply mean 'the dead leaves made a sound'. As mentioned above, English onomatopoeia usually consists of a verb combining both expressive and grammatical elements: here both Seidensticker and Holman use "rustle(d)", which clearly has a similar mimetic quality (albeit unreduplicated: 'rustle-rustle' sounds childish, perhaps, and is lengthy) and hence is an effective equivalent. In some cases a formally closer equivalent such as 'make a rustling sound' (verb+present-participial adjective+noun) might be appropriate, but generally English favours the more economical verbal structure.

2.1.5.1 b. action/manner representation (擬態語 *gitaigo*)

In categorising mimetics it might be desirable to separate action (what is done) from manner (the way in which it is done), but in practice this is often difficult:

| ST/ Dir. Tr. Excerpt | Seidensticker 1 | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|--|--|---|
| 271. 彼女は眩しそうに くるりと寝返りして、掌で 顔を隠したまま布団を 滑り出ると、廊下に座 り、『「昨夜はありがとう ございました。」と、綺麗 なお辞儀をして、立っ たまの私をまごつか せた。 Dir. ‘with a quick turn she turned over in bed’ | <u>Abruptly</u> , still hiding her face, she <u>rolled</u> <u>over</u> , slipped out of bed, and bowed low before me in the hall. I stood dumbly wondering what to do. | As if dazzled by the morning light, she <u>rolled over</u> and slipped out of bed, her hands still against her face. Then she knelt on the veranda and thanked me for the evening before. I stood over her uncomfortably. | She <u>turned away</u> as if to avoid the light. Hiding her face with her hands, she slid out of the covers and knelt in the hall. 『“Thank you for last night.” She gave a pretty bow. I felt awkward standing over her. |

くるりと寝返りして *kururi to negaeri shite* consists of the adverbial *kururi to* (‘with a quick turn’—an emphatic form of the normal reduplicative くるくる *kurukuru* ‘round and round’ that indicates a single, abrupt turn) and the compound verb *negaeri suru* ‘turn over in bed’ (*ne-* from 寝る *neru* ‘sleep/lie’ and *-gaeri* from 返る *kaeru* ‘turn over’). Only S1 attempts to convey the manner of the movement (“[a]bruptly”), with the other two translations simply reporting the basic action itself (S2: “she rolled over”; H: “She turned away”). There seems no particular reason to suppress this descriptor, as English is equipped to deal with the temporal inflection (‘made a quick turn’ and ‘flipped over’ being two verb-based solutions beyond the adverbial “abruptly” that come to mind).

In any case, however, this example shows the difficulty of separating an action and the manner in which it is performed when both inhere in the mimetic; indeed, often the point of a mimetic adverbial expression is to modulate the base action verb with the particular manner of its execution, while still echoing the base semantic element. Here, for example, *kururi to* contains at once the senses of ‘turn’, ‘abruptly’ and ‘one time’, with the former echoing the meaning of *-gaeri*. Naturally, such polysemy also inhabits

such English mimetic equivalents as ‘flipped’, indicating a degree of phonomorphological commonality between the languages.

Thanks in part to such a commonality, in some cases the translators can both locate the nuance of the mimetic and echo its form:

| ST | Literal Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|---|---|
| 578. 私の言葉が終わらない先き終わらない先きに、何度となく <u>こくりこくり</u> うなずいて見せるだけだった。 | Lit. ‘Before my words came to an end, before they came to an end, countless times (she) just <u>nodded nod-nod</u> .’ | <u>Now and then she would nod a quick little nod</u> , always before I had finished speaking. | She just <u>kept nodding over and over</u> before I had even finished speaking. |

This is a tricky sentence stylistically because of the repetitive structure 終わらない先き 終わらない先きに *owaranai saki owaranai saki ni* ‘before (they) ended, before (they) ended’, and indeed neither translator addresses this repetition. Instead, they focus on the other repetition in こくりこくりうなずいて *kokuri kokuri unazuite*. *Kokuri kokuri* ‘nod-nod’ is a reduplicated variant of the more usual *kokkuri* ‘(single) nod’, suggesting a series of little nods rather than a single emphatic one. Both translators rely on repetition to capture the reduplication, though the repeated word differs: for Seidensticker it is “nod”, as verb and noun, in “nod a quick little nod”. This predicate is given a temporal dimension by the (doubled) adverbial phrase “[n]ow and then”. Holman on the other hand uses the repeating “over and over”, which has sufficient temporal specification, and chooses to emphasise this with a verbal marker of continuity: “kept nodding”. Neither quite matches the almost vertiginous sense of an infinite loop that envelopes the original.

I finish this subsection with an example that bridges the action/manner representation of (b) and the combination of *sound* and action in (c) below. ぽろぽろ

poroporo (§611) represents the falling of drops of liquid; ぽたぽた *potapota* (§552) conveys both this action and the sound of the falling drops. Let us observe an example of the former:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| 611. 涙が <u>ぼろぼろ</u> カバンに流れた。 | Dir. ‘Tears flowed <u>drop-drop</u> onto my bag.’ | I <u>wept</u> silently, and when my cheek began to feel chilly I turned the sack over. | My tears <u>spilled</u> onto my bag. |

Neither translator renders exactly the manner in which the tears flow, although Seidensticker’s “wept” and Holman’s “spilled” perhaps imply copious tears. Seidensticker projects no sound value in *poroporo* when he writes “I wept silently”. *Potapota* is compared in the next section.

2.1.5.1 c. combined sound and action representation (擬音擬態語 *gion-gitaigo*)

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|-------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| 552. わけもなく涙が <u>ぽたぽた</u> 落ちた。 | Dir. ‘Without a reason tears <u>fell plop-plop</u> .’ | For no good reason I found myself <u>weeping</u> . | Inexplicably <u>my tears fell</u> . |

This sentence marks the time the narrator starts crying, and it may be that Kawabata chooses the more sound-expressive term *potapota* here to emphasise the surprise the narrator experiences as he realises he is crying. This moment occurs shortly before the incident above, so the novelty has yet to wear off. But neither translator conveys the sound element, Seidensticker using the same verb “weeping”, and Holman writing “my tears fell”, which isolates the drops, but leaves their sound value unaddressed. Then again, drawing attention to the sound element might make for an ungainly phrase like

‘my tears plopped’, so perhaps understandably the translators ignore the acoustic aspect.

There is perhaps less excuse for doing so below:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 87. [63] ¶暗いトンネルに入ると、冷たい雫がぽたぽた落ちていた。 | Dir. ‘When (I) entered the dark tunnel, cold drops were falling <u>plop-plop</u> .’ | ¶Cold drops of water were falling inside the dark tunnel. | ¶Cold drops of water <u>plopped</u> inside the dark tunnel. |

The description implies discrete drops of water and the reverberation of their plops inside the tunnel. Seidensticker does not capture this audiovisual complementarity, focusing only on the visual aspect with “[c]old drops of water were falling”; Holman, however, covers both with “[c]old drops of water plopped”, the near-rhyme of “drops” and “plopped” a deft reverberative parallel.

Combined sound-action mimetics thus present a double challenge to render, but English does have a number of such mimetics itself, making translation a straightforward process at times:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 34. 私は肌に粟粒を拵へ、かちかちと歯を鳴らして身震いした。 | Lit. ‘I sounded my teeth <u>kachi-kachi</u> ’ | <u>My teeth were chattering</u> and my arms were covered with goose-flesh. | It gave me goose bumps. <u>My teeth chattered</u> and I shivered. |

In かちかちと歯を鳴らす *kachikachi to ha o narasu*, *kachikachi to* imitates both the sound and movement of chattering teeth in much the same way that ‘chatter(ing)’ does (note in particular that both expressions share the consonantal blend /tʃ/). The English “chatter” is both the sufficient and necessary equivalent in this case, in that the word is eminently suitable to render *kachikachi*, and no equally obvious alternative suggests itself (possibly ‘clacking’?). Hence we have Seidensticker’s “were chattering” and

Holman's "chattered".

2.1.5.1 d. state representation (擬態語 *gitaigo*)

Mimetics often represent a permanent or temporary state or condition of an object or person, with no attendant auditory element. The mimetic that Kawabata uses most frequently in the ST exemplifies this phenomenon, and, much like the pseudo-onomatopoeic しーん *shiin*, which evokes 'the sound of silence' and the stillness that accompanies it, じっと *jitto* means something like 'stock still'.¹²³ The expression occurs five times in the ST,¹²⁴ referring exclusively to the narrator or the dancing girl, and occurring mostly when they are in each other's company, which suggests it is a device linking the pair. Four instances are adverbial, while in §568 it operates as a verb along with the placeholder *suru*. While it does not directly express state of mind, *jitto* can be connected with paralysing emotions such as embarrassment and melancholy, thus suggesting that the pair have brought each other to a literal and emotional standstill.¹²⁵ The first three cases characterise the narrator, and the last two the dancing girl, perhaps intimating a subtle pivot in power that occurs as the enthrallment seems to shift from the former to the latter.

The example below describes the narrator, transfixed by the sound of the entertainers' performance in the distance:

¹²³ This translation is only a starting point, but it has the virtue of combining alliteration—a faint echo of the literal glottal stop that the geminate cluster じっ, represented by the double-consonant *jitto* in romanisation, produces—and a concise metaphorical allusion that captures some of the viscosity of the Japanese mimetic. See Donovan 2001: 173-174, 177, 179 for further consideration of the use of metaphor in translating mimetics.

¹²⁴ §70, 165, 181, 568, 577.

¹²⁵ In the earlier phase of the story, the narrator is restless owing to the dancing girl, and *jitto* is used with a negative verb to express that he *cannot* sit still: cf. §165, 181.

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|--|--|--|
| 181. 私は神経を尖らせて、いつまでも戸を明けたまゝ <u>じっと</u> 座っていた。 | Dir. ‘I sharpened my nerves, and, forever with the door left open, was sitting <u>still</u> .’ | I sat <u>rigid</u> , more and more on edge, staring out through the open shutters. | My nerves were on edge. I left the shutter open and <u>just</u> sat by the window. |

Seidensticker uses the ‘trick’ of part-of-speech shift, converting the adverb+verb combination *じっと座っていた* *jitto suwatte ita* into the verb+adjective “sat rigid”, which seems a good approximation. Holman’s “**just sat**” has the virtue of being phonologically similar to *jitto suwatt-*, though semantically it is a little weak.

Near the end of the story, the dancing girl appears consumed by the thought of losing the student narrator:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 568. 傍に行くまで彼女は <u>じっと</u> していた。 | Dir. ‘Until (we) got up to her she <u>was staying still</u> .’ | <u>She did not move</u> as we came up, only nodded a silent greeting. | <u>She remained motionless</u> until I reached her. |
| 569. 黙って頭を下げた。 | Dir. ‘She was silent and lowered her head.’ | | Silently, she lowered her head. |

In §568, *jitto* provides the semantic value for the placeholder verb *suru*. The sense of inertia is intensified by the first verb of §569, 黙って *damatte* ‘remaining silent’: we are thus presented with a figure who is busy doing and saying nothing, until she lowers her head. Seidensticker deals with this issue by choosing the negative construction “did not move”, joining §568 and §569 into one sentence, and shifting the meaning of ‘be silent’ from the verb to the adjective modifying an inferred but rather dubious “greeting”. This reads smoothly, but diffuses the impact of the dancing girl’s motionlessness in §568. Holman is a little closer to the original with “remained motionless”, and keeps the two sentences separate, sustaining the glum sense of stasis with “[s]ilently”.

2.1.5.1 e. mood / mental representation (擬情語 *gijōgo*)

Japanese frequently uses mimetics to convey feelings because of their visceral quality. After *jitto suru* above, the most commonly occurring mimetic in the ST is ほっとする *hotto suru*. One may observe here an extreme form of the quotative quality of Japanese to which I have already referred: *hotto suru* actually imitates the out-breath that accompanies a feeling of relief (whose sound-symbolic equivalent in English might be ‘pew’, which is technically an utterance): thus while it can be reliably translated as ‘be relieved’ in most situations, it does not mean ‘be relieved’ so much as metonymically represent it, an out-breath being associated with relief and hence coming to stand for it. This almost metaphorical relationship between signifier and signified is common in *gijōgo*, where many terms are recruited from *giongo* to perform extra duty as mood representations as well as sound imitators. Here is an example sentence with *hotto suru*:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|-------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| 96. ♪私はほっとして男と並んで歩き始めた。 | Dir. ‘I <u>was relieved</u> and began walking alongside the man.’ | ♪Rescued, I walked on beside him. | ♪Relieved, I fell into step with the man. |

Holman indeed uses “[r]elieved”, but Seidensticker goes a step further with “[r]escued”, which is possibly overdetermined, inferring as it does the narrator’s thought processes. Note that each rendering creates an appositive structure, removing all of the first clause 私はほっとして *watashi wa hotto shite* ‘I was relieved’ except for what amounts to the past participle. Holman and Seidensticker apparently feel full clausal treatment as with the direct translation above would be excessive. This is probably connected with the paucity of verb content: like *jitto suru*, *hotto suru* consists of a semantic element and a

placeholder verb. In this case the English ‘be relieved’, with its auxiliary copula plus the semantically rich past participle (participial adjective), is not so distant from this structure; nevertheless the translators probably wish to minimise the use of the copula as this is a common literary stylistic bugbear in English.

どぎまぎ *dogimagi* is connected with どきどき *dokidoki*, which first of all imitates the sound of a heartbeat, and secondarily and metaphorically means ‘excited’. *Dogimagi*, with its unusually mixed set of phonemes rather than the standard reduplication of *dokidoki*, conveys a more irregular quality: hence its meaning is closer to ‘flustered’. This indeed is how the translators treat it:

| ST/Direct Translation | Seidensticker 1 | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|---|---|
| 113. ♪「夏でしょう。」と、私が振向くと、踊子はどぎまぎして、♪「冬でも——。」と、小声で答えたように思われた。 Dir. ‘ “That would be summer,” (I said) and when I looked back, the dancing girl, flustered, answered “Winter too,” in what seemed to be a small voice.’ | ♪ “In the summer, I suppose.” I looked back. ♪She was <u>flustered</u> . “In the winter too,” she answered in an almost inaudible little voice. | ♪ ‘In the summer, I suppose.’ I looked back. ♪‘In the winter too,’ she answered in an almost inaudible voice. | ♪I turned back toward them. “In the summer, right?” ♪The dancing girl was <u>flustered</u> . “In the winter, too,” I thought I heard her answer softly. |

S1 gives the phrase its own little sentence (“She was flustered.”), but S2 eliminates it, perhaps considering the sense sufficiently expressed when he editorialises 小声 *kogoe* ‘small voice’ as “almost inaudible”. Holman also gives the phrase its own sentence: “The dancing girl was flustered.” Thus both translators divide the ST single sentence into either three or four sentences, evidently regarding the ‘flustered’ phrase as too distinct from the surrounding elements to be joined to them.

One general point arising from the two examples above is that with *gijōgo* mimetics

the Adv+V_i form in the SL becomes copula+pp (passive) in the TL. Thus for example *dogimagi suru* becomes ‘be flustered’ rather than ‘fluster’ (‘fluster’ in the SL would be the causative *dogimagi saseru* dir. ‘make flustered’). This is a common part-of-speech difference between SL and TL equivalents.

2.1.5.1 Conclusion

The translation of mimetics should be handled with care, both because their form in the SL differs substantially from that of their equivalents in the TL, and because mimetics are such a potent expressive device in the SL that their potency must be adequately displayed in the TL. Further, TT equivalents should address temporal-inflection issues in the ST. Where an appropriate mimetic equivalent cannot be found in the TL, the translator can draw on other expressive devices such as metaphor to convey the effect/affect of the original.

2.1.5.2 Utterances

Perhaps the most useful way to approach the treatment of ST utterances is to view them as a group and look for patterns in how they are translated. In the table overleaf the 27 instances of utterances in the ST are listed along with their romaji transliteration and the two main TT renderings.

Table 5: Utterances and their putative translations

| ST § | Transliteration | Seidensticker | Holman |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| 12. ええ—— | <i>ee—</i> | Yes | Yes |
| 35. おや | <i>oya</i> | But you're soaked. | Ø |
| 35. さあ | <i>sā</i> | Ø | Ø |
| 55. そうかねえ。 | <i>nē</i> | Well now. | Ø |
| 57. こんなに綺麗になったかねえ。 | <i>nē</i> | And so pretty, <u>too</u> . | Ø |
| 125. それは、それは。 | <i>sore wa, sore wa</i> | S1: Oh, would he? S2: Oh, would he[.] | Well, well. |
| 125. まあ | <i>mā</i> | <u>Do</u> come in | Come <u>on</u> in |
| 132. まあ！ | <i>mā!</i> | Dear me, | My goodness. |
| 132. あれあれあれ——。 | <i>areareare—</i> | Ø | Look at that! |
| 136. ねえ | <i>nē</i> | Ø | Ø |
| 146. へえ。 | <i>hē</i> | Oh? | Oh, |
| 183. ああ、 | <i>aa</i> | Ah, | Oh, |
| 204. なあに。 | <i>nāni</i> | Ø | What? |
| 210. ほれ、 | <i>hore</i> | <u>Damned if they haven't</u> seen us. | Ø |
| 234. さ、さ、 | <i>sa, sa</i> | Ø | Well, then, |
| 255. なあに。 | <i>nāni</i> | Ø | What do you mean? |
| 259. よう——。 | <i>yō—</i> | S1: Fine, fine. S2: Ø | Ø |
| 260. ぞ | <i>zo</i> | Ø | It's all night tonight! |
| 260. ぞ | <i>zo</i> | Ø | Ø |
| 290. まあ | <i>mā</i> | Ø | Ø |
| 297. へえ。 | <i>hē</i> | Ø | Ø |
| 315. さあ | <i>sā</i> | Ø | Come <u>on</u> in. |
| 345. こら。 | <i>kora</i> | Ø | Hey, |
| 391. ああ、 | <i>aa</i> | S1: Ah, S2: Ø | Oh, |
| 437. ああ | <i>aa</i> | Ø | Ø |
| 512. おや、 | <i>oya</i> | S1: Heavy! S2: Ø | Hey, |
| 588. まあ | <i>ma</i> | S1: Ø S2: <u>Please</u> . Just look at her. | <u>Just</u> look at her. |

Of the 27 utterances in the ST, the five that occur most often are *ma* (*mā*) (four times), *sa* (*sā*) (four times), *aa* (three times), *nē* (three times) and *are* (three times consecutively). Note that I have included *nē* and *nāni* here because they are emphatic forms of the standard *ne* 'isn't it' and *nani* 'what'. I have also included *zo* (§260) because, while a tag emphatic particle like *yo*, it is much rarer than the latter in this text.

Now let us examine how the translators approach the utterances. I have ordered the five types of approaches by frequency. (Note that I only cite ST/TT punctuation below where it is relevant to the issue of rendering.)

i. → omission

The most common approach is simply to remove the utterances. Seidensticker omits them 16 times out of 27 in his second version, although, interestingly, in several cases he references them in his original version (cf. §125, 259, 391, 512). Holman omits them in eleven cases. Such a high rate of omission apparently reflects the translators' view that these utterances are inessential to the text and their inclusion in the TT may hinder fluency or appear too mannered. Such a view would suggest that English either does not use as many utterances as Japanese or does not have the degree of flexibility of inflection that exists in Japanese and hence cannot reflect non-standard forms (e.g. *nāni*).

ii. → non-quotative

Seidensticker renders the ST utterances in paraphrastic, non-quotative form in seven cases: §12 *ee—* → “[y]es”; §35 *oya* → “[b]ut”; §57 *nē* → “too”; §125 *mā* → emphatic “[d]o”; §210 *hore* → “[d]amned if they haven’t”; §259 *yō—* → (S1) “[f]ine, fine”; §588 *mā* → “[p]lease”. Holman does the same in six instances: §12 *ee—* → “[y]es”; §125 *mā* → “[c]ome on in”; §132 *areareare—* → “Look at that!”; §204 *nāni* → “What?”; §255 *nāni* → “What do you mean?”; §315 *sā* → “[c]ome on in”; §588 *mā* → “[j]ust”. In §204 he in effect de-emphasises *nāni* back to its normal state *nani* by rendering it as “What?”.

iii. → homophonous utterance

Seidensticker uses a sound-alike in four cases: §55 *nē* → “[w]ell now”; §132 *mā!* → “[d]ear me”; §183 *aa* → “[a]h”; §391 *aa* → (S1) “[a]h”. Holman does so in three cases: §132 *mā!* → “[m]y goodness”; §183 *aa* → “[o]h”; §391 *aa* → “[o]h”. There is only partial congruence in most cases, with *aa*/‘ah’ being the closest match, one that Holman, interestingly, rejects. Naturally, some of these phonemic correspondences are likely to be simply coincidental.

iv. → heterophonous utterance

Seidensticker replaces the ST utterance with a different-sounding utterance in two cases: §125 *sore wa, sore wa* → “[o]h”; §146 *hē* → “Oh?”. Holman does so in five cases: §125 *sore wa, sore wa* → “[w]ell, well” (at least retaining the duplication); §146 *hē* → “[o]h”; §234 *sa, sa* → “[w]ell, then,”; §345 *kora.* → “[h]ey,”; §512 *oya* → “[h]ey”.

v. → punctuation

The least common device the translators use to represent something of the ST utterance is punctuation. Seidensticker does this once, though only in S1: §512 *oya*, → “Heavy₁” Holman uses punctuation exclusively in one case, and in conjunction with other techniques in three cases: §260 *zo* → “It’s all night tonight₁”. §132 *areareare—*. → “Look at that₁”; §204 *nāni.* → “What?”; §255 *nāni.* → “What do you mean?”

I shall conclude by looking at five examples in context: two where both translators omit the ST utterance, one where they both retain it in some form, and two where one translator retains and the other omits, and then vice versa.

The first example (§35) contains two utterances, *oya* and *sā*. The utterer is the garrulous teahouse proprietress, who waylays the narrator in the early stages of the story, thus it is reasonable to expect her speech to be longwinded and peppered with redundant phrases. Seidensticker translates *oya* as “[b]ut”, capturing the sense of shock that *oya* expresses. Holman makes no attempt to render *oya*. (The ‘all’ in “[y]ou’re all wet” is an intensifier, but this most likely renders the suppressed emphatic *ん (の) n (no)* implied in お濡れになってるじゃございませんか *onure ni natte iru ja gozaimasen ka* which ‘sutures’ together the two verbal structures. Seidensticker has used “soaked” to achieve a similar intensification.)

Sā follows two sentences later in her speech: さあ、お召物をお乾かしなさいまし。 ‘Well, please dry your vestments here.’ Looking at the direct translation below, we can see that the flow of her patter would be interrupted by the “[w]ell” in the TT, almost creating a non sequitur. Both translators omit the utterance and do not compensate for it elsewhere in the text:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|---|---|
| 35. 茶を入りに来た婆さんに、寒いと云うと、¶「 <u>おや</u> 、旦那様お濡になってるじゃございませんか。こちらで暫くおあたりなさいまし。 <u>さあ</u> 、お召物をお乾かしなさいまし。」と、手を取るようにして、自分たちの居間へ誘ってくれた。 | Dir. ‘When (I) said to the old woman, who came to serve tea, I was cold, she said “ <u>Oh</u> , Master, you have become wet, have you not. Please remain here for a while. <u>Well</u> , please dry your vestments here,” reaching for my hand and inviting me into her own living room.’ | I was a little cold, I said to the old woman when she came back with tea. ¶“But you’re soaked! Come in here and dry yourself.’ She led me into her living-room. | The old woman came back to serve tea. I told her I felt cold. ¶“You’re all wet, aren’t you, sir?” She spoke with great deference. “Come in here for a while. Dry your clothes.” Reaching for my hand, she led me into her own parlor. |

Two further examples demonstrate how in some cases the same SL utterance has a different nuance depending on the context, and thus needs to be rendered differently in

the TT:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 436. 私が指でぺんぺんと太鼓を叩くと小鳥が飛立った。 | Dir. 'When I tapped the <i>taiko</i> with my finger, the little birds flew off.' | I tapped the drum and the birds started up in alarm. | I thumped the drum with my fingers and the birds flew away. |
| 437. ¶「ああ水が飲みたい。」 | Lit. ' <u>Aah</u> I want to drink water.' | 'I'm thirsty.' | ¶“I'm thirsty,” I said. |

Here *aa* acts as a transition from one topic (the birds) to another (thirst). It could be argued that the utterance in fact signals abruptness of transition, in which case the translators' unanimous omission of an English equivalent, where it might not have the same function, is quite justifiable. In that case, however, one may wonder why they retain it here:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| 182. 太鼓の音が聞える度に胸がほうと明るんだ。 | Dir. 'Each time the sound of the <i>taiko</i> could be heard, my heart lit up brightly.' | At each drum-beat I felt a surge of relief. | I felt some consolation every time I heard the drum. |
| 183. 「ああ、踊子はまだ宴席に座っていたのだ。 | Dir. ' <u>Aah</u> , the dancing girl was still sitting on the banquet seat.' | ' <u>Ah</u> , she's still there. | ¶“ <u>Oh</u> , the dancing girl is still at the party. |

In both cases *aa* expresses the release of the narrator's pent-up feelings. Here *aa* serves as a linking rather than contrastive device, which could explain why they retain it in this case.

In the next example both translators render the ST utterance (§125):

| ST | Dir./Lit. Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|--|---|
| 123. ♪湯ヶ野の木賃宿の前で四十女が、ではお別れ、と云う顔をした時に、彼が伝ってくれた。 | Dir. ‘When the woman in her forties gave a face in front of a Yugano inn as if saying good-bye, I he spoke for me.’ | ♪In front of a shabby inn the older woman glanced tentatively at me as if to take her leave. | ♪When we arrived at a cheap lodging house in Yugano, the older woman nodded as if to say good-bye. But the man spoke for me: |
| 124. ♪「この方はお連れになりたいとおっしゃるんだよ。」 | Dir. ‘“This gentleman says he wants to become our companion.”’ | ‘But the young gentleman would like to go on with us,’ the man said. | “This young gentleman has kindly offered to accompany us.” |
| 125. ♪「それは、それは。旅は道連れ、世は情。私たちのようなつまらない者でも、御退屈しのぎにはなりますよ。まあ上がってお休みなさいまし。と、無造作に答えた。 | Lit. ‘“That is, that is. [...]”’ | ♪‘Oh, would he,’ she answered easily. ‘On the road a companion, in life sympathy, they say. I suppose even poor things like us can liven up a trip. Do come in. We’ll have a cup of tea and rest ourselves.’ | ♪“Well, well. As the old saying goes, ‘On the road, a traveling companion; and in the world, kindness.’ Even boring people like us will help you pass the time. Come on in and take a rest.” She spoke without formality. |

Sore wa, sore wa is meaningless in itself (lit. ‘that (is), that (is)’ or ‘as for that, as for that’), but as it represents the older woman’s pivotal reaction to the narrator’s desire to continue accompanying the entertainers, it should be retained in some form. Seidensticker uses the deictic pro-verb “would”, where “would” stands for the man’s antecedent “would like to go on with us” in §124. This echoic construction efficiently and naturally connects the dialogue, and further conveys the older woman’s relaxed reaction and her humorous acknowledgement of the slight presumption in his request. Holman’s “Well, well” captures both the repetition of the ST original and the woman’s unconcerned reaction, though there is scant humour in it.

The final two examples more emphatically contrast the translation styles of Seidensticker and Holman. Returning to one of the key moments in the story, the river-bathing scene, we see that Seidensticker gives considerable weight to *hore* ‘hey’ plus the rough *te iyagaru* verb form, whereas Holman does not:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 210. ——ほれ、こちらを見つけたと見えて笑っているやがる。」 | Dir. ‘— <u>Hey</u> , it appears (they)’ve found us and are laughing.’ | <u>Damned if they haven’t</u> seen us. Look at them laugh.’ | I think they’ve noticed us. They’re laughing.” |

Here three elements interact to intensify the discourse: the initial dash, the utterance and the final verbal suffix. The dash emphasises the forcefulness of Eikichi’s utterance and this is given a coda in the rough ~やがる verb suffix. Together, these elements, eloquently expressing as they do Eikichi’s sudden awareness of and lighthearted resignation to the mildly perplexing situation, justify Seidensticker’s bold decision to use the colloquial phrase “[d]amned if ...”. Despite its stark cultural conversion, which exemplifies Seidensticker’s sometimes overriding policy of capturing the spirit rather than the letter of the ST, it is surely superior to Holman’s tepid “I think they’ve noticed us”, which contains nothing of the original character or intent of Eikichi’s speech patterns.

2.1.5.2 Conclusion

The translators appear to make the decision to retain, modify or omit the ST utterance based on how it fits into the flow of the surrounding sentences. They often remove utterances, suggesting both their limited expressive value and relative paucity in the TL. At the same time, the translators acknowledge through some attempts at rendering that judicious retention in some form can help convey the ‘flavour’ of ST dialogue.

2.1.6 VERB MORPHOLOGY

By ‘verb morphology’ I mean the intra-verb and multi-verb structures that manifest themselves in the ST morphosyntax. Intra-verb structures comprise agglutinations affixed to the base form of a single verb (e.g., 食べる *taberu* ‘eat’ can become 食べられる ‘can eat’ or ‘is eaten’). The semantic effects of such agglutinations are predictable and do not present great problems for translation; thus I shall focus on multi-verb structures in this section. These consist of either separate verbs in a chain—a ‘combination verb’—or two verbs fused to form a compound.

A combination verb consists of a base verb in its *-te* gerund form, which provides the main semantic value, plus a following auxiliary verb that either modifies the sense of the base verb or provides an additional sense (Martin 1975: 510ff.). For example:

59. ¶小一時間経つと、旅芸人たちが出立つらしい物音が聞えて来た。

Dir. ‘When almost an hour had passed, the sound of the travelling entertainers preparing to depart came to be heard.’

In this case, 来た *kita* ‘came’ modifies 聞こえて *kikoete* ‘was (could be) heard’ to create the meaning ‘came to be heard’. If the verb structure simply consisted of 聞こえた *kikoeta* ‘was audible’, it would indicate a continuous or continual sound with no definite beginning or ending point. Here the postmodifier *kita* informs us that the sound began at a particular point within the timeframe of the description (Martin 1975: 537).

This idiomatic sense of 来る *kuru* in fact more often appears in its original directional meaning in combination with another verb:

4. 修善寺温泉に一夜泊り、湯ヶ島温泉に二夜泊り、そして朴歯の高下駄で天城を登って来たのだった。

Dir. ‘(I) had stayed one night at Shuzenji Spa, two nights at Yugashima Spa, and then climbed up Amagi in high *geta*.’

Here 天城を登って来た *Amagi o nobotte kita* can be rendered ‘I [had] climbed (up) Amagi’, the implication being that the narrator will then go on to relate events that occurred there, with no need for an explicit ‘came [there]’ to make the connection.¹²⁶

A complicating factor in the TL rendering of such combinatory verb forms is that the latter part is often superfluous in English, as with ‘~~came~~ to be heard’ and ‘climbed ~~and came~~’. Sometimes the second verb even contradicts English logic: for example, はさみを買って来る *hasami o katte kuru* (lit. ‘I’ll buy scissors and come’), which ‘must’ be rendered something like ‘I’ll go and buy a pair of scissors’, because English focuses on the action of going somewhere to buy the scissors, while Japanese focuses on the place where the utterance is made (Martin 1975: 536).

The second category to examine is ‘compound verb’. A Japanese compound verb is similar to English phrasal verbs in that a base verb, again appearing first, though this time in its root form (e.g., 振(り) *furi*- rather than dictionary form 振る *furu*, or 食べ *tabe*- rather than 食べる *taberu*), is modified by the direct suffixation of a supplementary verb, much in the way that an English phrasal verb consists of a base verb modified by a postpositive particle. For example:

415. 私が振返って話しかけると、[...]。

Dir. ‘When I turned back and started talking, [...].’

¹²⁶ Of course, ‘come up Amagi’ is possible, but this loses the sense of ‘climb’.

振る *furu* means ‘turn’ in this context, while 返る *kaeru* means ‘go back’; thus together they form ‘turn back’ or ‘look back’. However, as with English phrasal verbs, combinations are often idiomatic, the resultant sense differing considerably from that of the constituent parts:

60. 私も落ち着いている場合ではないのだが、[...]。

Lit. ‘It was not my case to be calm either, but [...].’

落ちる *ochiru* ‘fall’ and *tsuku* 着く ‘arrive’ combine to form 落ち着く *ochitsuku* (here 落ち着く¹²⁷) ‘be calm’; similarly in English, if a couple “falls out”, no-one is going to call an ambulance, though they may recommend a good counsellor. In other words, *ochitsuku* and ‘fall out’ are similar in the way that an idiomatic, unpredictable meaning arises from the combination of their parts, though they differ in that the former consists of two independent verbs, while the latter is phrasal (verb+particle).

At first glance, then, Japanese and English verb forms do not appear so divergent. Similarly, the simple present and present continuous in English are largely matched by the non-past and continuous non-past in Japanese, while the simple past and past continuous are matched by the Japanese ～た *-ta* and ～ていた *-te ita* verb forms. Furthermore, English’s present perfect continuous and past perfect continuous have reasonable counterparts in the Japanese ～ている *-te iru* and ～ていた *-te ita* forms respectively.¹²⁸

But there are several important SL–TL differences to consider. First, tense is more

¹²⁷ Kawabata omits much standard *okurigana*.

¹²⁸ Note however that there is no discrete equivalent in Japanese for the English past perfect simple (e.g. ‘the tree had fallen’).

labile in Japanese than English as the former is more centred on aspect (Miller 1986: 148-157). If a writer in English starts a narrative in the simple past, s/he is expected to continue with it and not jump to the present, unless there is good reason to do so. Japanese literature, however, can move smoothly between past and non-past.¹²⁹ This is aided by the fact that non-past continuous and non-past perfect forms are conflated in the *-te iru* structure. Furthermore, when nouns are premodified by a verb structure, analogous to a relative clause in English, the verb form often reverts to the non-past, as if this is the default state.¹³⁰

Second, as in §59 above, Japanese often, though not always, requires vigilance in reporting changes of state. Thus, for example, when something becomes audible, it is reported as 聞こえてきた *kikoete kita* ‘came to be heard’, rather than 聞こえた *kikoeta*, which means ‘(I) heard (something with no clear beginning or ending)’ or ‘(something) was audible’. English is more forgiving about such changes of state, often not signalling them explicitly (hence ‘(was) heard’ is preferable to the longer ‘came to be heard’).

Now I shall examine in detail a representative combination verb form and its manifestations in the ST.

～て来る・～てくる *-te kuru*¹³¹

As outlined above, the verb *kuru* ‘come’ is used as a postpositive auxiliary to other

¹²⁹ See tense forms in §214, 217 and 218 in Chapter Four, for example.

¹³⁰ For example, in §60 above, Kawabata writes 落ち着いている場合 *ochitsuite iru baai* (non-past continuous), not 落ち着いていた場合 *occhitsuite ita baai* (past continuous).

¹³¹ Directional: §1, 4, 36, 46, 63, 69, 73, 77, 98, 109, 129, 152, 155, 165, 170, 178, 199, 213, 249, 282, 303, 312, 318, 325, 343, 352, 363, 365, 374, 413, 417, 432, 438, 439, 448, 467, 471, 473, 474, 496, 517, 529, 557, 579. Idiomatic: 48, 59, 69, 220, 551. Total: 48 instances.

verbs in their gerund (*-te*) form (Martin 1975: 510) to impart either a directional action (as in its base meaning) or, idiomatically, a sense of development of some state or action.¹³² We can see the same uses prepositively with English ‘come’, as in ‘come over’, where the preposition ‘over’ takes the role that the first verb does in Japanese (one equivalent is 寄ってくる *yotte kuru* in Japanese), and ‘come to understand’ (わかってくる *wakatte kuru*) respectively. The main issue that arises for translation is that the utterer orientates the directional verb *kuru*, and Japanese usage thus differs somewhat from how English orientates directional verbs, both spatially and temporally.

A further complication is that English directional verbs such as ‘bring’ and ‘take’ embody an orientation (towards and away from a notional location), which means they incorporate the base meaning of ‘come’ and ‘go’ respectively. Japanese, however, has no such multiply embodied directional verbs: all orientation with respect to the utterer must be added by the context-appropriate affixation of *kuru*, *iku*, or another directional verb to indicate such combined senses. Therefore when it comes to translating such verbs, English is more likely to use a phrasal verb or a single-word verb that embodies directional elements than to use a combination verb. English does use combinations such as ‘come (and) see’ or ‘come looking’, but not as frequently as Japanese.

The translators use several approaches to expressing the directional element of *-te kuru*. First, though rarely, they may ignore it:

109. [...] 冬の用意はして来ないので、下田に十日程いて伊東温泉から島へ帰るのだと云った。

Lit. ‘They had not prepared for winter and come, so after being in Shimoda for about ten days they would return to the island from Itō Spa, they said.’

¹³² Martin: “The two auxiliary meanings have to do with GRADUALNESS or with ONSET (beginning) of a continuing process.” (1975: 537; original emphasis.)

S: [...] [T]hey had no winter clothes with them. After ten days or so at Shimoda in the south they would turn north again and sail back to the island from Ito.

H: [...] [T]hey had not yet made preparations for winter. They said they were planning to stay in Shimoda for just ten days, then cross over to the island from Ito Hot Springs.

‘They had not come prepared for winter’ (or possibly ‘they had not brought winter clothes with them’) would seem reasonable renderings, but the question of movement apparently seems insufficiently relevant to both translators in the context of winter preparations.¹³³

A second approach is to render *kuru* explicitly as ‘come’ in a phrasal verb. Seidensticker favours this: examples are “came back” (five cases), “had come along”, “come here”, “came by”, “came after” and “came up to” (two cases).¹³⁴ Holman, however, tends to prefer a third approach of embodied verbs (that is, where the ‘come’ sense is tacit, embedded in another verb). Comparing the same sentences where Seidensticker uses “came back”, we find greater variety in Holman: “returned”, “came back”, “were returning”, “returned” and “came back”. Seidensticker’s other uses of ‘come’ are matched by the following in Holman: “had been following”, “to travel in my direction”, “called on me”, “trudging along behind me”, “came up to”, and “approached”.

Holman uses a form of ‘come’ in only three cases out of the eleven cited above. One could make the argument that Seidensticker’s approach is formally closer to the ST, as it preserves ‘come’ as a separate element and direct analogue of *kuru*. While the repeated use can be seen as detracting from stylistic felicity—firstly, the close proximity of instances introduces repetitiousness, and secondly, the use of embodied forms may

¹³³ See §152, 282, 352 and 365 for other cases of TT omission.

¹³⁴ §63, 318, 343, 374, 439 (“came back”); 155, 178, 199, 413; 557, 579 (“came up to”).

sound more ‘literary’—the former does not appear to be the case here, and the latter is debatable.

As mentioned earlier, English verbs other than explicitly directional verbs can embody direction. Thus one observes, for example, this use of “brought”:

| ST/Literal Translation | Seidensticker 1 | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|--|--|
| 129. 踊子が下から茶を運んできた。Lit. ‘The dancing girl <u>carried tea and came</u> from below.’ | The little dancer <u>brought up</u> tea from below. | The little dancer <u>brought</u> tea from below. | The dancing girl <u>brought</u> us some tea from downstairs. |

Seidensticker relies on the embodied ‘come’ in “brought”, while Holman adds the focalising “us”.

Often an embodied verb is combined with both a directional preposition and a focalizing object to orientate. Take, for example, §1 S: “swept toward me” / H: “swept up after me; §77 S: “ran up the road after me” / H: “tottered along behind me”; and §325 S: “leaning ... over the board” / H: “hunched over the board”. In fact, Seidensticker replaces the entire verb with a prepositional adverbial phrase in the following:

303. 引返して来ると、[...].

Dir. ‘When (we) came back, [...].’

S2: On the way back, [...].

H: As we walked back, [...].

Without the orientation of an appropriate preposition, there is also a slight risk with using an embodied verb that the directional element may be confounded:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|---|---|
| 36. ¶その部屋は炉が切 ってあって、障子を明 けると強い火気が <u>流れ て来た</u> 。 | Dir. ‘In that room a fireplace was cut out, and when one opened the <i>shōji</i> a strong heat from the fire <u>came flowing</u> .’ | ¶The heat from the open fire <u>struck me</u> as she opened the door. | ¶There was a hearth in the middle of the floor of her room. When she opened the sliding door, the hot air <u>flowed out</u> . |

Seidensticker correctly orientates the fire’s heat towards the narrator (“[t]he heat ... struck me”), allowing the directional element of *kuru* to be implied in the personal object pronoun ‘me’. Holman’s “the hot air flowed out”, however, gives the impression that the heat is moving away from the speaker and out of the room, when perhaps he means ‘the hot air flowed out of the hearth’. This ambiguity would have been avoided by a more explicit construction like ‘the hot air came flowing out’.

This suggestion introduces a fourth approach, which both translators use, though again Seidensticker particularly favours: another combination verb form, this time ‘come’+present participle, as in “came tripping up behind us” (§98), “came ... climbing behind me” (§417), “came running back” (§448), and “came running up” (§467, 474). Holman, treating the same instances, again avoids ‘come’, using embodied forms in all but one case: “scurried to join us”, “climbing ... behind me”, “came back up”, “following on our heels”, and “caught up with us”.

Let us turn now to idiomatic uses of *kuru* in the ST, which all approximate the use of the verb *naru* ‘to become’, implying a change of state. Japanese requires what might be termed a ‘transitional’ auxiliary, whereas English does not. Thus, for example, a Japanese translation of ‘the horse tired’ (meaning ‘the horse became tired’) might be 馬が疲れてきた *uma ga tsukarete kita*, but not the stative 馬が疲れた *uma ga tsukareta*, which would mean rather ‘the horse was tired’, focusing on the state rather than the

process. Thus what is a grammatical necessity in Japanese is not passed on in English, because it is unneeded:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|--|---|
| 59. ¶小一時間経つと、 旅芸人たちが出立つら しい物音が <u>聞えて来</u> <u>た</u> 。 | Dir. ‘When almost an hour had passed, the sound of the travelling entertainers apparently preparing to leave <u>came</u> <u>to be heard</u> .’ | ¶Perhaps an hour later I <u>heard</u> them getting ready to leave. | ¶About an hour later, I <u>heard</u> the entertainers preparing to leave. |

Neither translator attempts to convey the sense of onset that the ST implies, because it would sound finicky in English, as the direct translation suggests. Indeed, in none of the four idiomatic cases does the English make explicit the concept of ‘becoming’ that *kuru* expresses here, because it is neither grammatically required nor compelling.

2.1.6 Conclusion

While many other SL verb forms could be addressed, I have used a particularly common instance to exemplify several issues that arise in the treatment of verbs in the TL. Both make use of combination verb forms, but Japanese requires more specificity of directional and stative information than English. The TL’s tendency to eschew repetition increases the likelihood that English translations will favour single verbs, often with embodied directional or stative elements, over combination forms.

The relative ubiquity of ‘come’ combination forms in both languages allows for a high degree of identity between ST and TT, as Seidensticker demonstrates; however, English’s greater dislike for repetition mitigates this possibility, as evidenced in Holman’s approach. It is thus likely that a given translation will consist of a mixture of phrasal-verb and embodied-verb renderings.

Chapter Two Conclusion

The most consistently recurring issue in translating the lexical features that I have outlined in Chapter Two is a difference in the semantic ‘centre of gravity’ between Japanese and English, with a tendency for Japanese to concentrate meaning in nouns and English in verbs. This is particularly evident in the analysis of lexical identity. Time and again, the translators shift the semantic moment from one part of speech in the ST to another in the TT, in the form of ‘downshifting’ (choosing the most compact and least complex part of speech from the TL) and ‘sideshifting’ (choosing euphonious or elegant TL structures that are a different part of speech to the SL forms).

A second and related characteristic of the translations exemplified in Chapter Two is the common introduction of lexical variety into the TT where it does not exist in the ST. As has been stated, Japanese appears to have a greater tolerance for formal repetition than English, which often finds it inelegant. This is another reason for sideshifting: providing variety through changes in part-of-speech patterns.

A third related characteristic of the translations is paraphrase, which again can sometimes prompt part-of-speech shifts. The visceral impact of mimetics and utterances is often displaced into a different, analogous feature in English; similarly, TL embodied verbs may conflate two SL verbal elements.

Finally, many of the textual examples in this chapter suggest that Japanese tolerates ambiguity on both lexical and structural levels to a greater degree than English. Often this is simply because Japanese does not need to make grammatically explicit aspects that must be explicit in English; in some cases, it appears elegant in Japanese, as a ‘reader-responsibility’ language, to leave it to the reader to provide a ‘missing’ element.

As proxy TL readers, it is the translators' job to manifest the illocutionary force of the ST in the TT so that the TL reader can apprehend it within the 'writer-responsibility' milieu of English. In summary, then, the translations are often more explicatory and explicit than the ST.

Chapter Three: A Taxonomy of Japanese Syntagmatic Features and the Issues Arising for Translation into English

3.0 Introduction

If paradigmatic features concern choices within a particular lexical set of possibilities, syntagmatic features manifest mainly as relationships between combinations of these lexical elements, contributing to textual coherence. Although I have mostly avoided the terms ‘style’ and ‘stylistics’ in this thesis thus far, syntagmatic features are more closely connected with such terms in that one cannot speak of form without context, whereas it is easier to consider lexical features in isolation. Repetition, for example, is one of the most important features in this section, but by definition repetition does not exist without more than one element to consider.

When we considered the translation of *onna* in **2.1.2.2. a. i.**, we noticed differences in the lexical segmentation of this term and possible English counterparts such as ‘woman’, and considered the possible implications of these differences for translation. A longitudinal analysis of all incidences of *onna* in the ST and all corresponding translations in the TTs was helpful in establishing at once (a) the range of meanings, (b) the possible (though, naturally, not exhaustive) set of translations, and (c) the differences between the translators’ treatment of the term. However, this analysis did not consider the syntagm; it simply created a representation (in the form of a table) of the vertical paradigm ‘*onna*’ and its set members (including English equivalents). In this chapter, we must go further, and examine the ST co-text to analyse how Japanese instigates and presents syntagmatic features as a function of a sequence of lexical

elements, and then examine the corresponding section of the TTs to analyse how—or, indeed, whether—the translations reflect such syntagmatic features. Thus, for example, if the word *onna* is repeated in a sentence, this is an instance of repetition, a marked coherency structure: is the repetition reflected in the translations, and if so, in what form(s), and with what ramifications for JE English translation?

As in Chapter Two, I begin by listing the feature sections in a hierarchical structure, with major sections ordered alphabetically and group categories in SMALL CAPITALS. Further divisions are made with italicised Roman numerals within each feature section.

3.1 Syntagmatic Features

3.1.1 ANAPHORA (p. 208)

- a. demonstratives (p. 209)
- b. また *mata* ‘again’, etc. (p. 214)
- c. も *mo* ‘too’, etc. (p. 217)
- d. もう *mō* ‘already’ (p. 221)

3.1.2 Clause Extent Marker 程 *hodo* (p. 224)

3.1.3 Double Subject; Topic and Subject (p. 228)

- a. convergent subjects (general+detail) (p. 228)

3.1.4 MULTI-CLAUSE SENTENCE (p. 232)

3.1.4.1 Paratactic clause structure (p. 233)

3.1.4.2 Hypotactic clause structure (p. 235)

- a. multi-clause hypotactic (p. 236)
- b. ‘heavy-handed’ conjunction (p. 241)

c. multiple conjunctives (p. 245)

3.1.5 PREMODIFIER (p. 248)

3.1.5.1 Prenominal modifier (p. 253)

a. clausal premodifier (p. 253)

b. concatenation of premodifiers with possessive particle *no* (p. 261)

3.1.5.2 Preadjectival/preverbal modifier (adverbial) (p. 268)

a. set adverbial structures (p. 268)

b. time/manner/place (TMP) nominal+postposition (p. 270)

c. clausal+nominal preverbal modifiers (p. 275)

3.1.6 QUOTATIVE MARKER と *to* (p. 278)

a. no quotative verb attached (p. 278)

b. *to* not followed by regular quotative verb (p. 280)

3.1.7 REPETITION (p. 283)

a. general repetition (p. 283)

b. repetition of word-family-related lexical items (p. 286)

c. phrasal repetition (p. 288)

d. redundancy (p. 293)

e. subject-noun, epithet repetition (p. 294)

3.1.8 Sentence-length Difference (p. 301)

3.1.1 ANAPHORA

Both English and Japanese make use of anaphora, a form of deixis where something that has already been mentioned (the ‘antecedent’) is referenced. It is worth recapitulating the main points made in **2.1.2.2 c.** regarding deictics, because of the impact of the SL/TL differences on translation issues related to anaphora.

Japanese deictics differentiate three forms—for example, the demonstrative adjectives *kono*, *sono* and *ano*, and corresponding demonstrative pronouns *kore*, *sore* and *are*—while English only has two, ‘this’ and ‘that’ (which operate both as demonstrative adjectives and nouns). Japanese pays particular attention to the spatial relationship of the referenced subject/object to the speaker, with *kono/kore* corresponding to ‘this’ (near or of the speaker), *sono/sore* ‘that’ (near or of the auditor) and *ano/are* ‘that (...) over there’, something or someone distant from both speaker and auditor. Analogous is the temporal dimension: *ano* can refer to something that both speaker and auditor are aware of and spoke of on a previous occasion, while *sono* could imply that only the speaker knows what s/he is referring to, or is referencing something that has just been mentioned.

Further complicating the use of Japanese deictics in literature is that they are orientated by the focaliser; that is, they may express the narrator’s spatio-temporal point of view as well as simply orientating the reader towards him or her. Thus when the ST narrator says (§341) この木賃宿 *kono kichinyado* ‘this inn’, he is referring to it as if it has rematerialised in his act of remembering it. English, on the other hand, usually retains the distancing of narrative, likely rendering *kono kichinyado* as ‘the inn’ or, emphatically, ‘that inn’ (albeit with exceptions: see below). This difference is analogous

to how Japanese may switch to a ‘narrative present’ tense to relate past events, while this is rare in English.¹³⁵

The anaphoretic adverbials *mata* and *mo* are problematic for translation because while they superficially resemble English ‘again/further’ and ‘too/also’ respectively, both have a wider syntactic and semantic ambit than their English versions, in the sense that their inclusivity stretches beyond the immediate noun they are modifying to include more abstract and/or implicit equivalencies than a direct English ‘equivalent’ might.

3.1.1 a. demonstratives この・その・あの *kono/sono/ano*; これ・それ・あれ *kore/sore/are*; こちら・そちら・あちら *kochira/sochira/achira* (‘this way’ or ‘my’ / ‘that way’ or ‘your’ / ‘that way there’ or ‘his/her/their’)

i. *kono/kore/kochira* used to reference something physically removed from the narrator

In some cases, English uses a similar device to specify the object of discussion:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 22. 『私はそれまでにこの踊子たちを二度見ているのだった。』 | Dir. ‘I had up to then seen <u>this</u> dancing girl and the others twice.’ | [130] 『I had seen <u>the</u> little dancer twice before. | 『I had seen <u>this</u> troupe twice previously. |

Here Seidensticker feels no need to replicate the deixis with an emphatic demonstrative,

¹³⁵ Miller on the languages’ different focus on tense and aspect: “We [English speakers] are generally so accustomed to reference to ‘past’, ‘present’, and ‘future’ as overall verbal categories that we are likely to fall into the deceptive trap of assuming that these three entities are somehow immutable absolutes with a separate, ideal existence somewhere in the real world—and also that, by that token, any language that does not precisely account for them is somehow imperfect, inadequate, or defective. [...] [T]he Japanese verb is generally far more concerned with whether or not an action or state is continuous, completed or incomplete [aspect], than it is with the particular point in chronological time at which it takes place [tense].” (1986: 148-149.)

leaving the deictic work to “the”; however, Holman preserves the demonstrative with “this”.¹³⁶ But Japanese literary licence often extends further than English finds comfortable:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 316. ¶一時間程遊んで芸人達は <u>この</u> 宿の内湯へ行った。 | Dir. ‘After playing for about an hour the entertainers went to the inside bath in <u>this</u> inn.’ | ¶ An hour or so later they all went down for a bath. | ¶ The entertainers stayed about an hour, then went down to <u>the</u> inn bath. |

Here the narrator is referring to the inn in which he was staying at the time, rather than where he is ‘now’, as he writes, yet still uses *kono* ‘this’, perhaps thereby emphasising the connection between himself and the entertainers, an emphatic function of the Japanese demonstratives that is usually absent in English. This difference is reflected in the translations: Seidensticker omits ‘(this) inn’, relying on implication, while Holman simply uses the deictic force of “the” (again, the definite article often being used to refer to an antecedent) to convey that they are bathing in the same inn as the narrator.¹³⁷

The following example reveals the importance in Japanese of orientating the narrative to the narrator:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|--|---|
| 343. <u>こちらの</u> 部屋へ一緒に立って来る途中で、鳥屋が踊子の肩を軽く叩いた。 | Dir. ‘As they stood up and came to the room <u>over here</u> , the poulterer lightly tapped the dancing girl’s shoulder.’ | As they came back he laid a hand lightly on the girl’s shoulder. | As the girls were returning to <u>their own</u> room, the man patted the dancing girl’s shoulder. |

Here the sense is that the girls are returning to the narrator’s present location within the

¹³⁶ Also in §90, 124, 206, 357, 491.

¹³⁷ Also in §341, 343.

story, or at least in that direction. One could conceivably translate this phrase as ‘the room where I was’, but neither translator wants to be so explicit, Seidensticker relying on the orientation of the phrasal verb “came back”, while Holman uses “returning”, which is noncommittal in its orientation, but supplements it with “their own room”, in the process shifting the viewpoint from the narrator to the girls.

ii. kono used to reference something temporally removed from the narrator

There appears to be only one example in the ST, and here again Japanese and English literary norms seem to concur, even though this harmony is not reflected in the translations:

330. この日も、栄吉は朝から夕方まで私の宿に遊んでいた。

Dir. ‘This day too, Eikichi was playing in my inn from morning till evening.’

S: Eikichi spent the day at my inn again [...].

H: Again Eikichi stayed at the inn with me from morning until late afternoon.

It would be acceptable in English to preserve ‘this’ in the translation even though we are dealing with a location physically and temporally removed from the narrator, but ‘that’ would still be more common. That both translators again omit the demonstrative suggests the use of ‘this’ in such a context would be marked or even heavy-handed in the TL. This case offers an example where a difference in lexical compatibility combines with a perceived superfluity to encourage the translator to omit the expression and kill two birds with one stone, as it were; but, as Venuti contends, such ‘tidying up’ as part of a strategy of fluency may not be a desirable thing in literary translation (1995: 15-16, 304).

iii. sono/sore/sochira

Of the three demonstrative forms in the ST, *sono/sore* has the greatest prima facie correspondence to its English equivalent ‘that’. Yet in only one of the 17 instances in the ST is the correspondence preserved in the TT, in this case an emphatic rather than spatio-temporal use:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 106. 『「そうでしょう。それくらいのことは知っています。」』 | Dir. ‘That’s right. I know <u>that</u> much about it.’ | 『 ‘Really, even I know that much,’ the girl retorted. | “That’s right, isn’t it? I know that much. |

In all other cases,¹³⁸ the demonstrative is either omitted or muted to a pronoun or direct article:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|---|---|
| 40. 身の周りに古手紙や紙袋の山を築いて、 <u>その紙屑のなかに埋もれていると云っ</u> [59] てもよかった。 | Dir. ‘Around his body he had built a mountain of old letters, paper bags, and so on, and one could have said he was buried in <u>that</u> wastepaper. | Around him was a mountain of old paper bags and bits of paper. I might have said that he was buried in <u>the</u> mountain. | Around him lay piles of old letters and scraps of paper. <u>They</u> almost buried him. |

Again this shows the tendency of the TL to de-emphasise explicit deictic references. One explanation may be the near-ubiquity of identifiers such as pronouns and direct articles in English, against the relative paucity of similar forms in Japanese. There is, for example, no direct equivalent of ‘the’ in Japanese, which means there is no article in unmarked situations—prior reference often being signalled by the *ga* particle instead—

¹³⁸ *Sono*: §36, 40, 102, 141, 179, 262, 288, 370, 414, 496; *sono uchi*: 136, 247; *sore*: 48 (*sorera*), 161, 215, 356.

or the explicit *sono* is used. *Sono* is more marked than ‘the’, but conversely ‘that’ is often more marked than *sono*, and this lexical differentiation combined with a TL literary expectation of implication rather than explicitation of ‘obvious’ elements may explain translators’ frequent use of ‘the’ as a replacement for *sono*.

On the other hand, paradoxically, the translators insert ‘that’ in other situations where there is no demonstrative in the ST—where they feel the need to provide more emphasis than the original, or where an awkward transition needs to be bridged:

| ST | Literal translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 66. お客があればあり次第、どこにだって泊るんでございますよ。 | Lit. ‘Wherever there are customers, they’ll stay anywhere!’ | If they find someone who’ll pay them, <u>that</u> ’s where it will be. | Wherever they can attract an audience, <u>that</u> ’s where they stay. It doesn’t matter where it might be. |

Here the ST structure would be awkward and the meaning vague if preserved in the TT, but at the same time both translators wish to preserve the tone and cadence of the old woman’s speech. ‘That’ enables them to provide an emphatic node about which the sentence turns, while simultaneously making explicit the damnatory thrust of her outburst, namely that the entertainers will stay anywhere they can get a paying audience.

In fact, it appears, although the number of ST instances is limited,¹³⁹ that *ano/are/anna* has a greater correspondence in terms of emphatic moment, as we see in the below examples:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|
| 293. <u>あの</u> 上の娘が女房ですよ。 | Dir. ‘ <u>That</u> oldest girl is my wife!’ | <u>That</u> ’s my wife, the older of the two women. | <u>The</u> oldest girl <u>there</u> with us, she’s my wife. |

¹³⁹ §65, 293. Note that the element is not translated using ‘that’ in §234, 295 and 331.

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 65. 『「あんな者、どこで泊るや分るものごぞいますか、旦那様。」』 | Dir. ‘People <u>like that</u> , is where they stay something one knows, little master?’ | 『 ‘People <u>like that</u> , who knows where they’ll stay?’ | 『“There’s no way to tell where people <u>like that</u> are going to stay, is there, young man?” |

3.1.1 b. また *mata*

i. ‘again’

In many cases, *mata* can be readily translated as ‘again’:¹⁴⁰

193. また湯には入った。

Lit. ‘Again (I) entered the hot water.’

S: I went down to the bath again [...].

H: I went down again for a bath.

Note, however, that syntax differs, like most adverbials (cf. 3.1.4.2), with Japanese favouring an initial position, and English a medial or terminal position.

In the following example, *mata* does more work than a simple ‘again’ would indicate:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|--|--|
| 14. 『踊子と真近に向い合ったので、私はあわてて袂から煙草を取出した。』 | Dir. ‘(I) was directly facing the dancing girl, so I flusteredly took a cigarette out of my sleeve.’ | 『 She sat near me, we were facing each other. I fumbled for tobacco and she handed me the ashtray in front of one of the other women.』 | 『 Sitting so close, facing the dancing girl, I fumbled to pull a cigarette from my kimono sleeve.』 |
| 15. 踊子が <u>また</u> 連れの女の前の煙草盆を引寄せて私に近くしてくれた。』 | Dir. ‘The dancing girl <u>again</u> brought the ashtray of her woman companion towards her and put it near me.’ | | The girl took the ashtray sitting in front of her female companion and placed it near me. |

¹⁴⁰ Other examples: §333, 376, 377, 399, 474.

English expects a high degree of identity between the antecedent and the anaphoretic element. Thus when we use the adverb ‘again’, we imply the repetition of the same, or a very similar, action or state. However, as the above example indicates, *mata* has a wider range of application, referring to the past actions of the dancing girl in relation to the narrator—in other words, what she has done for (*shite kureta*) him. In §11, the dancing girl turned over her cushion and offered it to the narrator. Now in §15, she provides him with an ashtray. The *mata* yokes these actions together under the category of ‘things the dancing girl has done for the narrator’, rather than simply referencing a certain action that she then repeats, as English prefers.¹⁴¹ It is thus unsurprising that neither translation carries the sense of ‘again’, because ‘again’ or indeed any other English word indicating repetition would not be up to the task.¹⁴²

This is not to say, however, that the translators never try to employ ‘again’ in this way: but it requires assistance to extend its range of influence. Observe the following:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|--|---|
| 425. [92] ¶それからまた踊子は、¶「お父さんありますか。」とか、¶「甲府へ行ったことがありますか。」とか、ぽつりぽつりいろんなことを聞いた。 | Dir. ‘After that the dancing girl <u>again</u> asked “Do you have a father?”, “Have you ever been to Kōfu?”, and so on, various things one after the other. | ¶ ‘Are your mother and father living?’ she <u>took up again</u> . And, ‘Have you ever been to Kofu?’ | Then she <u>went on</u> . “Do you have a father?” “Have you ever been to Kofu?” She asked all kinds of questions. |

In both cases the translators attempt to convey the inclusivity of *mata* (referring not just to asking *again* the questions “Do you have a father?” and “Have you ever been to

¹⁴¹ As indicated in the next example, English might achieve a similar sense of inclusivity by using a superordinate *verb* such as ‘she helped him’ and then appending ‘again’, but Japanese has no need for such a catch-all verb; the adverbial itself is sufficient. Furthermore, the injection of such summary verbs may significantly change the ST diction.

¹⁴² Other examples where both translators omit a *mata* equivalent: §261, 284, 299, 518.

Kōfu”, as English rather narrowly demands, but also any other questions) through the phrasal verbs “took up” and “went on”, which imply broader questioning. While Seidensticker’s “again” offers an explicit correspondence with *mata*, because ‘again’ now works in conjunction with the more expansive “took up”, Holman instead internalizes the sense of ‘again’ in “went on” (i.e., continued speaking, not necessarily in the sense of repeating exactly what has come before). Such part-of-speech shifts, however, would not work in every case (for instance in describing the dancing girl’s acts of benevolence above).

ii. ‘further’

This meaning of *mata* seems much more straightforward:¹⁴³

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|--|---|---|
| 384. ¶ また正月には私が手伝ってやって、波浮の港で皆が芝居をすることになっていた。 | Dir. ‘ <u>Further</u> it was decided that at New Year’s I would help, and everyone would do a play at the port in Habu.’ | ¶ It was decided, <u>too</u> , that I would help with a play they were giving on Oshima for the New Year. | ¶ <u>Moreover</u> , I was to help out during new year holidays when they performed at the port in Habu. |

Both “too” and “[m]oreover” seem adequate to express the sense of additional actions.

But once again such apparent identity is confounded by a counter-example:

¹⁴³ Other examples: §274, 384, 446.

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|--|--|
| 154. 彼は長岡温泉の印半纏を着ているので長岡の人間だと思っていた。 | Dir. 'He was wearing the outfit of Nagaoka Hot Springs so I had thought he was a person from Nagaoka.' | Because he wore the Nagaoka livery, I had assumed he was from Nagaoka, in the northern part of the peninsula. | I assumed he was from Nagaoka, since his jacket bore a Nagaoka Hot Springs emblem. |
| 155. また顔附も話振りも相当知識的なところから、物好きか、芸人の娘に惚れたかで、荷物を持ってやりながらついて来ているのだと想像した。 | Dir. 'Further both his countenance and his manner of speech were quite intellectual, so I imagined that he was accompanying them while carrying their baggage, whether out of curiosity, or having fallen for an entertainer girl.' | His face and way of speaking seemed not unintelligent. I speculated that, from curiosity or a fancy for one of the women, he might have come along to help with their luggage. | His intellectual manner of speaking and his facial expressions made me wonder if he had been following the entertainers and carrying their luggage simply out of curiosity, or perhaps because he had fallen in love with one of them. |

Here the *mata*, implying as it does a connection or continuation of something, appears to be a non sequitur from a TL point of view, since the English reader can descry no obvious connection. The link is particularly subtle, consisting of something like the enumeration of reasons why the narrator has misidentified the man. First, the narrator has assumed he is from Nagaoka, when he is actually from Ōshima; second, he has assumed the man is a stranger tagging along with the entertainers, when he is in fact the dancing girl's brother. The *mata* here is presumably meant to link these two misapprehensions. However, both translators ignore it, apparently seeing this as too tenuous a connection to preserve in English.

3.1.1 c. も *mo* 'too/also' / negative '(n)either'

i. 'also' (including ... *mo* ... *mo* 'both ... and ...')

As Martin notes (1975: 66), *mo* often shares with *mata* the sense of reference to a

general set of actions rather than the recurrence of a specific action:¹⁴⁴

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|--|--|
| 59. ¶小一時間経つと、旅芸人たちが出立つらしい物音が聞えて来た。 | Dir. 'When no more than an hour had passed, I heard the sound of the travelling entertainers apparently leaving.' | ¶ Perhaps an hour later I heard them getting ready to leave. | ¶ About an hour later, I heard the entertainers preparing to leave. |
| 60. 私も落着いている場合ではないのだが、胸騒ぎがするばかりで立上る勇気が出なかった。 | Dir. 'I <u>also</u> was not in a position to relax, but I was completely flustered and did not have the courage to stand up.' | My heart pounded and my chest was tight, and yet I could not find the courage to get up and go off <u>with them</u> . I fretted beside the fire. | I had not settled in to stay <u>either</u> , but I was so anxious that I did not have the courage to stand up. |

Seidensticker's translation does not completely ignore the issue of the similar states of non-relaxation that the entertainers and narrator supposedly share, but shifts the sense of commonality to their departure: "go off with them". Holman resolves the issue by converting the verb "relax" to the more explanatory "settled in to stay", hence unpacking the implied similarity between the entertainers' and narrator's situation.

Also similarly to *mata, mo* often has a more restricted sense akin to English 'too'.¹⁴⁵

In §97, the male entertainer begins asking the narrator questions. Shortly thereafter so does the woman:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| 103. 四十女もぼつぼつ私に話しかけた。 | Dir. 'The woman in her forties <u>also</u> little by little started asking me questions.' | The older woman presently joined in the conversation. | Little by little, the woman, who seemed to be in her forties, began to talk to me. |

¹⁴⁴ Cf. §84, 143, 261, 330, 355, 380, 382, 385, 387, 598, 628.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. §103, 128, 329, 372, 373, 386, 422, 493. Martin calls this "loose reference" (1975: 69; 326-328).

Interestingly, neither translator translates *mo* as ‘too’ or ‘also’: Seidensticker conveys the sense of additional similar action with the verb “joined in”, while Holman omits the parallel. Indeed, out of the example sentences listed in the footnote, we see “also” only in Holman’s translation of §372, and “too” only in Seidensticker’s translation of §386 and Holman’s of §493,¹⁴⁶ and many translations have no verbal echo of inclusivity either. Thus once again we can see TL avoidance of explicit forms of inclusivity-marking.

ii. emphatic

This concerns *mo*’s related meanings of ‘even’ (especially as *demo*) and ‘all of’/‘as many as’ (as in 日本には1億2千7百万人もいます ‘there are all of 127 million people in Japan’). A good representative example¹⁴⁷ is §149:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|---|--|
| 149. それまでは私も芸人達と同じ木賃宿に泊ることばかり思っていたのだった。 | Dir. ‘Until then I had been thinking that I <u>too</u> would stay with the entertainers at the same inn.’ | I had thought that I was to stay with them. | Until then I had assumed I would be staying at the same lodging house with the entertainers. |

The pleonasm is obvious in the direct translation: if you are staying in the same inn, then ‘too’ is an unnecessary addition, *unless* there has just been talk of someone else who will stay with the entertainers, and such is not the case. (In fact, Seidensticker even considers translating 同じ木賃宿 *onaji kichinyado* ‘the same inn’ unnecessary for the sense.) From the Japanese point of view, the *mo* is not redundant but emphatic (rather as,

¹⁴⁶ To be fair, §128, 329 and 373 are effectively forms of the double *mo* ... *mo* ... structure, which can really only be translated as ‘(both) ... and’.

¹⁴⁷ The other affirmative examples are §70, 77, 149, 165, 202, 276, 417, 584; see below for negatives.

in English, one can say ‘I had already been there for three days when they arrived’, where the ‘already’ is semantically unnecessary). Here is another case where superficially semantically equivalent SL and TL terms have different usage boundaries, making them far from interchangeable.

One can also see the apparently redundant emphatic *mo* within negative set expressions,¹⁴⁸ for example 間もなく *ma mo naku* ‘shortly’, 意味もなく *imi mo naku* ‘meaninglessly’, わけもなく¹⁴⁹ *wake mo naku* ‘without a reason’), and other negative expressions.

Here *mo* retains no sense of ‘also’, having at the most an emphatic effect, but often not even that. It has largely become a vestigial and redundant negative marker, somewhat like the ‘pas’ (original meaning: ‘pace’, as in ‘step’) in French *ne ... pas* ‘not’:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|--|--|--|
| 50. [60] 『私は婆さんに答える言葉もなく、囲炉裏の上にうつむいていた。』 | Dir. ‘Not able to say a word <u>even</u> to the old woman, I was hunched over the hearth.’ | 『Unable to think of anything to say, I sat hunched beside the fire.』 | 『Without a word to the old woman, I bent over the hearth.』 |

This should not be translated as ‘without a word even to say’, as if there were something else besides words that could be said. There is simply no antecedent in this case. ‘Even a word’ may seem reasonable, but it subtly shifts the emphasis to the *number* of words.

A more striking instance is where two *mo* appear in a yoking role in the ST:

¹⁴⁸ Total list: §31, 47, 48, 50, 92, 165, 229, 248, 257, 379, 380, 414, 419, 439, 525, 545, 552, 622.

¹⁴⁹ *Ma mo naku*: §31, 439. *Imi mo naku*: §248. *Wake mo naku*: §552.

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|--|--|
| 380. ¶好奇心もなく、軽蔑も含まない、彼等が旅芸人と云う種類の間であること [88] を忘れてしまったような、私の尋常な好意は、彼らの胸にも沁み込んで行くらしかった。 | Dir. ‘It was <u>neither</u> a sense of curiosity, <u>nor</u> did it contain contempt—as though I had completely forgotten they were the variety of human called travelling entertainers, my common goodwill had apparently soaked into their hearts <u>too</u> .’ | ¶ I was not held by curiosity, <u>and</u> I felt no condescension toward them. Indeed, I was no longer conscious that they belonged to that low order, traveling performers. They seemed to know and be moved. | ¶ My common goodwill—which <u>neither</u> was mere curiosity <u>nor</u> bore any trace of contempt for their status as itinerant entertainers—seemed to have touched their hearts. |

This is one of the most complex sentences in the ST, and in response one can see that Seidensticker has broken it up into two, while Holman has conflated various elements to allow for a smooth single sentence. The *mo ... mo ... -nai* structure usually corresponds to the English ‘neither ... nor’, which Holman has indeed used, while Seidensticker instead employs ‘and’ to yoke the negatives ‘not’ and ‘no’, which reads a little more awkwardly. Here at least both have been able to preserve the sense of linkage that the double *mo* implies; but neither translates the third, emphatic *mo*.

3.1.1 d. も う *mō* ‘already’

I have already given one non-ST example where English uses ‘already’ emphatically (note that my first use of ‘already’ in this sentence itself is grammatically optional), and we can see in the ST one case where the corresponding TT appears quite comfortable with the form:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|--|---|---|
| 55. 『「そうかねえ。この前連れていた子がもうこんなになったのかい。」』 | Dir. ‘Really eh. The girl who accompanied you last time has <u>already</u> become like this, has she.’ | ‘Well now. So this is the little girl you had with you before, so big <u>already</u> .’ | “So this is the little girl you had with you before. |
| 56. いい娘 <small>あんこ</small> になって、お前さんも結構 <small>もん</small> 者だよ。 | Dir. ‘(She)’s become a good girl, you’re lucky!’ | Why she’s practically a grown woman. Isn’t that nice. | She’s turned out to be such a nice girl. That’s good for you. |

In his translation of §55, Seidensticker uses “already” naturally, though Holman omits any reference to もうこんなになった *mō konna ni natta* ‘has already become like this’, presumably because he considers it too similar to what follows in §56. ‘Already’ is not used for any of the other ST instances,¹⁵⁰ even though it would appear acceptable in some cases.

In the case of §252, however, ST usage clearly exceeds the TL’s level of tolerance for emphasis:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 252. 『「どうしよう。今夜はもう止しにして遊ばせていただくか。」』 | Dir. ‘What shall we do. Shall we <u>already</u> bring it to a stop for tonight and be allowed to play?’ | 『How about it? Maybe we could ask to take a holiday.’ | “What do you think? Shall we <u>just</u> forget about it and have a good time instead?” |

There is no way to use ‘already’ naturally in the TT. Seidensticker omits it, while Holman replaces the temporal emphatic with the manner emphatic “just”, aptly replicating the effect.

¹⁵⁰ §70, 199, 235, 252, 524, 604.

3.1.1 Conclusion

SL usage boundaries often extend further into emphatic forms than TL equivalents do, requiring translators to avoid pleonasm. Further, English makes wider use of deictic markers such as pronouns. Both of these factors lead to more variety of expression in the TL. Given the ambiguous semantic value of many major aphorisms in Japanese, it seems reasonable for the translators to ignore an instance where it appears unmarked in the original, and translate it when it is both being used emphatically in the ST and has a ready TL equivalent.

3.1.2 Clause Extent Marker 程 *hodo*

程 *hodo* is sometimes an adverbial post-modifier of adjectives, along with くらい・ぐらい *kurai/gurai*. Martin calls *hodo* and its informal equivalents *kurai/gurai* “quasi-restrictives” (1975: 92). In the usage considered here, *hodo*’s range extends further, to the entire preceding clause, causally linking it with the following clause. Possible direct translations are ‘to the extent that’ or ‘inasmuch as’,¹⁵¹ but it is often rendered most usefully by the English clausal yoking structure ‘so’+adjective (+‘that’)+clause: e.g., 眠られない程暑かった *nemurarenai hodo atsukatta* → ‘it was so hot (that) I couldn’t sleep’. (Compare the stilted ‘it was hot to the extent that I couldn’t sleep’ or ‘inasmuch as it was hot, I couldn’t sleep’.) Adjective+‘enough to’+infinitive clause is comparable, but this structure has limitations: for instance, we cannot render the above as *‘it was hot enough to not be able to sleep’, so would have to modify it to something like ‘it was hot enough to stop me sleeping’.

The main sub-categories observable in the ST are *i. clause+hodo+adjective*;¹⁵² *ii. clause+hodo+clause*;¹⁵³ *iii. clause+hodo+noun*;¹⁵⁴ and *iv. adjective+hodo+adjective*.¹⁵⁵ Both translators regularly translate structures *i.* and *ii.* using the ‘so ... that’ construction:

¹⁵¹ Applied to the *effect* clause in the case of ‘to the extent that’, and the *causal* clause in the case of ‘inasmuch as’: see the example sentences above.

¹⁵² §33, 353, 385 (negative), 433, 544, 612.

¹⁵³ §53, 68, 484.

¹⁵⁴ §218.

¹⁵⁵ §326. No analysis of type *iv.* is provided in the current work.

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 433. 鳥がとまる枝の枯草がかさかさ鳴る程静かだった。 | Dir. 'It was <u>so</u> quiet <u>that</u> the dried leaves of the branch the birds landed on rustled.' | The dead leaves rustled as they landed, <u>so</u> quiet was the air. | It was <u>so</u> still I could hear the dry leaves on the branches rustle when they alighted. |

This is an example of structure *i*. What is particularly interesting about the TT is that Seidensticker has retained the original clause order by inverting what is normal in English, producing a slightly poetic effect with the caesura of the medial comma, which effectively reproduces the silence as well as the moment of landing. He does the same in §33 and 544, while Holman consistently preserves standard English clause order.

Demonstrating type *ii*. is §53, which proves straightforward for the translators:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 53. 私の着物から湯気が立って、頭が痛む程火が強かった。 | Dir. 'Steam rose from my <i>kimono</i> , and <u>the fire was hot to the extent that my head hurt.</u> ' | Steam rose from my kimono, and <u>the fire was so warm that my head began to ache.</u> | Steam rose from my kimono. The fire was <u>hot enough to scorch my face.</u> |

Seidensticker uses the 'so ... that ...' structure, while Holman uses the variant of adjective+'enough to'+infinitive clause: "hot enough to scorch my face".

Type *iii*. is more challenging, as there is no ready equivalent in English, and certainly no way to reproduce the syntax. Both translators attempt a relative construction:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|--|--|
| 217. 子供なんだ。 | Dir. 'She is a child, you see.' | She was a child, a mere child, a child <u>who could</u> | She's a child—a child <u>who can</u> run out naked |
| 218. 私達を見つけた喜びで真裸のまま日の光りの中に飛出し、爪先きで背一ぱいに伸上る程に子供なんだ。 | Dir. 'In joy that she found us, running out totally naked into the sunlight, and stretching up on tiptoe to her full height, she is a child <u>to that extent</u> , you see.' | run out naked into the sun and stand there on tiptoes in her delight at seeing a friend. | in broad daylight, overcome with joy at finding me, and stand tall on her tiptoes. |

There is a kind of synoptic inclusivity to the ST *hodo*, occurring as it does at the end of the sentence, that the English does not capture because of the reverse syntax: the sense is that all these actions contribute evidence to the narrator's sudden strong conviction that the dancing girl is a child (a very important plot element), whereas in the English her actions appear more as an incidental list after the mention that she is a child. Further, to make the structure palatable for English readers, both translators have used the potential form ("a child who could run out ..."; "a child who can run out ..."). The translators thus convert evidence of her childish nature into an enumeration of things that she is able to do because she is a child, a subtle difference.

Another subtle meaning in the *hodo* structure that is somewhat easier to convey in English is its occasional sense of 'almost':

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| 353. 私が読み出すと、彼女は私の肩に触る程に顔を寄せて真剣な表情をしながら、眼をきらきら輝かせて一心に私の顔をみつめ、瞬き一つしなかった。 | Dir. 'As I began reading, she brought her face close <u>enough</u> to my shoulder <u>to</u> touch it, showing a serious expression, her eyes sparkling and staring absorbed at my face, and did not blink once.' | Her head was <u>almost</u> on my shoulder as I started to read. She looked up at me with a serious, intent expression, her eyes bright and unblinking. | Once I began reading, she brought her face close <u>enough to</u> touch my shoulder, her expression serious. Her eyes sparkled as she gazed at my forehead without blinking. |
|---|--|--|--|

Whether the dancing girl's face actually makes contact with the narrator's shoulder is

ambiguous in the ST, and Holman preserves this ambiguity with the infinitive structure “close enough to touch”, while Seidensticker seemingly decides that her face does not quite touch with his use of “almost”.

3.1.2 Conclusion

The relative frequency of the *hodo* structure, combined with its inverted syntax in comparison with parallel TL structures, means that the translators must take care in reformulating the structure to delineate equivalent causal relationships. Various set structures are available in the TL from which they can choose, but they cannot necessarily reproduce the nuances of the original structure. In the first example §433, Seidensticker shows that at times one can at least retain the original clausal structure without producing an awkward equivalent in the TT.

3.1.3 Double Subject; Topic and Subject

In Japanese, the topic of the sentence is marked with the particle *wa* ‘as for’, while the subject is marked with *ga*.¹⁵⁶ This allows for the coexistence of what may appear to an English speaker to be double or even multiple subjects.¹⁵⁷ In many sentences, only a topic marker or subject marker is present. However, topic and subject can co-occur in the same ST sentence, presenting for translators a potential problem of settling on a single subject, which TL grammar expects.¹⁵⁸

3.1.3 a. convergent subjects (general+detail)¹⁵⁹

Here the topic and subject(s) are intimately related. The topic represents a general issue, while the *ga* subject fills in the details (example overleaf):

¹⁵⁶ Another distinction one can make between these two grammatical markers is that *ga* introduces a *new* subject, while *wa* restates a previously mentioned subject (somewhat akin to how English indefinite and definite articles operate: 猫が角にいる ‘*a* cat is on the corner’ has not been mentioned before, while 猫は角にいる ‘*the* cat is on the corner’ has). We can see this distinction clearly in the final ST example §600 in this section.

¹⁵⁷ Martin: “A number of Japanese sentences come to the surface with more than one “subject”, i.e. the predicate seems to have two or more adjuncts marked with the particle *ga*. And many other sentences contain a structure N1 *wa/mo* N2 *ga* in which the focus-marking with *wa* or *mo* can be taken back to an underlying *ga* in a sentence of the same kind.” (1975: 256; italics added.) I do not examine sentences containing multiple *ga* markers in this thesis.

¹⁵⁸ Total feature list for this category: §23, 36, 119, 273, 291, 336, 354, 385, 396, 422, 496, 498, 560, 577, 600, 606, 625. (17 instances.)

¹⁵⁹ §36, 496, 498, 560, 606. This subcategory can be seen in contrast with ‘parallel subjects’, whereby the topic and subjects are only related by proximity; there is no inherent connection between them, only a made one. §23 and 119 are ST examples, but in these cases the topics are clearly adverbial to begin with and hence present little problem for translation.

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 21. 踊子の連れは四十代の女が一人、若い女が二人、ほかに長岡温泉の宿屋の印半纏を着た二十五六の男がいた。 | [See below for direct translations.] | Two other young women were with her, and a man in his mid-twenties, wearing the livery of a Nagaoka inn. A woman in her forties presided over the group. | The dancing girl was accompanied by a woman in her forties, two older girls, and a man of about twenty-five, who was wearing a jacket with the insignia of Nagaoka Hot Springs on it. |

In this case, the verb いた *ita* ‘was/were’ is compatible with all *four* grammatical subjects (踊子の連れ *odoriko no tsure* ‘the dancing girl’s companions’, designated the overall topic with the *wa* particle, and the older woman, younger women and man, members of the set ‘the dancing girl’s companions’, all assigned *ga* subject markers), thus one can effect a direct translation with a nominative predicate structure, placing the *wa*-set on one side as the grammatical subject and the *ga*-set on the other side of the ‘equation’ as the predicate:

‘The dancing girl’s companions were a woman in her forties, two young women, and also a man of twenty-four or -five who wore a jacket with the crest of a Nagaoka Hot Springs inn.’

Alternatively, one can choose to translate *wa* by its nearest English equivalent ‘as for’, which enables the detachment of the topic subject marker *wa* from the copula, and insert the dummy subject ‘there’ which stands in for the women and the man as the grammatical subject:

‘As for the dancing girl’s companions, there were a woman in her forties, two young women, and also a man of twenty-four or -five who wore a jacket with the crest of an inn from Nagaoka Hot Springs.’

However, the ‘as for’ structure is ungainly, lengthy and marked, and hence is usually avoided in translation.

The translators take a different approach here to the double subject than the basic options shown above. Seidensticker shifts the gist of the nominal phrase 踊子の連れ *odoriko no tsure* ‘the dancing girl’s companions’ into a self-contained predicate clause—“two other young women were with her”—and breaks up the multiple *ga* subjects, putting the older woman by herself in a separate sentence. Holman on the other hand converts the noun phrase into a passive verbal structure (“The dancing girl was accompanied by”), though he retains the layout of the original sentence. Note, however, that he removes the repetition of “woman/women” by changing 若い女 *wakai onna* ‘young women’ to “older girls”, shifting the point of reference from the older woman to the dancing girl (cf. 2.1.2.2 a. i.).

Overall, the most common tendency is for the translators to convert the topic to an adverbial phrase, one which often sets the scene:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--------------------|--|---|--|
| 560. 町は秋の朝風が冷たかった。 | Dir. ‘As for the town <u>the autumn morning wind was cold.</u> ’ | ¶ <u>An autumn wind blew cold through the town.</u> | ¶ <u>The morning autumn breeze blew chill in the town.</u> |

Both translators perhaps consider the topic+subject format vague and the ST predicate 風が冷たかった *kaze ga tsumetakatta* ‘(the) wind was cold’ as limp, and thus completely reorganise the information. Seidensticker uses “through the town” and Holman “in the town”, positioned at the end of the sentences, while both change the verb to the much more energetic “blew”.

3.1.3 Conclusion

Multiple subjects may present an initial confusion as to agency, but this difficulty can usually be easily resolved. English does not tolerate more than one grammatical subject in a clause, thus translators need to convert the ST topic into another part of speech, and often an adverbial phrase is effective.

3.1.4 MULTI-CLAUSE SENTENCE

The topic of multi-clause sentences is almost as broad as syntax itself, but can be roughly divided into compound (paratactic), complex (hypotactic or subordinate), and compound-complex (combined) structures. As one might expect, a sentence with multiple clauses presents considerably more difficulties for the translator than ‘simple’ sentences (i.e., those with only one clause). This is because any given pair of languages both is bound by their respective syntaxes and possesses intersecting but distinguishable sets of conjunctives.

Translators, perhaps paradoxically, may experience more unease when presented with a structure or lexis superficially similar to English than when they must deal with a fundamentally incompatible structure, since relative identity might seem to demand attempts at preservation. Unfortunately, at times, striving to retain this identity leads to a forced-sounding structure that does not do justice to the flow or meaning of the original.

Paratactic and hypotactic structures appear to be distinct and not interchangeable, in that paratactic structures in both languages emphasise the coordinate status of the clauses they link, while hypotactic structures set up hierarchies of information. However, as we have found with lexical segmentation, the paratactic and hypotactic structures’ distribution and usage patterns differ between the two languages, sometimes to the extent that a TL paratactic conjunctive may be the preferable equivalent for a SL hypotactic conjunctive, or vice versa.

3.1.4.1 Paratactic clause structure

The paratactic structure is so integral to Japanese discourse that an actual conjunction is usually dispensed with. The base infinitive structure, e.g. 食べ *tabe* ‘eat (and ...)’, from 食べる *taberu* ‘to eat’ (Martin 1975: 394-395), or gerund (-*te* form) of the verb, e.g. 食べて *tabete* ‘eat (and ...)’ (Martin 1975: 479), is instead used to do the work of conjuncture. Japanese verbs can thus be embedded with a conjunctive-like function, which causes the clausal linkage itself to be downplayed, slipping into the recesses of linguistic ‘furniture’ in a way that an English ‘and’, being a discrete word, never can.

Sometimes the sense of ‘and’-concatenation that remains explicit in the English conjunction more closely approximates, in the Japanese infinitive/gerund, juxtaposition or the representation of simultaneity.¹⁶⁰ English narrative likes to establish at the very least a temporal consecutivity between clauses—in other words, a sense that one thing follows another. What is often presented as a greater translation problem, though, is the perceived tendency towards paratactic, non-causal, or even ‘non-logical’ sentence structures in Japanese,¹⁶¹ because English presumably favours explicit causal and logical connections between clauses, if not paragraphs.¹⁶²

As mentioned above, with paratactic structures Japanese usually dispenses with conjunctives, instead relying on the infinitive or gerund to string clauses together into a sentence. In Kawabata’s writing, such sentences can stretch to four or five clauses, as is

¹⁶⁰ See Martin (1975: 394-395, 479) for a list of the nine conjunctive uses of the infinitive/gerund (temporal sequencing, causality, conjoining, contrast, and so on). For convenience’s sake I usually represent the basic function as being equivalent to TL ‘and’.

¹⁶¹ This may be partly because of the multiple functions of the infinitive/gerund (Martin 1975: 479), with the reader being expected to infer which is/are relevant, whereas the function of most English conjunctions is clear (with exceptions such as ‘as’ having both a causal and temporal use).

¹⁶² Note that the below analysis of the recurrent ‘heavy-handed’ hypotactic conjunctives in the ST goes some way towards contradicting this perception.

observed in §353:

353. 私が読み出すと、彼女は私の肩に触る程に顔を寄せて真剣な表情 [86] をしながら、眼をきらきら輝かせて一心に私の顔をみつめ、瞬き一つしなかった。

Lit. ‘When I started reading, she brought her head towards my shoulder almost close enough to touch it and while making a serious expression, she made her eyes sparkle and stared wholeheartedly at my face, and did not blink once.’

The bold-underlined expressions are paratactic conjunctives (寄せて *yosete* ‘brought close (and)’, 輝かせて *kagayakasete* ‘made sparkle (and)’ and みつめ *mitsume* ‘stared at (and)’ with their own clauses, while the other clauses (with the verbs 読み出すと *yomidasu to* ‘when I started reading’ and (真剣な表情を)しながら (*shinken na hyōjō o*) *shinagara* ‘(while) looking (serious)’ are hypotactic. There are thus five clauses in total, not counting another adverbial clause (私の肩に触る程に *watashi no kata ni fureru hodo ni* ‘as much as to touch my shoulder’).

English is unlikely to sustain such a long sequence of parataxis without transformation. Indeed, both translators break the sentence up into two, presumably more ‘manageable’, portions, albeit at different points:

S2: Her head was almost on my shoulder as I started to read. She looked up at me with a serious, intent expression, her eyes bright and unblinking.

H: Once I began reading, she brought her face close enough to touch my shoulder, her expression serious. Her eyes sparkled as she gazed at my forehead without blinking.

Nevertheless, Seidensticker’s original translation demonstrates that a single sentence need not be unreadable:

S1: Her head was almost at my shoulder as I started to read, and she looked up at me with a serious, intent expression, her eyes bright and unblinking.

Seidensticker is, however, employing a range of manipulations to reduce the overall length of the sentence, as will be examined in the following section.

3.1.4.2 Hypotactic clause structure

Hypotactic sentences demonstrate a hierarchical relationship between clauses, with one clause subordinate to the other. Because the subordinating conjunction (for example, ‘because’) can be placed at the beginning of a sentence as well as between clauses, English hypotactic sentences are syntactically more flexible than (written) Japanese sentences (see **Chapter One, Table 1, Rules of the ‘Games’**). Such Japanese conjunctions must occur at the end of a clause; moreover, the subordinate clause must precede the main clause. That the conjunctions *kara/node* can be translated either as ‘so’ (focusing on the *result* clause) or ‘because’ (focusing on the *causal* clause) further complicates matters. In choosing between ‘so’ and ‘because’, translators must determine whether the ST sentence places greater emphasis on *cause* or *result*. If they appear equally emphasised then the choice becomes a matter of personal preference, often resting on what sounds better to the ear.

Adding to the complexity here is that beginning a sentence with a subordinate conjunction is often slightly marked in English,¹⁶³ and thus translators often render ～から・ので *kara/node*¹⁶⁴ ‘so/because’ either as ‘so’ with the causal clause first, or

¹⁶³ For example: ‘Because he was hungry, he ate an apple.’

¹⁶⁴ Martin makes the following distinction: “*kara* refers to a SUBJECTIVE reason and *no de* to an OBJECTIVE reason”. (1975: 856; original capitalisation, italics added.)

‘because’ with the causal clause second,¹⁶⁵ unless they feel a particular need to emphasise the causal clause (see below). In other words, a degree of syntactic homogenisation occurs with this structure as the translator pulls the syntax towards perceived TL norms.

Another issue regarding hypotactic conjunctives arises on the ST side. The verb suffix *～ながら(も)* *-nagara(mo)* is a conjunctive that operates similarly to English ‘while’ in that it can have both a temporal (‘While I was making dinner, the phone rang.’) and adversative (‘While I made dinner tonight, don’t expect it every night.’) function (Martin 1975: 412). A similar distinction appears in the following two ST examples of *-nagara*:

1. 道がつづら折りになって、いよいよ天城峠に近づいたと思う頃、雨脚が杉の密林を白く染めながら、すさまじい早さで麓から私を追って来た。

Dir. ‘Around the time the road began to wind, and I thought I had at last reached Amagi Pass, a rain-shower, while dyeing the dense cedar forests white, pursued me at amazing speed from the foot of the mountain.’

19. それが卵形の凛々しい顔を非常に小さく 見せながらも、美しく調和していた。

Dir. ‘While that made her oval, dignified face look small, they beautifully harmonised.’

However, as we shall shortly observe, the apparent identity of *-nagara* and ‘while ...’ is misleading.

3.1.4.2 a. multi-clause hypotactic

While *kara* and *node* theoretically have distinct semantic domains, with *kara* falling

¹⁶⁵ Hence: ‘He was hungry, so he ate an apple.’ and ‘He ate an apple because he was hungry.’, respectively. Note that I use ‘so’ as a proxy for all similar cause→effect conjunctions (thus, therefore, etc.) and ‘because’ as a proxy for similar effect→cause conjunctions (since, as, for, etc.).

more on the emotive and *node* on the rational side of the continuum (Martin 1975: 971ff.), in practice they are often interchangeable in prose. Further, in both form and function, *kara/node* are similar to English ‘so’/‘because’, although, as mentioned earlier, ‘so’ places emphasis on a subsequent result clause, and ‘because’ emphasises a subsequent causal clause, while *kara/node* can be read either way, situated as it is in most cases at the juncture between two clauses.¹⁶⁶

The ST contains 39 instances of *kara/node*, with relatively similar frequency (*kara* 17 and *node* 22). The slightly higher frequency here of *node* is perhaps attributable to the written mode, *kara* being more common in spoken Japanese (and, indeed, predominant in the ST dialogue). Out of the 39, only nine conjunctives are used without a following comma, six of these being *node* and three *kara*.

One might expect that, as in English, a comma paired with a conjunctive would likely indicate a change of subjects between clauses. For example, ‘my friend offered me cake, so I took a piece’ may be slightly preferable to ‘my friend offered me cake so I took a piece’.¹⁶⁷ However, in the ST there appears to be no discernable difference in the use of commas after conjunctives, whether the clause subjects are the same or different. Compare the following two examples:

¹⁶⁶ It can be argued that the presence of a comma after *kara/node* emphasises the causal clause by effectively separating the conjunctive from the following clause. We shall examine the role of the comma later. A separate issue is the rare number of cases where *kara/node* occurs near the beginning of a sentence following only a ‘dummy’ clause consisting of the copula (eg. *ですから行きません desu kara ikimasen* ‘So I won’t go’, but this fragmentary sentence type is as uncommon as it is in English.

¹⁶⁷ On the other hand, in English when the subject remains the same and is repeated in both clauses, the choice seems to come down to a matter of emphasis caused by the comma caesura: ‘I wanted to take something so I made a cake’ is not inherently preferable to ‘I wanted to take something, so I made a cake’. (This equal level of preference appears to remain even when the common subject is omitted in the second clause: ‘I wanted to take something so made a cake’ versus ‘I wanted to take something, so made a cake’.)

92. しかし急に歩調を緩めることも出来ないので、私は冷淡な風に女達を追越してしまった。

Dir. 'However, I could not suddenly reduce my pace, so I coolly overtook the women.'

130. 私の前に座ると、真赤になりながら手をぶるぶる振わせるので茶碗が茶托から落ちかかり、落とすまいと畳に置く拍子に茶をこぼしてしまった。

Dir. 'When she sat in front of me, becoming red, her hand shook so the cup began to fall from the saucer, and at the moment she put it down in case she might drop it, she spilled the tea.'

The subject is the same in the two clauses of §92, yet Kawabata puts a comma after *node*; on the other hand, in §130 the subject changes from the dancing girl to the teacup on either side of *node*, and yet there is no comma. Based on this and other examples, it is reasonable to assume that the use of commas in the SL has more to do with rhythm and flow than any delimiting function. (Kawabata uses fewer commas after *kara/node* in his dialogue, suggesting that it is more a written device.) Nevertheless, even if the discussion is confined to the level of euphony or emphasis, the fact that a comma in the ST puts a caesura *after* the conjunctive, whereas one in the TT places the pause *before* the conjunctive, is not entirely trivial.

Since 30 out of 39 incidences of *kara/node* include commas, it is worth considering briefly how many commas are brought over into the TT. Seidensticker preserves only nine, while Holman uses double that number (18). Further, most of Holman's commas precede a hypotactic conjunction, whereas few of Seidensticker's do. In this aspect Holman clearly follows the ST form more closely than Seidensticker, whatever the resultant difference in effect may be.

I shall now consider some problematic issues around *kara/node* in the ST and how they are addressed in the TTs. A first note concerns the relative rarity of the word

‘because’ in translating these terms, despite its apparent aptness. Two aspects may militate against its use. First, it cannot be employed in the same position—that is, interclausally—as the ST conjunctive without reversing the position of the clauses. Second, as observed earlier, beginning a sentence with ‘because’ is quite marked and therefore unlikely among normative-orientated translators. (Seidensticker uses it three times out of 39 (§154, 222, 562), and Holman only once (§562).)¹⁶⁸

It thus seems that ‘so’ would be an ideal equivalent for *kara/node*, as it preserves ST clausal syntax. Indeed it is worth observing a non-problematic example, where the conversion process appears almost seamless:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|---|--|
| 585. どうにもしようがね えから、わしらが相談し て国へ帰してやるところ なんだ。 | Dir. ‘There’s nothing to be done about it, <u>so</u> we’ve consulted and we’re about to send (them) back to their hometown.’ | We couldn’t think of a thing to do. <u>So</u> we’re sending her home. | We couldn’t think of anything else to do, <u>so</u> we talked it over, and we’re sending them back to their old hometown. |

The translated clauses run in the ST order of cause and effect. Both translators use ‘so’ and a punctuated caesura (a full stop in Seidensticker’s case and comma in Holman’s). But what is remarkable about this example is that it is the only case out of the 39 instances of *kara/node* in the ST where both translators agree on translating the conjunctive with ‘so’—and in Seidensticker’s case, there is a sentence break before “So”. Seidensticker in fact only uses ‘so’ in this case, while Holman uses it sixteen times. This contrast offers clear evidence that Seidensticker habitually modifies hypotactic clause structures, while Holman preserves them. The first proposition (confined to the ST) is patently true, but Holman’s fidelity to the ST is less clear when

¹⁶⁸ The only examples of ‘because’ equivalents at the start of a sentence are Seidensticker’s “[s]ince” in §92, and Holman’s in §279. Neither uses ‘as’ in such a way.

we remind ourselves that in the remaining 23 cases out of 39, he uses a different structure.

Given that *kara* and *node* exhibit such similarity to ‘so’ in terms of meaning, clause position, register and, indeed, the formal consideration of word length, what accounts for the use of other renderings? Let us now examine the hidden problematic aspects of the SL terms in relation to their TL counterparts.

One general issue is the differences in lexical sets of hypotactic conjunctives between the SL and TL. Two metrics indicate English has more variety in causal conjunctives. First, it has a larger set of lexical items (including ‘since’, ‘for’, ‘hence’, ‘thus’, ‘therefore’, ‘because’, ‘as’, and ‘so’), with a further group of adverbial noun phrases that can function as causal conjunctives in a noun phrase: ‘because of (this)’, ‘as a result (of this)’, ‘owing to (this)’, etc. Second, the subordinating conjunctions among these (i.e., ‘as’, ‘because’ and ‘since’) can be used in sentence-head and sentence-medial positions (e.g. ‘Since I woke up late I didn’t have time for breakfast.’ versus ‘I didn’t have time for breakfast since I woke up late.’). Japanese has no other regular causal conjunctives than *kara* and *node*, though it does make use of grammaticalised nouns such as 訳 *wake* ‘reason’, 為 *tame* ‘purpose’ and 結果 *kekka* ‘result’, adverbs such as 程・くらい・ぐらい *hodo/kurai/gurai* (cf. 3.1.2), and gerund adverbial structures such as ～(に)従って ～ (*ni shitagatte*) ‘consequently’ to postmodify nouns and nominalised clauses to indicate causality. However, cursory observation suggests that *kara* and *node* are used almost as frequently as similar causal conjunctions in English, thus it is reasonable to anticipate that literary English, with its tendency towards avoidance of repetition, and with a ready supply of synonymous conjunctions, will go beyond the most commonly used equivalents *so* and *because*.

Furthermore, since literary English avoids the use of too many of the same structures, clause+conjunction+clause is often replaced with a grammatical structure that can be felt as equivalent. (Examples follow below.)

Let us now look at two specific major issues regarding *kara/node* that can be observed in the ST.

3.1.4.2 b. ‘heavy-handed’ conjunction

By this expression I mean a conjunction that makes explicit a causal link that is obvious without its use and hence borders on pleonasm. In the below example the awkwardness of the literal English translation actually distracts readers, since it encourages them to seek a deeper meaning than the face value:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 14. ¶踊子と真近に向い合ったので、私はあわてて袂から煙草を取出した。 | Dir. ‘I was directly facing the dancing girl, ₁ <u>so</u> I flusteredly took tobacco out of my sleeve.’ | ¶She sat near me, we were facing each other. I fumbled for tobacco and she handed me the ashtray in front of one of the other women. | ¶Sitting so close, facing the dancing girl, I fumbled to pull a cigarette from my kimono sleeve. |

Both translators render this passage with greater concision and lightness of touch than a direct translation would afford. Seidensticker divides the sentence into two sentences, breaking at the point where the conjunctive occurs in the ST, and removing the conjunctive. The minimalism of conjuncture—and thereby the tentativeness of the characters’ relationship itself—is emphasised by the comma splice in the first sentence (“She sat near me,₁ we were facing each other.”). Seidensticker hence uses a simple juxtaposition of clauses to echo the narrator’s awkwardness (and attendant taciturnity: cf. §12 and 16 (“ ‘Yes,’ I murmured stupidly [...]”; “Still I said nothing.”)). His

decision to link the fumbling for tobacco with the next ST sentence, where the dancing girl offers the ashtray, emphasizes a different cause-and-effect chain than the original (TT: ‘he fumbled for tobacco, *so* she handed him an ashtray’, rather than ST: ‘they were sitting close to each other, *so* he reached flusteredly for tobacco’).

Holman, on the other hand, commits to the original cause-and-effect chain, but does so by starting with two participial clauses (“Sitting so close, facing the dancing girl,”) which are resolved by the main clause “I fumbled [...]”. Participial clauses are dependent on the main, finite verb in the sense that they cannot stand on their own in a sentence, but at the same time they are paratactic in the sense that they do not set up an explicit hypotactic/causal relationship (hence here “Sitting so close, facing the dancing girl” could be replaced by “I was sitting so close and facing the dancing girl, and I fumbled [...]”, although the underlined emphatic adverb “so” implies causality). In this way Holman creates a dependent structure that implies a causal relationship without resorting to a hypotactic conjunction.

What is most notable is that both translators leave it to the reader to make the causal connection.¹⁶⁹ More broadly, this case exemplifies two of the main minimisation devices employed by the translators to deal with heavy-handed conjunctions: omission, and conversion to a paratactic form. Let us examine these more closely.

Omission takes three major forms in dealing with ST conjunctives: (1) complete omission of a clause and attached conjunctive; (2) conflation of multiple clauses and conjunctives into one or more ‘representative’ clauses; and (3) replacement of a conjunctive by punctuation (usually a full stop). Seidensticker demonstrates (3) above.

¹⁶⁹ As will be apparent later in this section, the opposite often occurs in the case of paratactic conjunctives: the translators consider the *te*-verb form and its putative equivalent ‘and’ too weak a connector, and choose to make explicit the implied causal link with a hypotactic conjunction.

We can see an example of (2), conflation, in Seidensticker's translation of §130, the original of which I quoted above:

Dir. 'When she sat in front of me, becoming red, her hand shook so the cup began to fall from the saucer, and at the moment she put it down in case she might drop it, she spilled the tea.'

S2: As she came to me the teacup clattered in its saucer. She set it down sharply in an effort to save herself, but succeeded only in spilling it.

Seidensticker has omitted the underlined clauses and conjunctive as written, though he has redirected the information 'her hand was shaking' into "the teacup clattered in its saucer" and 'the cup began to fall from the saucer' into "in an effort to save herself".

Holman, on the other hand, demonstrates omission type (3) in his translation of the same passage:

H: Kneeling in front of me, she blushed bright red. Her hands were trembling. The teacup almost tumbled off the saucer. She set it down on the mat to keep it from falling but spilled the whole cup of tea.

He retains the clauses, but removes the conjunctive, replacing it with a sentence break and thus requiring the reader to make the causal connection that was explicit in the original. Both Holman and Seidensticker favour this type of omission in handling *kara/node*, with Holman employing it 10 times, and Seidensticker 15.

In the below example of type (1) omission, Seidensticker has, characteristically, removed an awkward clause+conjunction:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|--|--|---|
| 160. 男は断って行き過ぎようとしたが、庭に紙包みが落ちたままなので、引返してそれを拾うと、「こんなことをなさっちゃいけません。」と、抛り上げた。 | Dir. 'The man refused and went to leave, but <u>the paper packet was just lying there in the garden</u> , so he went back and picked it up, saying "You shouldn't do such things," and threw it up.' | He started to go without it, but turned to pick it up. ¶'You shouldn't,' he said, and threw it back. | The man refused it and turned to go, but <u>he couldn't leave the money lying in the garden</u> so he returned and picked it up. ¶'You shouldn't do things like this," he said, tossing the packet back up at me. |

Seidensticker employs a great deal of ellipsis in this passage, which is obvious in comparison with Holman's rendering. Holman retains the causal clause and conjunction, though note that he imputes the man's motive in returning to get the money, a shift in focaliser that is absent from the ST.

The second form of minimisation, conversion to a paratactic form, is sometimes manifested in such structures as appositives and present participles, but there are few examples with reference to *kara/node*, so instead I shall here focus on the most significant converted form, a paratactic conjunction. Seidensticker makes eight such conversions, while Holman makes only two. In the below case their choices coincide:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 430. 私が急に身を引いたものだから、彼女はこつんと膝を落した。 | Dir. 'I suddenly pulled myself back, <u>so</u> with a thud she dropped to her knee(s).' | I drew back in surprise, <u>and</u> she fell to one knee. | I jerked away, <u>and</u> she dropped to her knees with a thud. |

Both translators, perhaps considering 'so' to be too bare a causal conjunctive, opt for the relative discretion of the paratactic 'and', preserving the comma to emphasise the sequentiality rather than simultaneity of events, and hence implying causality.

3.1.4.2 c. multiple conjunctives

A sequence of conjunctives in one longer sentence can sometimes confound causality, which can become an issue when the translator attempts to make clausal relationships more explicit in the TT:

84. 私は五十銭銀貨を一枚置いただけだったので、痛く驚いて涙がこぼれそうに感じているのだったが、踊子に早く追附きたいものだから、婆さんのよろよろした足取りが迷惑でもあった。

Dir. 'I had only left a 50-*sen* silver coin, so I was painfully surprised and felt that my tears were on the point of spilling over, but I wanted to pursue the dancing girl quickly, so the old woman's wobbling gait was a nuisance.'

S1: ¶So much **gratitude** for one fifty-sen piece was rather touching. I was in a fever to overtake the little dancer, and her hobbling only held me back.

S2: ¶Her **gratitude** for one fifty-sen piece was touching. But I was in a fever to overtake the little dancer, and this hobbling held me back.

H: ¶She seemed so overwhelmed, as if she were on the verge of tears, just because I had left a fifty-sen coin. But I was eager to catch up with the dancers, and the old woman's doddering pace hindered me.

I have underlined all conjunctives in the original and given double-underlining to the hypotactic conjunctions. The remaining three elements are a paratactic conjunctive consisting of the gerund 驚いて *odoroite* 'was surprised [and]', a quotative verb that is part of a nested-verb structure (～に感じている *~ ni kanjite iru* 'I felt [that] ~'), and the contrastive conjunctive が *ga* 'but'. There is insufficient space to examine such compound-complex sentences in detail, but given the confusion that this sentence creates, it is worth considering it as a representative example, while focusing on its hypotactic elements.

The first observation to be made about the translations is that both break the original

into two sentences at the contrastive *ga* (though note that Seidensticker has omitted the conjunction in his first translation, and simply made a sentence break). Given the length and complexity of the original, this decision seems reasonable.

Because Holman appears to have misattributed the emotional content of the clause to the old woman, suggesting as he does that she, rather than the narrator, is surprised and on the point of tears, his hypotactic “just because” leads to a non sequitur with the use of “but” at the beginning of the next sentence. The non sequitur arises in part because he has rendered *node* as ‘because’ rather than ‘so’, shifting the focus from the effect (‘I was surprised’) to the putative cause (‘I left a 50-*sen* coin’). The adverb ‘just’ has tellingly moved from its original position modifying the amount (‘just 50 *sen*’) to modifying the causal conjunctive (‘just because’), which mischaracterises the original and contributes to the difficulty. Seidensticker makes explicit the old woman’s “gratitude”, unstated in the ST sentence, creating a noun phrase “so much gratitude for one fifty-sen piece” that replaces the *node* conjunctive clause.

If the translators’ approaches towards the first hypotactic conjunctive are markedly different, they converge in dealing with the second. Both convert (*da*)*kara* to “and”, presumably finding ‘so’ or a similar hypotactic conjunction unnecessarily strong for the occasion. This strategy may be part of the general attenuation or minimisation outlined above, which is all the more likely to be observed when ST conjunctives occur in quick succession.

3.1.4 Conclusion

While many instances of *kara/node* can reasonably be translated by ‘so’—as Holman demonstrates—a number seem to over-emphasise the causal element if translated

directly into English, and hence the translators either omit them or convert them into a less overt form using punctuation or paratactic conjunctions.

The translators are apt to reduce the conjunctive 'load' of a particularly long multi-clause sentence containing hypotactic conjunctives, by breaking up the sentence, removing conjunctives entirely, and/or converting them to paratactic forms.

3.1.5 PREMODIFIER

I shall devote a considerable amount of time to the issue of premodifiers, because they are the most frequently occurring linguistic feature in the Japanese–English set as it is exemplified in *Izu no odoriko*.¹⁷⁰ Part of the essential nature of literature is to describe both abstract concepts and the physical world, and in grammatical terms description ‘translates’ as modification (in the sense of an addition to an existing element). One may take a base element—usually a noun or verb, or a clause containing both—and modify it either postpositively or prepositively, thereby characterising the base element. Another way for a writer to engage in a descriptive act is simply to combine subjects and predicates to portray a state or action, a tactic that I contend English prefers more than Japanese (cf. Nakajima’s (1987: 13) contrast of “descriptive” Japanese and “dynamic” English).

This contention helps to explain an overall part-of-speech shift pattern to a state of lesser formal complexity—what I have termed ‘downshifting’—in translating from Japanese to English. However, not only does this occur paradigmatically, with, for example, adverbs being shifted to adjectives; it also happens syntagmatically: noun compounds become subject+verb clauses, prenominal clauses are shuffled into postnominal collapsed relative clauses, and so on. Whether or not such shifts result in the reduction of semantic value, they certainly result in more compact textual elements. Again, one can also observe syntagmatic manifestations of ‘sideshifting’, where there is no particular change in length or degree of complexity, but rather the reconfiguration of

¹⁷⁰ Part of the count includes adverbials that are straightforward to translate, but I include them anyway as they demonstrate the pervasiveness of the feature in the ST and SL.

language units is more euphonious in the TL.¹⁷¹

Returning to the premodifier group in general, it presents a significant issue simply because it consists of *premodifiers*. While English can technically employ modifiers before nouns, for example, they sound awkward beyond more than a couple of words (e.g., ?‘my standing-on-the-corner-of-the-street friend’), thus such descriptive clauses normally occur as postmodifiers, particularly relative clauses of both restrictive (‘The man who is standing on the corner is my friend.’) and non-restrictive (‘The man, who is standing on the corner, is my friend.’) types.

It is also noteworthy that SL prenominal clauses, which are the equivalent of relative clauses, have no restrictive/non-restrictive variants (Martin 1975: 623). There is no grammatical way, within the same structure, to distinguish between ‘The man (who is) standing on the corner is my friend’ and ‘The man, who is standing on the corner, is my friend’, both of which would become something like 角に立っている男は僕の友達だ *kado ni tatte iru otoko wa boku no tomodachi da*. To make the distinction in Japanese, one must write something like 男が角に立っている。僕の友達なのだ。 *Otoko ga kado ni tatte iru. Boku no tomodachi na no da*. (‘A man is standing on the corner. (He)’s my friend.’) Therefore, in theory, the translator will need to distinguish between a restrictive or non-restrictive meaning for each ST clausal prenominal modifier. An example from the ST illustrates this:

¹⁷¹ Note how, for example, the adverbial phrase “in aesthetic terms” may be preferable to “aesthetically” because it is less of a tongue-twister rather than being shorter.

| ST/Direct Translation | Seidensticker 1 | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|---|--|
| 517. 踊子は <u>ちょこちよこ部屋へは入って</u> <u>来た</u> 宿の子供に銅貨 をやっていた。 Dir. 'The dancing girl was giving coins to the inn children who came toddling into the room.' | The dancer handed out pennies to the inn children, <u>who darted in and out</u> . | The dancer handed out pennies to the inn children <u>who darted about</u> . | The dancing girl gave a copper coin to one of the innkeeper's children <u>who came toddling into the room</u> . |

S1 treats the underlined premodifying clause *ちょこちよこ部屋へは入って来た* *chokochoko heya e haitte kita* as non-restrictive, indicated by the comma inserted before the relative pronoun: "children, who darted in and out". However, S2 has revised this, removing the comma and hence changing the relative clause's status to restrictive. Holman similarly provides a restrictive relative clause. The implication in Seidensticker's shift is that either interpretation is possible, but that the restrictive one is, on reflection, preferable. Ironically, however, the non-restrictive interpretation may be more logically valid: the corollary of the restrictive interpretation is that the dancing girl has only given coins to the child(ren) who came into the room; any other unfortunate inn children who may have been more reticent have missed out on the bonanza.¹⁷²

Another issue regarding relative clauses, however, remains. English considers nested relative clauses, whose parentheticality interrupts the flow of a sentence (as in this clause), to be intrusive at times. However, in Japanese, partly because no commas are required to punctuate them, equivalent premodifiers do not appear to present major stylistic issues.¹⁷³ Thus the translator is likely to seek other alternatives to relative

¹⁷² This suggests that in many cases the supposed restrictive/non-restrictive distinction is moot in modern English, with the gradual elimination of the non-restrictive comma.

¹⁷³ In fact, Martin believes nominal premodifiers can be used for literary purposes: "Japanese authors often make skillful use of adnominalizations to carry along their narrative, where the English translator would prefer conjunctions." (1975: 623.)

clauses when confronted by a chain of prenominals in Japanese. Further, while Japanese can set up appositional structures naturally using prenominals, English, a language in which apposition may often sound awkward (as again in this clause), prefers alternatives where possible. (See examples below.)

Returning to prenominal modifiers in general, in much the same way that one can determine that a relative clause is non-restrictive if its removal does not affect the meaning of the main clause, one can ascertain the degree of adverbiality by checking whether or not the expression can be removed without affecting the clause to which it is attached. Indeed, I have excluded from my analysis cases where the adverb is essential to the meaning ('defining') and thus does not simply provide additional information, which is the especial expressive power of the adverbial. For example:

§526. ㊦昼飯から三時間と経たないうちに夕飯をすませて、私は一人下田の北へ橋をわたった。

Dir. 'Finishing dinner less than three hours after lunch, I crossed a bridge alone to the north of Shimoda.'

This sentence contains four adverbials:

- (1) 昼飯から *hirumeshi kara* 'after lunch', embedded in
- (2) 昼飯から三時間と経たないうちに *hirumeshi kara san-jikan o tatanai uchi ni* 'less than three hours having passed since lunch'
- (3) 一人 *hitori* 'alone' (more usually 一人で *hitori de*)
- (4) 下田の北へ *Shimoda no kita e* 'towards the north of Shimoda'

However, only (1) is integral to the essential meaning of the sentence; any of the others

can be removed without affecting the essence:

I crossed a bridge alone to the north of Shimoda.

Finishing dinner less than three hours after lunch, I crossed a bridge to the north of Shimoda.

Finishing dinner less than three hours after lunch, I crossed a bridge alone.

But the same is not true of the following:

Within three hours [of what?], I crossed a bridge alone to the north of Shimoda.

Certainly it would be *grammatically* possible simply to write 三時間と経たないうち
に *san-jikan o tatanai uchi ni* ‘within three hours’, leaving it to the reader to infer that
this refers to the last-reported event in the previous sentence: however, this would
fundamentally change the meaning as it would no longer refer to lunchtime. Therefore,
hirumeshi kara ‘after lunch’ must be retained. Such adverbials are worthy of their own
examination, but since I am considering modifiers as a subcategory, wherein they are by
definition *modifying* rather than *defining* the semantics of the words they precede,¹⁷⁴ it
seems more important to focus on the expressive element I mentioned at the outset.

The next issue to be considered concerns the relative syntax of premodification
versus postmodification. Premodification introduces the modifying element prior to that
which is modified; thus in the case of nominals, it provides commentary on the status of
the noun *before* it introduces the noun. Hence Japanese authors are perhaps more likely
to use a premodifier—where, grammatically, they have a choice—when defining or
describing a person or thing, and a regular SOV clause when defining or describing the

¹⁷⁴ I am making an exception for ST clausal premodifiers that correlate with restrictive relative clauses in English because of their more ambiguous status.

action of a person or thing. In English, as postmodification of extensive information is the norm, description is likely to follow the introduction of the subject in both cases outlined above. This has implications for narrative flow, and the translation of narrative between Japanese and English, for it suggests that English can misrepresent definitions or descriptions in the shift from premodification to postmodification.¹⁷⁵

3.1.5.1 Prenominal modifier

3.1.5.1 a. clausal premodifier

A clausal premodifier can be defined as a clause occurring before a nominal that provides information about the nominal.¹⁷⁶ Since Japanese grammatically requires neither subject nor object markers, such a clause may consist of nothing more than a verb. Under this definition there are approximately 139 instances of clausal premodifiers in the ST, making it one of the most dominant features in my taxonomy. Here is a typical example:

7. 折れ曲った急な坂道を駆け登った。

Dir. ‘[I] climbed up the twisted steep road.’

S: I ran on up the road, now steep and winding, [...].

H: I bolted up the steep, twisted road.

It seems easy enough to preserve the clausal premodifier in English, which is what Holman does here with “twisted road”, the past participle doing duty as an adjective;

¹⁷⁵ See the below discussion of the ‘bridge’ example (§150) for a detailed exploration of this issue.

¹⁷⁶ Martin calls clausal prenominal modifiers ‘adnominalisations’: “It is possible to adnominalize almost any perfect or imperfect Japanese sentence [...] merely by putting it in front of a noun or a nominal sentence, which—whatever its source—serves as the EPITHEME (the target) of the adnominalization.” (1975: 616; original emphasis.)

Seidensticker's decision to make it postmodifying ('the road, [which was] now steep and winding') reflects a considered choice rather than grammatical necessity. However, such an apparently straightforward example belies the rarity of true clausal premodifiers in English, since finite verbs do not precede the subject. A verb element is only permitted to precede a noun in a participial form ('the twisted road', 'the winding road'). Thus we cannot include the finite auxiliary verb—*‘the was-twisted road’, *‘the was-winding road’, etc.—whereas Japanese can do so with ease (折れ曲がっていた道 *oremagatte ita michi* is as acceptable a construction as 道が折れ曲がっていた *michi ga oremagatte ita*).¹⁷⁷

Further, participial clauses longer than a few words are unacceptable. Thus, if §7 had read ところどころ折れ曲がった道 *tokorodokoro oremagatta michi*, ‘the here-and-there twisted road’ would likely not be an acceptable translation, because the premodification is now too long. In such a situation an English speaker would almost inevitably shift the clause to postmodifying position: ‘the road, twisting here and there’ (a collapsed relative structure), or, fully, ‘the road, which was twisting here and there’.¹⁷⁸ Hence we can conclude that the relative clause is the closest English equivalent to the extended Japanese clausal premodifier.

Before examining the most common translation strategies employed for clausal premodifiers in *Izu no odoriko*, it is worth identifying the types of nominals that are most commonly modified in this way. Strikingly, the main characters of the story are

¹⁷⁷ Admittedly, the form 折れ曲がった *oremagatta* in the ST sentence is closest to the past-participial form in English, rather than auxiliary plus past participle, but the example I give here, 折れ曲がっていた *oremagatteita*, would be equivalent to the latter English.

¹⁷⁸ Equally likely would be a reformatting of the structure to remove the relative clause: ‘The road twisted here and there’; however, this cannot be considered a close equivalent of the ST. See the discussion below for a detailed examination of this shift.

rarely so modified, despite the reasonable expectation that they might be. *Odoriko* herself only appears three times in the list (§11, 303, 567), followed by the man *otoko* twice (§21, 93: never with his proper name Eikichi). Yet the unnamed baby *akanbō* appears as many times as the dancing girl (§279, 378, 426). This relative paucity suggests that the narrative is driven more by relating characters' *actions* within it than by defining them *through* the description of those actions. That the baby is so modified is probably because it is always a passive victim, having already died before the narrative begins and forever defined by that passing.

However, the narrator's self-descriptions are slightly more common. *Watashi* 'I' is clausally premodified five times.¹⁷⁹ One can perhaps explain the discrepancy with the observation that the narrator is himself a largely passive, and somewhat self-obsessed, observer throughout the story, a figure to whom things happen far more than one who initiates events. (The issue of passivity is revisited in the discussion of the mimetic modifier *jitto* below.)

By far the most recurrent premodified nouns are the grammaticalised forms of *koto* (17 instances)¹⁸⁰ and *no* (14),¹⁸¹ presumably so common because they perform a vital syntactic function, enabling their preceding clauses to be treated as nominals and hence to be operated on by other verb clauses:

¹⁷⁹ §200, 271, 323, 431, 614. *Watashi*, like all so-called pronouns, is grammatically a noun in Japanese, allowing it to be premodified, whereas this is unacceptable in English (e.g., *'the dumbstruck I'). Cf. Suzuki (2001: 115) and Yamada (2010: 63).

¹⁸⁰ §149, 153, 165, 273, 274, 380, 381, 385, 386, 425, 426, 443, 483, 493, 497, 525, 625.

¹⁸¹ §27, 98, 135, 282, 324, 331, 336, 465, 479, 485, 498, 603, 619, 628 (cf. also the variant *mono*: §65, 67, 84, 385).

98. 二人が話出したのを見て、後ろから女たちがぱたぱた走り寄って来た。

Dir. 'Seeing that the two [of us] had started talking, the women came running up pitter-patter from behind.'

S: [...] [T]he women, seeing that we had struck up a conversation, came tripping up behind us.

H: Seeing the two of us talking, the women scurried to join us.

The translators' versions indicate that there can be a straightforward conversion, but the equivalent combination in English of sensate verb (see, hear, notice, etc.)+(‘that’)+object clause is obviously the inverse syntax of the Japanese (object clause+nominaliser *no/koto*+object marker *o*+sensate verb); there is no way to replicate the ST syntax in English, and this impossibility may have implications for narrative flow.

Moving to the translators' treatment of this structure in the ST, the three overwhelmingly most popular transformations are (1) verb-clause reorganisation (i.e., replacing nominal modification with a predicate structure; S: 42 cases, H: 40), (2) conversion to relative clauses (S: 22, H: 31), and (3) conversion to nominals (S: 23, H: 14), with both translators' choices ranked in the same order of frequency. Hereafter follow representative examples of each.

(1) conversion to verb clauses. Simple conversion of the ST nominal clausal premodifier into its formally closest English equivalent, a clausal postmodifier in the form of a (non-restrictive) relative clause, produces a clearly awkward result, as the direct translation indicates:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|--|---|--|
| 589. ¶ <u>ぽかんと立っている</u> 婆さんの背には、乳呑児がくくりつけてあった。 | Dir. 'On the back of the old woman, <u>who was standing vacantly</u> , an infant had been strapped.' | ¶ <u>She was standing dumbly</u> , a baby strapped to her back [...]. | ¶ <u>The old woman stood there with a blank expression</u> , an infant strapped to her back. |

Instead, both translators convert the structure to a straight verb clause, which reads much more naturally in apposition to the description of the infant, and better reflects the structure of the ST.

However, there are numerous cases in which (2) **conversion to relative clauses** is in fact an effective equivalent, such as §47:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|--|---|---|
| 47. 爺さんは峠を越える旅人から聞いた、新聞の広告を見たりすると、その一つをも洩らさずに、全国から中風の医療を聞き、売薬を求めたのだそうだ。 | Dir. 'When the old man did such things as hear from travellers <u>who went over the pass</u> or see newspaper advertisements, without leaving out one of them, he would ask for palsy treatments from around the country, and order patent medicines, apparently.' | He would hear about palsy cures from people <u>who came over the pass</u> and he would read advertisements, never failing to give his attention to each piece of advice and to order each medicine. | Whenever he heard of a treatment from travelers <u>who came over the pass</u> or saw an advertisement in the newspaper, he never failed to send for it. |

Here the relative construction, being short, does not interrupt the flow of the sentence. Where the full form might prove unwieldy, both translators make extensive use of collapsed relative structures, with Seidensticker using them in half, and Holman in a third of cases, as with §89:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|---|--|
| 89. トンネルの出口から白塗りの柵に片側を縫われた栈道が稲妻のように流れていた。 | Dir. ‘ <u>The mountain road, stitched from the tunnel exit on one side by a white-painted fence</u> , flowed like lightning.’ | <u>Lined on one side by a white fence</u> , the road twisted down <u>from the mouth of the tunnel</u> like a streak of lightning. | The mountain road, <u>stitched on one side with white-washed pickets</u> , coursed down <u>from the mouth of the tunnel</u> like a jagged lightning bolt |

This case provides an interesting comparison of appositive structures. Seidensticker places the collapsed relative clause “[l]ined on one side by a white fence” before the nominal it modifies, “the road”, while Holman starts his sentence with “The mountain road” and puts his modifying clause directly after a comma. Removing the usual relative pronoun and verb¹⁸² not only reduces the unwieldiness of the relative clause, it also allows it to be relocated to a premodifying position, which is what Seidensticker has done. The relative rarity of this appositive premodification marks the phrase, but only slightly, and Seidensticker is to be commended not only for using what is in fact a well-established literary structure in English (likely under-represented in translation because of the latter’s conservative tendencies), but also thereby effectively preserving the ST word order. (Both translators consider the adverbial トンネルの出口から *tonneru no deguchi kara* ‘from the tunnel exit’ to be detachable from the clausal premodifier, both placing it after the verb in its ‘traditional’ position in the sentence.)

The next-most-common transformation, **(3) conversion to a nominal**, is another reconfiguration of the relative clause, this time into a collection of noun elements which mimic the ST in appearing prenominally, but again lack the precision of the relative clause, as well as the invigoration of the verb. Nonetheless, nominals have the

¹⁸² E.g., the full form of Holman’s would have been “The mountain road, [which was] stitched on one side with white-washed pickets [...]”.

advantage of being unmarked and are thus particularly suited to replication of copular constructions, where the verb has little value other than as a place-keeper in any case.

Seidensticker makes use of enumerated nominals in §216, where he is faced with a string of prenominal elements:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|--|--|---|
| 216. 若桐のように足のよく伸びた白い裸身を眺めて、私は心に清水を感じ、ほうっと深い息を吐いてから、ことこと笑った。 | Dir. ‘Gazing at <u>her white bare body</u> , whose <u>legs greatly extended like a young paulownia tree</u> , I felt in my heart pure water, and after taking a deep breath “ <i>hōtto</i> ”, gently laughed.’ | I looked <u>at her</u> , <u>at the young legs</u> , <u>at the sculpted white body</u> , and suddenly a draught of fresh water seemed to wash over my heart. I laughed happily. | When I gazed at <u>her white body</u> , <u>legs stretched</u> , <u>standing like a young paulownia tree</u> , I felt pure water flowing through my heart. I breathed a sigh of relief and laughed out loud. |

He has broken up the single underlined element in the ST, whose base nominal is the final 裸身 *rashin* ‘bare body’, into three object nominals yoked by the repetition of “at”: “at her” (this pronoun standing in as the overarching nominal); “at the young legs”, which covers 足のよく伸びた *ashi no yoku nobita* ‘legs greatly extended’; and “at the sculpted white body”. He has omitted the simile that appears at the head of the prenominal: 若桐のように *wakagiri no yō ni* ‘like a young paulownia tree’, and perhaps the addition “sculpted” is designed to compensate for this omission, by reflecting gracefulness, though the shift from an innocent image of nature to a manmade construct (formed under an exacting adult gaze, no less) is potentially problematic.

Holman’s approach is a little different, as he integrates the verbal elements of the ST, but the effect of enumeration is similar. He effectively employs a collapsed relative construction, in which the full relative clause would be something like “her white body, [whose] legs [were] stretched”, and combines it with a participial clause, “standing like a young paulownia tree”. Both renderings aim at concision, though neither is quite as

compact as the original, and of course the syntax is reversed, with, for example, the simile that leads the structure in the ST finishing up at the end of the clause in Holman's version. This has the effect, slight though it may be, of emphasising the antecedent (the girl's body) more in the TT than in the ST, since it appears first in the TT, but at the end of the string of prenominal modifiers in the ST.

Such clusters present another challenge when they take the form of several nominal premodifiers spread throughout a single sentence, as in §431:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|--|---|---|
| 431. <u>かがんだまま</u> 私の身の周りをはたいて廻ってから <u>掲げて</u> いた裾を下ろして、 <u>大きい息をして立っている</u> 私に、¶「お掛けなさいまし。」と、云った。 | Dir. 'Staying <u>crouched</u> , [she] brushed around me and then lowered the hem <u>that had been raised</u> , and said to me, <u>who was breathing heavily and standing</u> , "Please sit down."' ' | When she had brushed me off front and back, <u>bent low before me</u> , she stood up to let down her skirts, <u>which had been tucked up for walking</u> . <u>I was still breathing heavily</u> . She invited me to sit down. | She brushed the dust all the way around my kimono, then dropped the hem. <u>I stood there breathing deeply</u> . ¶"Sit down," she said. |

The first, かがんだまま *kaganda mama* 'staying crouched', can be disregarded, since the ostensible subject *mama* is in fact merely a grammaticalised nominal used to indicate an unchanging state, and has no noun equivalent in English (see 2.1.2.1 h. i.); thus Seidensticker converts it to the appositive "bent low before me" and Holman omits it. The second, 掲げていた裾 *agetete ita suso*, 'raised hem', can be unproblematically converted to a relative clause (cf. Seidensticker's editorialising "which had been tucked up for walking"; Holman again omits this reference).¹⁸³ It appears that both translators here reach their limits of patience with the nested elements of the sentence, for they opt to break it at this point and introduce the narrator in a new sentence; and further, they do not convert 大きい息をして立っている私 *ookii iki o shite tatte iru watashi* 'I,

¹⁸³ The problem here, incidentally, is rather one of attribution: whose hem is it? Seidensticker labels it "her skirts", while Holman's "the hem" connects it to the narrator's kimono.

breathing deeply and standing’ to a relative construction, but rather give it its own predicate: S: “I was still breathing heavily.” / H: “I stood there breathing deeply.” Overall, then, it appears that both translators’ approach to multiple premodifying elements is to minimise and break them up.

3.1.5.1 b. concatenation of premodifiers with possessive particle *no*¹⁸⁴

The particle *no* performs many tasks in Japanese, one of which is to indicate possession in much the way English employs the apostrophe: namely, the following nominal is deemed to ‘belong’ to the preceding one. This is complicated by the fact that it can also indicate a kind of appositive nominal equivalence similar to paired parenthetical commas in English. Thus, for example, アメリカ人の踊子 *Amerikajin no odoriko* could mean either ‘The American’s dancing girl’ or ‘the American dancing girl’ (‘the dancing girl, an American, ...’).¹⁸⁵ Further, Japanese arguably has a greater tolerance for the number of nominals that can be prefixed to the base nominal to modify the meaning without sounding ridiculous. Martin gives the following example, containing five nominal elements joined by four *nos*, which also highlights the potential for alternative interpretations:

The phrase *watasi no siriai no Kansai no aru zassi no hensyuu-sya wa* [...] might be taken either as ‘the editor of a certain Kansai magazine who is an acquaintance of mine’ or as ‘the

¹⁸⁴ I have excluded from the analysis basic pronominal possessive forms (私の *watashi no* ‘my’, 彼女の *kanojo no* ‘her’, 彼の *kare no* ‘his’, 彼らの *karera no* ‘their’, etc.) as they can almost always be translated directly into their English equivalents; however, I have included *watashi no* in two instances (§38, 482) because of their unusual usage. I have also excluded *no* compound nominals where *no* actually represents the subject marker *ga* (e.g. §486 踊子の云うの *odoriko no yuu no* ‘what the dancing girl said’).

¹⁸⁵ See Martin (1975: 623) for a similar example.

Kansai editor of a certain magazine who is an acquaintance of mine’. (1975: 657; italics added)

Normally such concatenations do not exceed three elements connected by two *nos*, but, converted into apostrophes, even such a modest gathering of possessives does not scan well in English. It is thus unsurprising that the translators employ various techniques to break up the clumps, and the most common is (1) **omission** of one or more elements. Out of a total of approximately 311 instances (including 38 cases of multiple consecutive *nos*),¹⁸⁶ Seidensticker omits a nominal element in 109 cases, and Holman in 58. This takes two forms: straight omission, where no trace of the original element remains, and conflation, where one term can be seen to substitute for all. Let us observe examples of the latter:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 127. ♪みなと一緒に宿屋の二階へ上がって荷物を下した。 | Dir. ‘Together with everyone I went up to <u>the second floor of the inn</u> and put down my baggage.’ | ♪We went <u>upstairs</u> and laid our luggage down. | ♪I went <u>upstairs</u> with them and put down my bag. |

Here both translators conflate the double nominal: 宿屋の二階 *yadoya no nikai* ‘the inn’s second floor’ is compressed into “upstairs”, a considerably more concise expression. But the translators differ in their treatment of §371:

| ST | Literal Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| 371. 太鼓の音は私の心を晴れやかに踊らせた。 | Lit. ‘ <u>The taiko’s sound</u> made my heart dance sunnily.’ | <u>The rhythm</u> filled me with a clean excitement. | <u>The sound of the drum</u> set my heart dancing. |

Seidensticker clearly feels it unnecessary to repeat the reference to the *taiko* drum,

¹⁸⁶ The number of instances irrespective of multiples is 311, and 38, or c. 12%, contain two or more *nos*. There are 349 nominal-concatenating *nos* in total.

which has just been mentioned in §369, so he retains the single noun “rhythm” only. Holman, however, preserves the ST double nominal, but inverts the nouns and uses the possessional preposition “of” to link them: “[t]he sound of the drum”.

This latter technique of (2) **using a preposition to link noun elements** is the second most common overall, with Seidensticker using it in 101 cases, and Holman in 133 (it being his most frequent technique). The preposition consists of the possessive ‘of’ in 42 and 43 cases respectively, with the remainder comprising a range of other prepositions:

| ST | Literal Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 135. 峠の婆さんに煽り立てられた空想がぽきんと折れるのを感じた。 | Lit. ‘I felt the fantasy aroused by <u>the pass’s old lady</u> break with a crack.’ | I felt the excitement aroused by the comment of <u>the woman at the tea-house</u> subside. | The daydream that <u>the old woman at the pass</u> had sparked in me had been dashed. |

Both translators replace the possessive relationship with a spatio-relational one by using the preposition “at” to relate the old “woman” and “tea-house”/“pass” (Seidensticker substitutes “tea-house” for “pass”).

At the same time, many of the base nouns that are apparently being premodified in the ST are in fact spatio-temporal markers (Martin: “relational nouns”¹⁸⁷) such as 前 *mae* ‘in front of/before’, 後ろ *ushiro* ‘behind’, 上 *ue* ‘above’, 下 *shita* ‘below’ and 近く *chikaku* ‘near’. Japanese has few direct equivalents to English prepositions: only the particles に(て) *ni(te)* ‘in, into’, で *de* ‘in, by’, へ *e* ‘towards’, から *kara* ‘from’ and ま で *made* ‘until, up to’. Most spatio-temporal relationships are indicated by employing *no* with a relational noun, which may be followed by one of the above particles if it is to be connected to a verb other than the copula. Out of the total of approximately 311

¹⁸⁷ Martin: “[V]arious kinds of spatial and temporal relationship are represented by adnominalizing a predicate (often but not always a noun) to some RELATIONAL noun.” (1975: 577; original emphasis.)

nominal concatenations with *no*, 51,¹⁸⁸ or one-sixth, employ a spatio-temporal nominal attached to a concrete nominal. This would suggest that it is possible simply to translate such concatenations with preposition+noun in the English; and in fact this is borne out in the TT translations:

| ST | Literal Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| 264. [...] 芸人達はまだ床の中 <small>とこの中</small> にいるのだった。 | Lit. ‘The entertainers were still <u>in the bed’s inside</u> .’ | [...] They were still <u>in bed</u> . | [...] The entertainers were still <u>in bed</u> . |

The double nominal 床の中 *toko no naka*, literally ‘bed’s inside’, can readily be reduced to the preposition ‘in’ plus noun ‘bed’. Similar patterns occur in the translation of spatio-temporal nominal concatenations with such relational nouns as 前 *mae* ‘in front of’/‘before’, 方 *hō* ‘the direction (of)’, 間 *aida* ‘between’, 上 *ue* ‘above’, 傍 *soba* ‘next to’, 横 *yoko* ‘beside’, 向こう *mukō* ‘opposite’, 下 *shita* ‘below’, 奥 *oku* ‘inside’, 後 *ato* ‘after’, 近く *chikaku* ‘near’, 内 *uchi* ‘within’, 側 *gawa* ‘side’ and 裏 *ura* ‘behind’. Out of 51 instances, Seidensticker uses prepositions in 33 and Holman in 39 cases.

A point where the translators’ techniques both intersect and diverge highlights several approaches to relational nouns in general (textual comparison overleaf):

¹⁸⁸ §15, 39, 40 (two), 48, 49, 50, 61, 90, 123, 150, 151, 161, 167, 186, 201, 211, 212, 213, 218, 238, 239, 245, 246, 249, 251, 263 (two), 264, 288, 325 (three), 328, 383, 400, 401, 412, 428, 431, 432, 439, 453, 455, 466, 495, 503, 563, 566, 621, 626.

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|--|---|--|
| 325. 二人きりだから、初めのうち彼女は <u>遠くの方から</u> 手を伸して石を下ろしていたが、だんだん我を忘れて一心に <u>碁盤の上へ</u> 覆いかぶさって来た。 | Dir. ‘It was just the two [of us], so <u>in the beginning</u> she stretched her hand out <u>from far away</u> and put down a stone, but gradually forgetting herself she intently came to lean forward <u>over the go board</u> .’ | A model of propriety <u>at first</u> , sitting bolt upright and extending her hand to make a play, she soon forgot herself and leaned intently <u>over the board</u> . | With just the two of us there, the dancing girl <u>initially</u> sat back, playing her stones <u>from a distance</u> with her arm outstretched. But gradually she forgot herself and hunched <u>over the board</u> , absorbed in the game. |

初めのうち *hajime no uchi* (noun+*no*+relational noun) is a temporal adverbial which Seidensticker formally replicates with preposition+noun “at first”,¹⁸⁹ while Holman retains only the semantic aspect with “initially”. Seidensticker does not translate 遠くの方から *tooku no hō kara* (noun+*no*+relational noun+postposition), presumably deeming “extending her hand” (from ST 手を伸ばして *te o nobashite*) sufficient; Holman, however, not only translates it—“from a distance”—but further converts the *te o nobashite* verbal into its own prepositional phrase “with her arm outstretched”. But both translators are in agreement over 碁盤の上へ *goban no ue e*, rendering it as “over the board”.

The third-most-common translation technique is (3) **stand-alone premodifiers**, either nominal or adjectival. Seidensticker uses 23 of the former and 14 of the latter, Holman 21 and 26 respectively. In §2, Kawabata writes of the narrator’s 高等学校の制帽 *kōtōgakkō no seibō*, ‘high-school cap’, which both translators render as “school cap”, with the nominal premodifier “school” requiring nothing but its immediate precedence to link it to and modify “cap”. Similarly, in the same sentence, 紺飛白の着物 *kongasuri no kimono* ‘dark blue kimono with splash patterns’ is rendered (S) “dark kimono” and

¹⁸⁹ Seidensticker emphasises the contrast in the dancing girl’s early and later behaviour by inserting the interpretative “[a] model of propriety”.

(H) “indigo-dyed kimono”, this time with adjectives modifying the noun (though of course “indigo-dyed” is participial in origin). The advantage of such premodifiers is that they mimic the ST structure in terms of syntax and concision; but owing to the TL length constraints earlier mentioned they cannot be used in as many situations in the TL as they can in the SL, which may explain their third-place frequency ranking.

As with clausal nominal premodifiers, (4) **verbalised structures** are also a frequent choice, with Seidensticker’s 19 cases and Holman’s 25 ranking the technique fourth. §21 provides a typical example:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|---|--|
| 21. 踊子の連れは四十代の女が一人、若い女が二人、ほかに長岡温泉の宿屋の印半纏を着た二十五六の男がいた。 | Dir. ‘The dancing girl’s <u>companions</u> were one woman in her forties, two young women, and besides a man of twenty-five or -six who wore the livery coat of a Nagaoka Hot Springs inn.’ | <u>Two other young women were with her, and a man in his mid-twenties, wearing the livery of a Nagaoka inn. A woman in her forties presided over the group.</u> | <u>The dancing girl was accompanied by a woman in her forties, two older girls, and a man of about twenty-five, who was wearing a jacket with the insignia of Nagaoka Hot Springs on it.</u> |

While one might consider the direct translation ‘the dancing girl’s companions’ an adequate rendering of 踊子の連れ *odoriko no tsure*, both translators decide instead to verbalise it, with Seidensticker using the simple copula plus complement “were with her” and Holman the passive “was accompanied by”. This shift away from ST nominals could be regarded as further evidence of the verbalising tendency of English.

(5) **Use of the possessive “ ’s ” and conversion to relative clauses** are in a virtual tie for fifth-ranking technique. The obvious merit of apostrophe-s is that it preserves both the word order and concision of the original:

174. 女の長い叫び声が聞えた。

Dir. ‘A woman’s long scream was heard.’

S: [...] I heard [...] a woman’s voice calling to someone [...].

H: I heard a woman’s long scream.

Despite its formal fidelity, similar to nominal/adjectival premodification this technique is only effective with short nominal concatenations. The relative clause, however, not only allows the translators to avoid an ungainly clumping-together of modifiers before the noun, but also apparently gives them licence for helpful explication:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|--|--|
| 11. ¶突立っている私を見た踊子が直ぐに <u>自分の座布団</u> を外して裏返しに傍へ置いた。 | Dir. ‘The dancing girl, who saw me standing there, immediately pulled out <u>her own zabuton</u> and turning it over placed it nearby.’ | ¶The girl turned over <u>the cushion she had been sitting on</u> and pushed it politely toward me. | ¶As soon as the dancing girl noticed me standing there, she pulled out <u>the cushion she had been kneeling on</u> , turned it over, and placed it near her. |

Evidently both translators consider that translating 自分の座布団 *jibun no zabuton* as ‘her own cushion’¹⁹⁰ provides insufficient information, and hence add, via the relative clause, an explanation that is absent in the ST.

3.1.5.1 Conclusion

3.1.5.1 a. The length and complexity of ST prenominal clauses means they must be converted to a postnominal form in English. The most frequent technique is to convert the noun being modified into the subject of a new clause, but relative clauses and nominalisations are also common transformations. These transformations may potentially alter narrative flow.

¹⁹⁰ Note that 自分の *jibun no* is the reflexive ‘(one’s) own’, not *kanojo no* ‘her’.

3.1.5.1 b. Japanese often binds together nominals with the particle *no*. Translators employ various techniques to avoid clumps of nominal elements in the TT, such as converting one element to a different part of speech. For example, in many cases the spatio-temporal element of the ST nominal clump will readily convert to a preposition in English.

3.1.5.2 Preadjectival/preverbal modifier (adverbial)¹⁹¹

Besides the ‘defining’ adverbials I mentioned in the introduction to premodifiers, I am excluding the following types of adverbials from my present analysis:

- (1) gerund adverbials using *-te/de*, as they are dealt with under **2.1.6 Verb Morphology**;
- (2) ubiquitous adverbial elements such as *soshite* ‘then’, *mada* ‘already’, and *sukoshi* ‘a little’ (note that I have already dealt with lexically divergent elements such as *mō* ‘already’ and *mata* ‘again’ in **3.1.1 Anaphora**);
- (3) clausal adverbials (apart from special cases) with the suffix *-te/demo* ‘even if ...’.
- (4) mimetic adverbials (sound-symbolic utterances are almost always adverbial in Japanese), which are dealt with in **2.1.5.1 Mimetic**.

3.1.5.2 a. set adverbial structures

I have identified six regular-patterned adverbial structures that occur in significant numbers in the ST and are potentially problematic, thus meriting their mention, but which appear in practice to present few translation difficulties due to their consistency, and the consequentially consistent approaches with which translators transform them, or

¹⁹¹ Given that the total number of adverbials I have identified is 438, I consider it more useful to list them under the relevant sub-categories.

are discussed in detail elsewhere (as indicated). Here I shall do nothing more than briefly introduce them and provide ST textual references.

i. \sim に \sim *ni* adverbial¹⁹² and \sim く *-ku* adverbial.¹⁹³ The *ni* form is the adverbial form of the *na*-adjective (usually formed from a Sino-Japanese compound noun), while the *ku* form is formed from the *i*-adjective. Thus, for example, (the rare) 小さ_に *chiisani* *‘small-ly’ is from 小さ_な *chiisana* ‘small’, and 小さ_く¹⁹⁴ *chiisaku* *‘small-ly’ is from 小さ_い *chiisai* ‘small’. Such adverbs can often be translated with a -ly adverb (S: 12 cases, H: 14) or other adverbial (S: 17, H: 16). Downshifting to an adjectival form is also common (S: 12, H: 14). For example, Holman renders *chiisaku* as ‘small’ in §19.

ii. \sim ながら(も) *-nagara(mo)* ‘(while) -ing’.¹⁹⁵ As with its putative English equivalent ‘while’, this verb suffix can express both temporal (‘while I was waiting...’) and adversative (‘while I agree with you in principle...’) senses.¹⁹⁶ However, it is very rarely translated using the conjunction ‘while’ in the TT, the only such case being §282, where both translators do so. In most other temporal cases it is translated with an -ing clause or ‘and’+clause, and in the adversative cases (§5, 19) with “but”, “yet” or “although”.

¹⁹² §9 (two), 11, 19, 20, 21, 39, 57, 70, 72 (two), 74, 92, 116, 121, 126, 131, 133, 143, 156, 168, 239, 276, 289, 308, 317, 343, 349, 371, 374, 430, 441, 457, 472, 489, 493, 495, 514, 537, 542, 562, 621. Total: 42 instances.

¹⁹³ §18, 19 (two), 31, 39, 80, 84 (two), 88, 116, 119, 147, 164 (two), 167, 180, 201, 245, 247, 312, 343, 357, 366, 402, 404, 434, 556, 596, 628. Total: 29 instances.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. §19 and 88.

¹⁹⁵ §1, 5, 19, 48, 61, 73, 105, 116, 130, 155, 165, 172, 225, 234, 256, 266, 282, 302, 348, 353, 415, 447, 461, 466, 469, 476, 499, 518, 562, 566. Total: 30 instances.

¹⁹⁶ Martin calls it the “concurrent-concessive” (1975: 412).

iii. ~のように ~ *no yō ni* ‘like/as’.¹⁹⁷ Both translators often retain the simile, though Seidensticker is more likely to convert it to a direct metaphor:

| ST/Direct Translation | Seidensticker 1 | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|--|---|---|
| 359. それから彼女は花のように笑うのだ。 Dir. ‘And then she laughed like a flower.’ | S1: And <u>her laugh was like a flower’s laugh</u> . | S2: And her laugh was a <u>flower’s laugh</u> —the expression does not seem strained when I think of her. | H: Next was <u>her flowerlike smile</u> . |

iv. ~て・で(から) *-te/de (kara)* ‘after -ing’.¹⁹⁸ This temporal structure presents no great problems to translate, with the translators using conjunctions such as “and” and “after”, and the adverbial “then”.

v. ~ほど(程) ~ *hodo (ni)* ‘to the extent that ...’/‘so ... that ...’.¹⁹⁹ Discussed in **3.1.2**.

vi. ~ずに *-zu ni* ‘without -ing’.²⁰⁰ In one case (§329), both translators render the structure as ‘without’+ing, but the others are a mixture of different negative structures, omission and paraphrasing.

3.1.5.2 b. time/manner/place (TMP) nominal+postposition

This group covers adverbial phrases, which in a standard Japanese sentence occur

¹⁹⁷ 38, 89, 180, 202, 216, 287, 313, 359, 360, 370, 378, 405, 518, 625. Total: 14 instances.

¹⁹⁸ §3, 45, 119, 140, 148, 237, 316, 382, 388, 394, 431, 485, 601. Total: 13 instances.

¹⁹⁹ §33, 53, 68, 218, 353, 385, 433, 484, 544, 612. Total: 10 instances.

²⁰⁰ §47, 48, 76, 245, 320, 329, 451. Total: seven instances.

before the verb, and sometimes before the subject, of a clause, which is why I place them under the rubric of premodifiers. Since the SOV language English also tends to place its adverbs before the verb (though it can place them after), it follows that English adverbs will sometimes appear in a different place in a sentence from where they occurred in the ST, which may slightly alter the effect on the reader. But there is a second, subtler issue of syntax that may often be overlooked in the translation process. SVO languages such as Japanese are sometimes called ‘TMP’ (time/manner/place) languages, placing their adverbials in order of priority based on their content: time-related adverbials such as 2 時に *ni-ji ni* ‘at 2 o’clock’ precede manner-related adverbials such as 車で *kuruma de* ‘by car’, and both precede place-related adverbials such as 京都へ *Kyōto e* ‘to Kyoto’: hence the likely order in a sentence containing these three categories of adverbials is 2 時に車で京都へ行きます *niji ni kuruma de Kyōto e ikimasu*, which, translated into English while preserving the syntax of the adverbials, would read ‘I will go at two o’clock by car to Kyoto’.²⁰¹ Clearly the preferred natural translation would read ‘I will go to Kyoto by car at 2 o’clock.’ This natural English translation exemplifies the place/manner/time (‘PMT’) ordering of adverbs that is characteristic of some European languages (but not German, which follows the TMP order of Japanese). This is of course not to say that English *cannot* write ‘I will go at two o’clock by car to Kyoto’, simply that the latter is clearly a marked structure, its unusual word order drawing attention to itself.

At the same time, on occasion stylistic issues may trump the general rule, as for example in §218 (also discussed in Chapter Four):

²⁰¹ Yamada (2010: 38) argues that Japanese time adverbials appear at the head of the sentence because they are yoked to the verb tense indicated by the verb suffix, which appears at the very end of a Japanese sentence, the structure hence operating ‘outside-in’ like nested pairs of parentheses.

218. [...] 真裸のまま日の光りの中に飛出し [...]

Dir. (original order of adverbials): ‘run out simply naked into the middle of the sunlight’

S: [...] a child who could run out naked into the sun [...]

H: [...] a child who can run out naked in broad daylight [...]

If one were to follow the standard English PMT ordering strictly, one would write ‘into the sun’ (place) before ‘naked’ (manner), but it is clear that “naked into the sun” both reads better and orders the information in the most appropriate way for the circumstances.²⁰²

There are two main types of adverbials within this group: noun+postposition, and noun+relational noun+postposition. As the two nominal elements in the second type are concatenated with *no*, there is overlap with the previous category of *no*-compound nominals, but the suffixation of a particle (*de*, *ni*, *e*, *to*, *kara* or *made*:²⁰³ as already mentioned, the only direct equivalents of English prepositions) to create an adverbial distinguishes the structure as a separate entity.²⁰⁴

Compared with other premodifiers, adverbial phrases seem to be fairly

²⁰² Plag claims that TMP and PMT ‘rules’ are meaningless: “Native speakers are in fact much more inclined to place shorter expressions before longer ones, irrespective of their meaning [...]” (2007: 108.)

²⁰³ *Ni*: §10, 12 (with *ue*), 14, 22 (*made*), 27 (*tochū*), 28, 38, 40 (two) (*mawari*, *naka*), 50 (*ue*), 88, 90 (*hō*), 109, 127, 130 (*mae*), 136 (*uchi*), 141, 160, 180, 199, 201 (*shita*), 212 (*naka*), 213 (two), 218 (two) (*naka*), 224, 225, 231, 246, 264, 267, 272, 274, 279 (*made*), 303, 313, 318, 328 (*mae*), 330, 342, 364, 369, 375, 402, 428, 429, 449 (*shita*), 454 (*kururi*), 460, 466 (*gawa*), 518, 520, 532, 567 (*giwa*), 602 (*ushiro*), 611. Total: 57 instances.

De: §1, 4, 8, 23, 29, 35, 113, 123 (*mae*), 153, 159, 165, 197, 213, 219, 237, 239 (*ue*), 246 (*ue*), 263 (*yoko*), 266, 274, 282, 286, 294, 333, 377, 384, 387 (*mae*), 410, 428, 436, 461, 464, 523, 528, 532, 537, 539, 563 (*naka*), 566. Total: 40 instances.

Kara: §1, 26, 47, 53, 71, 89, 98 (*ushiro*), 129 (*shita*), 152 (*ushiro*), 155, 158, 159, 163, 167, 213 (*naka*), 235, 238 (*ushiro*), 259, 325 (*hō*), 336, 375, 412 (*naka*), 439 (*aida*), 448 (*shita*), 453 (*aida*), 465 (*toki*), 503 (*ato*), 529, 566 (*kara*). Total: 29 instances.

E: §11, 31, 107, 127, 213, 283, 312, 325, 342, 343, 432. Total: 11 instances.

Made: 22 (+*ni*), 39, 85, 121, 203, 226, 230, 279 (+*ni*), 443, 568. Total: 10 instances.

To: 127, 153 (two), 539, 604. Total: 5 instances.

²⁰⁴ Note that clause+noun+postposition is dealt with separately (3.1.4.2 c.).

straightforward to translate, with the most frequent technique being an equivalent adverbial unit consisting of preposition+noun (S: 84 cases; H: 98).²⁰⁵ A double example can be found in the first sentence of the ST:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. 道がつづら折りになって、いよいよ天城峠に近づいたと思う頃、雨脚が杉の密林を白く染めながら、すさまじい早さで麓から私を追って来た。 | Dir. 'About the time the road became twisting, and I thought at last I approached Amagi Pass, the shower, dyeing the dense cedar forest white, pursued me <u>with terrible speed from the foot of the mountain.</u> ' | <u>With alarming speed</u> , a shower swept toward me <u>from the foot of the mountain</u> , touching the cedar forests white as the road began to wind up into the pass. | About the time the road began to wind and I realized that I was finally near Amagi Pass, a curtain of rain swept up after me <u>at a terrific speed from the foot of the mountain</u> , painting the dense cedar forests white. |

I have already considered the issue of clause- and phrase-rank syntax in this sentence in Chapter One. What Holman's translation in particular demonstrates is that in some cases it is possible both to retain an adverbial phrase and to order two adverbials as they were in the original (at least in relationship to *each other*). Seidensticker has chosen to reorder the entire sentence, which is why his begins with the rhetorical flourish of the adverbial.

The technique Seidensticker uses second most frequently is omission (29 cases), while Holman only makes use of this in 10, his second choice being an adverbial with no preposition (H: 15 cases; S: 10). The following example demonstrates their divergent choices:

²⁰⁵ Such a noun phrase governed by a preposition is sometimes called a *prepositional object*.

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|--|---|---|
| 329. 千代子と百合子もあわてて湯から上ると、二階へは上って来ずに逃げて帰った。 | Dir. ‘Both Chiyoko and Yuriko hurriedly rose <u>from the bath</u> , and without coming up <u>to the second floor</u> ran away home.’ | Chiyoko and Yuriko clattered <u>out of the bath</u> downstairs at almost the same moment and retreated across the bridge without saying good-bye. | Chiyoko and Yuriko rushed <u>out of the bath</u> at my inn and hurried back to their lodging house without coming <u>upstairs</u> . |

Again the example contains two adverbials. The translators treat the first 湯から *yu kara* in the same straightforward way (“out of the bath”—though note that this differs considerably from the literal translation ‘from the hot water’ (see 2.1.1 b. ii.)). But Seidensticker omits the reference to the second floor, while Holman modifies it to the vaguer “upstairs”, a term which of course originally consisted of a preposition plus a noun (‘up (the) stairs’) but has coalesced into a single adverbial chunk.

Although infrequent, some of the most interesting transformations again occur in the English translator’s urge to verbalise (verb clause: S: 8 cases, H: 7; conjunction+verb clause: S:1, H: 7):

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|--|---|
| 71. ♪「お爺さん、お大事になさいよ。寒くなりますからね。」と、私は心から云って立上った。 | Dir. ‘“Grandfather, please take care! Because it’ll get cold, won’t it,” <u>I said from the heart</u> , standing up.’ | ♪‘Take care of yourself,’ I said to the old man as I got up, and <u>I meant it</u> . ‘Soon it will be getting cold.’ | ♪“Please take care of yourself,” I said to the old man. “It’s going to get colder.” <u>I spoke from my heart</u> as I stood up. |

While Japanese and English share the idiomatic phrase 心から *kokoro kara* ‘from the heart’, this does not mean it can be used indiscriminately across languages, and Seidensticker’s “I meant it” sounds much more natural than Holman’s literalism “I spoke from my heart”. Conversely, in §503, Holman’s and S2’s verbalisation is much smoother than S1’s attempt at formal equivalence:

| ST | Seidensticker 1 | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|--|--|---|
| 503. 私は芸人達の後から屋根裏のような二階へ通った。Dir. ‘I went through from behind the entertainers to a second floor that was like an attic.’ | I went up <u>behind the rest</u> to an atticlike room on the second floor. | I <u>followed the rest</u> up to an attic-like room on the second floor. | I <u>followed the entertainers</u> into a second-floor room that had all the appearances of an attic. |

In both S2 and Holman, the verbal element encapsulates the ST adverbial in a more elegant package.

3.1.5.2 c. clausal+nominal preverbal modifiers

As clausal+nominal preverbal modifiers consist of a verb clause modifying a noun, which in turn is used adverbially to modify a following clause, many examples of this structure coincide with prenominal clauses, as discussed above. The crucial issue is how one decides to delimit the analysis: if one focuses on the clause+noun structure, the clause is the modifier (of the noun); if one ‘zooms out’ to sentence level, one can regard clause+noun as a single unit modifying the entire subsequent clause.²⁰⁶ The latter set contains 33 instances.²⁰⁷

Such clausal+nominal adverbials are furthermore distinguishable from TMP adverbials in most cases because (a) they consist of a clause+noun, and (b) they are not necessarily followed by a postposition (18 out of 33 instances), meaning that in those

²⁰⁶ For example, in §334 below, the abstract temporal noun 度 *tabi* ‘the time’ is modified by the clause 歌う声が少し高くなる ‘(the dancing girl’s) singing voice rose a little’, creating *in toto* the adverbial clause ‘whenever her voice rose a little’. This clause then modifies the rest of the sentence as a conditional: 歌う声が少し高くなる度に、おふくろが云った。‘Whenever her voice rose a little, the mother spoke.’

²⁰⁷ §1, 8, 13, 18, 66, 121, 123, 130, 132, 167, 181, 182, 218, 225, 235, 257, 313, 327, 334, 343, 353, 386, 405, 409, 416, 431, 440, 444, 526, 537, 577, 578, 597.

cases in particular the adverbial role is indicated by the syntax rather than by a particle. Furthermore, all of the nominals are abstract entities—*toki/tabi/koro* ‘time’, *yorokobi* ‘happiness’, etc.

The most common translation technique centres on a verb clause that corresponds to the prenominal element in the ST, plus a conjunctive or adverbial element that corresponds to the nominal itself:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|
| 334. 歌う声が少し高くなる度に、おふくろが云った。 | Dir. ‘ <u>At the times (her) singing voice rose a little</u> , the mother spoke.’ | She both played and sang. <u>When her voice rose even a little</u> the woman would scold her. | <u>Whenever the girl’s voice rose as she was singing</u> , the woman reprimanded her. |

Seidensticker translates the ST clause+noun as relative adverb+clause (“[w]hen”+“her voice rose even a little”). Holman also translates it as relative adverb+clause (“[w]henever”+“the girl’s voice rose as she was singing”), but one may observe two differences: (a) ‘whenever’ more closely approximates the periodicity of 度に *tabi ni* (as opposed to the one-off nature of 時に *toki ni*); and (b) Holman has preserved the nested clause preceding the first nominal in the ST—歌う声 *utau koe* ‘singing voice’—in the second clause as conjunction+clause “as she was singing”.

3.1.5 Conclusion

While the SL adverbial has clear counterparts in the TL, as can especially be seen with the set forms in 3.1.4.2 a., English convention restricts their use, leading to their frequent ‘downshifting’ to other parts of speech such as adjectives and verbs. There is not space in this thesis to examine adverbial syntax in detail, but the earlier discussion of narrative flow in §1 suggests this issue merits closer scrutiny in the literary context.

If any general comment can round off this wideranging section on a pervasive and hence elusive feature, it is perhaps that the translators try surprisingly hard to retain premodifiers that are often, after all, elements secondary to the meaning and flow of the narrative. Rather than excise the modifiers, they attempt to minimise their length or condense them to their essence through downshifting, conflating and paraphrasing. Seidensticker in particular, concerned as he is with rhythm, avoids the awkwardness that may result from translating adverbials too directly. At the same time, if translators are often keenly aware of the importance of rhythm in their translations, they may give syntax a lower priority, as Seidensticker's reordering of adverbials in the first sentence of the ST attests.

3.1.6 QUOTATIVE MARKER と *to*

The Japanese quotative marker と *to* (or its informal form つて *tte*) is suffixed to all quoted material (which includes dialogue, indirect speech, and internal monologue with verbs of speech such as 言う・云う *iu* ‘say’, and ratiocination or feeling with verbs such as 思う *omou* ‘think’) when there is a quotative clause, or one implied, following the quote. English does not have a full equivalent to *to*, though ‘that’ (as in ‘he said (that) he would go’) is sometimes analogous. In English, if anything does follow the quotation within the same sentence, a quotative verb must be part of that, but this is not true of Japanese. The verb—indeed, whole clause—can be omitted, or a verb can be used that is not strictly a quotative one. English does have borderline cases of the latter (e.g., ‘“You look tired,” she smiled.’), but they are relatively rare. Kawabata uses quite a few such structures in the ST, thus presenting a translation challenge.

3.1.6 a. no quotative verb attached

The lack of a quotative verb takes two forms: a quotation either standing by itself²⁰⁸ or with a quotative marker (*to* or the informal *tte*).²⁰⁹ Seidensticker only adds a quotative verb in one case (§314), whereas Holman does so in half of them (§315, 403, 450). We have already considered the ambiguity that such stand-alone quotations can generate, such as §314-5, where it is unclear whether the character Chiyoko or the narrator is speaking. In this case, the translators invent quotative clauses (with different subjects), but in some cases they leave them out, mirroring a trend in modern English writing (and

²⁰⁸ §233, 314-5, 403, 440, 451.

²⁰⁹ §146, 285, 450.

evident, for example, in James Joyce's fiction):

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|--|--|--|
| 232. 私は立上ろうとした。 | Dir. 'I made to stand up.' | I started toward the veranda. | I started to get up. |
| 233. ¶「流しが来ました。」 | Dir. '“A troupe has come.”' | ¶ 'Don't you want to watch them?' | “Some entertainers have come looking for customers.” |
| 234. 「ううん、つまらない、あんなもの。さ、さ、あなたの手ですよ。私ここへ打ちました。」と、碁盤を突つきながら紙屋は勝負に夢中だった。 | Dir. '“Uh-uh, boring, that lot. So, so, it's your turn! I played here,” (said) the paper-seller, tapping the <i>go</i> board, absorbed in the game.' | ¶ 'Stupid stuff. It's your turn. I played here.' Intent upon the game, the man poked at the board. | ¶ “What? Them? They're nothing. Well, then, it's your turn. I put my stone here.” The paper seller pointed at the board, intent on the game. |

The context makes clear that the narrator is speaking in §233, and the paper merchant in §234; neither translator supplies subjects or a quotative verb.

§450 presents a more difficult case. We see the informal quotative marker *tte* with no verb, which is a fairly common abbreviation in casual Japanese speech, though it lacks an equivalent in English, where it would be similar to writing only 'that' in the quotative phrase 'they said that ...'. Here the speaker is reporting someone else's speech, so the quotative marker occurs within dialogue. Seidensticker does not translate this sentence, but Holman adds a quotative verb:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| 450. 大急ぎでいらして下さい <u>って</u> 。 | Dir. 'Please go in a big hurry, (they said).' | Ø | They said you should hurry down. |

There seems to be no alternative to Holman's "[t]hey said" in reporting the speech.

3.1.6 b. *to* not followed by regular quotative verb, or with ellipsis of regular quotative verb

i. indirect quotative/ideational verb²¹⁰ or adjective²¹¹

The main problem for the translator here is that the quotative verbs cannot be attached directly to a quotation in English like ‘normal’ quotative verbs such as ‘say’:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|--|---|---|
| 595. ¶「有難え。わしらが水戸まで送らにやならねえんだが、そうも出来ないんでな。」なぞと、鉱夫達はそれぞれ私に挨拶した。 | Dir. ‘ <u>They greeted</u> me one by one with such things as “Thanks. We hafta take (’em) to Mito, ya see, but we can’t, can we.”’ | ¶ ‘Thanks. We should see her to Mito ourselves, but we can’t.’ <u>They addressed</u> me in turn. | “Thank you. We really should see her all the way to Mito, but we can’t.” <u>The miners expressed their gratitude.</u> |

Clearly English does not allow the use of ‘greet’ plus quoted dialogue in the way that is possible in the SL. To solve this, the translators separate the dialogue from the verb into discrete sentences, and modify the verb from its base meaning of ‘greeted’ to (the generalised) “addressed”, and “expressed ... gratitude”, respectively.

§191 has the added problem of the ellipsis of a quotative verb attached to an adjective, a form unavailable in English:²¹²

²¹⁰ §168 (音…が生まれた ‘a sound was born’), 235 (声を掛けた ‘addressed’), 319 (伝えた ‘passed on’), 341 (呼んだ ‘called’), 478 (声が…私の耳に入った ‘voice ... entered my ears’), 595 (挨拶した ‘greeted’).

²¹¹ §191 (悩ましかった ‘was worrying’).

²¹² Martin explains the acceptability of the elliptical construction in Japanese: “[I]t is not always necessary to postulate a particular tie between the quotation and a given verb, since we can often assume an ellipsis of *to itte* ‘saying that’ or *to omotte* ‘thinking/feeling that’.” (1975: 996; italics added.)

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|---|---|---|
| 191. 踊子の今夜が汚れるのであろうかと <u>悩ま</u> <u>しか</u> <u>った</u> 。 | Dir. ‘Whether the dancing girl’s night would be sullied <u>was</u> <u>worrying</u> .’ | What would she be doing, who would be sullying her through the rest of the night? | <u>I was tormented</u> , <u>wondering</u> if the dancing girl’s night might be sullied. |

Seidensticker removes the framing quotative structure, leaving us to infer the narrator’s anguish from the indirect internal monologue. Holman converts the adjective to *two* verbs, expressing the element of anguish with “I was tormented”, and the ideational framing element with “wondering”.

ii. ellipsis of quotative verb leaving an unrelated verb²¹³

§251 provides a clear delineation of the two main translation approaches to dealing with the disjuncture between the quotative structure and a verb that has no connection with quotation or ideation:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|--|---|
| 251. 「『廻るんですが。』と、男は <u>娘達の方を見</u> <u>た</u> 。 | Dir. ‘ “We’ll go around, but,” <u>the man looked towards the girls</u> .’ | ¶‘Do we?’ the man <u>asked the women</u> . | ¶ “Yes, we are, but ...” <u>The man looked toward the girls</u> . |

Seidensticker takes a functional, integrative approach, assuming that the point of the man’s speech and action is to address the women: “the man asked the women”. This approach means the loss of the original verb (‘looked towards’), but preserves the structure and integrity of the single sentence. Holman takes a formal, segregative approach, preserving the original verb form (“The man looked toward the girls.”), but in so doing he deletes the connection between the dialogue and the verb and divides the

²¹³ §35, 70, 113, 132, 160, 178, 234, 238, 251, 276, 327, 341, 372, 505, 537.

original single sentence into two. Such techniques are repeated throughout the set of instances, with either a quotative verb being added alongside the non-quotative verb, or the dialogue being separated from the non-quotative verb and standing on its own.

3.1.6 Conclusion

The ST *to* quotative marker offers great flexibility in the relationship between quoted dialogue and attendant verbs, sometimes allowing the writer to dispense with the verb while still indicating that the preceding utterance is a quotation. English has no such quotative device, and thus must rely on more conventional verb/dialogue relationships: omitting the quotative aspect, using a standard verb+dialogue structure, or separating verbs and dialogue into stand-alone sentences.

3.1.7 REPETITION

Based on the evidence of the case study, and the research of such scholars as Martin,²¹⁴ Japanese appears to have a greater tolerance for repetition than English. There are many possible reasons for this, only some of which I shall touch upon here. First, we should consider English's principle of elegant variation. Second, Japanese's avoidance of pronouns makes it more likely than English to repeat a proper noun or epithet as the grammatical subject of a clause. Third, Japanese employs a reduplicative lexicomorphology wherein the same character is repeated for intensificatory or emphatic effect (e.g., 山々 *yamayama* 'mountains' (and idiomatically, the adverbial 'very much'), where the 々 '*onaji*' mark represents the reduplication of 山, similar to English 'ditto'). This is echoed in Japanese's many native mimetic expressions, written in *kana*. Such attributes produce a gulf between the types and frequencies of repetition observable in the SL and TL.

3.1.7 a. general repetition

*i. の no possessive, premodifying attributive*²¹⁵

Nakajima claims that Japanese can form sentences consisting only of nouns (1987: 10), and that the particle *no*, one of whose main uses is to link nouns, is the most common word in the language (1987: 12). In the ST, therefore, one of the most frequent structures is one or more noun phrases premodifying other nouns with the help of the

²¹⁴ "In English we usually avoid repeating a noun when we can substitute a pronoun [...]. Japanese find nothing awkward about simply repeating the noun." (Martin 1975: 252-253.)

²¹⁵ §8, 15, 26, 46, 67, 90, 108, 123, 150, 186, 211.

possessive *no*, which sometimes equates to the English apostrophe.²¹⁶

Most of these noun phrases contain one *no*, but four (§15, 90, 108, 150) contain three. In any case, there is a repetition not only of the possessive particle, but also of a nominal unit in the general sense. Such concatenation of nouns is likely to sound stodgy in English, thus measures must be taken, as with §90, which contains three *nos*:

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 90. この模型のような展望の裾の方に芸人達の姿が見えた。 | Dir. 'Towards the bottom of this model-like landscape the figure of the travelling entertainers could be seen.' | Near the bottom of the jagged figure were the dancer and her companions. | The scene resembled a landscape in miniature. I could make out the itinerant entertainers down at the bottom. |
|-------------------------------|---|--|---|

If the syntax of the original noun phrase この模型のような展望の裾の方に *kono mokei no yō na tenbō no suso no hō ni* is preserved in English, it would read something like 'In this model-like landscape's bottom's direction', a perfectly grammatical structure that is also perfectly unreadable. My direct translation of this part of the sentence is readable enough, but taken as a whole the sentence becomes staid and inert because of the adjacent clumps of nouns '[t]owards the bottom of this model-like landscape' and 'the figure of the travelling entertainers'. Seidensticker transplants the vaguer but more concise "jagged figure" from the previous sentence in the ST to replace 'model-like landscape'. Holman splits the sentence into two, verbalising 'model-like landscape' to "The scene resembled a landscape in miniature." and shifting 'bottom' to the end of the second sentence. 'Towards' disappears in the transformation.

The dangers of following the original structure are evident in the following:

²¹⁶ Nakajima: "[N]o is the highest-frequency word in Japanese. This perhaps indicates how many nominal expressions there are." (1987: 12; my translation from the Japanese.)

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|--|--|---|
| 150. 私達は街道から石ころ路や石段を一丁ばかり下りて、 <u>小川のほとりにある共同湯の横の橋を渡った。</u> | Dir. ‘We descended things like a gravel road and stone steps about one <i>chō</i> , and crossed <u>a bridge that was beside communal baths in the vicinity of a small river.</u> ’ | We climbed down over rocks and stone steps about a hundred yards from the road. <u>There was a public bath on [134] the bank of a small river Just beyond it a bridge</u> led to the garden of my inn. | We walked about one hundred yards along a gravel road and down some stone steps, then crossed <u>a bridge near a public bath beside a stream.</u> |
| 151. 橋の向うは温泉宿の庭だった。 | Dir. ‘On the other side of the bridge was the hot-spring inn’s garden.’ | | The garden of the inn was on the other side of the bridge. |

The noun phrase 小川のほとりにある共同湯の横の橋 *ogawa no hotori ni aru kyōdōyu no yoko no hashi* ‘a bridge that was beside communal baths in the vicinity of a small river’ is a confusing mass of spatial relationships, partly because the order is reversed in English, and thus we start with what is spatio-temporally the *final* element, the bridge, whose location is furthest from the starting point of the walkers of all the places mentioned. In the Japanese, the reader is led from the stone steps to the river to the public baths, and onto the bridge, before being directed to the inn and its garden. This sequence is much more logical in Japanese, but ‘a small river’s vicinity-being-in public baths’ side’s bridge’ is not likely to engage an English reader.

Seidensticker deals with the issue by reducing the elements to three only and describing their spatial relationship to each other instead of the characters’ movements in relation to them: “a public bath on the bank of a small river”. He withholds the bridge, and the action of the crossing of the bridge, until the next sentence, which is a conflation of elements of §150-151. This rendering roughly preserves the sequence of the original. Holman attempts to retain the description of the action of crossing the bridge in §150, but in so doing creates a confusing spatial image: “then crossed a bridge

near a public bath beside a stream. The garden of the inn was on the other side of the bridge.” Although the bridge links, almost literally, §150 and 151, the English syntax negates this connection by ending the first sentences with ‘stream’ instead of the original *hashi* ‘bridge’, making it difficult to follow the motion.

The spatial confusion is compounded when the characters suddenly appear in a bath in the next sentence: H§152: “I stepped into the bath and the man got in after me.” Is it the public bath just mentioned, beside the stream, or perhaps the bath of the inn whose garden is on the other side of the bridge near the public bath? (Yes, I am deliberately recalling the spatially confusing syntax.) Seidensticker’s translation, at least, has brought us at the end of §151 to “my inn”, so the reader is comfortable in assuming that “We went together for a bath” refers to the inn’s bath. Holman’s attempts to copy the narrative flow of the ST sometimes result in a conflict with logic conventions in the TL that produce non sequiturs (see also **3.1.3.3 a. ii.**).

3.1.7 b. repetition of word-family-related lexical elements²¹⁷

By this expression I mean co-occurring words with the same etymology or base *kanji*, but perhaps with different parts of speech. The strongest example in the ST stretches over seven sentences: §212-218 (see ‘the bathing scene’ in **4.2** or **Appendices Table 1** for the complete sequence). The character 裸 (*kun-yomi* (native reading) *hadaka*, *on-yomi* (Chinese-compound reading) *ra*) ‘nakedness’ appears five times within the space of six sentences, in various forms: 裸体 *ratai* ‘naked bodies’ (§212), 裸の *hadaka no* ‘naked’ (§213), 真裸 *mappadaka* ‘complete nakedness’ (§214), 裸身 *rashin* ‘naked body’ (§216), and, again, 真裸 *mappadaka* ‘complete nakedness’ (§218). It is interesting to track the translations using a table:

²¹⁷ §27, 212-218 (five).

Table 6: Translation of 裸 ‘naked(ness)’-related expressions in a passage of *Izu no odoriko*

| ST | Seidensticker | Holman |
|---|--------------------|---------------|
| §211-212 裸体 <i>ratai</i> ‘naked bodies’ | naked figures | bodies |
| §213 裸の女 <i>hadaka no onna</i> ‘naked woman’ | [o]ne small figure | a naked woman |
| §214 真裸 <i>mappadaka</i> ‘complete nakedness’ | her nakedness | stark naked |
| §216 裸身 <i>rashin</i> ‘naked body’ | body | body |
| §218 真裸 <i>mappadaka</i> ‘complete nakedness’ | naked | naked |

Seidensticker uses “naked” in three out of five cases, as does Holman, though not in the same places. In the other cases, Seidensticker’s “body” implies nakedness in the context, while “[o]ne small figure” does not. Holman’s “bodies” and “body” both imply nakedness. (Interestingly, the common synonym ‘nude’ appears nowhere in the translations, perhaps because of its erotic overtones.) Both translators have thus shied away from explicitly conveying nakedness to match every instance in the ST, using “body” or “figure” to slightly de-emphasise the references.

Another consideration is that in the Japanese, the variations in pronunciation (with two instances of the ‘compound’ *on-yomi* form and three of the ‘stand-alone’ *kun-yomi* form), along with the variant lexis of 裸体 versus 裸身, both meaning ‘naked body/ies’, are able to effect a greater variety of forms than ‘naked’ can, encouraging the translators to look outside the word family for equivalents. Finally it is worth noting that while the native pronunciation *hadaka* is inextricably linked with ‘nakedness’ in the mind of the reader, the *ra* of *ratai* and *rashin* may not have such an evocative correspondence, and thus downplaying the ‘naked’ element in the English may indeed be reasonable.

3.1.7 c. phrasal repetition

I contrast sentence-rank and utterance-rank repetition in this subcategory, with sentence-rank repetition meaning repetition of a phrase (not necessarily a whole sentence) at least once across several consecutive sentences, and utterance-rank repetition meaning the duplication of an expression immediately after the original expression.

i. sentence-rank repetition²¹⁸

A significant feature of the ST is repetitive female speech across a few sentences. In §74-78, the old woman of the teahouse complains twice that the narrator's tip is too big (勿体のう ございます *mottai nō gozaimasu*); in §137-139, the mother is insistent about the similarity of a design on the narrator's clothing (同じ柄 *onaji gara*); in §227-229, one girl echoes another in inviting the narrator to visit them (お遊びにいらっしやいまし *oasobi ni irasshaimashi*); in §486-490 we hear four times how nice a person the girls think the narrator is (いい人 *ii hito*), plus once from the narrator himself for good measure; and in §532-536, the mother repeats her offer to meet the narrator off the boat in Ōshima (船まで迎えに行きますよ *fune made mukae ni ikimasu yo*).

This repetition within dialogue is a significant characterisation device, both in terms of imparting a particular cadence to some female voices and in suggesting how people may become preoccupied with one concern, an important motif in the story. Thus how the translators deal with these repeated elements is significant. Let us again use a table to track the elements. (Quotation marks etc. have been removed for clarity.)

²¹⁸ §74-78, 137-139, 227-228, 486-493 (five), 531-536.

Table 7: Translation of repetitious female speech in *Izu no odoriko*

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker | Holman |
|---|--|---|---|
| 74. こんなに戴いては 勿体のうございま す。 78. 勿体のうございま す。 | 74. Receiving this much <u>is a waste</u> . 78. It <u>is a waste</u> . | This is too much. It's really too much. | This is far too much money. This is much too generous. |
| 137. この方の飛白は民 次と同じ柄だね。 139. 同じ柄じゃないか ね。 | 137. This person's <i>kasuri</i> kimono has <u>the</u> <u>same pattern</u> as Tamiji's. 139. It's <u>the same</u> <u>pattern</u> , isn't it? | It's just like Tamiji's isn't it. Just like Tamiji's. | The pattern is the same as Tamiji's. Isn't it the same? |
| 227. お遊びにいらっし やいまし。 228. お遊びにいらっし やいまし。 | 227. <u>Please come and</u> <u>play</u> . 228. <u>Please come and</u> <u>play</u> . | Come on over[.] 'Come on over[.] | Please come visit us. Please come visit us[.] |
| 486. いい人ね。 488. いい人らしい。 489. ほんとうにいい人 ね。 490. いい人はいいね。 493. 私自身にも自分を いい人だと素直に感じ ることが出来た。 | 486. (He)'s <u>a good</u> <u>person</u> , isn't he. 488. (He) seems to be <u>a</u> <u>good person</u> . 489. (He)'s really <u>a</u> <u>good person</u> , isn't he. 490. <u>A good person</u> is <u>good</u> , eh. 493. I myself was able to feel sincerely that I was <u>a good person</u> . | He's nice, isn't he[.] He seems very nice. He really is nice. It's nice having someone so nice. She [...] made it possible for me to think of myself as, frankly, 'nice'. | He's a nice person. He seems like a nice person. He really <i>is</i> nice. It's good to have such a nice person around. I, too, was able to meekly consider myself a nice person. |
| 532. それじゃ冬休みには 皆で船まで迎えに行 きますよ。 536. 船まで迎えに行き ますよ。 | 532. Well then, in winter vacation everyone will come to the boat to meet you! 536. (We)'ll come to the boat to meet you! | Well anyhow we'll see you in the winter [...]. We'll all come down to the boat to meet you. [...] we'll all be there to meet you. | Well, then, during a winter vacation, we'll all come out to meet your boat. We'll meet you at the boat. |

Given the very limited amount of variation of repeated structures in the ST, there is a remarkable consistency within both translators' versions, considering the ever-present expectancy norm imposed by elegant variation. Only in §532-536 can we see a significant difference in the repeated element (S: "We'll all come down to the boat to meet you" vs. "[W]e'll all be there to meet you."; H: "[W]e'll all come out to meet your boat." vs. "We'll meet you at the boat.").

Perhaps one explanation for the lack of variation is that in many cases the

repetitions occur a few sentences apart, and in only one case (§227-228) is the ST repetition absolutely identical, without any additional textual elements. Furthermore, in this case Kawabata acknowledges the repetition in the surrounding text:²¹⁹

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 227. ♪「お遊びにいらっしやいまし。」 | Dir. ‘“Please come and play.”’ | ♪“Come on over,” she called to me. | ♪“Please come visit us.” |
| 228. ♪「お遊びにいらっしやいまし。」 | Dir. ‘“Please come and play.”’ | ♪“Come on over,” <u>the younger woman</u> | ♪“Please come visit us,” <u>the oldest girl repeated.</u> |
| 229. ♪ <u>上の娘も同じことを云って、女達は帰って行った。</u> | Dir. ‘The elder girl too <u>said the same thing,</u> and the women went back.’ | <u>echoed,</u> and the two of them turned back toward their inn. | Then they left. |

Both translators make use of this flagging of the repetition to ‘give themselves permission’ to repeat the dialogue word for word—but note that both of them also conflate §228 and 229, presumably so that they can append the editorial comment directly to the repeated dialogue.

Perhaps the most striking example of sentence-level repetition is found in §486-490, which is again one of the key passages in the book, this time preceding the narrator’s insight that he is not the irretrievably misanthropic “orphan by nature” he had assumed himself to be. The repetition both emphasizes the artlessness of the girls, and underlines the strength of their conviction (see overleaf):

²¹⁹ He does something similar in §531, this time anticipating the repetition that occurs in §536.

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 485. 暫く低い声が續いてから踊子の云うのが聞えた。 | Dir. ‘After low voices had continued for a while the dancing girl’s speaking could be heard.’ | The conversation was subdued for a time. ¶‘He’s nice, isn’t he,’ the girl’s voice came again. | They continued their conversation for a time. Then I caught the dancing girl’s voice again. |
| 486. ¶「いい人ね。」 | Dir. ‘“(He)’s a good person, isn’t he.”’ | | ¶“He’s a nice person.” |
| 487. ¶「それはそう。」 | Dir. ‘“That’s right.”’ | Ø | ¶“You’re right. |
| 488. いい人らしい。」 | Dir. ‘(He) seems to be a good person.”’ | ¶‘He seems very nice.’ | He seems like a nice person.” |
| 489. ¶「ほんとうにいい人ね。」 | Dir. ‘“(He)’s really a good person, isn’t he.”’ | ¶‘He really is nice. | ¶“He really <i>is</i> nice. |
| 490. いい人はいいいね。」 | Dir. ‘“A good person is good, eh.”’ | It’s nice having someone so nice. | It’s good to have such a nice person around.” |
| 491. ¶この物云いは単純で明けっ放しな響を持っていた。 | Dir. ‘This way of speaking had a naïve and open sound to it.’ | ¶ She had an open way of speaking, a youthful honest way of saying exactly what came to her, which made it possible for me to think of myself as, frankly, ‘nice’. | ¶ This exchange had an echo of simplicity and frankness. |
| 492. 感情の傾きをぼいと効く投出して見せた声だった。 | Dir. ‘It was a voice that emanated an emotional tendency and worked directly (on one).’ | | Hers was a child’s voice expressing her sentiments without censure. |
| 493. 私自身にも自分をいい人だと素直に感じる事が出来た。 | Dir. ‘I myself was able to feel sincerely that I was a good person.’ | | I, too, was able to meekly consider myself a nice person. |

As mentioned earlier, the translators are consistent in their use of “nice” throughout the passage (although note that Holman does render one instance of いい *ii* in §490 as “good” instead, presumably to avoid a jingle like Seidensticker’s rather precious “it’s nice having someone so nice”). This consistency suggests they indeed consider preserving the repetition as being important for the story. Probably more telling is that they both render *ii* as “nice” rather than its direct translation of ‘good’: they likely consider ‘good’ to have too strong a moral implication for the girls to be voicing such an assessment about a relative stranger, whereas *ii* is free of such associations, or at least not dominated by them. It is unfortunate, therefore, that ‘nice’ may be too hackneyed or mawkish a term to convey the simple warmth of the ST dialogue.

ii. utterance-rank repetition²²⁰

As noted above, I use this term to describe expressions that are reduplicated—i.e., self-repeating—and usually limited to a small part of one particular sentence²²¹ rather than ranging over several sentences. What is notable about the translations of these elements is that there are few true repetitions, but many double expressions that imitate the reduplicated *form* more than the content itself.²²² Here are some examples of the latter:

§257 頭が冴え冴えしている *atama ga saezae shite iru* ‘[my] head was fresh’ → S: “I felt alert and clear-headed”; H: “my mind was so keen” (only one element, so no echoing of the reduplication). §500 ところどころ *tokoro-dokoro* ‘here and there’ → S: “Now and then”; H: “Here and there”.

Few ST repetitions, and none of the *kanji* reduplications (i.e., those without *okurigana*), are translated directly.²²³ Most are simply intensifiers rather than indicating any real sense of multiplicity, and thus one might expect the translations to reflect this; however, some ignore the emphatic aspect too:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|--|--|--|
| 245. ♪紙屋は芸人の方を見向きもせずに、碁盤の目を一つ一つ数えてから、 <u>増々</u> 注意深く打って行った。 | Dir. ‘The paper-seller, without looking in the direction of the entertainers, after counting each <i>me one</i> <u>by one</u> , played with <u>greater and greater</u> concentration.’ | ♪ Paying no attention to the performers, the merchant counted stones and played with <u>yet greater</u> concentration. | ♪ The paper dealer kept playing, studying the board and counting points without even a glance at the entertainers. |

²²⁰ §132, 165, 245, 247, 253, 257, 258, 279, 348, 386, 442-443, 494, 500, 517, 578. *Kanji* reduplication: §194, 238, 245, 279, 286, 417, 494, 498, 514.

²²¹ Martin describes such repetition as “iteration” (1975: 1060).

²²² The translations that exhibit actual repetitions are S§247 (もう一石、もう一石 *mō isseki, mō isseki* → ‘How about another?’ said the merchant. ‘Let’s have another game.’, H: “How about it? One more round, just one more round[.]”); and similarly H§279 and 578.

²²³ §132, 194, 238, 245, 253, 258, 279, 286, 348, 386, 417, 494, 498, 514.

It would seem straightforward enough to echo the repetition of 一つ一つ *hitotsu hitotsu* ‘one by one’ in the translation, but neither does, although Seidensticker at least conveys the intensificatory nature of 増々 *masumasu* with “yet greater”.

3.1.7 d. redundancy

Redundancy here means not formal repetition but rather conceptual duplication, where an expression collocates with another that is semantically near-identical.²²⁴ Again, redundancy seems a more pervasive feature of Japanese than English; in the context of Japanese’s limited use of subject and object markers, redundancy probably contributes to textual cohesion, and hence is not truly redundant in many cases.

The most apparently redundant words in the source text are まだ *mada* ‘still’ (§157), もう *mō* ‘already’ (§199 and 235), 自分 *jibun* ‘myself’ (§202), どうせ *dōse* ‘anyway’ (§255), and だけ *dake* ‘only’.²²⁵ An indication of the redundancy of their dictionary denotations at least is the fact that they all regularly remain untranslated. For example:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 199. ㊦翌る朝の九時過ぎに、もう男が私の宿に訪ねて来た。 | Dir. ‘The next morning after nine, the man <u>already</u> came to visit my inn.’ | The man came by my inn at nine the next morning. | After nine o’clock the next morning, the man from the troupe called on me at my inn. |

Here *mō* is obviously an intensifier used by Kawabata to comment on the eagerness of the man to visit the narrator—evidenced by the relatively early hour—and alludes to the considerable period of time they have already spent together at the inn. Neither

²²⁴ For the purposes of this section I am ignoring the role of semantically null emphatic fillers such as *no* (+ copula) where no repetition is involved.

²²⁵ Apart from *dake*’s 11 instances (§12, 84, 299, 301, 360, 375, 386, 387, 412, 530, 578), these are far from frequent in the ST, but are a common feature of modern prose fiction, especially dialogue.

Seidensticker nor Holman translates it, which is perhaps an oversight. However, in the second instance of *mō*, its purpose is more nebulous:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|--|--|--|
| 235. 私がそわそわして いるうちに芸人達はもう 帰り路らしく、男が庭か ら、『「今晚は。」と声を 掛けた。 | Dir. ‘While I was being restless the entertainers were apparently <u>already</u> on their way home, and the man addressed me from the garden: “Good evening.”’ | I fidgeted, and the performers seemed about to leave. ‘Good evening,’ the man called up. | But now I was restless. It sounded as though the entertainers were leaving. The man called from the garden. ¶ “Good night.” |

There is no indication that the troupe is leaving particularly early, hence ‘already’ seems a poor equivalent for *mō* in this instance, although a case could be made for ‘now’. Seidensticker’s “about to leave” can be seen as referring obliquely to *mō*, but nothing in Holman’s version explicitly captures its additional nuance.

3.1.7 e. subject-noun, epithet repetition

i. 踊子 *odoriko* ‘the dancing girl’

The eponymous dancing girl is referred to by her epithet 75 times during the short novella.²²⁶ Her given name, 薫 Kaoru, is revealed near the middle of the story (§300), and thereafter only mentioned once more, near the end (§562).²²⁷ Further, she is referred to by the pronoun 彼女 *kanojo* ‘she’ 15 times, two of which are in the plural form *kanojo-tachi* ‘she and others’. Notably, all of these uses of *kanojo* reference the dancing girl and no other female character. The other females are referred to exclusively by their

²²⁶ §11, 14, 15, 17, 21, 22, 24, 27, 62, 68, 84, 102, 104, 110, 112, 113, 115, 116, 129, 133, 165 (plural), 183, 191, 215, 222, 225, 257, 266, 296, 303, 318, 320, 332, 342, 343, 348, 350, 352, 357, 361, 362, 369, 375, 389, 390, 404, 413, 416, 417, 425, 428, 435, 439, 441, 448, 461, 467, 474, 478 (two), 483, 485, 505, 507, 513, 517, 539, 543, 567, 574, 576, 577, 597, 601, 603.

²²⁷ According to local sources on the island of Izu-Ōshima, whom I interviewed in September 2010, the real-life individual upon whom the dancing-girl character is based was called either Mine or Tami; her elder *brother*’s name was Kaoru.

given names or some epithet. Therefore *kanojo* (which is so emphatic in Japanese it often means ‘girlfriend’) becomes synonymous with the dancing girl in this story.

In comparison, the pronoun 彼 *kare* ‘he’ is used 17 times, nine of them in the plural form *karera* ‘he and the others’/ ‘they’ (including at least one male). Of the eight times *kare* is used in the singular, seven refer to the dancing girl’s brother, again making the term near-synonymous with a major character.

Seidensticker uses “she” 87 times to refer to the dancing girl, and Holman 84 times. Seidensticker refers to her as the “dancing girl” twice and the “dancer” 32 times (the “little dancer” 12 times, and “dancers” plural three times). Conversely, Holman calls her the “dancing girl” 63 times and uses the term “dancers” twice. Thus we can see that the ST uses the epithet much more than the pronoun to refer to the dancing girl, while both translators use the pronoun “she” substantially more than their chosen epithets to refer to her. Further, Seidensticker and Holman are shown to be almost totally consistent in using the epithet for *odoriko* that they began with in their translations of the novel title—“dancer” and “dancing girl” respectively.

As noted earlier (Martin 1975: 1075), the dominance of the epithet in the ST is partly due to Japanese’s infrequent use of pronouns in general, with English’s much greater use of pronouns stemming from its grammatical need for a subject. The following case exemplifies this contrast:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|--|---|--|
| 350. 続きを読んでくれ と私に直接云えないの で、おふくろから頼んで 欲しいようなことを、踊 子がしきりに云った。 | Dir. ‘(She) could not directly say to me please read the continuation, so the dancing girl repeatedly said to the mother that (she) wanted the mother to ask me.’ | Shy about asking me directly, she remarked more than once how good it would be if someone could be persuaded to go on. | She did not want to ask me directly, so she told the woman that she would like me to read the rest of “The Story of the Lord of Mito” for her. |

In the ST, the subject, the dancing girl, appears once as *odoriko* late in the sentence, but neither translator renders this directly. Holman uses “she” three times (plus the indirect object “her”). Seidensticker takes a more oblique approach, replacing *odoriko* with a single “she”, but not referring to the older woman, and abstracting the narrator to “someone”.

However, when one examines pairs of contiguous sentences both containing *odoriko* a marked difference in the translators’ approaches appears:

Table 8: Translations of 踊子 *odoriko* in consecutive ST sentences

| ST Sentence Numbers and Form | Seidensticker | Holman |
|--|------------------------|---|
| §14-15 <i>odoriko; odoriko</i> | she; she | the dancing girl; the girl |
| §21-22 <i>odoriko; odoriko-tachi</i> | her; the little dancer | the dancing girl; this troupe |
| §112-113 <i>odoriko; odoriko</i> | the girl; she | the dancing girl; the dancing girl |
| §115-116 <i>odoriko; odoriko</i> | she; she | the dancing girl; the dancing girl, she |
| §342-343 <i>odoriko; odoriko</i> | the dancer; the girl | the dancing girl; the dancing girl |
| §361-362 <i>odoriko; odoriko</i> | her; she, herself | the dancing girl; she |
| §389-390 <i>odoriko; odoriko</i> | the little dancer; she | the dancing girl; she |
| §416-417 <i>odoriko, kanojo; odoriko</i> | she, she, she; she | she, her, she; the dancing girl |
| §576-577 <i>odoriko; odoriko</i> | she; she | she; the dancing girl |

Seidensticker minimises the epithets, replacing all but four with a pronoun. Conversely, Holman retains the epithet or another noun in all but six subject slots. On this point, the translators adhere to their overall TL-/SL-orientated strategies.

I shall conclude this subsection with an analysis of another defining passage of the ST in which the repetition of *odoriko* plays an important role:

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|--|---|--|---|
| 567. 乗船場に近づくと、海際にうずくまっている踊子の姿が私の胸に飛込んだ。 | Dir. 'As (we) approached the pier, the figure of <u>the dancing girl</u> crouching by the sea jumped into my heart.' | ¶ As we came to the pier I saw with a quick jump of the heart that <u>the little dancer</u> was sitting at the water's edge. | [31] ¶ As we approached the dock, I was struck by the sight of <u>the dancing girl</u> crouching near the water. |
| 568. 傍に行くまで彼女 はじっとしていた。 | Dir. 'Until I came up next to her <u>she</u> was motionless.' | ¶ <u>She</u> did not move as we came up, only nodded a silent greeting. | <u>She</u> remained motionless until I reached <u>her</u> . |
| 569. 黙って頭を下げた。 | Dir. '(<u>She</u>) was silent and lowered her head.' | | Silently, <u>she</u> lowered <u>her</u> head. |
| 570. 昨夜のままの化粧が [104] 私を一層感情的にした。 | Dir. '(<u>Her</u>) make-up, the same as the night before, made me even more emotional.' | On <u>her</u> face were the traces of make-up that I found so engaging. | <u>Her</u> makeup, the same this morning as it was the previous night, made me feel even more sentimental. |
| 571. 眦の紅が怒っているかのような顔に幼い凜々しさを与えていた。 | Dir. 'The red in the corners of (<u>her</u>) eyes gave a childish nobility to (<u>her</u>) angry-looking face.' | The rather angry red at the corners of the eyes gave <u>her</u> a fresh young dignity. | The rouge at the corners of <u>her</u> eyes bestowed a youthful strength, as though <u>she</u> might even be angry. |
| 572. 栄吉が云った。 | Dir. 'Eikichi spoke.' | ¶ 'Are the others coming?' Eikichi asked. | ¶ "Are the others coming?" Eikichi asked. |
| 573. 外のも来るのか。」 | Dir. '“Are the others coming?”' | | |
| 574. 踊子は頭を振った。 | Dir. ' <u>The dancing girl</u> shook [<u>her</u>] head.' | ¶ <u>She</u> shook her head. | ¶ <u>She</u> shook <u>her</u> head. |
| 575. 皆まだ寝ているのか。」 | Dir. '“Is everyone still sleeping?”' | ¶ “They’re still in bed?” | ¶ “Are they still asleep?” |
| 576. 踊子はうなずいた。 | Dir. ' <u>The dancing girl</u> nodded.' | [147] ¶ <u>She</u> nodded. | <u>She</u> nodded. |
| 577. 栄吉が船の切符とはしけ券とを買いに行った間に私はいろいろ話しかけて見たが、踊子は掘割が海に入るところをじっと見下ろしたまま一言も云わなかった。 | Dir. 'While Eikichi went to buy the boat ticket and the barge ticket I tried talking about various things, but <u>the dancing girl</u> just looked down unmoving at the place where the canal entered the sea without saying a word.' | ¶ Eikichi went to buy ship and lighter tickets. I tried to make conversation, but <u>she</u> only stared at the point where the canal ran into the harbor. | ¶ Eikichi went to buy my ticket for the boat to Tokyo and our passes for the launch. While he was gone, I tried to make small talk, but <u>the dancing girl</u> said nothing. <u>She</u> just stared down at the water pouring from a drainpipe into the sea. |
| 578. 私の言葉が終わらない先き終わらない先きに、何度となくくりくりうなずいて見せるだけだった。 | Dir. 'Before my words came to an end, before they came to an end, (<u>she</u>) just nodded an endless number of times.' | Now and then <u>she</u> would nod a quick little nod, always before I had finished speaking. | <u>She</u> just kept nodding over and over before I had even finished speaking. |

The sequence demonstrates a complex interplay of obtrusive epithets and implicit

subjects in the original: the ST uses *odoriko* three times and *kanojo* once, with no possessive pronouns, in the space of twelve sentences; Seidensticker uses “the little dancer” once, “she” five times, and “her” twice, over ten sentences; and Holman uses “the dancing girl” twice, “she” seven times, and “her” four times, over eleven sentences. Pausing for a moment to consider the opposite perspective, we can speculate that the translations might appear to a Japanese reader to be riddled with repetitious *pronouns*. Yet a native English reader will barely notice their presence. Here once again the translators have shifted the pattern of repetition away from epithets and towards pronouns, better to fit the grammatical rules and stylistic conventions of the TL.

ii. 男 *otoko* ‘the man’²²⁸

Similarly to their treatment of *odoriko*, Seidensticker tends to suppress the epithet, while Holman regularly preserves it. Out of 18 instances, Seidensticker uses “the man” ten times, while Holman does so 16 times (in fact, Holman even replaces the ST pronoun 彼 *kare* ‘he’ with “the man” in §284). Note that as with *odoriko*, the matching pronoun *kare* occurs far less than its antecedent *otoko*, appearing only eight times in the ST, as mentioned above.

iii. 四十女 *yon-jū onna* ‘woman in her forties’²²⁹

While compact enough as a three-character premodified nominal element in Japanese, this is an ungainly expression when rendered in English, and it is thus no surprise that both translators generally abridge or paraphrase it. Seidensticker alludes to the woman’s

²²⁸ §93, 96, 97, 99, 120, 148, 152, 158, 160, 162, 199, 202, 224, 230, 251, 272, 276, 282.

²²⁹ §100, 103, 117, 123, 132, 136, 226, 274, 276. Total: nine instances.

age in §21 (S1 “woman of about forty”; S2 “woman in her forties”), thereafter using “the older woman” in all but one case (§277 “the woman”). Holman introduces the woman as “the woman in her forties” in §100, but then (as noted in 2.1.2.2 a. i.), apparently errs in re-introducing her in §103 with an overly explicatory relative clause: “the woman, who seemed to be in her forties”. After this he uses “the older woman” on all occasions except §136 and §277, where he opts for “the woman”. Notably, neither translator ever replaces this epithet with the pronoun “she”, perhaps to avoid confusion with the dancing girl or other female characters.

iv. おふくろ *ofukuro* ‘the mother’²³⁰

In fact, the woman in her forties has two epithets, the second, *ofukuro*, marking her kinship status, although, as Suzuki terms it, fictively (2001: 135), for she is neither the mother of the narrator nor Eikichi, who both use the epithet to describe her. Much as *otoko* ‘the man’ becomes the proper noun ‘Eikichi’ once he has formally introduced himself to the narrator,²³¹ when Eikichi reveals that the older woman is Eikichi’s mother-in-law in §295, she thenceforth is referred to as *ofukuro*.

However, the translators avoid the familial term, probably because such a direct equivalent would not typically be used in English to refer to someone else’s mother (except perhaps by a devoted daughter- or son-in-law), as it is most often employed in the ST. Holman only uses the term “mother” when Eikichi describes her thus in §295. Seidensticker does the same, but also uses it once more in quoting Eikichi’s dialogue in §311, this time capitalised, as if Eikichi is referring to his own mother. In this case

²³⁰ §276, 295, 311, 328, 332, 333, 334, 344, 350, 366, 367, 372, 375, 446, 455, 462, 478, 505, 529, 531, 540, 541. Total: 22 instances.

²³¹ Although *odoriko* never ‘becomes’ Kaoru.

Holman opts for the rather colloquial, and possibly misleading, “[t]he old lady”. In all other cases, the translators render *ofukuro* as “the woman” or “the older woman”, hence adding consistency to references to the older woman and reducing the possibility of TL reader confusion.

3.1.7 Conclusion

Repetition, by definition, is a feature of language that is inessential to conveying basic information. However, it is an established literary convention in both languages, for important reasons such as emphasis, sentence cohesion and euphony, and hence cannot be ignored in translation. Various features of both languages—for example, the necessity or otherwise of a grammatical subject—influence the frequency and forms of repetition, and can lead to considerable differences in application. These have the potential to cause problems in translation, with, for instance, excessive omission changing emphasis, and excessive inclusion sometimes leading to awkwardness. Having said that, since the TL has its own tradition of repetition—if not verbatim repetition—it can often successfully reflect the ST by use of repetition elsewhere in the text or in the form of multiple, rather than strictly repeated, elements.

3.1.8 Sentence-length Difference

The length of sentences in literary prose is a common touchstone for discussions of style,²³² and with good reason: it is one of the few features that can be easily assessed either impressionistically, as a reader or critic, or more systematically, as a linguistic statistician or theorist. Rather than having to temper our assessment by saying that such-and-such an author ‘tends to’ use certain words or phrasings, with sentence length one can count the number of instances of short or long sentences, or readily calculate the average number of words in a sentence.

In translation studies, such analysis can also quickly reveal that translators tend to create normative sentence lengths, joining together clusters of short sentences into one, and conversely splitting up long sentences into shorter ones.²³³ The presumable motive, whether conscious or otherwise, for this textual homogenisation is the conviction that the TL reader might find (sequences of) unusually short or long sentences unpalatable.

The objections to such an approach are obvious. English texts from native speakers often display such variance of sentence lengths as a natural manifestation of individual idiosyncrasy and particular intent, as one would expect in any language. The author presumably reflects in the length of a sentence the extent of a given thought; thus if Holden Caulfield in *Catcher in the Rye* makes a series of trenchant observations on the ‘crumminess’ of modern society in the form of a succession of short sentences, this is because Salinger means them to be biting to the point. Similarly, if Dickens expends

²³² See, for example, Laviosa’s summary of corpus research in this area (2002: 61).

²³³ Laviosa hypothesises, after comparing extensive non-translated and translated corpora, that “a comparatively lower average sentence length may be considered an aspect of stylistic simplification and that a preference for such simpler style may be typical of translation per se, independently of the influence of the language pairs involved.” (2002: 61-62.)

several hundred words in penning a single sentence about the labyrinthine workings of nineteenth-century jurisprudence in *Bleak House*, it is partly because this is a textual manifestation of the very convolutions he exposes. Thus there is no precedent for a translator to claim that English literary prose ‘prefers’ average-length sentences. By adjusting sentence lengths to suit a perceived locus of acceptability, the translator is doing away with one of the few formal aspects that can actually be retained between languages, particularly philologically unrelated languages like Japanese and English.

At the same time, there may be occasions where syntactic grammatical difference or the need to retain narrative flow in the TT requires the translator to alter sentence patterns. If a sentence or sequence of sentences sounds awkward in the TL because of its length, this stylistic infelicity is likely to override the benefits of retaining the original structure. Thus one could argue that the ‘golden rule’ of sentence length in translating is the same as that in other translation contexts: where one can preserve a formal aspect without creating an infelicity in the TT, it should be preserved.

Here I shall examine how the translators deal with sentence length over the course of the entire ST. Of the 632 sentences in the ST, Seidensticker modifies (here in the sense of ‘changes’) the length of a total of 236 (37%), while Holman does so with only 178 (28%), but given that he appears to follow a strategy of preserving the ST form, this is still a very substantial amount of modification. The two main types of modification are combining sentences and splitting them; the minor ones are changing the break point in adjacent sentences, adding information, and changing sentence order.

In the vast majority of cases, both translators either combine two sentences into one, or split one sentence into two. Seidensticker combines two sentences in many more cases than Holman—44 (7%) to 13 (2%). On the other hand, Holman splits sentences

more than Seidensticker, doing so in 141 cases (22%), against Seidensticker's 116 (18%). Most of these splits are of one sentence into two, but one is split into three in 15 and 12 cases respectively, one into four in eight and four cases, and each translator splits one sentence into five (see **2.1.2.1 h. i.** (§271) for Holman's example).

While Seidensticker makes somewhat fewer splits than Holman, he uses a greater variety of splitting methods. For example, he changes clause syntax four times and then splits the sentences into the same number of parts (two sentences becoming two differently ordered sentences (cf. §264-5, 266-7, 362-3, 531-2)). Both translators change the break point of sentences on three occasions, leaving two sentences as two sentences but splitting them at a different point than in the original (S: §281-3, 289-90, 565-6; H: 123-4, 378-9, 526-7). Furthermore, in five places Holman adds information for expository purposes, giving it its own sentence (§66, 147, 404, 554, 594); Seidensticker does this in three places (§60, 535, 588).

While Seidensticker restored most of the text that was excised in the abridged first translation in his second version, he still omits four sentences (§138, 367, 450, 487); Holman omits none. Indeed, Holman retains more sentences in their approximate original length than Seidensticker, with 454 (72%) versus 392 instances (62%). A further key difference is that Seidensticker puts a sequence of sentences in different orders on four occasions, while Holman never does.

Rather than exemplifying the above summary with a selection of isolated instances of short and long sentences here, I consider it more fruitful to take one extended passage containing both short and long sentences and observe how each translator deals with it *in toto*. This passage, the pivotal 'bathing scene', will be the focus of my analysis in Chapter Four, thus I shall leave the detailed consideration of sentences until that section.

Chapter Three Conclusion

Syntagmatic features work across multiple lexical elements rather than manifest themselves in a single, easily definable unit as a lexical feature may. Consequently, syntagmatic features are harder to characterise, and to render analogously in the TL. Again, the most consistent generalisation to be made in conclusion here regarding differences in SL/TL features is the gravitation of meaning to nouns in the ST and verbs in the TTs.

This distinction correlates with Nakajima's characterisation of Japanese as a static, descriptive language and English as dynamic and explanatory (1987: 13), and also helps explain the general tendency in TT transformations of syntagmatic features for shifts among parts of speech, often towards the most compact and/or euphonious forms available. I termed these phenomena 'downshifting' and 'sideshifting' in Chapter Two, but in Chapter Three, where the focus is on the sentence as a whole (or group of sentences), the terms assume more dynamism, as multiple elements are redistributed within the sentence(s). The pieces of the co-text are re-arranged to fit different grammatical rules and literary conventions, and not simply replaced with a different part of speech.

Nakajima in fact goes on to characterise English and Japanese in terms of physical moment: English, according to him, starts with the subject as the centre of the 'action' of a sentence and moves out from there in a centrifugal (「遠心的な」 *enshinteki-na*) movement; Japanese starts from the peripheral information and moves inwards in a centripetal (「求心的な」 *kyūshinteki-na*) movement towards the subject (1987: 13). Syntagmatic reconfiguration is hence often a more complex process than that of lexical

shift, and thus may more likely result in inadvertent semantic attenuation, and cause elements to be ‘lost in the fray’. The most pervasive difference between ST and TT syntax is premodification in the former and postmodification in the latter—whether it occurs at nominal, clausal or sentence rank—with possible implications at the longer end for narrative flow and focus. These issues will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Four.

Ellipsis and its quasi-opposite repetition receive different emphases in the two languages, with Japanese omitting pronouns while repeating epithet nouns, and English doing the reverse. Japanese’s greater tolerance for, and indeed exploitation of, verbatim repetition sends the English translators searching for the elegant variation of synonyms among nouns, verbs and modifiers that is expected in the TL. Moreover, while Japanese can sometimes omit verbs (further strengthening the role of nouns in the sentence), English must supply the verbs ‘missing’ in the ST, thereby partly fulfilling the explicatory role that Nakajima assigns for it.

Chapter Four: ‘Shall We Dance?’ Translation Acts in the English Translations of *Izu no odoriko* and Beyond

4.0 Introduction

In the previous two chapters the analysis moved from ST to TT, observing how a set of ST features interacts with the characteristics of the TL to create a kind of ‘interference pattern’, problematic translation issues which can obscure the form or content of the original. I demonstrated how the translators dealt with various manifestations of the features in a range of examples drawn from throughout *Izu no odoriko*. I also considered how the tactical decisions, or translation techniques, employed by each translator either underlined, or undermined, the overall strategy that each translator appears to favour: a more TL-orientated *skopos* for Seidensticker, and ST-orientated *skopos* for Holman.

This chapter starts with an in-depth analysis of the ST and TTs of a key scene from *Izu no odoriko*, moving to a general taxonomy of the types of transformations the translators have employed throughout their translations. This compilation of a suite of techniques, repeatedly exemplified in Chapters Two and Three, characterises the key ways the translators are seen to engage with a piece of Japanese literature at the micro level. It culminates in a reconsideration of JE translation as a whole in the light of the thesis’s overall findings.

4.1 Translation Acts

Before looking closely at the sequence of sentences I have chosen to exemplify the issues outlined in Chapters Two and Three and the translators' responses to them, it is important to understand how I have analysed the translation 'acts' themselves. I continue with a descriptive approach (Toury 1995), trying to establish what is going on in the TTs as clearly as possible before discussing the implications of the translators' techniques.

I draw upon two authors in tentatively outlining a taxonomy of JE translation acts based on the case study. First, Baker's (1992) list of "compensation strategies"²³⁴ (see **Appendices Table 4** for an application of them to the scene under discussion) outlines a variety of common techniques for bridging cultural and linguistic divides. This pragmatic, hands-on approach is limited, however, by the specificity of its categories, and mainly focuses on lexical issues. Malone (1988), on the other hand, offers a linguistics-based, systematised set of "trajectories", which treat translation transformations, both lexical and syntagmatic, as something approaching equations. While exhaustive and elegant in its analysis of the often binary, complementary patterns that he contends recur universally in translation, its exhaustive series of ever-finer distinctions and categorisations is ultimately unwieldy and hard to grasp.²³⁵

²³⁴ (a) translation by a more general word (superordinate), often qualified; (b) translation by a more neutral / less expressive word; (c) translation by cultural substitution: "[R]eplacing a culture-specific item or expression with a target-language item which does not have the same propositional meaning but is likely to have a similar impact on the target reader."; (d) translation using a loan word or loan word plus explanation; (e) translation by paraphrase using a related word: "This strategy tends to be used when the concept expressed by the source item is lexicalized in the target language but in a different form, and when the frequency with which a certain form is used in the source text is significantly higher than would be natural in the target language."; (f) translation by paraphrase using unrelated words; (g) translation by omission. (Baker 1992: 31.)

²³⁵ Malone's introduction to the trajectories gives a taste of the complexity of his undertaking: "A

Using aspects of these two approaches I have tried to condense translation acts into the simplest-possible attributions in order to draw some general observations about JE translation strategies and tactics, before dividing these basic acts into observed sub-categories. The following system of classification is my own.

As has been discussed at length, translators, like the antecedent author of the ST, constantly make two types of choices: paradigmatic and syntagmatic. For both choices, there are two fundamental options: *retain* or *change*. I have divided the latter possibility into three sub-options, which yields a total of four basic choices: Omission, Addition, Modification and Retention. I shall list them in order from greatest to smallest impact on the ST, sub-categorising the transformations and providing one example each from those instances that have appeared in this thesis.²³⁶

First, then, one can **omit** the original element. Seidensticker is particularly partial to this approach, as we have discovered. In general, omission may be a perfectly valid technique where there is no readily acceptable translation for a phrase or expression, or where including an element could somehow undermine the text as a whole, or the flow of a given section. One might summarise that for Seidensticker, brevity—enabled by omission—is the ‘soul of lit.’, as it were. However, injudicious omission risks precluding important semantic content and thereby attenuating the interlingual transmission of a work of art, as Seidensticker’s first abridged translation attests.

Based on the example sentences I used in Chapters Two and Three, one can

TRAJECTION may be characterized as any of a number of basic plerematic [semantic/syntactic] translational patterns into which a given source-target pairing may partially be resolved.

“Nine SIMPLE trajections are posited, eight of which pair off under GENERIC trajections, for a total of thirteen: “MATCHING (subsuming EQUATION and SUBSTITUTION); ZIGZAGGING (DIVERGENCE and CONVERGENCE); RECRESCE (AMPLIFICATION and REDUCTION); REPACKAGING (DIFFUSION and CONDENSATION); and unpaired REORDERING.” (1988: 15; original emphasis.)

²³⁶ Romanisation of the ST Japanese has been omitted for reasons of concision, but can be found in the original context of the examples in Chapters Two and Three.

distinguish the following sub-categories of **Omission** (which is almost always syntagmatic, except for omission of part of a word):

a) **full omission**. For example:

- i. **omission of an entire sentence** (S2: §138, 367, 450, 487)
- ii. **omission of a repeated element** (§4 修善寺温泉に一夜泊まり、湯ヶ島に二夜泊まり ‘(I) had stayed at Shuzenji Spa for one night, and stayed at Yugashima Spa for two nights’ → H “I had stayed at Shuzenji Hot Spring one night, then two nights at Yugashima”)
- iii. **omission of a redundant (emphatic) element** (§199 翌る朝の九時過ぎに、もう男が私の宿に訪ねて来た。 ‘The next morning after nine, the man already came to visit my inn.’ → S2 “The man came by my inn at nine the next morning.”)
- iv. **omission of a proper noun** (§4 修善寺温泉に一夜泊まり、湯ヶ島に二夜泊まり ‘Shuzenji Spa ... Yugashima’ → S2 “I had spent three nights at hot springs near the centre of the peninsula”)

b) **conflation**, of:

- i. multiple nominals, adjectivals or adverbials into one or two representative elements (§121 荻乗や梨本なぞの小さい村里 ‘such small villages as Oginori and Nashimoto’ → S2 “a village or two”)
- ii. nominal compounds (§32 戸障子 ‘doors and *shōji*’ → H “sliding paper doors”)

c) **replacing a conjunction with a sentence division** (§14 踊子と真近に向い合ったので、私はあわてて袂から煙草を取出した。 ‘so.’ → S2 “She sat near me, we were facing each other. I fumbled for tobacco”)

d) **abbreviation**, including compressed structures such as

- i. **appositives** (§96 私はほっとして男と並んで歩き始めた ‘I was relieved and

began walking alongside the man' → H "Relieved, I fell into step with the man")

- ii. **collapsed relative clauses** (§216 足のよく伸びた白い裸身 'white naked body whose legs greatly extended' → H "her white body, legs stretched").

The second possible change is to **add** material to supplement the original. Owing to the nature of 'addition', this is almost always syntagmatic (intra-word addition being a possible exception). Based on the case study, something is usually added (a) for semantic reasons: to explain or contextualise cultural or linguistic material that is likely to be meaningless to the TL reader by itself; and/or (b) for aesthetic reasons: to facilitate the cadence and flow of the translation. Addition could also take the form of an extratextual footnote or introductory comment in a foreword. The advantage of the intratextual explication is that the text is left intact as (the illusion of) an autonomous entity; the disadvantage is that an explanation causes the TT to diverge from the ST, leading in extreme cases to editorialisation, where the translator's interpretation colours the translation. Further, such an interpolation can interfere with the flow of the sentence.²³⁷

Here are the main sub-categories of **Addition**:

a) **disambiguation**:

- i. **supplying implied information** (§58 女の子は早いものだよ 'Girls are early' → H "Girls grow up so fast")
- ii. **clarification** (§11 傍へ置いた 'placed it nearby' → H "placed it near her")

- b) **explication/unpacking of an element** (§11 自分の座布団 '(her) own zabuton' → S2 "the cushion she had been sitting on")

²³⁷ The case-study translations contain no extratextual features. The advantage of footnotes is that they do not interfere with the flow; on the other hand, they risk turning a work of literature into an academic exercise, and dispelling the illusion of an autonomous text.

- c) **adding a grammatical element** necessary in the TL (§260 打ち明かすんですぞ
'(We)'ll play till morning' → S2 "We'll play the whole night through")
- d) **adding a lexical nuance or euphony** preferable in the TL (§159 私は金包みを投げた
'I threw a money packet' → S2 "I threw down some money in an envelope")

The third type of change one can effect is to **modify** (alter) the original so that it becomes more acceptable to the TL reader. This constitutes the vast majority of both paradigmatic and syntagmatic translation acts, and thus I shall enumerate the transformations in greater detail. The most common modification is a shift from one part of speech to another (paradigmatic), or from one part of a sentence to another (syntagmatic).

(1) **Paradigmatic modification:**

(a) **substitution of one part of speech for another** for improved felicity of utterance in the TL:

i. **'downshifting'** (use of a more compact/less complex part of speech). Examples:

1. adverb → adjective: (§19 美しく調和していた 'beautifully harmonised' → H "created a beautiful harmony")
2. noun → verb (§262 湯ヶ野出立の約束だった 'It was a promise of departure from Yugano' → H "We had agreed to leave Yugano")

ii. **'sideshifting'** (reconfiguration of parts of speech):

1. clause+nominal → adverbial (§182 太鼓の音が聞える度に 'every time (I) heard the sound of the taiko' → S2 "At each drum-beat")
2. nominal+verb → passive verbal (§32 平常用はない 'There was no regular use' → H "it was not used regularly")

3. verb+verb concatenation→phrasal verb (§329 慌ててお湯から上る ‘hurried and rose from the bath’→ H “ rushed out of the bath”)
4. passive verb→active verb (§472 見られると ‘if (one) is seen’→H “If someone sees”)
5. adverb→adverbial phrase (§18 大きく*‘bigly’→S1 “in mounds”)
6. adverb+verb→verb (+complement): (§433 かさかさ鳴る ‘made the sound *kasakasa*’→ “rustle(d)”)

(b) **conceptual conversion** (culture-specific items are not included):

- i. set expression (299 いろいろな事情がありまして ‘there are various circumstances’→S2 “it couldn’t be helped” / H “it’s a long story”)
- ii. idiom (§410 胸先上りの木下路 ‘under-tree path rising steeply at chest height’→S2 “The road ... so steep that climbing it was like scaling a wall”)

(c) **paraphrase**:

- i. **generalisation** (to superordinate) (§554 羽織 *haori*→S2 “kimono”)
- ii. **summary** (§410 胸先上りの木下路 ‘under-tree path rising steeply at chest height’→H “abrupt climb through the trees”)

(d) **specification** (to hyponym) (§101 荷物 ‘baggage’→S2 “bundle”)

(e) **shift in lexical nuance** (§1 染めながら *somenagara* ‘while dyeing’→ S2 “touching” / H “painting”)

(2) **Syntagmatic modification** (listed from smallest to largest element, all often taking the form of **inversion**):

a) **word-rank reordering** (§371 太鼓の音 ‘The *taiko*’s sound’→ H “The sound of the drum”)

- b) **phrase-rank reordering** (e.g. adverbials) (§127 みなと一緒に宿屋の二階へ上っ
て ‘(I) went up together with everyone to the second floor of the inn’→H “I went
upstairs with them”)
- c) **clause-rank reordering** (§1: Seidensticker (see 1.1))
- d) **sentence-rank reordering** (S1: §235←→248) (not referenced elsewhere in this
thesis; the position of the sentences was reversed in Seidensticker’s original
translation)
- e) **splitting of sentences** (§213 one sentence: H→three sentences)
- f) **combining of sentences** (§211-212 two sentences: S2→one sentence)
- g) **conversion of ‘heavy-handed’ hypotactic conjunction to paratactic conjunction**
(§430 私が急に身を引いたものだから、彼女はこつんと膝を落とした ‘I
suddenly pulled my body back, so she dropped a knee’→S2 “I drew back in surprise,
and she fell to one knee”)
- h) **conversion of conjunctive clause to participial clause** (§14 踊子と真近に向い合
ったので ‘I was directly facing the dancing girl, so’→H “Sitting so close, facing the
dancing girl,”)

Finally, and most rarely, one can try to **retain** the original ‘unchanged’. This is effectively impossible, given that English and Japanese use different graphologies, but even between languages that share them, the act of transplanting text from the original into a different context fundamentally alters the content. Paradigmatically, the closest one gets to retention is loanwords, but they are really only a transliteration, so are of course not graphologically identical to the original. (The *kanji* characters 羽織, for example, bear not the slightest resemblance to the Roman script ‘*haori*’, and it is unlikely that a native speaker of English would pronounce the letters in the way that a

Japanese speaker would pronounce the *kanji*.) Syntactically speaking, putting the words in the same order as the original is usually impossible between Japanese and English, as was observed in 1.1. However, a higher level of correspondence may be achieved at clause rank. The forms of retention shown below typically go against TL norms, thus they are to some degree ‘symptomatic’, as Venuti puts it (1995: 29), challenging the fluency norm of standard Western literary translatorial practice. Holman is much more closely associable with this choice than Seidensticker in the case study. Here are the most readily identifiable sub-categories:

(1) **Paradigmatic retention** of such lexical items/forms as:

- a) proper noun (§23 湯ヶ島 [...] 湯川橋 ‘Yugashima [...] Yukawa Bridge’≈H “Yukawa Bridge [...] Yugashima Hot Springs”)
- b) set phrase (§235 今晩は ‘good evening’≈S2 “good evening” (H→“good night”)
- c) utterance (§12 ええ ‘yes’ (or utterance *ee*)≈“Yes”)
- d) passive (§327 叱れる ‘(I)’ll be scolded’≈S1 “I’ll be scolded for this”)
- e) mimetic (e.g., phonomime) (§168 ととんとんとん ‘to-ton-ton-ton’≈H “*Ton-ton-ton-ton*” (but the anacrusis *to-* is lost; 2(a) below is also an example of a manner mimetic)
- f) nonspecific phraseology
 - i. inclusive nominal set (§121 萩乗や梨本なぞの小さい村里 ‘small villages Oginori, Nashimoto and so on’≈H “tiny villages with names like Oginori and Nashimoto”)
 - ii. spatio-temporal range (§1... と思う頃 ‘(about) the time I realised ...’≈H “About the time ... I realised’)

- g) subject+nominal predicate (§260 今夜は徹夜ですぞ ‘Tonight is all night!’≈H ‘It’s all night tonight!’)
- h) adverbial (phrase) (§1 すさまじい早さで ‘with terrible speed’≈H ‘at a terrific speed’)
- i) idiom (§216 若桐のように ‘like a young paulownia tree’≈H ‘like a young paulownia tree’)

(2) **Syntagmatic retention** of such features as:

- a) repetition (§578 こくりこくりうなずいて ‘nodding nod-nod’≈S2 ‘Now and then she would nod a quick little nod’ / H ‘kept nodding over and over’)
- b) phrase-rank order (『伊豆の踊子』 *Izu no odoriko*≈H ‘*The Izu Dancer*’)
- c) clause-rank order (§433 鳥がとまる枝の枯草がかさかさ鳴る程静かだった (standard translation order:) ‘it was so quiet the dead leaves on the branch the birds landed on made the sound *kasakasa*→S2 ‘The dead leaves rustled as they landed, so quiet was the air’ (the verb in its inversion here is also close to original Japanese syntax)
- d) sentence length or number (§3-4≈H same sentences (see **1.2**))

The following section **4.2**, an analysis of the ‘bathing scene’ in the ST, refers to some of the above translation acts in describing Seidensticker’s and Holman’s response to the challenge of the semantically and formally complex series of sentences. It employs this taxonomy to draw some general conclusions about the translators’ choices in the context of their putative overall strategies. **Appendices Table 3** contains a more detailed analysis of the translation acts in the scene, specifically referring to the above sub-categories by number and letter.

4.2 Textual Comparison: the ‘Bathing Scene’ (§209-218)

I have chosen to focus on this scene for several reasons related to translation studies in general and the JE translation process in particular. First, the scene illustrates part of the semiotic ‘dance’ in which the two main characters are engaged in *Izu no odoriko*. By choosing to, literally, reveal herself to the protagonist when she appears naked before him in the riverside bath, the dancing girl demonstrates her confidence in the cultural mores that envelop her, and in the character of the youth she trusts. She is making a statement, unconscious or otherwise, with her actions, one that radically alters the protagonist’s attitude towards her, in that he realises she is ‘just’ a child, and hence an object of his affection rather than his lust, and it is a great relief to him.²³⁸

The only reason the narrator realises her true status is because she has literally stripped herself of the enculturated signs (elaborate hairstyle; thick make-up; mature outfit; artful dance and drumming) that have misled him into overestimating her age as sixteen or seventeen rather than thirteen or fourteen. In appearing naked before him in public, it is as if she is speaking frankly about herself to him. Only in this scene is she portrayed as completely at ease and full of joy, ironically when she is apparently most vulnerable. The Japanese mixed communal bath as it was then not only strips the bathers of the exaggerated trappings of gender that can misrepresent age, it also removes those of social status (monetary, educational, and so on) that have shadowed the two throughout their acquaintance. At this moment only—apart from when she holds her own against him in a board game—can the protagonist and the dancing girl relate as something approaching equals.

²³⁸ Starrs, however, argues that in fact this realisation simply feeds the narrator character’s narcissism (1998: 51-59).

The second reason to focus on this scene is that the narrator's shift in perspective regarding the dancing girl is artfully echoed in the narrative structure of the passage—for example in the shift in diction from 「女」 *onna* 'woman' in §213 to 「子供」 *kodomo* 'child' in §217, and the long premodifying paen to this child in §218—and the translator is thus tasked with capturing both its semantic content and the form of its transmission. The way in which this scene unfolds is crucial to its communicative success as a work of art.

Third, at the same time, given the difference in cultural mores between Taishō-era (1912-1926) Japan and a modern western audience, the translator has to be sensitive to how the 'nude scene' will appear to the target audience. Indeed, within Japan itself, the story's fame probably exceeds its literary merit partly because of the notoriety of the bath scene, despite one point of it being to underscore the innocence of the relationship. The translation must not come off as laughable or lewd, for that would misrepresent it in the target language. Instead, it must be lyrical.

A final reason to focus on this scene is the density of co-occurrence of features. As the list below the text demonstrates, the sentences contain a large number of the features identified in Chapters Two and Three, and, as I posited in **1.5.2**, the denser the feature set at a given point in the ST, the more problematic its translation may be, since each feature represents a paradigmatic or syntagmatic divergence between SL and TL.

It is now time to scrutinise the scene. The text is compiled in the usual columns of the original Japanese; a direct translation, where I have tried to echo Japanese clause order as much as possible, and thus distort English syntax more than usual; and then the Seidensticker and Holman translations.

Following the text are two interpretations of the 'data', the first from the ST side in

the form of a list of features occurring in the text. The second, Table 9, is from the TT side, examining Seidensticker's and Holman's transformation acts. The analysis is not comprehensive (see **Appendices Table 3** for a more in-depth evaluation), but it allows for a relatively objective comparison between Seidensticker's and Holman's translation acts at the same point in the ST.

The 'Bathing Scene'

| ST | Direct Translation | Seidensticker 2 | Holman |
|---|--|---|--|
| 209. ¶「向うのお湯にあいつらが来ています。」 | “That lot has come to the bath on the other side. | ¶ “Look. They’ve come for a bath, over there across the river. | ¶ “Look. They’re over at the other bath. |
| 210. ——ほれ、こちらを見つけたと見えて笑っていやがる。」 | —Hey, it appears (they)’ve found us here, and (they)’re laughing.” | Damned if they haven’t seen us. Look at them laugh.” | I think they’ve noticed us. They’re laughing.” |
| 211. ¶ 彼に指ざされて、私は川向の共同湯の方を見た。 | Pointed by his finger, I looked towards the public bath on the other side of the river. | He pointed over at the public bath, where seven or eight naked figures showed through the steam. | He pointed across the stream toward the public bath on the other side. |
| 212. 湯気の中に七八人の裸体がぼんやり浮んでいた。 | Amid the steam seven or eight naked bodies were floating hazily. | | I could distinguish seven or eight bodies through the steam. |
| 213. ¶ 仄暗い湯殿の奥から、突然裸の女が走り出して来たかと思うと、脱衣場の突鼻に川岸へ飛下がりそんな格好で立ち、両手を一ぱいに伸して何か叫んでいる。 | When (I) thought that perhaps from the interior of the dim bathhouse, a naked woman suddenly came running out, (she,) standing at the edge of the changing area with the appearance of being about to jump down towards the riverbank, stretching up both hands together, is shouting something. | ¶ One small figure ran out into the sunlight and stood for a moment at the edge of the platform calling something to us, arms raised as though for a plunge into the river. | ¶ Suddenly a naked woman ran out from the rear of the dark bathhouse. She stood at the edge of the changing area as if she might come flying down the bank. She was shouting with her arms outstretched. |
| 214. 手拭もない真裸だ。 | Without even a hand-towel, (she) is completely naked. | It was the dancer, her nakedness covered by not even a towel. | She was stark naked, without even a towel. |
| 215. それが踊子だった。 | That was the dancing girl. | | It was the dancing girl. |
| 216. 若桐のように足のよく伸びた白い裸身を眺めて、私は心に清水を感じ、ほうっと深い息を吐いてから、ことこと笑った。 | Gazing at (her) naked white body, whose legs greatly extended like a young paulownia tree, I felt in my heart pure water, and after taking a deep breath “ <i>hōtto</i> ”, gently laughed. | I looked at her, at the young legs, at the sculpted white body, and suddenly a draught of fresh water seemed to wash over my heart. I laughed happily. | When I gazed at her white body, legs stretched, standing like a young paulownia tree, I felt pure water flowing through my heart. I breathed a sigh of relief and laughed out loud. |
| 217. 子供なんだ。 | (She) is a child, you see. | She was a child, a mere child, a child who could run out naked into the sun and stand there on tiptoes in her delight at seeing a friend. | She’s a child—a child who can run out naked in broad daylight, overcome with joy at finding me, and stand tall on her tiptoes. |
| 218. 私達を見つけた喜びで真裸のまま日の光りの中に飛出し、爪先きで背一ぱいに伸上る程に子供なんだ。 | In (her) joy at having found us, completely naked just as (she) is into the sun’s light (she) jumps, (she) is a child enough that (she) stretches up on tiptoes to (her) full height. | | |

The following features (including those collated during research but not treated in this thesis) appear in this scene (bracketed figures are the number of instances):

Paradigmatic:

- Abbreviated Form (1); Ambiguity (lexical) (3); Different Lexical Identity: Connotation (2), Part of Speech/Lexicalisation (3); No Plural Marker (2); Passive Voice (1); Sound-symbolic Language: Mimetic (3), Utterance (1); Verb Morphology Difference: Verb Form (10), Verb Tense (8).

Syntagmatic:

- Ambiguity (structural) (1); Anaphora (2); *-hodo* clause extent marker (1); Multi-clause Sentence: Paratactic (5); Nested Clauses with *to* Quotative (2); *No* Explanatory, Emphatic Particle (2); Premodifier: Adverbial (17), Prenominal (14); Punctuation: Dash, Emphatic (1); Repetition: Other (5), Subject-noun, Epithet (1); *-to* Conditional (1).

Appendices Table 2 (a) directly correlates the ST Linguistic-Paradigmatic Features with TT transformations. (The other feature tables **2(b)-(d)** list all other ST-feature instances, including the cultural features (unaddressed in this thesis), but not the TT transformations.)

Table 9: Summary interpretation of ST→TT transformations in the bathing scene

| Paradigm | Syntagm |
|--|---|
| §209 | |
| Both Seidensticker and Holman add the interjection “Look.” at the beginning as its own sentence, apparently considering it too abrupt a transition from the previous section without it. Seidensticker also adds “river”. Seidensticker translates 来ています <i>kite imasu</i> ‘has/have come’ as “have come <u>for</u> a bath”, adding the reason; Holman does not translate the verb ‘come’. Both translate あいつら <i>aitsura</i> (the familiar, even slightly contemptuous ‘that lot’) as “they”. | Both Seidensticker and Holman make a sentence break after “Look.”, creating two sentences. Seidensticker puts the nominal modifier 向うの <i>mukō no</i> ‘the other side of’ at the end of the sentence, while Holman keeps it near the beginning. |
| §210 | |
| Seidensticker attempts to capture ——ほれ <i>hore</i> (‘—Hey’ or ‘—Look’) not directly, but rather by shifting the impact to the emphatic and idiomatic “Damned if they haven’t”. Holman does not translate this interjection. Likewise Seidensticker tries to capture the colloquial, emphatic, marked male verb construction 笑っていやがる <i>waratte iyagaru</i> ‘are laughing’ with “Look at them laugh.” (note, not ‘laughing’); Holman does not. Holman’s diction is flattened here as a consequence: “I think they’ve noticed us.” | Both split the ST sentence into two. |
| §211-212 | |
| Neither translator preserves the passive 彼に指ざされて、私は <i>kare ni yubizasurete</i> ‘pointed by his finger, I ...’. Both change it to the active “He pointed”, which alters the focus from narrator to the man. Further, Holman converts 七八人の裸体がぼんやり浮んでいた <i>shichi hachi nin no ratai ga bonyari ukande ita</i> ‘seven or eight people’s naked bodies were hazily floating’ to “I could distinguish seven or eight bodies”. Again this rendering alters the focus, but now from the observed to the observer. Seidensticker retains the focus with “showed”, but winds up with a characterless paraphrase of ‘floating’. Both translators omit the mimetic <i>bonyari</i> ‘hazily’. | Seidensticker combines the two ST sentences; Holman keeps them separate. There is more suspense if they are separated. Both translations relocate 湯気の中に <i>yuge no naka ni</i> “through the steam” to the end of the sentence. |
| §213 | |
| Seidensticker performs three transformations on the short phrase 裸の女 <i>hadaka no onna</i> ‘naked woman’. He generalises 女 <i>onna</i> as “figure”, adds “small”, and omits “naked”; Holman retains it as “naked woman”. The problem is that “woman” implies someone older. Seidensticker evokes meaning in her arm movement “arms raised <u>as though for</u> a plunge into the river”, while Holman just reports the action: “She was shouting with her arms outstretched.” | Again, SL syntax prefers to place adverbial phrases (仄暗い湯殿の奥から <i>honogurai yudono no oku kara</i>) at the beginning of the sentence, while the TL prefers a later position. However, Holman inserts “[s]uddenly” at the beginning, presumably a reflection of 走り出して <i>hashiridashite</i> ‘began running’. Seidensticker omits 脱衣場 <i>datsuijō</i> ‘changing area’ and paraphrases 湯殿 <i>yudono</i> ‘bathhouse’ as “platform”, while Holman retains both. On the other hand, Seidensticker retains the one sentence, |

| | |
|---|---|
| | while Holman breaks it into three, disrupting the fluidity and rapidity of the action. |
| §214-215 | |
| Both generalize 手拭 <i>tenugui</i> ‘hand-towel’ to “towel”. | Holman delays the revelation of the naked figure’s identity until the last, like the ST, and heightens this by keeping the information in its own sentence (though note not with §217 below). Seidensticker, however, combines two sentences and reveals the identity in the first clause. |
| §216 | |
| Seidensticker converts 眺めて <i>nagamete</i> ‘gazing/gazed and’ to “looked”; Holman retains the sense in “gazed”. Only Holman retains 若桐のように <i>wakagiri no yō ni</i> “like a young paulownia tree”. Both expand on and conceptually convert 心に清水を感じ <i>kokoro ni seisui o kanji</i> ‘I felt pure water in my heart’: S “suddenly a draught of fresh water seemed to wash over my heart” (possibly “suddenly” is compensation for the later <i>hōtto</i>); H “I felt pure water flowing through my heart.” Seidensticker omits the entire phrase ほうっと深い息を吐いてから <i>hōtto fukai iki o haite kara</i> ‘after taking a deep breath “ <i>hōtto</i> ” ’; Holman only omits the mimetic <i>hōtto</i> and the modifier ‘deep’: “I breathed a sigh of relief”. | Both Seidensticker and Holman split the ST, Seidensticker into two sentences, Holman into three. |
| §217-218 | |
| Holman retains the non-past tense; Seidensticker uses the past. Holman expresses the narrator’s thoughts; Seidensticker is continuing narrative description. Seidensticker translates 私達 <i>watashitachi</i> ‘us’ as “a friend”; Holman as “me”. Both change the focus. Seidensticker adds “mere” to “child”. Both translate 程に <i>hodo ni</i> ‘enough that/to the extent that’ as potential “could”/“can” (very concise). Seidensticker omits 背一ぱいに <i>se-ipai ni</i> ‘to her full height’; Holman paraphrases with the adverb “(stand) tall”. | Both combine the two ST sentences into one. Seidensticker relates 爪先で <i>tsumasaki de</i> “on (her) tiptoes” to 私達を見つけた喜び <i>watashitachi o mitsuketa yorokobi</i> “her delight at seeing a friend”, whereas Holman more correctly relates <i>watashitachi o mitsuketa yorokobi</i> “overcome with joy at finding me” to 日の光りの中に飛出し <i>hi no hikari no naka ni tobidashi</i> “run out naked in broad daylight”. However, it sounds more awkward and unemphatic to put “and stand tall on her tiptoes” at the end. Both translators rearrange the order of the five adverbial phrases (Seidensticker omitting one). |

The list of features above Table 9 makes it clear that the translators must contend with many challenges in a short space of text, and it is thus no surprise that they perform multiple transformations, and, as the two-column division shows, to a more or less commensurate degree on the paradigmatic and syntagmatic axes. But what is equally apparent in comparing the translators’ acts of rendering is how many transformations

seem elective rather than obligatory (the latter, for example, being where the lack of an explicit grammatical subject in §217 means they must insert the subject ‘she’).

Seidensticker obviously changes more than Holman, but neither is extremely faithful to the wording of the original, as a comparison with the direct translation reveals. Of course, a direct translation is unacceptable in literary terms because, as we observed in Chapter One, its form (but *not* grammar) is inadequate, sometimes even obscuring the basic meaning of a sentence with its clumsiness. It is no wonder that the translators take liberties with form, but are all of the transformations necessary to achieve their habitual *skopos*?

As we would expect with someone who favours a TL-orientated approach to translation, Seidensticker **omits** many lexical elements and **modifies** many others. Syntagmatically he modifies constantly, changing the position of adverbial phrases and both splitting and combining sentences. Holman clearly makes a greater effort to **retain** expressive elements, particularly idioms, and also sticks more closely to original clause order and sentence breaks; but he tends to split longer sentences.

It is easy enough to find examples of each approach making the other look inadequate at particular points in the text. In §210, for example, Seidensticker’s “Damned if they haven’t seen us. Look at them laugh.” differs substantially from the form of the ST, and Holman’s “I think they’ve noticed us. They’re laughing.” is superficially closer, if omitting equivalents for ——ほれ *hore* and so on. Clearly, however, Seidensticker’s tone is much more redolent of the bluff, jocular original than Holman’s anodyne rendering. On the other hand, Holman retains the simile with the paulownia tree in §216, as it is part of Kawabata’s expressive lyricism here, and Seidensticker suddenly sounds trite without it: “the young legs, the sculpted white

body’. In this juxtaposition we can see the strengths and weaknesses of each approach.

But neither is entirely consistent in his approach. One might expect a pragmatic reason for this variability—where the overall approach detracts from conveying the essence, it would seem reasonable to adapt and use an alternative approach. However, what seems at least as plausible is that such inconsistencies reflect the unconscious nature of many translation decisions, or, relatedly, the translators’ failure to keep track of certain aspects of the ST. It is of course possible that the translators are using different criteria unaligned with the analytical approach of this thesis—but if so, I have detected no clear evidence of their existence. The risk with taking a case-by-case approach to translation issues as they arise is that the formal coherence of the ST may be attenuated more than necessary.

It is undeniable that the act of transformation, at least in the first instance, should be performed intuitively, with an author’s eye and ear open to the flow and rhythm—for the qualities that telegraph ‘literature’. But often in this passage the choices seem arbitrary, as if the translator has momentarily lost control, or somehow misplaced a semantic element in the course of transformation. For example, why does Holman shift the narrative focus in §212 when he chooses to change the subject of the clause 湯気の中に七八人の裸体がぼんやり浮んでいた *yuge no naka ni shichi hachi nin no ratai ga bonyari ukande ita* ‘Amid the steam seven or eight naked bodies were floating hazily’ to “I could distinguish seven or eight bodies through the steam”? This distorts the original with no apparent gain—dynamism without equivalence. On the other hand, Seidensticker is here uncharacteristically deferential to the form when he writes “seven or eight naked figures showed through the steam” rather than something with more impact. Indeed, both translators forego the opportunity to translate *bonyari ukande ita*

‘were floating hazily’ *at all*, even though it would be simple to polish the direct translation to ‘floated hazily amid the steam’ or even to perform a downshift: ‘floated hazy in the steam’.

I shall finish this textual analysis by returning to the issue of sentence length, broached at the end of Chapter Three. As noted, Seidensticker tends to amalgamate short sentences into a longer sentence, while Holman generally preserves short sentences; but on the other hand, he also often breaks longer sentences up, while Seidensticker more frequently retains them.

It is instructive to work through a more detailed comparison of the apportionment of sentence lengths in the translations of this scene (beginning at §211 so as to avoid the complications of the monologue in §209-210). Seidensticker combines the shorter sentences of §211 and 212 into one, while Holman retains two sentences of corresponding length. Seidensticker retains the longer sentence §213, but Holman splits it into three. Again Seidensticker combines §214 and 215 into one sentence, while Holman keeps them separate. Then both translators split the longer §216 into two, Seidensticker at the final clause (“I laughed happily.”) and Holman at the penultimate clause (“I breathed a sigh of relief and laughed out loud.”). Finally, Seidensticker combines the very short §217 子供なんだ。 ‘(She) was a child.’ with the longer §218 to make a single sentence, as does Holman, who, however, uses a dash to separate the short passage from the longer one.

In summary, Seidensticker reduces the original eight sentences to six, while Holman increases them to ten. Seidensticker preserves all longer sentences except §216, and Holman preserves all shorter sentences except §217. Conversely, Seidensticker combines all shorter sentences, while Holman splits all longer sentences (except §218).

The below table more clearly demonstrates the difference in sentence lengths and break points among the three texts:

Table 10: Comparison of Sentence Lengths and Break Points among the ST and English Translations

| ST | Seidensticker | Holman |
|--|---------------|--------|
| 211. 彼に指ざされて、私は川向の共同湯の方を見た。 | | |
| 212. 湯気の中に七八人の裸体がぼんやり浮んでいた。 | | |
| 213. 灰暗い湯殿の奥から、突然裸の女が走り出して来たかと思うと、脱衣場の突鼻に川岸へ飛下りそうな格好で立ち、両手を一ぱいに伸して何か叫んでいる。 | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 214. 手拭もない真裸だ。 | | |
| 215. それが踊子だった。 | | |
| 216. 若桐のように足のよく伸びた白い裸身を眺めて、私は心に清水を感じ、ほうっと深い息を吐いてから、ことこと笑った。 | | |
| | | |
| 217. 子供なんだ。 | | |
| 218. 私達を見つけた喜びで真裸のまま日の光りの中に飛出し、爪先きで背一ぱいに伸上る程に子供なんだ。 | | |

Using these data we can thus readily address the issue of whether or not the ST sentences are in fact ‘too’ short or long to render in a sentence of a similar length in English: where one translator splits a longer sentence, the other preserves it; and where one combines two shorter sentences, the other leaves them as they are. This is strong evidence that in many cases translators may be choosing to alter sentence length based on aesthetic preferences or contextual assessments rather than because of some perceived normative difference in acceptable sentence length between the languages. The only sentences where the translators’ transformations coincide are §217 and 218, and these are thus perhaps the most interesting. The fact that both translators decide to combine the sentences suggests something inherently problematic about leaving §217

intact in the TL.

Probably the key issue is repetition of the phrase 子供なんだ *kodomo nan da*, which appears as the entirety of §217 and again at the very end of §218. In the ST, Japanese syntax separates the phrases (since in §218 it appears at the end of a longer sentence), whereas English syntax naturally places them together: ‘She was a child, you see. She was a child, you see, who [...].’ Neither translator has a problem with the repetition per se (Seidensticker even adding an extra “child” for good measure). Perhaps they feel that its emphatic quality adds to the lyricism of the narrator’s panegyric. However, they do not give the first ‘she was a child’ its own sentence: perhaps this would seem too strong a caesura after so short a statement. Compelling stylistic conventions thus encourage the translators to combine the two sentences.

Thesis Conclusion: ‘Shall We Dance?’ The Future of Japanese-to-English Literary Translation

Let us for a moment revisit the scenario I presented near the beginning of this thesis (1.1), but with the perspective reversed: that is, starting with an English literary work and considering prospective Japanese equivalents. The below sentence will sound familiar:

If one is a single man with a good fortune, the fact that one must want a wife is, wherever one goes in the world, an accepted truth.

Of course, Jane Austen’s original is:

It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife.

Now let us juxtapose these sentences. What is the difference?

It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife.

If one is a single man with a good fortune, the fact that one must want a wife is, wherever one goes in the world, an accepted truth.

The answer is that despite the paraphrasing (“an accepted truth” for “a truth universally acknowledged”, etc.) and different rhythmic patterning, there is little *semantic* difference, but there is a substantial *pragmatic* difference: the illocutionary force (applying Austin’s term (1975: 98ff.) to Austen), or implied meaning, is different. This

stems from a crucial difference in syntax. Austen purposely chose to begin the opening sentence of *Pride and Prejudice* with the self-confident statement “It is a truth universally acknowledged” to prime the pump for an irony that only engages when we read the rest of the sentence and find out what the so-called ‘truth’ is. If we reverse the clauses, the bathos and slyness are lost. The original inveigles us into accepting the ‘truth’ by dint of the seemingly unassailable weight of the collapsed passive relative “It is a truth [that is] universally acknowledged” at the beginning.

The above paraphrase of Austen’s immortal sentence is in fact my back-translation of a Japanese rendering of the original:

相当の財産をもっている独身の男なら、きっと奥さんをほしがっているにちがいないということは、世界のどこへ行っても通る真理である。

(Translation: 富田 Tomita (Austen 1994: 1))

If one is a single man with a good fortune, the fact that one must want a wife is, wherever one goes in the world, an accepted truth.

(Back-translation: Donovan)

One may quibble with the lexical choices in my back-translation, but the fact is that the translator has arranged the Japanese clauses in much the inverse order of the original English, presumably because writing them in the order of the original English sounds awkward. In other words, here is an example where stylistic preferences in the target language affect pragmatic force in the source text.²³⁹

²³⁹ Tomita’s version is representative of the other widely available professional Japanese translations of *Pride and Prejudice*. Obi Fusa (2011), Abe Tomoji (2006), Nakano Kōji (2003) and Nakano Yoshio (1997) make similar inversions in the opening sentence—and Nakano Kōji in fact splits the sentence into two. Yabuki Tarō of Aoyama Gakuin University offers a handy, if largely unannotated, comparison (in Japanese) of the opening passages of all of these versions save Obi’s on a webpage entitled ‘Pride and Prejudice、翻訳読み比べ（その1）’, which can be found at <http://blog.unfindable.net/archives/663>.

What happens when one tries to render the Japanese as close as possible to the original English clausal syntax (and, incidentally, lexis)? First it must be acknowledged that it is in fact impossible to retain *both* the original clause order *and* the original nested-clause structure. This is because in English the main clause must occur before the nested clauses, while in Japanese it must occur after. The only way we can appear to do both is with a structural sleight of hand: we convert the nested, hierarchical structure based around “that” to the simple linking device of the clausal conjunctive が *ga* ‘but/and’:

ST: It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife.

Donovan: 普遍的に認められる事実だが、相当の財産を持っている独身の男は妻をほしがっているはずだ。

Dir. ‘It is a universally recognised truth, but a single man who possesses a considerable fortune must be wanting a wife.’

This is probably ungainly Japanese, but one might prefer this version to Tomita’s because although he has preserved the nested clausal structure of the original, in doing so he has eviscerated the illocutionary force set up by the carefully arranged syntax, and turned it into a statement with a much more earnest tenor than the original, which belies the tone of the rest of the book.

As I mentioned in the introduction to the thesis, we see a similar phenomenon in the first sentence of *Izu no odoriko*. Let us revisit this discussion. Here is Edward Seidensticker’s (second) rendering of the ST:

With alarming speed, a shower swept toward me from the foot of the mountain, touching the cedar forests white as the road began to wind up into the pass.

Compare this with the original:

道がつづら折りになって、いよいよ天城峠に近づいたと思う頃、雨脚が杉の密林を白く染めながら、すさまじい早さで麓から私を追って来た。

Dir. 'The time the road became winding like a kudzu, and I thought finally I approached Amagi Pass, a shower, while dyeing the dense cedar forest white, with terrible speed came and pursued me from the foot of the mountain.'

Notice where each version begins and ends. The original starts with the winding road and ends with the shower pursuing the narrator. Seidensticker's translation starts with the pursuing shower and ends with the winding road, with the narrator/observer sandwiched in the middle.

Here, too, the nature of English and the nature of Japanese interfere with the author's sentence structure. There is little doubt that Seidensticker's version reads better than the direct translation: in effect, then, target-language style is privileged over source-language structure.

On the other hand, Holman's translation preserves much of the ST syntax, perhaps at the expense of TL readability:

About the time the road began to wind and I realized that I was finally near Amagi Pass, a curtain of rain swept up after me at a terrific speed from the foot of the mountain, painting the dense cedar forests white.

His sentence 'winds' up in the white-tinged cedar forests, just as Kawabata's does (although again the narrator is marooned in the middle of the sentence, while in the original the narrator object (私を *watashi o*) fetches up just before the sentence-terminal

verb). Does this mean it is truer to the original, or is formal equivalence an insufficient measure of translatorial fidelity or, indeed, efficacy?

While in practice syntax and lexis cannot be extricated from each other in a literary sentence (which is part of the fraughtness of a debate about ‘style’), it has perhaps been enlightening to temporarily consider them separately as I did in Chapters Two and Three. As mentioned in Chapter One, I prefer to talk of content and form rather than content and style, because, frankly speaking, the latter is simply too context-bound to survive the translation process largely intact. But by presenting example sentences that go both from English to Japanese and from Japanese to English, and are distinct in a number of ways, I am suggesting that form, as it is manifested in syntax, is as important a semantic consideration as lexis, yet it is very often neglected in favour of the former.

Let us step back for a moment here and consider the big picture. Humans are, by nature, isolated beings. We cannot read each other’s thoughts—fortunately enough, perhaps—and instead rely on verbal and non-verbal communication to convey them. But behind that communication lies a vast network that is the sum of human thought and feeling. We cannot communicate without the systematisation and conventionalisation of points in common among us. A language is perhaps the ultimate manifestation of our commonalities, because we can use it to communicate with someone completely separate from our physical reality. The irony is that language, which can exist only because of phonological, graphological, semantic and syntactic demarcations, divides as much as it unites, both within same-language and among different-language communities. To paraphrase Saussure, language is difference (1916/1974: 121), and this applies equally at the stages of production and comprehension.

On the face of it, Japanese and English have very little in common, and the many examples throughout Chapters Two to Four purposely emphasise these differences. The languages' phonetic systems are often incompatible; their word order is often the inverse of each other's; and they draw upon vastly different cultural backgrounds to inform their terms of reference. Yet, like two exchange students at a dance party, they have eyed each other awkwardly across the gulf separating them, and, sensing some affinity, have made attempts to cross it (with the help of translator go-betweens). A translation can be regarded as the bicultural child of such a potential union, and while some may be struck by its beauty, others may find something to mock in its hybridity, its otherworldly status as neither the original work nor a mere clone of it.

Continuing with the theme of parents and children a little longer, one notes that the narrator of Kawabata Yasunari's novella *Izu no odoriko* is an orphan, just as Kawabata himself was. He worries at a certain point in the story that his nature determines him:

496. 二十歳の私は自分の性質が孤児根性で歪んでいると厳しい反省を重ね、その息苦しい憂鬱に堪え切れないで伊豆の旅に出て来ているのだった。

S: I had come at nineteen to think myself a misfit, an orphan by nature, and it was depression that had set me forth on this Izu journey.

H: Twenty years old, I had embarked on this trip to Izu heavy with resentment that my personality had been permanently warped by my orphan's complex and that I would never be able to overcome a stifling melancholy.

Is it taking things too far to suggest that we can view language differences in a similar fatalistic way: that translation, as the novelist and critic David Lodge says, is impossible²⁴⁰ because languages by their very "nature" are never compatible; they are

²⁴⁰ Lodge (1966). Leech and Short summarise his "monist" (vs. "dualist") position: "(i) It is impossible to paraphrase literary writing; (ii) It is impossible to translate a literary work; (iii) It is impossible to divorce the general appreciation of a literary work from the appreciation of its style." (1981: 25.)

just too “complex”? Are languages isolated from each other by dint of their cultural and linguistic differences, what we could view as their parental backgrounds?

I have approached such questions by analyzing the linguistic issues that arise in *Izuno odoriko*, attempting to scan the ‘interference pattern’ that results when translators take the original Japanese work and try to render it in English. Defining what issues exist, and their boundaries, is an inherently subjective task, but I have tried to offset this subjectivity by being as systematic in my analysis as possible. I have used the moment of translation as my starting point—the moment when a translator selects certain words over others and chooses a certain order for them over other possible orders—partly because this mimics the act of original writing; but my ending point, the close reading of a short piece of Japanese text and two English translations, is almost as analytical as an equation (as **Appendices Table 3** demonstrates).

With Chapter Four’s taxonomy of translation acts I have tentatively completed the equation of correspondence $SL(st) \approx TL(tt)$ that is the relationship between SL and TL, where the ‘st’ and ‘tt’ are ‘variables’ in the equation, actual exemplars that give character, scope and dynamism to that relationship. If there are potentially problematic features on the SL side, then there are potential solutions on the TL side, and these are manifested in the ST and TT respectively (with any number of other *potential* issues and solutions existing in the background, waiting to be realised, just as any number of texts wait to be realised).

Two issues came to the fore in Chapter Four: is there such a thing as being ‘too’ faithful to a ST, at too great a cost to the TT; and conversely, can one draw the line at taking certain liberties with the ST? Is it a universal truth, acknowledged or otherwise, that a single word in possession of a good range of meanings must be ‘in want of’—in

other words, inviting—a wide range of interpretations, or is there indeed an invariant core of meaning (Bassnett 2002: 33) that precludes certain renderings (‘wants’ other meanings in the sense of ‘lacks’ other meanings)²⁴¹ when the word is in a particular context?²⁴² To cast it in translation-studies terms, is a source text so intertextual that its meaning is contingent, underdetermined, as Venuti argues (1995: 18), so that it is not so easy to talk of a ‘wrong’ translation; or is it semantically essentialised, overdetermined, as Popovič considered, with a delimitable boundary on acceptable meanings, no matter how much time passes, how many other texts it references, or how literary fashions evolve?

Inevitably all translators have their own ‘pride and prejudices’. They provide their TL take on a given ST, playing a pivotal role as ‘prime reader’ for the monolingual masses in the target culture who must rely on their judgement. They have innumerable linguistic and literary predilections, both conscious and unconscious, which not only help to cohere their literary (re)writing but simultaneously act to fragment it; which not only work to communicate a foreign text, but simultaneously move to obfuscate it. As has become an ongoing refrain in Chapters Two and Three, temporarily expedient translating tactics may work against overall translation strategies just as easily as they may help to bolster them.

I have been interested in shining light on some of the translation decisions for *Izu no odoriko*, because between the extreme poles of grammatical necessity and personal idiosyncrasy there is a normative middle-ground within which translators make

²⁴¹ Incidentally, the latter sense (preserved today in the hackneyed “found wanting” and “to want for nothing”) is entirely lost in the Japanese translations above; but at the same time the modern native English reader is unlikely to think of it anyway.

²⁴² The matrimonial associations of Austen’s quotation lend a new dimension to the issue of translatorial ‘fidelity’.

decisions, one that may benefit from being challenged in this way. As Hermans writes:

If there is a whole swathe of decisions which translators make and which are neither fully predetermined nor totally idiosyncratic, what is it that leads translators to opt for certain choices rather than others, and to do this not just once or twice but regularly? [...] The answer which Anton Popovič gave [...] was that translation involves a confrontation of two sets of linguistic and discursive norms and conventions, those which reside in the source text and those which prevail in the target culture [...]. In other words, when non-compulsory choices are concerned, translators will decide in favour of one option rather than another because they are aware of, and respond to, certain demands which they derive from their reading of the source text, and certain preferences and expectations which they know exist in the audience they are addressing. Because such decisions are made regularly across a range of texts, patterns will establish themselves which in turn will affect the expectations readers bring to translated texts. In this way norms become fixed. (1999: 74)

Translators' decisions affect their audience's expectations, and these expectations in turn affect subsequent translation decisions. Part of the translator's job, then, is to provide the foundation for future translations; and work such as this thesis adds to the conversation about what future JE translation may be like.

Linguistic difference, it can be argued, acts not only between languages and cultures, and among different genres and registers of the same language, but within the mind of the translator itself: translating is an act of *construal*—simultaneous construction and comprehension—and the resultant translation is the manifestation of this construal of difference, the interference pattern that appears when the translator selects a certain ST and holds it up against the grid of the TL. Naturally literary translators aim for some sort of correspondence, if not perhaps Nida's bald equivalence, between ST and TT. If they are TL-orientated, the interference pattern will be minimised, and the text will appear to be, in Venuti's words, "transparent" (1995: *passim*), reading much as if it were

the original, with ST diction that could be considered infelicitous in the TT having been expunged. On the other hand, if they are SL-orientated, the interference pattern will be emphasised—producing, in Venuti’s words, a “resistant” translation—with certain ST artefacts apparent in ‘awkward’ prose, obscure references, and so on. In Venuti’s eyes such artefacts are a laudable reminder of the “otherness”, the unbridgeable difference between languages which nevertheless does not preclude the attempt at translating among them (1995: 306).

My goal in this thesis has not been to advocate for one approach or the other, but rather to point out the characteristics of these two representative approaches as well as their potential implications, strengths and pitfalls, as they are manifested in the TTs: for, indeed, any translation contains elements of both approaches. It is my hope that such observations, some of which have probably been systematised for the first time, can encourage translators to be more aware of the kinds of decisions they are making, consciously and unconsciously, throughout the Japanese-English literary translation process. Long may the ‘dance’ continue—and let us keep refining our footwork.

Bibliography

- Araki, J. T. (1976). 'Japanese Literature: The Practice of Transfer'. *Monumenta Nipponica*, vol. 31 no. 1, Spring 1976: 77-85.
- Austen, J. (1994). 『高慢と偏見』 (上) *Kōman to henken (jō)* 'Pride and Prejudice (Part One)', trans. A. Tomita. Tokyo: Iwanami Bunko.
- (1997). 『自負と偏見』 *Jibu to henken* 'Pride and Prejudice', trans. Y. Nakano. Tokyo: Shinchōsha.
- (2003). *Pride and Prejudice*. London: Penguin Classics.
- (2003). 『高慢と偏見』 (上) *Kōman to henken (jō)* 'Pride and Prejudice (Part One)', trans. K. Nakano. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.
- (2006). 『高慢と偏見』 *Kōman to henken* 'Pride and Prejudice', trans. T. Abe. Tokyo: Kawade Shobōshinsha.
- (2011). 『高慢と偏見』 (上) *Kōman to henken (jō)* 'Pride and Prejudice (Part One)', trans. F. Obi. Tokyo: Kōbunsha.
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to Do Things with Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Backhouse, A. E. (1993). *The Japanese Language: An Introduction*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge.
- (1996). 'Corpus-based Translation Studies: The Challenges That Lie Ahead' in *Terminology, LSP and Translation: Studies in Language Engineering in Honour of Juan C. Sager*, H. Somers (ed.), 175-186. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- and Saldanha, G. (2008). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. (2nd ed.) London: Routledge.

- Bassnett, S. and Lefevere, A. (1998). *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Bassnett, S. (2002). *Translation Studies*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Biguenet, J. and Schulte, R. (eds.) (1989). *The Craft of Translation*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Donovan, R. (2000). 'Issues in the Literary Translation of Japanese Mimetic Expressions into English.' *Ritsumeikan Studies in Language and Culture*, vol. 12 no. 1: 179-193.
- (2001). 'Fuzzy Logic: A Case Study of Two English Translations of Japanese Mimetics in Kenji Miyazawa's *Ginga tetsudō no yoru*.' *Ritsumeikan Studies in Language and Culture*, vol. 12 no. 4: 173-186.
- Fowler, E. (1992). 'Rendering Words, Traversing Cultures: On the Art and Politics of Translating Modern Japanese Fiction.' *Journal of Japanese Studies*, vol. 18 no. 1, Winter 1992: 1-44.
- Fowler, H. W. and F. G. (1922). *The King's English*. (2nd ed.) Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic Criticism*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Frank, A. P., Kittel, H. and Greiner, N. (2004). *Übersetzung: ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung 'Translation: An International Handbook on Translation Research'*. Part 1, Volume 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hatim, B. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Translation*. New York: Pearson Longman.

- Hendry, J. (1998). *Interpreting Japanese Society: Anthropological Approaches*. (2nd ed.) London: Routledge.
- Hermans, T. (1999). *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Hinds, J. (1987). 'Reader versus Writer Responsibility: A New Typology' in U. Conner and R. B. Kaplan (Eds.) *Writing Across Languages: Analysis of L2 Text*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley: 141-152.
- Hobbes, J. (2004). 'Bridging the Cultural Divide: Lexical Barriers and Translation Strategies in English Translations of Modern Japanese Literature.' *Translation Journal*, vol. 8 no. 2, April 2004. Online, accessed on 2 August 2011 at <http://translationjournal.net/journal//28litera.htm>.
- Holcroft, D. (1991). *Saussure: Signs, System, and Arbitrariness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hwang, S. (1990). *Shadows of a Sound*. ed. Holman, J. M. (also some translation). San Francisco: Mercury House.
- Ii, H. (ed.) (2004). 『日本文学 翻訳の可能性』 *Nihon bungaku: honyaku no kanōsei* 'Japanese Literature: The Possibilities of Translation'. International Japanese Literature Report 2. Tokyo: Kazama Shobō.
- Ikegami, Y. (2000). 『「日本語論」への招待』 'Nihongo-ron' e no shōtai 'An Introduction to Japanese-language Theory'. Tokyo: Kodansha Philisophica Press.
- Johnson, F. A. (1995). *Dependency and Japanese Socialization: Psychoanalytic and Anthropological Investigations of Amae*. New York: New York University Press.
- Joyce, J. (2000). *Dubliners*. London: Penguin Classics.
- Kawabata, Y. (1954). 『伊豆の踊子』 *Izu no odoriko*. Trans. E. Seidensticker (as *The Izu Dancer*). *Atlantic Monthly*, vol. 195, December 1954.

- (1974). 『伊豆の踊子』 *Izu no odoriko*. In *The Izu Dancer and Other Stories*. Trans. E. Seidensticker (as *The Izu Dancer*). Tokyo: Tuttle.
- (1985). 『伊豆の踊子』 *Izu no odoriko*. In 『伊豆の踊子・浅草紅団』 *Izu no odoriko: Asakusa kurenaidan*. Tokyo: Horupu Shuppan.
- (1996). 『千羽鶴』 *Senbazuru*. Trans. E. Seidensticker (as *Thousand Cranes*). London: Vintage Books.
- (1996). 『雪国』 *Yukiguni*. Trans. E. Seidensticker (as *Snow Country*). London: Vintage Books.
- (1997). 『伊豆の踊子』 *Izu no odoriko*. In *The Oxford Book of Japanese Short Stories* (ed. Goossen, T. W.). Trans. E. Seidensticker (as *The Izu Dancer*). London: Oxford University Press.
- (1998). 『伊豆の踊子』 *Izu no odoriko*. In *The Dancing Girl of Izu and Other Stories*. Trans. J. M. Holman (as *The Dancing Girl of Izu*). Washington: Counterpoint.
- (2004). 『眠れる美女』 ‘*Nemureru bijo*’. Trans. E. G. Seidensticker (as ‘House of the Sleeping Beauties’). In *House of the Sleeping Beauties and Other Stories*. Tokyo: Kodansha.
- (2006a). 『掌の小説』 ‘*Tanagokoro no shōsetsu*’. Trans. L. Dunlop and J. M. Holman (as *Palm-of-the-Hand Stories*). New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- (2006b). 『雪国』 *Yukiguni* ‘*Snow Country*’. (New ed.) Tokyo: Shinchōsha.

Kawamoto, K. and Inoue, K. (Eds.) (1997). 『翻訳の方法』 *Honyaku no hōhō* ‘*Methods of Translation*’. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.

Kenkyūsha's New Japanese-English Dictionary 『新研究社和英辞典』, 5th edition, electronic version (2005). Tokyo: Kenkyūsha.

- Kumakura, C. 'History and Narrative in Japanese.' *Surfaces*, vol. V 206 (v.1.0A), 20 November 1995). Online, accessed on 14 May 2011 at <http://www.pum.umontreal.ca/revues/surfaces/vol5/kumakura.html>.
- Kurisu, K. (2005). 'Gradient Prosody in Japanese.' *Journal of East Asian Linguistics*, vol. 14 no. 3, July 2005: 175-226.
- Kussmaul, P. (1995). *Training the Translator*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Landers, C. E. (2001). *Literary Translation: A Practical Guide*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Laviosa, S. (2002). *Corpus-based Translation Studies: Theories, Findings, Applications*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Leech, G. N. and Short, M. H. (1981). *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. London and New York: Longman.
- Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Levý, J. (1966). 'Translation as a Decision Process'. In *To Honor Roman Jakobson*, vol. 2: 1171-1182. The Hague and Paris: Mouton..
- Lidov, D. (1999). *Elements of Semiotics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lodge, D. (1966). *The Language of Fiction: Essays in Criticism and Verbal Analysis of the English Novel*. London: Routledge.
- Lux, E. V. (1993). 'Metaphor and its Translation.' In *Translation—The Vital Link*, XIII FIT World Congress proceedings. London: Chameleon Press.
- Malone (1988). *The Science of Linguistics in the Art of Translation*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Martin, S. E. (1975). *A Reference Grammar of Japanese*. New Haven and London: Yale

University Press.

Miller, R. A. (1986). *Nihongo: In Defence of Japanese*. London: Athlone Press.

Miyazawa, K. (1987). 『銀河鉄道の夜』 *Ginga tetsudō no yoru*. In *Night Train to the Stars and Other Stories*. Trans. A. Bester (as *Night Train to the Stars*). Tokyo: Kodansha.

Munday, J. (ed.) (2009). *Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

Murakami, H and Shibata, M. (2000). 『翻訳夜話』 *Honyaku yawa* 'Translation Night Talks'. Tokyo: Bungeishunjū.

— (2003). 『翻訳夜話 2 サリンジャー戦記』 *Honyaku yawa 2: Sarinjā Senki* 'Translation Night Talks: Salinger War Records'. Tokyo: Bungeishunjū.

Murasaki Shikibu (1960). 『源氏物語』 *Genji monogatari*. Trans. A. Waley as *The Tale of Genji: A Novel in Six Parts*. New York: Modern Library.

— (1976). 『源氏物語』 *Genji monogatari*. Trans. A. Seidensticker as *The Tale of Genji*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Nakajima, F. (1987). 『日本語の構造』 *Nihongo no kōzō* 'The Structure of Japanese'. Tokyo: Iwanami Shinsho.

Newmark, P. (1985). 'The Translation of Metaphor.' In W. Paprotté and R. Dirven (Eds.) *The Ubiquity of Metaphor: Metaphor in Language and Thought*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

— (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall International.

— (1991). *About Translation*. Multilingual Matters series, no. 74. Clevedon: Cromwell Press.

Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill.

- (2001). *Contexts in Translating*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Niwa, F. (1965). 『嫌がらせの年齢』 *Iyagarase no nenrei*. Trans. E. Seidensticker et al. as *The Hateful Age*. Tokyo: Hara-Shobō.
- Orwell, G. (1970). *A Collection of Essays*. London: Mariner Books.
- Oxford Dictionary of English*, 2nd edition (2009). C. Soanes and A. Stevenson (Eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pierce, C. S. and Hoopes, J. (1991). *Pierce on Signs: Writings on Semiotic*. North Carolina: UNC Press Books.
- Plag, I. (2007). *Introduction to English Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Walter de Gruyter.
- Plotnik, R. and Kouyoumdjian, H. (2010). *Introduction to Psychology*. Florence, Kentucky: Cengage Learning.
- Refsing, K. and Lundquist, L. (2009). *Translating Japanese Texts*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.
- Richie, D. (2000a) (Ed.). *Words, Ideas, and Ambiguities: Four Perspectives on Translating from the Japanese*. Chicago: Imprint Publications.
- (2000b). ‘No CIA Tryst with Izu Dancer’ (letter to the editor). In *The Japan Times*, 15 October 2000.
- Round, N. (2005). ‘Translation and its Metaphors: the (N+1) Wise Men and the Elephant.’ *SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation*, 1: 1, 47-69.
- Rubin, J. (2002). *Making Sense of Japanese: What the Textbooks Don't Tell You*. Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- (2005). *Haruki Murakami and the Music of Words*. London: Random House UK.

- Ryan, G. R. (1980). 'Translating Modern Japanese Literature.' *Journal of Japanese Studies*, vol. 6 no. 1, Winter 1980: 49-60.
- Saussure, F. de. (1916/1974). *Course in General Linguistics*. C. Bally and A. Sechehaye, (Eds.); W. Baskin, (Trans.). Glasgow: Collins Fontana.
- Schmid, W. (2010). *Narratology: An Introduction*. Amsterdam: Walter de Gruyter.
- Seidensticker, E. (1989). 'On Trying to Translate Japanese.' In J. Biguenet & R. Shulte (Eds.) *The Craft of Translation*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- (1990). *Kafu the Scribbler: The Life and Writings of Nagai Kafu, 1879-1959*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- (2002). *Tokyo Central: A Memoir*. Washington: University of Washington Press.
- Senft, G., Östman, J. and Verschueren, J. (2009). *Culture and Language Use*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Shibatani, M. (1990). *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shore, S. (2001). 'Teaching Translation.' In E. Steiner and C. Yallop (Eds.) *Exploring Translation and Multilingual Text Production: Beyond Content*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Starrs, R. (1998). *Soundings in Time—The Fictive Art of Kawabata Yasunari*. London: Routledge.
- Tanizaki, J. (1995). 『蓼食う虫』 *Tade kuu mushi*. Trans. E. Seidensticker. (as *Some Prefer Nettles*). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- (2009). 『細雪』 *Sasameyuki*. Trans. E. Seidensticker. (as *The Makioka Sisters*). London: Vintage Classics.
- Thomas, L. and Wareing, S. (1999). *Language, Society and Power: An Introduction*.

London: Routledge.

Tobias, S. (2006). 'Culture-specific Items in Japanese-English Literary Translation: Comparing Two Translations of Kawabata's "Izu no odoriko".' *Monash University Linguistics Papers*, vol. 5 no. 1: 91-97.

Toury (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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

Vermeer, H. J. (1994). 'Translation Today: Old and New Problems.', in M. Snell-Hornby, F. Pöchhacker et al (Eds.) *Translation Studies—An Interdiscipline*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wakabayashi, J. (1996). 'Translation Theory in Japan: Familiar Ideas or Fresh Insights?' In XIV World Congress of the Fédération Internationale des Traducteurs proceedings, 9-16 February 1996, Melbourne, vol 2: 899-904.

— (2009). 'Translational Japanese: A Transformative Strangeness Within.' *PORTAL Journal of Multidisciplinary International Studies*, vol. 6 no. 1, January 2009. Online edition, accessed on 10 August 2011 at <http://epress.lib.uts.edu.au/ojs/index.php/portal>.

Watson, S. H. (1991). 'Ideological Transformation by Translation: *Izu no odoriko*.' *Comparative Literature Studies*, 28, 3: 310-321.

Woodburn, A. G. (2000). *Translating Modern Japanese Prose: A Theoretical Approach*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of British Columbia.

Yamada, T. (2010). 『日本語のしくみ』 *Nihongo no shikumi* 'The Structure of Japanese'. Tokyo: Hakusuisha.

Yabuki, T. (n.d.). 'Pride and Prejudice、翻訳読み比べ（その１）.' Webpage accessed on March 1, 2012 at <http://blog.unfindable.net/archives/663>.