# **CHARACTERISATION IN TWO**

# TRANSLATIONS OF "I AM A CAT"

#### **Joel Nilsson**

Uppsats/Examensarbete:	15 hp
Program och/eller kurs:	JP1520
Nivå:	Grundnivå
Termin/år:	Vt /2018
Handledare:	Yasuko Nagano-Madsen
Examinator:	Martin Nordeborg
Rapport nr:	xx (ifylles ej av studenten/studenterna)

## **Abstract**

Uppsats/Examensarbete:	15 hp
Program och/eller kurs:	JP1520
Nivå:	Grundnivå
Termin/år:	Vt /2018
Handledare:	Yasuko Nagano-Madsen
Examinator:	Martin Nordeborg
Rapport nr:	xx (ifylles ej av studenten/studenterna
Nyckelord:	Translation Studies, role language, Japanese, shoseikotoba

Aim:	To examine if the characterization in different translations of Natsume Sôseki's		
	I Am a Cat correspond to the trends in translation studies at the time of		
	publication.		
Theory:	Yoko Hasegawa (2012) provides an overview of the history of the discipline of		
	Translation Studies. Satoshi Kinsui (2003) details the history of shoseikotoba,		
	and what defines it. Grestle (2000) details what defines Tokyo		
	Downtown/Shitamachi dialect.		
Method:	The dialogue between the protagonist and the character Kuro/Blacky has been		
	singled out across a Japanese version and two English translations and		
	compared through the focus of characterization.		
Result:	The characterization in the 1972 translation is much more visible than in the		
	1961 version, where it is almost non-existent. This does coincide with the trend		
	difference in translation theory, as the focus shifted toward being understood in		
	the target language.		

## Table of Contents

1. <u>Inti</u>	roduction	
1.1	Problematization, aim and research questions	
2. <u>Tra</u>	unslation Studies and Previous Research	
2.1	Translation Studies.	2
<u>2.2</u>	Previous Research	4
3. <u>Ro</u> l	le Languages	5
<u>3.1</u>	Shoseikotoba	6
<u>3.2</u>	Tokyo Downtown/Shitamachi Dialect	7
<u>4.</u> <u>Me</u>	<u>thod</u>	8
<u>4.1</u>	Material	8
<u>4.2</u>	Method	8
<u>5.</u> <u>An</u>	alysis and Discussion	13
<u>5.1</u>	The Language of the Unnamed Protagonist	13
<u>5.2</u>	The Language of Kuro/Blacky	16
<u>5.3</u>	The Two Translations	18
<u>6. Sur</u>	mmary	19
Referen	ce list	21

## 1. Introduction

In this thesis, I am going to examine the characterisation in two different English translations of the novel 吾輩は猫である (Wagahai wa Neko de aru) or I Am a Cat by the renowned Japanese novelist Natsume Sôseki. I Am a Cat is Sôseki's first novel written in 1905, and it is with full of Meiji period flavour. I will focus on two types of role language, or yakuwarigo, such as proposed by Kinsui (2003) and Gerstle (2000). One of them is shoseikotoba, which was unique to the Meiji period and is spoken by the unnamed cat serving as the story's protagonist, and the other is the Downtown Tokyo/Shitamachi dialect spoken by the cat 黒, translated as either Kuro or Blacky. I will explore the main differences in translating the two role languages. I will also discuss if the two translations reflect the trends in translation studies at the time of publication. The main method of this analysis will be qualitative.

## 1.1 Problematization, Aim and Research Questions

Upon researching this topic, I found that the number of works comparing different translations, especially from Japanese, were surprisingly few. I was hard pressed to find that many written in English. Not many works seem to have a second translation, unless they happen to be old, famous classics like the Tale of Genji. While the demand for new translations is indeed growing (Hasegawa 2012), I find that the number of works having received more than one translation is low, and the field of comparative studies of different translations needs further research.

The aim of the present study is to compare and analyse the two English translations of the Japanese novel 吾輩は猫である (Wagahai wa neko de aru), English title being I am a Cat, one written in 1961 by Shibata Katsue and Kai Motonari, and the other written in 1972 by Aiko Itou and Graeme Wilson. The analysis will be done with a focus on two types of role language, shoseikotoba, (student language) which was specifically used during the Meiji period, and the Downtown Tokyo/Shitamachi dialect. I am a Cat is written by the famous Japanese novelist Natsume Sôseki in 1905 during the Meiji period, and thus it is considerably older compared to the works cited in the Previous Studies section and is full of the imagery of the Meiji period.

The research questions will be as follows:

- Are there any discernible differences in the characterization of the two cats used in the two translations?
- Do these differences (if any) correspond to the trends seen in translation studies at the time in which the translations were written?

## 2. Translation Studies and Previous Research

#### 2.1 Translation Studies

As Yoko Hasegawa writes in her book *The Routledge Course in Japanese Translation* (2012, p192-225), translation studies as a discipline covering all professional and academic translation-related issues is fairly young. However, she writes, recorded discussions on translation go back to the work of Cicero around 46 BC, discussing the merits of sense-forsense or free translation over literal word-for-word translation, which was commonly used when translating the bible.

The focus of the translation discourse, she writes, was largely limited to this dichotomy until the middle of the twentieth century, a few notable exceptions being the works of English poet John Dryden (1631-1700) and German philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834). Dryden expanded on the dichotomy by dividing translation into three kinds rather than two, adding an ideal middle ground. Schleiermacher eschewed the word-for-word versus sense-for-sense dichotomy in favour of one based on either keeping the author's way of expression intact or adapting the text to the target reader, which he called alienation versus naturalization. This was later adapted and renamed by Venuti (1995) into foreignization and domestication respectively.

Following the 1940s and 50s, Hasegawa writes, the study of translation became more systematic and scientific, like many fields of study at the time. As it was a newly formed discipline, scholars incorporated already established theories into translation studies. In one instance of this, she writes, Nida (1964) used parts of Chomsky's then-prevailing *Classical Transformational Grammar* theory, which describes two levels of grammatical structure: the semantic "deep structure" and the transformational "surface structure", and claimed that texts

should first be broken down to the simple deep structure, translated, and rebuilt up to the surface structure.

Nida also, she writes, proposed the concept of another dichotomy of formal and dynamic (later re-dubbed functional) equivalence in 1964. Formal equivalence focuses strictly on that the text itself, sentence and meaning, is sufficiently translated, while dynamic equivalence places importance on the translation producing a sufficiently similar effect in the reader of the translation as the original does for a native speaker of the source language.

Following this, in the 1970s and 1980s translation studies underwent a shift from the linguistic, source-text based methods towards more functional, target language-focused approaches. Hasegawa brings up the example of the *skopos* theory (Reiss and Vermeer 1984), which puts focus on the purpose (skopos in Greek) of the translation in question rather than the nature of the source-text and is the first theory to give consideration to the effect of the initiator who commissioned the translation for a specific purpose.

Aside from the *skopos* theory, there was also a different approach proposed in the 1980s by Antione Berman (1942-1991) called the *Negative Analytic*. This view reasons that all translation is inherently deformative and lists different deforming tendencies in the system of translation. Some examples are *rationalisation*, changing syntax and omitting text to better fit the translator's standards, *clarification*, adding information that is only implicit in the source text, and *ennoblement*, a tendency to write more elegantly than the source text.

From the 1990s and onward, the focus of the translation discourse shifted even further from the text itself. The prevailing viewpoint, she writes, has been that language does not stand on its own, but is an important part of culture, and thus also part of a wider cultural and textual context. As such, translation is a communication between the original author and the reader, and thus one between cultures. Kern (2000: 1) posited that:

"Successful communication in another language requires shifting frames of reference, shifting norms, shifting assumptions of what can and cannot be said, what has to be explicit and what ought to remain tacit, and so on. In other words, it involves *thinking differently* about language and communication".

This gave rise to the notion of what Kramsch (2006) calls *symbolic competence*, wherein a translator on top of being competent in the language, cultural norms and conventions, and factual knowledge, they also need to be able to manipulate symbolic forms. These are both vocabulary items and communication strategies, but also "embodied experiences, emotional"

resonances, and moral imaginings" (Kramsch 2006). As such, meaning is considered to be created in the act of reading, through the experiences and identity of the individual, rather than being contained in the text. Thus, a text has been interpreted in the translator's reading, creating a new meaning presented for the readers of the translation, who in turn create their own meaning when reading.

### 2.2 Previous Research

Comparisons of two translations with Japanese as the source language seems to be fairly few. In his article, "Culture-specific items in Japanese-English literary translation: comparing two translations of Kawabata's 'Izu no Odoriko'", Shani Tobias (2006) compares translations of Kawabata's novel 伊豆の踊子 (Izu no Odoriko), or The Izu Dancer, focusing specifically on difficult-to-translate items specific to Japanese culture. The author compared two translations, one written by Seidensticker, published first in 1954 and the other written by Martin Holman and published in 1997. The author's conclusion was Seidensticker's translation is one of 'fluency' that enables readers to read Japanese specific cultural items to relate to the terms of English readers (domesticating). His sentence structure, syntax and style also depart greatly from that in the original Japanese text so as to be more 'readable' from an English language point of view. By contrast, Holman's translation takes a more foreignizing approach, exposes the cultural differences in more detail and by so doing caters to readers who are interested in Japanese society, and promotes cultural understanding.

For another novel by Kawabata, Gräwe (2011) wrote an article called "日本文学のドイツ語 訳について—『雪国』の 2 つの翻訳" (About the German translation of Japanese literature – two translations of "Snow country"), where she analyses two translations of Kawabata Yasunari's novel 雪国 (Yukiguni), or Snow Country, into German. She utilizes a system consisting of a diverse set of categories, which are as follows:

- Translation of terminology and names
- Translation of measuring units
- Translation of metaphors
- Translation of similes

- Translation of conversation
- Choice of dialect
- Mistakes in translation
- Translation choices

However, her work does not focus on the two translations of Japanese novel to German, rather she addresses a more general question 'what is a good translation?'

Another recent example is Theo Gillberg's (2017) MA thesis "Across the Pond and Beyond: A UK/US comparison of game localisation and literary translation from Japanese works", where he analyses the British and American translations of the Japanese video game ファミコンウォーズ DS 失われた光 (Famicom Wars DS Ushinawareta Hikari), with the translations being Advance Wars Days of Ruin (American translation) and Advance Wars Dark Conflict (British translation). He rejects the notion of "Anglo-American" translation as a homogenous discourse and posits that Great Britain and the United States have diverged far enough since the 1700's to be considered separate cultures. He explores the cultural influence on translation, how supralinguistic aspects like names and humour are translated, and the difference between localization of video games and literary translation. He concludes that, contrary to popular belief, American translation and British translation are decidedly different. While both translations tended to domesticate fairly heavily overall, the British version kept closer to the source text than the American one. His study also shows that video game localizations have vastly more freedom to take creative liberties than literary translations.

In addition to the above works, there are some works that have been written from a contrastive linguistic perspective. For example, Yamaguchi's (2007) article "役割語の個別性と普遍性 一日英の対照を通して一一" (Universals and Specifics of Role Language in Popular Fiction: A Contrastive Analysis between Japanese and English) compares the characterisation of stereotypes in Japanese and English. He analysed four different characters from English fiction and illustrates how different the two languages are when presenting stereotypes (role language) through their speech.

## 3. Role Languages

This chapter will present some information on the speech patterns used by the characters being analysed. The first section will break down the historical speech pattern *shoseikotoba*, a hallmark of the Meiji period, and the second section will detail the more modern and well known Downtown Tokyo/*Shitamachi* dialect.

## 3.1 Shoseikotoba

Something that is a significant part of *I Am a Cat* is the language known as *shoseikotoba*, or "Student Language". According to Satoshi Kinsui in his book *Virtual Japanese: The Enigma of Role Language* (2003), it is a speech-pattern that is specific to the Meiji era (1868-1912), the time in which the events of the novel are set, and the way in which the narrator delivers the story to the reader.

Kinsui writes that the term *Shosei*, the primary speakers of *Shoseikotoba*, would describe males of a certain Meiji era age demographic comparable to the modern university student. Though while the word is translated as "student", it also encompassed young (primarily male) people of the same age who were doing things other than studying, such as looking for work or simply living with their parents without an occupation.

Kinsui also notes that it contains elements of language from the western regions of Japan like Kyuushuu and Chuugoku, such as ending words in *-choru* and *-oru*. This could be indicative of the fact that a lot of *Shosei* were from those regions, thus bringing those elements into *Shoseikotoba*. As a result, *Shoseikotoba* could be considered a mix of the dialects of western Japan and the standard Tokyo dialect.

Although mostly stereotypical, the perception of *Shoseikotoba* has also changed in modern times into being more linked to older men of high status, like company CEOs. This can be attributed to the fact that the youths that were used to speaking in that way made their way in the world and became the older generation. And since that generation has now passed, only the image of "Boss's Speech" remains.

As for the characteristics of *Shoseikotoba* itself, in addition to the Western dialect, Kinsui references several examples, which were originally proposed by Komatsu (1974), which I'll include below:

- 1: The use of the pronouns *boku* and *wagahai* as first-person pronouns.
- 2: *Kimi* being the only second-person pronoun used, with the only other ways of addressing someone being their name either followed by the honorific "-*kun*" or lacking any honorific whatsoever.
- 3: The extensive use of *tamae* (please) and *beshi* (should) as imperative expressions.
- 4: The use of the term *shikkei* (rude) as a greeting.
- 5: Extensive use of foreign loanwords and Sino-Japanese terms.

When looking at these examples, there is evidence that *Shoseikotoba* has taken some influence from the language of the samurai class of the old Edo period (1603-1868). Kinsui specifically mentions the use of *tamae*, which was an honorific term before being replaced by the familiar *-raru*, leaving only the imperative form when it was incorporated into the language of the Edo samurai. Kinsui references its use by samurai characters in a number of works published in the late 1700s.

He also notes the use of *kimi* and *boku* as an example, again referencing Komatsu (1974). In his article Komatsu describes *boku* as an originally being a Confucian term showing strong humility, but its actual use being in normal conversation between members of the samurai and educated classes, as well as having a paired usage with *kimi*.

Finally, Kinsui also details the relationship between the term *boku* as a *Shoseikotoba* pronoun and the decidedly not *Shoseikotoba* first-person pronoun *ore*. He shows the trend of characters using *boku* being respectable and educated, but also sheltered and weak. On the other hand, characters using *ore* are portrayed as uneducated and rude, but also strong and spirited. This is something which is quite visible in Sôseki's work in conversations between the protagonist, living with a teacher, and another cat belonging to someone of a lower class.

## 3.2 Downtown Tokyo/Shitamachi dialect

Another dialect that plays a visible role in *I Am a Cat* is the one from downtown Tokyo, also called *Shitamachi*. It is one of two major dialects in Tokyo and considered more vulgar and direct than the formal standard Japanese, being associated with the middle and lower class such as merchants, craftsmen and small family businesses (Morgan 1995). It is used in the

novel in conjunction with the previously mentioned *ore*, as well as *omae* (=you) and the use of sentence final particle -ze, creating an image of rudeness and lack of education.

As for the specifics of the dialect itself, it is similar to standard Japanese, with the difference being mostly phonological rather than syntactical. The most notable examples are that the [ai] and [ae] sounds are both pronounced as [ee], as well as [shu] becoming [shi] and [hya] becoming [sha] (Grestle 2000).

## 4. Material and Method

#### 4.1 Material

The Japanese novel used for the present study is 吾輩は猫である (Wagahai wa neko de aru), or I Am a Cat in English, written by the famous novelist Natsume Sôseki in 1905. This was chosen because it is one of the few Japanese works to have received several translations, as well as being one of the more modern ones, despite being publishes more than a hundred years ago. It is a serialised short story turned novel set during the Meiji period of Japanese history and follows the life of a middle-class family through the eyes of their nameless housecat, who is the narrator of the story. The novel is a satire on the weird actions of human beings when seen from the perspective of an outside party, as the narrator relays his observations of the family's daily lives and his conversations with other cats in the neighbourhood.

As the material for analysis I will use a version of *I Am a Cat* that has been written in the modern Japanese script (new kana spelling), adopted from the Aozora Bunko website.

I will also use two different translations of the novel for comparison. The first one being Shibata Katsue and Kai Motonari's version written in 1961, and the second being Aiko Itou and Graeme Wilson's version written in 1972. I believe them to be sufficiently different to warrant analysis, since the discipline of Translation Studies underwent a change between the times they were written. Though it should also be noted that the latter work involves a native English translator while the former is done by two Japanese translators.

### 4.2 Method

I have gone through and compared the first chapter of each of the three versions of *I Am a Cat* and singled out the spoken lines uttered by the protagonist and the character Kuro/Blacky, as well as a few other examples chosen to provide. From this list I have selected relevant lines and their translations for analysis, with the full list available below.

The analysis structure is loosely based on the character analysis done by Yamaguchi (2007) in her essay on role language translation, where she lists the character's first-person pronoun, sentence ending particles and interjections. I have opted to remove interjections from the list due to it not being applicable to the material and have added second-person pronouns instead. Following this I have used examples from the material throughout the text.

## 5. Analysis and Discussion

When exploring the linguistic characterisation of the two cats we need to establish their portrayal in the original language. In the Japanese version, the most prominent feature that defines the two characters is their differing dialects. The author is making use of *yakuwarigo* to differentiate the speakers, where the unnamed protagonist is given an educated and slightly snobbish image, and his conversation partner Kuro/Blacky is presented as rude and uneducated. I will first analyse the presentation of the protagonist, followed by an analysis of Kuro/Blacky. After this there will be some general points about the two translations.

## 5.1 The language of the unnamed protagonist

First person pronoun: 吾輩 (wagahai), the second person Pronoun: 君 (kimi), sentence final form: だ (da), である (de aru), ない (nai).

Table 1

Speaker	Japanese	English A (1961)	English B (1972)
Protagonist	<u>吾輩</u> は猫 <u>である</u> 。名前はまだ <u>な</u>	I am a cat though, as	I, sir, am a cat. I have
	V	yet, I don't have any	as yet no name.
		name.	

Protagonist	そう云う <u>君</u> は <u>一体</u> 誰だい	And who are you?	And you, who on
			earth are you?
Protagonist	うち <u>吾輩</u> はここの教師の 家 にいる	I live here in the	I live here, in the
	<u>吾輩</u> はここの教師の 家 にいる	schoolteacher's house.	teacher's house.
	の <u>だ</u>		
Protagonist	一体車屋と教師とはどっちがえ	I was just wondering	Which do you think is
	らいだろう	which of the two is the	superior, a rickshaw-
		greater-the	owner or a teacher?
		rickshawman or the	
		schoolteacher.	
Protagonist	実はとろうとろうと思ってまだ	To tell the truth, I have	Actually, though I'm
	کے	been wanting to catch	always thinking of
	と 捕ら <u>ない</u>	one for a long time but	catching one, I've
		the opportunity has	never yet caught any.
		never come.	
Protagonist	にら	But when it comes to	But when it comes to
	しかし鼠なら <u>君</u> に 睨 まれては	rats, I hardly believe	rats, I expect you just
	百年目だろう。	they would have a	pin them down with
		chance against you.	your hypnotic glare.

It is quite obvious that the protagonist is supposed to be speaking *shoseikotoba*, as many of the aspects that Kinsui (2003) described are present in his dialogue and the novel in general. The first-person pronoun 吾輩 (wagahai) is showcased in the novel's title, and the protagonist uses 吾輩 (wagahai) throughout the dialogue, as well as exclusively using the second person pronoun 君 (kimi) in his dialogue, both of which can be seen in table 1. The choice to make the protagonist speak a dialect mainly used by high-status characters establishes him as a character who seems polite, high-brow and educated. However, as he has yet to accomplish much of anything, this image is most likely hinting at a false sense of superiority.

As for the other *shoseikotoba* aspects, the protagonist uses both 給之(tamae) and べし(beshi) as imperative markers, as well as the unusual use of the 君(tamae) honorific in reference to a female character, all of which can be seen in table 2. He does not use the pronoun 僕(boku), though it does occur in the novel as it is used by the protagonist's master. Both of them use the word 失敬(shikkei), but not as a greeting. These aspects will not feature heavily in this essay, however, as they occur in the narration and dialogue of later chapters, outside the focus of the analysis. Nevertheless, I thought it best to include them.

In table 1 there does not seem to be much difference between the two translations except that translation B is more accurate in translating the nuance of 一体 (who on earth), which is omitted in translation A, as well as including "hypnotic glare" as a translation for  $\mathbb{R}$  まれて (to be glared at), also omitted in translation A. Both tried to show his formality by using the expression 'as yet' instead of more casual 'I don't have a name yet'. Translation B also shows his politeness by the small addition of 'sir' in the first example, as well as by translating the honorific  $\mathbb{R}(kun)$  into 'Miss' in table 2, whereas it is omitted in translation A. Table 2

Speaker	Japanese	English A (1961)	English B (1972)
Protagonist	自己の利益になる間は、すべ	Love others only when	[Not covered]
(in	からく人を愛す <u>べし</u> 。	it brings personal	
narration)		benefit.	
Protagonist	まず世間を見渡して見 <u>給え</u> 。	For instance, take a look	[Not covered]
(in		at what happens every	
narration)		day in the world.	
Protagonist	<u>吾輩</u> の尊敬する筋向すじむこ	When I met Shiro across	Miss Blanche, the
(in	うの白 <u>君</u> …	the street whom I	white cat who lives
narration)		respected	opposite and whom I
			much admire

To show the protagonist's polite and educated image, the Japanese version relies heavily on the pronouns for its characterization. For the English translations, however, this is difficult to utilize, since the English language does not feature different pronouns based on status or character. As can be seen in tables 1 and 4, both 吾輩(wagahai) and 己和(ore) has been translated to "I" and both 君(kimi) and 御めえ(omee) has been translated to "you". Due to this, the characterization in the English versions must be expressed in another way.

Table 3

Speaker	Japanese	English A (1961)	English B (1972)
Protagonist	だいぶ	You look extremely	You, being the cat of a
	君も車屋の猫だけに大分	strong. Most probably,	rickshaw-owner,
	強そう <u>だ</u> 。車屋にいると	living at the	naturally look very
	ごちそう	rickshawman's house,	tough. I can see that one
	御 馳 走が食えると見える	you get plenty to eat.	eats well at your
	ね		establishment.
Protagonist	追ってそう願う事にしよ	Sure, some day, maybe.	In due course I may
		But to me, it seems as	come and ask to join

	うち う。しかし 家 は教師の方	though the	you. But it seems that
	う。しかし 家 は教師の方	schoolteacher lives in a	the teacher's house is
	が車屋より大きいのに住ん	bigger house than the	larger than your boss's.
	でいるように思われる	rickshawman.	
Protagonist	<u>君</u> などは年が年であるから	Being as old as you are,	You, judging by your age,
	だいぶん	you've probably caught a	must have caught a
	大 分 とったろう	lot of rats yourself.	notable number of rats?
Protagonist	٤	Being such a famous rat	And I suppose that it's
	<u>君</u> はあまり鼠を捕るのが名	catcher, you probably	because you're such a
	人で鼠ばかり食うものだか	eat nothing else and	marvellous ratter, a cat
	らそんなに肥って色つやが	that's why you're so	well nourished by plenty
	善いのだろう	plumb and glossy, I'm	of rats, that you are so
		sure.	splendidly fat and have
			such a good complexion.

In table 3 you can see that the protagonist's characterization in the English version is expressed mostly in his choice of words. His detached and high-brow nature can for example be seen in Translation B, in how he uses "one" when speaking generally, rather than the more common "you". You can also see his educated image in his choice of longer words such as "establishment", "marvellous", "nourished", "complexion" and "a notable number", as opposed to simpler synonyms like "house", "great", "fed", "colour" and "many". His politeness is also shown by the small addition of "sir" in table 1.

In Translation A however, while the translation is serviceable, there is not much to go on in terms of characterizing the protagonist. By way of word choice, it uses shorter and more average synonyms like "house", "plumb", "glossy" and "a lot".

## 5.2 The language of Kuro/Blacky

First Person Pronoun: され (ore), Second Person Pronoun: 御めえ (omee), End of sentence:

だ (da), だぜ (daze), ねえ (nee).

Table 4

Speaker	Japanese	English A (1961)	English B (1972)
Kuro/	<u>御めえ</u> は <u>一体何だ</u>	he abruptly asked me who I	And who the hell are you?
Blacky		was.	
Kuro/	おくろ	Me? Huh-I'm Kuro, living at the	Me? I'm Rickshaw Blacky.
Blacky	<u> 己れあ</u> 車屋の 黒 <u>よ</u>	rickshawman's place.	
Kuro/	<u>御めえ</u> のうちの主人を	Just take a look at your	Just look at your master,
Blacky	<u>見ねえ</u> 、まるで骨と皮	teacher-he's all skin and bones	almost skin and bones.
	ばかり <u>だぜ</u>		
Kuro/	かん	When you come to think of it,	It's depressing [] when you
Blacky	考 げえるとつまら <u>ね</u>	it's not all fun.	come to think of it.
	<u>え</u> 。		
Kuro/	<u>御めえ</u> なんかも	Stick with me for a while	You too, instead of creeping
Blacky	ちゃばたけ	instead of going around in	around in a tea plantation,
	茶 畠 ばかりぐ	circles in the tea patch and	why not follow along with
	るぐる廻っていねえ	you'll look better yourself in	me? Within a month, you'd
	、 おれ あと	less than a month.	get so fat nobody'd recognize
	で、ちっと <u>己</u> の後		you.
	へくっ付いて来て <u>見ね</u>		
	<u>え</u> 。一と月とたた <u>ねえ</u>		
	うちに見違えるように		
	太れるぜ		
Kuro/	<u>御めえ</u> は今までに鼠を	By the way, how many rats	How many rats have you
Blacky	何匹とった事がある	have you killed?	caught so far?
Kuro/	たんとでも <u>ねえ</u> が三四	Well, I can't say a lot-maybe	Well, not too many, but I
Blacky	十はとったろう	thirty or forty.	must have caught thirty or
			forty
Kuro/	鼠の百や二百は一人で	I could handle one or two	I can cope [] with a hundred
Blacky	いつでも引き受けるが	hundred rats alone but when it	or two hundred rats, any time
	いたちってえ奴は手に	comes to weasels, they're not	and by myself. But a weasel,
	合わ <u>ねえ</u> 。	to my liking.	no. That I just can't take.
Kuro/	去年の大掃除の時だ。	It was at the time of our annual	It was last year, the day for
Blacky		housecleaning last summer.	the general house-cleaning.
Kuro/	いしばい	The master crawled under the	As my master was crawling
Blacky	うちの亭主が 石 灰	veranda to put away a sack of	under the floor-boards with a
	えん	lime, and-what do you think?	bag of lime, suddenly a dirty
	の袋を持って橡の下	He surprised a big weasel who	great weasel came whizzing
	は へ這い込んだら <u>御めえ</u>	came bouncing out.	out.
	1 垣 1 込んだり <u>岬のえ</u>   七きかいたもの駅前ぶ		
	大きないたちの野郎が		
	めんくら   面 喰 って飛び出し		
	囲 限 つし飛い山し		

	たと思い <u>ねえ</u>		
Kuro/	ちきしょう	Thinking him to be just another	So I chase after it, feeling
Blacky	こん 畜 生 って	big mouse, I cornered him in a	quite excited and finally I got
	気で追っかけてとうと	ditch.	it cornered in a ditch.
	どぶ		
	う泥溝の中へ追い込ん		
	だと思い <u>ねえ</u>		
Kuro/	くせ	Even now when I see a weasel I	Since that time, whenever I
Blacky	<u>臭 え</u> の臭く <u>ねえ</u> のっ	get giddy.	see a weasel, I feel
	てそれからってえもの		uncommon poorly.
	はいたちを見ると胸が		
	悪くならあ		
Kuro/	いくら稼いで鼠をとっ	Rats are interesting but, you	However hard one slaves at
Blacky	たって――一てえ人間	know, there's nobody as crafty	catching rats In the whole
	ほどふてえ奴は世の中	as humans in this world.	wide world there's no
	にいねえぜ。		creature more brazen-faced
			than a human being.
Kuro/	てい	Do you know what humans	The plain fact is that humans,
Blacky	おい人間てものあ 体	are? Well, I'll tell you. They're	one and all, are thieves at
	V	men, yes, but thieves at heart.	heart.
	の善い泥棒だ <u>ぜ</u>		

The image that is portrayed through Kuro/Blacky is one of rudeness, lack of education and strength. In table 4 you can see in the words ending in  $\dot{z}$ — (-ee), such as 御めえ (omee), 見  $ね\dot{z}(minee)$  and ふてえ (futee), as well as the negative sentence ending  $\dot{z}$   $\dot{z}$  (-nai) becoming  $\dot{z}$   $\dot{z}$  (-nee), that he's speaking Downtown Tokyo/Shitamachi dialect, which is associated with the middle and lower class of Tokyo. The rudeness can be seen in the informal pronouns  $\dot{z}$   $\dot{z}$  (ore) and the previously mentioned  $\dot{z}$   $\dot{z}$  (omee), which is Shitamachi dialect for 御まえ (omae), modern spelling  $\dot{z}$   $\dot{$ 

Regarding the translations, translation A has changed the direct question style to indirect in the first sentence, while translation B keeps it as direct. B also translates 一体 (who the hell), while it is omitted in translation A.

In the second example, the cat's name,  $\mathbb{R}$  (*kuro*), meaning black, is kept as is in translation A, using the Japanese word directly, while in translation B, it becomes Blacky, following a more English naming convention. Translating the colour aspect also brings with it its connotations of darkness and menace, amplifying his intimidating image. This can also be felt in the

contrast between the simplicity of his name in contrast to that of the character  $\boxminus$  (*shiro*), meaning white, translated as Shiro/Miss Blanche in table 2.

In the third example, both translations are similar, and none of the rough or dialectal expressions such as 御めえ (omee), 見ねえ (minee) and だぜ (daze) are reflected in the translated sentences. This shows that, as with the protagonist, the Japanese pronouns do not lend themselves well to English translation, and the translators had to rely on different methods for characterisation.

Table 5

Speaker	Japanese	English A (1961)	English B (1972)
Kuro/	なあ	What? I don't go unfed	Ah well, as far as I'm
Blacky	何 に <u>おれ</u> なんざ、どこの国へ行っ	anywhere!	concerned, I never want
	たって食い物に不自由はし <u>ねえ</u> つも		for decent grub
	りだ		wherever I go.
Kuro/	べらぼう	Huh! What if the house	You dim-wit! A house,
Blacky	箆 棒 め、うちなんかいくら大	is big? That doesn't	no matter how big it is,
	た きくたって腹の足しになるもんか	mean you get your belly	won't help you fill an
	きくたって腹の足しになるもんか	full there, does it?	empty belly.
Kuro/	人のとった鼠をみんな取り上げやが	They take all the rats I	Every rat I catch they
Blacky	って交番へ持って行きゃあがる。	catch over to the police	confiscate, and they
		box.	tote them off to the
			nearest police box.
Kuro/	きま	What a question! The	Why, a rickshaw-owner,
Blacky	車屋の方が強いに 極 っていらあ	rickshawman, naturally.	of course. He's the
	な。		stronger.
Kuro/	何、猫だ? 猫が聞いてあきれら	A cat? You don't say so!	You a cat? Well, I'm
Blacky	あ。		damned.
Kuro/	ぜん	Where do you live?	Anyway, where the
Blacky	全 てえどこに住んでるん <u>だ</u>		devil do you hang out?
Kuro/	ひど あ 一度いたちに向って 酷 い目に逢	A weasel once gave me a	Once I had a hellish
Blacky	一度いたちに向って 酷 い目に逢	terrible time.	time with a weasel.
	った		
Kuro/	ところが <u>御めえ</u> いざってえ段になる	Yeah. Just as I was going	Not in the least. As a
Blacky	さいご ペ と奴め 最 後 っ屁をこきゃがっ	in for the <i>coup-de-grace-</i>	last resort it upped its
	と奴め 最 後 つ凪をこきゃがっ	can you imagine what it	tail and blew a filthy
	た。	did? Well, it raised its tail	fart. Ugh! The smell of
		and-ooph! You should	it!
		have taken a whiff.	

As with the protagonist, we can see some characterization in Kuro/Blacky's choice of words, though it is not as abundant. In table 5 you can see that in Translation B he uses the unflattering synonym "grub" when talking about food. He also uses the more casual "hang out", when asking where the protagonist lives, as well as using the shorter phrase "tote" instead of "carry".

He is also more prone to swearing than the protagonist, showcasing his ruder demeanour. In Translation B, there is a contrast between tables 1 and 3, in the translation of the emphasizing "一体". In the Japanese version, both characters use the same phrase. In the translation however, the protagonist uses "who on earth", while Kuro/Blacky instead uses "who the hell". In table 5 he can also be seen using the phrases "Well I'm damned" and "where the devil" which, while they are not that intense, are not something you would hear the protagonist say.

Table 6

Speaker	Japanese	English A (1961)	English B (1972)
Kuro/	どうせそんな事だろうと思った。い	I thought so. You sure	Huh, I thought so.
Blacky	P	are skinny.	'Orrible scrawny aren't
	やに瘠せてるじゃ <u>ねえ</u> か		you.
Kuro/	いたちってけども何鼠の少し大きい	As you know, a weasel	I say to myself 'So
Blacky	<u>ぐれえ</u> のものだ。	is only a little bit bigger	what's a weasel? Only
		than a rat.	a wee bit bigger than a
			rat.'

Furthermore, some of the image of the original have been transferred to the English translation. We can see in table 6, Translation B, through the omission of the H and lack of conjugation in "horrible", that Kuro/Blacky is speaking with a Cockney English accent. Since Cockney English carries some similar connotations of *Shitamachi* dialect, such as low status and lack of education, this effectively matches the characterisation of the original.

Meanwhile, Translation A once again does not provide much in the way of characterisation. The names are kept from the original Japanese version, and there is no discernible dialect. There are minor instances, where in table 5 the translator chose to make some of his statements into outbursts, showing his aggression, though this is also done once by translation B in table 4, as well as occasional insertions of "huh" in his dialogue, some of which can be seen in table 3 and in table 4. Overall however, the translation uses similar and fairly plain language, with not much differentiating the two characters.

#### 5.3 The two translations

From this analysis it seems that the 1972 translation of the novel does more work to ensure that the characterization and feeling is efficiently translated using several different methods. The 1961 translation seems to mostly focus on translating the words accurately. This is further illustrated by table 7, where the 1972 translation opted to change the currency used from the Japanese *sen* to the British penny, which is more readily understood by the target audience.

Table 7

Speaker	Japanese	English A (1961)	English B (1972)
Kuro/	کے	The policeman there	Since the copper can't
Blacky	交番じゃ誰が捕ったか分ら <u>ねえ</u> から	doesn't know who	tell who caught the
	そのたんびに <u>五銭</u> ずつくれるじゃ <u>ね</u>	actually catches them	rats, he just pays up a
	<u>え</u> か。	so he hands my master	penny a tail to anyone
		five sen per head.	who brings them in.
Kuro/	おれ うちの亭主なんか <u>己</u> の御蔭でもう	Because of me, my	My master, for
Blacky	うちの亭主なんか <u>  己</u> _の御蔭でもう	master has made a neat	instance, has already
	もう <u>壱円五十銭</u> くらい 儲 けていやがる	profit of one yen and	earned about half a
	<u>壱円五十銭</u> くらい 儲 けていやがる	fifty sen, but yet he	crown purely through
	ろく 癖に、 碌 なものを食わせた事もあ	doesn't give me any	my efforts, but he's
	癖に、 碌 なものを食わせた事もあ	decent food.	never yet stood me a
	りゃし <u>ねえ</u> 。		decent meal.

Although the 1961 translation strives for accuracy it can be argued that the 1972 translation manages to be more accurate in some places, such as the translation of -体 (on earth/the hell) in table 1 and table 4, as well as the inclusion of "glare" as a translation of  $\mathbb{R}$  まれて (to be glared at) in table 1, although the sentence is changed from passive to active form. Even in conversational filler phrases the 1972 translation manages to be more accurate. In most cases in the novel, such phrases are just translated with appropriate English ones, as can be seen in the first two examples of table 8. The translation of  $\mathbb{R}$  まくやった (well done) is however unquestionably more accurate in the 1972 translation.

Table 8

Speaker	Japanese	English A (1961)	English B (1972)
---------	----------	------------------	------------------

Protagonist	へえなるほど	So? And what	Did you really?
		happened?	
Protagonist	ふん	Oh?	Really?
Protagonist	うまくやったね	You did?	That was well done

This is most likely an issue of translator skill rather than intentional choice, though it is not certain. The fact remains, however, that the 1961 translation keeps focus on the text and not much else, whereas the 1972 translation adds a lot more characterising information and caters more to the English-speaking reader.

This falls in line with the history of Translation Studies, as the 1961 translation was published when the prevailing translator mindset was one of rigorous and linguistic translation favouring the source text, while the 1972 translation was published as the discipline started to shift towards a more functional approach favouring the target language. The 1972 translation also seems to fit well into Nida's (1964) notion of dynamic equivalence, making use of dialect and word choice, as well as changing names and currencies, in an attempt to create a smoother, easier experience for the English-speaking reader while still producing a similar reaction to the original text.

This provides an interesting contrast to Tobias's (2006) article, where it is the earlier translation that caters to the target-language reader and the latter that favours the source text, rather than the other way around. The 1997 translation favours the expression of the source culture, which is in line with the discipline at the time. The 1954 translation however is heavily domesticating in a time dominated by foreignisation. This shows that outliers exist, meaning the trends are not absolute, and it is still the choice of the translator to follow them.

I would be remiss to mention, however, that a possible contributing factor to the difference between the translations is the fact that the 1972 translation was co-authored by a native Japanese and a native Englishman, while the translators of the 1961 version were both Japanese. This does not necessarily go against the analysis however, since the choice of translator is also affected by the state of the discipline. It is possible that the choice to include native speakers of both languages was made to ensure accuracy and fluidity. Though this is impossible to know, and as such, while the translations do indeed seem to correspond to the trends in Translation Studies, we cannot know if they were informed by them.

One could however question if the choice to employ characterisation strategies in the 1972 translation counts as domestication or foreignisation, when talking about *yakuwarigo*, as doing so provides more insight into the meanings the author has written, and thus moving the reader towards the author, as compared to simply omitting the translation of *yakuwarigo* altogether like the 1961 version and losing some of the meaning in the process. Gillberg (2017) remarks in his MA thesis that generally both the American translation and the British translation of *Advance Wars 4* are heavily domesticating, with the American version being the worst in this regard. However, he notes, the American translation is also the one most accurately representing the characters' use of *yakuwarigo*.

This means that while the results of this study show that the characterisation used in the two translations reflect the trends seen in Translation studies when it comes to *yakuwarigo*, further study would be required to discern whether this can also be seen when putting the focus on other sets of data and other aspects of the translations.

## 6. Summary

The language of the unnamed protagonist features many of the hallmarks of *shoseikotoba* described by Kinsui (2003). He uses the first-person pronoun *wagahai* when referring to himself as well as the second-person pronoun *kimi* when talking to others. He uses *tamae* and *beshi* as imperative markers. Even some aspects of *shoseikotoba* that the protagonist didn't make use of such as the pronoun *wagahai* and the greeting *shikkei* were still included in another character, showing that *shoseikotoba* is a big part of the novel.

This is translated in the 1972 version mostly through word choice, where the protagonist is using longer than average synonyms when speaking. In the 1961 version there is no real deviation from plain English that stands out in a way that is not also done by the 1971 version.

The rough language of Kuro/Blacky is represented through several features, such as his Downtown Tokyo (*Shitamachi*) dialect, his informal pronouns *ore* and *omee* and his use of the tough male sentence ending *daze*.

This is given more attention overall in the translations. In the 1972 version he occasionally uses shorter, more crude synonyms as well as speak in a cockney English accent. He also gets a different name more reflective of his character. The 1961 version does provide some

minimal expression of character through a single outburst and the occasional added "huh", though otherwise does not deviate much from plain English.

The 1961 translation does not expend much effort into differentiating its characters and instead focuses only on translating the words and sentences, though at some points it manages to be less accurate than the 1972 translation. The characterisation is limited to a few minor ways such as changing some punctuation and adding occasional short words. On the other hand, the 1972 version employs several different strategies to try to evoke similar images in the reader as the original would in a Japanese-speaking reader. These include the characters' choice of words, changing some names and making a character speak with a certain accent. Whether it was intentional or not, and if you consider it a better translation or not, this does reflect the changes toward a more functional approach in the trends seen in the discipline of Translation Studies at the time of publication when it comes to *yakuwarigo*. In other aspects of the work outside this analysis the results may vary, as *yakuwarigo* presents somewhat of a paradox where domestication is sometimes able to convey more information that is otherwise lost.

As such, it would be interesting to see more of other facets of comparative translation being explored in future studies, such as sentence structure or cultural phenomena, rather than just characterisation and *yakuwarigo*, to see if the same results apply, as there are still only a small number of works comparing several translations.

It would also be interesting to see more works studied the same way, analysing *yakuwarigo*. Though that, as well as comparative studies of translation in general, would require a higher number of literary works receiving more than a single translation, which is unlikely now, but may become more common as the demand for retranslations keeps growing.

## References

Gerstle, C. A. Ed. (2000). 18th Century Japan: Culture and society. Routledge.

Gillberg, T. (2017). Across the Pond and Beyond: A UK/US Comparison of Game Localisation and Literary Translation from Japanese Works. (Unpublished master's thesis). Göteborgs Universitet.

Gräwe, G. (2011). 日本文学のドイツ語訳について: 『雪国』の2つの翻訳(=On the German translation of Japanese literature; Two translations of Snow country. (石井芙桑雄教授追悼記念論集). *The Ritsumeikan literature review*, 620, 843-827.

Kidoura, T. (2013). *Natsume Sōseki, the Greatest Novelist in Modern Japan*. University College London.

Kinsui, S. (2017 [2003]). *Virtual Japanese: Enigmas of Role Language*. (Översättning av Kinsui, S. *Baacharu Nihongo Yakuwarigono Nazo*, vilken först publiserades år 2003, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.). Osaka: Osaka University Press.

Komatsu, H. (1974). *Ichidoku Santan Tōsei Shosei Katagi no edo-go-tekitokushoku (Edo-language-like features of Ichidoku Santan Tōsei Shosei Katagi)*, Saitama Daigaku Kiyō, No. 9, pp 17–28, Saitama Daigaku Kyōyō Gakubu.

Kramsch, C. (2006). From communicative competence to symbolic competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 2(90), 249–252.

Levey, D., & Harris, T. (2002). Accommodating Estuary English. *English Today*, 18(3), 17-20.

McClellan, Edwin (2004). Two Japanese Novelists: Sōseki & Tōson. Tuttle Publishing.

Morgan, C. (1995). *Teaching Modern Foreign Languages: A handbook for teachers*. London: Routledge.

Natsume, S. (1987). *夏目漱石全集1*. ちくま文庫 and 筑摩書房. Retrieved March 23, 2017, from <a href="http://www.aozora.gr.jp">http://www.aozora.gr.jp</a>

Nida, E. A. (1964). Toward a science of translating. New York: E. J. Brill.

Nintendo of America. (2008, January 21). *Nintendo of America: Advance Wars: Days of Ruin Game Info*. Retrieved June 6, 2018.

Nintendo of Europe. (2008, January 25). *Nintendo of Europe: Advance Wars: Dark Conflict Game Info*. Retrieved June 6, 2018.

Tobias, S. (2006). Culture-specific items in Japanese-English literary translations: comparing two translations of Kawabata's 'lzu no Odoriko'. *Monash University Lingusitic Papers*, *5*(1), 27-35.

Takahashi, Akio (2006). 新書で入門 漱石と鴎外 (A pocket paperback == introduction: Natsume and Ōgai). Shinchosha.

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

Yamaguchi, N. (2007) Yakuwarigono Kobetsuseito Fuhensei (= Individual and universal properties of yakuarigo). In Kinsui (ed.) *Yakuwarigo Kenkyuno Chihei.* (=The Horizon of Yakuwarigo Study). pp7-26. Tokyo: Kuroshio