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Preface

The idea of organizing a workshop on "Cultural Translations" was born among several scholars who met in the summer of 2009 at the International Research Center for Japanese Studies (Nichibunken) in Kyoto, Japan. The theme was chosen because it seemed to be the most suitable starting point to view current cultural phenomena from cross-disciplinary fields such as language, translation, literature, cultural studies, music, and sociology.

The workshop "Cultural Translations and Transculturality" was held outside Gothenburg, in Varberg, on August 26-28, 2010, with thirteen participants from Sweden, Germany, Japan, Norway, Spain and the United States. During the two days of meetings, the notion of "transculturality" and its methodological validity were discussed. Various cultural meetings and "translations" with focus on the questions of cultural translation, hybridity and intertextuality were the central themes of the papers presented.

Our research under the theme was further supported by Nichibunken, and a symposium entitled "Cultural Translations: Research on Japanese Literature in Northern Europe" was held on February 25-27, 2011, in Kyoto. Varberg members along with additional scholars from Australia, China, Denmark, Finland, and Taiwan were invited. One of the objectives of these two scholarly meetings is to point a new research direction for young researchers.

The proceedings in a CD-format consist of the papers presented at both the Varberg workshop and the Nichibunken symposium. The twelve papers written in English are listed here roughly according to the order of the presentations at Nichibunken. The five papers written in Japanese are, however, grouped together and placed following the papers written in English, for practical reasons, regardless of the original presentation order.

There are 17 papers in total. Noriko Takei-Thunman's paper deals with the question of transculturality and a case of the subject position in Japanese literature. Nanyan Guo's paper discusses the definition of cultural translation and its representation in a New Zealand film. David Hebert's paper analyzes a theoretical model of cultural translation exemplified by Japanese music. Teresa Rodriguez's paper focuses on how ethical and aesthetic values of Japanese culture were translated in the West. Martin Nordeborg's paper studies the early schoolbook translations and how the Christian "God" was translated in the Meiji period. Thomas Ekholm's paper shows how the Japanese word chanoyu was translated in Europe one century ago. Lisa Paajarvi's paper examines some translation problems related to the use of katakana in Shōno Yuriko's novel. Nagashima Yōichi’s paper discusses the transition from literary translation to cultural translation in Mori Ogai's translation of Ibsen's plays. Irmela Hijiya-Kirschnereit's paper examines the relatively new phenomenon of "self-translation" by Japanese authors, who intend to make their texts more accessible to international audience by avoiding cultural specifics. Jeffrey Angles' paper examines choices made by Kawashima Chūnosuke when he translated Le tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours. Terttu Rajala's paper critiques Finnish translations of Mishima Yukio's four novels.
Carl Cassegard’s paper aims to better understand contemporary Japanese society through the concept of the ‘public’.

The papers written in Japanese start with that of Mei Dinge, which argues how political affiliations affected Manchurian and Japanese writers in colonial Manchuria. Reiko Abe Au-estad’s paper analyzes intertextuality between Itō Hiromi’s works and early Buddhist sutras. Chen Weifen’s paper examines Japanese modernity through translation of the notions of “nature”, “civilization” and “philosophy.” Kuranaka Shinobu’s paper discusses how historical accounts of the Chinese monk Ganjin, an emblematic figure of Japanese-Chinese religious contact in the eighth century, were rewritten by fiction writer Inoie Yasushi. Finally, Suzuki Sadami’s paper evaluates the methodological validity of transcultural approaches in literary and cultural studies and, especially, when re-writing modern Japanese literature history.

Taken as a whole, this compilation of papers convincingly demonstrates that the field of “cultural translations” offers rewarding insights that merit further exploration toward a deeper understanding of contemporary society from the perspectives of literature and culture.

Gothenburg & Kyoto, summer 2011

Noriko Takei-Thunman, Nanyan Guo
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Literature and Transculturality:
Some reflections on transcultural subject position

Noriko TAKEI-THUNMAN
University of Gothenburg

Abstract
In this paper, the term “transculturality” is discussed in relation to other related terms such as multi- and interculturality. The conclusion is, different from multi- and interculturality, transculturality opens up a more egalitarian view of cultures due to its conception of culture itself; culture is not regarded as, by national and ethnic borders, enclosed system that is inevitably caught in economical and political hierarchy. Culture is regarded essentially heterogeneous with mixed genealogy.

Transculturality is by no means a new phenomenon in literature. However, the mobility of people, cultural artifacts and ideas through new information technology is a rather new phenomenon since some decades, which is thought to have changed the conception of subjectivity and the sense of belonging in general (Appandurai 1996). Transcultural stance vis-à-vis culture blurs the notion of “border” itself, as Napier’s study shows, though for some, the origin of the artifact (manga) bears an emblematic meaning (Napier 2005). I would argue that, more importantly, it also creates a transcultural “space/position”, where an individual can feel free from one’s own tradition and culture.

(Im)migrants’ literature is a genre that focuses on border crossing and swaying subject position. Tawada Yoko who writes both in German and Japanese is a contemporary Japanese writer, calling for attention for the phenomenon of border transgression. Her protagonists reside in a transcultural space, from where the world is perceived. I will analyze the protagonist’s subject position, which seems residing in the most conscious, critical contemporary space.
Transculturality

Since around the 1990s, we meet the word “transculturality” (also ‘transcultural’) in academic studies, especially in sociology, but also in the field of psychology, social care, literary studies and pedagogy and so forth. The establishment of institutions in the name of ‘transcultural studies’ proves the term’s advance in academic circles in the last decade. New Centers for Transcultural Studies are established in the U.S./U.K., Australia, in Europe, and also in Japan. “Transcultural Human Relations” appears as a university course in U.S. Transcultural studies are counted, for instance, to be an research profile and one of the important ‘academic strengths’ of the University of Heidelberg (2010). It is also indicative that the UNESCO Chair in Transcultural Studies, Interreligious Dialogue, and Peace, was established in 2007 at the University of Oregon (U.S.A.). The terms transculturality and transcultural seem well-established today in the academic world and also in the field of literary studies as publications and conferences show. There have been related notions such as “multiculturality” and “interculturality”. And, also, “transculturation”, which, borrowed from biology, has been a helpful notion in the field of anthropology. Among them “multiculturalism” has no doubt been the most well-established term.

Behind the upswing of “transculturality” lies the need to theorize the actual state of culture and society in the postmodern world of globalization. The anthropologist and scholar of area studies Arjun Appadurai is another example of those, who scrutinized the question of culture in the light of modernity and globalization. He pointed out electronic media and mass migration as the two main factors that have changed and are changing our collective imagination and how we construct our ‘modern’ subjectivity. (2-3) According to Appadurai, “diasporic public spheres” created by TV or movies “confound theories that depend on the continued salience of the nation-state as the key arbiter of important social changes” (4) The technological changes have amplified the ordinary people’s access to distant culture. This, in turn, creating opportunities for them to create “the plurality of imagined worlds” Appadurai uses the word imagination (“imagined”) to designate not the individual capacity of imagining, but to give a name to a collectively constructed image, or a model interpretation. He does not use the term transcultural or transculturality but ‘transnational’ or ‘postnational’ (8), especially having the global flow of capital in mind. People move as political refugees, migrants, travelers, students, researchers and in business as never before, likewise cultural artifacts move over national borders through electronic media like film, TV and internet. As Appadurai formulates, the past few decades saw “a general rupture in the tenor of intersocietal relations” (2)

Transculturality is an ideology in the sense that it regards ‘culture’ essentially heterogeneous, impossible to binding to ethnicity and national state. In multiculturalism, each culture is regarded closely tied to a nation and its people. Culture is regarded internally homogenous, and it is defined in relation to and in contrast to other cultures, which are also coupled to own ethnicity and nationality. In this respect, Herder’s definition of culture in the late 18th century can be said to have been paradigmatically most influential. Casanova called attention to the (hidden)

2 Johann Gottfried Herder, Ideas on the Philosophy of the History of Mankind. Herder’s significance has been
agenda of Herder, which was to fight for obtaining cultural capital for Germans to challenge the French hegemony in literature and culture in 18th century Europe, where French was conceived as the most beautiful, cultivated, intellectual, international and prestigious language in literature, and also in politics, in Europe. One may say that Herder's objective was both national and international; international because he fought for the hegemony of German as the literary language in the European cultural scene, no less worthy of French, and national, because to attain the goal, he stressed the characteristics of the soul of German people, mirrored in German language and culture.3

Herder’s texts should be read as a historical text of his time. He is contemporary of Goethe (1749-1832) and Mme de Staël (1766-1817), and about thirty years senior of Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778). Linnaeus’ (1707-1778) is contemporary of Rousseau, and his notes on primitive races would never pass unremarked today. Herder’s ideas bear humanistic vein, humanistic in the sense that people, regardless of national and political hierarchy, have an equal right to culture. People are the bearer of the national soul and culture. Herder’s texts show curiosity for the other (various folks and their culture), which also is consonant with the time of exploration still going on in the late 18th century in Europe.4 Herder’s reflection on exotic folks like Arabs and American Indians, and distant regions like China, Japan, Korea and India, and their culture, foretells future anthropologists’ treaties.5 After the end of World War II and in the process of decolonization, Herder’s idea that each national language embodies national identity with pride had bearing in Africa, South-Asia and elsewhere.6

Herder’s conception of culture may be time bound to the time of national competition in the 18th century Europe, but it seems nevertheless not have lost its magnetic power today,7 as a re-


4 Along with missionaries, who were the early sources of knowledge of distant continents and people, travelers and scientists carried out in the late 18th century expeditions to distant places; James Cook (1728-1779) explored the region of Pacific Ocean, and Alexander von Humboldt (1799-1804) America. Carl Peter Thunberg (1743-1828), an apostle of Carl Linnaeus, is another example. He came to Japan 1775 and stayed until 1776. He left Flora Japonica, 1784, and also his general observation of Japan in Resa uti Europa, Africa, Asia, förrättad åren 1770-1779, Upsala : Joh. Edman, 1793. The first English translation came out 1795, Travels in Europe, Africa, and Asia, made between the years 1770 and 1779, in four volumes. Vol. IV, which contains Travels in the empire of Japan, and in the islands of Java and Ceylon, together with the voyage home came out from London: Printed for F. and C. Rivington 1795.

5 Heder’s interpretation was not based on empirical observations, thus offering a telling example of a method in which suppositions predetermine the outcome. However, including the whole aspect of life in the notion of culture, he foretells the future discipline anthropology.

6 Casanova, ibid., 79-80.

7 A symposium “Herder, nationen och det musikaliska kulturvarvet” (Herder, nation and national cultural heritage) was held 24 - 25 February 2006 in Sweden, organized by Centrum för folkmusik- och jazzforskning (Research Center of Folk music and Jazz). At the occasion, ‘folk’ and ‘folk music’ among others were discussed referring to Herder.
cent seminar about Herder’s Folkslied in Sweden shows. At the seminar, a Swedish researcher appreciated his writing on Folkslied, saying that, by focusing on the tradition of folksong, Herder’s text helped making the suppressed class of ordinary people (Folk) visible.8

The term culture is today ‘naturalized’ and used in everyday discourse, Masuzawa points out.9 But it has been endowed with a special significance in the formation of the knowledge of modernity, and it is “one of the most important reality-constituting terms” (Miyasawa 70) Whenever it is used, the term tends to be value charged and ‘overtly argumentative’ (71) Europe defining itself as modern since the 18th century, constructed the other as a mirroring antipode. Hence dichotomies like modernity/tradition, civilized/primitive and own/the other came to constitute the core of the ideology of modernity. These terms cannot liberate themselves from imperialist and colonial heritage as shown in postcolonial and cultural studies.10

The reason of the upswing of the term transculturality is, argues Epstein, the crisis of the concept of “multiculturalism”11 Multiculturalism stems from U.S. concern on migration and has spread rapidly to other countries. It expanded to the study of marginalized groups and raised the question of the content of education, canonization and marginalization in history and cultural practice. A dictionary account reads,

As a descriptive term, multiculturalism refers to the coexistence of people with many cultural identities in a common state, society, or community. As a prescriptive term, it is associated with the belief that racial, ethnic, and other groups should maintain their distinctive cultures within society yet live together with mutual tolerance and respect.12

Culture is, here, regarded as identity marker for a certain group of ‘racial, ethnic, and other groups’. The origin of the term multicultural and how it has been used as instrumental in political and cultural discourses make the term value laden and polemical. It has ensued the notions of assimilation, rejection and exclusion, and also hybridity. Hybridity in this context implies power relationship of dominant and dominated cultures, and is value laden: hybridity is contrasted against authenticity and that which is legitimate. Multiculturalism can urge for ‘understanding’ of the other. However, power relationship imbedded in the notion of the other has an abusive effect on performing a really egalitarian act of understanding. Multicultural view has been confrontational, and in real politics, the root of many serious conflicts in the world. For this reason, the introduction of the term transculturality seems necessary to give a name to an egalitarian view of culture, and to interpret actual cultural performance today.

Why transculturality?

Before discussing transculturality and subject position, I would like to make just a short remark about the term. As Welsch and Appadurai, too, pointed out, the phenomena of transfer or move of people and cultural artifacts or ideas is by no means exclusively contemporary phe-

---

8 See note 5.
10 See Masuzawa 1998, 78. The article gives a useful survey of the genealogy of the term culture.
12 Quotation from the account under “multiculturality” in Dictionary of the Social Sciences, 2002, ed. by Craig Calhoun, Oxford University Press.
nomenon. However, until long into the 20th century, it was a luxury just for few chosen elites and out of reach of the majority of people to move in between languages and cultures. Situation has drastically changed during the last decades. The change calls for coining a new term ‘transculturality’; firstly, to conceptualize the new conception of culture, which is more heterogeneous and egalitarian, and not enclosed by a national border and determined by a nation’s political or ethnic power relationship, and secondly, to elucidate the increased accessibility of various cultures and cultural artifacts, greatly due to the advance of electronic media and transportation system (at least in the industrialized part of the world). This changed cultural performance is thought to have changed the individual’s subjectivity, which will be discussed later. This changed state of affairs merits to be made expressively visible by the term transculturality in contrast to the previous multicultrality.

Transcultural fandom

Susan Napier scrutinized a new attitude towards cultural product taking anime as example.\(^\text{13}\) Note that anime as genre is regarded belonging to ‘subculture’. About anime, she writes that it offers an extremely heterogeneous kind of cultural self-representation, which is in fact one of its attractions. The “transformation and change” that the medium foreground resists any attempt at narrow cultural categorization. As a result, the Japanese national cultural identity put forward by anime is increasingly, and perhaps paradoxically, a global one. In this regard anime is perhaps the ideal aesthetic product for the contemporary period, at the forefront of creating an alternative cultural discourse that goes beyond the traditional categories of “native” or “international” to participate in what may well be a genuinely new form of global culture.” (236)

Accordingly to Napier, the origin of anime is not an important marker for those who watch. She also stresses the “distinctive properties” of the medium itself, which transgresses the border of the real and the fantastic, in her word its “hyperreal” nature. As such, anime positions itself as a newcomer (the Other in Napier’s word) in the field of action or fantastic films. This otherness itself is an important factor for anime fans more than its national origin. (236) General attitude among anime fans, which her questionnaire survey showed is,

(A)nime fans are engaged in a relatively new form of spectatorship, that of the committed media fan. The fan’s interacting with the cultural object is deeply engaged, transcending issues of national boundaries, content, style, or ideology, and it cannot be subsumed under any one-note description. (242)

According to Napier, a new kind of spectatorship has been shaped and successively shaping today in a transcultural space; transcultural, in the sense that anime as a cultural product moves globally, but its otherness is not excessively bound to national or ethnic identity, Japanese.

Rather than the product’s national origin, more important is the medium’s position in the field of cultural production itself, namely its otherness or marginal position. Spectators create a personal, individual bond to a cultural product without attaching much importance to its national or ethnic otherness.

Hills is critical of those, including Napier, who stresses on transculturality in the reception of

popular culture like anime, reminding a considerable symbolic power of national origin. However, having warned against downgrading the significance of national origin, Hills writes about fandom,

US/UK use of the term “otaku” acknowledges that fandom is hegemonically devalued both in Japan and the West. The Japanese fan is therefore linked to the non-Japanese fan: fan identity is prioritised over national identity. This identification can be read as an attempt to ‘naturalise’ fan identities by implying that fandom is an essentially transnational/transcultural experience. (Quotation according to the original without any change)

His argument is somewhat hesitant regarding the position of the spectatorship; on the one hand, admitting the emergence of a new ‘transcultural’ spectatorship in a global cultural scene, but on the other hand, reminding the existence of the spectatorship that is enhanced by the ‘imagined’, stereotype conception of the Other, and for whom the imagined Other carries a significance. Conclusively, however, he seems admitting transculturality in fandom of anime, stating that,

Cultural and national contexts are one version of “academically prescribed categories”, as are categories of “appropriation” and “globalisation”. The case of anime suggests that we need to refuse these terms, or at the very least supplement them by recognising that subcultural homologies (the way subcultures use certain texts to articulate their group identity) can become transcultural homologies (subcultures can use representations of other national subcultures to articulate a shared identity or devaluation). (ibid.) (Quotation according to the original without any change)

Both Napier and Hills highlighted the changed transcultural practice of the spectatorship of anime, the latter with a portion of hesitation. The change suggests the emergence of a new kind of relationship of the spectatorship to the world.

Subject position

Change in spectatorship seems to point to the changed subject position of the spectatorship. One powerful marker of the subject position has been national belonging and language (the mother tongue). With language, one can ‘narrate’ about oneself. Thus, to investigate the subject position, written texts seem offering an excellent site.

Immigrant literature is a genre, where one may expect transculturality, operating in a space in between different languages, between the memory of the native and the new culture.

Among contemporary Japanese writers, Tawada Yoko comes immediately to mind as such writer. She writes both in Japanese and German, and she has been consciously questioning and cross-examining her relationship with the two languages. Her novels and essays are expected to give us a picture of how the site looks like in between two languages.

14 The most serious point Hills raises against Napier’s interpretation is the fact that her conclusion was based only on 30% of the answers she got of the questionnaire. 70% knew somehow that what they watched is Japanese, however, attaching varying ‘meaning’ to the knowledge.
Tawada’s work appeared in Swedish translation, entitled *Talisman*, in 2009. The Swedish *Talisman* includes both German *Talisman* 1996 and *Verwandlungen* 1998. The German *Talisman* is a collection of essays, where the first person narrator is to be read identical with the author. A short notice at the back of the Swedish *Talisman* also invites the readership to read it as such, saying that the author tells as ‘an ethnologist’ about a foreign country (meaning Germany), studying it with an intentionally naïve eyes. *Verwandlungen* includes a series of lectures Tawada gave in Tübingen, along with some essays, which also circles around the question of language and subjectivity.

In these texts, Tawada scrutinizes her meeting with German language and culture, presenting an interesting, somewhat instable positioning in between Japanese and German. Her texts show tellingly that a transcultural stance and subjectivity cannot be internalized straightforwardly, but, rather, it is a process, which starts with an altered self-consciousness of an individual vis-à-vis own language and culture, and, leads successively to a space that is neither in or out of own or foreign culture but, so to speak, to the third place. (Third, in a figurative sense, because in a case, where an individual moves among three languages, it should be called the fourth place.) The third position/place is, as mentioned, a figurative place from where the individual seems able to objectify both his/her own and the other’s language and culture. Mother tongue is amorphous, Sakai pointed out, and a native uses without having any conception of its grammaticality.

To live in a foreign language, surrounded by it and using it, sharpens the sensibility toward language in general, and also toward own mother tongue. The mother tongue ceases to be a transparent medium of communication. The mother tongue acquires an opacity and foreignness. In other words, it becomes a poetic language, pregnant of abysses and dissonances, void of the illusion of oneness of words and the world. This sense of split between language and the real is an important site, not only of the poetics, but also, more fundamentally, of critical objectivity to be set in motion. The sense of disaccord of words and reality (like feelings) gives the subject a reflective, critical position toward both language and the real that is denoted by language. Tawada continues,

"(German) words that came out of my mouth did not express what I felt. Besides, I realized that I could not find, even in my mother tongue, words that expressed my feelings. It is just that I never felt this way before living using a foreign language." (37)

To live in a foreign language, surrounded by it and using it, sharpens the sensibility toward language in general, and also toward own mother tongue. The mother tongue ceases to be a transparent medium of communication. The mother tongue acquires an opacity and foreignness. In other words, it becomes a poetic language, pregnant of abysses and dissonances, void of the illusion of oneness of words and the world. This sense of split between language and the real is an important site, not only of the poetics, but also, more fundamentally, of critical objectivity to be set in motion. The sense of disaccord of words and reality (like feelings) gives the subject a reflective, critical position toward both language and the real that is denoted by language. Tawada continues,

"I was often caught of disgust against those who spoke their mother tongue fluently. They gave me an impression of being incapable of thinking or feeling anything other than what their language swiftly and easily delivered."
To live surrounded by, and using, a foreign language, opens up the third place, which seems an important premise of constructing the subject position that is not caught innocently in oneness with the mother tongue.

As a new language learner, the author is sensitive to the differences of the two languages, Japanese and German. Japanese constitutes a point of reference, but it is the meeting itself that makes Japanese visible.\textsuperscript{21}

In “From the mother tongue to the mother of tongue” (Från modersmålet till språkmoder)” in Talisman, the narrator ‘I’ is keenly aware of the foreignness of the new language, German, to the degree that a pencil in Japanese and German, enpitsu and Bleistift, seemed to her two different categories. (7) When she comments the outburst of her German colleague at the office, where she works, and compares it to general Japanese attitude towards things, it sounds like a reversed Orientalism. German nouns have three genders, masculine, feminine and neutral. As a Japanese, she is enhanced with the sex of things, and a sterile office landscape opens up an almost fantastic scene for her. She establishes a personal relationship with everyday things around her. A typewriter is feminine, which makes her feel a personal tie, when writing on the machine, the foreign language. The typewriter, due to its stable, inviting feminine form, as she sees, and its grammatical gender, becomes the mother of her new language, giving her a sense of being ‘adopted’ by the language

Acquisition of a new language is compared to a child’s learning the mother tongue, where words, cut off of semantic connotations and syntactical chains, can fly free in fantasy. (10-11) This is a freedom in language, liberating the language from its everydayness.

Not only meeting the new language with the eyes of a marveled child, her method of acquisition is physical. Vision plays a role, for instance the shape of the consonant ‘s’ on a poster at a buss stop in Hamburg which seduced the author. (35) But she seems more keenly sensitive to ears and hearing. Meeting with the foreign language seems to have bestowed her with a new self-consciousness regarding the act of hearing. The episode of a Tibetan monk is telling. The author heard a monk recite a prayer in a temple in Tibet, which gave her the sensation of hearing multiple voices in one voice. (22-23) In the monk’s voice, the author believed hearing the voice of the dead. She recounts more lengthily the episode in “Others’ timber (Andras klang)” (92-102), where she also tells about own ‘sound-memory’ since the childhood in Japan. Regarding the Tibetan monk, the author asks, “Why do we not hear several voices in a voice, when they are actually there?” (94) She tries herself to simultaneously produce multiple tones. To believe that one’s own voice does not have one clear tone, but contains other voices like that of the dead, shows that the author’s subjective position is no longer clearly enclosed, but open for multiplicity. The awareness of manifoldness of one’s own voice figuratively informs the position of subjectivity of the author, which cannot be identified by nationality or the mother tongue. This sense of manifoldness, without any clear-cut sense of identity, should be called, in my opinion, the ‘transcultural’ positioning of the subjective. Her utterance is not anchored in any homeland but open to

\textsuperscript{130} All English translations of her text are mine. \textsuperscript{21} See Sakai and note 21.
multiple interpretations. Japan is remembered as the site of myths and memories, sometimes somewhat stereotype such. But it can never serve as a secure, real point of reference.

The place she feels secure is the womb of the mother, from which she has been separated at the birth. She can never return there, so her genuine homeland is forever lost.22

*Language learning is, more than intellectual, physical.*

*Pitch and volume of a voice is put right, you imitate the language’s rhythm and pay attention to in-and exhalation. Each consonant, each vowel, and perhaps even each comma passes through cells of the body, and transforms the speaker.*23

She approaches German language, markedly physically, engaging all the cells in her body. (13) Her adherence to female body and insistence on physical sensations, like hearing, seem gender-bound, that she is a woman. However, more fundamentally, it is important to remember that the meeting with the foreign made her aware of the mother tongue.

*“Before I came to Hamburg did my voice bear no significance to me.”*24

A foreign language can open a port toward the linguistic land of marvels, where logic can be turned up side down, inviting the speaker to reflect upon his/her own subjective position.

To acquire this freedom, which I would call the transcultural positioning of the subject, is a process of deconstructing the individual’s linguistic and cultural ‘identity’ as conceived in Herder’s sense. Tawada’s text shows in some places, the tenacity of the Herder type conception of culture, but more expressively giving a voice to the subject, who resides in the ‘third’ place position, both in and out of own and foreign languages and cultures.

In *“Actually you cannot say it to anyone, but Europe does not exist (41-47), she writes,*

*If my tongue may taste Europe and speak Europe, I might be able to transcend borders between a viewer and an object. Because, what one eats goes down to the stomach, making the spoken pass through the brain to become one with the flesh.*25

One cannot return to mother’s womb, but one can always eat up a new language and alien culture to digest, to make them a part of one’s flesh. How can one know which is own and which is alien, when it is digested and one with the flesh?

Transculturality may be the most individualistic stance in the face of culture and cultural artifacts, because the subject cancels the political and power relationship at macro level, but commits oneself to own physical and perceptive world of micro cosmos. This may sound negative. However, the same individualistic, physical stance creates the third palace, where the subject acquires a keen self-consciousness of own linguistic and cultural place (which is actually the impossibility of defining own ‘linguistic’ and ‘cultural’ place). The third place constitutes the most

22 About womb, see “Seven histories about seven mothers (Sju historier om sju mödrar)” in *Talisman*, 2009, 84-85. And the ‘I’ tells that the best place of literary creation is a small, naked room, which is the substitution of the lost womb.

23 Ibid., 128.


25 Ibid., 47.
critical subject position, where, in the best case, both poetry and humanistic compassion can reside. Tawada’s essays seem pointing to the direction.
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Abstract
In this presentation, I will first try to define several key words based on previous research, such as, ‘culture’, ‘translation’, ‘cultural translation’ and ‘cultural hybridity’. I will look at why the concept of ‘cultural translation’ is useful when we want to make sense of the things we are not familiar with, either within our society or from different societies. Then I will examine a renowned New Zealand novella The Whale Rider (1987), which is a mixture of Maori mythology, fiction and contemporary Maori lifestyle. Finally, I will see how ‘cultural translation’ takes place inside the story, between the literary text and the film adaptation (2002), and in the Japanese (2003) and Chinese versions (2006) of the novella.

The Whale Rider was written by Witi Ihimaera, a New Zealander with Maori and European backgrounds. In the novella, the heroine, a young girl, faces her great-grandfather’s discrimination who believes that women cannot lead the Maori people. Eventually the heroine proves her capability by riding the whale king. The novella raises several issues: how the so-called Maori traditions should adapt to modern times; how the conflicts between men and women need to be resolved; and how the natural environment must be protected for the Maori and whales to survive.

I will concentrate on several aspects of the novella and the film where ‘cultural translation’ takes place: 1) the difference in interpreting ‘authentic’ Maori leadership by the old generation and the new, and by men and women, 2) the difference in interpreting the role of whales in Maori society by the people and by whales themselves, 3) the transformation from discarded traditions to a newly unified community, 4) the limits in understanding and the possibility of misunderstanding some Maori concepts, and 5) cultural hybridization in the novella, the film and the Japanese and Chinese versions.
Introduction

‘Cultural Translation’ is a term which has been frequently used recently. In a broad sense, this term is considered to refer to the common practices in most societies from the beginning of human history and cultural formation.

In this paper, I will first look at several representative definitions of the words ‘culture’, ‘language’, ‘translation’ and ‘cultural translation’ which are to be used often here. Second, I will focus on a renowned New Zealand novella The Whale Rider (1987) whose content displays typical examples of ‘cultural translation.’ Third, I will move to its Japanese (2003) and Chinese (2006) translations to see how ‘cultural translation’ takes place between different languages and cultures. Fourth, I will analyze how images can or cannot be translated. Finally I will discuss why the term ‘cultural translation’ is useful in analyzing literary translations involving different languages, as well as in observation of social contacts between different cultures in today’s world.

Culture, Language, Translation

The most classical definition of ‘culture’ was made by Edward B. Tylor in 1865. ‘Culture or civilization, taken in its wide ethnographic sense, is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, customs and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society’ (Tylor, 1865, 1871). Since then the term ‘complex whole’ has been often used to describe ‘culture’.

Tracing the development of the concept of ‘culture’, Raymond Williams, pointed out in 1958 that ‘culture’ originally meant ‘tending of natural growth’, and then a ‘process of human training’. It was always ‘a culture of something’. But in the 18th century and the early 19th century, it became ‘a thing in itself.’ He continued to say,

"It came to mean, first, ‘a general state of habit of the mind’, having close relations with the idea of human perfection. Second, it came to mean ‘the general state of intellectual development, in a society as a whole’. Third, it came to mean ‘the general body of the arts’. Fourth, later in the century, it came to mean ‘a whole way of life, material, intellectual and spiritual’ (Williams, 1958)".

Analyzing the functions of ‘culture’, Malinowski pointed out in 1944 that ‘culture’ is ‘the integral whole consisting of implements and consumers’ goods, of constitutional charters for the various social groupings, of human ideas and crafts, beliefs and customs.’ Meanwhile, he paid attention to the fact that culture is constantly under pressure for change. ‘A cultural standard of living...means that new needs appear and new imperatives or determinants are imposed on human behaviour. Clearly, cultural tradition has to be transmitted from each generation to the next.’

George P. Murdock illustrated the process of cultural changes in 1960. ‘Cultural change begins with the process of innovation, the formation of a new habit by a single individual which is subsequently accepted or learned by other members of his society.’ He then further divided innovation into four groups: variation, invention, tentation and cultural borrowing. He emphasized the importance of ‘cultural borrowing.

*Of all forms of innovation, cultural borrowing is by far the most common and important. The overwhelming majority of the elements in any culture are the result of borrowing...for it is doubtful whether there is a single culture known to history or anthropology that has not owed at least ninety per cent of its constituent elements to cultural borrowing.*

This statement, based on his careful study of the nature of culture, shows the fact that there is no ‘pure’ culture being formed in isolation. Hybridity is part of culture. Not only culture, but also language is hybridized. Language is probably the most representative aspect of culture which tends to show characteristics of cultures.

Edward Sapir wrote in 1949, ‘Of all aspects of culture, it is a fair guess that language was the first to receive a highly developed form and that its essential perfection is a prerequisite to the development of culture as a whole.’ According to him, ‘A great deal of the cultural stock in trade of a primitive society is presented in a more or less well defined linguistic form. Proverbs, medicine formulae, standardized prayers, folk tales, standardized speeches, song texts, genealogies are some of the more overt forms which language takes as a culture-preserving instrument.’ It seems culture would not have developed if humans did not possess a language.

Just as ‘cultural borrowing’ is universal to all cultures, linguistic ‘borrowing’ is also universal to all languages. Sapir continued, ‘Of the linguistic changes due to the more obvious types of contact the one which seems to have played the most important part in the history of language is the “borrowing” of words across linguistic frontiers. This borrowing naturally goes hand in hand with cultural diffusion. One of the essential parts of ‘cultural borrowing’ and ‘word borrowing’ is ‘translation.’

Taking the meaning of ‘translation’ in a broad sense, George Steiner pointed out, ‘Any model of communication is at the same time a model of trans-lation, of vertical or horizontal transfer of significance. No two historical epochs, no two social classes, no two localities use words and syntax to signify exactly the same things, to send identical signals of valuation and inference. Neither do two human beings.’ Therefore, he thought, ‘a human being performs an act of translation, in the full sense of the word, when receiving a speech-message from any other human being... In short: inside or between languages, human communication equals translation.’

---

9 Steiner, George, 1975 *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press,
Newmark thought, ‘translation is the most economical method of explaining one culture’s way to another’ and ‘translation mediates cultures.’ It seems that translation is an intrinsic part of human activities, without which communication is impossible, and cultures cannot be formed. In other words, culture will not exist if there is no ‘translation.’ If culture is mediated by ‘translation,’ then it is inevitably accompanied by adjustment of cultural values, as Lawrence Venuti wrote, ‘Translation, like every cultural practice, involves the creation of values, linguistic and literary, religious and political, commercial and educational, as the particular case may be. What makes translation unique is that the value-creating process takes the form of an inscribed interpretation of a foreign-language text, whose own values inevitably undergo diminution and revision to accommodate those that appeal to domestic cultural constituencies.’

It seems that translation is an intrinsic part of human activities, without which communication is impossible, and cultures cannot be formed. In other words, culture will not exist if there is no ‘translation.’ If culture is mediated by ‘translation,’ then it is inevitably accompanied by adjustment of cultural values, as Lawrence Venuti wrote, ‘Translation, like every cultural practice, involves the creation of values, linguistic and literary, religious and political, commercial and educational, as the particular case may be. What makes translation unique is that the value-creating process takes the form of an inscribed interpretation of a foreign-language text, whose own values inevitably undergo diminution and revision to accommodate those that appeal to domestic cultural constituencies.’

It short, all translations are cultural, being linguistic translation or ‘translation’ in the broad sense. Therefore, the term ‘cultural translation’ may sound strange, because it can imply a kind of translation that is not cultural. But this shall not surprise us, because ‘translation’ has been often mistaken as a simple transmission of words and sentences, regardless of cultural context. However, many translators, according to David Katan, are not aware of the relation between translation and culture. “First, how languages convey meaning is related to the culture. Secondly, though languages can convey concepts from other cultures, people (including translators and interpreters) tend not to realize that their perception (through language) is, in fact, bound by their own culture.” Therefore, Hatim and Mason proposed that a translator be placed to identify and resolve the disparity between signs and values across culture.

Even though all translations are cultural, the term ‘cultural translation’ is still useful because it can highlight cultural aspects of a language text. Now we shall see how the so-called ‘cultural translation’ takes place at several different levels in a New Zealand novella The Whale Rider.

Translating Traditions

The Whale Rider was published in 1987. It was written by Witi Ihimaera (b. 1944), a prominent New Zealand writer with Maori and European backgrounds. The story is about how a young girl proved to be the leader of the Maori tribe. Her great-grandfather, the elder Moari tribe chief Koro Apirana, thinks that only the male line of the oldest son can inherit the leadership. When his oldest grandson’s first child was born a girl, Koro was deeply disappointed. Because of his firm belief in male’s leadership, he has ignored all the signs that indicate the girl’s potential. He constantly discourages her, and discriminates against her. But the girl loves him, and wants to help him to find the next leader, until she herself becomes the one.

The novella is a mixture of Maori founding myth, fantasy and daily life. The myth relates that the
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ancestor of the Maori arrived in Aotearoa (today’s New Zealand) on the back of a whale. The author Ihimaera said that he intentionally changed the myth.

*I wrote Whale Rider based on a particular legend and that legend was of our ancestor, Paikea, who was male, who was one of the royal sons of Hawaiki who came to New Zealand on the back of a whale. So it’s a specific tribal story that applies only to Whangara and to the Maori people of the North Island or the out areas of New Zealand... What I did was that I subverted the original (legend) so that instead of a male riding a whale, it would be a young female riding a whale... Today, it is so important to recognize that the world has indeed changed, but it takes time for tradition to be dismantled.*

Ihimaera has made several alterations to the original myth: (1) providing an explanation to the relationship between the ancient bull whale and the male ancestor; (2) giving a reason for the journey to discover Aotearoa (New Zealand) by the two; (3) creating a motivation to the voluntary death of today’s whales; (4) changing the gender of the new whale rider; (5) forming a new relationship between the whales and the people. Through these devices, he ‘culturally translated’ the old oral myth into a new one, in which the old traditions are transformed, the Maori language became a hybridity of the English and the Maori, and the relationship between humans and whales turned to be heart-warming. Ihimaera’s expectations of ideal human relations, and of the connection between nature and people are ‘translated’ into an artistic work full of visual and acoustic images.

Just as Jill Scott once wrote, ‘Myth is a mode of communication, which is by its very nature always already a translation. There primeval texts of humanity reach both backwards and forwards from and into diverse cultural narratives, illustrating social identities and complex configurations of community.’ Ihimaera’s work is a vivid example showing how a myth needs to be changed in order to maintain its vitality for future generations. It is ‘cultural translation’ that gives verbal expressions to his imagination.

**Why to Translate?**

As the one who translated The Whale Rider into the Chinese language, I need to reflect on why and how I translated it. Although I had lived in New Zealand for ten years before I first encountered the film adaptation Whale Rider (2003), I did not have much knowledge of Maori history, tradition and legends, except the commonly promoted images of Maori culture. When I watched the film, I was touched. Afterwards, I rushed to a bookshop to find a copy of the novella. I read it, and was again moved to tears. I returned to watch the film twice more. I felt a strong urge to share the story with the people of the Chinese language sphere.

This kind of urge has been theorized by Schleiermacher as an attempt to be understood positively, and a desire to build community and thus understanding. My translation was made possible by several factors. First, the film helped me to familiarize myself with some aspects of Maori

---

culture. Second, the film helped me understand the theme in the novella better, just as Hewson and Martin said, ‘people might well consult a translation in order to have a better (or more complete) understanding of the original.’\textsuperscript{17} In this case, the film is a successful ‘translation’ of the novella from verbal expressions to visual images. Third, the story itself made me believe that it can be understood and appreciated universally regardless of differences between nationalities, races, cultures and languages.

In the process of translation, one of the difficulties is how to translate the Maori names of people and places, and how to translate the names of plants and animals that are native to New Zealand. I find it easy to translate abstract concepts because they can be explained by adding words. But the names will not sound like names if they carry explanatory words. Also, I had to take a balance between allowing the Chinese people to understand the foreign names based on their own culture on one hand, and keeping the Maori-ness of the names on the other. The reader shall face a text that is both understandable and puzzling. It is the process of ‘domesticating’ the foreignness of the original text, and ‘foreignizing’ the host language—the Chinese in this case. The strategy consciously or unconsciously employed in my translation somehow echoes Schleiermacher’s suggestion that aspects of the original language (the English and Maori) be incorporated into the target language (the Chinese) in order to enrich the latter, to make it open up to otherness.\textsuperscript{18}

Inside the novella, the naming of the heroin is one of the most important developments of the story. To the great-grandfather Koro, naming a girl Kahu after the primary ancestor and hero of the tribe is unbearably offensive. That will not only belittle the ancestor hero, but also will give an impression that a female can imitate the hero. He fiercely opposes such a naming. On the contrary, his wife Nanny Flowers, their grandson and his wife do not see any problem in giving the girl such a name, because they want to connect the girl with the tribe. Obviously they have a different cultural value from that of Koro’s. Meanwhile such a naming prophesies the future of the girl, just as Friedman argued, ‘Cultural identity and conflict are retracted in names given to characters; names parents give their children; renaming by oneself or by others; nicknames; and place names.’\textsuperscript{19}

Because each Chinese character has its own meaning, choosing proper kanji to represent the phonetic signs of the original Maori names needs to be carefully done. In the novella, there are abundant acoustic images of songs, sounds and voices, and visual images of the ocean. It is almost imperative that I use the kanji associated with those images, such as, $ge$ (歌), $fan$ (泛), $lang$ (浪), $tang$ (淌), etc. while translating the Maori names. However these images do not appear in the Japanese translation because the katakana are used to represent the names. In other words, the Chinese translation has added more images related to the ocean and music, which the origi-

nal names do not necessarily have. Now let us see a short list of how the names appeared in the Japanese and Chinese versions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maori</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, Whangara (the actual place)</td>
<td>ファンガラ</td>
<td>泛歌拉</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, Kahutia Te Rangi (the ancestor)</td>
<td>カフティア・テ・ランギ</td>
<td>天人卡呼提阿</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, Porourangi (the heroin's father)</td>
<td>ボロウランギ</td>
<td>泊罗浪击</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, Koro Apirana (the tribe leader)</td>
<td>コロ・アピラナ</td>
<td>祖父阿皮拉纳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, The Lord Tangaroa (the governor of the ocean kingdom)</td>
<td>タンガロア</td>
<td>滌歌若阿</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared with the katakana used in the Japanese version, the Chinese characters provide much more images of water movement, singing and calling. However, the majority of Maori names cannot be substituted by meaningful kanji, and therefore in the Chinese translation, many Chinese characters function just like the katakana in the Japanese version. Nevertheless, because of the meaning of the Chinese characters, the Chinese version, to some extent, reflects the richness of visual and acoustic images in the original text. In the Chinese version, more cultural values are added to the names, so that the names become more meaningful. This kind of enrichment (or corruption) is an inevitable aspect of ‘cultural translation’.

Generally speaking when translating a literature work, all translators make efforts in selecting words, presenting visual images, choosing phonetic signs, and adjusting literary styles. It is a constant endeavor to take balance between retaining the original culture and incorporating the host culture. The foreignness and the familiarity must co-exist. Otherwise, the translated work cannot be understood properly.

Another difficulty in the translation is how to render some visual images in Maori culture into Chinese verbal expression, when actual images cannot be presented. Sometimes the reader may imagine things quite different from the original ones. Just give several examples in the opening paragraph of the novella.

The original one:

_In the old days, in the years that have gone before us, the land and sea felt a great emptiness, a yearning. The mountains were like the _poutama_, the stairway to heaven, and the lush green rainforest was a rippling _kakahu_ of many colours. The sky was iridescent _paua swirling_ with the_ |

---

21 『クジラの島の少女』ウィティ•イヒマエラ著、澤田真一、サワダ・ハンナ・ジョイ訳、角川書店、2003年。
22 《骑鲸人》威提•依希马埃拉著 郭南燕译、上海人民出版社，2006年。
kowhaiwhai patterns of wind and clouds; sometimes it reflected the prisms of rainbow or southern aurora. The sea was ever-changing pounamu, shimmering and seamless to the sky. This was the well at the bottom of the world and when you looked into it you felt you could see to the end of forever. (underlined by me)

The Japanese one.

昔々、われわれが生まれるはるか前の時代に、陸と海は大きな空しさを覚え、満たしの時が来るのを待ち望んでいた。山々は天に掛けられたポウタマ（階段）、瑞々しい緑の雨林は細波の立った色とりどりのカカフ（マント）のようなであった。空は、風と雲が織り成す渦巻きの模様を装った玉虫色のパウア（パウア貝）で、おりおり虹のプリズムや南の方のオーロラを映し出した。海は変化自在のポウナム（グリーンストーン=緑色の翡翠）で、煌めきを途切らすことなく空にまで届いた。ここは世界の底にある泉。中をのぞき込めば、永遠の終わりまで見通すことができるような気がした。

The Chinese one.

在古老的日子里，在流逝的岁月间，大地和海洋沉浸在巨大的空旷和渴望之中。山岳如同通向天堂的阶梯，葱翠的森林仿佛室多色的浮动斗篷。灿烂的天空呈现出漩涡状的风云，有时映出七色彩虹，有时反射出南极之光。海水变幻无常，波光粼粼，水天相连，融为一体。这里是世界底部的井口，如果一直往下看，你将瞥见永恒的尽头。

The underlined words in the Maori cannot be easily visualized by the reader from different cultures. However, this kind of lack of understanding or misunderstanding is something unavoidable in the process of ‘cultural translation.’ Wilhelm von Humboldt believed that ‘all understanding...is always at the same time a misunderstanding.’ Nevertheless, it is recognized that ‘the act of translation enriches and gives new life to the original, saving it from oblivion and even transforming the language of the source text in the process.’ People always try to understand foreign cultures against their own cultural background. When the terms from their own culture are used, overlapped images are created. In fact, ‘cultural translation’ is also a process of hybridizing cultures.

In this novella, the most common thing that can be understood universally is the gender issue presented. Without this universality, the reader may not be easily attracted to the theme of the story. It is a problem almost every nation, every culture, every generation has been facing. That probably is why the film has won such an enthusiasm in the world after it was released in 2002. It was awarded numerous prizes by the audience. Many people over the world could identify themselves with the hardship the heroin was experiencing.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have only focused on a few aspects of ‘cultural translation.’ ‘Cultural translation’ is an attempt of interpreting different cultures. It also occurs between generations, social groups and individuals. It takes place anywhere and anytime. We need to have constant ‘cultural translations’ in order to make sense of things we are unfamiliar with. There also frequently exists misunderstanding in this process. Until we share misunderstanding, cannot we be conscious of the existence of misunderstanding.

One of the functions of ‘cultural translation’ is making us aware of the fact that everything has to be understood through translation, and translation is a process of understanding and misunderstanding, and imagination. When we use the other terms, such as, ‘trans-culturality,’ ‘bi-culturality,’ ‘multi-culturality,’ ‘cross-culturality,’ or ‘inter-culturality,’ although all having different connotations, the overall emphasis is put on demystifying the ‘otherness’ and being engaged to try to better understand ‘the other.’
Cultural Translation and Music
A Theoretical Model and Examples from Japan
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Abstract
Music, like language, qualifies as a field in which “ideological horizons of homogeneity have been conceptualized,” and postcolonialist scholars such as Homi Bhabha and Paul Gilroy have acknowledged its critical role as an emblem of identity within the very sites of hybridity that especially interest scholars of cultural translation. This paper will explore various ways that intercultural analyses of musical communication may offer theoretical insights applicable to the broader field of cultural translation. While much has already been theorized regarding how foreign musical genres may be transplanted, adopted and fused with indigenous traditions, the notion of musical “translation” may most accurately fit the precise objective of intentionally representing aesthetic practices of one tradition through the techniques of another culturally distinct genre. Artistic choices to (or not to) aim for this mode of cultural translation are routinely made by musicians active in contemporary fusion projects, and analysis of specific examples from such ensembles as the Helsinki Koto Ensemble, Yoshida Brothers, Moscow Pan-Asian Ensemble and Tokyo Brass Style will illuminate how cultural translation can be either conscious or unconscious, and deliberately highlighted or downplayed, within musical hybridity. A theoretical model will be proposed as one way of conceptualizing various approaches to cultural translation in music.
PRELUDE

In 2003, an original artistic project entitled “Correspondence” was conceived and performed in Tokyo that, in retrospect, seems to offer some stimulating insights into issues of cultural translation. Correspondence was a modest original opera, for which I collaborated with Belgian avant-garde artist Dr. Eric van Hove as co-producer and co-director. For this experimental project, van Hove wrote the words to be spoken and sung, and designed images to be displayed, while I created music to accompany the performance with both vocalists and a chamber orchestra. Our work was supplemented by both semi-improvisatory sounds from renowned electronic dance musician Kenji Williams and masterful movement from butoh dancer Kinya “Zulu” Tsuruyama. Correspondence was quite a low-budget project since most performers were still students, including the Japanese orchestra members, singers, and other participants, and what is relevant to this essay is not so much the novelty (or nostalgia) of our work, nor its artistic contribution, which admittedly may have been regarded as rather insignificant in the judgment of some audience members. Rather, I would like to begin with a brief consideration of what was expressed through this artistic performance regarding attempts to bridge cultural differences, particularly via “translation” in the discourses of music and language.

The principal unifying theme of Correspondence was reflected in multiple layers within its title. This work was about the angular meeting of lines and planes, including the attempt to understand how ideas in one domain (e.g. Japanese society, language and art) may be expressed in another (e.g. European societies, languages and music), while it was also literally based on a series of letters, or correspondence between van Hove in Japan and his acquaintances abroad to whom he was writing about his initial observations of life in contemporary Japan. We offered a special sneak preview of selections from the opera at a school for disabled children in Western Tokyo, whose administration assured us we were the first group of foreigners ever to visit. That was a deeply touching experience, since we sensed that the performance in some way meant as much to these Japanese children, with their broad range of mental and physical struggles, as it could ever mean to an audience of healthy and educated adults. They too seemed to struggle to understand and be understood, and perhaps also feared causing offense that could lead to rejection in what seemed to us to be a society deeply invested in perfection. Of course, van Hove and I were still only beginning to understand Japanese society at the time, and had much to learn.

I suppose there is inevitably something somewhat megalomaniacal about any attempt to embark on an original artistic project of this kind, yet van Hove and I felt at the time that it was also courageous and somehow necessary. If we did not strive to create some great new performance art to express our impressions of contemporary Japan, we mused, who would? Since the

1 Correspondence website, http://www.transcri.be/correspondence.html
2 Eric van Hove official website, http://transcri.be
3 Kenji Williams website, http://www.kenjiwilliams.com/
5 For recent research on music therapy interventions, see Brynjulf Stige, Gary Ansdell, Cochavit Elefant, and Mercedès Pavlicevic, Where Music Helps: Community Music Therapy in Action and Reflection (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2010), and Brynjulf Stige, Culture-Centered Music Therapy (New Braunfels, TX: Barcelona Publishers, 2002).
time of Correspondence, I have focused more on academic scholarship, often at the expense of neglecting my artistic side, while van Hove has completed an MA degree in shodo (Japanese calligraphy) from Tokyo Gakugei University and a PhD in contemporary art from Tokyo University of Fine Arts, and given exhibitions and performances in numerous countries around the world. Dr. van Hove is perhaps most well-known as a poet and avant-garde calligrapher nowadays, with projects that involve drawing improvised poetry in unusual modes and locations worldwide, such as in public squares, underwater; across sands in the desert, in the arctic snow, and in Africa in collaboration with various wild animals, and his best known work is probably the provocative Metragram series that entails images of calligraphy being drawn on the abdomens of an assortment of women in around 50 locations all across the world.

Dr. van Hove’s poetry, which I turned into song, expressed many intriguing images associated with the challenge of attempting to reach an understanding of an entirely different foreign culture and its language. In “Correspondence”, van Hove wrote “The seams of modern Japan are visible, and its creators have only celestial reflection of the human condition’s infinite tragedy, daily and unnoticed as the beauty of a pool of water.” I recall that as I strove to develop music for this intriguing line of poetry, I was struck with how difficult it is to express cross-cultural understandings meaningfully without essentializing differences. At the same time, van Hove’s writings were to some extent about the reflective experience of self-discovery in a foreign context. In another line of Correspondence he wrote, “You know as I do, this discomfort that submerges you when suddenly you hear yourself: being so far from truth at the very time when you were walking on a serene path with it as the destination.” I was also deeply impressed by some passages from Correspondence in which van Hove acknowledged the musicality of a language one is still struggling to comprehend. “Little by little,” van Hove observed that “Japanese makes its significant inroads toward me, from a still hollow significant is birthed the full signifier that I could only suspect until now.” Indeed, we may have much to learn about the nature of language and process of translation by reflecting on parallel phenomena in music.

This essay will explore various ways that intercultural analyses of musical meanings may offer theoretical insights applicable to the broader field of cultural translation. Music, like language, qualifies as a field in which “ideological horizons of homogeneity have been conceptualized,” and postcolonialist scholars such as Homi Bhabha and Paul Gilroy have acknowledged its critical role as an emblem of identity within the very sites of hybridity that particularly interest scholars of cultural translation. Nevertheless, it appears that previous studies have not explicitly acknowledged the role that music may play in the field of cultural translation, and there is need for theoretical models to address its relationship to other forms of discourse in this regard.

While much has already been theorized regarding how foreign musical genres may be trans-
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6 Sociomusicology blog (David G. Hebert), http://sociomusicology.blogspot.com
7 Metragram Series website, http://cargocollective.com/metagram
planted, adopted and fused with indigenous traditions, the notion of cultural translation may most accurately fit the specific objective of intentionally representing significant aspects of one musical tradition through the techniques of another distinct tradition. Artistic choices to (or not to) explicitly aim for this mode of cultural translation are routinely made by contemporary musicians active in hybrid genres, and analysis of specific examples from such ensembles as the Yoshida Brothers, Helsinki Koto Ensemble, Tokyo Brass Style, and Moscow Pan-Asian Ensemble will illustrate how cultural translation can be either conscious or unconscious, and deliberately highlighted or shunted in such music projects. A theoretical model will be proposed as one way of conceptualizing various approaches to cultural translation in music.

**RATIONALE AND LIMITATIONS: MUSICAL TRANSLATION**

Cultural translation can be rather difficult to define. By virtue of its being (1) an emerging interdisciplinary field, and (2) a corpus of paradigms disseminated via pedagogy within academic contexts, it seems a vast array of activity within the field of cultural translation might itself be regarded as cultural translation, for whenever we strive to effectively communicate complex concepts from one system of thought from another – whether to colleagues in other disciplines or to students of any age or educational background – it appears we are to some extent engaging in cultural translation. Still, for the purposes of this essay I will regard cultural translation to constitute only a very slight broadening of the notion of “translation” as traditionally used in reference to languages.

For several generations, musicologists have written about similarities between music and language, and reflected on ways that analytical approaches from the field of linguistics may be effectively applied to music. Linguists and literary critics, however, have generally taken less of an interest in musicological paradigms. Unsurprisingly, a similar trend may be seen in the emerging field of cultural translation, for which it already appears that linguistic and literary discussion may be dominant relative to paradigms associated with research on other forms of cultural discourse (such as music, theatre, dance, visual art, fashion, etc.). What of consequence to intercultural understanding might inevitably be missed by theorization that arises almost exclusively from examination of a single form of discourse as a basis for cultural analysis? Translators routinely grapple with complex meanings embedded in nonlinguistic forms of communication that defy conventional modes of translation, and consequently a holistic and trans-disciplinary theoretical orientation is seemingly desirable to many proponents of cultural translation. Sherry Simon has acknowledged “the concerns of those who fear that an uncontrolled enlargement of the idea of translation will be a threat to the new discipline of translation studies.”

In recognition that this concern may have some legitimacy, the rationale for this essay arises from a recognition that even a field striving to maintain its focus on language may still have something valuable to learn from the other form of symbolically-rich human discourse regarded to most closely resemble language: music. Moreover, my approach will make deliberate use of a generously conservative definition for what “translation” might entail in musical contexts. Despite such reservations and qualifications, one must acknowledge that according to the positions advanced in many of

its seminal documents,\textsuperscript{11} it would appear that analysis of intercultural musical practices – and the ways in which they are explained – merits a place in the field cultural translation. Specifically, systems of music transmission and pedagogy seem to represent especially fertile areas for research on educational issues in cultural translation.\textsuperscript{12}

In order to bring a manageable focus to this discussion, it is important to be impeccably clear about what will \textit{not} be addressed here, and why. I will avoid discussion of mere song lyrics and their meanings, in order to maintain a focus on the sentient features of musical sound that may be independent of any linguistic significance, the reason being that such a focus will enable us to face the distinctive features of musical discourse in contrast to linguistic discourse. I will also eschew discussion of the kinds of challenges and dilemmas most often faced by ethnomusicologists, scholars who seek to construct comprehensive verbal descriptions of musical systems that are translated across cultural boundaries. Much has already been written on that topic, which I greatly appreciate, yet this theme would appear to be less relevant to the purposes of our forum. Rather, the question here today is how musicians adopt ideas and practices from one musical system into another musical system, a process that to some extent typically requires a bridging of cultural differences: in other words, projects that entail an attempt to translate one music (or at least prominent aspects of a preexisting tradition) into another form of music. I will also consider educational implications of this kind of cultural translation, which typically yields some prototypical form of musical hybridity as its outcome.

For those unfamiliar with music research there may also be some reluctance to recognize the meaningfulness of musical practices, or at least the validity of their interpretation. Just how significant should music-making, the mere production of pleasurable sounds, be appropriately regarded within the context of other seemingly translatable human activities? The global ubiquity and expansive history of musical activity serve as some testament to its ultimate utility, for social scientists consider music-making to be a universal practice associated with all known human societies, and with a lengthy history that may even rival that of language.\textsuperscript{13} In November of 2010, I taught briefly for the Higher Institute of Music in Damascus, Syria, a nation that is home to some of the earliest evidence of music in the world. At the National Museum of Syria I viewed Ur-Nansha, one of the world’s oldest known carvings of a musician. Ur-Nansha is the name inscribed on a 26-cm tall gypsum statue that depicts an androgynous court musician, the chief singer of Iblul II, who was King of the city-state of Mari, located in what is now Eastern Syria. The Ur-Nansha figure was found in a Massif Ridge archaeological dig, nearby the Ninna Zaza temple (2600-2400 BC). According to recent research findings, a 3,200 year old song, also from Syria, offers the ear-


\textsuperscript{12} Margaret Mehl, “Cultural translation in two directions: The Suzuki Method in Japan and Germany,” \textit{Research and Issues in Music Education, 7} (2009), \url{http://www.stthomas.edu/rimeonline/vol7/mehl.htm}.

liest known written clues regarding ancient musical practices. In the lyrics of this song, dated to 1200 BC and found inscribed in cuneiform symbols on a clay tablet, an Assyrian woman approaches the moon goddess, Nikkal, to seek a cure for infertility. However, there is even earlier evidence of musical activity than these examples, including primitive Stone Age cave paintings and, most recently, the discovery of bone flutes from over 35,000 years ago in the region that is now southwestern Germany. Music clearly serves an essential human need, as seen from its use in all known societies to construct meaning and regulate social behavior, as well as evidence of its practice that extends to prehistoric times, and it may very well have evolved in tandem with language.

THEORETICAL MODEL OF MUSIC TRANSLATION

The theoretical model I will propose in this essay has two parts: a) Four Culturalist Conceptions, and b) Five Domains of Cultural Translation via Music. The first part illustrates how cross-cultural relationships may be conceived in relation to education and other institutionalized forms of socially structured interaction, which also has implications for literature and related arts. Rather than serving an analytical function for interpretation of particular examples of cross-cultural artistry, the Four Culturalist Conceptions is intended to serve an illustrative purpose in normative discussion of prospective approaches to cultural policy. The second part Five Domains of Cultural Translation via Music delineates diverse aspects of music production and consumption that may parallel phenomena encountered in other art forms, and as will be demonstrated, is proposed for direct use as an analytical tool.

If multicultural education, as James Banks explains in Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education, is “a concept, an educational reform movement, and a process” that “incorporates the idea that all students – regardless of their ethnic, racial, cultural, or linguistic characteristics – should have an equal opportunity to learn in school,” then there would seem to be precious little philosophical - especially ethical - foundation for opposition to multiculturalist approaches to education in the 21st century. Still, the notion of multiculturalism continues to be debated – particularly in contemporary Europe – and the field of cultural translation seems increasingly concerned with this issue. When considered from an historical perspective, it becomes clear that this way of thinking about education has only become popular in recent generations. Moreover, nowadays, as I have written elsewhere, “the dizzying array of complex inequalities and diverse identities encountered across the globe today may even justify adopting the perspective that any education which is not to some extent multicultural in orientation essentially fails to offer students sufficient opportunities to become meaningfully attuned to the reality of the human condition outside their immediate experience.”

14 This is according to Dr. Theo J. H. Krispijn, Professor of Assyriology at Leiden University, the Netherlands. See Charles Leroux, “Blast from the past: The tale of the oldest song ever,” Chicago Tribune (2007, April 2).
tion and disjuncture from origins caused by its dissemination via mass media, remains strongly connected to cultural roots, even among hybrid genres, a phenomenon that has complex and multifaceted educational implications. The following coloured figure illustrates Four Culturalist Conceptions, as will be explained further below:

**Model 1. Four Culturalist Conceptions**

*Figure 1: Model-Four Culturalist Conceptions*

1. Biculturalism
2. Multiculturalism
3. Interculturalism
4. Transculturalism

The Four Culturalist Conceptions illustrated here consist of 1) Biculturalism, 2) Multiculturalism, 3) Interculturalism, and 4) Transculturalism. Each conception entails a slightly different approach to institutionalization of the cross-cultural meeting of two or more distinct traditions, as encountered in various public sector contexts, such as education and arts policy. The first example, "Biculturalism", indicates the meeting of two major cultural strands, each of which is expected to respond to the other in an attitude of cooperation and even compromise. This approach to cross-cultural contact has for many years been regarded as official government policy in such nations as New Zealand, where there is a single clearly identifiable indigenous population and a single colonizing power, in this case the Maori and British (or Pakeha) residents. However, as I have discussed elsewhere, nowadays the demographic makeup of even a nation like New Zealand is actually far more complex than mere biculturalism would appear to suggest, since there are many Asians and Pacific Islander residents from an array of backgrounds, some of whom (such as in the case of the Niueans) are found in greater numbers in New Zealand than "back home." The second example, Multiculturalism, is often represented through the use of such common metaphors as a "melting pot" or "salad bowl." In this conceptualization, society as a whole is believed to benefit from the contributions of diverse cultural groups who collaborate to raise the collective achievement, forming an even stronger new culture through a synergy that to varying degrees may either result in some loss of the distinctive original cultures (as in the melting pot metaphor) or overall maintenance of heritage (as in the salad bowl metaphor). Some scholars and public figures use these kinds of conceptualizations in debates regarding contemporary society in the United States, Australia, Brazil, Malaysia, and

---


since there are many Asians and Pacific Islander residents from an array of backgrounds, some of whom (such as in the case of the Niueans) are found in greater numbers in New Zealand than “back home.” The second example, Multiculturalism, is often represented through the use of such common metaphors as a “melting pot” or “salad bowl.” In this conceptualization, society as a whole is believed to benefit from the contributions of diverse cultural groups who collaborate to raise the collective achievement, forming an even stronger new culture through a synergy that to varying degrees may either result in some loss of the distinctive original cultures (as in the melting pot metaphor) or overall maintenance of heritage (as in the salad bowl metaphor). Some scholars and public figures use these kinds of conceptualizations in debates regarding contemporary society in the United States, Australia, Brazil, Malaysia, and Khazakhstan, for example. Interculturalism is a concept gaining currency of late in western Europe, where many reject the idea of ever permitting the citizenry to become so ethnically and racially diverse as North America, yet acknowledge that the increasingly obvious presence of large immigrant populations from such places as Africa and the Middle East requires some modifications to public policy. Interculturalism seems to entail an orderly and respectful recognition of difference that leads to some alteration of trajectory on the part of both parties, but perhaps without major transformation. Transculturalism, on the other hand, seems to consist of a free and uninhibited nexus of multiple influences with some risk of “graying” (or lessening of original distinctiveness), yet leading to eventual transformation, while generally retaining some of the original characteristics, illustrated here via slight modifications to color but not trajectory. These Four Culturalist Conceptions may prove useful in any conversations regarding the ultimate purpose of cultural translation within academia. Scholars of cultural translation are presumably motivated by the desire to attain improvements in cross-cultural understanding, yet there is likely to be an array of diverse visions regarding what ultimately may be the outcome of a significant lessening of the epistemological barriers and non-empathetic tensions between cultural groups that give rise to such profound allegories as the Tower of Babel and have even led to countless unnecessary and abominable wars throughout history. The promotion of cross-cultural understanding has arisen as a topic on the landscape of music education in Japan across recent years, and is likely to be a subject of continued debate across a broad range of fields far into the future.20

One important domain in which cultural translation is likely to be especially prominent is that of fusion (or hybrid) music genres and specific examples of musicians and ensembles that seek to blend influences from culturally distinct sources. Until recently, research on hybrid music traditions has “generally implied that they lacked authenticity or were degenerate and oversentimental, having been influenced only by the ‘lowest’ forms of Western music.”21 However, across the past decade, hybridity has arisen as a particularly important area of music research. Ethnomusicologist Tina Ramnarine has recently observed that by “moving beyond simple understandings of hybridity as musical cultures in contact that result in ‘new’ musical expressions we move

---
20 Mitsuko Isoda, Ongaku Kyoikuto Tabunkashugi [Music Education and Multiculturalism] (Otsu: Sangaku, 2010). Also, for examples of how the power of music has been used in conflict resolution, see Olivier Urbain, ed., Music and Conflict Transformation: Harmonies and Dissonances in Geopolitics (London: I.B. Tauris, for Toda Institute for Global Peace and Policy Research, 2008).
towards politically articulated readings of social relations and creative processes.”

Thus, hybridity requires an especially broad view in order to grasp all relevant factors, which is why the second part of this model is relatively wide in its scope, encompassing five domains.

The second part of the model is entitled Five Domains of Cultural Translation via Music, which are identified as follows (see below): A) Technological Adaptations, B) Idiomatic Conventions, C) Aesthetic Notions, D) Creative Practices, and E) Receptive Contexts.

Model 2. Five Domains of Cultural Translation via Music

Figure 2: Model-Five Domains of Cultural Translation via Music

What is meant by conceptualization according to these five domains in the cultural translation of music (or, alternatively, the musical translation of music)? Consider the following descriptions:

A. Technological Adaptations. This refers to an array of tools and associated techniques, including instruments, notation systems, sound media (synthesizer programming of non-sampled sounds or even samples, etc.) used by musicians.

B. Idiomatic Conventions. This refers to actual approaches to the use of musical sounds, including tonal, rhythmic, textural, timbral, and formal systems.

C. Aesthetic Notions. This includes holistic approaches and expressive devices that embody characteristics regarded to sound appropriate and “good.” This does not necessarily require new techniques (although it often does); Rather, it can merely consist of new ways of

listening to and evaluating sounds that influence the intentions of musicians.

D. Creative Practices. This means particular approaches to improvisation, composition, etc., the extent to which material is revised, how it is prepared and developed, mixed and mastered, and so on.

E. Receptive Contexts. This includes not only rituals or venues, but also modes of mediation and any combinations with other media, such as drama, dance, or visual image.

Clearly, the above categories, despite maintaining integrity in some respects, are most often deeply intertwined in the context of any genre. Nevertheless, I sense it is possible to identify examples of musics that have been mostly “translated” in terms of primary emphasis on a single one or particular combination of these categories, typically resulting in some form of artistic hybrid or fusion. Ultimately, the usefulness of such a conceptualization will only be recognizable if put into practice, so I will soon proceed to some concrete illustrations that make use of a template entitled Pentagonal Analysis of Cultural Translation (PACT) that was developed to enable this Five Domains of Cultural Translation in Music model to be implemented as an analytical tool. I must stress that this model is intended to be merely interpretative, to guide subjective analysis and stimulate more robust and precise discussion in conversations and debates among both scholars and artists.

Applications to Japan

The remainder of this essay will offer consideration of how the aforementioned model may be applied to specific examples of musicians who are either Japanese or doing work inspired in some way by Japanese cultural traditions, and conclude with some discussion of implications for other domains of cultural translation. It is important to acknowledge that this is by no means the first discussion of how westernized music in Japan may be theorized, for there have been very significant prior contributions to this theme. However, in terms of how the specific practice of “musical translation” may be defined, as explained earlier, there are arguably some unique aspects to the present discussion. Still, I will begin by briefly describing two of the most interesting previous models that aim to conceptualize various ways that Japanese musicians have approached the mixing of indigenous and western influences, as well as the related role of cultural identity, in their musical activities, both of which are topics of relevance to the theme of musical translation.

Transference, Syncretism, and Synthesis. Music theorist Yayoi Uno-Everett has offered an insightful model in the book Locating East Asia in Western Art Music for interpreting East Asian composers’ strategies for constructing hybrid music compositions. This model makes use of the three categories of: 1) Transference, 2) Syncretism, and 3) Synthesis. According to her conceptualization, within works in the first category (transference), Asian composers: a) “Draw on aes-

24 See Yayoi Uno Everett in Everett and Lau, 2004, p. 16.
thetic principles or formal systems without iconic references to Asian sounds,” b) “Evoke Asian sensibilities without explicit musical borrowing,” c) “Quote culture through literary or extra-musical means,” and d) “Quote preexistent musical materials through the form of a collage.” In the second category (syncretism), Asian composers: a) “Transplant East Asian attributes of timbre, articulation, or scale system onto Western instruments” and b) “Combine musical instruments and/or tuning systems of East Asian and Western musical ensembles.” In the final category (synthesis), which is presumably least commonly encountered, composers fully “transform” elements from at least two traditions into “a distinctive synthesis.” Yayoi Uno Everett’s model seems particularly effective for analysis of the work of composers in the field of art music, for which it was originally designed, and it may also offer some valid applications to other forms of music.

Fence, Flavor, and Phantasm. Another interesting metaphorical model is proposed by Gordon Mathews, who suggests that attitudes toward “Japaneseness” in music be considered in terms of their resemblance to the notions of fence, flavor, and phantasm. By “fence,” Mathews means an attitude that promotes “walling off Japanese from change and foreignness,” which he contrasts with both seeing Japaneseness as “a flavor to be enjoyed by anyone in the world,” and as a “phantasm,” by which he means “Japaneseness obliterated, to be created anew if enough people can be convinced of the validity of such a recreation.” The Fence/Flavor/Phantasm model offers an attractive approach that may be helpful in framing discussions regarding cultural identity in an array of musics.

Despite the apparent utility of these two models, I sense that some Japanese musicians nowadays may actually maintain a relatively cosmopolitan and culturally “omnivorous” identity for which the very notion of “Japaneseness” and awareness of the Asian origins of musical material have little relevance. Shuhei Hosokawa has identified a phenomenon he describes as “the temporary bracketing of ‘identity’ that constitutes the Japanese self” among Japanese musicians, who he recognizes as often capable of maintaining transitory and multi-faceted, or even multiple, musical identities. Both of the aforementioned models may serve as useful tools for grappling with how musical sound or cultural identity may be conceived in specific contexts. However, these models may also be sufficiently malleable so as to be considered in combination with other models, such as in the Aesthetic Notions domain (zone C) of the Pentagonal Analysis of Cultural Translation (PACT) approach developed and applied in this essay for the precise purpose of understanding musical “translation.”

JAPAN IN MUSIC TRANSLATION

I will now proceed to discussion of four examples of contemporary musicians who make various uses of influences from Japanese traditional culture within their work. For the purpose of this essay, I have selected two bands comprised of Japanese musicians who perform in a kind of fusion genre – the Yoshida Brothers and Tokyo Brass Style – and two bands comprised of non-Japanese musicians who perform in hybrid styles inspired by Japanese culture: the Helsinki Koto

26 Hosokawa, 1999, p.526.
Ensemble, and the Moscow Pan-Asian Ensemble. The Yoshida Brothers, who clearly combine Japanese traditional music with various global popular music styles, appear to be the only of these four bands to have already been thoroughly researched. Tokyo Brass Style seemed an attractive choice because it entails a hybrid of western brass band and contemporary Japanese youth culture. I am already well-acquainted with members of the ensemble from Finland, and performed as a member of the ensemble from Russia, so familiarity and accessibility also naturally influenced the selection of these examples.

Yoshida Brothers

The Yoshida Brothers are a renowned popular music act from Hokkaido consisting of brothers Ryoichiro Yoshida (b. 1977) and Kenichi Yoshida (b. 1979), who play the tsugaru-shamisen. Interestingly, the brothers first gained enormous fame throughout Japan and the USA largely due to an appearance performing their song “Kodo (Inside the Sun Remix)” in a 2007 television commercial for the Nintendo Wii videogame system. The Yoshida Brothers official website explains their meteoric rise to fame as follows:

“Each picked up the shamisen at the tender age of five, and began studying Tsugaru shamisen under Takashi Sasaki I in 1990. After sweeping prizes at national Tsugaru shamisen conventions, the brothers made their major debut in 1999. The debut album sold over 100,000 copies, which is an extraordinary figure for a traditional folk music release. They won the “Traditional Japanese Music Album Of The Year” category of the 15th annual Japan Gold Disc Award, as well as the “30th Anniversary Of Normalization Of Japan-China Diplomatic Relations Commemorative Special Prize” of the 17th Annual Japan Gold Disc Award.”

The historic roots of such tsugaru shamisen music have been thoroughly researched, which has not proceeded without controversy since much of the original sources appear to be unreliable. The Yoshida Brothers received extensive training in the tsugaru shamisen tradition, but later decided to take their music in a new direction. Although some performances of the Yoshida Brothers may legitimately qualify as “traditional Japanese music,” much of their music is clearly influenced by rock and other popular music styles, notably including their hit “Rising,” which even contains heavy metal elements. On their MySpace website, the Yoshida Brothers are described as “Japan’s young masters of the ancient tsugaru-shamisen” and we are told that their new album Prism “reflects their long-standing commitment to traditional Japanese folk music, refracted through modern musical sensibilities, incorporating elements of pop, rock, and world music sounds.” The website also boldly declares that the Yoshida Brothers have “taken the tsugaru-shamisen further than any other modern musician, practically reinventing its sound, leading to a musical style both firmly rooted in the traditions of the past and boldly looking forward to the future.” The Yoshida Brothers MySpace website offers many quotations that laud the uniqueness of their artistic achievement. One quotation credits The Globalist for describing the Yoshida Brothers as “an example of how music, though it can bend, does not break with tradition. The history and tradition that echoes through their sound proves that even the most global music is rooted in local soil.” Another quotation attributed to Jon Parales of the New York Times asserts “Their set, like a shredding heavy-metal solo was all about speed and twang.” The Boston Globe reportedly claims that “The brothers embrace tradition, playing standards from the shamisen

repertoire. But they also expand on it. In their own compositions, they riff on themes from the old songs, incorporating other instruments and elements from jazz, classical, flamenco, rock, the blues even techno. The music is high energy, and it is highly improvisational.” Such statements from an array of sources are strategically used by Yoshida Brothers and their management as a form of online self-representation, suggesting that their work remains connected to Japanese traditional music despite some overtly commercial qualities. In other words, the Yoshida Brothers have attempted to “translate” the essence of their traditional music into the familiar idiom of popular music preferred by young people today both in Japan and abroad. Their music, thereby, “remains in an ambiguous position” between traditional, folk and popular genres. The proposed model could be applied to the high-profile case of the Yoshida Brothers as demonstrated below:

### Pentagonal Analysis of Cultural Translation (PACT)

**Musical Example:** Yoshida Brothers  
**Cultural Origins:** Japanese Folk Music / Global Popular Music (techno, heavy metal, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Domain:</th>
<th>Salience of Hybridity:</th>
<th>Explanation/Evidence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Technological Adaptations</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Japanese shamisen with heavy-metal style guitar effects and techno dance backing tracks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Idiomatic Conventions</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Familiar popular music style accompaniment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Aesthetic Notions</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>“Phantasm” or “flavor”? Syncretism of modern pop styles with historical musical practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Creative Practices</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Little evidence of new approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Receptive Contexts</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>TV advertising for videogames: new marketing approach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3: PACT-Yoshida Brothers**

Minna Padilla and the Helsinki Koto Ensemble

Another very interesting musician who merits some discussion is Ms. Minna Padilla, a Finnish koto player and leader of the Helsinki Koto Ensemble, who agreed to an interview for the purposes of this research (on 10 February, 2011). One year earlier, in February of 2010, a crew from TV Tokyo had traveled to Helsinki to interview Minna for its show “Japan All Stars.” The crew filmed her performing and teaching koto to children, and rehearsing with the Helsinki Koto Ensemble. They also interviewed Minna about her compositions, studies, and concerts in Japan, as well as innovative techniques for koto playing. As Minna recalls, “The film crew said they were impressed by my music when they heard The Helsinki Koto Ensemble playing, and that it was great to see koto used with this kind of music group.” Nowadays, Minna maintains a busy performance schedule as leader of the Helsinki Koto Ensemble, with concerts in Japan and at various festivals and embassy-affiliated events in Europe. Typically billed as “Minna Padilla and the Helsinki Koto Ensemble,” these Finnish musicians perform original semi-improvisatory folk music compositions that are largely inspired by Japanese music and culture yet also have roots in con-

I asked Minna, “What generally are the intentions behind the style of fusion (or hybrid) music you have developed, and does it have a distinctive atmosphere or meaning that is different from other kinds of music?,” and she gave the following reply:

“My music is influenced both by Finnish folk music and by the Japanese koto tradition. I’m always interested in finding new sound combinations between instruments and new techniques in playing. I started to combine the sound of kantele and koto in year 1998 in Finland and this is how my composing to koto started … My first music piece for koto and kantele was “Kanjiki” (1998). I think there is something magical in the sound of koto, something that touches people through all ages with beauty, power and intimate sound. Nature is a very important source for me, for inspiration. My composition “Koto” (2003) started with the idea of fire sparks in the log fire. “Ensilumi” (The First Snow) is inspired by the beauty of the first snow in the branches of the trees in my hometown. One other important thing in my composition process is using the traditional Japanese poetry, which also lends its own unmistakable atmosphere to the songs.”

Originally trained as a Finnish folk musician at the Sibelius Academy, Minna studied koto briefly at both the Tokyo National University of Fine Arts and the Hokkaido University of Education, where her prior musical training and technique enabled her to learn remarkably quickly. However, the style of music that she would eventually develop is quite different from traditional Japanese koto playing. Minna described Japanese responses to her own koto ensemble music as follows:

“My music group, Minna Padilla & The Helsinki Koto Ensemble, went to tour to Japan for the first time in 2006. I was anxious to know how the Japanese people would react to me playing the
koto and also to my group and koto combined with Finnish national instrument kantele, wooden flutes, percussions, accordion, electric bass guitar and voice. The reaction from Japanese people was very positive towards my music and our playing. They even said that my music felt like walking into a Finnish forest, gives you feeling like falling in love. My wonderful koto teacher Yukiko Takagaki requested us to visit her home and we played also there as a vocal and koto duo. She was interested in my compositions and thought that this is a new style to play the koto."

Minna explained that the lyrics of many of her songs are derived from Japanese poetry from the 9th through 19th centuries, particularly as translated into Finnish by Kai Nieminen and G. J. Ramstedt. Specifically, Minna has composed musical settings to the words of "Jakuren, Ono no Komachi, Basho, Sampu, Kito, Issa, Shiki, Seibi and Saighyo Hoshi." According to Minna, “Some Japanese haiku and tanka poems have special beauty and interesting thoughts in them that make me ask more and find the answers in musical language." To Minna, musical sounds provide an opportunity to express the ineffable essence of a poem’s original atmosphere, and she offered the following as a specific example:

"Like in the poem of Jakuren (my composition Night on the Mountain) I found it was very interesting to think about melancholy’s connection to colours or non colours. This made me feel that this poem is more like sentimentality, beauty of giving up than crushing sadness. Like trees getting ready for winter’s coming. Then I started to compose music to find colours for this.”

Although some space for improvisation is deliberately included in Minna’s music, it is primarily melodic and fully composed with clear forms. My application of the model to Minna’s music is offered below:
Pentagonal Analysis of Cultural Translation (PACT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Domain:</th>
<th>Salience of Hybridity:</th>
<th>Explanation/Evidence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Technological Adaptations</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Indigenous folk instruments from two continents, recent technologies used in recording studio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Idiomatic Conventions</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Melodic and harmonic influences are traceable to both Japanese and Finnish traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Aesthetic Notions</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>“Flavor” and syncretism of contemporary Finnish folk music with Japanese artistic traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Creative Practices</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fully composed, yet some improvisational elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Receptive Contexts</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Embassy-affiliated performances, concerts in Japan and Europe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7: PACT-Helsinki Koto Ensemble**

**Tokyo Brass Style**

Hiroshi Watanabe, a Professor of Aesthetics at Tokyo University, has argued that mixed or hybrid musics, particularly indigenous brass bands, offer an important way of understanding Japanese cultural identity in the globalized contemporary world. Although Watanabe’s analysis specifically refers to the earliest examples of western hybridized music in Japan, I have extended on such assertions in previous projects to demonstrate how the kind of wind bands most commonly encountered in Japan’s educational system are also particularly important in terms of contemporary cultural identity. Watanabe has observed that “in each location around the world, with the natural mixing of local music fusions, truly diverse brass bands have come into existence. Recently, with the progress of research into these kinds of bands, it becomes clear that the particular cultures of various non-western regions, facing the invasion of Western culture, have skillfully adapted with modernity to bear living witness to an array of distinct cultural identities.” Watanabe’s perspective is quite interesting to consider in light of one of the most high-profile recent developments in the field of wind music fusions in Japan, Tokyo Brass Style, also known as “Brasta.” This is a band comprised entirely of young women who perform original arrangements on brass and percussion instruments. “Anijazz,” fusing anime and jazz, is one term widely used to explain what Brasta actually plays: a kind of “jazzy” hybrid instrumental arrangement of familiar tunes and songs from Japanese anime and videogames that have been popular across recent years among contemporary Japanese youth. Their performance style is utterly exuberant, replete with “kawaii” gestures and enthusiastic youthful energy. In many respects, I would argue, their approach to hybridity echoes patterns of musicianship that may be traced more than
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31 Hiroshi Watanabe, “Kangaeru Mimi,” *Mainichi Shinbun* (14 September, 2005) [my translation in collaboration with Dr. Hiro Shimoyama, physicist].

32 Tokyo Brass Style, [http://www.brasta.jp/](http://www.brasta.jp/)
a century in the past to the “jinta” and other early westernized wind and percussion ensembles in Japan that adopted local folk melodies. Brasta appears to have arisen quite organically, and its musical approach is to freely adapt the songs most familiar to Japanese youth to the kinds of western instruments commonly taught in Japanese schools. Notable examples of Brasta songs include their popular performance of “Maka Fushigi Adventure” from the Dragon Ball videogame, (derived from manga and anime), as well as BrastaGhibli, a recent album devoted entirely to brass arrangements of music from Hayao Miyazaki’s beloved epic anime adventure films (Studio Ghibli productions). The following figure illustrates application of the model to Tokyo Brass Style:

Pentagonal Analysis of Cultural Translation (PACT)

Musical Example: Tokyo Brass Style
Cultural Origins: Contemporary Japanese Youth Culture (anime/gaming) / European Brass & Latin Dance Band (ska/salsa)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Domain:</th>
<th>Salience of Hybridity:</th>
<th>Explanation/Evidence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Technological Adaptations</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Little new here considering the origins: Japanese school band adaptations of global band traditions combined with Japanese youth culture influences (anime, videogame music, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Idiomatic Conventions</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mastery of Latin styles; strong musical skills with unique image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Aesthetic Notions</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>“Phantasm”? Traditional notions of Japaneseness may be irrelevant here. Outstanding performance technique on complex arrangements of seemingly simplistic tunes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Creative Practices</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Very original arrangements, effective improvisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Receptive Contexts</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Performances in nightclubs and workshops in schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: PACT-Tokyo Brass Style

Moscow Pan-Asian Ensemble

The Moscow Pan-Asian Ensemble (previously known as Wa-On Ensemble) is another example well worth consideration. In 2003, I performed and recorded a few times on trumpet and voice with this unique free improvisation ensemble at the Tchaikovsky Conservatory while I was living in Moscow and employed as a lecturer for Lomonosov Moscow State University. The Pan-Asian Ensemble is led by expert Russian musicians trained in composition, ethnomusicology, and music therapy, and who are especially inspired by Asian music, particularly Japanese traditional music. On the JazzLoft website, the Moscow Pan-Asian Ensemble is described as follows:

"Pan-Asian Ensemble is led by Georgy Mnatsakanov (shakuhachi) and Dmitry Kalinin (shakuhachi, hichiriki, Chinese gong-chimes and voice). The Ensemble is augmented by Varvara Sidoro-va, Kakujo Nakagawa and Misako Mimuro (all three on biwas) and Pyotr Nikulin on dijeridu and Dmitry Schyolkin on percussion. The leaders studied with great Japanese teachers. Amazingly, the Russians try to create new music based directly on Japanese musical traditions and its aesthetic principles without distorting European composing techniques. Amazingly, they manage to create something truly original."34

In fact, both Mnatsakanov and Kalinin are highly accomplished shakuhachi players, each of

34 http://www.jazzloft.com/p-45603-mujou.aspx
whom have devoted many years to serious traditional study of the instrument under Japanese masters. Detailed information regarding their work with the ensemble is available on the primary online resource for international shakuhachi players, "shakuhachi.com." According to that resource, Mnatsakanov studied shakuhachi under Ronnie Nyogetsu Seldin, Koku Nishimura, Ikkei Nobuhisa Hanada, and Kohei Simidzu. According to the ensemble’s own website, Mnatsakanov first studied under the guidance of Om Prakash, in Germany, pursued additional studies with Michiaki Okada, Reisho Yonemura, and Kifu Mitsuhashi, and in 1998 first began playing Japanese traditional music with the Wa-On Ensemble at the Tchaikovsky Conservatory. Dmitry Kalinin, the other leader of the Pan-Asian Ensemble, was born in 1975 in Moscow. He has studied shakuhachi (kinko-ryu) and koto (ikuta-ryu) extensively with various teachers in both Kyoto and Moscow. In 2004 he even attained certification as a koto teacher through the Sawai Tadao koto school. He is a graduate of the composition department of the Tchaikovsky Conservatory, where he studied under professors K. K. Batashev and A. B. Bobylev. According to the Pan-Asian Ensemble’s website, he was "a soloist and an artistic director of Japanese music ensemble at PI. Tsaikovsky Moscow State Conservatory "Wa-on". Kalinin and Mnatsakanov began collaborating on experimental music for shakuhachi in 1999, and in 2000 they founded the ensemble "Wa-on-exp," which was later renamed Pan-Asian Ensemble in 2005. Another important member is Dr. Varvara Sidorova, who has performed with the ensemble since its inception. Dr. Sidorova is also a professional psychologist and art therapist whose dissertation compared the "consciousness of Russian and Japanese people." She studied koto under Keiko Iwahori (Tadao Sawai school) and also briefly learned biwa under Kakujo Nakagawa. Another member of the ensemble is Yuri Rubin, who plays taiko, percussion, and various electronic instruments. Yuri has also been active as a drummer in Moscow's avant-garde and acid jazz scenes. Occasionally other musicians join in the ensemble's performances such as didjeridoo player Piotr "Ragu" Nikulin.

Moscow Pan-Asian Ensemble performances entail no planning of any kind other than the setting out of instruments to be used. There is no notation, no set song forms, and no discussion regarding musical intentions. Rather, the musicians simply begin making sounds, gradually adding more instruments, and see where their collective spontaneous creation leads them, typically through a mysterious terrain of expressive gestures. The band members are such extraordinarily open, focused and responsive improvisers that one often perceives seemingly ordered sequences in their music. The improvisations typically combine European and Asian traditional instruments, vocal sounds, electronic sounds, and the sounds of homemade instruments and found objects. The model may be applied to the Moscow Pan-Asian Ensemble as follows:

---

http://www.shakuhachi.com/R-Shaku-Mnatsakanov.html

Moscow Pan-Asian Ensemble, http://shakuhachi.ru/pae/index_e.html

http://shakuhachi.ru/pae/musicians_e.html
It should be clear from the preceding discussion that cultural translation can be either conscious or unconscious, and deliberately highlighted or shunted in such music projects. Tokyo Brass Style, for example, appears to have arisen quite organically, relatively unconscious of any standard notion of “Japaneseness,” yet ironically, it may most closely represent the spirit of contemporary Japanese youth culture for which Japanese traditional music has generally had minimal relevance in recent decades.\(^{38}\) The Yoshida Brothers, on the other hand, seem to comfortably straddle both traditional folk and popular music fields. The approach to hybridity evident in the Helsinki Koto Ensemble and the Moscow Pan-Asian Ensemble appear to be conceptually similar, although their actual sounds are quite dissimilar, with the Finns offering intelligible beauteous and melodic music, while the Russians produce an atonal, mysterious, challenging, and at times even horrific improvised collage of sounds that would make an ideal backdrop for a terrifying suspense movie.

These observations also present an opportunity to revisit the first part of the proposed model that compares various “culturalisms.” While hybridity has traditionally been avoided in institutionalized forms of music instruction, some radical approaches have recently been proposed that embrace experimentation via hybridity.\(^{39}\) It remains to be seen whether such innovations will come to be perceived as merely a curious and temporary trend or the beginnings of a new movement. I would suspect the latter is a more likely outcome, due to the effects of globalization and the tendency of institutions to eventually respond when new opportunities are convincingly demonstrated.

---

38 This phenomenon lends further support to Shuhei Hosokawa's observation that contemporary Japanese musicians do not “limit themselves to an identity in opposition to non-Japanese. In addition, they can also recognize themselves as Other” (1999, p.526). It should also be noted, however, that there are some indications of a minor revival of Japanese traditional music in the first decade of the 21\(^{st}\) century.

39 See the Master of Global Music program website (http://glomas.net), and proceedings from the EU-sponsored project Orally Transmitted Music and Intercultural Education, http://www.music-orality-roots.eu/content/proceedings-symposium-paris.
POSTLUDE

By way of conclusion, allow me to return for a moment to the Correspondence opera project mentioned at the start of this essay, for we may now reconsider the relevance of its vision statement, co-authored by van Hove and myself in 2003:

"This opera seeks to join the silence of writings and the sound of music together, and its theme is illustrated by the following points:

- Does the sound of a foreign language not become musical before its words overcome their misunderstood meaning?
- Is music not a form of metalanguage that overcomes language itself: If it is not translated, it must be universal.
- Does translation not find it’s echo in the artist’s work: to translate its inspiration.
- Before an audience of diverse languages and cultures, how may an artist use writings without negotiating the divisions that -- unlike music -- they will generate?
- Is Chinese and Japanese script not at the same time both drawings and words: he who cannot read them, may still contemplate them."

One rationale for developing the theoretical model of music translation offered in this essay was the belief that it might also apply in some respects to parallel processes and approaches in literature and other discourses associated with the broader field of cultural translation. In certain respects, the approaches used in particular musical projects might, for example, be determined to resemble the kind of sublime poetic license taken by Coleman Barks in his critically acclaimed translations of Rumi’s poetry, or perhaps by Walter Kaufman, who attained help from Hazel and Felix - his wife and brother - in producing the most popular English translations of Nietzsche’s influential philosophical writings, such as his richly poetic Thus Spoke Zarathustra. More specifically, in the case of Japan we might take such an approach to consider the broader range of phenomena associated with how Shakespeare has been translated into Japanese culture across generations, or how an array of Japanese literary works, from Shikibu Murasaki through the writings of Kenzaburo Oe and Haruki Murakami today are interpreted for diverse audiences in the form of both text and new media. It is my hope that the ideas offered here will prove to be stimulating to scholars in other areas of cultural translation and perhaps lead to work that enables us to better understand the perennial mysteries of expressive communication and cultural difference.

40 Correspondence website, http://www.transcri.be/correspondence.html
The reception of Ethical and Aesthetical values of Japanese Culture in the West

The translations of Nitobe’s *Bushidō* and Okakura’s *Book of Tea* into Spanish.
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Abstract

The aim of this paper is to analyse and compare the context, pretext and some examples of two representative works of the nihonjinron discourse at the beginning of the 20th century in Japan: *Bushido: The Soul of Japan* by Inazo Nitobe (1900), and *The Book of Tea* by Okakura Kakuzō (1906). These Japanese authors-translators were pioneers in both inter-cultural studies and transmitting values and concepts of Japanese culture to the West. Like Nitobe’s Bushido, Okakura wrote *The Book of Tea* in English, already a sort of self-translation -a self translation “in mente”- (Tanqueiro, 1999, 2002).

These texts will be analysed to see how the context as well as the reader influence the reception of the text as discourse through the translation process both the translator the self-translator, a privileged translator (Tanqueiro, 1999). We also present a diachronic study of some translations of the above mentioned books published in Spanish between 1909 to 2007. The paratextual elements of these translations will reflect the interaction between contexts, pretexts as well as the ideology and “visibility” of the translators influencing the interpretation of the text as discourse. The translators “rewrite” the texts censoring when necessary, to make values and concepts of the beginning of the 20th century. This analysis may also shed light on the reception of Nitobe’s Bushido and Okakura’s Book of Tea in Spain during the last 100 years as well as the changing images that Spaniards have had on the “Culture of Bushidō” and the “Culture of Chadō”.

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to analyse and compare the context, pretext and text of two representative works of the Nihonjinron discourse at the beginning of the 20th century in Japan: Bushido. The Soul of Japan, by Inazo Nitobe (1900), and The Book of Tea, by Okakura Kakuzô (1906). These Japanese authors-translators were pioneers in both inter-cultural studies and transmitting values and concepts of Japanese culture to the West. Both Nitobe and Okakura wrote their books in English, which was a kind of self-translation, “a mental” translation (Tanqueiro, 1999, 2000, 2007).

These texts will be analysed to see how the context as well as the reader influence the reception of the text as discourse through the translation process of the translator and the self-translator, a privileged translator (Tanqueiro, 1999). We also present a diachronic study of some translations of the abovementioned books published in Spanish between 1909 and 2007. The paratextual elements of these translations contribute to the interaction between contexts, pretexts and texts as do the ideology and “visibility” of the translators, influencing the interpretation of the text as discourse. The translators “rewrote” the texts, censoring when necessary, to make values and concepts of the exotic culture of Japan acceptable to Spanish-speaking communities, “reinterpreting” the Orientalist discourse on Japan that both Nitobe and Okakura represented at the beginning of the 20th century. This analysis may also shed light on the reception of Nitobe’s Bushido and Okakura’s Book of Tea in Spain during the last 100 years, and how the images the of “Culture of Bushidô” and the “Culture of Chadô” received by Spaniards have changed over this period.

The influence of translation in Japanese Culture

In “Modern Japan and Trialectics of Translation” (2008:1-5), Indra Levy states that modern Japan is a culture of translation and discusses what translation means in the context of Japan and what the focus on translation brings to the study of Japanese Modernity. In fact, translation has played an extremely important role in the reception and syncretism of foreign cultures in the history of Japan, in the reception of both continental Asian culture and thought in ancient times and Western culture and thought, beginning in the 16th century and in particular from the 19th century onwards.

In Japan the era of written history begins with the adoption of the Chinese script in the 5th Century. Japanese scholars began to use the phonetic element of Chinese characters to represent the sounds of Japanese, e.g. Kojiki (712), in which abbreviated Chinese characters are used as phonograms. The task of decoding Chinese texts so the Japanese could read them, led to a further development: the formation of “hiragana and katakana” (Levy, ibid: 2-3). As Levy pointed out, “this co-existence of Chinese writing and Japanese enunciation [...] produced a condition of linguistic hybridity that has no parallel in others parts of Asia, much less in the West” (ibid:2).

In the second half of the 19th Century, and in particular since the arrival of the American navy (kurobune) in the Edo bay in 1854, Japan was forced to open its ports and end more than 200 years of an isolation (sakoku) caused in part by Japan’s fear of being colonized by western powers. This led to a new era of communication with the foreign world and, as had happened with
China in ancient times, Japan was able to learn about the culture and thought of the leading western powers through translation.

Contemporary Japanese scholars, such as Maruyama Masao (1914-1996) Katô Shuichî (1919-2008), in their book entitled “Honyaku to Nihon no kindai”, /Translation and Japanese Modernity” (1998) also discuss the intellectual history of translation in Japan. Honyaku to Nihon no kindai is a published dialogue (taidan) between the two auta popular genre in Japan. The American researcher Andre Haag’s paper, “Maruyama Masao and Katô Shuichi on Translation and Japanese Modernity” (2008) has made a valuable contribution in the dissemination of their ideas to English speaking scholars. The main questions that Maruyama and Katô deal with are:

What was the historical context of modern translation in Japan, and how did Japan’s foreign relations in the late Edo and Meji period determine the course of translation? What kinds of texts were translated? Why did Japanese embrace translation as a means of learning about the world? And why was priority given to translating every available text? (Haag, 2008: 15-16)

Theoretical framework.

The theoretical framework of this paper is based in the theories of German functionalists (Reiss and Vermeer, 1991; Nord, 1997), who consider translation to be a purposeful activity and that the translation skopos refers to the goal of the translation process, which may not coincide with the function of the source text (Schäffner, 2009: 120). Evidence of the skopos can be found in the texts as well as in paratextual elements.

We have also used Widdowson’s concepts of Text, Pretext and Context (2004), wherein discourse is interpreted in the interaction between text and context, “What interpretation involves is the relating of the language in the text to the schematic constructs of knowledge, belief and so on outside the text. In this way discourse is achieved” (2004: 61). Widdowson’s notion of pretext is related to that of skopos, it is an ulterior motive or a discourse purpose, “The meaning of words in texts is always subordinated to a discourse purpose: we read into them what we want to get out of them (ibid: 86). Also useful for our analysis is the concept of the translators’ visibility (Venuti, 1995), and the theories of the Manipulation School (Hermans, 1985; Lefevere 1992; Bassnett and Lefevere, 1990, Toury, 1995) who focus on the analysis of translation between distant cultures and languages and stress the influence of ideology on translation. Culture is defined following Katan (1999/2003), who highlights the bonds between culture and translation and the importance of the translator as a cultural mediator. Orientalism (Said, 1978) and the Nihonjinron movement (Guarnè, 2006) are also useful concepts with which to study the images of Japan that the authors/translators (Nitobe and Okakura) would like to present to the West in the two STs, and the TTs analysed in this paper. Finally, the concept of self-translation (Tanqueiro, 1999, 2000, 2007), is used to describe these two authors/translators.

General context

The end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century were characterized by the military, nationalist propaganda which influenced the construction of the modern state in Japan. During this period of time Japan was not fully part of the Western world and it was necessary
to discuss what role Japan was to play in the international community. "In this nationalist and imperialist context, the Japanese used the concept of Yamato Damashii, or "the Soul of Japan", to represent all those qualities and traditions that made up their national identity. Theories about the essence of Japanese identity traits were developed within the Nihonjinron movement, and two of the most important books published in this tradition at the Meiji Era were written originally in English by Japanese authors. One of these was Nitobe's Bushido: the Soul of Japan (1900). The other was The Book of Tea by Okakura Kakuzō (1906)." (Beeby and Rodríguez, in press)

Nitobe and Okakura belonged to the élite who were key witnesses to the spectacular modernization that took place in Japan during the years following the Meiji Restoration (1868-1912). Both authors used English, not their mother tongue, as a vehicular language to write their books on Japanese culture. Despite the absence of a previous text in Japanese to be self-translated, both cases could be considered "mental translations" (Tanqueiro, 2000; Neunzig and Tanqueiro, 2007), i.e., the process by which the authors/translators reinterpret the product (the text and specially its cultural references) in English aimed at the Anglophone readers.

These books were soon popular in the West, and to a certain extent considered prestigious works. Although originally written for Western readers, they were later translated into Japanese and read by Japanese who, in their majority might have agreed to be represented abroad by the "images of their culture" constructed by Nitobe and Okakura.

1. Nitobe’s Bushido the Soul of Japan: the introduction of the Way of Samurai to the West.

Nitobe’s Bushido is an example of “Self-translation” and "Cultural translation". The author was a Japanese diplomat and scholar from a samurai family. He came to be Under Secretary of the League of Nations (1920-26) and married Mary Elkintorff, an American quaker. Nitobe’s book was written in 1899 and first published in 1900. In the preface, he pointed out that his purpose (skopos) was to explain Japanese culture to the West through the tradition of Bushido, the ideal code of morals and conduct of the Samurai nurtured by Oriental wisdom and religion. This was in fact a great effort of intercultural mediation and one of the first attempts to explain Japanese cultural traits to the rest of the world (Beeby and Rodríguez, 2009). The source text (ST) used for this study is a reissue of the enlarged 10th edition published by G. P. Putnam’s Sons in New York in 1905, printed by Tuttle Publishing in Boston in 2001.

Context

Inazo Nitobe (1862-1933) grew up in the Meiji Era (1868-1912), the period which saw the transformation of Japanese society. The Meiji Restoration was started by a sector of the samurai class mainly from the domains of Choshū, Tosa and Satsuma, which rebelled against Tokugawa, the Shogun, ending seven centuries of feudalism and opening the way to the establishment of a "modern", constitutional state, inspired by the European models of the time.

During this period, unlike many other Asian countries, Japan learned to emulate Western imperialist strategies and become a European-style colonial power (Diez del Corral, 1974: 36-37). The Japanese policy of extending their influence in the Asian continent was successful due to the spectacular victories of the Japanese navy and army in the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895) and
the Russian-Japanese War (1904-1905). In Japan, these victories were mainly attributed to the spirit of Bushidô: “An unconscious and irresistible power; Bushido has been moving the nation and individuals.” (Nitobe, 2001: 171) As a result of these military victories, the prestige of the Japanese forces in the West increased and this led to growing interest in Japanese culture and thought in Europe and the USA. Nitobe’s popularity in the West has been almost constant until nowadays as can be seen by the numerous translations of his works. Professor, economist, moralist, diplomat, and author (his completed works are compiled in 24 volumes and it is important to notice that a quarter of his works were written in English).

Nitobe also worked as a University professor (Howes, 1993: 7; Kojima, 2003); as a civil servant in the colonial administration (in Taiwan and the Asian Pacific Area) and as a diplomat in the West. On many occasion he was sent by Japan’s Taisho Government as a mediator in the conflicts between Japan and the West. Bushido. The Soul of Japan is perhaps the most popular of his publications. In the preface to the 1905 edition he describes its genesis in a conversation with Dr. Laveley a reputed Belgian jurist very interested in Japanese morals and education, and his own wife, who persuaded him to write a little book that would make Bushidô accessible to Western readers. The book was first published by Leeds & Biddle Company in Philadelphia in 1900 and in Tokyo the following year. However, the most internationally successful edition was that published by Putnam’s Sons in 1905, the year of Japan’s resounding victory in the war against Russia.

In Nitobe’s prologue to the tenth edition he expressed his surprise about the book’s unexpected success in the five years since the first edition. Many translations had been published, including translations into Chinese, Japanese, and Polish (the latter censored by the Russian government); a Russian manuscript was ready for the press. In Charles E. Tuttle’s 2001 reproduction of the 1905 edition, a foreword is provided with an explanation of the book’s success in the intervening years.

Bushidô, or the path of the warrior, is a consuetudinary ethical code that represented the “spirit” of Japan, which Nitobe compares with the German term “Volkgeist”. Nitobe says that is the “noblesse oblige” of the warrior class. In this book, Nitobe “translates/reinterprets” Bushidô, by presenting its origins, values and teaching following a western methodology. He also questioned its survival in a period of political and social revolution when Japan was being invaded by Western influences. Nitobe made his pretext explicit in his preface to the first edition. He was trying to explain Japanese culture to the West at a time when very little was known:

All through the discourse I have tried to illustrate whatever points I have made with parallel examples from European history and literature, believing that these will aid in bringing the subject nearer to the comprehension of foreign readers. (Nitobe, 2001: xii - xiii)

Nitobe’s concept of translation.

In his book on Bushidô, Nitobe also wrote about his concept of translation, questioning the way to express Japanese cultural references in a foreign language. He was particularly conscious of the difficulties of translating between distant cultures and languages, East and West and used both foreignising and domesticating strategies to get his message across.

“Bushido means literally Military-Knight-Ways- (…) Having thus given its literal significance,
I may be allowed henceforth to use the word in the original. The use of the original term is also advisable for this reason, that a teaching so circumscribed and unique, engendering a cast of mind and character so peculiar, so local, must wear the badge of its singularity on its face; then, some words have a national timbre so expressive of race characteristics that the best of translators can do them but scant justice, not to say positive injustice and grievance. Who can improve by translation what the German “Gemüth” signifies, or who does not feel the difference between the two words verbally so closely allied as the English gentleman and the French gentilhomme? (Nitobe, 2001: 4)

Nitobe did not translate many of the specifically Japanese cultural references in order to emphasise what was distinct about the samurais and their institutions in comparison with “the other culture”. This foreignising strategy is very close to Nihonjirón discourse, but at the same time, he wanted to build bridges between East and West, using also domesticating strategies to present an idealized, Orientalist vision of Bushidō, adapting the rigid samurai system to the Western values (especially to the Christian values) so that the Japanese culture would be well received in the West. For example, Nitobe equates the Bushidō concept of rei (politeness) with Saint Paul’s description of charity/love (Agape) in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, 13: 4-5, by quoting directly from the translation in the 17th Century King James Bible

“In its highest form, politeness almost approaches love. We may reverently say, politeness "suffereth long, and is kind; envieth not, vaunteth not itself, not puffed up; doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, taketh not account of evil” (p. 50).

At the same time, he contributed to the construction of “a unified nation, by presenting the ethical values of the “Warriors Code” as the essence of Yamato Damashii or the Soul of Japan. In fact, the values and teachings of the “path of Samurai”, or the warrior elite, which constituted just a 6% of the population, were disseminated through education. This phenomena has been called the “Samuranisation” of Japanese society (Befu, 50).

Nitobe’s Bushidō and the cultural identity of Japan in the contemporary world

The influence of Nitobe’s Bushido at the beginning of the 20th century can be seen in many countries, for example, Nitobe’s Bushido served as an inspiration for the reinforcement of Poland’s national identity, leading to its independence on November 11th, 1918. According to John H. Howes, Nitobe’s book was “probable the single most influential volume on Japan in the English language and a modern Japanese classic in translation” (Howes, 1993:3). The continuing influence of Nitobe’s Bushido internationally can be seen by the number of Internet pages dedicated to this subject and directed at a variety of interests groups, including pacifists organizations, groups interested in Oriental and New Age Religions, martial arts and right-wing politics. The relevance of Nitobe’s legacy was “highlighted in a Symposium “Why Nitobe now?”, held in Tokyo in June 2004. Organized by the United Nations University, UNU, Nitobe Foundation and Japan Foundation, The symposium aimed at drawing inspirations from his teachings to find alternative solutions to the many problems facing the international community”. (See Beeby and Rodriguez, 2009: 222).

1 quoted in (Iwabuchi, 1994:2)
In 2009, Patrick Heinz wrote a book on Nihonjinron discourse, and on the effects of globalization in Japan, entitled How the Japanese became foreigners to themselves, in which he devoted a lot of space to Nitobe’s Bushidô and Nitobe’s career as a diplomat and intercultural mediator. Heinz stresses the “Deep humanity of the Samurai spirit (p. 41), and claimed that “one of (Nitobe)’s greatest achievements as a politician and statesman has been the solving of the Aland Island conflict between Sweden and Finland (1921) by applying the philosophy and principles of Bushidô” (Hara et al, 2007, quoted in Heinz, 2009: 41).

Examples of Nitobe’s influence in Japan can be seen in other spheres. In the mid 20th century in Japan, it was customary to use the image of the most representative authors and thinkers of the Meiji Restoration, as well as other symbols, to express Japan’s cultural identity on yen bills. The 5000 yen bill had the image of Nitobe for 20 years (1984-2004). On the reverse of these bills could be seen Mount Fuji, one of the chief sacred symbols (kami) of Japan.

New editions of Nitobe’s Bushido continue to appear both in the West and in the East and its influence persists. In 2002, Lee Teng Hui, the Taiwanese leader and ex-President of the ROC, wrote, Bushidô kaidai, noburesse oburige to wa. In this book he claimed that Nitobe’s interpretation of the values and teachings of Bushidô were an essential part of Taiwan’s cultural identity. In 2005, Fujiwara Masahiko, the Japanese mathematician and writer in his polemic bestseller entitled "Kokka no hinkaku." stressed the need for the Japanese to return to their “roots” in a period of economic uncertainty and crisis of identity. He pointed out the importance of Bushidô today, quoting from works such as Hagakure by Yamamoto Tsunetomo, and Bushido. The Soul of Japan, by Nitobe Inazo, and he seems to be very fond of Nitobe’s interpretation. (Fujiwara, 2008: 121).

In 2006, the discussion about the Reform of clause 2 of the Basic Education Law was influenced by Nitobe’s interpretation of Bushidô. According to Bunmei Ibuki, the former Minister of Education, “The book Bushidô (by Nitobe) formed the normative consciousness of the Japanese, […]”. (In “The education debate: Reaching for a Classic”, (JIN-397, December, 18)

Gonzalo Jiménez de la Espada’s Translation of Nitobe’s Bushido (1909)
There have been several translations of Nitobe’s book into Spanish since the beginning of the 20th century. The first translation into Spanish was by Gonzalo Jiménez de la Espada in 1909, which inspired the General José Millán Astray founder of the Spanish Foreign Legion and his Legionary Creed. After the end of the Spanish Civil War, the general made his own translation of this work (1941), as propaganda for Franco’s regime. (See Beeby and Rodríguez, 2009:222-230)

Gonzalo Jiménez de la Espada (1877-1938) was one of the first Spanish intellectuals to translate works that transmitted the values and teaching of Japanese culture to the West. Another was the renowned politician Julián Besteiro (1870-1940) who translated Lafcadio Hearn’s Kokoro. Impresiones de la vida íntima de Japón in 1907 (Almazán, 2008:781-782). Gonzalo Jimenez de la Espada was a son of Marcos Jiménez de la Espada (1831-1898), an outstanding but neglected scientist, who was very close to the Institucion de Libre Enseñanza founded in 1876 by the reformist intellectual Francisco Giner (1839-1915) The aim of this association was to modernize education in Spain and make it competitive with other leading countries in the world. Part of the
program was to promote and help students and scholars by providing them with scholarships to send them abroad to learn from other countries and help to modernize Spain, which had been almost isolated from the rest of the world since the reign of Philip II and especially since the decline of the Spanish Empire.

Jiménez de la Espada, educated in the spirit of the Institución de Libre Enseñanza, was very critical of the Spanish educational model of his time. He admired the efforts of Pre-Meiji and Meiji Japan, especially the efforts of the government to modernize Japan by sending students abroad and contracting professors from Europe and the USA. He felt that was Japan a model to imitate. Julián Besteiro is said to have coined the term “Japonizar España” (Japonize Spain) as a “metaphor” for “Modernizing Spain” (Almazan, 2008: 785). As a result, the Institución de Libre Enseñanza founded “la Junta para la ampliacion de Estudios”, JAE, an organism that provided fellowships to promote travel and education abroad. In 1907 Jiménez de la Espada went to Japan for ten years to learn from Japan while teaching the Spanish Language (as a oyatoi gaikokujin) at the Tokyo Foreign School of Languages (Tokyó gai-kokugo gakko).

Gonzalo Jiménez de la Espada was living in Tokyo in 1908 when he started his translation of Nitobe’s book. Bushido. El Alma de Japón, was published by the Editorial Daniel Jorro in Madrid in 1909. It is essential to become familiar with the socio-political context in order to understand the where, why and when of this translation. Military prestige was at its height in Japan after the country’s victories over the Chinese (1895) and the Russians (1905), and there was increasing international interest in the samurais, Bushidó and Nitobe’s book. The news of the Japanese victories had reached Spain, but living in Tokyo, Jiménez de la Espada was obviously more aware of Japan as an emerging power and Nitobe’s importance. The first Japanese edition of Bushido was published in 1908, translated by Sakurai Ōson, a close friend of Nitobe, and revised by the author himself. We know from Jiménez de la Espada’s introduction to the Spanish edition that he was in touch with Nitobe as well. The translator expressed his gratitude to the author for graciously allowing him to publish his book in the “noble lengua castellana” (Jiménez de la Espada, 1909: 7).

In 1898, Spain’s declining Empire was dealt a harsh blow with the loss of Cuba and the Philippines, the two most important of the remaining colonies. The intellectuals of the time, known as the “Generation of 98”, were nostalgic for Spain’s imperial past and very critical of the stagnant socio-political situation. They felt that no time should be lost in reaching out to other cultures in order to learn new ideas that might help to halt Spain’s decline and prepare the country to face the storm clouds gathering over Europe. Jiménez de la Espada’s translation of Bushido can be seen as a part of this tendency. He was both initiator and translator of the book. In his introduction, “Algunas palabras del traductor”, he wrote that Spain and Japan admired each other’s cultures although little was known in Spain about the Japanese.

The purpose of his translation was to make Japanese thought and culture known in Spain (Jiménez de la Espada, 1909: 5) He was also motivated by a personal affinity with Nitobe’s Bushido, and the fact that the original was in English, which made it easier to translate. He insisted on

---

his faithfulness to the author of the source text. Nitobe is very visible indeed in the 1909 translation, which maintained Nitobe’s preface to the first and tenth English editions. (Nitobe (1938b: 13). In his preface, the translator described the translation strategies he used to remain faithful to the source text and maintain what was exotic and unique in the Japanese culture. While trying to make the most of this unusual opportunity to understand Japanese thought from the inside, he made an effort to stay as close as possible to the author’s style, even if it meant sacrificing his own. However, although Jiménez de la Espada tried to avoid over-domestication in his translation, he wanted to make clear to Spanish readers that Japan and Spain shared certain values that were enshrined in the samurai and “el caballero español”. His one criticism was that, whereas Nitobe had compared the codes of the samurais and European chivalry in general, he had not mentioned the close similarities between the samurai and the Spanish caballero. The Spanish translator stressed the importance of these shared values, in particular the caballero’s legendary orgullo (pride) and his disdain for material wealth. Jiménez de la Espada also felt that the two cultures were governed by similar politeness rules. He referred to the caballero’s gallantry towards the fairer sex, a characteristic that was satirized in el Quijote but that was commented on favourably in several chronicles by European travellers to the Iberian Peninsula from the nineteenth century.3

As far as content is concerned, Jiménez de la Espada’s translation follows the original closely. His affinity with Nitobe is remarkable and we have not found obvious cases of deliberate censorship or manipulation. (There are some examples where his translation does not reflect the ST, but these are usually due to false friends between English and Spanish, e.g. “injury” (Nitobe 200: 128) and “injuria” (Nitobe (GJE), 1909: 119-120).4 He even maintained Nitobe’s reference to the Spanish defeat in the Philippines (1898), which is completely omitted by Millán-Astray. Nitobe explained this defeat, the Prussian victory over Napoleon and the Japanese victories in terms of the martial virtues: “What won the battles on the Yalu, in Corea and Manchuria were the ghosts of our fathers, guiding our hands and beating in our hearts” (Nitobe 2001: 188). Jiménez de la Espada’s translation, that was published only a decade after Spain had lost the Philippines, was aimed at inspiring his readers to rediscover martial virtues in Japan.

Esteve Serra’s Translation of Nitobe’s Bushido (1989)

In 1989 a new Spanish translation of Nitobe’s Bushidô was published, entitled Bushido, El alma de Japón and translated by Esteve Serra, a professional translator working from English to Spanish in Barcelona, for the Editorial Olañeta, based in Palma de Mallorca. This publishing house specialises in small, unexpensive, but attractively designed books, and has several collections.

The historical context of this translation is important in that neither the publishing house nor the translator would have been under any pressure to censor any aspect of the ST. In 1989, Spain’s transition from a dictatorship to a democratic state, had been concluded successfully and Spain had entered the European Community in 1986. References to Marx or the Masons would not have been suspect. Japan was not a military power to be emulated or feared. A context quite

4 “Injuria” is a grave offence of word or deed.
different of that of Millán–Astray Translation in 1941. General Millán Astray, was the founder of Spanish Foreign Legion and a fervent supporter of Franco before and after the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939). He translatedNitobe’s Bushidô in 1941, at that time he was Director of the State Delegation for press and Propaganda, he translated Nitobe’s Bushido as a “a part of Propaganda campaign after the Nationalist victory in Spain and in the Middle of World War II” so the text was manipulated. The technique of omission was often used, in particular when the cultural references to be translated clearly offended Millán-Astray’s ideology and they were censored, (See Beeby and Rodríguez, 2009: 225-227). However, in the context of Esteve Serra’s translation, the interest in Bushidô or Japan would mainly be due to, interest in “New Age” tendencies, martial arts, Japanese children’s cartoons, Manga comics, or admiration for Japan’s economic power.

Our only contact with the translator has been through the publisher, José Olañeta, as Esteve Serra was unwilling to be interviewed or answer a questionnaire about the translation. He told the publisher that he had little to say on the subject, it was a literal translation and he had tried to stay as close to the ST as possible while respecting the orthographic and syntactic norms of the target language. Nitobe was generous with capital letters and exclamation marks when he wanted to be emphatic. Most of the translators maintained these markers, but only Millán-Astray actually added orthographic markers to heighten the emotional intensity of his translation. However, Esteve Serra omitted most of them, respecting the orthographic norms of Spanish.

Apart from this, he is practically invisible. There is no introduction from the translator. The only pretext is Nitobe’s preface to the first edition and the rest of the contents are faithfully reproduced. He followed Nitobe’s strategy for Japanese cultural references, using a transliteration of the Japanese word followed by Nitobe’s explanation, drawing parallels with European cultural references from the end of the 19th Century. Esteve Serra did not adapt these references to meet the expectations of Spanish readers at the end of the 20th Century. Very occasionally, he added a translator’s note at the bottom of the page, as in the example below, where Nitobe used German terms in his attempt to explain what the Emperor meant to the Japanese: *Rechtsstaat*/*Estado de Derecho* (N del T); *Kulturstaat**/*Estado civilizado* (N del T). Nitobe (Esteve Serra)1989: 24).

RegardingEsteve Serra translation strategies, we can observe that he kept his translation as “literal” as possible, using the same metaphors even when they did not have the same impact in Spanish. His English comprehension must be very good as he was not misled by “false friends”, as most of the other translators we studied were. For example, he knew that “a patron” in English is someone who supports the arts or other people’s endeavours, whereas “el patrón” in Spanish is the owner or the boss. Therefore, in the above example, he translated “Patron” for “Patrocinador”, whereas the other translators used terms that suggested “the boss”: *Patrón* (GJE); *Maître* (CJ); *amo* (M-A). (I would like to say that I have studied several translations of Nitobe’s Bushido, but I have chosen to talk about the Translation by Gonzalo Jiménez de la Espada and the translation by Esteve Serra). However, all the other translators, despite some problems with the English of the ST, had a personal commitment to their own reading of Nitobe’s Bushido and to the importance of sharing this reading with a wider public. Esteve Serra was following a professional brief and his translation is accurate but lacks the emotional intensity of the ST and the other TTs.
II. *The Book of Tea* (1906) by Okakura Kakuzō, an introduction of the aesthetic and ethical values of Zen Buddhism to the West

The second text studied in this paper is *The Book of Tea, by Okakura Kakuzō.*

By analysing this text, our aim is to stress the importance of the author/translator as intercultural mediator and highlight his role in exporting the aesthetical values of Japanese culture, in particular, his outstanding contribution to the introduction of Zen Buddhism in the West through the ritual of “chanoyu” or the tea ceremony.

Okakura Kakuzō, also known as Okakura Tenshin (1863-1913) was a curator, art historian and painter, specialized in traditional Japanese painting (Nihonga). He belonged to the first generation of students at the Imperial University of Tokyo, founded in 1877. His academic background was strongly influenced by foreign professors, such as Ernest Fenollosa (1853-1908) with whom he both cooperated on several translation projects and developed a strong friendship. Okakura also had the opportunity to continue his studies in Europe and USA.

According to Toshiya Kaneko (2007:1), “Okakura Tenshin became an overnight celebrity in Japan at the outbreak of the Pacific War. The first line of his 1903 publication *The Ideals of the East*—“Asia is one”—was celebrated posthumously as the most powerful expression of Japanese wartime aspirations, and Okakura was considered a visionary of Japanese political ascendancy in Asia. Kaneko added “Okakura’s principal philosophical notion of Asian spiritualism found an unexpected political home during a time of increasing antagonism vis-à-vis the West” (Kaneko, ibid)

He is often considered one of the most important representatives of Pan-Asianism at the beginning of 20th century, along with figures such as the Indian writer Rabindranath Tagore and the Chinese *NATIONALIST LEADER AND THINKER SUN YAT-SEN.*

*The Book of Tea* by Okakura appeared in 1906, just one year after the successful publication of the enlarged tenth edition of Nitobe’s *Bushido. The Soul of Japan,* and the resounding military victory of Japan over Russia, with the justification of Bushidō values as the essence of Japanese cultural identity. Okakura’s book was also very influential in the construction of the image of Japan in the rest of the World.

In this book, the author defended the most representative aesthetic values of Japanese Culture and tradition, by comparing them with the most remarkable aesthetic values of Western Culture at the time. Okakura made an important contribution to understanding “chadō” culture by presenting its sources, values and teaching using a Western approach, similar to that used by Nitobe in *Bushidō.*

However, as mentioned above, Okakura stressed the uniqueness, or singularity of the Japanese aesthetic values such as *sabi, wabi, hie, yōhaku, yūgen,* and even their superiority and refinement compared with the aesthetic values of Western Culture (which he often considers vulgar (Okakura, 1991: 23-32). Sometimes the author’s attitude is ambiguous or paradoxical, especially towards the West and Western Imperialism, "We used to think that you (Westerners) were the
most impracticable people in the earth, for you were said to preach what you never practised” (Okakura, 1991: 33), “Unfortunately the Western attitude is unfavourable to understanding the East. The Christian missionary goes to impart but not to receive” (ibid).

At the same time, he tried to convince Western readers of the importance of approaching the Japanese culture, the “Other culture”, as did Nitobe in Bushido:

“What direct consequences to humanity lie in the contemptuous ignorance of Eastern problems” (ibid: 34).

“European imperialism which does not disdain to raise the absurd cry of Yellow Peril, may also awaken to the cruel sense of the White Disaster! […] We have developed along different lines, but there is no reason why one should not supplement the other. You have gained expansion at the cost of restlessness. We have created harmony which is weak against aggression. Will you believe it? – The East is better off in some respects than the West? (ibid: 34-35)

Okakura made his pretext explicit in his first chapter, entitled “The Cup of Humanity”. His skopos was to explain an essential part of Japanese culture (Taoism and Zen Buddhism) through the “chadô” or the Way of Tea, at a time when it was very little known in the West. Okakura did not include any introductory texts in his source texts in English and paratexts and pretexts are very important to the interpretation of texts as discourse. However, the present edition of the ST has an introductory text since it was published after the author’s death.

The source text used here is an edition published in Tokyo by Kodansha Publishing House in 1991. We have chosen this edition mainly because of the Paratextual elements (Foreword and Postscript by Sen Soshitsu XV, one of the most famous living Tea-Masters and a descendant of the illustrious Tea-Master Sen no Rikyû (1521-1591), the disseminator of the Chanoyu performance under the support of Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1536-1598), during the Momoyama period, one the most splendid epochs of “Samurai Culture”. These paratexts provide us with valuable information about the ST and its author.

In the Foreword, Sen Soshitsu XV says: “Writing at a time of Japan’s first success in utilizing Western military methods Okakura took upon himself the task of interpreting Japanese civilization for the West. In writing of chanoyu his concern was the broad current of Asian culture flowing Eastward from India, and its potential person to disseminate the culture of chanoyu in the World. However, Sen Soshitsu was very critical with Okakura: ‘Okakura was in some way an unlikely candidate for his role of introducing chanoyu to the West since the Teahouse he built in Japan did not show that Okakura would performed chanoyu in his everyday life (ibid). He added that Okakura’s discourse expresses a passionate, ironic attitude which does not fit the atmosphere that surrounded the performance of chanoyu’ (ibid). However, we think that the clue to understand this kind of discourse is closely related to the skopos, and as Sen Soshitsu states, “Okakura’s aim was to “translate” one of the most essential cultural traits of Japanese culture and tradition.” In this sense, his aim was similar to Nitobe’s skopos when he wrote his book on Bushidô.
Despite these comments, in the Afterword Sen Soshitsu XV begins by saying that chanoyu has always been present in his life and that without Okakura’s insight his lifelong masterpiece would have been quite different. According to Sen Soshitsu, “there were three main factors which influenced Okakura’s Book of Tea: his relationships with Westerners from his early youth, and throughout his life, his interest in studying the Classics, and his appreciation of Art” (Okakura (Sen Soshitsu), 1991: 135)

In the Afterword, Sen Soshitsu XV compares the Meiji Period, the period when The Book of Tea was first published and the 1950s, the period following the defeat of Japan in World War II and the occupation of the allied forces. Both were times when Japan was influenced by Western culture, ideas and institutions, times when the Japanese feared losing their rich cultural traditions.

Cultural references in the Text

In the first chapter, entitled “The Cup of Humanity”, Okakura mentioned Bushidô, which for him was the “Art of Death”. Afterwards, he explained what “Teaism” meant to Japan and defined it as the “Art of life”. “Much comment has been given lately to the Code of Samurai- the Art of Death which makes our soldiers exultant in their self-sacrifice, but scarcely any attention has been drawn to Teaism, which represents so much of our Art of Life” (Ibid: 32).

Okakura rendered the culturema “chanoyu” as “teaism”: “Teaism is a cult founded on the adoration of the beautiful among the sordid facts of everyday existence” (Ibid: 29). He tried to bring the concept nearer to the intended readers, by comparing the ritual of “chanoyu” to a quasi religious ceremony: “The philosophy of Teaism is not just aestheticism, as the term goes; rather it expresses the duality of religion and ethics, that is, the core of our view of man and nature” (Ibid: 13)

This is an example of a “cultural translation”. However, Sen Soshitsu XV does not think it is an adequate translation: “In groping for a suitable dimension for this dimension of chanoyu, Okakura speaks of “Teaism” or the “Tea Cult”. Neither of these terms is adequate, and neither has entered common usage, for though they convey the religious element in the way of tea, they place it in a Western dimension” (Okakura (Sen Soshitsu XV), 1991: 22).

Translation strategies in Okakura’s work

In this book, Okakura translates/reinterprets Zen Buddhism by approaching/ comparing its aesthetical values and teachings to Western culture. In the process we can observe a certain ideological manipulation and the visibility of Okakura as author/translator. Okakura used both, domesticating and foreignizing strategies to get his message across. He did not translate many of the specifically Japanese cultural references in order to stress the “singularity and uniqueness of Japaness”; Nevertheless, he also wanted to build bridges between East and West, using domesticating strategies to present an idealised, Orientalist vision of chadô, and the Zen ritual of chanoyu that would make Japanese aesthetic values acceptable to the West.

Examples of domesticating strategies include the abovementioned culturema, “Teaism" instead of “chadô", literally “The way of Tea", a most suitable term for Japanese readers. Another is the explanation of the classical Chinese treatise on Tea, “Chaking” as the “Sacred Book of Tea", "The reception of Ethical and Aesthetical Values of Japanese Culture in the West"
intending to give the Book a quasi religious status. He even refers to the Chinese poet Lu Wuh as “the Apostol of Tea”.

The Book of Tea by Okakura is an essay with seven chapters dealing with the definition sources and origins of Teaism; its reception and importance in Japan (p. 3), its exportation to the West; the different schools of Tea in China and Japan (pp. 31, 57-71); the chashitsu (or tea room) (pp. 75-94); the aesthetic values of Zen ritual and the Tea Masters (pp. 95-133). Okakura ended this book with the last Tea Ceremony performed by the great Master Sen no Rikyū with his disciples, just before committing seppuku because of a punishment of his Patron, Toyotomi Hideyoshi. This is in fact the representation of one of the most refined aesthetic values of Zen Buddhism, materialized through the Tea Ceremony and the zenith of the Bushidō axioms: seppuku, or the Art of dying beautifully. Two essential parts of Japanese classical culture are combined: The Art of Life and the Art of Death. The text is beautifully written, and is very emotional, sometimes passionate, with a lot of metaphors and intonation signs. It reflects Okakura’s love of Japanese art and beauty, and by his writing he is also trying to persuade, to seduce the reader with the magnificence and refinement of Japanese aesthetic values.

Reception of The Book of Tea

The Book of Tea was first published in New York, by Fox Duffield and Co. Publishing House. This publication gave and extraordinary fame to Okakura in EEUU and Europe. And a few years later it was published in different countries:

TN Fullies, The Edinburgh Press, Edinburgh /London (1919);

A.L Sadler, Anges and Robertson, Ltd, Sidney, 1935;

Kenkyûsha, Tokyo, 1940 (Foreword and comments by Hiroshi Muraoka). The 19th ed. has recently been published; Charles E Tuttle Co., Rutland, Vermont/Tokyo, 1956 (Foreword and Biography by Elise Grili and illustrations by Sesshû, now in the 6th edition).

As to Spain, its massive reception has been quite recent (some 15 years ago), and several translation into Spanish have been published since then. However, it is important to stress that, the first translation of this book in Spain, was the one by Marcial Pineda into catalan, published in Barcelona in the 20s. In the 40s, appeared the translation into Spanish entitled El libro del té, by Angel Samblancat, a Catalonia’s reknowned left-wing politician who exiled in Mexico after the Spanish Civil War. (Caulfield, 2002).

The translation by Samblancat was first published in Spain by the publishing house Kairós, Barcelona in 1978, the year of the promulgation of Spain’s first democratic Constitution after Franco’s regime. The fourth edition of the book appeared in 2005.

As we have stated, we can also find several translatains of The Book of Tea such as

The translation by Teresa Solá entitled *El libro del Te* (2001), with Foreword and Comments by Sakai, Kazuya, Tokyo University, and edited by Miraguano in Madrid, 2001. This edition is particularly interesting because it was translated from the one published by the Kenkyūsha, Tokyo. The Kenkyūsha edition is remarkable because all the shortcomings of the ST by Okakura were revised a lot of notes and comments added, a paratextual information which facilitates the reading and comprehension of the ST. Finally, it is worth mentioning, the translation by J. Javier Fuente del Pilar, published by Miraguano, 2007. It should be noticed that both Esteve Serra and J. Javier Fuente del Pilar have also translated Nitobe’s Bushidō into Spanish.

Okakura inspired many artists and writers both in Asia and the West. His influence on Ernest Fenollosa and Ezra Pound was remarkable. His book has contributed to awakening Western interest in Zen Buddhism since the beginning of 20th century. It also inspired Suzuki Daisetsu (1871-1966), the distinguished Japanese author and disseminator of Japanese Culture in the West, in particular his book Zen and Japanese Culture (1938) includes many references to Okakura.

Okakura’s inspiration can also be seen at the Memorial Garden "Tenshin-en" (1988), a Zen garden located in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, where Okakura was curator of Asian Art for many years.

According to Sakai (2001: 8), the reason why the Book of Tea still grips the interest of readers all around the world, 100 years after its publication lies on the fact that it remains both a classical text on the tea ceremony and an indispensable reference for researchers on art, culture and thought of East Asia.

The influence of this book as an intercultural product can be perceived as well in many different sorts of products, such as Orientalist products for Japanese markets: the recent design of the Shiseido package of its by-product, the perfume Zen, inspired in chashitsu (2007).

Finally, in 2006, an International Symposium on Okakura Tenshin was held at the Tokyo Watarim Bijutsukan to commemorate the centenary of the publication of The Book of Tea. The collected papers from the Symposium have been published in *Ochano hon no hyakunen /100 years of the Book of Tea*.

Conclusions

We have checked by the analysis of the two STs that both authors have the same skopos, that is to reinterpret and disseminate the Japanese cultural identity traits to the rest of the world so that Japan would be accepted and valued abroad as an Asian leading power. In the case of Nitobe’s Bushidō, as a National identity trait (Yamato Damashii or "The Soul of Japan"), and in the case of “Chadô”, both as identity traits and as intercultural product. (It should also be noticed that both terms Bushidō and Chadō are terms coined in the Meiji Era).

We have observed that both STs are good examples of translation between distant cultures as well as “mental” self-translations. We have seen the significance of the authors /translators in their reinterpretation of Japanese values and tradition of Bushidō and Chadō in order to be
understood by the West on a time when very little was known about Japan. We have also inves-
tigated the influence of the paratextual elements, the context and the pretexts both in the STs and
in the translations analysed here.

However, the discourse of Nitobe was slightly different than Okakura’s. Nitobe, being a diplo-
mat, tries to find points of encounter between East and West, whereas Okakura, being an artist,
is more passionate and occasionally paradoxical. On one hand he tries to bring Japanese values
closer to Western values, but on the other hand, he claims the superiority of these values. And
as we have observed in Nitobe’s Bushido, Okakura sometimes doesn’t translate many of the
specifically Japanese “cultural elements” in order to enhance their “singularity” in relation to the
“Other culture”.

Regarding the reception of these works, two of them have been very popular and influential
books until nowadays in the West since their publication. However, in Spain, while Nitobe’s
Bushidô has been translated into Spanish from 1909 onwards, Okakura’s Book of Tea was first
translated into Catalan in the 20s, and into Spanish much later (in the 40s), but being published
in Mexico and other Latin American countries, that translation and other translations into Span-
ish were hardly known in Spain at the time. In fact, most of the translations of Okakura’s Book of
Tea are from 1995 onwards. In the case of the translations into Spanish we also notice the influ-
ence of context, pretexts, and the “visibility” of translators. Perhaps the ones in which translator
is less visible are by Esteve Serra: Nitobe’s Bushidô (1989) and and Okakura’s Book of Tea by
Eseve Serra (2005). We have found also that in the translations into Spanish of Nitobe’s Bushido,
translators are in general more “visible” that in Okakura’s translations.

Finally, as we have already stated, the two STs are case study representatives of the Nihonjin-
ron discourse. Yet, the opposition between Japan and the West is often shown in an Orientalist
text, as in Okakuras’s book, where the author often displays an aggressive antagonism towards
the West, while at the same time comparing Japanese culture with the “other culture”, as did Ni-
tobe in Bushido.
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Abstract
In this paper, I will address issues of Japanese Literature as a literature of the world. I will talk about a relatively new phenomenon called pre-translation, observed first of all by scholars of Arabic literatures. It is the practice of Japanese authors to make their texts more easily accessible to an international audience by avoiding cultural specifics and/or by elaborating on cultural specifics which are self-evident to readers of Japanese. Also, Japanese sentences may be formulated in such a way as to suggest their easy transposition into a Western language, most likely English. This technique can be observed with Murakami Haruki but also with other authors such as Mishima Yukio. Other strategies of making Japanese Literature fit for World Literature is heavy editing on the part of translators and publishers. In reflecting on these strategies, I will question the notion of “world literature” and suggest problems involved in various procedures. Elsewhere, I have already problematized what I have termed the "Hollywoodization" of Japanese literature. Here, I will try to add new angles to this discussion. Finally, I will sketch some consequences for authors, translators, publishers, critics, and readers.
Translation, or better, linguistic translation, becomes necessary only when we assume that the potential readership of a work transgresses the borders of the language that it was written in. As long as we naïvely identify language, ethnicity, culture, and nationality, as has often been the case when speaking of ‘Japanese literature’ in particular, the issue of translation may have been thought to be of little consequence. Japanese writers throughout most of Japanese history, including the twentieth century, may not have harbored aspirations of being read beyond the borders of their home country, even though the majority of them had been avid readers of foreign literature, Chinese or European. This one-way traffic in the communication of Japanese writers, artists, and intellectuals with the world outside Japan in the 19th and 20th centuries, but also in earlier stages of their history, has formed a rich and productive field of research in the past two or three decades, but it has also contributed to consolidate Japan’s image, within the country as well as abroad, of a nation that is open to the world but closed to the outside at the same time, with all its positive and problematic connotations. Now at last the time seems ripe to learn more about Japan’s role not as a receiver, but as a giver in an internationalized world, and to shed new light on the perceived information imbalance. I will deal with some aspects of Japanese literature on a global scale, for in spite of many misconceptions and prejudices concerning the potential as well as the actual status of Japanese literature, a ‘world literature’ in the 21st century is simply inconceivable without a Japanese component.

Japanese Literature in a Transnational Dimension

While we can find with modern and contemporary Japanese writers a lot of skepticism or disinterest towards being translated into foreign languages, Meiji writer Mori Ōgai may serve as a fine counter-example here. Perhaps it is no coincidence that Ōgai, himself a prolific translator and transmitter of Western knowledge since his years of study in Germany from 1884 through 1888, self-consciously conjures up the notion of ‘world literature’ (sekai no bungaku in his wording), coined in Germany in the 1770s and disseminated since its 1827 use by Goethe 1, in a novella written in 1911. Ōgai’s text, titled “Hyaku monogatari”, tells of a narrator who attends a party in which an old-fashioned game of telling ghost stories is to be played, the “hundred tales” of the Japanese title. The respective passage right in the beginning of the text, after two brief paragraphs, from the English translation by Thomas Rimer, reads as follows:

“I know well enough that in fiction no explanations are provided, but here I flatter myself, as perhaps would anyone, in thinking that if a tale such as this were to be translated into any of the European languages, then, when it joined the literature of the world, readers in other countries would doubtless have difficulty in fathoming its meaning; they would be convinced that the writer had created something altogether preposterous. Therefore, I have decided to begin my tale with an explanation.” 2

Here, the author coquettishly refers to his story being translated into European languages


which makes it part of “the literature of the world”, in his understanding. This gesture serves
at least two purposes, for the self-conscious reference effectively paints a global horizon for his
story with its deliberately traditional setting. At the same time, however, it serves as a narratorial
device to provide information deemed necessary for his Japanese readers who are just as depen-
dent on this explanation as would be “readers in other countries”.

In this fascinating story Mori Ōgai not only makes his Japanese readership aware of the trans-
national dimensions of literature by making them imagine the story being translated into other
languages, but he also offers us a kind of very early example avant la lettre of the phenomenon
termed pre-translation which I want to explain now.

The expression was brought up in the discussion of Arabic literatures translated into Western
languages, when Jenine Abboushi Dallal maintained that Arabic contemporary authors tend to
“pre-translate” their issues for an implied European audience, because they feel they have to ex-
plicate for “Western” readers what would otherwise be common cultural knowledge among Ar-
abs. Instead of entering into the controversial discussion around this notion in the case of Arabic
literatures, let me alert you to the fact that “pre-translation” in this sense is also at work in Japa-
nese literature. I am referring to the practice of Japanese authors to make their texts more easily
accessible to an international audience by avoiding cultural specifics and/or by elaborating on
cultural specifics which are self-evident to readers of Japanese. Mori Ōgai’s tongue-in-cheek re-
mark on having to explain the game in face of the fact that his text may be translated is an early
example of the awareness for the necessity to adjust one’s text to the needs of a globalized read-
ership. But Ōgai is unique also in the sense that he uses this awareness playfully as a narratorial
device.

**Japanese Authors Pre-Translating their Works**

How do other Japanese authors pre-translate their texts? Turning to contemporary writers,
one immediately thinks of Murakami Haruki’s works with their relatively unspecific contem-
porary settings in nameless cities which could be any metropolis from Tokyo or Osaka through
Shanghai or Los Angeles. Take his novel Afterdark, which is written in a partly unidiomatic
Japanese with an overabundance of sentence subjects and with clearly un-Japanese expressions,
figures of speech and gestures which ring more English than Japanese. One might attribute these
characteristics of style to his work as a translator of Anglophone literature or to a conscious deci-
sion to give his literature in Japanese a foreign and quasi-cosmopolitan ring. On the other hand,
the ‘translatability’ in Murakami’s case is also due to his pre-translation, or explanation of things
or attitudes which are self-evident to Japanese. I wonder how Japanese readers react to the de-
tailed and circumstantial description of how to access and make use of a Love Hotel, something
about which no Japanese youngster would need any educational advertising. But who knows,
perhaps this functions as a kind of alienation effect to Japanese readers, provided they notice
these adaptations to an international readership’s assumed expectations in the first place. On
the whole, the architectural and technological setting in Murakami’s work is so standardized that
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3 Jenine Abboushi Dallal, “The Perils of Occidentalism: How Arab Novelists are Driven to Write for Western
one may not expect anything other than this catering to a globalized kind of lifestyle feeling from this novel anyhow. If we read it as just another version of the young consumerist oriented urban novel, that’s that.

The forms of pre-translation which I want to point out clearly hint at a double framework with two types of audiences addressed at the same time, the Japanese and what Ōgai would have called the "readers in foreign countries". Their cultural knowledge is, of course, much more difficult to assess. We may not be generally wrong, though, in assuming that to those authors who ‘pre-translate’ their works, their frame of reference can be pinned down to either readers of European languages, if we presume a conservative stand identical with Ōgai’s perspective, or, more realistically perhaps, readers of English on a globalized scale, with an American readership as a primary audience, so to speak. This assumption goes hand in hand with the observation that quite a few Japanese writers seem to be biased in their valuation of translations into English. Here, I speak from my experience as editor to a 32 volumes series of translations of Japanese literature into German between 1990 and 2000 called “Japanische Bibliothek” (“Japan Library” or Nihon bunko), when more than once we were denied translation rights on the basis of the authors’ wishes to have a translation into English first. Nobody, of course, can ignore the hegemony of English in international communication, but literary markets are quite something else, yet this is a topic which necessitates more explanation than can be given here.4

Advantages and Problems of Pre-Translation

Back to the issue of pre-translation. This is, of course, no speciality of literature written in Arabic or in Japanese. Japanese-born British writer Kazuo Ishiguro admits in an interview in 2005 to carefully try to avoid local color. He suspects himself to be the first in his generation to work from the very beginning with the aspect of translatability in mind, in a linguistic as well as in a cultural sense. Thus, he confesses to abstaining from using English wordplay or puns. Also, he avoids describing a person by brand names or the names of the restaurants that he or she frequents, for “this kind of information may make sense to a reader living in London, but not to someone in Norway or Kansas City”. He goes so far as to even scrutinize his subject matter according to its global compatibility, suggesting that there are topics which may be important in an English context but not necessarily in other parts of the world.5

So what could be wrong then about pre-translation in a Japanese novel if even Anglophone authors with a wide international circulation frankly admit to adjusting their works to the assumed expectations of a globalized readership? In the case of Ishiguro at least, it seems that his strategy, embraced from his very start as a professional author, of writing for an international market worked out even, and the fact that he writes in English will certainly have added to his success. But can his example serve as a model for other writers, particularly those of other languages and cultures? And how do we measure Ishiguro’s success anyhow? Are we counting sales figures, or the number of translations into other languages, or literary prizes for his works, or what? I will

5 I have dealt with this issue in a number of articles, see, e.g., my Nihon bungaku shōkai habamu Eigo yūsen shugi, in: Asahi shinbun (yükan), Nov. 15, 1994, p. 11.
return to this question in the context of discussing the notion of ‘world literature’ later.

Let me state here that pre-translation in the case of contemporary Japanese literature, understood as a more or less consciously executed act of ‘editing’ a work in order to make it more palppable to a presupposed international standard is just one strategy out of a larger number that serve to make it compatible with a wider transcultural literary scene.

Readers of contemporary Japanese works, once they are sensitivized to the phenomenon, will have no difficulties in identifying instances of pre-translation with other authors. Mishima Yukio could perhaps be counted as an early sample. Some critics read from his tetralogy Hōjō no umi (The Sea of Fertility) with its theme of re-incarnation and heavy explanation of Buddhist philosophy particularly in the third volume title Akatsuki no tera (“The Temple of Dawn”, publ. 1969) Mishima’s intention of catering to an international audience. If this observation should hit the mark, it also points to one of the problematic aspects of pre-translation, namely a tendency to self-orientalingizing or self-exoticizing that has also been observed and criticized in the case of contemporary Arabic authors.

While pre-translation is a practice exercised by the authors themselves, other strategies of making Japanese literature fit for a world market are applied at a later stage by translators, readers or editors of the target language. The forms of editing are manifold indeed, and it would take another paper to deal with them or even to list all of them. I will limit my observations to a few remarks concerning the cooperation between authors and translators in this respect.

Whereas many authors will not be able to check what has happened to their work in the target language, and others may not even be interested in the results of its transformation as long as the book looks nice and royalties are flowing, some are fairly explicit about how they want to be translated. In one of Mishima’s German versions, we find a note stating that the work was translated from the English at the author’s demand. Was it that he distrusted German translators more than English ones? And was his distrust so strong that he rather opted for a multiple translation? We will never know.

We could also draw here on the example of Murakami Haruki’s double standard system,


as Murakami opts for a globalized version on the basis of the English translation of his works, which, in the case of Nejimakidori Karonikkuru (3 vols, 1994-1995, English version: The Wind-up Bird Chronicle, 1997) and other novels may differ substantially from the original, or domestic, version. Murakami is obviously convinced that the editing, the shortening and straightening out of a number of episodes and scenes that took place in order to adapt the work to US-American readers’ tastes and standards, produced an ‘international’ version of his works which he wants to see as the basis for translations into other languages. While it is, of course, perfectly legitimate for an author to decide on if, when and how his works are translated, it may come as a surprise that this Japanese author pro-actively supports the hegemony of American literary tastes. I have discussed this problem under the rubric of the Hollywoodization of literature in an article in the journal Sekai in January 2001 titled “Murakami Haruki o meguru bōken”.

The backdrop to my observations concerning strategies of making Japanese works of literature compatible to international standards, however defined, is the question of so-called world literature, and it is this topic which I want to reconsider in the last part of this paper.

Implications of ‘World Literature’ or the ‘World Republic of Letters’

As we have seen before, the conception of ‘world literature’ was forged in the European period of Romanticism, when the foundation for the development of different national literatures all over Europe was laid. Whereas Goethe’s reflections on what he termed the ‘free trade of notions and feelings (or: world market of intellectual goods)’ are regarded by many scholars as an anticipation of the contemporary situation of entanglement of literatures and cultures, the concept has nevertheless been discussed controversially, as based on a eurocentric vision, or, as others, among them sociolinguist Tanaka Katsuhiko, have maintained, as accentuating the very notion or ‘ideology’ of national literatures that it intends to transcend. Others therefore speak of an international literary space with “its own mode of operation: its own economy, which produces hierarchies and various forms of violence; and, above all, its own history”, a point which is made by Pascale Casanova in her reflections on the “World Republic of Letters”.

I have started out with the observation that some Japanese writers may not even be interested in having their works cross linguistic and cultural borders. And yet, they have been part of a global literary space for many generations now. Their choice of topic and style is also shaped by a globalized consciousness, whether they are aware of it or not. The notion of ‘world literature’ is, of course, not identical with the global literary space, and it remains contested. Yet it is based on

12 Freihandel der Begriffe und Gefühle, in his talks with Eckermann 1827.
the presumption that a work is alive in a number of cultures and languages other than its origin, that it is read, discussed, and perhaps adapted and inspires other works in the target cultures. This can be observed with many a Japanese literary work already. According to the most recent bibliography of translations of modern Japanese literature into German, there have been app. 1,800 translations of 1,553 Japanese works between 1868 and March 2009, done by 544 translators. This is just one example, from one language, for the fact that whether we are aware of it or not, Japanese literature is indeed, at least potentially, part of the literary life of other nations. It seems to me that this aspect deserves much more critical attention, on the part of scholars and critics, as well as readers, and by the authors themselves. What makes a Japanese work ‘fit’ for ‘world literature’? Does the author have to keep an international readership in mind while writing? Does she have to pre-translate? Does he perhaps orientalize his work, or, by contrast, try to strip his work of local color?

When Korean star author Kim Young Ha was asked in an interview about the reaction of European readers to his novels – he has not yet been translated into Japanese, as far as I know –, he responded that readers seemed to have missed an Asian, an ethnic Korean touch. But, he said, as his works are situated in a historical moment when Western consumer culture boomed in his country, this may have been a natural consequence. Asked about globalization in Korean literature, however, he admitted that this cannot and should not be aimed for.

It is this kind of critical reflection and self-reflection that I would like to see in respect to Japanese literature as well: Japanese writers and readers, scholars of Japanese literature in and outside Japan, and translators, forming a lively discourse about what it means to translate and to be translated, what the role of English is or should be in this context, and what to make of strategies of adapting to an international market. It takes a professionalized critique of translations in the target countries with a feedback into Japan, to make the idea of Japanese literature as ‘world literature’ come alive better. My appeal – what an old-fashioned thing to do! – is therefore addressed at all players in this complex game.

Tasks for the Target Language

As an example of what the target language culture can do in this context, let me introduce to you a bibliography of reviews of Japanese literature in German translation. It systematically lists, on close to 900 pages, with 4 indexes, all reviews, in full text, that were published in German language newspapers with national circulation in former West and East Germany as well as Switzerland and Austria from 1968 through 2003. This bibliography serves as a tool for research into how Japanese literature has been received and what part it plays on the wider continental book

16 As for a concrete example what it means for Japanese literature to be part of the literatures of the world, see the case of the reception of Mishima Yukio as material and literary motif in various literatures, cf. my essay “Mishima Yukio in the literatures of the world” in Mishima Yukio, cf. note 10.
market. Another indispensable tool in this context lies, of course, at the most basic level in the form of reliable dictionaries. Once more, here is what we have been working on for the past decade or so in German in order to enhance the quality of translation from the Japanese: It is a Comprehensive Japanese-German Dictionary (Wadoku daijiten), the largest bilingual dictionary for Japanese that ever existed, with more than 120,000 main entries (midashi-go) or more than a million words including sub-entries (tango). The first of altogether three vols. (A – I), with 2,540 pages, has just been published with countless sample sentences from literature, and with sources given. To give these examples may look hopelessly self-laudatory, but they should serve as illustrations as to what the contributions from the Japanese studies side in the target culture may look like, contributions which are mostly hidden from public attention, because they are too basic to be taken note of. And yet they also contribute, in their modest and unspectacular way, to making Japanese literature part of "world literature". What is needed is a platform to discuss more seriously what happens with and because of Japanese literature in an international context. The English expression "world-readable" has implications that we have not yet fully understood, and while the European bias is waning steadily in the 'world republic of letters', we need to study its mechanisms and institutions of legitimation. In order for Japanese literature to be recognized as an important and original player on this stage, it takes all parties involved – the authors first, but also translators, researchers, critics, and, of course, experienced and curious readers, who acknowledge a work, not necessarily for its 'Japaneseness', but for its individual aesthetic qualities as a work of art.
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Abstract

Translation could become “a form of ideological resistance” and questions of power in dealing with cultural translations have also been illuminated in previous research (Gentzler and Tymoczko 2002; Wing-Kwong Leung 2006). Within this framework this paper will highlight the process of translating Christian concepts in early Meiji Japan.

Monotheism, believing in one supreme God, was one of the greatest stumbling blocks when American missionaries in the late 19th century struggled with the translation of the Bible into Japanese. In a country, where religion was characterized by pragmatism, syncretism and a myriad of gods believing in an all-mighty God was not obvious. Japan had, with some exceptions, been secluded from the outside world for over two hundred years and was opened, assisted by American gunboats, in 1853. Although efforts at translating the Bible into Japanese had started outside Japan (eg. by Gützlaff and Bettelheim) the process accelerated when the missionaries were allowed into the country. The Gospels of Mark, Matthew and John were translated by Brown and Hepburn in 1872 and a complete Japanese Bible translation was published in 1887. At the same time the newly established Ministry of Education chose an American, highly Christian-tainted, primer as a model for the first Japanese primary school reader, Shôgaku tokuhon (1873).

The aim of this paper is to clarify the nature and significance of the discrepancies between the American original and the Japanese translation. The construction of the “good child” in the first Japanese primary school reader highlights the general adaption of Western culture in the early Meiji period. The Christian moral of Willson Reader was “Japanized” by adding a high dose of Confucianism, also text strategies and illustrations underwent transformation. Furthermore, the two versions of the hitherto largely neglected schoolbook point at the wavering education policies moving from Shinto ideology to a more Confucian or secular standpoint. Historically, Japanese literature has had a tradition of absorbing “the Other”, hybridisation thus has a long tradition (Morton: 2009). From a viewpoint of translation strategies, the text has been domesticated to suit the Japanese traditional ethics but a high dose of foreignization is preserved, involuntarily perhaps, in the direct rendering of a foreign culture.
Translation could become "a form of ideological resistance" in dealing with cultural translations as has been illuminated in previous research.\(^1\) Within this framework this paper will highlight the process of translating Christian concepts in early Meiji Japan.

The end of the 19th century witnessed an intensive period of translation. Suddenly awakening to the threat posed by Western powers, Japan was eager to obtain knowledge of the West. Translations of what were believed to be key Western texts helped foster knowledge. But finding Japanese equivalents for imported concepts such as "equality," "liberty," and "rights" was no easy task. At first, Japanese scholars made use of Chinese equivalents appearing in translations of Western books (on medicine, astronomy, geography, history, mathematics, and so on). Later, translators began inventing their own appropriate Japanese words. Whichever the case, they preferred using compounds of Chinese characters rather than Western loanwords themselves to render such words as "freedom" and "rights" into Japanese. Douglas Howland (2002) suggests that the tradition of Chinese learning and a familiarity with the Chinese written (but not spoken) language among intellectuals accounts for this preference.\(^2\)

Shortly after the Gakusei, the Fundamental Code of Education, was promulgated in 1872, the Ministry of Education issued detailed guidelines for primary school curriculum and textbooks. The guidelines recommended texts describing Western civilization (including several of Fukuzawa's works) and not specifically meant for children, as well as books that had been used in the terakoya schools of the Tokugawa period, especially before the Ministry of Education and the Tokyo Normal School started issuing their own material.\(^3\)

In this "age of translation" (honyaku jidai), though, a much wider spectrum than the traditional elite was curious about things Western. Fukuzawa, therefore, distanced himself from the Sino-Japanese style and was one of the few who strove to make his language as colloquial as feasible, hoping to capture as wide an audience as possible. Studying the development of translation at this critical juncture in Japanese history, therefore, helps us to appreciate specific nuances in the transition from the Tokugawa period to Meiji. We will see that where the dissemination of knowledge was concerned, translation dislodged the erstwhile feudal hierarchy, and provided access to new ideas irrespective of class.\(^4\)

Translators used different strategies for rendering Western words and concepts into Japanese. Borrowings were taken from Dutch learning, and translations were done via Chinese or old loanwords from Chinese were given new meanings, e.g. the meaning of bungaku, implying knowledge

---

in general, was changed to “literature” at this time. As *kango* (words of Chinese origin) were to a large extent used for constructing equivalents in Japanese, many translators thought it appropriate to use the Sino-Japanese style *kanbun-yomikudashi* rather than the spoken language, i.e. using a literary style (*bungo*) with a predominance of Chinese characters rather than the indigenous *kana* syllabary. Even if it was far from the spoken language, it was a style with which the intellectual elite (the presumed readership) at the time was acquainted. The Sino-Japanese style made use of metaphors and expressions from classical Chinese. Early Tokugawa translations had tended to be free adaptations, especially those of practical use. Omissions and additions were common. In the early Meiji period, when there was a lack of resources to deal with the influx of new material, translations—largely of the “word-for-word” variety—had been characterized by their ineptness, frequent mistakes, and unrefined concepts. Later, in the 19th and 20th centuries, literal translations became more frequent.

Translation served a critical role in the Japanese modernization process on a number of fronts. One feature of translation which has been largely overlooked, is the process by which translation introduces new concepts and their corresponding terminology. Take for example, the way “liberty” entered Japan, which Douglas Howland discusses in *Translating the West: Language and Political Reason in Nineteenth-Century Japan*. Historically, the Chinese word used in Japanese for “liberty,” *jiyû*, meant “having one’s way” or “following one’s inclination.” As translations in the early 19th century linked *jiyû* to “selfishness,” the famous thinkers (as well as translators) Fukuzawa Yukichi and Nakamura Keiu felt the need to apply a more positive connotation to the term, associating it with “freedom from tyranny” and “independence.” Apparently, the Meiji elite was more interested in using “liberty” to civilize (or edify) the people than arguing for its position as a natural right.

At the time of the opening of Japan, in the mid-1850s, aware of Japanese scepticism and fear of Christianity, President Filmore addressed a letter to the Emperor of Japan where he emphasized that it was against the constitution and laws of the United States to interfere with religious matters of other countries. He also instructed Commodore Perry (captain of the first fleet sent to Japan) to “abstain from every act which could possibly disturb the tranquility of your Imperial Majesty’s dominions.” Religious services were nevertheless held onboard the ships and a Christian funeral rite was held on land.

---

8 Howland, *Translating the West*, 4-6, 16, 22.
believe advances man’s progress here and gives him his only safe ground of hope for hereafter... 

In the beginning of the 19th century, the so called Awakening movement transformed Protestantism in the USA. Charismatic leaders warned that the foundations of society were threatened by non-religious behavior and immorality. Many converts were eager to demonstrate their faith by busying themselves in doing away with social evils. A widespread interest for missionary efforts was also a result of this. Unless converted into Christians, it was believed that peoples of other religions would be tortured in hell. The spirit of the missionary activities was also expressed in American expansionism westward and the forming of a national consciousness. The mission in Japan was set up mainly as a result of this missionary spirit combined with expansionist interests.11

The future of Japanese religion was seen as a special responsibility of American Protestants, even more so as European missions had concentrated on other countries. Furthermore, the missionaries believed that America, as the model of success, was best suited to spread Christianity—“the religion of development, progress and prosperity”—to the still heathen Japan. One assumed that the mounting interest for Western culture would automatically lead to the Japanese accepting Christianity.12

Secular and religious aspects of the West were so indivisible to them that Christianization assumed the character of Westernization, and Westernization implied the necessity of conversion to Christianity. Since to the American missionaries many of the Western social and political developments of the nineteenth century had to accompany or even precede successful evangelization, they felt that the utility of the West’s culture and society could not be considered independent of its normative system.13

The carefully selected missionaries were puritan Christians who were at the same time outstanding scholars, social workers and linguists, the latter such as J. C. Hepburn. Robert Morrison, the translator of the Bible into Chinese, had a similar background; apart from the Bible he also translated Chinese classics and compiled a grammar. These missionaries believed that Christian norms were the final phase of development. Therefore their main concern was education. As the ban on Christianity would not be lifted until 1873, they were, of course, also restricted from openly preaching, yet Western knowledge and institutions were seen as prerequisites for the adoption of Christianity. It also happened that the devotion to education was the main focus of Meiji leaders in their efforts to build a modern nation based on Western knowledge.14

*Let the world return to the ancient days of the Bushidô. Nay, I mean what I want to see is the baptized Bushidô.*15

This statement by one famous convert, Uemura Masahisa (in 1894), points at Christianity be-

ing seen by some as a development of Confucian ethic. The converts were convinced that Christianity was the basis of Western progress and crucial for the modernization of Japan. According to Caldarola, the former samurai’s interest in Christianity could be explained by the warrior class wanting to return to a lord-vassal relationship of the type that had been dismantled along with feudalism. The Emperor did not meet the requirements, as he did not distribute fiefs as the former domain lords had done. God was put in the place of the feudal lord. Devoted to their lord and their social mission, they felt that their status as samurai had been restored.¹⁶

One missionary, Liggins, wanted to remove Japanese prejudices and misunderstandings about Christianity. To this end he had such books as Schurner’s *History of England* and E.C. Bridge- man’s *History of the United States* translated into Japanese.¹⁷ In this respect it is interesting to note that one of the most influential missionaries of the time, G.F. Verbeck¹⁸, recommended that the *Willson Reader* be translated for use as a primary school reader. This was done, and the book became *Shôgaku tokuhon*, the focus of this study

Translating God into Japanese

Translating religious concepts was a problem in itself. Jan Assmann (1996) accounts for the struggle Christian missionaries had in finding an equivalent for “faith” and “belief” in the languages of the people they wanted to address. “People walking by faith had to tell a story the truth of which rests on matters outside the visible world. They could translate the story but not the god”¹⁹

In 1549, when Francis Xavier translated the catechism with the assistance of Yajirō, “Dainichi” "大日" (as in the Buddhist *Dainichi nyorai*) was used for “Deus.” Xavier was of course aware of the circumstances of Japanese religion and might have chosen this translation as a way to bridge Christian and domestic Buddhist thought or, alternatively, as a way to refute the existing view of God in Japan. The policy of translation was changed when Baltasar Gago, who arrived in 1552, indicated that using Buddhist terms could cause serious misunderstandings (“if one wishes to treat the truth with words of error and lies, they impart the wrong meaning”). Portuguese or Latin words (e.g. “Dios,” “paraiso,” “infierno”) were now used instead when translating Christian terms. Early Jesuit works translated “credo” (“belief”) by using the loanword “fides” (“faith”) as in “hiidesu ni uku” (“to receive faith”), avoiding the Buddhist-tainted “shinkô.”²⁰

Christianity was prohibited in 1614 and missionaries were expelled from Japan. All efforts to translate the Bible appear to have disappeared, as Protestant missionaries in the 19th century seemed unaware of the work that had been done by the Portuguese Jesuits in later attempts to
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¹⁶ Ibid., 31-32.
¹⁸ Guido Verbeck, a Dutch-born American missionary, had great influence as vice-rector of the southern wing of the university and he was often consulted by the Ministry of Education. His proposal of books and charts to be imported was sent by Tsuji Shinji, chief secretary at the southern wing, to Minister of Education Ōki in 1872. Some of the books were subsequently ordered from the United States and translated to Japanese.
render the New Testament into Japanese. However, during their long period of seclusion from the rest of the world, educated Japanese seem to have been acquainted with Christian terminology through Chinese translations. In contrast to Jesuit efforts of using colloquial Japanese language, influences from Christianity were now transmitted through Chinese, a language that the Japanese intelligentsia of the time mastered well (in its written form). Chinese translations of religious and scientific Western works had existed since the 17th century. Furthermore, many of the missionaries who were later to come to Japan had introduced Western learning in China, where Protestant missionaries were present as early as the beginning of the 19th century. The central figures in the first full translation of the New Testament, Hepburn and Brown, were clearly influenced by the Chinese translation carried out by Bridgman and Culbertson.

After the arrival of Commodore Perry to Japan, many efforts were made to translate the Bible, or rather parts of it, into Japanese. At the time the first Japanese primary school reader was developed, James Curtis Hepburn, who was also to be famous for his Japanese-English dictionary, published a translation of the gospels of Mark (1872) and Matthew (1873). As references Hepburn used Hebrew, Greek, Latin, English and Chinese translations of the Bible. He tried to be as faithful to the original as possible and was experienced using literary and colloquial style as well as using the Latin alphabet. The first translations of the gospels made by Hepburn and Brown in 1872 were printed in 1000 copies in the 1st edition and were widely spread in the Kobe and Nagasaki areas.

As opposed to other religions, which either were not interested in missionary work (Judaism and Hinduism) or imposed a language on followers (Islam), Christianity from the start aimed at delivering the message in people’s native languages. Thus the efforts of the missionaries brought with them an interest for translation of Christian texts. Nida suggests that the efforts by translators to find exact equivalents for Christian concepts in single terms point to “an exaggerated form of paternalism”. Instead he suggests the use of phrasal equivalents.

An example of the “paternalistic” attitude of the early missionaries can be seen in the following, which is a description of the situation for Christian missionaries in the early Meiji period written by Pastor H. Ritter in 1898:

The poverty of the vocabulary and the inelasticity of the Japanese language rendered communication and mutual understanding extremely difficult in the intellectual and spiritual matters, especially in religion. For example the corresponding words for our “spirit,” “God,” “Son of God” are almost useless, because to a Japanese they suggest at once their native superstitious ideas of a spirit as a ghost or spectre, or of a god or son of god after the fashion of their own numerous gods or sons of gods.

22 Ibid. 22-26.
27 Ibid., 189.
The Japanese language does not differentiate between singular and plural, so when *kami* is used for translating God, you cannot tell if it is one or several gods. Of course, it is problematic to try to convey the Christian God using one single word. The American missionaries who came to Japan shortly after the Meiji Restoration based their use on the Chinese translation of the Bible, which existed in two versions: one using *jôtei*, the other *kami*. It was the latter which was brought to Japan and which would influence the Japanese translation of the Bible. 

**Faith in Shôgaku tokuhon**

Was the message of early educational texts in line with Shinto ideology, or was it more slanted towards the Western thinking that characterized the *Gakusei*? In Western Europe and the United States, religion constituted the guiding hand in Sunday schools but also in popular education in general. The *Willson Reader* (1860), a popular school book in the USA in the latter half of the 19th century, was no exception. As stories from the Bible and Christian values were abundant, it may seem puzzling that the book was translated and designated the first Japanese primary school reader, *Shôgaku tokuhon* (“Primary School Reader” as published by the Ministry of Education in 1873). As mentioned above, however, adopting Christianity was seen by some as a necessary step towards civilization.

The parts of *Willson Reader* that were translated, the *First Reader* and *Second Reader* (of a total of five readers), contain a collection of short stories (half a page to two pages long) often taken from the child’s world. Out of the 183 stories in the *First and Second Readers*, 29 mention God. Of the latter, 19 (66%) were excluded from the Japanese translation. Of course, other stories were also excluded—a total of 57 (31%) stories were not part of the translation—but the reluctance to include stories with religious content is noteworthy. In the Japanese school book there is only God, and no reference is made to Jesus Christ. Stories about the latter’s life included in *Willson Reader* or any mention of the Bible are excluded, as are personal relationships to God, and praying to God/the Lord is transformed into praying in general. This is hardly surprising considering people’s scepticism towards Christianity.

Aside from exclusion, there were other ways the content was adapted. Below I will examine how the content of the stories mentioning God was affected when translated into Japanese. Supplemented moral values also balanced the original Christian message. At the end of *Shôgaku tokuhon* there are larger sections which have been supplemented, all of which are thorough elaborations on moral values.

**Translating “God” in Shôgaku tokuhon**

The two versions of *Shôgaku tokuhon* use different terms when translating “God” into Japanese. The first translation (1873) in itself uses different words for “God”: Amatsukami (天津神), *shinmei* (神明) and sometimes *kami* (神). The revised version (1874) sticks to the latter. Considering that this was done before the Japanese translation of the Bible (1887), the lack of a standard translation may not be surprising. Amatsukami is actually the name for the gods in heaven. *Shinmei* can be used when worshipping Amaterasu Ōmikami, but in *Shôgaku tokuhon* it used as

---

a synonym for *kami*. The latter is a general term for “divinity” or “god” used in Japanese religion. Other translations from Western civilization (among them the translation of Samuel Smiles’ *Self-Help* 1870–71) of the same period used the word for God found in the Chinese Bible translation, *jôtei* (上帝), or *tentei* (天帝) or *shinshin* (真神), so the terms used in *Shôgaku tokuhon* seem contrary to the mainstream.30 A word list used for the direct translation of the *Willson Reader* uses *kami* for both “God” and “Lord”.31 On the other hand, a direct translation done the same year, 1883, uses *jôtei* (上帝) for “God” and *shutei* (主帝) for “Lord”.32 Using the Japanese *kami* for “God” and drawing a parallel between the four major gods of Shinto and the Christian God, did not apparently upset the Government or the Shinto ideologists.33

A reflection of the official Shinto ideology is expressed in the translation of *Willson Reader*. In the margin of the first version of *Shôgaku tokuhon* (T73), in the translation of “A Child’s Morning Prayer”, the principle gods (*kami*) are named: “The main gods are called Takamimusubi, Kami-musubi and Amaterasu Ômikami.”34 These gods (and Amenominakanushi) were venerated in the shrine of the Great Teaching Institute, constructed as the central shrine of Shinto.35 Yamaguchi (1991) maintains that Shintoism (as perceived by Hirata Atsutane), in the form of Amatsukami, approached the Christian concept of an absolute God, and that perhaps Tanaka had a liking for this view when he edited *Shôgaku tokuhon*.36

In my translation of *Shôgaku tokuhon* back to English below I have preserved the Japanese terms for “God”.

**A PERSONAL, FAMILIAR GOD?**

In the *Willson Reader* biblical scenes are illustrated and taken as common knowledge. A personal relationship between the child reader and God is exhibited. A good example to illustrate this is the following story about a “Child’s Morning Prayer”. First I will present how the two versions of *Shôgaku tokuhon* present the story. (In the citations from *Shôgaku tokuhon* “T73” means the first translation of 1873 and T74 stands for the revised version of 1874.) Thereafter I compare my translation back to English from the Japanese versions with the original story in *Willson Reader*. The aim of these comparisons is to examine the possible discrepancies, interpretations and nuances in the rendering of Christian thought into Japanese.

---

31 Nakamura Gen, *Uirusonshi daiichi rîdoru jisho* (Tokyo: Matsui Chûbei, 1883)
33 Yamaguchi, “God no yakugo ni tsuite “Shôgaku tokuhon” no kami gainen,” 5.
Amatsukami, I pray, another night has passed without incidents and we can be happy. This morning, bestowing light upon us after dawn and letting us see the faces of father and mother healthy, many thanks. Please lead me so that I may enjoy happiness and save me in case I make errors. When I die please show me to heaven, I pray.

Every morning you wake up early and pray to kami. All until this morning it is kami that has granted us a life without incidents. Since you have given me light every breaking dawn and that we can see our father and mother’s faces safely (made it through the night) all these are favours we have to thank kami for. So you must pray for kami to guide you so that you will have a happy life and not make mistakes.

---


The American school text is in the form of a child’s prayer, i.e. the language uses second person singular and as it is directed to God using old forms such as “thee”, “thou” and “thine” as points of address. The Willson Reader also points to the importance of correct pronunciation, intonation and rhythm. In order to facilitate reading longer words are divided; e.g. “for-give” and “hap-py”. Furthermore, the prayer is in the form of a rhyming poem.

The use of polite language is noteworthy in the Japanese translation. In the first translation the verb “tamau” is used five times. “Tamau” is an honorific verb exalting the subject of the sentence. The revised version uses this verb only once (also once in the form of a noun “tamamono” (“gift”, “present”) using a different Chinese character 賜). This difference in the use of honorific language in connection with God can be observed throughout the translations. It is noteworthy to see the difference in the translation of “God” “Amatsukami” becomes “kami” in T74. The accompanying picture in the original translation is an indoor scene where a man is showing a boy something that looks like a Shinto table altar. In the revised version the man and boy are outside, and the man is pointing at the sky. The Willson Reader has a woman pointing at the sky for a girl. As will be discussed later in the thesis, the downgrading of the role of girls/women is a common feature in the translation.

The absence of the names of the gods in T74 and avoidance of direct translation of the personal relation to God expressed in Willson Reader gives the impression of T74 being more secularized. The first translation follows the original in relating a night having passed safely, and the revised version is normative here as well, e.g. “wake up early”. This follows the general trend of emphasizing diligence in the 1874 version. T74 is more in the form of a narrator instructing children (in the third person plural, “nanjira”) to pray to God. This difference is also apparent when interpreting the forgiving of sins in the prayer; “…my sins forgive” becomes “save me in case I make errors” in T73 and “guide you so that you will (have a happy life and) not make mistakes” in T74.

The Bible translated into Japanese uses “chichi” (my father). In Shôgaku tokuhon, though, “My Father’s smiles, which make the day” changes meaning when it is interpreted as the joy of seeing the faces of one’s parents having safely slept through the night in the translations. Having a “Father” in heaven who is not your real father may have been considered incomprehensible, and thus the wording was modified to a more recognizable respect for one’s parents. Inserting a term often associated with Confucian moral, 恩 “on” implying a “debt of gratitude” adds to the Japanizing tendency of the revised version. As in the prayer, God is sometimes replaced by “parents” in the Japanese translation. Shôgaku tokuhon even says that filial piety is commanded by God. Using “parents” rather than “father” for the object of reverence might also be an indication that Japanese religion is less patriarchal than Christianity in its approach.

Life after death, a central theme in Christianity, is faithfully rendered into Japanese initially, but in the second translation this topic is exempted.

Correcting the awkward language which was the result of the direct translation in T73 led to

---

40 孝順なるは、神より命したる Tanaka, Shôgaku tokuhon 1873, 155.
the personal touch being replaced by more authoritative language. The use of the suffix -beshi above is the imperative form. The personal touch of the letter to God in 1873 is changed to a commanding narrator style in 1874.

The individual’s responsibility to a supreme being, scolding you if you do wrong, is brought up in another section of the Willson Reader.

Do you know that it is wicked to tell lies? Yes, you have often been told so. The Bible also says so; and the Bible tells the truth. It is very mean, as well as very wicked, to tell lies.

If you tell lies, God will be angry with you; all good men will despise you; and all good boys and girls will shun you. Then what would you gain by telling lies? You would not gain any thing, but you would lose much.⁴¹

This is followed by a poem and a concluding remark: “Do you wish to be a child of God? Then speak the truth.”

In the Japanese translation God will not be angry with you but you will be abandoned by everyone (人皆汝を棄てゝ) if you tell a lie.⁴² Being honest is not only between you and God. You may lose your friends even be despised by everyone (必衆人賤しを免れず)⁴³, but on the contrary if you tell the truth “people will respect you and you will be assisted by God”. (必衆人の、敬愛を得て、神の助を蒙り)⁴⁴ Once again God is not visible, not acting like a human being by getting angry etc. The other instance when God appears in the Japanese translation is when describing an honest child who “will no doubt receive the assistance of God” (神の助を得て)⁴⁵ In the first Japanese translation, which stretches over four pages, God is mentioned only twice, the Bible not at all. In the above story "Never tell a lie", the Japanese translation is more preoccupied with what people will say than with becoming a child of God.

The Willson Reader often uses rhyme, as in the following lesson, which deals with God as being close to you:

---

⁴¹ Willson, The Second Reader, 73.
⁴² Tanaka, Shōgaku tokuhon 1874, 135.
⁴³ Tanaka, Shōgaku tokuhon 1873, 153.
⁴⁴ Tanaka, Shōgaku tokuhon 1874, 135.
⁴⁵ Tanaka, Shōgaku tokuhon 1874, 135.
In the English monologue God is always near, thus is nothing to fear. In the translation, the simple verse is changed to a burdensome explanation. The rhetorical question "Why should I fear when God is near?" is excluded and instead the presence and power of God seem to have to be motivated. If you are afraid of the dark (which is reiterated in the first two sentences) it is good to have God at hand. A moralizing section is added, making us aware that God is able to both reward and punish.

A personal relationship with God permeates the American school book. A girl kneels by her bed and says her morning prayer in the manner of a conversation with God. The intimacy between a child and someone outside the family, a stranger, may have appeared odd to a Japanese audience, which may explain why it was excluded in the translation. These independent relationships would also impede creating loyalty ties structured around the family, subsequently inserting the Emperor as father of the "family state".

The supplements made to the Japanese translation predominantly revolve around concepts such as filial piety and loyalty. Respect for your parents is, of course, also a Christian virtue, but the minor role it is awarded in the Bible is said to be one of the reasons for Japanese reservations towards Christianity. What happens in Shōgaku tokuhon, however, is that this respect replaces the child’s relationship to God (e.g. "A Child’s Morning Prayer"). A major challenge for the new government was to create a sense of belonging to the Japanese nation, shifting loyalties from the local, clan level to the national arena. Therefore creating ties around the familiar “five relations” with the Emperor as the father of the nation seemed more logical than letting children believe in

---

46 Willson, The First Reader, 63.
47 Tanaka, Shōgaku tokuhon, 123.
a foreign Christian God. *Kokutai* (national polity) and the Emperor are not mentioned in *Shōgaku tokuhon*, but appear in the contemporary preaching of the national evangelists (as well as in the second primary school reader published by the Ministry of Education, the "Sakakibara reader"). The school book nevertheless takes the first step in that direction by secularizing the content of the *Willson Reader* and instead focusing values on reverence for your parents.

Christian values dominate the *Willson Reader* imbuing the text with many stories about God and the Bible. The revised translation in particular excluded many of these stories, or made major adaptations of the content. Nowhere in the revision is there any indication that the book is a translation. It would appear to have been originally written in Japanese. The only clues to its origins are to be found in the content and the illustrations, the latter of which were also somewhat "Japanized" by the occasional insertion of Japanese-looking people. Even so, quite a few foreign images were preserved in *Shōgaku tokuhon*.

Also distinguishing the *Shōgaku tokuhon* from the Christian values of the *Willson Reader* is the set of “Japanized” rules it provides its young readers. The first translation (T73) adopts some of the Shinto terminology used by the Government in its campaign to unite state and religion. Japanese deities are used to name "God". The gods chosen (Amaterasu, for example) nevertheless may show signs of Westernization, as they are used to describe a universe-creating power, thus approaching the Christian view of a supreme being. Trying to overlay the monotheistic worldview of the original text with the Shinto pantheon of gods was so fraught that when the translation was revised (T74), translators dispensed with any mention of Shinto deities and used the neutral/secular term *kami* to translate "God." *Kami* is a term for any of a myriad of Japanese gods, whether they are mountains or saints. But the term could also be used to refer to “divinity” in general.

How then should we interpret these variations in the translations. One possible explanation is that they signal a movement away from the dogmatic Shinto campaign, mirroring the way these policies were downgraded in the government itself. *Kami* would also be the term used in the Bible translation. Perhaps it was just easier for people to refer to this naming of “God” than to the Shinto terminology. After the ban on Christianity was lifted in 1873, one can well imagine that skepticism remained towards the barbarian faith, although even leading intellectuals had converted, seeing it as a natural road to "enlightenment." Nevertheless the traces of a supreme, all-creating God have vanished in the revised translation.
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Abstract

"Tea ceremony" is today the most common translation of chanoyu or sadō/chadō. However, at the same time the number of authors who refrain from using a translation increases - those who rather use the words chanoyu or sadō as they are. A study into the origin of the translation of the term chanoyu or sadō reveals somewhat complex relations between the authors and terms used.

I will use material ranging mainly from Jesuit missionaries in the 16th century to the start of the Second World War written in several European languages. The purpose is to shed light on the question how the translation “tea ceremony” came into being – as well as other translations of which some are still used in modern times. It reveals two broadly defined groups of authors. Simply put, those who translate and those who do not (or is forced to translate unwillingly). There is also a strong connection between the length of a text and its author’s choice of term. The translation into “tea ceremony” might reveal a “light” version on Chanoyu – a description limited only to the preparation and serving of tea.

1 My deepest gratitude goes to Professor Kumakura Isao who led on the path to study the origin of the term. I hope this paper will be an acceptable start to the assignment, however regretfully late.
Today the most common translation of chanoyu or sadō/chadō is “tea ceremony”. This translation has its origin in the late 19th century shortly after the end of Japan’s isolation. The impact of each culture upon each other shall not be ignored. Japan tried to become westernized and had in Europe – even though the Japanese were commonly seen as inferior – profound effect on European art – japonisme. Even though utensils of chanoyu were commonly collected in Europe the interest of chanoyu did not, in European eyes, visibly improve. Rather a selective view of chanoyu grew and still exists today, which may be summarized with the term “tea ceremony”. By using the translation of chanoyu (or the absence of it), as a guide to the texts about chanoyu, certain structures becomes visible. Though different times and different relations between western nations and Japan also affect the understandings and views of chanoyu, there is a division among the authors in Europe that seems unbound by time. One major difference between two sets of perspectives can be found in the translation of chanoyu – and in a sense the lack of it. Before I set out to map out the differences in the texts available to me about chanoyu in European languages, I have to explain and in a sense define my own position.

I will use the Japanese term chanoyu and not a translation. Any Japanese or translated term that I use might place me within a certain category that will be apparent to the reader at the end of this paper. I might use a “new” term, but it may have imbued values that unwillingly will be imposed upon the understanding thus further complicating the matter.

Before going to the sources, the Japanese terms themselves should shortly be addressed. The term most used in Japan until the early 20th century is chanoyu. The term sadō is today more commonly seen and a shift has gradually changed during the 20th century. As of yet, I have failed to find a difference in these two terms in Japan. There seem to be none in Japan, but outside its borders at least one example may be found. In her book An introduction to Japanese Tea Ritual J. Anderson (1991) has crafted different ways to see and understand chanoyu depending on the Japanese term used. For her, sadō represented the philosophical part of chanoyu.

Premodern times

The voyage of chanoyu into the minds and texts of the westerners begin as far back as the 16th century. The Jesuit missionary activity began in 1549, and under the regulations of Valignano, missionaries were to adapt to Japanese society and customs. This included a room in which guests to the Jesuit residences were prepared and served tea. This room became the centre of their view of chanoyu. In the Japanese-Portuguese dictionary, the word chanoyu may be found. One of the two translations found here is a direct translation of the characters: hot water for tea. The second is not related to the term chanoyu as we might assume, but rather to the room in which guests were served tea. The function of this chanoyu-room was protected by certain rules. One may not take water or fire from the room, not indulge in rest or other non-related activities to mention some.

During the isolation of Japan (sakoku) it was through the sole European contact, the Dutch, that information and goods flowed between Japan and Europe. In service of the Dutch East India...
Company (VOC), men came from different nationalities – the three most famous were not Dutch at all: Kaempfer and Siebold were German and Thunberg Swedish. Kaempfer described chanoyu and showed illustrations of utensils. He noticed not only the aesthetic values but also saw the social interaction and compared it to Western counterparts. Cock Blomhoff who was active about a century later would bring a lot of utensils and models back to Europe. They were placed in museums and thus showed how chanoyu was conducted – yet left “the essence of chanoyu unexplained”. An early aesthetical influence upon Europe that the Japanese had, maybe unknowingly, was “Japanning”. It was the European imitation of Japanese lacquer.

**Modern times**

The influence upon European art, *japonisme*, began after the Japanese was forced to open their borders in 1853-54. Japanese ethnographic collections were also made and put on display. The reason behind this was that the real Japan – the land before westernization – was attractive. In Sweden at this time little was written about the modernizing Japan during the Meiji era. This strengthening of the country by adapting Western ways was seen as undesirable by Swedish eyes. To the Swedes and others the old Japan was of much more interest. The view of Japan was two-folded – the negatively viewed modernization versus the culture seen as exotic.

When the Japanese culture was introduced into Europe, the observers’ own interest had great influence. Amongst the collections of Japanese craft, porcelain was at first the most common, but gradually approaching the shift to the 20th century, ceramic tea bowls became the most common item. However, this does not mean that the interest in chanoyu grew. Rather they were solely seen as objects of arts and not utensils. In the descriptions of these “items of art”, chanoyu is only shortly touched upon. Texts that concentrate upon chanoyu more than briefly are fewer than those about Japanese art including chanoyu utensils.

Other material that mentions chanoyu is rather scarce due to two factors. Until the 1940s only a few books were written in European language and the search for single articles is time-consuming. Kumakura Isao has made a list of texts from 1870 to 1976. In this list, I can only find four non-Japanese texts, which all will be mentioned later. The material I use is not a complete collection of all published sources during this time, but still enough to get a perspective of the early understanding of chanoyu in Europe.

**The material**

The material used will be divided into three groups mentioned separately. The division is based on the type of material. Firstly, I will study some articles that are limited in size. The second group is the books about chanoyu that have been published, and finally, I will look at the

---

6 Two of these are problematic. In 1933 a book called *Cha no yu – The Japanese Tea Ceremony* by Sen Soshitsu is mentioned. This is probably the book by A.L. Sadler by the same name and year. The tea master however, is present in a full length photograph inside the book. The other book, *Tea Cult of Japan* by Fukukita Yasunosuke in 1939 is correctly mentioned. This is a shortened version and only one of several publications of these two versions of the books during the 1930s (and later). Both these two sources will be covered in this paper.
Japanese authors that have published texts in a European language.

To avoid critique, I would like to make clear that I do not value the authors negatively. My interest is in the content and use of term, and not the author and his relation to, and view of, Japan. For example, Minear (1980) has studied Orientalism in the study of Japan. Chamberlain is one that falls within this category. Orientalism has in studies been used to “brand” an earlier author; they failed to take the other side into consideration.

The articles

I will use several articles for this part: four in English, one in French and two in Swedish. The earliest is published in 1885 and the latest in 1914. It is not only the use of term that is of interest but other common aspects in their descriptions.

They all use the term “cha-no-yu” but not all use the term “tea ceremony”. The common theme, however, is the perpetuation of chanoyu as a ceremony. The earliest text, J. Dixon *Japanese etiquette*, mentions chanoyu as “tea drinking”, yet it was still a ceremony: “cha-no-yu and other ceremonies”.7 It is still present in D. Bildts text *Japonica*, in which it is stated as “teceremonien (cha-no-yu)”.8 It can be found in French as well, “Les ceremonies du thé” by H. Gailment.9

There are, however, a few articles that have a slightly different approach. Two of the authors use the term chanoyu, yet in their explanation it is the act of preparation and serving the tea that is in focus - thus the ceremonial part of chanoyu. These are J. Goodrich, whose title *The Japanese tea drinking ceremony*, leaves nothing to question and C. Holme’s *The pottery of the cha-no-yu* where it is stated: “ceremonious tea function in Japan known as the cha-no-yu”.10 In his famous *Things Japanese*, B. Chamberlain refrains from using chanoyu.11 Since Chamberlain might be seen as one as the most influential authors of early Japanese studies, then his usage of “tea ceremony” solely might be one of the more significant factors behind its usage even in present times.

An aspect of interest, seen in a broader context, is the view of chanoyu as something related to the old Japan and that it will fade away with the modernization of the country. Goodrich sums it up as follows:

> In the rush of development, progress, civilization (call it what you will) that is sweeping over Japan (…), many curious and interesting customs are rapidly going to decay, and from disuse on the part of the natives and ignorance on the part of most foreigners, are likely to be soon forgotten. One of these of the Cha-no-yu, or tea-drinking ceremony.12

In Europe, many ethnographic collections were created due to the idea that the modernization, and westernization, of non-civilized units (including Japan and other non-western nations) was to replace the old culture. If it was not collected and protected in European collections, it would be lost for all time.

---

7 Dixon 1885:1.
8 Bildt 1914: 352.
9 Gailment 1895: 291.
10 Holme 1908: 163.
11 Chamberlain 1890: 333-339. The content of his following publication of 1891 is exactly the same.
12 Goodrich 1888: 137.
H. Stolpe gathered items in Japan for his collection for the same reason – that it would otherwise be lost. He and others also placed it in close relation to the Japanese character. To him, cha-no-yu represented the traditional Japan, a representation of the Japanese character. It was a way to understand them, but more importantly a way to show their difference to the contemporary westerners. Similarly, Goodrich wrote: “The fondness of the Japanese for precise formality is epitomized in the ceremony ...” According to Chamberlain one needed an “Oriental fund of patience” since to the “European the ceremony is lengthy and meaningless.”

To Chamberlain chanoyu was also closely related to art and etiquette. Dixon’s text is about Japanese etiquette, Holme’s about pottery (and thus art) and Bildt’s and Stolpe’s may be connected to art as well since they describe Japanese items. These two aspects are understood from their context. The western interest in Japanese art which included ceramics, lacquer, etc. included many utensils of chanoyu, and the chanoyu was taught to girls in school and for many a requirement to marry.

Lastly, a common theme in the articles is the content. The “ceremony” or the act of preparing and serving tea is described to some length and Goodrich’s is the most detailed. They also wrote about its history, the personalities of the past, such as Toyotomi Hideyoshi, Ashikaga Yoshimitsu and Sen Rikyu, to mention a few. Chanoyu was thus, maybe unknowingly, more firmly connected to the old, traditional Japan; a thing of the past rather than the modern – “Its old bloom is gone beyond recall, for modern Japan is too busy over more important matters to busy itself with the minutiae of cha-no-yu and other ceremonies.”

The books

There are only a few books written about chanoyu in the early 20th century, and none, to my knowledge, during the late 19th century. Two of the five authors of interest are Japanese and will thus be studied later. The three remaining authors came from different countries and wrote in different languages. In a chronological order, Ida Trotzig wrote Cha-no-yu – japanernas teceremoni in Swedish 1911, Anna Berliner wrote Der teekult in Japan in German 1930, and the last one was A. L. Sadler’s Cha-no-yu – The Japanese Tea Ceremony in 1933. Sadler had published an article in 1929 which later became the introduction chapter in the book and therefore he is mentioned here and not in the part of the articles.

The works of Trotzig and Sadler has similarities. Not only the title is similar, but the contents are in a broad sense similar as well. They both have extensive explanations about the preparation and serving of tea, the utensils and the place where it is performed. Trotzig goes more into detail and mentions variations, while Sadler focuses more on the history and its personalities in this second and longer chapter on “tea masters”. A difference between the two, however, is the introduction to chanoyu, how they place it in perspective. Sadler’s first sentence is as follows:

For the last four hundred years there has existed in Japan a very definite point of view, or a

13 Goodrich 1888: 137.
14 Chamberlain 1890: 338.
15 Dixon 1885: 1.
16 I am going to use the 1962 reprint of the book.
way of life, associated with the ceremonial drinking of tea. It is called Cha-no-yu, literally – Hot water for Tea; or Chado, the Way of tea...\textsuperscript{17}

As mentioned earlier, the introduction was also published as an article and the title of that was not the same as the book: “Chanoyu or the Tea Philosophy of Japan a Western Evaluation”. This title rings more true with the beginning of the texts; that chanoyu consists of something more than the “ceremonial drinking of tea”. In the list of “books consulted”, one may find Kaempfer, Chamberlain and Holme, authors who have focused more on the “ceremonial part”. There are also Japanese sources used which will be mentioned in detail later. To further complicate the matter, Sadler uses not mainly one term but rather three – chanoyu, ceremony and teaism. The last term “Teaism” has close relation to the Japanese author Okakura Kakuzo (Tenshin), mentioned in the next chapter. The terms used are not simply divided into a simple division of chanoyu as a way of life or a philosophy and the ceremony as a way of drinking tea, rather they are mixed.\textsuperscript{18} Lastly, Sadler has placed the chanoyu in close relation to the Japanese history and old traditions: “Indeed Chanoyu may be considered an epitome of Japanese civilization...”\textsuperscript{19}

The Swedish author who published her book about two decades before, and thus contemporary with the articles rather than the books, had the same perspective. To her it had a strong footing in the past but managed to survive, due to being rooted in all classes of society – whereas Ogasawara had been forgotten. Noticeably, she had an aspect of etiquette embedded in the description. The usage of the terms chanoyu and teaceremony (she does not use teaism) is more differentiated than Sadler’s. “Chanoyu is an institution...” while the teaceremony “consists of a chain of symbolic actions”.\textsuperscript{20} The term chanoyu has become a representation of something more than just the ceremonial part – “...Chanoyu strives towards peace and harmony, as well as a higher ethic.”\textsuperscript{21} The ceremonial action had become a way of meditation to achieve this, and thus the religious aspect and history is strongly connected to the activities in contemporary times. The articles had similarly brought up religious and historical aspects, but they saw chanoyu as a thing of the past, were Trotzig still saw it as still present in the period of her time.

There is one last aspect of Trotzig that is interesting. Sadler writes that there is but a few other authors on the subject of chanoyu. Trotzig mention the same in her presentation. Chamberlain’s and Holme’s texts are mentioned in hers, just has Sadler had, but there is indication that she might have known about several others as well.\textsuperscript{22} Even though she mention that some have more detailed description about the subject and criticized western authors on the subject. To her, the

\textsuperscript{17} Sadler 1929: 635; 1962: vii.
\textsuperscript{18} One would need to examine all mentioning of the terms in the more than 200 pages of the work. Due to lack of time the extended study has been emitted for this paper.
\textsuperscript{19} Sadler 1929: 635; 1962: vii.
\textsuperscript{20} Trotzig 1911: 16. My translations.
\textsuperscript{21} Trotzig 1911: 17. My translation.
\textsuperscript{22} A list of works in the subject can be found in the archives of the Ethnographic Museum in Stockholm, Sweden. No bibliography was published in her book but a few mentioned in the text. When this bibliography was written is not noted on the page and lost in time, with the only cue being the date of the mentioned works. The last work being Okakura’s The Book of Tea in 1906 may hint that the list is prior to the publication of her book in 1911, but neither Okakura nor the term teaism is mentioned. To complicate the matter, Trotzig would later use Teaism and mention Okakuras work, but the unpublished manuscript and published articles are of a later date.
simple presentations had negative impact on the view of the chanoyu in the west:

_This to the Japanese most important and significant institutions are poorly known by the Europeans. [The Europeans] want wrongly, all too often in this see only a faint of the Japanese excessive cult of etiquette and love for details and peculiarities._

To my knowledge, Trotzig is the first to make a difference in the usage of chanoyu and tea ceremony and the criticism of the lack of a more broad perspective, but she would not be the last. An author that stands more than the previous is the German Anna Berliner. She criticized other authors for their limited view on chanoyu, but mentioned Trotzig as an exemption. Berliner’s focus on the subject also shines in stark contrast to all other authors in her own time and for a time thereafter: In her book of close to 400 pages, she mentions the utensils, tea room and several types of preparing tea. In contrast to the other authors, she spends the last portion to the question “Was ist die tecomorienie...” (What is the tea ceremony). For Berliner, Chanoyu was something more, and even though she uses the term “ceremony”, her title mentions it as a “tea cult”. It contained something more, and thus “ceremony” would be inadequate.

### The Japanese sources

The Japanese were active in trying to present themselves in the west. In many subjects of Japanese studies, there are Japanese who have presented their view and chanoyu is no exception. I will use three authors for material, and finally also shortly present an introduction movie to Chanoyu, sent by the Japanese Government to Sweden. In the western sources, only a few ventured beyond the act of preparing and serving tea. For the Japanese authors, who had no language or cultural barriers hindering, a more complex view could have been presented – or had they been trapped in the westerners’ lack of interest in Chanoyu beyond the visible?

To my knowledge, the earliest material written by the Japanese is Matsumoto Kumpei’s “The tea ceremony of Japan” from 1895. Matsumoto is very similar in his description of chanoyu to his contemporary western counterparts. As only a few other, he separated chanoyu from normal tea drinking: “The ceremony of tea-drinking, or ‘cha-no-yu,’ must be strictly distinguished from the ordinary tea-drinking. Again, the notion of such vulgar way of drinking tea as with sugar or cream must be cleared from the reader’s mind.” Even though his description has many similarities, differences may also be found. Instead of using a term such as cult as Berliner had, Matsumoto called it an institution, a social as well as an artistic one. He ends the article as follows: “It must be remembered that such a social institution of pleasure has been developed to suit not the European nor the American People, but the Japanese, who have peculiar tastes.”

This separation of the west and the Japanese interests is not as provocative as Okakura Kakuzo in his similar statement in _The Book of Tea_.

_Those who cannot feel the littleness of great things in themselves are apt to overlook the greatness of little things in others. The average Westerner, in his sleek complacency, will see in the tea ceremony but another instance of the thousand and one oddities which constitute the_

---

23 In the article, his name is presented as “J. Kumpéi Matumoto”.
25 Matsumoto 1895: 120.
quaintness and childishness of the East to him.  

To Matsumoto, the Japanese was odd, but to Okakura it was rather the West that failed to see what was grand in Japan. But however famous Okakura has become, his work should rather be placed separately from the other source. The main reason for this is that he does not talk about chanoyu. One might say that he tries to explain the philosophy behind, rather than the activity per se. To him it was more of a cult: “a religion of aestheticism – Teaism”. It was also the aesthetic that was the focus on which the foundation lay. The term he created, “teaism”, has not been influential, neither in his time, nor in the present. The single author that I have seen, even in present titles, that extensively uses the word “teaism” may also have presented an answer to why most authors of chanoyu do not use the word:

*By far the best description of its spirit is the short essay of Okakura Kakuzo entitled “The Book of Tea,” a work of great charm of style very suitable to the elegance of the subject, rather stimulating interest in “Teaism”, the word he coined to describe it, than giving a detailed account of it.*  

Okakura’s influence may be found in spreading the interest in the tea of Japan, the aesthetics of tea – but should one wish to understand or see what chanoyu was, then one needed to study other works than his. His lack of details may have affected other authors negatively; that they refrained from using his term teaism. The last author, even though his book has been republished several times, has been close to forgotten. Fukukita Yasunosuke’s book *Cha-no-yu – tea cult of Japan*, was first published in 1932 and the fourth edition came out in 1940. A shorter version, with the confusing title *Tea Cult of Japan – an aesthetic pastime*, was made for and published by the Board of Tourist Industry in 1934, with a third edition in 1937, and after the war it was re-published in 1947, 1955, 1959, 1961 and 2006.  

Fukukita may have been the first to extensively discuss the complication of “ceremony”: “cha-no-yu is more than the ceremony of serving powered tea.” A term to use was however not to be found, but he uses the term “cult” as Berliner had done. As for the serving of tea, Fukukita sometimes refers to this as “ritual”, similar to Okakura, he also fathomed the cult to be an aesthetic one. Fukukita was not content with the term cult – to him, chanoyu was a kind of “entertainment or pastime, from which those who participate derive aesthetic pleasure...”. It contained connections with all kinds of arts and the daily life – it was multi-facetted. In his shorter version, the discussion is left out. In the early presentations, Fukukita uses the term “entertainment” more often – thus more of a pastime. Knowledge of chanoyu would, however, help in understanding Japanese culture as a whole:

*It is a subject which requires a life-long study to appreciate fully the underlying subtle aes-*

---

26 I have used an only copy of the book ([http://www.gutenberg.org/files/769/769-h/769-h.htm](http://www.gutenberg.org/files/769/769-h/769-h.htm); 2011-02-11)  
27 A simple Google search (2011-02-11) of the following terms gave the following hits: chanoyu 122 000; tea ceremony 897 000; teaism 35 400. (Numbers are rounded off.)  
29 In the last edition an appendix that mentioned the tea house build in Stockholm in 1936. Fukukita was most likely hired as a translator for Fujiwara Ginjiro who donated the tea house to The Ethnographic museum in Stockholm.  
30 Fukukita 1932: 105.  
31 Fukukita 1932: 105.
theticism, with its manifold bearings upon religion, literature and philosophy, as well as the arts and crafts. A knowledge of Cha-no-yu, however slight, will therefore be highly useful to understand and adequately appraise the home life of the Japanese people.32

In the late 1930s, a film was sent to the Ethnographic museum in Stockholm, Sweden. It had been made a few years before and was a gift from the Japanese Government to the museum. The movie had been made by Board of Tourist Industry and the text (the film contained no sound) was in English, and the time and publisher coincide with Fukukita’s book. Thus it is very plausible that Fukukita was consulted; maybe even the author of the texts within. Two parts are of interest for this paper:

The Tea Ceremony or “chanoyu” is a refined pastime in Japanese homes. It is a cult to develop spiritual enlightenment and encourage mental relaxation.

Now the formal tea ceremony begins.

It was a cult, not aesthetic but of self-development, which could be found in Japanese homes. It would thereby be seen as generally conducted by the Japanese. The film shows a dinner being served before drinking the tea. The second quote above is from the moment the guests once more enter the tea room, this time to be served tea. The term “ceremony” is hereby even further reinforced. In the first of the above two quotes a spiritual part of chanoyu is mentioned, thus gives a hint to a more complex structure than the ceremony itself.

Concluding remarks

The common description of chanoyu during this period is that it is a ceremony of tea drinking with aspects such as aesthetics and etiquette included within the activity. To many it was a thing of the past that would be lost with modernization (westernization). Only a few ventured beyond the preparing and serving of tea and those who did also tried to use other terms in their descriptions. The term “tea ceremony” would then only refer to a limited part of chanoyu representing just the activity of tea drinking and excluding the context beyond the etiquette and aesthetic. A provocative comparison would be to study Christianity in Europe from the ceremonial activities such as wedding and funerals, without taking into account the European culture or religious thought. Chanoyu during the early 20th century was more than a way to teach young girls etiquette and other skills needed before marriage. Several of the members within the financial and political elite in Japan used chanoyu when socializing with each other – a custom that traces back even to the 16th century and merchants meeting daimyos.

There are other scholars in modern time that have brought up the problems with limited view of chanoyu by using the term “tea ceremony”. In his dissertation The tea cult in history from 1985 Robert Kramer wrote that the term “ceremony” was to him closely associated with the act to prepare and drink a cup of tea.33 His feeling is thus similar to the finding in this paper. Jennifer Andersen would like to avoid the usage of “ceremony.” Chanoyu was something more than that: “It should be becoming increasingly obvious [when reading this book] that there is much more to a

33 Kramer 1985: vi.
tea gathering than ladies in pretty kimono fluttering over exquisite ceramics”.

The limited view, and in the end, understanding of chanoyu has its origin mainly from the late 19th century. I assume that most of those who wrote about it had been to a tea gathering and it was thus this visual part that was (mis-)understood. For those that wrote a more facetted view that tried to at least explain the aspects beyond the visible, many used “cult”. They could not distance themselves from the term “ceremony” even if they wanted to – it had become synonymous with the activity of tea drinking.

Chanoyu, as many modern scholars tend to use, is maybe not the only solution to the problem of fully depicting the activity into one term. Due to the multifaceted nature of chanoyu, with so many aspects to take into account, one solution might be to strive for several terms rather than one. Anderson had used the term sadō to represent the philosophical aspects, thus different from chanoyu; “ceremony” may be used to represent the preparation and serving the tea as a whole. Chanoyu, being a term with strong historical tradition, might be used to bring the different aspects into one word – but that is nothing but my perspective on the matter.

**Sources used**


---


Matsumoto, K. (1895) "The tea ceremony of Japan" in Lippincotts monthly magazine, 56: 115-120.
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Abstract

This paper examines the translation of Shōno Yoriko’s writing style and forms of expression; specifically in the 1994 Akutagawa prize winning novella Taimusurippu konbin’to, which was published as “Time Warp Complex” (translation by Adam Fulford, with assistance from Takahashi Yuriko and Ito Nobuji; stylized by Michael Fujimoto Keezing) in the Review of Contemporary Fiction 2002. The novella is written in a style similar to stream of consciousness, and the main character’s many thoughts and associations – in relation to objects/ideas on one hand and words/sounds on the other – play an important part in the story. The latter kind of association is especially interesting, since word games like these can be considered one of the characteristics of Shōno Yoriko’s style. Because of their language specific nature, they can also be regarded as obstacles for the translator. Images based on words, such as the novella’s vivid description of a place called Umishibaura based on the three components of its name (umi, shiba and ura), pose similar problems because they’re not directly accessible to non-speakers of Japanese. This paper presents a number of examples from the original text and the translation mentioned above, along with a discussion about the translatability of the text and the choices made by the translator.
1. Introduction and aim of the paper

Despite her success of winning three major Japanese literary awards in the early nineties, Shōno Yoriko is a writer who is still not very well known to the general public in Japan – and, due to the lack of translations of her works, even less so in other countries. My own interest in her works sparked a couple of years ago when I first read the collection of her three prize-winning stories, Shōno Yoriko Sankanshōsetsushū, starting with the novella “Taimusurippu konbināto”. While researching material for my master thesis about the narrative strategies and techniques used in this novella, I found that an English translation of roughly half of it had been published in 2002, under the title "Time Warp Complex", in the magazine Review of Contemporary Fiction. However, reading the translated version of the story was a quite different experience compared to the original text. A lot had been lost in translation. The aim of this paper is therefore to examine some of the difficulties that occur when translating Shōno’s writing style and forms of expression in this work. To achieve this, I have studied the translation together with the original text, as presented in the first hardcover edition of Taimusurippu konbināto, comparing the two side by side. I have selected some of the areas that pose obvious problems for the translator, as well as examples where the translator has added or left out information from the original text, which I will discuss here. But before moving on to the comparison, I would like to make a brief introduction of the work itself.

2. “Taimusurippu konbinato” - an overview

The novella is written in first person using the pronoun watashi, in a style similar to stream of consciousness, and the main character’s many thoughts and associations – in relation to objects/ideas on one hand and words/sounds on the other – play an important part in the story as a whole. As in many of Shōno’s works, the main character is a middle-aged female author who is living by herself, withdrawn from society, and the story begins when she suddenly receives a phone call from an unknown person telling her that she has to go somewhere. The phone call comes when she’s asleep, dreaming about being in love with a tuna, and thus the boundaries between reality and dream are blurred. This uncertainty remains throughout the text, creating some of its peculiar atmosphere. The first half of the story, the part that was published in English translation, consists of this mysterious phone call (concerning where to go, and what to do there) and the main character’s thoughts surrounding it; while the second half describes her way to a station called Umishibaura in search of the tuna of her dream. Umishibaura is the last stop on the Tsurumi line, a small train line in the industrial area of Kawasaki at the outskirts of Tokyo, and while it is an existing station it also has symbolical value as a “station with no exit”: with one side of the platform facing the sea and the other side having only one exit that leads straight into the Toshiba factory area, therefore only being accessible to employees of Toshiba. This station can be viewed as a symbol of the Shōwa era, where the two major events of the war and the bubble

1 The NOMA LITERARY AWARD for New Writers for “Nihyakkaiki” in 1991, followed by the Akutagawa Prize for “Taimusurippu konbinato” and the Mishima Prize for “Nanimoshitena”, both in 1994.
3 Translated by Adam Fulford, with assistance from Takahashi Yuriko and Ito Nobuji; stylized by Michael Fujimoto Keezing. The text can be found on the internet, together with a translated interview with Shōno, on the following page: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_hb3544/is_2_22/ai_n28932062/
The story relies greatly on this context, with its many references to war (particularly, but not only, World War II) the bubble economy and the following recession. The half-abandoned, rusty industrial landscape of the Kawasaki area also reminds the main character of her home town of Yotsukaichi, bringing back memories from her childhood and even causing her to believe that she’s in a time slip – thus giving the story its title. This connection fully evolves in the second part of the story, when the main character travels through this landscape, and the title therefore carries less significance for any reader who hasn’t read the original text.

3. “Time Warp Complex” - introduction, levels of politeness, ambiguity

As mentioned previously, the translation of “Taimusurippu konbināto” that was published as "Time Warp Complex" only covers roughly half of the original text, finishing up at the point where the main character sets off for Umishibaura. The beginning of the text can be likened to a summary, that describes in short what the story is about.

All of this happened last summer. I was upset about a dream of being in love with a tuna when I got a call from either the tuna himself or Super Jetter, boy wonder of the comic books I read as a girl. I wasn’t sure which, but the caller kept saying, “There’s somewhere you have to go,” and I ended up having to go to a station called Umishibaura.

Umishibaura is the last station on the Japan Railways Tsurumi Line. It has one long platform that runs right over the sea at one end. At the other end there’s an exit of sorts, a staff-only entrance to a Toshiba factory, but it’s strictly “no entry allowed” to anyone but Toshiba employees.

Here the translator starts by adding the pronoun "I", that is implied but not used from the start in the original text. Another modification is that a description of Super Jetter, "boy wonder of the comic books I read as a child", is added as a clarification for the English speaking audience who probably hasn’t heard of the Super Jetter comic. Further down, however, there is a modification that seems like a misinterpretation made by the translator. It says that Umishibaura station "has one long platform that runs right over the sea at one end", when it’s actually one side of the platform that is facing the sea. The original text has that 「長いホームの一方が海に面している」, and while this 一方 can be translated as either “one side” or “one end”, it is quite clear that it is the former that should be used here. This mistake reappears later in the conversation, when the caller says "At one end of the platform is the sea, after all." (ともかくプラットホームの片側が海なんですから, 21) and "The other end of the platform is a Toshiba factory!" (片側は東芝の工場なんですね, 21). The two later sentences even use the word katagawa, which carries the more specific meaning of “one side", but the translator still chooses to stick with “one end”.

As the conversation with the caller unfolds, it is notable that the atmosphere between the

---

5 Uno Kenji discusses this in the article 「笙野頼子『タイムスリップ・コンビナート』論－昭和という時代は」
main character and the caller doesn’t look quite as “strange” and unnatural in translation as it does in the original text, mostly because the different levels of politeness that exist in the Japanese language are difficult to translate into English – and even more so when they are used in non-conventional ways. For example, in the beginning of the telephone conversation the main character uses standard/formal and polite keigo forms on top of each other, giving the sentences a slight comical touch.

——あ、判ります。判ります。聞いておりますです。 （11）

“Uh, I see. Yes, I’m listening”

——それはいろいろ考えておりますです。実はさまざまです。ただ・・・・・・。（11）

“Well, I’ve thought about this...matter from various points of view,” I continue. “A very wide variety indeed. It’s just that...”

The underlined words show how “double polite forms” like these are used by the main character. These nuances are not included in the translation, and since English doesn’t have keigo in the same way as Japanese (the patterns of polite language being more limited in English) it would probably be a very difficult task to include them.

Vague and ambiguous sentences, for example with the very common pattern of omitting the grammatical subject altogether, can also be difficult to translate. There the translator often has to decide which grammatical subject to point out, and thereby the translation necessarily becomes more precise than the original text. This may also be the reason why this translation lacks some sentences from the original, such as the one underlined below:

——どこかに出掛けるということですね。ええ、それについては理想的に完璧です。ただ、後はですねえ、どこへどちら側から行くか何をするか、例えば、いくら払って誰と一緒に何のために行くかと。（12）

“It’s just that, well, there’s the question of how I get to wherever it is I’m going, and what I do there. And how much do I pay to get there? Who will I go with? And what for?”

The phrase 「理想的に完璧」 can be translated as “ideally perfect”, but the full sentence doesn’t really show what is ideally perfect, and is therefore troublesome to translate. In a later version that was published in Shōno Yoriko Sankanshōsetsushū, this sentence is changed and the subject "I", watashi, is added – making it somewhat less ambivalent.9

4. Katakana usage

Conventional use of katakana in a text, that is when using loan words, foreign names, or naming species of animals and plants, do not usually present any special problems for a translator. In this novella, however, katakana is also used in other situations, as a means to express certain nuances in the text. For example, katakana is used instead of hiragana a number of times when the main character believes that she hears the tuna’s voice on the phone, telling her to come:

…………イラッシャイヨ…………。(page 21, also repeated in the exact same way on page 31)

“...Do come...”

On page 21, katakana is also used in a sentence in the preceding dialogue, which may suggest some kind of connection with the tuna, but this is not indicated in any way in the translation.
—うーん、ウラシマ伝説とプラットホームですか。
—えっ、ナニヲバカナコトヲイッテルンダロ・・・・・・片側は東芝の工場なんですよ。
—・・・・・・イラッシャイヨ・・・・・・。

"The Urashima Taro legend...and the platform...?" I asked.

"What? What kind of stupid nonsense are you getting at? The other end of the platform is a Toshiba factory!"

Then, all of a sudden, I heard a voice that unleashed a wave of nostalgia.

"...Do come..."

Here one may also notice that the style of the sentence completely changes, from short/informal speech to standard/formal, when the characters change from katakana only to the standard mix of hiragana and kanji. As the above quote shows, these changes are not at all present in the translation, where the sentence "The other end of the platform is a Toshiba factory!" continues in the same way as the preceding sentence. The six dot leader (or ellipsis) that separates the two sentences in the original text is also omitted.

Katakana is sometimes also used in the main character’s thoughts, as a part of her "internal monologue", although it’s not as common as the other examples of katakana used in dialogues. This might be a way to emphasize the words written in katakana, creating a flat, foreign-sounding effect in sentences like these:

気が付けば昔の事ばかり思い出している。コレハアブナイ。 (16)

I found myself wallowing in memories of the distant past. This was getting dangerous.

Yet another effect is produced when katakana is used together with kanji (instead of the usual hiragana) such as the last sentence in the example below.

—でもねーえ、カメラは新宿なんか行けばーあ、五万円くらいでうってるんだけどなーあ。
そんな事は少しも面白くなかった。私は慌てて出来るだけ平気そうに言った。
—ええと、今ハ、カメラハ、要ラナイデス。 (15)

"I’ll tell you what" he said. "If you go to Shinjuku or somewhere, they’ll sell you a camera for around 50,000 yen."

That was definitely not interesting. I was flustered, but tried to sound indifferent.

"I do not need a camera at present, thank you."

In manga, mixing katakana and kanji in this way can be done to express the accent of a Japanese speaking foreigner that uses fluent and correct Japanese with a foreign sounding intonation, but that most likely differs from the effect that Shōno is trying to achieve here. Instead, this might be a way to express the main character trying to "sound indifferent". The added "thank you" in the end of the sentence can be a way of trying to express that, and likewise using the words "do
not” and “at present” that have a harder and more formal sound than “don’t” and “now”. However, most of these katakana nuances disappear when the sentences are translated.

5. Hiragana / katakana / kanji conversion

Character conversion is another related area that usually doesn’t create any problems for the translator – since it is normally hidden within the text. That is, character conversion is a step that normally comes before the text is presented, without leaving noticable traces in the text. Shōno, however, uses the process of conversion itself in her writing, and this presents a major obstacle for the translator since this process doesn’t exist at all in English, as well as most other languages. The following quote is a notable example from the main character’s “stream of consciousness”, where the process of word conversion is used together with word play.

Hawaii or Okinawa. As words do in childhood, Okinawa suddenly reverted for me to its constituent sounds, o-ki-na-wa. O-ki-na-wa-re-ver-sion. My mind swam with underlined text and photographs from school textbooks on Japanese history. The reverted Okinawa led to the Reversion of Okinawa, and the common theme linking Hawaii to Okinawa shifted from pleasure travel to politics.

Here the translator has chosen not to explain or ignore the conversion process, but rather to create a different process of a word reverting to its constituent sounds in English (adding “as words do in childhood”) and thereby leading associations to the 1972 Reversion of Okinawa. This process serves the purpose of leading to a change of focus in the connection between Hawaii and Okinawa, which is necessary for the part of the story that follows, but in a quite different way than the original text. One can also wonder why the translator here decides to use the word “politics” instead of “war”, sensō, that is used in the original text.

6. Word games: playing with sounds and meanings

Puns and word games are other difficult, sometimes near impossible, areas to deal with when translating a text. ”Taimusurippu konbināto” has frequent examples of this, and one of them is a mishearing on the part of the main character, who interprets the word kaikan (hall) as kaigan (shore) and therefore believes that she’s going all the way to the island of Okinawa when she’s actually only going to the Okinawa Hall.

——ええとね、・・・・・・ハワイはともかく、沖縄会館行きませんか。
——え、沖縄の海岸に行けるんですか。でも今は暑いか。
——だから沖縄会館ですよ。气温は同じなんです。鶴見って駅を知ってますよね。(31)
"Hawaii is one thing, but would you go to Okinawa Hall?"
"You want me to go to the shore in Okinawa? But it's the hot season down there now."
"I said Okinawa Hall. The temperature is constant. You’ve heard of Tsurumi station?"

Here the translator just translates the dialogue literally, without any explanation or comment on the mishearing, and the uninitiated reader may find it a little odd that the main character re-
peatedly hears “shore” instead of “hall” in the conversation, since the two words don’t sound as similar in English as they do in Japanese. A footnote with a brief explanation would probably be helpful.

On a side note, this misconception on the main character’s part continues way into the later part of the story, where she asks a passer-by about the way to Okinawa shore and to her amazement immediately gets an answer and a description of how to get there. Of course the person she asks knows of the existence of Okinawa Hall and interprets her *kaigan as kaikan*, thereby in a way setting the records straight.

In another part of the story, the translator chooses to express the main character’s way of playing with sounds in a *different way* of playing with sounds, thereby also adding to and changing the meaning. Here the main character hears about the Umishibaura station for the first time, and she plays with the name by ways of splitting it into the three words (kanji characters) it consists of, and further into its six syllables (hiragana characters).

In the original text the main character plays with the syllables by adding “*de*” (“and”) in between, concluding that this is even stranger than the syllables making up the word “platina”. In the translation, however, she adds “*way*” between the syllables (pointing out that it’s the way “kids playing with the sound of the word would say nowadays”) and compares this with adding “*yay*” instead, with the conclusion that “things have gotten stranger”. The translation of something like this obviously has to be very free, to keep the feeling of playfulness that would probably be lost in a word-by-word translation, but at the same time a lot of the meaning of the original text is lost here. The playfulness remains, though, as well as the feeling of something strange (変); though the strangeness in the translation is related to time (“nowadays”) rather than the place of Umishibaura, which gives the text a slightly different nuance.

7. Images based on words and kanji characters

Directly following the short passage quoted above comes a longer passage with another kind of association, using meanings and images, that is interesting enough to quote in full:

My sleepy-agile mind leapt into overdrive, bringing forth a completely unsolicited image to
match this name, a sea as artificial as a backdrop, like a piece of glittery cloth. You couldn’t see any islands, but there were several large patches of grass on the shore. A ghostly hand popped up from within my mind to pluck a single blade of this grass. But the blade seemed to be connected to the rest of the grass by a thread which the hand was rapidly winding in, like the stitching of a piece of fabric, and the sea unraveled together with the grass and everything got tugged up. Then from out of nowhere, riding on a stuffed, decorative, endangered sea turtle, came a crumbling mummy dressed in bright, kabuki-colors. It was Urashima Taro in a grass skirt, the boy from the folk tale who returned from beneath the sea to find everything changed. He swished on his turtle through the white space which the tugged-up sea had exposed, and when he disappeared, there finally emerged a realistic seacoast worthy of the word shore.

Here the main character uses the meanings of the kanji characters that are combined to write the name Umishibaura, umi (海), shiba (芝) and ura (浦), to construct a mental image of what a place could look like. Besides the near surrealistic description of a sea with grass being pulled up in one thread by a ghostly hand, and the “realistic shore” coming out of it, the description also plays with the fact that ura, written with a different kanji character (裏), also means “back” or “reverse side”. Also, the mythological figure Urashimatarō appears here, and it’s no coincidence that his name contains the word ura as well as shima – which is similar to the sounds in shiba and umi combined. Because Urashimatarō is a very well known mythological figure, associated with the passage of time, his appearance also carries cultural significance that might not be understood by a reader that is not familiar with Japanese mythology and folk tales. Therefore the translator has added “the boy from the folk tale who returned from beneath the sea to find everything changed” to the description of Urashimatarō, to make it easier for readers who don’t have that information. The mentioning of kabuki (as in “kabuki-colors”) is a follow-up from an earlier part in the text, a sentence that is completely omitted in the translation.

恋マグロ二十一世紀か、カブキの題名みたいだ。（11）

Here the word kabuki is written with katakana, though the quote before uses kanji.

8. Concluding remarks

Comparing the translation of "Taimusurippu konbināto" side by side with the original text has led me to the conclusion that it contains many elements that are very challenging to translate. The process of conversion between the different writing systems, images that are based on kanji characters, association and word play are some of them, as well as more general problems like levels of polite language and ambiguous sentences. Using Shōno’s own (translated) words, one can say that this novella, as well as her major novel Restless dream, “relies deeply on the fact that it was written in Japanese”. Shōno is known as a writer who challenges the different “systems”, visible as well as invisible, that surround people in their everyday lives – in the form of state, emperor, family, gender and even language/writing in itself – and as this awareness shows up in her texts it is no wonder that translating them into other language systems will present many obstacles for the translator. Even more so than other types of texts, where the language system is only implicitly present in the text itself.
From ‘Literary Translation’ to ‘Cultural Translation’
Mori Ōgai’s translation of Henrik Ibsen’s plays
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Abstract

Mori Ōgai (1862-1922), one of the most prominent authors and translators in Japan, translated four plays by Henrik Ibsen into Japanese: Brand (1866) in 1903, John Gabriel Borkman (1896) in 1909, Ghosts (1881) in 1911, and finally A Doll’s House (1879) in 1913.

In Bokushi – Ōgai’s translation of the second act of Brand, he wiped away the matters concerning Christianity in such a way that the essence of the original text was distorted and manipulated. In his translation of John Gabriel Borkman Ōgai changed his translation strategy. Although the central ideas in the play were somewhat blurred, there was no distinct omission or manipulation in Ōgai’s version. His critical comments on the original play, however, were recast and placed outside the translated text, namely in his own novel Seinen (Youth, 1910). Translating Ghosts as Yūrei, Ōgai used the same translation strategy as in John Gabriel Borkman, but this time he narrowed the focus on the concept of ‘ghosts’ – ‘gengangere’ in Norwegian, meaning ‘something that comes back’, which corresponded to his evoked interest in ‘past’ and ‘history’ in general.

Analyzing Ōgai’s translation of Ibsen’s plays, I elaborate on his challenging way of ‘cultural translation’ with special reference to the transition from ‘literary’ to ‘cultural’ translation.
I John Gabriel Borkman

Henrik Ibsen died in 1906 at the age of 80, which evoked, or rather revived, much interest in his works in Japan. Japanese writers and critics of the naturalistic school established an Ibsen Society in 1907, and devoted their time to reading Ibsen’s plays and to discussing his thoughts of the new age. Not only the naturalists but also Tsubouchi Shōyō (1859-1935) and Ōgai were deeply involved in the Ibsen-boom. 1909 was the year when Jiyû gekijô (Free Theatre) was organized by Ōsairai Kaoru (1881-1928) as one of the first modern theatres, which performed western plays in Japanese translations. For the opening performance he selected Ibsen’s John Gabriel Borkman (1896), and Mori Ōgai (1862-192) was requested to translate it. The performance at the Yûrakuza-theatre in Tokyo in Ōgai’s translation was a sensation in many respects.

Without knowing much about the visual representation of the play such as the appearance of the characters, their costumes and the interior of a Norwegian home, the Japanese actors, almost all of them were Kabubi-actors, played both the male and female characters. Actresses were yet to appear because of the conventions of the time. What the audience saw on the stage of the Yûrakuza was thus far from the scene Ibsen had created. Still, the audience could at least listen to Ibsen’s ideas through the speeches of the characters, (if the actors remembered the lines) and the audience was reported to have been excited. 1 Although the performance was clumsy and the audience misunderstood some of the messages in the play, as I will elaborate later, their excitement was real. 2

Anyway, the performance of John Gabriel Borkman, one of Ibsen’s latest plays, became a starting signal for modern Japanese theatre. It was a sensation, but Ōgai’s translation itself was, in my view, also a sensation in a sophisticated kind of way.

In the process of translating John Gabriel Borkman in 1909, Ōgai apparently changed his translation strategy. Generally speaking, his translation of John Gabriel Borkman was rather good. He only made a few mistakes. Some of them weren’t due to him, but were the fault of the German version he had used.

Compared with his previous translations, which were more or less arbitrary, his version of John Gabriel Borkman did not explicitly eliminate western elements like Christianity; he didn’t exercise a simple Japanization of the original text, either. Ōgai did not try to make the original his own, as was the case of Sokkyô shijin (1892-1901, published as a book in 1902), a translation of Hans Christian Andersen’s The Improvisator.

2 This mechanism can easily be compared to the excitement and the tremendous influence which Sokkyô shijin, Ōgai’s translation of Hans Christian Andersen’s The Improvisator, had created and had had over the young writers and poets in Japan, even though his translation was more an adaptation, if not a mistranslation. See Yôichi Nagashima. Hans Christian Andersen remade in Japan: Mori Ōgai’s translation of Improvisatoren. IN Johan de Mylius et al (eds.). Hans Christian Andersen: A Poet in Time, Odense University Press. Odense 1999, pp. 397-406; Yôichi Nagashima. Mori Ōgai – Bunka no hon’yakusha. Iwanami Shinsho 976. Tokyo 2005, pp. 41-79; Yôichi Nagashima. ‘Sokkyô shijin’ to Italia – Mori Ōgai to Anderusen. IN Ritsu-meikan gengo bunka kenkyû, vol. 20, no. 2, Kyôto 2008, pp. 43-49.
Ôgai, the translator, seemed almost passive and submissive in his translation of *John Gabriel Borkman*, and was ever faithful to Ibsen’s original, when he tried again and again to explain the meaning of each of the characters speeches. In Ôgai’s text, there was an abundance of words. Accordingly, Ôgai’s version of *John Gabriel Borkman* became much longer than the original. He appeared more like a serious but straightforward translator who first of all tried to convey the meaning of the original. Ôgai did not use his red pen while translating *John Gabriel Borkman*, but he extracted stimulating thematic elements from the original play and further developed them in his own works, where emphasis was laid differently on chosen elements. And Ôgai did it more or less with discretion. Those typical Ibsenian themes such as the free individual, the individual of autonomy, and the new woman, were reorganized in a new context and discussed in a new light outside of the translated text; not by Ôgai the translator, but by Ôgai the writer. Ôgai put a mask on in order to become a new type of translator, and then, as a result, became a new type of writer.

Many scholars have already examined, how Ôgai utilized the episode of the sensational performance of *John Gabriel Borkman* on November 27th and 28th, 1909, in his novel *Seinen* (Youth, 1910-11).³ In the novel Ibsen’s thoughts were transmitted through a writer called Fuseki, Ôgai’s fictional invention of Natsume Sôseki (1867-1916), while Fuseki’s lecture on Ibsen was attended by Koizumi Junichi, the protagonist of the novel and one of Ôgai’s alter egos in a much younger version. Ôgai’s own view on Ibsen and his ideas were thus presented in a multiple way, as he introduced Fuseki, Junichi, and even Ôson, a parody of himself. Behind all of these characters, however, stood Ôgai himself. As a matter of fact, they never disagreed with each other. However, due to this intriguing displacement, Ôgai’s view was deepened and became multifaceted.⁴

In fact, Ôgai attended the performance on the second day at the Yûrakuza-theatre.⁵ In the novel, however, it is Junichi who depicts and narrates his observations and impressions of the performance, and Ibsen’s ideas of individualism is discussed widely by Ôgai’s alter egos elsewhere in the novel. In Ôgai’s case it wasn’t a simple literary technique, but should rather be considered a result of the sophisticated change of his translation strategy. In the process of writing *Seinen*, Ôgai still continued to ‘translate’ *John Gabriel Borkman*, not its text but its central themes. For Ôgai translation became both presentation and introduction of a given source of material, which was to be commented critically by him afterwards and outside of the translated text.

*John Gabriel Borkman* is a play about the disillusioned adults’ mutual struggle to attempt to make the next generation rehabilitate their defeats in life. Born a son of a miner, gold predominated John Gabriel Borkman, the dreamy power seeker, all through his life. He tried to realize

---


⁵ See Kobori Keiichirô, *op.cit.* p. 183.
his dream during the 1870s, when capitalism developed rapidly. But he failed scandalously. His defeat was due not to his ability as a businessman or his financial disposition, but to the tragi-comical failure in his human nature. He was a betrayer. In order to reach the summit of power as director of a bank who has free access to the customers’ assets, he abandoned his love for Ella and was content with to marry her twin sister Gunhild. The lawyer, to whom he had offered Ella, because she had given him the cold shoulder, disclosed Borkman’s punishable abuse of the customers’ accounts. The lawyer had also believed that Borkman had influenced her.

The plot so far is enough to inspire a Hollywood TV series, but it gets worse in Ibsen’s play. Borkman was put in prison. His house was sold by order of the court and bought by Ella. She took Borkman’s and Gunhild’s son Erhart into her home as if he was her own child, while she let Gunhild stay in her country house. Released from five years’ imprisonment Borkman came back to Ella’s country house only to move in on the first floor. The couple was still married and lived in the same house, but they never talked to each other nor even saw each other. Their son, Erhart, visited them occasionally, but only separately.

Now eight years had passed since Borkman’s release. In the meanwhile, Erhart, a young man in his twenties, fell in love with Mrs. Wilton, a divorced woman in her thirties living in the neighborhood.

All the information so far we gain retrospectively in the course of the play.

The play begins with the scene, where Ella visits Gunhild in her country house. While twin sisters talk to each other on the ground floor, one can hear Borkman’s everlasting footsteps on the first floor through the ceiling. He behaves like a prisoner in his own room. The purpose of Ella’s visit is to suggest to Borkman that she would like to adopt Erhart now that she suffers from an incurable disease. Erhart can then keep the family name of Rentheim. But also Gunhild needs Erhart to restore the family, the house and the name of Borkman to win restitution for the whole of her ruined life.

The second act unfolds on the first floor where Borkman has his study. Frida, a pretty, pale girl of fifteen has just finished playing Danse macabre by Saint-Saëns on the piano. Her father Foldal appears. He is one of Borkman’s former subordinate staff in his bank. He has always been loyal, a confidant of Borkman and the only person who still visits him. He is as dreamy as Borkman. His dream is to become a poet. They have shared the vital lie that they one day will be rehabilitated or recognized and given the right to be in the place they deservingly belong to. But they, that very evening, take their vital lie from each other by speaking about what they really meant to each other.

After a while Ella comes in and talks to Borkman for the first time in many years. Examining their past, she tells him the truth: “You have killed love in me. [...] The great sin for which there is no forgiveness is to murder love in a human soul.” (197) Ella explains her reason for being there

---

6 Citations from the English version are taken from James Walter McFarlane (ed. & tr.). The Oxford Ibsen. vol. VIII, Oxford UP, 1977. Page numbers are given after the citations.
and insists on her plan to adopt Erhart.

The third act takes place on the ground floor again. Every attempt to repair the situation for the adults fails eventually. Ella, suffering from cancer, wants Erhart to come back to her home before she dies. But his mother needs him too. Erhart liberates himself from both of them and chooses Mrs. Wilton. He tells the parents again and again that he is young and that he wants to live his own life, to be happy and to be together with Mrs. Wilton. He even cries with exultation: “I’m young! I never realized it before. But now I feel it coursing through my veins. I don’t want to work. I just want to live, live, live!” (215) The young Erhart and Mrs. Wilton are now leaving for abroad, and she, perhaps the only realistic person amongst them, has decided to take Frida, the daughter of Foldal, with them, primarily because she would like to give her a chance to get an education in music, but also because she thinks: ”Men are so unreliable [...]. And women, too. When Erhart is finished with me ... and I with him ... then it’ll be good for both of us, poor boy, if he has somebody else to fall back on.” (219)

In the last act the inner dark landscape of the second act is transformed into an outdoor white world where snow is falling. Borkman comes staggering out of the house for the first time in eight years. Talking to Ella, he still is infatuated with his old illusions. In the chillness of the real world, however, he dies of heart failure.

In order to legitimate himself Borkman tells Ella in the second act: “I wanted to gain command of all the sources of power in this land. Earth, mountains, forest, and sea – I wanted control of all their resources. I wanted to build myself an empire, and thereby create prosperity for thousands and thousands of others.” (198) Camouflaging his greed and desire for power, he talks about building a sweet home for the people. In fact he presents his own actions, for which he was sentenced, as an expression of farsighted altruism. The only weak point in his plan is Ella, the only person who has authority over him. Her judgment is therefore not to be ignored, because he was only connected to human life through her. For this very reason he never touched her assets, and for the same reason he now feels impelled to legitimate himself morally.

Ella says that there has been a curse on their relationship, and that he has killed all human happiness in her. She has dried out mentally: ”I have lived my life as though under an eclipse. Over the years it has become more and more difficult – and in the end quite impossible – for me to love any living thing; human, animal or plant.” (199) When she talks of her incurable disease and her wish to adopt Erhart, Borkman blazes up at first, because he notices that he is being accused, but then he feels weak while listening to Ella who claims a kind of compensation. Borkman abandons his son Erhart, whom he doesn’t need in his dream of power, by saying: “Very well, Ella. I am man enough to bear my name alone.” (203) Ella seizes and presses his hand and cries: “Thank you! (...) You have done all you could to make amends. And when I am dead, Erhart Rentheim will live on after me!” (203)

In spite of everything Ella forgives him his unforgivable mortal sin. Here, the Kierkegaardian paradox of absolution is clearly demonstrated by Ibsen.

Gunhild, Erhart’s mother, rushes in and claims him too. Erhart is called in order to let him
make a decision. But it turns out that he belongs to neither of the two women. He says: “I now
determine my own actions, Mother! And my will is my own!” (213) Hearing the resound of these
familiar words Borkman wakes up. He now believes that his son will follow the father’s way of
power, and tries to stir him by telling him of his future plan to achieve his own redemption. He
even asks Erhart to join and help him in this new life. In reality Borkman tries to repeat himself
and to realize his disguised altruistic project, but Ella tells Erhart warmly: “Oh yes do it! Help
him, Erhart!” (214) Lastly against her will Ella asks Erhart earnestly to help the unforgivable sinner
again. Ella is shown as the evangelical woman in the play. Ibsen’s play John Gabriel Borkman
is thus overwhelmingly religious and existential.

Borkman’s desire for power and his asserted altruism, however, are given a somewhat dif-
ferent context in Ôgai’s translation. Talking to Ella about Erhart’s future in the first act Gunhild
says: “Erhart’s first duty is to shine so brilliantly that people no longer see the shadow his father
cast over me ... and over my son.” (161) But here Ôgai uses expressions like risshin, takai ichi ni
noboru, meiyo o kunijû ni kagayakasu (success in life, rise highly in the world, win honor, shine
brilliantly over all the country). Given this guideline, Borkman’s effort to gain power is doomed
to be understood in the context of risshin shusse – a typical philosophy of life for Japanese men in
the period of nation building in Ôgai’s time.

In spite of the fact that the word ‘altruism’ is not used in the play, there is every reason to
believe that Ôgai was aware of this type of individualism. The theme of altruism is developed in
his novel Seinen, in section 20, where Ōmura, another alter ego of Ôgai, elaborates on the theme.
Ōmura sees individualism as having two faces: altruism and egoism, and maintains that: “Ni-
etzsche’s egoism represents the dark side of individualism, that is, will power. Its basic idea is to
become great by defeating others.” Just like Borkman, Ōmura continues: “But altruistic individu-
alism doesn’t work that way. Even as you stoutly defend the cast of your ego without budging an
inch from that principle, you try to find significance in every aspect of life. You remain loyal to
your master as a citizen (...). You are loyal to your parents.” Emphasizing loyalty of the individual
both to master and to parents, Ôgai counters selfish utilitarianism expressed in the figure of
Borkman with his own altruistic individualism.

Besides which Ôgai doesn’t see Borkman’s unforgivable sin in a Christian context. Ella’s forgive-
ness isn’t considered as evangelical behavior, either. Still, Ôgai is very much interested in the character
of Ella, which can be seen by the fact that Ôgai gives her speeches ample explanations in his transla-
tion. As is evident in her long speech in the second act, where she happily talks about her only love
to the young boy Erhart as though she was his mother, Ôgai’s translation is impressive and moving.
However, Ôgai’s sympathy for Ella doesn’t come from the circumstances that she is one of the Ibse-
nian ‘new women’, as some scholars stubbornly believe so. For Ôgai, Ella is a traditional woman.

---

9 Ibid. p. 482. On Ôgai’s altruism, see Helen M. Hopper. Mori Ôgai’s Response to Suppresorin of Intellectual
She is the incarnation of motherly altruism, ready for self-sacrifice. After all, Ōgai’s search for ideal women comes to constitute one of his conspicuous motives in his historical stories several years later, i.e. *Yasui fujin, Sanshôdayû, Gyogenki, Jiisan baasan, Saigo no ikku*.

At the Yûrakuza theatre in Tokyo in November 1909 the younger generation applauded Erhart with excitement for his decision to leave the adults in the country in order to live his own life together with Mrs. Wilton. It was a spontaneous reaction as well as an expression for their thirst for freedom and need for spiritual independence.¹¹

Ōgai’s description of the performance is given in section 9 of *Seinen*, told by Junichi, but Ōgai’s tone is restrained and sober without any sign of exultation, as the focus is moved from the relationship between Erhart and Mrs. Wilton on the stage to Junichi and Mrs. Sakai, a beautiful mature coquettish widow, whom the young Junichi meets at the theatre. It is obvious that Junichi and Mrs. Sakai correspond to Erhart and Mrs. Wilton, and this too is an intriguing displacement unfolded outside of Ōgai’s translation. Ōgai doesn’t give any emotional stress to Erhart’s or Mrs. Wilton’s speeches in his translation. But his novel *Seinen* shows his attitude towards their relationship indirectly and predicts their fate by depicting Junichi’s disillusioned relationship to Mrs. Sakai, which is soon to be dissolved. There is no way out for this type of freedom and independence.

Anyhow, Ōgai couldn’t change the fact that his translation of *John Gabriel Borkman* was, when performed under Osanai Kaoru’s direction, transformed by many young people at the theatre into a hymn to Erhart who left Borkman as a symbol of the capitalistic system, nation and modernization. Although the play was about Borkman’s fall, the younger generation in Japan gave Erhart applause for his quest for freedom and his absorption in a passionate life.

It was indeed an ironical event. Ōgai spurred on the young men, who were expected to build a new societal system and a strong nation through modernization of the country, to be free and altruistic individuals. The younger generation, however, was inspired by Erhart who would leave the adults to be free and to live his own life without any intention of working.

Ōgai both creates and describes this paradoxical situation by firstly translating *John Gabriel Borkman* and then writing his own novel *Seinen*. The process corresponds to the fact that his introduction to the individualist of ‘autonomy’ inspired by Ibsen develops into his own altruistic individualism. Likewise, Ōgai’s translation, the text, has received a status of ‘autonomy’. Ōgai’s critical comments on the original play are recast and placed outside the translated text in contrast to his previous practice of modification, adaptation and even manipulation of the original work within the framework of the translated text. As a result, his translation of *John Gabriel Borkman* can be read as a reproduction of Ibsen’s ideas without too much focus on Ōgai’s interpretations.¹²

---
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Ôgai’s change of translation strategy illustrates this very process. He has moved from ‘translation of culture’ within the framework of ‘literary’ translation to an act of ‘cultural’ translation, from a passive adjustment to an active re-creation. ‘Literary’ translation always contains ‘translation of culture’, conscious or unconscious manipulation of the original text, while ‘cultural’ translation, in the context of this paper, is an act of rewriting, retelling, commenting and/or criticizing the original text by a translator, and it takes place beyond the ‘literary’ translation.13

II Ghosts

While translating Ibsen’s Ghosts (Gengangere, 1881) as Yûrei in 1911, Ôgai used the same translation strategy as in his translation of John Gabriel Borkman, but this time his critical comments were not placed in a single work as was the case of Seinen, but scattered over several works.

Ôgai translated the original play through a German version, and the quality of his translation was as good as that of John Gabriel Borkman.

Ibsen’s play Ghosts was written two years after the sensational A Doll’s House (Et Dukkehjem, 1879).14 The heroines of the plays, Mrs. Alving and Nora, respectively, have often been compared with each other, maintaining that Mrs. Alving is the Nora who has chosen to stay at home after the breakdown of her marriage.

Nora no longer believed in the old authorities represented by the priest Hansen. She wanted to study in order to find out of whether she or the surrounding society was right. Also Mrs. Alving broke out of her marriage, but she was persuaded to go back to her duties by the priest Manders, to whom she had a close relationship. In her protest she began to read the same kind of books on the same new ideas that Nora would like to read about.

In the beginning of Ibsen’s play Ghosts, she is ready to have an argument with Manders and criticizes the society for its double standard of morality. While Manders preaches the moral of duties, Mrs. Alving unfolds the radical view that love and ‘joie de vivre’, happiness of life, should be the pillars of a marriage. At this point she resembles Nora, but she is a new Nora, as she is now a bitter housewife though a strong and passionate mother. She wishes to live with her son Osvald who has just returned home from Paris with the newest ideas of the time, but Osvald wants to die with her because of his incurable disease. While A Doll’s House is a provocative debating drama, Ghosts tries to analyze the motives behind Mrs. Alving’s idealism and her ghost-like nature.

Both Mrs. Alving and the priest Manders have attained their high position in society by suppressing their sexual desire and their free will. They have suffocated their love and deceived themselves in a tragic way. Their idealism has been false, and their suppressed desire emerges

---

on the surface together with Osvald’s return and inflicts a cruel revenge on them.

The title of the original play *Gengangere* means ‘something that comes back’, which might be interpreted as ‘trauma’ – wounds in the soul as a result of a pent-up past. Just like ‘ghosts’, which haunt over the graves restlessly, because something in one’s life is left undone and unsettled.

Mrs. Alving used to be a conscientious woman and devoted to her duties, while her husband, a captain, was a debauched person. Twenty years later she realizes that she made mistake, when Osvald closes the door and asks her to kill him and abandon the project she has been working on for many years – to build a sanctuary. He is dying of syphilis, probably transmitted from his father. Osvald may also have been as debauched as his father. He can at least have inherited his father’s characteristics.

Ironically the carpenter Engstrand would also like to build a kind of sanctuary for the seamen, but his sanctuary is actually a camouflaged brothel. For this purpose he needs help from his daughter Regine who has been serving in Mrs. Alving’s house as a maid for many years. Osvald wishes to marry Regine, not because he loves her, but because he wants to make use of her wish to go abroad in order to build a dreamy sanctuary of ‘joie de vivre’ where she could kill him.

Having heard of his plan, Mrs. Alving is appalled, because Regine is the daughter of Johanne, a former maid in the house, whom Mrs. Alving believes that her husband made pregnant. In which case, Osvald and Regine have the same father. Incest must be avoided. It turns out that Mrs. Alving’s family suffers from original sin.

The play *Ghosts* discloses the psychological world of all these characters and their weaknesses, and it depicts the fall of their ideal world of illusion down to the earthly world of flesh and blood.

Mrs. Alving is the only person who changes herself in the course of the drama. All the fatal actions have already taken place many years ago, and the past is now presented so that Mrs. Alving could make a new decision on actual matters in changed circumstances. In other words, her hitherto firm interpretation of the past is to be mended. The past should now be re-evaluated in the light of her concrete plan for the future. She would like to live with Osvald. By now her future might be built on the illusion that her husband was an ideal and that his dead body could be buried under the sanctuary. However, the late Alving comes up from the grave in the figure of Osvald and makes advances on Regine. A ghost has emerged. ‘Gengangere’ are also repeaters of the past.

Their past is invisible and only accessible through the characters’ account. Their past is given as reports; they are not objective but already interpreted, colored, and manipulated. By the same token Mrs. Alving is a ghost. She is a person who, in her own estimation, has always been bound to traditional meanings, consciously or not; she has thus made her own ‘self’ invisible and floating. She has kept her double standard of morality for twenty years.

The same kind of duplicity is to be found elsewhere in the characters’ speeches in the play.

---

15 It is also possible that Osvald got syphilis because of his carefree love life abroad.
16 Manders believes that Engstrand is Regine’s father, while Engstrand himself believes that Regine’s father was a foreign seaman with whom Johanne once had had an affair.
Behind every utterance lies two motives – an official, apparently unselfish, and a private, selfish. In Ibsen’s time it was good and even admirable to behave unselfishly, and bad and disgraceful to behave selfishly, no matter when and where. It was a status-giving norm in the Christian civil society of the time to SEEM unselfish, although everybody was living selfishly. Ibsen was fighting against this kind of Victorian ideal of ‘niceness’. Regine speaks French, simply because it is considered to be fine, and Engstrand uses empty Christian phrases, for it gives him an expected prestige. So does the sex-fearing priest Manders, in reality. In fact he is a diametrical opposite to the Kierkegaardian priest Brand of ‘all or nothing’. All the messages in the play have the double structure of to BE and to SEEM. Ghosts of meaning are buried here.

The whole drama of Ghosts is structured as Mrs. Alving’s finding of the inner coherence of her life. This process runs parallel with the disclosure of her past. For that purpose all the subordinate characters are formed as parallel- and mirror-figures of Mrs. Alving. They are her conscious or unconscious imposters, her ghosts.

The play Ghosts has a complicated structure. It is not a simple abstract drama of the radical ideas of Ibsen himself and of his time. The words of each of the characters contain passion and manipulation under the surface meanings. Their words are ambiguous. It is not easy to discern the real meaning in their speeches, when the actors give them on stage. For that very reason the play is rather to be considered a closet drama. Nevertheless the play can easily be misread, misunderstood and misjudged.

Ôgai finished his translation of Ghosts in September 1911. It was then staged in January 1912 at the Yûrakuza Theater by Engei dôshikai under the leadership of Kitamura Sueharu (1872-1932). It is said that this performance was thought to be a contrast to the successful performance of A Doll’s House staged first in September 1911 by Bungei kyôkai in Shimamura Hôgetsu (1871-1918)’s translation and his instruction, and later in November at the Teigeki Theater. The actress Matsui Sumako (1886-1919) who played the rôle of Nora enjoyed great success. It was also in September 1911, when the epoch-making journal Seitô was published and the term ‘New Woman’ was on everybody’s lips. There was a general Ibsen boom in Japan. Ôgai didn’t miss the chance to present his version of Ghosts, although Hashimoto Seiu had already translated the play into Japanese in 1907.17

However, it cannot have been the only reason for Ôgai to translate the play. The year 1911 was disastrous for free thinkers in Japan. The anarchist Kôtoku Shûsui (1871-1911) who had been accused of high treason in 1910 was sentenced to death and executed in January. Japan had annexed Korea in 1910 and Japanese colonial policy had unfolded on a large scale. The years of suppression had just begun, while the ghost of communism was still haunting Japan, though as yet it was an insignificant one.

In his position of surgeon general of the Japanese Imperial Army, Ôgai belonged to the power elite of Japan under the nation’s modernization. Ôgai the writer, however, had the bitter experi-

---

17 See Takemori Ten’yû. Ôgai sono mon’yô 27; Ibusen no iwayuru yûrei ni tsuite. IN Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshô, vol. 27, no. 4, 1972, p. 150.
ence that the authorities had banned his novel *Vita Sexualis* in 1909. Following the process of the trial for high treason, Ôgai was rather critical of the government’s way of carrying out the trial.18

Ôgai’s general attitudes to the authorities from this time can be traced in his short stories written in 1910 – *The Tower of Silence* (*Chinmoku no tô*) and *The Dining Room* (*Shokudô*).19 In the former story Ôgai sketches the government’s concern about ‘dangerous books’ and tries to make a necessary distinction between an intellectual knowledge of a system of beliefs and beliefs themselves. While in the latter story, sensing the tensions between the authorities and the intellectuals, he makes a distinction between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ socialism. Ôgai claimed a rational understanding of ‘dangerous beliefs’, whatever they might be.

The theme of the clash of ideas was further developed in his story *AS IF* (*Ka no yô ni*), written in December 1911 and published in January 1912.20 On the surface this story consists of a discussion between two Japanese who had lived abroad and experienced the western way of living and thinking. The real issue is, however, a confrontation between European-trained rationally thinking intellectuals represented by the protagonist Hidemaro (and for that matter Ôgai himself) and the reactionary statesmen represented by Hidemaro’s father, who are suspicious of these intellectuals, who are against the government’s attempt to combine myth and history in order to establish a solid nationalistic source of emotions for the Japanese people.

Hidemaro is a historian; he is about to write a history of Japan, but he finds difficulty in making a clear line between myth and history. In his opinion, not only myth but liberty and duty as well as religion do not exist and they are established on something, which cannot be proved to be real. “That is to say, ‘as if’ lies at their foundation.”21 His friend Ayakoji finds ‘as if’ a ‘monster’. Hidemaro responds by saying: “... ‘as if’ ... isn’t a monster at all. Without it, there would be no science, no art, no religion.”22

Continuing this argument Hidemaro refers to Ibsen: “I grow indignant whenever I see such plays as Ibsen’s that treat duty as a monster, a ghost, knowing that this cannot be proved as fact. A certain destruction of duty may be inevitable, but does nothing remain? At the foundation is ‘as if’, indisputable though intangible and very slight of form. Man should act as if duty existed.”23

Along with *AS IF*, another short story by Ôgai is related to his translation of *Ghosts*, namely *Ghost Stories* (*Hyaku monogatari*), which, written in October 1911, precedes the translation.

The protagonist ‘boku’ participates in a childish party of the *hyaku monogatari*, ‘a hundred tales’. The story is introduced with an explanation: “The ‘telling of a hundred tales’ requires that

---

19 Both short stories are translated by Helen Hopper and taken in J. Thomas Rimer (ed.). *Mori Ôgai: Youth and Other Stories. op. cit.* pp. 216-222 and pp. 224-230, respectively.
23 *Ibid*.
a large group of persons be gathered together. A hundred candles are set up and lighted. Each person in turn tells a ghost story, at which time one candle is extinguished. Then, just as the hundredth candle is put out, a real ghost will actually appear. Or so it is said.”

In this story Ibsen’s ‘ghost’ is mentioned twice. Firstly as a legacy from another age. Unfortunately, the English version reads as follows: “Tales of hundred ghosts such as those were now replaced with the Ghosts of Ibsen.” This is an inadequate translation, if not a mistranslation. Ōgai writes in the original: “Ipusen no iwayuru yûrei”, and he doesn’t specifically refer to the play itself. Secondly in the description of Tarô, who is the most beautiful geisha in Tokyo and the most intimate friend of Shikamaya, a rich host of the childish party. ‘Boku’ states: “From the moment I observed the pair, I had the sense that her presence at the side of this man was like that of a nurse at the side of her patient.” Tarô is no more geisha-like. She now appears more like a wife. She has a melancholy appearance and bloodshed eyes. ‘Boku’ then speculates: “Still, if this woman were to give her life as a nurse who might expect no reward, while all the time placing at the center of her own existence the care that she provided, then she could only be seen herself as a victim. If she were linked to him as a wife by any chains of duty, then she would be bound up in the kind of curse described in Ibsen’s Ghosts. Such would constitute a different issue. (But it wasn’t the case with Tarô.)”

Also here Ōgai writes in the original: “Ipusen no iu yûrei” with no specific reference to the play itself, but the English version makes sense this time. Already at this point, before the completion of his translation of Ibsen’s play, Ōgai’s aversion to considering ‘duty’ as ‘ghost’ is clearly expressed. Tarô is not considered as a sacrificing nurse nor as a slave-like wife, but a woman devoting herself by doing her ‘duty’ out of her own free will.

More interesting, perhaps, is the fact that Shikamaya, having inherited huge wealth and having become intimate with the world of geisha, and thus experiencing every kind of joy of life, now looks like a living ghost. ‘Boku’ thinks that he “must somehow or other have received some sort of intangible wound, one which could not be cured.” The wound must be a result of his course of life bound up with old habits and customs as well as troublesome human relations. He has, in ‘boku’’s opinion, become a ghost called bystander. ‘Boku’ who is a born bystander recognized another bystander in Shikamaya. He feels “as though he has met an old friend in a strange land.” This recognition gives the reader a chilling feeling and constitutes the only real ghost ‘observed’ that evening.

That ghost, however, has nothing to do with Ibsen’s ghosts. As a born bystander ‘boku’ recalls his own ghost-like life: “From the time when I first began to play with other children, and even when I grew to adulthood and made my way in the world, and with every kind of person in society, I have

---

25 Ibid. pp. 185-186.
27 Cited from Ghost Stories, op.cit. p. 190.
28 Ibid. p. 195. The last sentence is missing in the English translation.
30 Cited from Ghost Stories, op.cit. p. 194.
31 Ibid.
never been able to throw myself into the whirlpool and enjoy myself to the depths of my being, no matter what kind of excitement may have been stirred in me.”

Shikamaya is in fact a mirror image of ‘boku’, a bystander. Contemplating Shikamaya’s life until now and his childish arrangement of the party, ‘boku’ goes so far as to say: “Perhaps he observed the traces of his former glory through the eyes of a bystander just in the same way as a writer, for example, observes the work he has created through the eyes of a critic.”

In his mind Shikamaya was recalling his ‘past’ and fighting with his ‘ghosts’. It might be safe to say, that there is a certain interrelation between Ôgai’s *Ghost Stories* and his translation of Ibsen’s *Ghosts*. But there is, for good reasons, no trace of the Christian idea of original sin in Ôgai’s works.

Ôgai was against Ibsen’s negative conception of ‘duty’ as well as his merciless treatment of the female characters. Ibsen doesn’t give them any kind of relief. In his own stories Ôgai transformed Ibsen’s ghosts into Japanese bystanders, extracting from Ibsen’s play only the idea of ‘past’ – that dreadful ‘ghost’. Ôgai’s criticism of Ibsen’s play was thus placed outside his translation of it, thus practicing his ‘cultural translation’ in the realm of *AS IF* and it’s surroundings.

---

32 Ibid.
The “Territory of Translation” in Early Meiji-Period Japan
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Abstract

In Gothenburg, when I examined attitudes towards translation in the early Meiji period, I briefly mentioned the case study of Hachi-jū-nichikan sekai isshū: Shinsetsu, Kawashima Chūnosuke’s 1878 translation of Jules Verne’s 1873 novel Le tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours. This paper will focus more specifically on Kawashima as a case study in early modern translation practice, attempting to understand the logic by which he made his translation choices. This translation is historically important for several reasons. First, it was the first translation of a literary work from French into Japanese. Second, it served as a vehicle for the Japanese reading population to learn about the customs and technology present around the world, albeit through the imperial gaze of the main characters, the British gentleman Phileas Fogg and his French servant Jean Passepartout. Third, it served as the spark igniting a series of translations of Jules Verne, who quickly became perhaps the most popular French author in Japan; and fourth, and most importantly for this paper, it set a high standard of referentiality for subsequent translators of Western literature by attempting to reproduce not just the information within the text, which tended to be rendered in a relatively non-domesticizing fashion, but also the literary forms of the text itself. As this paper will argue, however, Kawashima’s translation was not necessarily neutral and did inscribe certain early Meiji cultural values into the text, adjusting in certain cases the control and deployment of imagery that shaped the ways that the individual civilizations would be judged by his fellow Japanese readers.
Introduction

With the Meiji Restoration in 1868, Japan embarked upon an ambitious program of modernization in order to be able to maintain its integrity and protect its own culture from the threat of the West. Soon after the arrival of Commodore Perry with his Black Ships in 1853, it had become clear to many Japanese intellectuals and functionaries that in order to protect itself, Japan needed to learn from the West in order to be able to stand on equal footing in terms of technology, military preparedness, and trade. In order to accomplish this, Japan began to import a large number of ideas from the West. Perhaps at no other time in Japanese history was translation more critical than during this era, as Japanese were striving to learn about the world outside their borders. As Japan worked to join the world community, translation became one of the principal conduits that negotiated the flow of information between nations. In fact, translation played such an important role in the development of Meiji culture that some have referred to these years as the “era of translation.”

Although a limited number of intellectuals had some experience translating Dutch texts in the Edo-period, the number of translations from Western languages exploded in Meiji period. It goes without saying that this process involved a great deal of experimentation, adaptation, and development. Interestingly, however, when one looks at early Meiji-period translations with contemporary eyes, they do not always resemble the kinds of translations we might expect to see today. In American and Europe, many people assume that translation is a transparent, seamless process that conveys the contents of the original with as little interference as possible. One finds, however, that early Meiji-period translations are often not “transparent”; the translations foreground the process of adaptation and negotiation. Considering the massive linguistic and cultural gaps between Japan and the West as Japan embarked upon its modernization, this only makes sense. Words did not yet exist in Japanese to represent all concepts, and even if they did, the content and culture of the Western texts were often difficult for Japanese to comprehend. When it came to literature, Western writing operated by very different principles than Edo-period literature so poetic devices and plot lines often felt radically alien to Japanese readers. As a result, early Meiji-period translators often felt a need to engage the original on their own terms, modifying the structure and form to fit Japanese tastes.

Of course, all translations involve negotiation of the source text to fit the target language and culture. This is true regardless of whether one is talking about translations from Meiji-period Japan or translations done today. The point, however, is that the norms that govern translation—the sense of what a “good” translation is, what a translation should accomplish, how a translation should be done—have changed immensely over time, and for this reason, texts completed in the early Meiji period look very different than translations completed today in contemporary Japan.

In order to get a better understanding of the ways that writers thought about and conceived of translation in this critical era of cultural negotiation, this paper examines two early Meiji period translations: Kawashima Chūnosuke’s 川島忠之助 1878 Hachijū-nichikan sekai isshū: Shinsetsu

\[\text{Donald Keene}, \text{Dawn to the West: Japanese Literature in the Modern Era, Fiction} (\text{NY: Columbia University Press, 1998}), \text{55-75}.\]
Translating the Trip Around the World

Theoretical Framework

Before looking at specific examples of translation from Meiji-period Japan, it would be helpful first to introduce a number of key terms that have often been used in the West to talk about translation. Perhaps the most famous and often quoted piece of translation theory in the English language is the preface that John Dryden wrote for a translation of Ovid’s epistles, published in 1680. There, he argued that there are three types of translation, each of which has certain goals.

1. **metaphrase**, defined by Dryden as “turning an author word by word, line by line, from one language into another”

2. **paraphrase**, which might be described as “translation with latitude, where the author is kept in view by the translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly followed as his sense, and that too, is admitted to be amplified but not altered”

3. **imitation**, in which the “translator (if now he has not lost that name) assumes the liberty, not only to vary from the words and sense, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion; and taking only some general hints from the original.”

Dryden notes that each of these kinds of translation has drawbacks. Because languages use different syntax, idioms, and modes of expression, a metaphrase rendition that substitutes word for word might be difficult for the target audience to read. Conversely, a paraphrase rendition simply goes for the general meaning and thus leaves out some of the specificity of the original wording and could perhaps miss certain important details. An imitative rendering might depart too far from the source text, thus making it difficult for the reader of the target text to see where the work of the original author ends and that of the translator begins. Dryden notes that an imitative rendering might not belong to the field of translation proper; however, in the world of seventeenth-century poetry, which provides most of the examples of the translations that Dryden discusses, imitation represented one of the most commonly used modes of writing that a writer would use to convey the poetical of the original text.

Dryden’s tripartite categorization is especially useful to a study of early Meiji translation because, as the examination of Niwa Jun’ichirō’s *Karyū shunwa* will show, imitation was one of the principal strategies employed by early Meiji period translations. Meiji-period translation prac-
tices were not just dominated by the more narrow, transparent, seemingly seemly kind of “translation” that we expect today. Rather, early Meiji translations covered a wider territory that includes many types of rewriting, including rewritings that were imitative and adaptive in nature.

The principal focus of Dryden’s system of categorization is the relative degree to which the translator rearranges the structural, linguistic elements of the source text. While it is tempting to read Dryden’s categorization as dealing with the degree of “fidelity” to the original text, this reading is overly simplistic. In fact, what Dryden does is complicate the notion of fidelity. Each of the three types of translations he posits is faithful to the text in one way or another. A metaphrase is most faithful to the individual words that make up the text; a paraphrase is faithful to meaning of the text in that it represents it in clause-by-clause, sentence-by-sentence units; meanwhile, an imitation can be most faithful to the “poetic” qualities of a text, especially when the original genre of the text would not be immediately recognized as “poetic” to the target culture. (One thinks, for instance, of early translations of waka poetry into English, which rendered the small Japanese poems into iambic pentameter or Italian quatrains, simply because unrhymed patterns of 5-7-5-7-7 sounds would not be recognizable to nineteenth century audiences as “poetry.”)

In his 1818 essay, the German theologian and thinker Frederich Schleiermacher gives us another approach to thinking about translations. Writing during the era of German national unification in which the boundaries of the perceived nation were drawn along linguistic lines, there was a strong sense amongst German intellectuals of Schleiermacher’s generation that the soul of the German people lay in the German language. Similarly, the cultural knowledge and identity of any people lay in their language. As a result, unlike Dryden, who focused on the degree of correspondence between texts, Schleiermacher focused instead on the ways that the translator deals with foreign culture within the text. He argues that translations fall into two categories: (1) one in which cultural elements in the original text are kept as much as possible and are included in the translation in order to help the reader access the source culture, and (2) one in which cultural elements from the source culture are replaced with cultural elements from the target culture in order to make the text accessible to readers who know little about the source culture. Many modern translation theorists including Lawrence Venuti, have called the former approach a “foreignizing translation” in that it makes the text seem “foreign,” while calling the latter approach a “domesticizing translation” in that it makes the text seem domestic and familiar. Schleiermacher believes that translators should either chose one approach or the other, arguing that by mixing the two approaches will produce a “highly unreliable result” and the “danger that writer and reader might miss each other completely.” In reality, however, a firm adherence to either principle is almost impossible. This is especially true in the case of longer translations, since the translator will almost inevitably include elements of the foreign culture in some places but domesticize in others.

Both Dryden and Schleiermacher’s taxonomies of translation strategies are relatively crude

heuristic tools, especially considering that translators often use multiple strategies in different parts of the same work, sometimes mixing within even the same paragraph. Moreover, there are multiple ways of producing, for example, a paraphrase or domesticizing translation. As a result, pigeonholing a translation as belonging to one of these categories provides only a rough sense of the kinds of the complex processes of negotiation that take place in it. Indeed, those negotiations are often the most interesting and revealing part since they tell us a great deal about linguistic differences and cultural conflict. Nonetheless, the concepts that Dryden and Schleiermacher have given to us can be extremely useful in thinking about the large question of what sorts of translations Japanese writers created during the early Meiji period. Using their terminology allows us to think in broad terms about the variety of translation strategies that early Meiji translators employed, and thus we can begin to sketch out the contours of the translation norms at that time.

Kawashima Chūnosuke’s Trip Around the World in Eighty Days

When the Meiji Restoration took place, there were very few people in Japan who were proficient enough to translate texts in European languages, and so for the first years of the Meiji period, the numbers of translated texts were somewhat limited. The texts that were published were most often non-fictional texts translated in order to give the Japanese a better sense of the history or culture of the West. Perhaps the most famous of these is the bestselling Saikoku rishi hen 西国立志編 (Success Stories of the West), based upon the book Self-Help by the Scottish writer Samuel Smiles, and published in 1870 by Nakamura Keiu 長倉景. An inspirational book written to teach people to better their lot in life and become more productive members of society, Self-Help offered a valuable glimpse at the ethical foundations that supported the cultural rise of the West. It was widely read in Japan as a document showing the Japanese how to move forward in their new, rapidly changing society.3

Translations of fiction were slower to come, no doubt because the production of literature was not considered an especially valuable pursuit in nineteenth-century Japan—certainly far less important than creating the factual books about the West that Japanese readers so intensely desired. The scholar Shinkuma Kiyoshi has noted that it took time for literary translators to come to the conclusion that literary translation was not just a pedagogical tool but also a means to create art.4 Ten years were to pass before translations of Western literature began to appear in any large numbers. One noteworthy exception was Satō Ryōan’s 斎藤了庵 1872 Robinson zenden 魯敏孫全傳 (Robinson’s Complete Biography), a translation of Defoe’s novel Robinson Crusoe. This work grew so famous that Ushiyama Ryōsuke 牛山良助 (also known by his pen name Kakudō 鶴堂) published another translation, Robinson hyōryūki: Shin’yaku 魯敏孫漂流記: 新譯 in 1887.

The year 1878, which fell between these two Defoe translations, was an important year be-

cause that year, there was a first significant surge in the number of literary translations from Western languages.\(^5\) Among the books published that year were the two books that this paper will use as a case study, Kawashima Chūnosuke’s translation of Jules Verne, and Niwa Jun’ichirō’s translation of Edward-Bulwer Lytton. I have chosen these two translations for this paper not simply because they were among the first wave of Meiji literary translations and both became bestsellers, but because they show two radically different approaches to translation, despite the fact that they were published during the same year.

Kawashima Chūnosuke was not a professional writer by trade. In fact, during his life, he is only known to have done two major translations. In what is the most detailed exploration of Kawashima’s life to date, the scholar of French literature Tomita Hitoshi has shown that Kawashima had a complicated work history, which included working for a French shipbuilding company in Yokohama and working as an interpreter for the local Kanagawa government in order to promote trade between Europe and Kanagawa.\(^6\) Kawashima was first sent a copy of Jules Verne’s novel *Le tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours* (*Trip Around the World in Eighty Days*, 1853) from a cousin who was in Paris, and although the book made an impact on him, he did not think about translating it right away because he was set to go on a trade mission to the West. It was later when Kawashima was traveling across the United States that he discovered an English translation of the book at the train station and reread it. (On this trip, he crossed the United States and went to Europe, not unlike the characters in the novel.) This second reading produced a big impact upon him, and he decided to translate the book.\(^7\) As Tomita Hitoshi has shown, Kawashima’s Japanese translation includes a much expanded section about the United States that was included in the American translation of the novel and not present in the original French, thus suggesting that although Kawashima specialized in French, he did work at least partly from the American translation. In any case, even Tomita considers this translation a landmark in translation history, in that it represents the first full-length translation of a fictional work from French into English.

\(^{5}\) For more about this translation and the translator’s approach to this text, see Keene, *Dawn to the West*, 17.


\(^{7}\) These were not the first literary translations from Western languages, just the first in the Meiji period. For instance, during the Edo period, there had been numerous translations and adaptations of Aesop’s fables, some by Jesuits interested in learning Japanese and others by Japanese working off of texts from Western traders.
Kawashima published the work in two volumes. The first was self-published in 1878, but it was such a success that a commercial publisher released the second volume in 1880. Kawashima once noted that he earned 267 yen from the publication of both volumes, a not inconsiderable sum in early Meiji Japan. The success of his translation was so great that many other translators jumped on the bandwagon and published their own translations of Jules Verne. Of these some worked from the original French whereas many others worked from English translations. Over the course of the next decade, nearly all of Verne’s major novels, including *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers* (*Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea*), *Voyage au centre de la terre* (*Voyage to the Center of the Earth*), and *Autour de la lune* (*Around the Moon*) would be published in Japanese. Among Verne’s early Japanese translators were many of the figures who would become the most important translators of the Meiji period, including Inoue Tsutomu 井上勤 and Morita Shiken 森田思軒, who is often known as the “king of Meiji translation.”

*Le tour du monde* remained one of Verne’s most popular pieces, and its stories were retold in multiple versions, including kabuki plays. One reason it appealed so strongly to early Meiji audiences was had to do with the adventure and excitement that filled its pages, but at the same time, it also gave Meiji readers a fun lesson in world geography. When Verne wrote the book he turned to a large number of contemporary accounts of places around the world to give his book local color, so the book is rich with descriptions of places few Japanese had seen. At the same time, because the characters travel through developing places like India, Hong Kong, and even the unsettled plains of the United States, the book showed Japanese readers that there were many places around the world at profoundly different levels of cultural development. In this way, the book

---

fit well with the early Meiji discourse about cultural development, which had quickly adopted the Spenserian notion that nations exist in a state of competition, and the ones that fare best in terms of technology and culture were most likely to succeed on the world stage.

If one looks at the cover of the book, one sees that the names of both the original author (who was unknown in Japan at the time of Kawashima’s publication) are lined up beside one another, suggesting that Kawashima conceived of the translation as a sort of dialogue between him and Jules Verne. When one looks at the text itself, one finds that although the text is written in the sometimes stiff kanbun kundokutai style common at the time in newspapers, magazines, and other texts for an educated audience, it shows a great degree of closeness to the text. In fact, Nakamaru Nobuaki has stated, "this is miraculously close to the original… This book is deserving of the honor of being known as the first novel translated from French in Japan not simply because it was [chronologically] the first, but because of its austere attitude toward the act of translation, which did not permit omissions, additions, or modifications."

For instance, if one takes a look at the opening passage of the novel, one notes that Kawashima has even tried to reproduce the long, run-on-sentence that opens the work. Below is the original French with an English gloss, plus Kawashima’s translation.

En l’année 1872, la maison portant le numéro 7 de Saville-row, Burlington Gardens -- maison dans laquelle Sheridan mourut en 1814 --, était habité par Phileas Fogg, esq., l’un des membres les plus singuliers et les plus remarqués du Reform-Club de Londres, bien qu’il semblât prendre à tâche de ne rien faire qui pût attirer l’attention.

[In the year 1872, the house with the number 7 at Saville Row, Burlington Gardens—the same house in which Sheridan died in 1814—was inhabited by Phileas Fogg, esquire, one of the most unusual and noted members of the Reform Club of London, even though he seemed to take pains to do nothing that could have attracted attention.]

The Japanese fits as much of the same content as possible while attempting to maintain the same general structure as the original (one long run-on sentence). The result is a sentence that, despite the huge linguistic differences between French and the Japanese, shows very little shift in focus or content. Kawashima’s sole additions to Verne’s original were the quick mention that

---

10 Tomita Hitoshi, Jūru Verunu to Nihon (Tokyo: Karin Shobō, 1984), n. pag.
12 Ibid., 330.
13 This appellation dates back to contemporary times, but it is reflected in more recent scholarship, including Taniguchi Yasuhiko, Denki Morita Shiken: Meiji no hon’yakuō (Okayama-ishi: San’yō Shimbunsha, 2000).
Burlington Gardens is in London (Rondon 龍動), something that any French reader would have immediately recognized. Moreover, he clarifies the spatial relationships between places, indicating that Saville Row is located to the side of Burlington Park. In order to describe the term Reform-Club, he has coined a neologism, kaishinsa 改進舎 made up of the three characters meaning “reform,” “progress,” and “organization,” thus using the creative powers of Japanese to capture non-Japanese ideas.

If one were to describe this translation using Dryden’s tripartite taxonomy of translations, this translation come closes to a metaphrase, which shows an almost one-for-one level of correspondence between the original text and the translation. In Schleiermacher’s categorization, the translation would be a “foreignizing” translation in that it carries the reader into the world of the original text. Rather than domesticizing elements of culture or erasing the offending cultural element altogether, Kawashima has carefully attempted to coin words that might be understood by a Japanese reader. Nakamaru Nobuaki has noted that Kawashima makes liberal use of such neologisms, something that perhaps in some ways might depart slightly from the kinds of language that one might find in the kudashibun of the era’s newspapers.

Occasionally, Nakamaru notes, there are places in Kawashima’s text that use Japanese-style (wabun 和文) turns of phrase that one would not expect to see in a text that sounds like it was derived from kanbun, and in other spots, especially the dialogue, it uses expressions reminiscent of plays, storytelling, and stage directions (togaki ト書き). Kawashima, in other words, when confronted by challenges, uses the stylistic resources at his fingertips in order to convey the content of the original, without allowing it to disappear altogether. While many Japanese writers in the mid-Meiji Japan complained that Japanese stylistics were not flexible enough to represent new ideas or to capture the shifts in consciousness and culture that were taking place in the new modernizing Japan, Kawashima’s translation stands as a testament to the flexibility of the Japanese of the time when used creatively. Nobuaki notes that from the point of view of traditional stylistics, the polyvocality of the style gave a sense of newness that many readers probably associated with being “Western.”

14 The Japanese written language has developed enormously in the hundred years since the Meiji period, as the pseudoclassical Japanese of the past gave way to a more fluid language that was less beholden to literary standards, fixed vocabulary choices, and established ways of writing. It is not entirely accurate to say that Japan was in a diglossic state in the early Meiji period, since there were many styles of language available to early-Meiji translators, and one could choose from these depending on the style and genre of writing in which one was engaging. One might more accurately call the language system in early Meiji period Japan “polyglossic,” in that multiple styles of writing co-existed simultaneously. Still, the case of Japan follows Charles Ferguson's classic theory of diglossia in that there were “high” forms of writing that were used for texts with a high degree of cultural value, and these stood in contrast with the “low” forms of speech, which people used in their daily lives and differed significantly from region to region.

Among the so-called “high” styles used for literary writing, the one that tends to appear most frequently to render foreign texts at the dawn of the Meiji era is kanbun kundokutai 漢文訓読対. Originally, this style of language had emerged as Japanese attempted to render classical Chinese texts (kanbun 漢文) into Japanese. Classical Chinese was a language of significant cultural value to the Japanese, as it was the language of the Buddhist classics, and many historically important texts about government, morality, and so on. The style, however, came to be used in many other fields, and since it was a style born out of “translation” in the first place, early Meiji translators seemed to see it as a natural stylistic choice for their own translations. Kanbun kundokutai tends to use a high density percentage of kanji compounds (not all of which were actually Chinese, since some were invented in Japan), which are ordered according to Japanese gram-
This is not to imply that Kawashima’s has not modified the text whatsoever. In fact, one of the places in which Kawashima has made incursions into the content of the text is in the sections in which the character Passepartout makes a stopover in Yokohama—the very same city where Kawashima lived for much of his adult life. If one reads the original carefully against the translation, one finds that there are a handful of noteworthy changes that Kawashima has made in these scenes.

1. Corrections of Verne’s misrepresentations of Japan in the original

2. Clarifications to make Passepartout’s attitude toward Japan appear non-judgmental and that neutralize potentially negative language regarding Japan

3. Inclusions that suggest the relative status of Japan vis-à-vis China

Because Verne had never visited Japan, he gathered descriptions of Japan from many of his contemporaries and cobbled them together to create descriptions of what the character Passepartout saw in Yokohama. Among them are a number of small misrepresentations of Japan. For instance, one sees this in the description of the part of town known as Benten.

Cette portion indigène de Yokohama est appelée Benten, du nom d’une déesse de la mer, adorée sur les îles voisines. Là se voyaient d’admirables allées de sapins et de cèdres, des portes sacrées d’une architecture étrange, des ponts enfouis au milieu des bambous et des roseaux, des temples abrités sous le couvert immense et mélancolique des cèdres séculaires, des bonzeries au fond desquelles végétaient les prêtres du bouddhisme et les sectateurs de la religion de Confucius, des rues interminables où l’on eût pu recueillir une moisson d’enfants au teint rose et aux joues rouges…

15 [This native portion of Yokohama is called Benten, after the name of the sea goddess worshipped on the neighboring isles. There, one finds magnificent streets of fir trees and cedars, sacred portals of a strange architecture, bridges buried in the middle of bamboo and reeds, temples protected under the immense, melancholy cover of the century-old cedars, monasteries at the bottom of which the priests of Buddhism and the followers of the religion of Confucius vegetated, unending streets where one could run into a group of children with a pink tint and red cheeks…]

As the Meiji period progressed, an increasing number of writers complained that this style of writing was not flexible enough to accommodate the ideas and vocabulary of Western languages. As their calls for language reform grew, their voices coalesced around the slogan genbun itchi 言文一致 (the unification of the written and spoken word). This is a bit of a misnomer for, as numerous scholars have shown, these writers ended up choosing the voice of a certain portion of Tokyo speakers as the “standard” and inventing certain words in order to represent certain ideas that were not easily expressed even in spoken language. (The most important of these is the literary copula de aru である.) Still, the style caught on with dizzying speed, and by around 1910, it had almost completely replacing the various forms of pseudoclassical Japanese seen in the early Meiji period, including kundokutai.

The massive changes that Japan has undergone in terms of language are one reason that translations done today might look very different from translations done nearly a century and a half ago; however, it is not the only source of difference. More important, I would argue, is the massive overhaul in ideas about translation—about what a translation can and should do—that took place in the mid-Meiji period. In other words, the differences in Meiji-period translations and contemporary translations cannot merely be ascribed to differences in stylistics.

The description of “neighboring isles” (les îles voisines) must have puzzled Kawashima, judging from the fact that he left it out, simply saying in the Japanese that Benten was a goddess worshipped in the area. Indeed, there are no isles in the harbor of Yokohama, although it is not impossible that Verne was thinking about Enoshima, which was described at some length in some of the literature in French that he is known to have consulted. Moreover, Kawashima has also corrected the incorrect representation of Benten as home to “monasteries at the bottom of which the priests of Buddhism and the followers of the religion on Confucius vegetated.” In fact, Benten was home to a large Shinto shrine, which needless to say, belongs to a tradition quite distinct from both Confucianism and Buddhism. As a result, Kawashima leaves that clause out altogether and translates Verne’s words “sacred portals” (portes sacrées) in a way that could only indicate a torii gate (shinmon神門). Moreover, he describes the monasteries as a Shinto sanctuary (shinden神殿), thus clarifying the exact nature of the place and making it fit with the reality. Finally, Kawashima corrects the descriptions of plants. Whereas Verne mentions “bamboo and reeds” and later “century-old cedars,” Kawashima mentions “old cryptomeria trees and ancient pines” and a bridge “alongside a bamboo forest.” Kawashima elegant describes the bridge as a niji no hashi, a kind of bridge that forms a half-circle like a rainbow. Indeed, old photographs confirm that there was just such a bridge located there in Benten.

Another type of change that Kawashima made was a clarification regarding Passepartout’s attitude toward Japan. In the novel, when the character Passepartout arrives in Japan, he is not happy to be there. The reason is that earlier, when he boarded the ship to Japan in Hong Kong, he found himself separated from his master and without money. As a result, when he arrives in Japan, he is stranded and worries about what to do next. In other words, his irritation has to do with his situation, not the specific fact that he is in Japan. Verne writes,

Passepartout mit le pied, sans aucun enthousiasme, sur cette terre si curieuse des Fils du

16 Jules Verne, Le tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours, Bibliothèque d’Education et de Récréation (Paris: J. Hetzel et Cie, 1874), 1. For the purpose of comparing differences between the French original and the Japanese translation, I have included back-translations into English. These translations should not be considered authoritative or perfect, as they also strive to make the grammar fit the laws of English. It is my hope that these rough translations will just serve as a guide that will help readers understand what was included and what was left out.
Soleil.  
[Passepartout made footfall, without any enthusiasm, on this soil, so curious, of the Children of the Sun.]

Kawashima, however, seems to have been concerned that Japanese readers might misunderstand and perhaps even be offended by Passepartout’s irritation, so he adds a bit, reminding Japanese readers of the reasons for Passepartout’s foul state of mind.

パスパルツーモ已ヲ得ズ上陸スレド　身ハ香港以降為ス事毎ニ鶴ノ嘴食ヒ違ヒケレバ心中怏々トシテ楽マズ　何ノゾ珍奇ニ富ム旭日国に来ルトモ遑アラン

[Passepartout couldn’t help going on land, but since Hong Kong, everything he had done was eaten incorrectly [as a] crossbill’s beak, so in his heart, he was not satisfied and not looking forward to this. Although he had come to the Land of the Morning Sun, rich with all sorts of novelties, he probably didn’t have time to spare.]

The crossbill (isuka鶴) is a bird which has an unusual beak with the top overlapping the bottom, as if the beak has been twisted. While the beak is useful for eating pine nuts, the bird is not terribly good at eating other kinds of food, so it came to be used as a symbol for something that does not go quite right. Interestingly, Verne describes Japan as a “curious” place—an ambiguous term that could represent either a neutral outlook (i.e. Passepartout finds things in Japan different than home) or a slightly negative judgement (Passepartout finds things in Japan to be “strange”). Kawashima, however, has rendered the word in a way that makes it sound much more positive, describing Japan as a place “rich with all sorts of novelties.”

Passepartout finds himself in a part of town that in many ways looks entirely European, but for the throngs of people crowding the square make him feel like an alien.

Là, comme à Hong-Kong, comme à Calcutta, fourmillait un pêle-mêle de gens de toutes races, Américains, Anglais, Chinois, Hollandais, marchands prêts à tout acheter, au milieu desquels le Français se trouvait aussi étranger que s’il eût jeté au pays des Hottentots.

[There, as in Hong Kong, as in Calcutta, there mingled a pell-mell of people all races—Americans, British, Chinese, Dutch, merchants ready to buy up everything—in the middle of which the Frenchman found himself as foreign as if he had been thrown into a country of Hottentots.]

此地モ亦香港ト同ジク　英　米　清　荷等各国の商賈ガ幅渋シテ一切ノ物品ヲ売買スル最繁昌ノ湊ナレドモ　パスパルツーハ此地ニ識ル人ナケレバ亜弗利加南部「ホツテント」ノ国へ俄然雲際ヨリ降リト更ニ異ナラザル思ヒヲナシタリ

[Here too, as in Hong Kong, merchants from England, America, Qing (Dynasty China), Holland, and all sorts of other countries were all milling about, forming an extremely prospering market where everything was being bought and sold, but Passepartout had no one there whom he knew, so he felt as even stranger as if he had abruptly come down from the clouds into the “Hottentot” land of southern Africa.]

The language that Verne uses to describe the throngs of people (pêle-mêle) is somewhat negative in tone, suggesting an unpleasant hustle and bustle, but in Kawashima’s rendering, the

19 Verne, Le tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours, 125.
scene seems to be merely one of many people coming together in a thriving marketplace. The
impression one takes away from the Japanese is that the place is, if anything, a sign of the rising
economic development of Japan. Kawashima once again feels the need to clarify the reason for
Passepartout’s mood: his lack of friends is the reason for his alienation. Kawashima seems to
have included this clarification as way of explaining away the parallel between Hottentots and
the Japanese—something that likely struck him as quite strange and that could have sounded of-
fensive, if handled badly in the translation.

The most telling shifts in the Japanese translation, however, are ones that come in the sections
in which Passepartout compares the Japanese to the inhabitants of Hong Kong, where he had
just been. In one scene, Passepartout sees a significant number of military personnel in various
types of clothing. The narrative explains,

...au Japon, la profession de soldat est autant estimée qu'elle est dédaignée en Chine.21
[...in Japan, the profession of the soldier is held in as much high esteem as it is downplayed in
China.]

Kawashima has rendered this in a way that sounds even more grandiose.

是蓋シ日本ハ清国ノ風ニ反シ兵事ニ鞅掌スルヲ栄トスルノ風習ナレバナラン22
[This was probably because in Japan, unlike Qing (dynasty China), it was the custom that
people would treat it as an honor to do military service.]

In the years surrounding the Meiji Restoration, many people felt the solution to Japan’s future
lay in creating a “wealthy nation and strong military” (fukoku kyōhei). Military service
had been opened so that it was no longer just former members of the samurai class who could
serve, but the entire male population. Military service was viewed by many as not just an honor,
but as a way of serving the nation. Here, Kawashima’s augmentation seems to be subtly project-
ing contemporary values onto the text in a way that would make Japan seem more advanced and
progressive than imperial China.

The most striking comparison of Japan and China comes in a passage in which Passepartout is
looking at a crowd of people. He describes the characteristics of the Japanese as follows.

...chevelure lisse et d’un noir d’ébène, tête grosse, jambes grêles, taille peu élevée,
tient coloré depuis les sombres nuances du cuivre jusqu’au blanc mat, mais jamais jaune comme
celui des Chinoise, dont les Japonais diffèrent essentiellement.23
[...smooth hair as black as ebony, big heads, long necks, spindly legs, rarely tall stature,
having colorations from the somber hues of copper to a flat white, but never yellow like
those of the Chinese, from which the Japanese differ in fundamental ways.]

21 Verne, Le tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours, 125.
23 Verne, Le tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours, 125.
The men had, for the most part, thin and short legs, and many of them had small trunks. The lacquer-black hair on their heads was tied in a bundle; there were people who had faces that were either a darkened bronze or white, but there was not a single person who had the weakened yellow like the people of the Qing nation.

Certain parts of Verne’s description which are not entirely flattering, such as the “big heads” and “spindly legs” are rendered in slightly more neutral vocabulary. The most strikingly word choice is Kawashima’s rendition is the word おしろ 黄萎, made up of the characters “yellow” and “withered” in the description of the skin color of the Chinese. This turn of phrase is unmistakably close to the word いおびょう 黄萎病 in Japanese, which chlorosis, an illness brought about by iron deficiency in the blood and characterized by weakness and paleness. Verne’s relatively neutral term “yellow,” which just referred to skin pigmentation, has been rendered in an offensive way that reflects a clear sense of Japanese racial superiority. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to saw that in these passages, one sees a sign of the racial chauvinism that would culminate in the Sino-Japanese war a little more than a decade after Kawashima published this translation.

As Lawrence Venuti and countless other scholars of translation have noted, almost any translation will in some ways show traces of the particular moment in time that it was created. In fact, translations that are able to speak to their moment in time sometimes strike a better chord among the reading population and find a wider audience. Venuti notes that translation “tends to privilege certain domestic values” and thus tends to establish “a canon of foreign texts that is necessarily partial because it serves certain domestic interests.” Clearly, one sees that here, in the small but subtle ways that Kawashima reflects the attitudes towards the military and toward the Chinese that circulating in Japan at the moment he was writing. Indeed, one cannot help but wonder if the fact that the translation “confirmed” Japanese thoughts about their own place in the world helped it sell to domestic Japanese audiences.

In sum, there are a number of places within Kawashima’s text where he has inscribed domestic cultural values upon Verne’s text. Still, the very fact that one is able to match passages in the translation with passages in the original means that there is still a relatively strong degree of correspondence between the two, even if there are small but significant ways in which the texts diverge. As the next section will show, Kawashima’s approach to translation is very different from other translators working at the same time—translators that fundamentally rewrote the story, taking only the general gist of the work and retelling it within their own terms.

25 Verne, Le tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours, 126.
Niwa Jun’ichirō’s *Spring Tale of Flowers and Willows*

Four months after Kawashima published the first volume of his translation of Verne, Niwa Jun’ichirō published the first volume of *Karyū shunwa: Ōshū kiji* (*Spring Tale of Blossoms and Willows: Strange Happenings in Europe*), which would become one of the biggest bestsellers of the early Meiji period. Like Kawashima, Niwa was not initially set on being a translator or writing by trade. He came from a samurai background, and after studying in Tokyo, and Kōchi, he went in 1870 to Britain to study at the orders of the government. After studying English in London, he went to the University of Edinburgh to study administrative law, where there he stayed until 1874. He was in Japan for only a few years before returning again in 1877, this time staying in London, studying law, and taking the exam to become a barrister. Soon after publishing *Karyū shunwa*, his career took a turn when he had a falling out with the Niwa family, which had adopted him during his youth. He abandoned their name, took the name Oda田, set out on his own, abandoned law altogether, and dedicating himself to writing full time.26 The scholar Yanagida Izumi noted while he was young, Niwa was a great admirer of Benjamin Disraeli, a British writer who managed to balance his work with a political career that took him all the way up to the office of the Prime Minster; however, it is ultimately unclear how strongly Niwa was ever wedded to the idea of being a lawyer and politician himself.27

In any case, the book that Niwa published in 1878 was the first volume in a multi-volume translation that combined Bulwer-Lytton’s novel *Ernest Maltravers* (1837) and its sequel *Alice* (1838) into a single work. Right away, the work became a hit, appealing to Japanese readers in an era when everything Western was of great interest. No doubt many readers were drawn to it

---

by the title, which with the titillating character “spring,” implied romance and even eroticism to Japanese readers. Indeed, the plot describes a virtuous but poor young woman who leaves her family to go live with a man of expectations, but after they start an affair, fate separates them, and it takes them many hundreds of pages to find one another once again, but by then, much has changed. The plot about separation and reuniting, no doubt appealed to readers who had seen similar plots in Japanese literature, and the fact that the book engages in the tendency, common in Japanese literature of the time to “advocate virtue and chastise vice” (kanzen chōaku 勧善懲惡), meant that it was immediately comprehensible to Japanese readers. The book was such a success that it spawned imitations. Tsubouchi Shōyō once recalled “the power of Karyū shunwa in those days was so great that people felt compelled to use the words ‘spring’ and ‘talk’ in their own titles.” Karyū shunwa also inspired a wave of translations of Bulwer-Lytton in Japan. Although he was just one of many popular authors of the era (and has almost completely disappeared from the modern canon of British literature), Bulwer-Lytton’s fame grew in early Meiji Japan to enormous proportions, as translator after translator tried his hand at rendering Bulwer-Lytton’s many novels into Japanese.

Interestingly, if one looks at the cover of the title, Niwa’s name appears in big letters, along with an “examiner” (kōetsu 校閲)—an established writer by the name of Hattori Seiichi 服部誠一 who lent his name and cultural authority to the text. Bulwer-Lytton’s name only appears inside, on the very first page of the novel. One reason for this is that Bulwer-Lytton was not yet known in Japan, and his name did not hold any cultural capital for readers who would not have recognized his name. (This quickly changed as Karyū shunwa skyrocketed him to fame.) At the same time, however, this is probably also a reflection of the Niwa’s outlook on translation. Whereas Kawashima seemed to see his work as a form of transnational collaboration and thus put both the author and translator’s names on the cover, Niwa seems to take the biggest part of the credit for the book for himself. The word yaku 訳 does appear after his own name, indicating that he (or perhaps the publisher) thought of Niwa as a translator, but as one quickly sees in comparing the English and Japanese, the latter is so free that if one were to place it into Dryden’s schematic, it could only be called an “imitation.”

Even a brief look is enough to show that Niwa’s rendition diverges radically from Bulwer-Lytton’s text. Here is one passage from the beginning of Chapter Eight. In this important scene, Alice, a girl from a poor family, is finally beginning to feel at home in the house of Ernest Maltravers, the man who has taken her in.

*It was a lovely evening in April; the weather was unusually mild and serene for that time of year in the northern districts of our isle, and the bright drops of a recent shower sparkled upon the buds of the lilac and laburnum that clustered round the cottage of Maltravers. The little fountain that played in the center of a circular basin, on whose clear surface the broadleaved water-lily cast its fairy shadow—added to the fresh green of the lawn—*

*“And softè as velvèt the yongè grass,”*

*on which the rare and early flowers were closing their heavy lids.*

The text is full of detailed description, and the structure of the sentences are complex enough that, if reproduced with the utmost faithfulness to syntactical relationships, they would likely have felt unwieldy and perhaps even confusing to a Japanese audience. Niwa has radically truncated the text and captured only the main idea, namely that a lush spring has come to England.

杜鵑血に叫ンデ緑樹、陰ヲ成シ晩鶯、口ヲ箝シテ牡丹、花ヲ着ントシ恰モ是レ春末夏初ノ天ナリ

[The cuckoo cried out for all it was worth, the green trees formed shadows; after the bush warbler, chirping so late in the spring, closed its mouth, the peonies and blossoms seemed to try to come forth; the weather most befitting late spring and early summer] 29

Niwa has omitted many portions of the source text, including details about climate, the rain upon the flowers, the fountain (something few Japanese would have seen at the time), and the short line of poetry that Bulwer-Lytton quotes. At the same time, Niwa has made a number of shifts that suggest what Niwa thought would sound poetic to Japanese readers. For instance, he has substituted the British flowers “lilach and laburnum” with “peonies and flowers,” which most readers would have understood to be cherry blossoms. Whereas the cherry blossoms represents a flower that has appealed to the Japanese imagination for centuries because of its intense beauty and short duration, the peony is a lush and beautiful flower that is more strongly associated with the Chinese-style arts. Niwa has made another nod to Chinese poetry by using the Chinese name for the cuckoo (token 杜鵑), as well as the idiom chi ni sakende (literally “call out in blood”)—a set phrase from Chinese poetry that suggests a bird chirping with all of its might. As if these flowers and birds were not enough, he also introduces another bird, the bush warbler (uguisu 鶯), using the poetic word ban’ō, which refers to a bird that sings late in the season. In other words, these short few lines present a jumble of a variety of birds and flowers that Japanese readers would have thought of as poetic. Rather than trying to introduce elements of the foreign culture, he opts for the poetic symbols associated in Chinese and Japanese poetry with the season, thus drawing upon a field of pre-existing knowledge and assumptions present among educated Japanese readers.

The changes in the passage that immediately follows are even more dramatic. Here is the original followed by Niwa’s translation.

That twilight shower had given a racy and vigorous sweetness to the air, which stole over many a bank of violets, and slightly stirred the golden ringlets of Alice, as she sat by the side of her entranced and silent lover. They were seated on a rustic bench just without the cottage, and the open windows behind them admitted the view of that happy room, with its litter of books and

---

29 Lawrence Venuti, The Scandals of Translation: Toward an Ethics of Difference (NY: Routledge, 1998), 71. In the chapter “Pedagogy,” Venuti shows how translations from different moments in time can be read not just as a document showing different attitudes toward the “foreign” but also as a survey that documents changing attitudes in the home, domestic audience.

30 As a result, some literary histories refer to him with the name Oda, but since Niwa was the name that appeared on the cover of Karyū shunwa, that is the one that I will use in this paper. For instance, Yanagida Izumi’s study, which provides the source of much of what we know about Niwa, uses the name Oda, no doubt because Yanagida knew him later in life, when he was using the name Oda. Yanagida Izumi, Meiji shoki hon’yaku bungaku no kenkyū, 299-320.
Again, Niwa has captured the general point—the scene shows a beautiful young girl by her room—but beyond that, almost every detail differs from the source text. The spatial configuration of the scene is quite different. In the English source text, Alice sits with her partner just outside the open window, but in the Japanese, she sits inside, apparently alone except for with her parrot. Once again, Niwa has domesticized the text, but in ways that Japanese readers would have immediately found poetic. “Golden ringlets,” if translated literally would have sounded terribly foreign to Japanese readers who had never seen blond hair. Perhaps it is for that reason that Niwa used a phrase from Song-dynasty poetry to describe her lovely hair, namely the word unryoku (literally “cloud green”) which compares her hair to a cloud of leaves on a tree. The “musical instruments” have been turned into a koto, a traditional East Asian instrument that would at the time been unknown in England, where the story was allegedly taking place.

Perhaps the most amusing domestication comes in the final lines, in which she is speaking to her caged parrot. The parrot would no doubt have struck Japanese readers as exotic and foreign, but what is especially curious is that she is teaching it “new poetry” (shinshi新詩). The term shi originally had referred in Japan to Chinese poetry which, because of its length and interest in rhyme-like patterns, stood in stark contrast to the short forms of poetry often written in Japan. As Japanese writers came into contact with the West, they realized that the poetic principles at work in the West were profoundly different than those in Japan, and so the Japanese resuscitated the word shi to refer to this newly discovered type of poetry, which once again was far longer than the types of poetry found in Japan. In short, shinshi refers to poetry written in the Western style, but it is a term that grew specifically out of the Japanese context and could only have been used in Japan.

The overall impression of this sentence, as well as what came before it, is that the narrator is Japanese and is peering through a telescope toward the West and describing what he sees there. What does not fit into his language, he abandons, simplifies, or describes as best he can, using only the language familiar to him. If one were to think about Niwa’s translation in terms of Schleiermacher, it is clear that Niwa’s translation is one that brings the author into the world of the reader, domesticizing many elements of the text. That being said, there are places in the text
where the narrative voice does not bulldoze over the cultural content of the English original and
does attempt to teach the reader a bit about Western culture. For instance, in one passage that
mentions a church, the translator includes a short note that says “according to the translator”
(yakusha iwaku 訳者曰く), a church is a place where people in England go to pray on Sundays.

In 1884, just a short couple of years later, Niwa published a modified version of the text enti-
titled Tsūzoku karyū shunwa, which softens the heavily Chinese-inflected style of the kakiku-
dashibun, thus making it more accessible to Japanese readers. (This version was, in essence, a
translation of his translation into an easier form of Japanese.) In this new version, Niwa (who
was already going by the surname Oda) explains why he wanted to translate the work in the first
place. He states that there are three types of history: histories of laws, histories of wars, and
histories of manners and customs. The novel, which is takes place within the world of British
manners and customs gives a look at that history from the inside. The translation therefore has
much to teach the Japanese about the customs of the West and could assist the Japanese in un-
derstanding the history of modern England.33 In other words, Niwa sees translation as having a
pedagogical function, allowing the reader to access information about the ways that people live
and behave.

From the point of view of the early twentieth century, when “imitative translations” are no
longer considered “good translations,” some readers might have difficulty understanding exactly
how Niwa thought he might be helping readers learn about Britain when so many details relat-
ing to British life and culture were excised or domesticized to the point of unrecognizability.
Yanagida Izumi explains that the goal of Karyū shunwa was not the introduction of the “symbolic,
intellectual West,” but rather the introduction of the “emotional West” (jōteki seiyō 情的西洋)
through concrete examples of how people behaved in certain situations.34 Shinkuma Kiyoshi has
also suggested that the book taught people a good deal about the behavior as well as the literary
customs of the British. He notes that Karyū shunwa and other works like it were different than
Japanese literature in that they focused on what the characters were thinking, feeling, doing, and
the emotional effects of those events. What happens to the characters are not just little parts of
a larger tale as they might be in a Japanese novel; the actions of the characters are themselves
what construct the tale. Shinkuma notes that it is significant that in English the novel is called
Ernest Maltravers, named after the character that is at the heart of the novel.35 This is an impor-
tant point, and helps explain how the work continued to have a strong Western air about it, even
though Niwa’s translation strategy was highly domesticizing and imitative.

33 Edward Bulwer-Lytton, Ernest Maltravers (NY: Harper & Brothers, 1838), 44.
34 Niwa Jun’ichirō, trans., “Karyū shunwa,” in Meiji hon’yaku bungaku shū, Meiji bungaku zenshū 7 (Tokyo:
Chikuma Shobō, 1972), 15. In the original 1878 edition, this passage appears on Niwa Jun’ichirō, trans.,
Karyū shunwa: Ōshū kiji (Tokyo: Takahashi Gengorō, 1878), 1:60. For the ease of reading, the 1972 edition
includes punctuation marks that were not in the 1878 version of the text. I have removed the punctuation
to make the quote above resemble the 1878 edition; however, I have left the characters in their modern,
postwar variants.
Conclusion, or Towards the Future

The point of these two case studies was to show how radically different translation strategies were among the earliest Japanese translators. As the case of Karyū shunwa shows, translation was not exactly what one thinks of today when Western or Japanese think of translation. Whereas today, there is a fairly strong delineation between translation (hon'yaku 翻訳) and "adaptation" (hon'an 翻案), this distinction was not so clear to Meiji writers. The two merely ran together to form one larger "territory of translation," which encompassed a broad variety of approaches that an author could use when rewriting a text in another language.

If one were to attempt to map out the contours of this territory of translation, using the two systems developed by Dryden and Schleiermacher, one could represent them on two separate axes: the X-axis showing Dryden's tripartite division of translations, based on the degree of linguistic and syntactic correspondence between the original and the translation, and the Y-axis showing the overall degree of domesticization and foreignization within a text. (As mentioned previously, Schleiermacher saw these two types of texts as mutually exclusive, but in reality, the distinction between the two is not so clear-cut. Most works show some domesticizing elements, and some foreignizing elements. If one thinks of the relative number of domesticized elements to foreignized elements within a text overall, then it indeed becomes possible to place Schleiermacher's system on a continuum.) What we not think of as "translation" (hon'yaku) and "adaptation" (hon'an) are not distinct entities with clearly defined boundaries, but rather specific regions of a larger field with no clear delineation between.
The reason the “territory of translation,” marked on this chart in blue and green, takes the shape of a strangely crooked parallelogram is because one finds in Meiji translations that if a translation tends to show a high degree of linguistic and syntactical correspondence—in other words, if it is a metaphrase—then the translator often tends to try to keep elements of foreign culture present within the text, thus producing a foreignizing translation. Conversely, if a translator tends to be very free with the text, only summing up the main jist of a paragraph instead of trying to find an equivalent for every single word, then he is more likely to elide or modify foreign the elements of foreign culture in the text, thus taking the translation in a domesticizing direction.

The two books examined in this paper as case studies would appear in opposite quadrants. Kawashima’s text appears in the area corresponding to metaphrase on the X-axis and a foreignizing translation on the Y-axis. Niwa’s translation, however, falls in the lower right quadrant, in the area of the graph reserved for imitative and domesticizing translations. In including them on the chart, I have represented them as a jagged star rather than a single, tiny dot. The reason for this is that no text of any length shows on a single, common, unified translation strategy that is absolutely the same at all points throughout the text. Rather, there are fluctuations within the text as the translator adopts one strategy to solve one linguistic or cultural problem, and another strategy to solve another linguistic or cultural problem. As demonstrated in the case of Kawashima’s translation, there are certain parts that are more closely tied to the structure and culture of the original text than others. Likewise, Niwa’s text elides a great number of small details having
to do with British culture, but there are other moments, such as when he mentions the church, where he retains elements of foreign culture and explains the meaning for his audiences.

The ways that the contours of what I have called the "territory of translation" have shifted over time is a subject that is too big to examine in this paper, which simply aims largely at producing a snapshot of translation norms in the early Meiji period. In lieu of a conclusion, I will simply say that the contours of the territory of translation began to shift during the mid-Meiji period, around the 1890s, as Morita Shiken, Tsubouchi Shōyō, and other translators began to argue about the value of different modes of rewriting a foreign text. It is then that they begin to make a firmer distinction between “translation” (hon’yaku) and “adaptation” (hon’an), which they begin to see as performing very different functions and appealing to different audiences. As a result, one begins to see a split in the territory of translation, which becomes increasingly divided into two different types of writing. The timing and reason for the split is an important subject that reveals a great deal about the ways that Japanese writers thought about their craft, but that will have to remain the subject of a future paper that will, no doubt, even been longer than this has been.
Abstract

In my paper I would like to discuss the translations of Mishima Yukio's four novels. All of them have been translated into Finnish via the English and German languages. My aim is to study how they reflect Mishima's literary concept(s). I will also study if or how they as cultural translations change Mishima's concepts seen in Finnish translations. Literary ideas are like a changing understanding of how a literary work exists, what are the tasks of writer and literature, what kind of aesthetic meanings or tasks are given to the work of literature (Arminen, Elina 2010). Works by Mishima included in my study are Aaltojen pauhu (潮騒, translated in 1963), Kultainen tempeli (金閣寺, translated in 1983), Kunnia on katkera juoma (午後の曳航, translated 1971) and Juhlien jälkeen (宴の後). I also refer to some of his essays in 三島由紀夫評論全集. I assume that Mishima's concept on literature was in many ways dialogical. I use intertextual approach to show this dialog and also to find out how the different cultural interpretations change this dialog. In this case, I study the dialog between the four Finnish translations of Mishimas novels, English translation and the Japanese original text. Also Japanese literary tradition and the way Mishima has been interpreted in Japan and in Finland are included.
Forword

I have been working on my doctoral thesis dealing with Mishima’s literary concept and method for quite a while and while I had to translate Mishima’s texts to be used in my thesis, I became interested in how they were translated in different languages, especially Finnish, English, German and Swedish. Of course in this paper, focus is on Finnish and English translations.

It is interesting to see that equivalence was important in 1960s, 1970s: discourse, elements in language, communicative functions. In 1980s equivalence was strongly criticized. From 2000 new coming of “equivalence” was seen but with a different meaning: “illusion of equivalence” (Koskinen, 2001). Mishima’s works were translated into Finnish equivalence was considered to be important.

Domestication in Mishima Yukio in fiction translated into Finnish

Introduction

In my paper I will study the Finnish translations of Mishima Yukio’s (1925-1970) works. I will examine certain cases of domestication of Mishima’s texts. I will also discuss the influence of domestication on the reception of Mishima by the Finnish audience, posing the question whether translations may change the idea contained in his method and literary concept, and in his representation of Japanese culture. In particular, I will focus on the translation of a number of cultural concepts of Mishima’s novels into Finnish. These occur in books translated via American translations; besides, the translations are quite old: Shiosai (潮騒, the Finnish title: Aaltojen pauhu, translated by Irmeli Nykänen 1960), Kinkakuji (金閣寺, the Finnish title: Kultainen temppeli, translated by Sirpa Kauppinen, 1961), Utage no ato (宴の後, the Finnish title: Juhlan jälkeen, translated by Helvi Vasara, 1966), Gogo no eikô (午後曳船, the Finnish title: Kunnia on katkera juoma, translated by Eeva-Liisa Manner, 1971). The following works have been translated directly from the Japanese language: (A fragment from the beginning of the novel Kamen no kokuhaku (仮面の告白, the Finnish title: Erään naamion tunnustuksia, translated by Kai Nieminen, 1983), and the play Sado kôshaku fujin, サド侯爵夫人 (the Finnish title: Markiisitar De Sade, translated also by Kai Nieminen, 1992).

Translator Kai Nieminen has been translating Japanese fiction into Finnish for ca. 30 years. The authors of his translations range from Genji monogatari, Bashô, Sôseki, Tanizaki, Mishima, and Kawabata to Banana Yoshimoto.

I interviewed Nieminen for this paper via e-mail on February 13, 2011. In the following I quote extracts of Nieminen’s reply (translated by me): “The most important role of a translator is to identify himself/herself with the author and transmit his/her thoughts to speakers of other languages. Translating Mishima is very difficult and also his Japanese readers are sometimes confused by his intentions. Difficulties appear because he used different genres, ranging from modern Nô-plays to Realism and Romanticism. For this reason, some of his texts are easy to grasp, while some other texts may pose great difficulties for a reader. The language of some of his novels is elitist because it is complicated, while some of his novels are written in a simple, easy-to-read fashion, almost like popular fiction. Besides, as if in order to impose himself, he sometimes...”
uses very rare, difficult kanji.”

Undoubtedly, the cultural concepts and representation of Japanese culture have been subject to some changes when translated into Finnish, on the one hand because of the difficulties in translating Mishima in general, and on the other hand because of certain translation shifts occurring in the British and American translations, connected with domestication and stereotypes.

As I mentioned above, the first four Finnish translations were based on the British/American translations. Lawrence Venuti points out in “Scandals of Translation” (1999) that “translation is often regarded with suspicion, because it inevitably domesticates foreign texts, inscribing them with linguistic and cultural values that are intelligible to specific domestic constituencies.” In his opinion, domestication shows in translation strategies rewriting the foreign text using domestic dialects and discourses, excluding other values than domestic ones.

Translation can also create stereotypes, thereby attaching a stigma to specific ethnic, racial and national groups, signifying either respect for cultural difference, or hatred based on racism or patriotism (Venuti 1999, 67).

**Finnish translations influenced by the canon of Japanese fiction in English**

Venuti points out that American publishers such as Alfred Knopf in the 60ies were aware of the literary as well as commercial values of Japanese fiction. Even though the publishers issued many translations of Japanese novels and story collections, their choices were quite selective. Mainly Tanizaki, Kawabata and Mishima were published so that, for example, *Yukiguni* by Kawabata was considered as representing typical Japanese writing.

Edward Fowler (1992) indicated that American publishers established a canon of Japanese Fiction in English that was not only unrepresentative but also based on a well-defined stereotype influencing reader expectations for roughly forty years. Moreover, the cultural stereotyping performed by this canon extended beyond English, since English translations of Japanese fiction were routinely translated into other European languages during the same period. Accordingly, the tastes of English-speaking readers have dictated the tastes of the entire western world with regard to Japanese fiction (Fowler 1992, 15-16).

English-speaking tastes belonged to a group of readers who were academic specialists in Japanese literature associated with trade publishers. The translations of Mishima, Tanizaki and Kawabata were made by university professors such as Howard Hibbett, Donald Keene, Ivan Morris and Edwin Seidensticker. (Fowler 1992, 12).

Miller says (as quoted by Venuti) that “It has been suggested that their translating was homogenizing, avoiding any language that “might not have been said or written by a modern American university professor of modest literacy and concomitantly modest literary gifts.” Of course, their interests of these American translators mentioned above, were shaped by an encounter with Japan around World War II. The image of Japan was nostalgic, and Japan was seen as a foreign country. (Venuti 1998, 72).

The canon did not change during the 1970-1980s. The volume of English translations was de-
By the end of 1980 the academic canon of Japanese literature was questioned by a new generation of English language writers. Leithauser writes that born after the Pacific war and under global reach of American hegemony, they were more receptive to different forms and themes. (1989, 10). Perhaps the best known sign of this is Banana Yoshimoto’s Kitchen (1993), which was also translated into Finnish in 1995.

Besides domestication, Mishima’s texts are sometimes seen more exotic than they really are. Stereotyping is usual in translations. Texts are also given completely different connotations from the intention of the author.

**Example of domestication**

*Shiosai*, (潮騒) translated into English 1956, into Finnish 1961. At the time when the Finnish audience had a chance to read the first novel by Mishima in Finnish translation, he was not very well known in Finland.

*Shiosai*, which Mishima wrote in 1954, is located in Utajima. It is a coming of age novel dealing with the maturity of Shinji and his romance with Hatsue, the beautiful daughter of the wealthy ship-owner Terukichi. The novel is based on the Greek 2nd century story of Daphnis and Chloe.

Even though there are various elements that can be seen as originating from the English translations, I think one feature is very distinctive. In the Finnish translation the words “jumala”, “jumalat” (‘God’, ‘Gods’ in the English translation) appear many times in different chapters. Kami(神) and kamisama(神様) were domesticated: in the American edition the concept “kami” has been explained as God, or gods. A translation forms domestic subjects by enabling a process of “mirroring” or self-recognition so that the foreign text becomes intelligible when the reader recognizes himself/herself in the translation by identifying the domestic values. In the case of *Shiosai*, various kami play an important part in daily beliefs of the people on Utajima. In the Finnish culture, using the word “jumalat” creates an allusion to the national Epic of Finns, The *Kalevala*. One of the most notable characteristics of Finnish mythology are gods. Every deity, even a minor one, rules in his own sphere as an independent power, or, to speak in the spirit of *The Kalevala*, as a self-ruling householder. The Primary object of worship among the early Finns was most probably the visible sky with the sun, moon, and stars, its aurora-lights, its thunders and its lightnings. Thus, the term Jumala was given to the sky, the sky-god, and the supreme God.

In this way, even though the American translation provides an allusion to the concept of God, the Finnish translation creates the domesticating effect by an allusion to Kalevala.
lopussa hän varta vasten jätti kertomatta
viimeisen, tärkeän toiveensa, jonka hän oli
esittänyt rukoillessaan meren jumalaa
muutamia päivää sitten.
"Meren jumalaa", 海神
In Finnish translation alludes to the Greek god of the sea, Poseidon.

Itse asiassaei Hatsue tuohon hetkeen saakka ollut tiennyt, mikä jumala oli häntä auttanut.
(Hatsue did not know until that moment, which of the Gods had helped her). (Aaltojen pauhu, p.110).

あれか。あれは神が怒っておられるじゃ。神の
怒りをなだめるには、どうしたらいでしようかと
宏がたずねる。そうさな。捧物をして祈るほかあ
るまい。みんなは母親からもらって来たか、ある
いはくすぐれてきた煎餅や饅頭を、新聞紙に載せ
て堅坑にのぞむ岩の上に祭った。
呪文を唱えて、上半身上げたり祈り曲げたりし
ながら祈った。p.96

"Tämä,lapseni",sanoi Sochan juhlallisesti,"tämä
on kiukkuaan ilmaiseva jumala."....Niin he ottivat
esiin riishiutaleet ja
papumuhennosleivonnaiset, jotka olivat saaneet
tai näpistäneet äideiltään."p.118

"riishiutale", riceflake=senbei
"joiku", the original oral prose/singing of sami
peoples in the northern part of
Finland,Sweden,Norway; had also some
religious connotations: here 呪文

"jumala", "kami": Finnish word has a Christianconnotation here

....lauloi merkillistä, juuri keksimäänsä
joikua ja rukoili sitten taivutellen yläruumistaan
eteen ja taakse."

"lapseni”=my child: this word does not occur in
the original
The translator Irmeli Nykänen could not compare the American text with the Japanese original. For this reason, the only possibility to translate the original “kami” was god(s). I think this gives the American translation a special taste of Christianity, whereas to the Finnish reader it implies also a familiar concept from the Kalevala Epic.

As a representative of the Japanese culture, the concept of God(s) gives a familiar aspect to a reader of 1961. Instead of mentioning “kami” or some kind of power that kami represent, the reader gets an image that there is something similar in the socio-cultural background of the novel.

**Example of a new connotation given by a translator**

Gogo no eikô (午後の曳航)

Gogo no eikô was translated in 1971, one year after Mishima suicide. The Japanese title曳航, eikô, a kind of boat, is pronounced similarly with栄光, glory but in the Finnish translation one can see clearly the influence of Mishima’s suicide.

The title in Finnish is “Kunnia on katkera juoma”, honour is a bitter drink, which implies to Mishima’s act in 1970. In the back cover it is told to the reader, that “the intensity of Mishima writing in Gogo no eikô seems to anticipate Mishima’s death. The English title is “The Sailor who Fell from the Grace with the Sea”.

In the Finnish version “Bitter drink” means the bitter tasting tea mixed with sleeping pills which the protagonist is having with young boys, who are planning to kill him. In the English translation by John Nathan “Glory, as anyone knows, is a bitter stuff:” In the Finnish translation by Eeva-Liisa manner: “Kunnia, niin kuin jokainen tietää, on katkera juoma”. Here the choice of used words in translation is interesting, the former implies to honor, which the protagonist dreamed to achieve while working on the boat as a sailor, and the latter to his death some minutes later.

In the original the novel ends:

飲んでから、ひどく苦ったような気がした。誰も知るように、栄光の味は苦い。p.176

**Conclusion**

At the present moment the Finnish public, especially young readers are quite well aware of Japanese cultural concepts. Or they think they are. Nowadays the question is, should certain Japanese words, such as “kami” or “san” be translated at all. But even today, novels by popular Japanese authors, such as Murakami Haruki, are translated indirectly, from English.
In Mishima’s case, even if translator used the original language, the ideas, language, kanji – characters are difficult to interpret, understand and translate, as translator Kai Nieminen pointed out. When the translation is done using English or American translations, the representation of Japanese culture seen through eyes of 1960s English and American translators attitude, coloured partly with their countries relationships with Japan.

My assumption is that there are many interesting cases of domestication in translations of Mishima in Finnish. Often his text is also give connotations to something that happened many years after a novel was written. I will continue working on this subject because here I could give only few examples and I myself still have only a slight idea of how much translations of 1960s and 1971 differ from the originals.
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Abstract
This paper is a meditation on the concept of the "public" and its usefulness in understanding the dynamics of contemporary Japanese society. Publics are not only the neutral media for but also the objects of contestation. This contestation is notable in the translation of the concept of the public into a Japanese context by social scientists, historians, philosophers, intellectuals and activists in Japan today. In my paper, I begin by discussing the classical formulations of the public in Habermas and Arendt, and I pay particular attention to how these theorists convey an image of the public as constituted not only by deliberation among concerned citizens but also, crucially, by silences, play-acting and bracketing of things relegated to the private or material realm. I then turn to the interpretation of the public in Japan, paying particular attention to how the dominant discourse of the public in terms of ōyake or related terms is challenged by alternative interpretations. Among the latter, I focus on three examples: Amino Yoshihiko’s discussion of the concept of muen (no-relation), Higashiyama Makoto’s discussion of the concept of gōko or kōko (rivers and lakes), and the use of concepts such as akichi (wasteland) or sukima (interstices) among activists in the homeless movement in Tokyo today. Common to the alternative interpretations is not only that they reject the elitist or statist connotations inherent in terms like ōyake, but also that they downplay the element of deliberation. Instead, they in various degrees emphasize the bracketing aspect of the public, which tendentiously becomes redefined into a Utopian space for the liberation of things previously denigrated or repressed. I suggest that we see these formulations as ways to illuminate and grope for solutions to a tension inherent in the classical concepts of the public. Instead of merely conveying meaning, they thereby contribute to the creation of meaning.
This paper is a meditation on the concept of the “public” in general and the concept of the “public sphere” in particular. What interests me is the process of translating the “public” into a Japanese context and how this process reflects back on the original concept itself. My argument will proceed as follows. In the first part, I raise the question of what the object of translation might be when we are dealing with a concept as unstable and contested as that of the public. Rather than positing any single or unified concept of the “public”, I will argue that translations should be viewed in relation to a matrix of possible meanings, which I will attempt to reconstruct on the basis of the classical formulations of the public or public sphere as found in influential theorists like Jürgen Habermas and Hannah Arendt. I will then argue that all translations that are located within the conceptual field opened up by this matrix can be regarded as legitimate translations of the “public”. This step will provide me with a criterion for venturing beyond the conventional translations of the “public” involving the character おはけ / こ. In Part Two, I discuss these conventional translations by surveying how the idea of the public has been formulated by Maruyama Masao and further developed in a dialogue with his thought by Tsurumi Shunsuke and Karatani Kōjin. In Part Three I turn to present-day challenges to this dominant current in historians like Amino Yoshihiko and Higashijima Makoto and activists in the homeless movement in Tokyo. Looking beyond the conventional translations will, I argue, reveal a whole undercurrent of alternative terms for the “public” which has often been neglected because of the tendency to focus attention on おはけ / こ. My conclusion will be twofold: firstly, that the concept of the public in Japan is far richer and multifaceted that has usually been acknowledged, and secondly, that paying attention to the “alternative” formulations of the public in Japan will also contribute to throwing light on aspects of the idea of the public in classical thinkers like Habermas and Arendt which have often been overlooked or regarded as of minor or marginal significance.

Classical formulations of the public sphere – rational deliberation and bracketing

The public sphere is a contested concept lacking any stable agreed on or neutral meaning. To present what I will here call the classical notion of the public sphere will not amount to presenting a unified, coherent concept. The concept, I argue, is better grasped as an assemblage of at least two parts that, depending on context, conflict or tend in different directions.

Following Habermas’ conceptualization, many theories of the public sphere stress its function as an arena for deliberation and rational debate. Unlike areas of social life dominated by economic transactions or bureaucratic power, the public sphere is a sphere in which validity is constituted by “people’s public use of their reason” and in which citizens consciously come together for the purpose of political will-formation through debate and the manifestation of arguments, standpoints and claims (Habermas 1989, 1996). Even theorists critical of Habermas have usually followed him in emphasizing the role of debate.

However, a careful reading of theorists such as Habermas or Arendt shows that there are also other qualities that are at least as important to what they mean by a public sphere. The public also involves a sense of distance to or detachment from preoccupations of everyday life, which is made possible through a temporary bracketing of dependencies and inequalities in wealth and status that define our situation in society – a bracketing without which the semblance of equality
and absence of hierarchy would have been impossible. What this implies in concrete interaction is illustrated by Georg Simmel (1964, 1997) in his discussion of the playful sociability in bourgeois salons. As he points out, the pleasurable lightness in these salons is created through a form of abstraction or bracketing of social reality. The interaction is playful and pleasant since participants engage in interaction for its own sake, disregarding the material interests or personal problems that burden it in everyday life, as well as matters concerning status. According to Simmel such interaction has a “democratic” character since all participants, within certain boundaries, behave as if they were equal. [...] Since the semblance of a public in which participants are equal can only come into being through a bracketing of real differences and relations of dependency, Arendt and Richard Sennett argue that the public is by necessity a place for “play-acting” and “theatre”. [...] Hence, the public is not only a realm of free and open communication or debate, but also an arena in which important parts of social life are systematically bracketed in order to create a semblance of equality among participants. This means that the public – against the commonsensical view – must be viewed not only as an arena of debate and communication. It is also constituted by a certain silence, a “bracketing” of topics which would risk dissolving it back into the “real” world if they were mentioned.

Against the inherent elitism of the classical concept of the public, it is only natural that critics have emerged who stress the right to political participation of the masses, the marginalized and the excluded. As Frazer points out, many subordinated social groups – women, gays or lesbians, ethnic minorities and the working class – have opted for a strategy of partial or temporary “exit” from the male-dominated, bourgeois or mainstream public sphere in order to constitute their own “subaltern counter-publics” (Frazer 1992:123). The formation of counter-publics can be seen as the revolt against exclusion by activists and dissidents who bring the excluded aspects of life back into play through verbal contestation, insisting on their right to public visibility.

In order to capture how articulations of public life relate to the two general dimensions of the “public”, we can try to locate them along two axes:

An important point that I will make here will be that both of these dimensions can be understood to indicate “publicness”. Although the position A most fully falls within the “classical” con-
The criticism of ôyake

In Japan the elitist connotations of the concept of the "public" have been strengthened by its association with the character ôyake / kô (公). The tendency to take ôyake or related words for granted as the translation of the "public" has often been accompanied by the diagnosis that Japanese tradition lacks a conception of a "genuinely" open or popular form of public in a Western sense, since ôyake / kô is etymologically linked to officialdom, government, or imperial authority rather than to popular political participation by citizens.¹ [...]

Rivers and lakes, muen, and vacant lots

Today many contesting interpretations eschew not only terms like ôyake or kô – along with their elitist connotations – but also often downplay the element of rational discussion there is so prominent in Habermas, Arendt, Maruyama and Tsurumi. Many of these interpretations take their point of departure in the findings of historians and other researchers who point to monk assemblies, renga-associations or popular federations as indigenous forms of egalitarian pub-
lics (e.g. Matsuoka 2004, Katsumata 1982). The historian Higashijima Makoto’s publications about the historical construction of the public sphere in Japan and the idea of "rivers and lakes" (gôko or kôko, 公) provide a particularly clear example of recent attempts to reformulate the public without relying on the problematic notion of ôyake or kô. He explicitly rejects the idea that ôyake, kô or kôkyô are suitable translations of the “public” or the “public sphere”. Instead he shows that the expression "rivers and lakes", which was popular in the bakumatsu and Meiji eras,

was used much like we would use "public sphere" today. Thus participants in the movement for freedom and popular rights were called “wanderes of rivers and lakes” (gôko hôrôjin), to publish something was called “asking the rivers and lakes” (gôko ni tou), the expression "learned men of rivers and lakes" (gôko shoken 江湖緒賢) corresponded to a Lesepublikum (dokusho kôshû), and several newspapers such as Kôko Shimbun used “rivers and lakes” in their names (Higashijima 2000:259ff, 2002). Higashijima’s conclusion is clear: in order to understand the indigenous concept of the public, we need to abandon the fixation on the term ôyake / kô in favor of gôko. “By paying attention to gôko it will no longer be necessary for us to rely on the established concept of kô in our pursuit of something corresponding to a public in modern Japan. It’s fine if kô means state or emperor, but we must not mislead us into thinking that it means public” (ibid. 2002:69).

The roots of the concept of “rivers and lakes”, however, are very different from the Western “public”. In medieval Japan it was used in the expression, “the scattered people of rivers and lakes” (gôko sanjin), which stood for people not bound by village society, travelling freely and often being despised by the settled people of the community. According to a Japanese-Portuguese dictionary published in Nagasaki in 1603, the Nippo jisho, “scattered people” was a derogatory term for itinerant people lacking a domicile, while “rivers and lakes” connoted despised or humble people of no account, such as travelling artists and entertainers (ibid. 2000:267f, 2002:76).

The expression “rivers and lakes” itself derives from Zen Buddhism and is closely linked to the idea of wandering about without fixed abode or home. Among medieval Zen monks, the wandering among “rivers and lakes” was not despised at all, but an ideal. The “spirit of wandering” (gôko no ki) expressed the freedom of having renounced the world and was seen as a spirit free of parties and cliques, resisting the claustrophobia of closed communities or institutions. Although this ideal had little influence on actual decisions, it did remain a cherished and often expressed ideal and also appears to have been influential in vouchsafing certain spaces in social life where people could associate without concern for status (ibid 305-311). Thus in 1386 we find the monk Gidô Shûshin (1325-1388) rejecting the prestigious office of head priest of the Nanzenji temple in Kyoto, which earlier the same year had been elevated to the top of the hierarchy of Rinzai temples in Japan. He did it by submitting his resignation to the shogun together with the following verse, where wandering among “rivers and lakes” clearly connotes freedom.

To an old man like me, a head priest is like a fish in a small pond.  What bliss to be set free and depart for the rivers and lakes!

「老来にして住院するは小池の魚、江湖に放ち向かわば楽有余」 (quoted in Higashijima 2002:78)

The bliss of “rivers and lakes” also became a popular motif in Zen-inspired painting. To Zen monks, Higashijima writes, landscapes like Sesshû’s “Haboku sansui” (Splashed ink mountains and water, 1495) were an image of freedom, a utopian world” (ibid 78). One popular way of expressing the freedom of "rivers and lakes" was by depicting a fisherman and a fish, as in the

---

2 The word originally refered to the wanderings of Zen monks between Yangtze River and Dongting Lake. It was used particularly in the Sôtô branch of Zen and became institutionalized in the form of “gôkoe” (meetings for religious training) (Higashijima 2000:296f).
enigmatic "Hyōnenzu" (Gourd and catfish, ink painting by Josetsu, probably dating from the early 15th century), which is often interpreted as a picture of a man who tries to catch a fish in a gourd but fails. In the light of Gidô’s rejection of the shôgun’s offer, Higashijima interprets the man as the shôgun and the fish, swimming towards freedom, as the Zen monk (ibid 2000:300-305).

One of the most influential studies of the concept of the public in Japanese history is the historian Amino Yoshihiko’s Muen-Kugai-Raku (first published in 1978). This is the work where he introduces the concept of muen無縁 ("non-relation", the severing of secular bonds), which has since become popular among medievalists, ethnographers, historians of religion and even political activists as a concept related to asylums or sanctuaries in early Japan. Literally it signifies a state of being cut off from all bonds. The term originated as a Buddhist term for freedom from secular ties and was used for temples and other places or even groups of people who were considered beyond the control of secular or human power, usually because they were regarded as sacred. To illustrate the principle of muen, Amino starts with the example of a children’s game called engacha. This is a tag and chase game where you escape the chaser by shouting “en ki-tta!” (I’ve broken off relations). In alternative forms of the game you could escape by touching a tree or entering a circle drawn on the ground, thus creating a sanctuary where you would be safe.

In the following chapters Amino works his way back into history, turning first to the enkiri-dera (temples for cutting off relations) of the Edo period, where women could get protection from their husbands and obtain divorces. He then shows that this was a legacy of a much vaster array of freedoms possessed by temples in medieval times, before their military power and economic independence was crushed by warlords in the 16th century. During medieval times, when the religious prestige of temples was buttressed by military might as well as political clout with the imperial court, some of them would function as sanctuaries, providing asylum not only to the old and sick but also to criminals or people escaping debts, and often possessing rights to refuse entry to secular authorities (funyûken) (Amino 1996:201-212).

Interestingly, in muen Amino sees an early, medieval form of the freedom and equality that we today associate with the public sphere. Through muen, discriminated people or people of low status were able to come together under conditions in which the norms and hierarchies of the surrounding society were no longer in force. [...] The freedom or protection offered by these places varied from case to case. It could be freedom from secular power, from marriage, from taxes and debts, from violence, or freedom of passage. The list of groups or places associated with muen – or the related terms kugai公界 and raku楽 which he claims were similar in meaning – is impressive. Apart from temples, similar qualities were attributed to mountains, riverbanks, the oceans, crossroads, cemeteries, rice storehouses, markets, free cities, the world of art (no and its predecessors, renga, tea, travelling entertainers, dancers and prostitutes), outcast organizations and egalitarian federations (ikki) (ibid 1996:29f, 125ff, 136-9, 145ff, 168ff; 2001:27f, 30ff). In his description of these groups and places it is clear that they were constituent parts of a public where everyone – diviners, mendicant monks, artisans, traders, money-lenders, entertainers,

3 The relation between these three terms is concisely explained in Amino (1996:110-124) and Hanada (2006).
outcasts and bandits – were supposed to be equal and live in peace and impartiality.4

Amino makes clear that this medieval “public” was different from how we think of the public sphere today. The universality or commonality offered by muen was not expressed in terms of general rights. The rights they were endowed with were not for “all citizens” as in modern publics, but local rights. They were bound to places or certain groups. Unlike the Greek agora or Roman forum – the archetypes of official public space in Europe – the public spaces portrayed by Amino belong to the margins and edges, and seem to have been populated above all by people outside the settled community or by people who had temporarily left it. Marginality was also a trait of the places with which muen is associated – the space of mountain roads, the edges of settlements, the border areas between communities, rivers, beaches, crossroads, the space beneath large trees, and so on. As Amino points out, it was usually in marginal spaces like these that “public” events such as markets, religious rites, dancing and performances took place in Japan. The fact that these places were also places of exclusion or at least places for the excluded comes forward with clarity in the fact that some of them (such as brothels and outcast communities, but also the enkiri-dera) had a “prison”-like character: once having entered them to leave them was difficult or required a certain period of time (ibid 1996:6, 26; 2002:192f). Furthermore, we can note that the “freedom” offered by muen was usually obtained by exit or withdrawal from the world of feudal power-relations and private interests, rather than by protest or revolution. It thus depended on rested on the fact that secular power was not yet as all-encompassing as it would be during the Edo period.

One of the reasons that Muen Kugai Raku was considered such a sensation was that he managed to make these medieval ideas of freedom, peace and equality sound relevant to his own age. As Nakazawa Shin’ichi points out, Amino appeared not only to be writing history but also to be creating a new “theory of freedom” that touched on the fundamentals in human nature, even as he was seemingly working with nothing but the tools of empirical historical science (Nakazawa 2004:94). To understand how he connects this idea of muen to contemporary times, we can turn to his earlier work, Môko shûrai (The Mongol Invasions). Although hard to guess for presentday readers this was a politically charged work. In an interview from 2001 Amino states that he had had Zenkyôtô – the most famous of the student bodies that rocked the Japanese campuses in 1968-69 – in mind when he wrote it, in particular the passages about stone-throwing and the use of clubs (Amino 2002:173f; cf also Nakazawa 2004:45-54). As is well known, stones and clubs (geba-bô) were favorite weapons of the radical students in their clashes with the riot police, and the “Shinjuku riots” in 1969 in particular are famous for the havoc they wrought by stone-throwing. Amino’s recognition of an old “primitive” force in the stone-throwing students shows that he by no means views the decay of muen as complete. Instead, we can see that for him muen instead continues to exist as a hidden, subterranean current in history. In his book Amino states that he hopes that the “principle of muen” will be revived (ibid 7). This affinity which he appears to have felt with certain forms of activism in his own time in which he saw an eruption or resurgence of this current helps explain the popularity of his writings among many young activists today.

4 The life of these itinerant “non-agricultural” groups are described at length in works such as: Amino (1990, 1993a, 2005a, 2007a, 2007b).
The issue of space, including the search for alternative space sheltered from the mainstream public, is central to the movement of the homeless people. Ever since around the turn of the millennium authorities in Japan have conducted an increasingly intensive campaign to evict the homeless from parks and riverbanks, often with the excuse of planned international exhibitions or sport events. In response, activists and homeless people have been protesting against discrimination, demanding the right to live in the tent villages without fear for evictions. In homeless activism in Japan, there has usually been a strong emphasis on daily survival in the form of patrols or takidashi (food offered to the homeless) combined with demands to authorities for reforms and welfare. Starting in the mid-90s, however, there have also increasingly been striking elements of “cultural activism”: activists who use drama, dancing, paintings and music to affirm life in the homeless communities. One can also find activists and artists who actively affirm homelessness by settling down in the homeless villages or choosing an ambulant or itinerant lifestyle with no fixed address. [...] 

A fascinating confluence of material and cultural concerns in homeless activism can be seen in the protests staged by support activists, homeless people, artists and other concerned citizens since 2008 against the planned renovation of Miyashita Park – a narrow park extending along the roof of a parking house just north of Shibuya station in Tokyo. Nike Japan bought the naming rights to the park in 2008 with the plan to construct sports facilities in it in cooperation with Shibuya Ward. Renamed Nike Miyashita Park, the new park would charge an entrance fee from visitors and the homeless living there were to be evicted. Rallying against this "Nike-fication" of the park, artists and activists under the name A.I.R. (Artists In Residence) began to protest using means as varied as art, adbusting and “homemade sound demonstrations” (street parties to which participants bring frying pans, metal cans and other things that make a sound). For about half a year – from March 2010, when the ward authorities announced the imminent enclosure of the park, until September 2010, when the park was finally closed – many of the activists managed to turn the park into a commons by squatting there together with the remaining homeless and using it as the arena for a variety of artistic activities. Moving both in and out of the mainstream “public sphere”, they were thus appealing to the public yet also affirming the autonomy of the threatened space. 

Let us look at the articulations of the “public” among the activists and artists. Many critics of the park’s “Nikefication” claim that the plans would transform the park into an “ad for Nike”, into a place for consumers rather than citizen, and that entrance fees and evictions are inconsistent with the idea of “public gardens” (the literal translation of kōen, park). Here are the opening words of a recent manifesto issued by the General Freeter Union in which heavy emphasis is placed on the need to uphold and defend the “public” nature of the park.

Miyashita Park must remain a park. A park is a public space. It must remain a place where anyone can freely enter, meet other people, talk, relax, recuperate and be creative. Allowing people to use it only after charging them with an entrance fee means that it has become dysfunction and that it can no longer be called a park. 

Claims addressing authorities or the general public belong in the public sphere in the classi-
cal sense, the arena where participants enact the role of abstract citizens, focusing on matters of common concern and bracketing circumstances deemed to be only “private”. However, the squatting, the cultural activities, and the calls for “life” here and now do not seem to be oriented solely to such a public.

A clue to an alternative conceptualization of the space in the park is provided by Ogawa Tet-suo, a painter who took the initiative to forming A.I.R. together with Ichimura Misako, another artist with whom he runs a barter café (Enoaru Café) in the tent village of Yoyogi Park where they both live. As Ogawa writes, Shibuya Ward defends its project by claiming that the park is not used today. Ogawa, however, does not invoke the reasonable argument that the park is used today or that its role as a “public garden” will be irreparably damaged by charging fees and evicting homeless. Instead he states that he likes Miyashita Park “since it is more like an empty lot [akichi] than a park”. It is a mistake to see parks or “public spaces” as essentially free and open. The public character of a space is no guarantee that it is open or free from control. It simply means that it is administered by public authorities, a fact which is compatible with strict controls. It is because Miyashita Park has remained an empty lot so long that the homeless have been able to build their huts there, he writes, and adds that “culture and art are born out of empty lots”. He also points out that the character こう/やけ in the word こうえん has strong connotations of state authority and that the very idea of public space (kōkyōchi) is premised on the idea of disembodied interaction that leaves little room for everyday activities of a shared life such as eating and sleeping.

To Ogawa it is important that the “empty lot” is a place for the discriminated. During an interview, he explains that he is drawn to the homeless since they, like the outcasts of Japanese history, have been rejected by society and are forced to live in the “interstices” (sukima). The settlements of the outcasts under premodern periods were often located on riverbanks and waste-lands, just like many of the tent-villages where the homeless live today. Referring to Amino he points out that during the Japanese Middle Ages these places were considered to be muen, places where one left behind one’s status in the surrounding society. Such places, which functioned as a sanctuary for the outcasts and other marginalized groups such as criminals, lepers and beggars, provide a model for what he and his friends are trying to create in Miyashita Park. “Today’s parks often originated in land belonging to temples or shrines, places that were left in peace and were relatively open to everyone”, he says. “They provided a place for the destitute or the discriminated and allowed them to settle down. Historically they functioned as muen”. Asked if he thinks that function survives today, he replies: “We try to recreate it in our activities”.

6 To him and his friends, then, the idea of a “park” is an object of competing forces. Against the administrative view that parks belong to the "public" (kō) – a view strongly resonating with the idea that they are gits from above – they try to reconnect the parks to their other and largely forgotten origin as places open to those in need, places more akin to riverbanks and mountain slopes than “gardens”.

In the course of A.I.R.’s occupation of the park, it became more and more evident that the ac-
tivists and artists were using it not only as the locus of protest activities directed to the authorities, but also to express an alternative life of life. As one of the participants explains it is a matter of “prefigurative” politics, i.e. of creating here and now the ideal society or the ideal life one wants to lead together. One builds new colorful benches and tables instead of those removed by the authorities. One tries to use the park and in that way show how a free and open park where everyone is welcome can be. Among the art objects on display along the fence was a large piece of cloth on which one had painted an “ideal image of the park”. On it is a big verdant park where people sleep under the trees and relax. Next to them are big houses with free rent. On a bridge one sees a father bringing his son to the park: “Come, let’s go to the park. It’s so free!”.

Words like empty lots or interstices resonante with what various theorists of urban space have referred to as dead zones, terrain vagues, no-man’s-land, loose space, urban voids, ruins, shadowed spaces or wasteland [...]. The intriguing opposition between public space and such spaces appears born out of a discontent with the elitism and exclusionary nature of the mainstream public sphere. To activists today, the mainstream social order is often viewed as unresponsive to protests. The fact that it is shot through by power relations regulating participation and systematically disadvantaging many groups is widely recognized. The “empty lot”, by contrast, is not exclusive. Rather, it is what receives you when you are excluded. Furthermore, since it does not require a bracketing of things unworthy of public display, it allows for experiments in alternative forms of survival (scavenging, squatting, community gardening, black markets and barter) as well as various expressions of life that are subject to mainstream disapproval. Asked what they meant by “empty lot”, other activists replied by reminding me of Doraemon, a popular anime in which the children usually gather on a vacant lot in the neighborhood to play. Speaking about Miyashita Park, Kurita Ryôko – a feminist activist in the precarity movement – explains that, “I can’t help believing that for every ‘empty lot’ that is destroyed, one more person will fall into mental illness” (quoted in Amamiya 2010:218). That the idea of empty lot is held in high regard is beyond doubt. On one of my visits in the park, I saw a cardboard sign saying “I love empty lots!” (akichi daisuki!).

Conclusion

Looking at the recent reformulations of the idea of the public among historians such as Amino and Higashijima or the activists of Miyashita Park, we can discern the following common traits.

One conspicuous trait is the attempt by professional historians as well as by the young park activists to present the public as not only a Western import, but also as rooted in premodern ideas such as gôko, muen or kugai – many of which are religiously colored. [...]

Another significant trait is that none of the reformulations rely on the character ôyake / kô. Higashijima is most explicit in rejecting translations of the “public” that involve this character, but a similar tendency is evident in Amino. A public reconceptualized as muen is a far cry from ôyake. Even though the word kugai contains the character ôyake / kô, Amino is careful to point out that the term stands for a conception of the public different from that associated with ôyake or official state power, even writing explicitly that “it never signified official power (kôkenryoku)” and that it represented “the germ of a popular ‘public’ that sprouted from the midst of Japanese
society” and in which “there was not even the shadow of the emperor” (Amino 1996:210, 288; cf. 2001:69). Activists in Miyashita Park too prefer resorting to terms such as “empty lots”, “interstices” or muen, rather than to rely on more conventional ideas about “public space”. They all argue for the existence, in Japanese history of a once vigorous idea of public life that has tended to be neglected or forgotten because of the excessive focus on ōyakē or kō. They thus differ starkly from the tradition of critical intellectuals who has argued – usually by reference to the authoritarian connotations of the term ōyakē or kō – that Japan lacks an idea of a true public.

Thirdly, not only do they resort to a new terminology to express their idea of the public, the content of this idea has also shifted. While they maintain the element of openness, they tend to redefine it. The ideals of “rivers and lakes” as well as muen appear wedded to an ideal of nomadic wandering rather than the idea of a citizenry assuming joint responsibility for the governing of a city or state. There is a “nomadic” quality to this openness, an affinity with anarchism in the portrayal of the public as space free from social determinations or what Deleuze & Guattari would call a “smooth space” [...]. Higashijima explicitly uses the term “nomad” [...] (Higashijima 2002, 2000:299). Amino too stresses the nomadic quality of public life, describing the public of muen as a realm of “non-agriculturalist” itinerants living outside the realm of settled, sedentary life, and linking his idea of muen to a relation of “non-possession” of the land which he, using Deleuze & Guattari’s term, describes as a “smooth space” (Amino 1996:331). The Miyashita Park activists too have frequently expressed their preference for an ambulent life, exploring forms of actively chosen homelessness, or what they call an isôrô (living with others) lifestyle – a life in which they circulate between places or homes in which to live, hitchhike or squat.

Connected to this is a forth trait, namely the fact that these formulations of the public is closely wedded to marginality and marginal populations. [...] 

Fiftly, concepts such as gôko and muen appear to downplay the element of rational debate in public life. Thus, the ideal of “rivers and lakes” contains very few connotations of rational discussion in its medieval usage. [...] The idea of muen too has a clear affinity to “bracketing” and to withdrawing from the major arenas of mainstream society. This, certainly, is a major difference compared to the classical idea of the public in thinkers like Arendt and Habermas. Freedom is conceptualized as liberation from worldly power, rather than as participation in it. [...] By shifting the idea of the public from ōyakē or kō to “rivers and lakes”, muen or “empty lots”, these thinkers and activists were simultaneously redefining the public, shifting emphasis from its deliberative to its bracketing aspects.

However, this element of bracketing is not identical to how it is formulated by classical theorists like Arendt or Habermas. To them, bracketing is above all a kind of prerequisite or means to create an arena for discussion and common decision making in which all participants would be able to participate on an equal footing. In the formulations of Higashijima, Amino or the park activists, by contrast, the liberation from the ties, roles and identities of everyday social life is much

7 For the use of terms like kôgi (公議), kôron公論 or kôsen公選 in Zen temples, which were associated with procedures for rational debate, the ideal of a universal law transcending power relations and rational procedures for electing head priest, cf. Higashijima (2000:306; 2002:68, 80f) and the detailed descriptions of such debates in Katsumata (1982).
more of a goal in itself, something to be valued for its own sake – as a kind of resetting of social norms and human relations giving a foretaste of utopian freedom transcending that of secular society, a degree zero from which everything must start anew and a new and better world can be born. [...] Bracketing is radicalized in the sense that what is bracketed is not so much the blemishes of one’s body or one’s biography so much as the yardsticks of the surrounding society. In such a world, make-belief is no longer even meaningful, since “private” blemishes such as poverty or failures in life are freed from their stigma and thus salvaged.

A final common denominator is that none of these spaces – “rivers and lakes”, muen or “empty lots” – are necessarily quietist places of withdrawal. Despite not being explicitly wedded to political participation, they are all portrayed as potential breeding grounds of political activism. [...] 

As I have already argued, these formulations must be considered legitimate translations or renderings of the idea of the public in Japan. The basic idea of an arena independent of and even transcending local power constellations and the “state” is there. It is linked to conceptions of equality and freedom, although these conceptions are different from those of the modern democratic West. The translations are legitimate, not only because they are developed out of a explicit dialogue with more conventional ones, but also because they are situated within what I have called the “matrix” of this concept.

[...] These developments reveal something about the “original” concept of the public in the West too, the concept that supposedly was to be translated. It was ambiguous from the beginning, including elements and potentialities that only co-existed uneasily in it. Already in the classic formulations, the public sphere is defined by a stubborn ambiguity, which is so pervasive that it can almost be described as a constant. On the one hand it is repressive and prone to exclusion; on the other hand it contains a promise of or potentiality of freedom. The striving for freedom can therefore take the form either of reinvigorating this potentiality of or striving for new alternative publics.

This ambiguity explains why people are still attracted to and call out for a public – whether a resurrected classical one, an “alternative public” or a “empty lot”. Yet we miss this ambiguity if we direct attention solely to the conspicuous or official self-image of the public as constituted by rational and open communication among concerned citizens. I have instead tried to delineate a more submerged quality, glimpsed in various authors and involving play, bracketing, materiality and ability to act back. Despite the fact that these “marginal” or “underground” interpretations often refer to Japanese history, I argue that they have less to do with traditionalism than with disillusionment with the classical, elitist idea of the public. Rather than criticizing them for being one-sided or distorted, I suggest that we see them as ways to grope for a solution to a tension inherent in the classical concept.
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Abstract
「満洲国」では、文学翻訳が盛んに行われていた。そのうち中国語から日本語への翻訳において大内隆雄がいちばん活躍していた。東亜同文書院から卒業した大内は、1920年代から陶晶孫などの小説を翻訳して中国文学を紹介していたが、30年代後半から精力的に満洲にいる中国人作家の作品を翻訳するようになった。大内訳単行本「満人作家短編集」『原野』『蒲公英』、古丁著『平沙』が日本国内で出版され、満洲文学が日本文壇に注目されるようになった。「満洲国」では、翻訳は「民族協和」という建前と『藝文指導要綱』に沿ったものであるが、その国語政策に対抗した一面もある。また、個々の翻訳者を具体的に検証してみるとそれぞれの目的と動機がある。満鉄時代左翼嫌疑で検挙されたことがあり、「満人」作家の良き理解者とされる大内隆雄は、「満洲国」の翻訳に対する考え方方が古丁らのと共通した部分があるが、目的などには相違が見える。本研究は、日本人翻訳者大内隆雄の訳を、「満人」古丁のそれと対照しながら考察し、実質上日本の植民地である「満洲国」で複雑に絡んでいた日中文化人の関係をさぐる。
はじめに

日本統治下の中国東北地方つまり「満洲国」（1932-1945）では、文学翻訳が主に日本語やロシア語から漢語へ、漢語、ロシア語から日本語への翻訳である。翻訳されたものが何処で出版されても、一つの国の中に生活している民族の言葉からもう一つの民族の言葉へという事実は変わらない。そのため、文学翻訳に民族間の問題、国語政策、そして、文化建設の問題が絡んでいる。特に国を治めている日本民族と人口が圧倒的に多い漢民族間の言語の翻訳はもっと複雑になる。要するに、「満洲国」では国策としての建前と各民族の実生活の中での考え方の本音との間に大きな差がある。ところが、これまで翻訳の角度から話題を上げる研究がまだ見当たらない。

大内隆雄、本名山口慎一は、1907年4月福岡県柳河町に生まれ、1921年満洲を訪れる。1925年3月長春商業学校を卒業して、1925年4月から1929年3月まで上海東亜同文书院商務科で在学する。1929年満鉄本社に入社する。1932年に雑誌『満洲評論』の編集長となり、同年末左翼嫌疑をかけられ、検挙される。1933年満鉄を退社して東京へ帰る。1935年新京実業新聞社に勤務するようになり、1939年6月芸文志事務会の参与となる。1940年新京日日新聞社発行部長となり、1941年満洲映画協会娯民映画部文芸部長となる。1944年満洲芸術家協会委員、大同劇団文芸部長、満洲雑誌編集長、満洲国編訳館責任者となる。1946年柳川に引き揚げて、1980年逝去。「満洲国」での著書に『東亜新文化の構想』（新京満洲公論社、1944）、『満洲文学二十年』（国民画報社、1944）、『文藝談叢』（中国語、芸文書房、1943）。

古丁は本名徐長吆、1914年長春県に生まれ、満鉄の公学、中学堂を経て、1932年北京大学に入学する。1933年中国左翼作家連盟北京部に入り組織部長となるが、間もなく逮捕され、長春に戻る。「満洲国」で国務院統計部に勤めながら文学活動を行い、雑誌『光明』、『芸文志』（芸文志事務会）の創刊に携わる。1941年10月公職を辞して、本屋兹出版社の株式会社芸文書房の社長となる。1957年右派とされ、1964年獄死する。1979年名誉回復される。著書に小説集『奮飛』（1938）、『竹林』（1942）、長編『平沙』（1939）、『新生』（1944）、エッセイ集『一知半解集』（1938）、『譚』（1942）。翻訳作品に夏目漱石著『心』（1939）、石川啄木著『悲しき玩具』（1937）、歩者小路実篤著『井原西鶴』（1940）、そして、大川周明著『米英東亜侵略史』（1942）などある。

大内と古丁は同じ年に左翼問題で検挙され、二人とも文学創作、翻訳を執筆する。また、大内は上海、古丁は北京、二人とも満洲以外の中国で生活したことがある。また、大内は郭沫若など中国作家と交流があり、中国文学に終始強い関心を持っている。似た経歴、近い思想的立場と文学愛好が言語障害のない二人の間に共通した話題を増やし、交流を深めたと考えられる。ただ、大内は日本人で支配民族に入り、古丁は「満人」で被支配民族に属する。

1大内の「満人」文学の翻訳及びその影響

1933年までに大内隆雄はその編集長を勤めた『満洲評論』で多くの中国関係の文章を発表していた。その中、「満洲問題に関する中国側言論の検討」（2巻 3号、1932）、「上海罷市と支那紙」（2巻 8号、1932）、「満洲国政府と社会政策」（2巻 14号、1932）、「満洲評判三年計画」（2巻 16号、1932）などは、満洲事変に対する中国側の反応、中国の労働者運動と共産党の動きについて、「満洲国政府と社会政策」（2巻 16号、1932）、「満洲協和党について」（2巻 19号、1932）などは、新しく作られた「満洲国」に、そして、「
上海で『吼えろう支那』上演」（2巻 2号、1932）、「欧陽予倩氏活動」（2巻 3号、1932）、「改良主義者胡適」（3巻 21号、1932）などは中国の文化界に関心を示している。『満洲評論』のほかに、大内が日本国内で発行された雑誌『改造』（「新しい蒙古の登場」、14巻 10号、1932）、「東洋」（「支那の人権保障問題と新文化運動」、33巻 8号、1930）、「国際知識」（「中国国民党と単洋華僑」、10巻 1号、1929）、「東亜」（「中国共産党分裂史」、6巻 5号、1933）などにも寄稿して活躍していた。また、雑誌『書香』に「郁達夫と本ー在支読書人雑稿」（10号、1930）、「田漢の書斎ー在支読書人雑稿 2ー」（11号、1930）、「中国のプロ小説選集」（25号、1931）、「中国文学雑記」（26号、1931）、「郁達夫の『迷羊』に就いて」（22号、1931）、「郭沫若氏と語る」（17号、1930）、「郭沫若「創造十年」」（46号、1933）などを発表して、中国文学へ関心を示している。この時期に翻訳した文学作品に陶晶孫著「音楽会小曲」（『読書会雑誌』、14巻 3号、1927）が見られる。

1937年総合雑誌『明明』の創刊の伴い、満洲の中国人文学の成長が著しくなる。このあたりから大内は「満人」（「満洲国」に在住する中国人）文学を精力的に翻訳するようになる。その作品は最初は満洲で発行された日本語雑誌や新聞に投稿していたが、後「満人作家小説集」『原野』（三和書房、1939）、『満人作家小説集』『蒲公英』（三和書房、1940）、古丁著長編小説『平沙』（中央公論社、1940）なども発表して、中国文学への関心を示している。ここでは、先ず大内の翻訳したテキストを検証し、その翻訳の大体の特徴をさぐる。

1.1 翻訳の特徴

大内は職業的な翻訳家ではないし、同じ時期にいくつかの新聞や雑誌に違う小説を翻訳、連載したりするので、時間をかけてじっくり翻訳を吟味することがほぼ不可能である。また、その目的は主に紹介にあるようなので、「満人」作家がどれほどいいものを書いたかを見せるのではなく、どのような内容のものが書かれたかを日本人に知ってもらうためである。そのためなのか、その翻訳は細部に拘ることがなくかなり荒っぽいものが多い。また、原作の中に現れた国策に適いない政治関係のものを処理したところもある。例えば、反満抗日と思われるところを隠したりしている。

1.1.1 荒訳

以下の例の出自は、日本語が古丁著大内隆雄訳「原野」（三和書房、1939）、中国語が漢語文芸誌『明明』（第3巻第1期、1938）である。

①吃一鍋拉一炕也是白扯白 P6
一鍋食ひ一瓶飲んでも駄目なのは駄目だ… P7

②又是 亻 麻「我活是你錢家的人死是你錢家的鬼」啦， P10それから又私の生きてる間は錢家の入間だし死んだら錢家の人間でために鈴家の幽霊になってやるとか P21

③經邦也在那分明沒有洋火的洋服口袋裏兎兎裏左翻右摸掏出來一根黑頭洋火，卻沒法劃着，只是在桌見上頓了頓煙卷，刁在嘴上。P10經邦もはつきり燐寸がないと判つてゐる洋服のポケットをあれこれひつく裏返したが出ては来ず、仕断無しに、煙草を卓に置き、口を歪めた。P21

④話說錢科長在仰在紅漆的太師椅上，嘴裏嚼着檳榔，一勁格格地打飽呃，卻沒忘了鋤豬毛
似地一下一下拽那鼻頭下的日本髭。 P7
さて鉈科長は紅い漆を塗つた文人椅子の上に仰向きになつて、口に檳榔を嚼みながら、鼻下の日本式の髭を撫でつけてゐた。 P9
これらの例をみると、大内のミスは、漢語の文章、文法、俗語や方言、民間の常識、習慣などにわたり、理由のない省略も見られる。どの翻訳にもミスがあるはずだが、大内の問題がそれが随所にみられることにある。それは当時古丁に指摘された理由かもしれない。

1.1.2伏字を使う
鉄道が満洲大地の宝物を持って行き、「親善」「共栄」等持ってくるほとは、日本帝国の満洲に対する侵略をほのめかしていて、反満抗日の傾向があると思われる。この段は、大内の翻訳の中に消えていて、そのもともとの位置に「……」で埋まっている。これはつまり伏字である。戦後作者の山丁がこのことで大内に感謝しているという。

1.2宣伝効果
単行本のほかに、大内訳「満人」文学作品が、日本国内の総合誌や文学誌に載せるようになった。『中央公論』、『婦人王論』、『大陸』、『文学界』、『文学者』、『文藝』、『三田文学』などには、「満人」文学家との座談会や「満洲文学特集」が組まれ、日本文壇に知られた山丁をはじめとする「満人」作家が日本雑誌へ寄稿するようになる。なお、訪日する「満人」作家は、日本で熱烈な歓迎を受けた。また、日本の反応が、満洲にいる日本人文学関係者にとっては励ましとなる。

1.2.1日本文壇での反響大内は、「さきに刊行した満人作家小説集「原野」がひろく非常な関心をもって読まれたことは、その翻訳に当つた私として大へん喜ばしいことであった」と述べている。

また、浅見淵がその『満洲文化記』の中で、そもそも満洲文学の存在を知らなかった日本文壇が大陸文学や民族問題に関心を持つため、「満人」文学に注目した、とその原因を分析している。そして、その関心が訪日に来た山丁に対する熱烈歓迎であらわれた。

正直にいふと、内地の文壇では、「原野」の上梓によって満洲文学の存在を知るまで、満洲に確たる文学が生まれてゐるなどといふことはほとんど風馬牛だつた。（略）それが「原野」の紹介が契機になり、一ぱう、続出する内地作家の誤はゆる大陸小説が薄手で詰まらぬことも手傳つて、単に満人文学者のみならず、ひろく満洲文学全般に対して内

1 大内隆雄の翻訳をどう思ふかと、僕は質問した。古丁はちょっと困つたやうな表情をしたが、一つの文章をいくつにも短く切つて譯してゐるのが気になつたこと、各作家の文章の持ち味が生かされないで、どの作家の文章も同じになることが缺點だと答へた。「しかし、誰の翻訳を見ても、難しいところよりも、一ぱう、綴出する内地作家の誤はゆる大陸小説が薄手で詰まらぬことも手傳つて、単に満人文学者のみならず、ひろく満洲文学全般に対して内

2 山丁「緑色の谷」（51）『大同報』1942.7.2、単行本P166）、筆者の日本語訳：（それは怪獣のように吼えてこの世界を目覚めさせる。誰でも知っているように、この世界を繁栄させる血管は、この年に喜びを増し、年に若くなる汽車だ。それはここから土地から収穫された成果、と掘り出された宝物を千万トン持ってゆき、帰りに「親善」、「合作」「共栄」「携手」を運んでくる。）

3 大内隆雄訳満人作家小説集『蒲公英・譯者後記』、三和書房、1940、P361-362
地の文壇人の関心が急に昂まって来たのだ。4

この「原野」に収められた満人作家たちの諸作品は、古丁氏の作品を始めとして、内地の文学作品とは伝統やジャンルを全く異にした、いはば中国文学の血を引いた大陸文学のロマンであり、それが物珍しかったので注目を惹いたのだ。5

一方時代がちやうど民族の問題について深い関心を拂つてゐた時だつたので、(略)

その人気のほどは、まもなく古丁氏が東京に現れた時、文壇を挙げて歓迎されたのを見ても窺われるのである。6

1.2.2ちやほやされた「満人」作家

1940年2月5日、日本の「紀元2600年を迎へて躍進を遂げつつある光輝日本の文化的諸施策につき満系文学者をして深く認識せしめようと」7「満洲国」国務院弘報処が、「官吏にして文話に所属する文学者」古丁、外文を木崎龍の引率で日本に派遣し、一か月くらいの訪問を行った。これについて、別の用で同行した山田清三郎がその『満洲文化建設論』の中で以下のように書いてゐる。

然るに、一行が一段東京に足を踏み入れるや、文壇各階面では聞き傳へて熱烈な歓迎を惜しまず、連日連夜交談の催しが絶えなかったのである。たとへば、中央公論社では正宗白鳥、徳田秋声、横光利一氏と古丁、外文両氏との交談の宴を催し、文藝家協議では多数の貴賓が集まって茶話を開いて随意なき懇談を始めへ、その他鎌倉ペンクラブでは久米正雄、川端康成、大佛次郎、島木健作、林房雄諸氏を始め多数鎌倉在住の作家が両氏を招いて鎌倉を案内し、岡田三郎氏等の雑誌「文學者」では多数の会員が集まって茶話を開いて隔意なき懇談を始めへ、その他鎌倉ペンクラブでは久米正雄、川端康成、大佛次郎、島木健作、林房雄諸氏を始め多数鎌倉在住の作家が両氏を招いて鎌倉を案内し、岡田三郎氏等の雑誌「文學者」では座談会を開くなど、両作家をして應接にいとまなからしめたのであるが、この事は初見の満人作家に対する多少の興味からも来てゐたであろう。8

「初見」の「満人」作家が珍しがられていたのであろう。訪日中、古丁は『満洲文話會通信』に「日本便り」を寄せていた。それを参照したら、築地小劇場で秋田鰻雀、別の座談会では阿部知二、尾崎士郎などにも会ったとわかる。また、『東京新聞』、『文学者』、『大陸』、『都新聞』などが古丁に原稿を頼んだ。なお、大内訳古丁著『平沙』が雑誌『大陸』に連載する予定だったが、山田清三郎の斡旋で、中央公論社から単行本として刊行するようになった。しかし、「日本便り」の中で鎌倉会見について古丁は以下のように思いを述べている。

作家が洋式あるのびやくつくりをする。老若大小、肥痩黒白、随分ゐる。だが、私は顔を
見ただけ(みなあまり綺麗ぢやない、我々人相の悪いのもさして違はぬ)、先斎の胸の中
を聞く時間が無い。大失敗だ。幸田露伴、島崎藤村は私のひたい人物だが、尋ねる時間
がないと思う。(略)世界に文人以上に言ひたいことを言ふ人種はゐまい。私は突如とし
て煩くなる。あゝ、文人! 9

この文章を読んで、言い放題して、人相の悪い一群れの作家像が浮かんでくる。この皮
肉った口調からすれば、鎌倉の作家たちが古丁にかなり悪い印象を残したようだ。実は、中
央公論社主催の座談会の計画には藤村、実篤、幸田、志賀、里見の出席が予定されたが、当
日は何れも顔を出さなかった。古丁は会いたい人に会えなかったが、会った人に「胸の中」
を聞く時間が少し。日本文学から栄養を摂取しようとする古丁らは、日本文壇にあこがれる
が、戦時下のジャーナリスティックな一面を嫌っていた。また、日本作家の本音を聞きたい

4 浅見潤『満洲文化記』、国民画報社、1943、P212。
5 同上、P238。
6 同上、P239。
7 「満系文学者を日本へ派遣」『満洲文話會通信』、第30号、1940.2.15、P13。
8 山田清三郎『満洲文化建設論』、芸文書房、1943年、P178。
9 古丁「日本便り」『満洲文話會通信』、第31号、1940.3.15、P5。
ということから、古丁は戦時下日本文壇の状況をかなり分かっていて、その中から同志を見つけるとする気持ちもあるように感じられる。実際、これを機会に、山田清三郎の斡旋で、古丁はこっそりと左翼作家に会ったことがあるという。

帰国した古丁らはまた「満洲国」で熱烈歓迎された。大連を経由する時歓迎座談会が開催されて、文話会新京支部の3月例会が「訪日作家感想座談会」にされた。その後、「訪日感想」が新京放送局でラジオ放送を行った。

「満洲国」はこの訪日をイベントのように行い、「満洲国」十年足らずの建設成果を日本と「満洲国」内で見事に宣伝したとみられる。これこそ国務院が古丁らを派遣する本当の意图かもしれませんが。この訪問を契機に、古丁も確かに日本文壇への認知を深めてきたようである。だが、同年10月に古丁はペストの流行で一カ月近く健康隔離されるようになる。

大内訳「満人短編小説集」が日本で刊行された以来、多くの満洲作家小説集が刊行されるようになる。山田清三郎が『日満露在満作家短編選集』（春陽堂、1940年）の「序」に以下のように書いている。

満洲に住む各民族作家は、総じてまだ年も若く、文学もせつかく成長の途上にあるといふべきであろう。またこの集は、第一次計画であつて、二次三次と更に継続して行きたと思つてゐる。願くば、日満支にわたつて、大斬の支持者を得んことを切願するものである。

結局、山田の計画は第一次計画にとどまったようだが、当時、彼等は継続していく夢を持っていた。その夢を膨らませたことは、大内の翻訳紹介をきっかけに満洲文学が日本文壇で認可されたことも役を買ったであろう。

2翻訳の呼びかけ及び国立編訳館設立への尽力
大内隆雄は漢語から日本語への翻訳を行っていたが、彼は古丁らと一緒に漢語への翻訳を呼び掛けている。彼は「大陸生活者の反省―橘先生の論稿に寄せてー」と言う文章の中で、15歳の時朝鮮を経由して満洲に渡り、「この大陸に住む人々の友でありたいといふ気持に燃えてゐのである。それはまさに幼いロマンチシズムであつたらう。その頃日本に流行つた人道主義的なものの影響を受けたものでもあつたらう」と述懐している。そして、「友となるためには相手を知らなくてはならない、相手を理解しなくてはならない」と言う。これは大内の大陸に対する態度の出発点を表したと言えられる。人道主義の立場から、大内は大陸に生きる人々を尊重し、彼等を理解しようとする。「満人」文学の翻訳もそれに基づいた仕事と思われる。

2.1満系文学の紹介と満系青年の声の伝達
古丁及び彼をリーダとする芸文志派が、自ら創作しながら翻訳を行っていて、満洲への翻訳仕事の中で一番活躍している。夏目漱石著『心』は中国語訳の最初の単行本で、石川啄木著「悲しき玩具」は中国語の最初の完訳である。彼らは翻訳に取り組む動機を、公に言えぬのは満洲文学の発展を図るためであるが、ほかに「満洲国」政策に対抗して公に言えない思
いもある。古丁は早くから多くの人が翻訳を呼び掛けたが、その訴え文句は、最初は伝統のない満洲文学の発展のためとしていたが、1941年3月以後『藝文指導用綱』の中の言葉を借りて「世界文芸の精化」と取り入れるためとする。対米英戦争が始まるとから東亜文化建設の議論が盛んになり、彼等はそれに乗って、満洲文化建設、「満人」民衆の文化レベルの向上などを訴えるようになる。何れも「満洲国」の文化政策に沿ったものである。

大内は満系の文学の動向を見守り、彼等の新しい文学成果を紹介する。『満洲評論』や他の日本語雑誌に「満洲文芸時評」や「最近の満人文学」のようなものを寄稿し、新しく発表された作品などの情報を提供する。また、「満人」作家の思想動向などを表すエッセイも翻訳紹介する。その中に、「1945年大内が満洲芸文聯盟漢語機関誌『藝文志』第8号に載せた田<count>「満洲文学の誕生」（満洲文芸の誕生）の一文を翻訳して、「満系は翻訳を求めていている」というタイトルで『満洲評論』ザ28巻第3号に発表した。この文章の中で、大内はまず満系の書店の店頭が「甚だ貧寒である」、「官庁や著書の出版審査は満系のための本を持っていない」、また、為替などの問題で中華民国からの本の輸入も困難である、という原因で満系知識青年に読める本がない現実を述べる。「ところで、筆者はこのほど一満系青年によつて書かれた一論稿を読んだ。それは多く文学の問題を扱ったものであるが、そのなかに、外から文化を取り入れることについて熱烈に主張してある部分がある。自らの文化を創造せんがためにそれを論者は真摯に説いてあるのである」と大内は理解を示している。

1940年4月に、日系は大内を、満系は古丁を中心に、30名の翻訳者が集まり、満洲翻訳家協会が結成した。大内は翻訳家協会の責任者として満系の翻訳関係の単行本に序を執筆している。

世界芸文の精化を紹介するのは、我々芸文創造を充実させるために欠かせない重大な任務だ。これについては、先日発表された芸文綱の中にも明示されている。そこで、このような訳稿の刊行は、娯楽や慰安の供給以上遥かに重大な意味を持つ、この点は私が特別に説明しておきたい。

我々は大東亜の新しい文学を建設している。大東亜の新しい文学創造がすでに始まった。この時、我々は大東亜各民族の文学を研究し、理解する必要がある。まず理解してから、そのうえで協力することが出来る。そのため、満文訳『牝虎』の出版がめでたいことだ。（略）これも民族協和の表れだ。

以上の引用前者は1941年に刊行された翻訳アンソロジー『譯叢』の「序」で、発布された間もない『芸文指導用綱』に則って本の価値を認めたものである。後者は対米英戦争が始まつてから1943年に出版された満洲在住ロシア人作家パイコフ著『牝虎』の中国語訳
の「序」で、大東亜新文学の創造と民族協和を持ち出している。大内が翻訳をその時の文化政策につなげて訴える手法は古丁らと共通している。被支配民族古丁らにとっては、大内隆雄は少数理解者の一人であろう。

満系の望を日本人に伝えるほかに、大内は自ら文章を書いて正面から翻訳の必要性を訴えている。例えば、「満洲文化の諸問題について」という文章の中で、明治日本に対照しながら、文化後進の「満洲国」が文化先進国を追いつく斬法として、文化の摂取、つまり翻訳が重要だと言い、それを政府にやってほしいと提言している。

優れた外国のものを摂取、また世界の古典にまなること、そのためには何としても立派な翻訳書や解説書を拠点に発刊して、国の隅々まで行き渡らせることが必要なのであります。しかし実状はまだそこまでてまっていないのであります。これには宜しく当局などに於いては慮さるべきことだと

2.2 国立編譯館の設立へのかかわり

当局にやってほしくは国立編譯館のことで、古丁は前から力を入れて呼び掛けていたものである。1939年12月古丁が『文藝春秋』第17巻第24号に「満洲文学雑記」という文章を寄稿した。その中で先ず満洲現段階の文学を限定版文学と規定し、限定版を普及版にするために、「文学に限らず、文化全般に亘って斯る大出版をやろうと思うと意気込んでおりは全く喜ばしい。しかし、これは実に民間営利事業とせずに、国家的業として、編譯館の知きものを置いて、之に当らせるのが一番望ましい」と、満洲文学の発展のために国立編譯館の設立を希望する。また、1940年4月、『文学界』第7巻第4号に寄稿した「満洲文学通信」の中で、「仏典の翻訳が曾て支那文学に寄与したように、翻訳文学も満洲文学に寄与し得るであろう。（略）機會ある毎に満洲国に於て国立翻譯館の如きものを置いて、一大国家の事業として日本他外国の文化を紹介する事に就て愚見を述べて居つたが、そのこともこういう意味で言ったのであり」と、国立編譯館の設立は理解を求め続けていた。ちょうど満洲文学が日本で注目されはじめたのである。

また、1943年8月第2回大東亜文学者大会の分科会で、古丁は、「国家的常置機関たるべき『大東亜翻譯館』を大東亜中心たる東京に設置され、その分館を新京、单京、北京に設置し大東亜文学ないし文化の伝ひをたらしめんことが望ましいのであります。これを可及的速かに実現せられることを切望して居て止まらない次第であります」21と大東亜文学ないし文化交流のために編譯館の設立を提言し、その実現を願う切迫した心情を表している。この提言は採択され、大東亜編譯館の創設（翻訳委員会の設置）は第2回大東亜文学者大会の議決事項として実践的な解決を約束された。

同じ1943年8月、満洲新聞紙上で満洲の国立編譯館の設立問題が提案され、藤山中央博物館長、寺田編審官、新井出版協会理事長及び作家古丁など文化人が各自の意見を述べている。それを読んで作家爵青が同年10月号『青年文化』で以下のように述べている。

それぞれの意見を見れば、全員が国家によって編譯館の設立が至急の要務で、満洲文
化を啓発する近道の一つだと認め、この提案を推進する熱意を表した。その中、寺田編審官が、さらに政府側の立場から、年内必ず設立と予算案を作成し、当局に提出すると表明した。（略）

編訳館の提案は重い構想であり、一時的な興味に流されず、政府当局に慎重に検討してその実現を促すよう願う。文化事業に関するならば、我々が朝野が今まで先に提唱したのが後に実行しない、という十年来のすずしこの欠点が誰の目にも見えていている。ただ、編訳館の問題だけは、いきもののように何も音立たずにそのまま終わってしまうのはめにならないよう願っている。23

年内設立要綱と予算案を政府に出すとまで運んできたが、実行するかどうか爵青は当局に自信を持っていないようである。

翌年 3月に発行された満洲芸文聯盟機関誌『藝文志』第 5期に「翻訳特輯」が組まれ、翻訳の必要性が主張され続けている。大内隆雄は「翻訳論の前に」（編訳館創設）という文章を寄せた。同年 9月発行された『新満洲』に「満洲編譯館之設立」（满洲編譯館的創立）特輯が組まれ、そこから結局国立編譯館が見送られ、その代わりに簡素な民間機構として満洲編譯館が創設されたと知らせる。おそらく寺田編審官の設立要綱と予案案が当局に通らなかったのであろう。

満洲編譯館は一体どのような組織であるかはっきりしないが、大内がその「満洲編譯館の創立について」（關於滿洲編譯館之創立）の中で、編譯館は同年 5月1日から満鉄など企業のオーダーも含めて様々な翻訳事業をやり始めたと言っている。だったら、大企業の委託を受けてビジネスを行う普通の民間会社のようなものと考えられる。

同じ文章の中で、大内は「我々は現段階の満洲国では、民間団体の編譯館の創設が求められていると主張」するが、今まで「国立」を呼びかけてきたが、なぜ今「民間団体」に変わったのか、政府とのやり取りがうまく行かなかったから（特に戦時下予算が難しいだろう）そう言わざるをえないのか。

万葉集を翻訳した張文華が、その文章「編譯館的創設與構想」（關於滿洲編譯館之創設與構想）の中で、国立として文教部に置くと満洲文化協会のような機関を新しく設立するという二つの案を挙げながら、

この二つの方法はどちらでもいいが、ところが、戦時下のためなのか、今の官庁は積極性を欠いている。それに官制の制限等々、恐らくいい効果が収まらないだろう。24

と言う。官庁に積極性がないことと官制の制限が国立で編譯館の設立出来なかった原因だと示している。

3「満洲国」における翻訳の位置づけ

23 張文華「翻譯論の前に」『新満洲』、同上、P28-29。原文:「滿洲編譯館之創設與構想」（關於滿洲編譯館之創設與構想）の中で、国立として文教部に置くと満洲文化協会のような機関を新しく設立するという二つの案を挙げながら、

この二つの方法はどちらでもいいが、ところが、戦時下のためなのか、今の官庁は積極性を欠いている。それに官制の制限等々、恐らくいい効果が収まらないだろう。24

と言う。官庁に積極性がないことと官制の制限が国立で編譯館の設立出来なかった原因だと示している。
3.1 翻訳と満洲国語政策
1938年ころから朝鮮半島では皇民化政策が実施され、学校では国語として日本語教育を行ない、朝鮮語の教育が禁止された。役所でも日本語が強制された。

「満洲国」では、1937年5月に「勅令」により「学制改正令」や「学制異解者」などが公布され、1938年から日本語を「国語の一つ」として国民学校等で教授するようになった。しかし、たとえば蒙古人居住区では、この学校令によれば、蒙古語のほかに、しばらく二つの国語、つまり満語と日本語を同時に教えるが、次第に満語の教授時間数が減っていき、日本語の教授時間数が増えてくる25。こうして、日本語を第一国語とし、事实上、各民族の共通語にする政策が進められている。一方、「満語」（満語）教育のテキストには、今まで注音符号で漢字発音を表示してきたが、それが廃止され、かわりに日本語のカナを使用するようになる。所謂「満語カナ」である。また、満洲国語研究会が結成され、その仕事の一つは国語の普及であるが、実質上、主に日本語の普及となっていた。

1941年10月になると、注音符号が禁止され、1944年文教部が「満語カナ」を公布した。つまり、「満語」（満語）を学ぶ場合、先ず日本語（かな）を学ばなければならないことになる。このまま実行すれば、日本語普及の目的はもちろん達成するし、同時に仮名で発音を表示される漢語もその独立性を失ってしまう。「満洲国」は表面上独立国家で、民族協和を掲げている。そのため、併合された朝鮮半島で行われたように公然と皇民化政策が実行できない。しかし、中国本土から完全に分離させることが十分できる。

古丁はその危険性をはっきり見抜いている。実際、林房雄など日本人作家に日本語で創作しないかと聞かれてもいる。それに対して、古丁は作家は母語で創作するべきだとはっきり答えている。

また、古丁は1938年8月「注音符号のこと」（『月刊満洲』11巻8号）、1940年8月「『話』の話」（『満洲国語』満語版第3号）、同年9月、「『話』の話」（『満洲国語』日語版、第5号）、1944年「注音の話」（聯盟『芸文志』第5号）を発表し、仮名より注音符号の先進性を論じる。つまり、政策の本当の目的をはっきり指摘しないが、注音符号をやめて仮名を使う政府のやり方を批判している。それは、漢語の存続に危惧しているからであろう。その中で、古丁の日本語から漢語への翻訳は、日本文化を取り入れて民衆の民度を高めると同時に、「満洲国」政府に対抗し、日本語に同化されないように漢語を守っていると考えられる26。

以上のような言語問題を背景に、1944年芸文書房から大内隆雄著『文芸談叢』が芸文書房から出版された。日本人が漢語を駆使して書かれた最初のエッセイ集となる。大内は日本人が漢語を学ぶべきと主張し、自ら率先実行したものである。それに対して、古丁は「漢文で書く」（用漢文写）（聯盟『芸文志』第5期、1944,3）という文章を書いて大内の地道な努力を高く評価している。

もともと文化事業に熱心ではない官庁であるから、また、翻訳事業は「民族協和」と「文化建設」に沿っているが、国語政策に矛盾しているので、ますます積極的にならないだろう。

---

25 于逢春「『満洲国』の蒙古族に対する日本語教育に関する考察」『広島大学大学院教育学研究科紀要』、二〇〇二年二月、二〇〇頁。
26 梅定娥博士論文『「満洲国」文化人古丁の思想的変遷をさぐる—翻訳、創作、出版』、2010
う。これはおそらく国立編訳館が設立出来なかった本当の原因の一つかもしれない。

3.2 翻訳と「民族協和」

前に言及したが、「満洲国」での文学翻訳には二つの特徴がある。ひとつは、同じ「国」の中で、一つの民族の言語からもう一つの言語へと翻訳すること、もう一つは、日本語から漢語へ翻訳する場面は、日本国と「満洲国」の関係は特殊なことである。

「民族協和」という政府の建前のスローガンに民族と民族の関係どうするような関係であるかはっきり定まっていない。特に日本民族と他の民族の関係には、建前と実生活の行動の間に大きな差がある。それは日本民族の「満洲国」での統治の仕方に関わるので、日本人も「満人」もそれを指摘している。

例えば、1942年3月号の満洲芸文聯盟機関誌『藝文』に解半知（古丁）著「第一建國から第二建國へ」が発表され、中に「満洲国」の民族協和の実状について以下のように描いている。

実際の社会生活の中で日本民族と漢民族は疑い合い信用しあっていない事情を指摘している。また、日本人の中には別の見度から指摘する人もいる。

満洲国における日本人は日本帝國臣民であって、同時に満洲国の指導的中核的国民なりということは、建国の本義の一つであって、（略）「満洲」を「満洲国」にするのは、おもてに神を敬う、神意を奉行精進する日本人の使命であるが、この大使命を果たすためには、われわれ大陸日本人の生活を見わたしたとき、あまりにも、大使命とかけはなれた生活態度が目につくので――が「示せ、手本を日本人が」という標語をうむにいたつものなることは、いふまでもない。

以上の引用は「満洲国」の官吏田村敏雄が1944年に書いたものであるが、指導民族として日本人の自覚とみられる。ただ、それは生活や職場のところから論じているのではなく、建国理想や惟神ながらの大使命の視点から言っている。

大内は早く1937年満洲文学を論じる時、「満人」文学を無視し、或いは過剰視する日本人もいると指摘し注意している。

私はさらに、其處に潜在的にでも、たとえばツアールの帝制が多数民族の経済的及び文化的発展を阻害するために力を盡した。多民族は普通土着語の学校、新聞を持つ権利を許さなかった、ありとあらゆる労務をもってロシア化を貫行したといふようなやり方が暗にされているのではないかと懸念する。若しもそのような意図でも存するならばそれは断乎として撲滅されねばならぬ。必ずしもは、後進民族の発展のために利用し得るものすべてを、より進歩した文化から取り入れることである。この国にいて文化の問題を論ずるに、先づこの理解が徹底することを望んで置きたかい。

満洲で土着民族文化を排撃し日本化しようとする予え断を危惧し、後進民族の先進文化的27

27 同上。
28 田村敏雄「大陸日本人の表情、姿勢、言語、作法」『満洲評論』第26巻第14号、P23（535）
29 大内隆雄「満洲文学の回顧」『満洲行政』第4巻第8号、1937、P96-97。
取り入れを主張する。取り入れはつまり翻訳を通って行われることである。大内の考え方の中には、日本語から「満語」（漢語）への翻訳が日本人の満洲統治につながっている。大内は植民地の言葉や文化を抹殺する帝国主義の統治の仕方に反対し、地元民族及びその文化を尊重し理解する民族協和の立場を示しているようがえる。大内は日本の満洲占領自体には反対していないと考えられる。

3.3翻訳と決戦満洲文化

1944年3月14日、『青年文化』誌上で「決戦満洲文化の方向」について大内隆雄と古丁の対談が掲載されている。二人は満洲文化建設の基底、方向、方法などについて議論している。文化建設における科学の役割、新聞社間の競争、執筆者を確保するために嘱託制の採用、映画、出版、文学、興亜仮名等について二人の意見がほぼ一致しているが、一つのところだけ、考え方に少しずれが出てくる。

古丁は物質面の発展を認め、精神面民族協和と建国精神の世界観を古典との融和に求め康徳文化と日本文化を分けて考え、日本文化を如何に摂取するかを問題にしている。満洲文化の建設は満人の伝統に立ち、連続性を持って日本文化を取り入れてあたらしい文化を作ろうとするのが古丁の見方である。それに対して、大内は日満間の交流と協力を重視している。

『満洲評論』第22巻第18号に発表された韓護著矢間恒（大内隆雄）訳「満洲文化観の確立―満洲文化のためにー」という文章があり、中で満洲国文化観が複雑で、相異った、違った性格を持っていると指摘している。それは①満洲の日系文化人の満洲文化観と満系の満洲文化観の相違、②政府の満洲文化観と民間の満洲文化観の違い、③原則上の満洲文化観と事实上上の満洲文化観の相対するものである。①については、満洲の日系の満洲文化観は満洲文化が日本文化の満洲への延長だ、満洲の日系文化人が満洲文化の代表だと認めるのである。満洲の日系の満洲文化の存在を否定するのであろう。とはいえて、若干の日系文化人が満洲文化の独立と満洲他系文化的存在を否定せぬことを唱えてゐるものもゐる。しかし、そうした観念の裏側では、やはり満洲文化は日本文化の延長であると認めざるを得ない。所謂独立性といふのも、この延長された日本文化の改造ではないのである。

それに対して、満系の満洲文化観の第一の特徴は、満洲の満系文化の然たる存在が、いかなる面からも否定消滅され得ぬことである。第二の特徴は満洲の満系民族は、完全に漢民族の延長であり、満系の文化は、當然に全く漢民族文化的延長だと言へることである。

また、「そして満系の文化観念では、満洲の日系文化を日本文化の大陸への延長だと見、同時に、双方の融合の可能性があるがしかし甚だ短い時間では実現出来ないと考えている」と分析している。

満系と日系はそれぞれ自民族の文化しか認めないのである。満系のほうは、日満文化的融合を否定しないが短い時間の間では不可能だと考えている。このような満洲国民間の

30 韓護著矢間恒（大内隆雄）訳「満洲文化観の確立―満洲文化のためにー」『満洲評論』第22巻第18号、P10-13（『復刻版』P635-638）
31 同上。
32 同上。
排他的文化観が政府の協和主義的な文化観との違い、つまり②が生まれる。また、この事実上の文化観と原則的協和的な文化観との相違、つまり③も生まれる。

「満洲国」の一致しない文化観が、「相対峙し、相異り、非調和的で、相互に否定し、独自的な存在である33」。そのため、満洲文化建設の先決条件正しい満文化観がまだ出現決定していないと、作者が断言している。

この文章の作者は「満人」であり、社会状況を冷徹に分析していて、理想や浪漫に燃えた日系とは全く違う。この文章を翻訳紹介した大内は、満洲文化建設に於いて漢民族文化伝統の尊重と受け継ぐことを主張するが、結局日本人であるからそのネーション的な立場を離れることが出来ない。これは大内と古丁の大きな違いとなる。それにとっても、大内の翻訳や翻訳館の設立に払われた努力が満系に認められている。

私たちは両手を挙げて大内さんのために吶喊したい、言うまでもなく、大内さんの努力はもともと我々のような可哀そうな人間のためであるから。34

結び

「満洲国」は実際上日本の植民地で、日本民族と漢民族は支配と被支配の関係であるが、その支配の仕方に満洲に日本人にもいろいろ違った意見があった。大内隆雄はその中の一人である。大内は長く中国で生活し、中国文化・文学を尊重している。それが自ら「満人」文学の翻訳につながる。また、大内は「満洲国」の建前の政策「民族協和」を擁護し、実際の社会の生活の中では民族間の隔たりを批判し、それを縮めようと努力している。翻訳を通じて、先進国の文化を取り入れて先進国を追いつこうと主張している。この点においては古丁の意見と一致している。ところが、民族協和は建前に過ぎず、しかも戦時下の「満洲国」ではいろいろな困難にも直面している。大内のような意見は政府政策の本音に合わず、実行がほぼ不可能である。にもかかわらず、大内は主張し続けている。

それに対して、古丁は「満洲国」の政策の本音を見極め、翻訳を通して自民族のレベルを高め、その文化を守ろうとしている。ここは大内と違うこととなる。

33 同上。P13（638）。
34 張文華（万葉集翻訳者）「編譯館的創設與構想」『新満洲』、前掲、P28-29。原文：我 們舉着雙手願意給大內先生吶喊，自然，大內先生的努力原是為著我們這可憐的人群。
Abstract

Inspired by Kristeva's idea of intertextuality, Gerard Genette has developed and refined his own theory on intertextuality, which he calls "hypertextuality." He argues that "any text is a hyper text, grafting onto a hypotext, an earlier text that it imitates or transforms," and therefore, "any writing is rewriting," but that some texts are more explicitly so than others. My paper will discuss an example of such explicit process of rewriting in Itō Hiromi's Mysterious Tales of Japan. Itō's text uses Buddhist tales of medieval Japan as its "hypotexts" (Nihon ryōiki) but transforms it into a postmodern text that responds to its own contemporary context. By looking at strategies of "cultural translation" in it, I hope to throw into relief the culturally and historically specific nature of Itō's text and the underlying concerns.
伊藤比呂美は1978年のデビュー以来もあに詩人として活躍してきたわけだが、最近の作品には古典の引用をちりばめた「間テキスト性」の目立つ詩的散文も多い。例をあげると2007年に紫式部賞、萩原朔太郎賞を受賞し、注目を浴びた『とげ抜き巢鴨地蔵縁起』。17章の自伝的な「語り」からなる「とげ抜き」はそれぞれ「・・・す事」という中世の説話集を思わせるようなタイトルがつき、各章の終わりに古事記、説教節、梁塵秘抄、能、近代詩などからもりた声のリストが記されている「間テキスト性」の顕著な作品である。続く2010年に出た『読み取り般若心経』も般若心経の「読み解き」と自伝的なエピソードが一緒になったジャンル的にも「間（あいだ）性」に富んだ作品である。今回の一射でとりあげる2004年の『日本ノ霊異ナ話』（にほんのふしぎなはなし）も仏教説話集『日本霊異記』を下にして書き直した「間テキスト性」に富んだ作品である。中世の説話に呼び起こされる文芸歴史的な記憶やイメージがコーラージュのように重なりあい、もつれあい、その緊張関係のなかからまた別の新しい何かが生まれていく———ようなテキスト自体の「書き直し」（Rewriting）の過程を目のあたりにする楽しみがある作品である。むろん読者は中世のオリジナルを頓着せずに読む自由を持ち、実際には無意識のうちにもテキストを埋め込まれた過去の言説を伊藤のテキストが中継するネットワークの総体として読んでいることになる。この「書き直し」と「読み直し」（Rereading）の過程のなかでののような「文化翻訳」が行われているのかについて考察するのがこの発表の趣旨である。

「間テキスト性」と「引用」について

「間テキスト性」は周知のようにMikhail BakhtinのDialogismにすでにあった考え方であり、その後、Julia Kristevaによって体系化され、その他もろもろの批評家にとりあげられて、美術にもあてはめて理論化した批評家、ミーケ・バルMieke Bal、の『カラヴァッジョを引用する』（Quoting Caravaggio 1999）という著書があるが、「間テキスト性」について示唆的な議論を展開しているので、ここでまずBalが述べている「引用」についての考察にふれてみたい。

Balは過去のテキストを現在において引用するという「書き直し」の過程のなかで、「誰が誰について解明しているのか」（Who illuminates whom?）という問いをたて、「引用」という行為における「主体」Agencyと意味生成の過程を問題化する。（無論、これに加えて読者が再読する際のAgencyと意味生成の問題系が加わるわけであって、これはいっそう複雑になるわけであるが、今回の発表では読んでいる「私」と読まれている「伊藤比呂美」が同世代の人間であり、文化的な「期待のHorizon」を共に持っているという事情があるので、この問題系は射程にない。）Balの結論を簡単にまとめると、「引用」とは現在と過去のテキスト、それぞれの作者の「対話」というよりは、それぞれの作者・編者が属するField(言説空間)同志の「対話」であり、それによって、現在と過去の両方のテキストについて「解明する」行為なのである、と言う。過去のテキストの引用によって、現在のテキストが「照らされる」と同時に、その行為そのものが、過去のテキストを「照らしかえす」ことにもなる———つまり「書き直し」と「読み直し」における解釈のループが過去の「現在」への介入であると同時に、「現在」の「過去」への介入であるということができ、その意味で、「過去」の歴史性だけでなく、「現在」の歴
史性にも留意すべきだと述べる。「引用」に関するこのようなBalの問題提起を射程にいて、伊藤の『日本の霊記な話』の「間テキスト性」について考えてみたい。

『日本霊異記』

まず、伊藤の作品の下地になっている『日本霊異記』についての考察から始めたい。『日本霊異記』はもと私度僧であった薬師寺の僧、景戒によって840年ごろに編纂された日本最古の仏教説話集である。仏教が律令制のもとで新しい国家宗教として組織化され、その教えがひろく広められてから数百年たった平安初期、戒律は目を覆うばかりに乱れ、その世相に危機感を抱いた景戒が「この世界に因果の理がきびしく貫かれていることを説話の具体例を通して人々に語りかけ」「かれらの心を正道におもむかせようという」目的で編纂したといわれている。6 私度僧僧団の指導者として行基が民衆のために伝導布教のほかにもろもろの社会事業を推し進めて活躍した聖武天皇の時代を理想としており、その私度僧たちの間に語り広められた仏教説話のがもとになっている。

ここで、私度僧についてだが、私度僧とは官許を得ず私的に出家した僧であり、律令体制下にあっては弾圧されていたこともあって、反体制的なところもあり、彼らの活動の対象は一般民衆であった。また、ひろく人々に訴えるという意味で、彼らの教えは現実的であり、したがって『霊異記』に示される応報も「現報」に重きがおかれていた。現世の数々の災いや不幸が個人のレベルで過去（世）の因果として説明される一方、今善い行いをすれば、必ずしも来世をまたずとも、この現世で報いが得られるという因果応報の理論であった。その行為がもたらす報によって善悪が把握されるという意味では、その倫理観には勧善懲悪的な要素がおおいにあると言える。したがって『霊異記』の数々のエピソードは読者がどのような行為がよい報をもたらしどのように報いが得られるかを現実的なレベルでとらえることができるようにわかりやすく語られる。カルマ（業）観についていれば、来世あるいは現世で救われたためには、よい行いをしてよいカルマ（業）を育てなければならないという、あくまでAccumulativeなカルマを前提としていた。

伊藤比呂美の『日本の霊記な話し』対『霊異記』

この『日本霊異記』から伊藤比呂美は序文をふくむ14編の説話をえらび出し、独自な言語感覚で、「引用」し、書き直しを行っている。全体の印象からいえば、書き直しにあたって、説話のなかで主人公たちが体験するかすかすの不幸や難儀を即物的にとらえ、彼らの迷いがいかにかかわるかをきれない関係にあるかを如実に、しかも生き生きと、美しく描き出す。まず一番最初にあたる「西暦でいったら七八七年」を見てみよう。「古典体系」の原文はかたい漢文訓読体で仏教が日本に伝わり広められてきた様子を簡単にまとめ、今の世の戒律の乱れについて憂いをこめて述べ、最後に景戒の謙虚な訴えと願いで締めくくる。一方伊藤のテキストは最初から一人称で景戒が「景戒です。ヒツジのようにおろかな僧として生きております」とその苦しい立場をあたかも読者がそこで聞いているかのようなOralityの強い言葉で直接的に訴えかける。

『霊異記』:

然れども、景戒、性をうることさしくあらず。濁れるこころ澄ますこと難し。かむ

5 『日本国現報善惡霊異記』日本古典文学大系、巻70、岩波書店1967年。
6 「はじめに」、『日本文学史：文学の誕生より八世紀まで』、岩波書店、1995年。
7 9世紀の「原文」は無論、漢文説読体ではなく、漢文体である。
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井の識（さとり）久しく大方に迷ふ。よき巧みのえる所に、浅きたくみを加ふ。・・・善きことをねがふことの至りにたへず、らむうの業を示さむことをおず。後に生るる賢き者、幸はくはわらぶことなる。祈はくはあやしきふみを観る者、邪なることをさりて正しきことに入れ。諸々の恥しきことはなすことなれ。諸の善きことは奉り行へ。（英訳）

『霊異（ふしぎ）な話し』

わたたくしは僧ではありますが、俗人のように寺の外に住み、俗人のように妻帯しています。子どももおります。何人も生まれましたが何人も死にました。・・・死んでいく子供を見るのはとてもつらい。それをみずからの手で焼き、埋葬するのはさらにつらい。それでもわたくしは妻と性交します。性交は楽しく妻はいとしい。妻は飽きることなくはらみ、痛み苦しみを冒して、産んでゆきます。わたくしはそれを養うために、あくせくとかけずりまわり、汚泥の中をのたくりながら、種々の罪をむすびながら、生きようとしております。・・・欲望も、執着も、こびりついて離れません。極貧から、煩悩から、逃れられません。何というふざまな生き方か。（11）

そして「欲望」「執着」「煩悩」の「むくいがやって来る」「縁が、因果が、くるくるめぐる」といい、表面的には『霊異記』にあるような因果応報の倫理について述べているように思えるのだが、行間から読むのは女も男も、欲望し、性の営みにげみ、子どもをつくり、自らの煩悩や執着の激しさを恥じながらも、けなげに生きようとする姿にある。「でも、人は、精一杯生きています。」といい、「精一杯生きるひとびとは、わたくしに手をさしのべてくれます。」といい、わたしはその手を「にぎり返したい。自分の足を、身体を、どんなにぬらしても、溺れゆく人々と、ともにいたイ。そして「人々の、どうもうな生きざまに、わくわくするのをやめられません。」と語って終わる。つづく序文のあとに来る二番目のテキストにも「精一杯生きている」人々に関する同じようなスタンスが見られる。「乳やらずの縁」と題されたこの説話は飯野和好の表紙の絵のイメージと重なるという点でも重要な章だ。

「乳やらずの縁」

『霊異記』にあるオリジナルは二ページにも満たない短い説話であり、寂林という僧が夢のなかで大きな乳に膿みがたまって苦しんでいる「たくましく肥えた」裸の女の幽霊に出会う話である。女は僧に事情を問いかけられて、若かったころ幼い子供をおいて男と邪淫にふけり、子どもに乳を与えることを怠り、飢えさせ、その罪によって、今乳がはる病気にかかっていると数行で答える。伊藤はこの女の返事を三ページ以上のモノローグに書き換える。ほったらかしにして帰ると「うれしがって駆け寄ってきて、べとべとのお手手をひろげて、抱きついてくる」子どもたちの様子が語られ、「そのときは自分でもあきれてしまうんですけど、またずく、男にあいたい男にあいたいと、そればかりが頭のなかに渦巻いたり。」

8 『霊異記』の序文、最後の節の英訳：
However, I am not gifted either wisdom or lucidity. Learning acquired in a narrow well loses its way when out in the open. My work resembles that of a poor craftsman working on the carving of a master... Only the desire to do good has moved me to try, in spite of the fear that this might turn out to be a presumptuous work by an incompetent author. I hope that learned men in future generations will not laugh at my efforts, and I pray that those who happen upon this collection of miraculous stories will put aside evil, live in righteousness, and, without causing evil, practice good (Miraculous Stories from the Japanese Buddhist Tradition: The Nihon ryôiki of the Monk Kyôkai, trans. Kyoko Motomochi Nakamura, Curzon 1973).

9 「はじめに」、『日本文学史：文学の誕生より八世紀まで』、岩波書店、1995
て、渦巻きよりほかはなんもなくなり、なりひとにお乳をやるのもうわのそらで」「男のまらをあたしのくぼに入れること、そればかり考えて」「いてもたってもいられなくなる」自分の性欲と煩悩について即物的に語られる。そしてこの母についても子どもの口から「帰ってきさえすれば母は母で」「きれいで、やさしくて、あたかくて、おっぱいがやわらかくて、たれていて、臭いのかかわしいのかわからないような」「かあちゃんのにおいが」したと。そして最後にオリジナルでは「誠に知る、母の両の甘き乳、まことにめぐ深しといへども惜しみてはぐくまざれば、返りて罪をなさることを。あに飲ましめざらみや」とあるのが、下記のように書き換えられる。

こういうことです。母たちはいくら男と、とついでも（セックスして）いいんです。しかしこれだけは、母たちは。ぴかぴかにもりあがる乳房を、誇りなさい。誇って、乳房を、むき出しなさい。むき出して、子らに、あふれる乳をあたえなさい。・・・そういうことだ、とわたしたしは思います。（25）

その性欲も母性も同時に肯定されねばならない、精一杯生きる女の姿が、表紙の絵の白い裸の女のイメージと重なる。深緑りに生い茂る植物と赤い長い舌を持つ紫の蛇と怪物に見守られながら、女は地べたに届かんばかりの長い茶色の髪を前にし、豊かな乳房をあらわに、一糸まとわず、ぺたっと地べたに座っている。「草木が繁りすぎるのです。煩悩、執着、そういうものがカタチをとるとしたら、この草木の繁りかたがそれでしょう。」「わたしたしの生まれ育った紀伊の国の名草の郡のあたりでは、草木は虫みたいに殖えるし、蛇みたいに這いまわる」（15）という本文の景戒の言葉に呼応するように、「繁る草木」が女の「欲望」のメタファーとして機能し、本文の女たちの営みを表紙のイメージと重ねて読むと、その奔放な性が、あるがまにいわば「仕方がないもの」として赦され、肯定され、祝福されているかのように見える。そのほか、お参りに来た女に欲情する僧、天女と交わる僧、息子と「交わ」りたがる母など、伊藤の作品の「間テキスト」的な断片のなかには、男女の性の営みのあり方がに関する「近代」のタブーを反故にする「中世」への、ポストモダン的といってもよいかと思われるノスタルジアの視線を読みとることができるだろう。

ポストモダン的な「身体的フェミニズム」

伊藤のテキストに髣髴とする「身体」をよりどころとした性に関する感覚にはいわゆる「身体的フェミニズム」で説かれる主体のありかたと呼応するところがあると思われる。「身体的フェミニズム」はCorporeal Feminismの訳で、Judith Butler、やElizabeth Groszによって80年代から90年代にかけて一般化された考え方であり、一言で言うならば、近代の「身体」と「精神」の二項対立のなかで、常に「精神」を優先するような主体観の批判として出てきたものである。「身体」は「精神」に受動的に「従属」するのではなく、「精神」とMobius Stripのように表裏一体をなす相関関係にあり、したがって「主体」が生きる場である「身体」（lived body）の積極的な役割を射程にいれずに、人間の「主体性」を理解することはできないとする。ここで、留意したいのは、彼らが唱える「身体」とは非歴史的な普遍な身体ではなく、特定の文化・社会的環境にあって具体性をもった「身体」（social body）である。『霊異記』に出てくる女性の主体性について、伊藤の言葉を借りて述べるとすれば、「男のくほをまらに入れ」孕み、産み、乳を張らせて、乳飲み子に乳をやる、そういった一連の身体的な行為が、彼女らをとり囲む文化・社会環境のなかで、どう体験されるかについて述べることなしには語れない、ということになるだろう。まだまだ性的な盛り期にある若く美しい母親が、男の理解なしに幾人もの幼な子の面倒を一人でみなければならない。
い環境にあって、生活はもちろんのこと、性に関する仏教の戒律はきびしい。伊藤のテキストでは、「いつも既に文化の刻印を受けているところの身体」がどう生きるべきなのか、という問いをその「精一杯生きる姿」を描くことによって、読者になげかける。「身体」が生き抜くところの煩悩と欲望に焦点をあてた『霊異記』に示唆されてこそ、発見できた、主体の「身体性」がここでポストモダンの「身体性」のイメージと重なりあう。

津島祐子が文庫本の解説のなかで、伊藤は「日本の近現代文学でおなじみの情緒とか」「自意識」というものを「みごとにきっぱりと切り落とし」そこにただ、「貪欲に生きようとしている熱い体」があり、「その命、罪深い命の、ありのままの美しさ」があるのみだと述べる（191）。そういう伊藤にとって『霊異記』の時代、「中世」は「近代」が抑圧してしまったアニミズム的な「生命力」にあふれる世界、植物も動物も人間も、いきしい生きるもののたがいが、生殖にはげみつける、ユートピア的な「場所」であるといえる。その意味で『日本の霊異な話し』に描かれた世界は欲望された「中世」のイメージの投影であるのではなく、この「中世」が実際には、景戒の9世紀の日本よりも、むしろ中世後期にクラシマックスをむかえた本覚思想的な世界に似ていることに留意したい。

『霊異記』の中世後期の本覚思想への系譜

伊藤のテキストでは『霊異記』にある、「仕方がないもの」としての「煩悩」や「欲望」を、後の仏教の本覚思想的な展開を先取りするようななかたちで、ふくらまして拡大解釈していると言えよう。伊藤のテキストをフィルターにして『霊異記』を見ると、そこにある凡夫の苦しい声の記録が、よりはっきりと浮き彫りにされるようを読めるが、「本覚思想」的な「即身成仏」や現世肯定の感性は『霊異記』の時代にはまだはっきりした形ではなかったはずである。

「本覚思想」という表現は島地大等（1875—1927）によって新しい解釈の概念として導入されたものであるが、いわゆる仏性は凡夫だれにも最初から宿っているものであり、従って、救いは、現世のうちに達成できるはずのものである、という現実肯定的な大乗仏教の流れとして、中世後期から一般化された考え方である。英語圏では高く評価されているJacqueline Stoneの著書を参考にして簡単にその概要をまとめてみたい。

「即身成仏」というように、本覚思想では悟りはわれわれの今の「体」のままで、来世を待たず生きているうちに遂げられるものであり、その意味で悟りがより身近にあるものとして把握される。言葉をかえれば、奈良仏教のようにいく世にもわたるカルマの積み重ねがあって始めて遂げる悟りでなく、現世のうちにかならず悟りのモデルとして導入されたといえる。また、人間だけでなく、草木にいたるまでの非知覚存在も悟りの可能性を秘めているとされ、この草木に宿る悟りの可能性という点については、仏教伝来前の日本古来からのすべての自然物に神性を見るアニミズム的感覚が影響したのではないかと考える批評家も多い。理由はともあれ、生じてそして消えていくすべての自然にある現象がそのまま本覚の顕れとして肯定された。

現実の現象を肯定的にみる態度は大乗仏教一般に通じる「不二」（non-duality）の概念と

10 Experience can only be understood between mind and body---or across them---in their lived conjunc-

11 Original Enlightenment and the Transformation of Medieval Japanese Buddhism (Studies in East Asian

Buddhism), University of Hawaii Press, 2004
変わらないということもいえる。とくに天台の法華経解釈の中の「不二」と共振する部分があると思われる（伊藤比呂美の参考文献リストの中にも法華経がある）。「不二」とは簡潔にいうと、現実のConventionalな現象は「固有性」に欠け、最終的には「空」であるということを前提とし、われわれの迷った心が「空」である現実に「二元性」を見、本来ひとつであるところの現象に切れ目をいれ、分裂させてしまうのだと説く。心と身体、善悪、迷いと悟りは本来なら非二元的であり、相互包含的なものであり、この「不二」を悟ることによってはじめて現実の世界を再認識することができる。そうすることで現実の世界は迷いの産物でも忌諱すべき難儀の場でもなくなり、真実を悟り救いを得るべき領域として把握される。そういう意味で「不二」とは原則的に因果応報とはおりあわない考え方であるといえる。

そしてさらに付け加えるなら、真実を悟った後、世を捨てることではなく、まだ悟りゆかしい人々を助けるための菩薩業を行うため、世にとどまる———経験的現実世界はそういう、凡夫とともに生きる「場」としてある。広い意味でいれば、本覚思想がこういう大乗仏教的な「不二」の考え方と共通する感性をもっているといってよいと思われるが、田村芳郎は本覚思想の、「不二」を極端な現世肯定と拡大解釈する傾向に、従来の大乗仏教との違いを見ている。

ジャックリーン・ストーン(Jacqueline Stone)の要約:

The "return" to the phenomenal world (in the Original Enlightenment Thought) affirms ... not only the "existential" aspects of that world, such as "birth" and "death," or "self" and "other," but also its delusive aspects, such as ignorance and the mental defilements. It is the ordinary worldly living in the actual world who is identified as the "true Buddha." Tamura argues therefore that, while the Original Enlightenment Thought is "grounded in traditional Buddhist thought," it definitely "oversteps the 'traditional' boundary of Buddhist thinking patterns" in "affirming deluded worldlylings." He ascribes this special development of the Original Enlightenment Thought to "the influence of Japanese thinking patterns." This definition has come to enjoy considerable currency. (Original Enlightenment and the Transformation of Medieval Japanese Buddhism, University of Hawaii Press, 1999)

この本覚思想の極端な現世肯定の流れが後の鎌倉仏教、とくに親鸞の浄土真宗に見られるような、「悪人正機」の概念へとエスカレートしていったといえるだろう。「悪人正機」の前提にあるのは人間は欲、煩悩、執着によって迷わされ、自分の力で悟りを得ることができるものであり、救いの唯一の道は阿弥陀仏に信仰をもち、その慈悲を無条件にありがたく受け賜ることにあるとされる。いわゆる「悪人」は自分の罪深さを自覚していれば自己や誇りがいたずらに邪魔することがないだけに普通人のみならず阿弥陀の慈悲をより受け賜りやすい立場にある。伊藤の「景戒」が序文で「突然、恥ずかしさにうちのめされ、息が苦しくなり」「顔がほてり」「自分がこうしてあることが、唾を吐きかけてもおさまらないほどですぐでもないものだと思える(10-11)「覚醒」するように、伊藤の『日本の霊異な話』に出てくる男や女たちはまさにそういう「悪人」、「羊のようなおろかな」ものが多い。伊藤の「景戒」はそこで「それでも、精一杯生きるひとびとは、わたくしに手をさしのべてくださる。」という、わたしはその手を「にぎり返したい。自分の足を、身体を、どんなにぬらしても、溺れゆく人々と、ともにいたい。」と言う、まさに迷いの凡夫にも現世にも肯定的な倫理観の持ち主なのである。

「引用」の歴史性

このように伊藤のテキストを出発点として「現在」と「過去」（中世）を行ったり来たりすることによって、「現在」「過去」（中世）について、どういうことが見えてくるのだろうか

文化の翻訳としての「間テキスト性」
ろうか。ポストモダンと言われて久しい「现在」、文学や映画をふくむ文化テキストに「中世」からの「引用」が目立つように思わわれる。80年代、90年代の網野善彦の中世を再解釈する一連の著書が、メイン・ストリームからはずれた、職人や、芸能民、漂白民などに注目したことで、従来の「中世」の均質的で単一的なイメージを変え、人々の中世への興味をおおいに刺激したということもあるかもしれない。宮崎駿の「もののけ姫」の中世、小説家でいえば、中上健二の『化粧』、津島祐子の『ナラ・レポート』などが思いあたる。とくに「性」に関して「中世」というと、近代家父長制度のもとで国家的な管理下に入る以前の、奔放な性がイメージしやすく、中世の説話集は男女の欲望や性欲が即物的に描かれる逸話の宝庫としてもてはやされてきたところではないだろうか。

これら一連のポストモダンの視点から中世説話を書き直した作品と比較してみると、「引用」の古典的なテキストである芥川龍之介の『藪の中』の歴史性が見えてきて興味深い。周知のように『藪の中』は同じ中世説話でも『今昔物語』を下地にして書かれた作品である。芥川の書き直しの方は女性の「性」が家制度の管理下にあった「大正」という時代にあって、オリジナルにはなかった、「貞節」という問題系を導入し、『今昔物語』では、強姦された妻が夫と手に手をとって「藪の中」を去るというユーモラスなエピソードを女性の「貞節」をめぐる殺人ドラマに書き換えてしまっている。「大正」の保守的な性のモラルを照らしたテキストだといえよう。即物的な視線で性欲を受け止めながらもさまざまな因果応報の仏教説話を「風船」のようにふくらませて、奔放な性を祝福する快楽的なテキストに書き直した伊藤の作品を思うと、Balの言っている「引用する」側の歴史性をわすれてはいけないという忠告が適切であることに思いいたる。伊藤の作品をふくむ、ポストモダンのテキストに垣間見られる「中世」に対する、ユートピア的なあこがれの視線も例外ではない。その視線はあくまで、彼らの歴史的位置から見て、創造（想像）された「中世」にむけられた視線なのだということに留意したい。
訳語と新語から見る日本の近代
「自然」・「文明」・「哲学」を例として

Chen Wei-fen
陳瑋芬台湾中央研究院

Abstract
「哲学」・「自然」・「文明」などの語彙は、もともと漢語圏で古来から存在したものであったが、十九世紀後半から二十世紀初頭までの間、さらに“philosophy”、“nature”、“civilization”の訳語となった。つまり、西洋から伝わってきた“philosophy”、“nature”、“civilization”らの概念を、漢字で表現しようとする際に、「哲学」・「自然」・「文明」が選ばれたのである。それ以降、「哲学」・「自然」・「文明」に含まれた意味は、漢語元来のものと違うようになり、新しい意味に取替えられ、いわば「新詞」（新しい言葉）として生まれ変わった。

この発表は、「哲学」（「理学」を含む）・「自然」（「天地」を含む）、「文明」（「文化」を含む）および“philosophy”、“nature”、“civilization”などの西洋概念の対訳関係は如何に出現したのか、その関係が成立した後、「訳語」から「新詞」へと新しい概念をもつようになったのは何時なのかを解明することを目的とする。

周敦頤のいう「聖希天、賢希聖、士希賢」の出典から「希哲の学」という意味をもつ「哲學」と、「格物窮理」という意味を含む「理学」は、それぞれ“philosophy”の訳語として二十数年存在したが、ようやく「哲学」だけが“philosophy”の訳語として一般化した。「自然」は、もともと道家によって「自然而然、自己如此」と理解されたが、近代以降、「天地」・「万物」・「造化」・「宇宙」などを意味する“nature”の訳語として選ばれ、「自然界」という意味をもつようになった。「文明」は、『易経』・『書経』では「文教発達、文采煥然」と理解されたが、“civilization”の意味をもつようになったから、現代性を表し、人類の進歩した生活を指す語彙となった。

この発表は、以上の三つの言葉の意味変化の過程を明らかにし、「哲学」・「自然」・「文明」といった新しい言葉がどのように近代の中国と日本の知識のコニストラクションを成り立たせたのかを考察する。
「自然」・「文明」・「哲学」などの語彙は、もともと漢語圏で古来から存在したものであったが、十九世紀後半から二十世紀初頭までの間、さらに“nature”、“civilization”、“philosophy”の訳語となった。つまり、西洋から伝わってきた“nature”、“civilization”、“philosophy”などの西洋概念の対訳関係は如何に出現したのか、その関係が成立した後、「訳語」から「新詞」へと新しい概念をもつようになったのは何時なのかを解明することを目的とする。

「自然」は、もともと道家によって「自然而然、自己如此」と理解されたが、近代以降、「天地」・「万物」・「造化」・「宇宙」などを意味する“nature”的訳語として選ばれ、「自然界」という意味をもつようになった。「文明」は、『易経』・『尚书』では「文教発達、文采煥然」と理解されたが、“civilization”的意味をもつようになったから、現代性を表し、人類の進歩した生活を指す語彙となった。周敦頤のいう「聖希天、賢希聖、士希賢」の出典から「希哲の学」という意味をもつ「哲学」と、「格物窮理」という意味を含む「理学」は、それぞれ“philosophy”の訳語として二十数年存在したが、ようやく「哲学」だけが“philosophy”的訳語として一般化した。

この発表は、「自然」・「文明」・「哲学」といった新しい言葉がどのように近代の中国と日本の知識のコンストラクションを成り立たせたのかを考察する。

一、「自然」の場合

『岩波古語辞典』では、「自然」に関わる条目は二十五ある。一つ目は「自然、自づから」、二つ目は「自然」、「自然、自づから」について、「己つ柄）」と解し、五つの釈義が挙げられている：(1) 自然の力、生まれつきの力；(2) 自然の成り行きで、自然に、当然に；(3) 成り行きのままで；(4) たまたま、偶然に；(5) ひょっとつると、もしかする。そして「自然」について、(1) おのづからであること；(2) 萬一のこと、不慮のこと；という二つの釈義が挙げられている。

(A) 「おのずから」という意の「自然」

「自然」という語に含まれる意味は極めて複雑なものである。漢語「自然」は十三経ではまったく例を見つかれないが、その最も古い用例は『老子』・『莊子』など道家文献にあった。これら「自然」の語は、自然界（“nature”）ではなく、「おのずから」、ない

1 大野晋など編：『岩波古語辞典』補訂版（東京：岩波書店, 1994年）、頁234。
2 同前註, 頁624。
3 老子に「人ハ地二法リ、地ハ天二法リ、天ハ道二法リ、道ハ法ルコト自ラ然リ」（人法地、地法天、天法道、道法自然）などおよそ六つの例があり、『莊子』に「物ノ自然二順ヒテ私ヲ容ルル無シ」（順物自然、而無容私焉）など五つの例があった。ほかに『列子』に「其ノ道自然ニシテ、聖人ノ通ズル所ニ非ズ」（其道自然、非聖人之所通也）などいくつかの例が挙げられる。
のは「無為」や「本性のままに生きる」という意である。従って、「道法自然」をニーダムが "The Tao into being by itself" と、ド・バリーが "Tao follows the way of itself" と訳したのは適訳だと思われる。ついてで、実態の自然界のことは、道家の古典では「天地」・「造化」・「宇宙」と記載することが多い。

八世紀以降、日本の典籍にも「自然」という語が現れた。『万葉集』第十三巻には「山辺の五十師の御井はおのづから成れる錦張れる山かも」とあり、原文は「自然成錦乎張流山可母」であるが、「自然」は「おのずから」の意であり、これを「さながら」と巧みに現代語訳したものもある。これらの「自然」はいずれも形容詞（「おのづからな（自然な）」）や副詞（おのづからに（自然に））として使われ、道家による「能産的な自然」という概念を継承したものである。自然界の意味する言葉は、「天地」・「乾坤」・「天壌」であり、「あめつち」と訓むこととなる。

それ以降の文学作品や思想文献において見れば、「おのずから」という意で使う用例は主流であった。例えば、十世紀頃の『古今和歌集』の「真名序」に、「春鶯ノ花中二嘲リ、秋蟬ノ樹上に吟フガ若キハ、曲折ナシト雖モ各歌謡ヲ発ス、物皆コレ有ルハ自然ノ理ナリ」とある。この「自然ノ理」は、「おのずから」のことだと思われる。また清少納言（約966-1025）の『枕草子』には「世の中になほいと心うきものは、人ににくまれむことこそあるべけれ。たれてぶ物狂ひか、われ人にさ思ばれむとは思はむ。されど、自然に宮仕へ所にも、親、はらからの中にても、思はるる思はれぬがあるぞいとわびしきや。」（二六七）とある。奉公先でも親兄弟の間でも、おのずと可愛がられる者と可愛がられない者という違いが起こるのは、実に情けないということで、この「自然」は「おのずから」や「ひとりでに」という意である。紫式部（？-1016年）の『源氏物語』にも「かくて例ならぬ事のさま、おのずから聞えなむと思ひて」を受けており、「このような尋常でない死に方を、世間に知られまいととりつくろっても、ひとりでに分かってしまうと思い」の意で、この「自然」は「ひとりでに」という意味である。

中世になると、仏典でも「自然」の語が見られる。まず注目すべきのは観鷹である。彼が「自然法爾」について思索し、著書『教行信証』には善導の言葉「自然ハ即チ是レ彌陀国ナリ」そのままを引用し、彌陀の名を常に誦すれば、臨終の際に彌陀が必ず迎えるという浄土宗の核心的な信念を強調する（「自然」の用例が八つが挙げられる。）また、曹洞宗の開山祖師である道元（1200-1253）の『正法眼蔵』には、師の教えによらず、その人に生来備わっている智でおのずから開いた悟りのことを「無師智・自然智にあふて無師智・自然智を正伝」と記載する。

4 小島憲之ら校注：『万葉集』（東京：小学館，1975-1976年），第3冊，巻13，頁380-381，第3235首。
5 清少納言：『枕草子』（北京：中國對外翻譯出版公司，2000），頁349。
6 澀谷榮一研究室による「源氏物語の世界」http://www.sainet.or.jp/~eshibuya/を検索すると、「自然」の用例が八つが挙げられる。
7 從従：『末煌鈔』．『大正藏』第83冊，頁713a-c。
するなり」（法性）と言っていた。自然界のことについて、「尽十方界、山河大地、草木自他」（自証三昧）と表現する一方で、それらは実態的な外界ではなく、「心なり」と繰り返し言い、「自然界」という概念など成り立つ余地もなさそうに思われる。

近世に入って、自然界のことについて、依然として「天地」や「万物」と呼ばれている。しかし注意すべきのは、「天地」といえば「万物」は含まず、「万物」といえば「天地」は含まないことである。従って、「天地」と「万物」とを含めた自然界の総体を言おうとすれば、個々の説明を加えて長大表現になってしまっていた。

「自然」の語の使い方も古来からの使い方に変わらず、「おのずから」という意が主流であった。朱子学派の藤原惺窩の「自然二発明」、林羅山の「天理自然ノ性」、山崎闇斎の「天倫自然ノ常道」、浅見絢斎の「天命自然ノ理」、佐藤直方の「天地自然」など、および陽明学派の中江藤藻の「自然ノ性」、熊沢蕃山の「天理自然ノ誠」などは、すべて「おのずから」の意としている。古学派になると、いささか変化がある。山鹿素行は「自然」を多く使い、『聖教要録』では「道ハ天地ノ間ニ在リテ、人物ハ自然ノ儀則アリ」や「凡ソ天地人物ノ間、自然ノ条理アリ、是勤礼ナリ」などは、すべて「おのずから」の意である。相良亨氏が、「素行において、『天地』ハ『自然』ノ形勢であり、ほとんど『自然のみ』『自然の全体』であった。『自然』を以て『天地』を指す場合には、ほとんどもう一歩手前のところまで来ている」と、素行における「天地」と「自然」とはほぼ同義となっていることを指摘した。伊藤仁斎に「自然」の語は多くはないが、その大部分は「自然二シテ然リ」、「自然ノ理」というように、「おのずから」の意である。藤原惺窩は、「天地」と「自然」を含む「天地自然」を用いるが、その大部分は「自然ニ発明」、または「自然ノ理」というように、「おのずから」の意である。

神道家・国学者らは、「自然」と「作為」とを相対的な関係にある思惟を受け継ぎ、「自然」を「特定な風土」と理解した。吉川惟足が「三国（日本・天竺・中国）ノ道モ各其ノ土地ノ自然ノ因デテ立タルモノゾ」、「是皆其々ノ国土ノ自然二ヨリテ道ハ出来タルモノゾ」（『聖教要録』）とのように、「おのずから」の意である。「天地のおのずからなる道」を唱え、「和歌は吾神州会開闢以来、自然ノ理を以て、自然天性の情をつらぬる」（『集義和書』）という説だが、「自然」は「おのずからなる」「ちまえの」という意であろう。

（B）「もしかすると・万一」という意の「自然」

老子・荘子が解した「自然」概念は、魏・晋時代になると、「おのずから」という意をさらに発展させ、「万一・偶然」という新しい意味が現れてきた。日本の文献ではこの意味の用例は多くないが、仏典・歌学・芸能書・神道関係の書物では見られるもので、日本的転生

8 例えば松永尺五は「天地の動静、日月の運行、山河草木の体、風雨草露のありさま……天地森羅万象、時々物々」（『彝倫抄』）と言い、伊藤仁斎は「天地日月、山川草木、物語諸彙」（『語孟字義』）と言い、熊沢蕃山は「天地・万物・山水・河海……春夏秋冬・幽明昼夜・風雷雨霧霜雪」（『集義和書』）と冗長な表記をするのである。
思想を基礎として、死亡に対する達観的な姿勢へと発展していった。

その具体的な用例として、「おのづから聞こし召しけむ」〈源氏蜻蛉〉、「この御所は分内狭くして、自然の事あらん時あしかるべし」〈保元上官軍勢汰へ〉などが挙げられる。能楽関係の書物では、世阿彌(1363-1443)の『風姿花伝』に、人が当然のように存在だと思えた「山高」、「海深」、「滿目青山」は実に偶然的な存在であると説き〈金島書〉、「自然鎌倉に御大事あらば」〈謡‧鉢木〉、「自然武悪が幽霊ではござるまいか」〈虎明本狂言‧武悪〉の中の「自然」も「ひょっとすると」との意である。そして鎌倉時代における数多くの軍記物語のなかでも、武士が出征の直前に、親族には「もし自然のことがあれば......」というようである。その「自然」は「もしかすると」との意だと思う。

この意の「自然」は、日本人の生まれ替わり思想によって理解されよう。柳田國男(1875-1962)はその特色として、第一に、「我邦では人の霊が木に依り、厳を座とするのは祭の時のみで、物にもそれぞれのタマは有ると見て居たが、それが人間の方から移って行ったといふことを、考へて居る者は今でもさう増加して居ない」と、あくまで人から人へという生まれ替え方であることを指摘した。第二に、「魂を若くするといふ思想のあったことである」。第三に、「最初は必ずしも同一の氏に、又血筋の末に又現れると思って居たが、我邦の生まれ替わりだったかとも創造せられる。」

なお、「おのづから」には「おのづからなる」と共に「おのづからある」という側面がある。国語学において「あり」が「あれ(生)」「あらわれ(現)」と共通する出生・出現を意味する語源をもつことが指摘されており、「あり」と「なり」の背後に根源的な生成力・生成の働きとも言うべき思惟の存在を考えることが許されるように思われる。そこでこの「自然」という語が生成的契機を中核とするものであり、その生成は死を包み超えるものとしての生成であるように思われる。

(C)「自然界」という意の「自然」

十八世紀の初に、自然界の意の「自然」の語を駆使する哲学が出現した。それが農学家・安藤昌益(1703-1762)の『自然真営道』である。「自然真営道」とは、自然が真に営む道すなわち自然の真の運動法則の意である。この「自然」は、対象的外界としての「天地」と「万物」を含めた全自然界である。安藤昌益の「自然」概念は、天地と共に生物の「人・物」を含み、木火土金水のあらゆる要素・あらゆる存在を包括するものである。「天地」という巨大な容れ物と、その中の無機・有機の全存在を一括した全自然の意の「自然」概念が、
そこに初めて成立している。それは日本思想史上における自然界の意の「自然」概念の初出であり、創造であった。

安藤昌益は「自然」の語を、「自（ひと）り然（す）る」と訓ませ、「自然」は「無始無終」の永遠の「自行」を「自り然ルナリ」と、創造であった。それは日本思想史上における自然界の意の「自然」概念の初出であり、創造であった。

安藤昌益は「自然」の語を、「自（ひと）り然（す）る」と訓ませ、「自然」は「無始無終」の永遠の「自行」を「自リ然ルナリ」と、創造であった。安藤昌益は「自然」の語を、「自（ひと）り然（す）る」と訓ませ、「自然」は「無始無終」の永遠の「自行」を「自リ然ルナリ。故而是ヲ自然ト謂フ」のである。「正ニレ自然トハ自リ然ルヲ謂フナリ、」「自リ然ル」とは、「自り行フ」（自行）、「自り感ク」（自感）とも言われる自己運動のことである。換言すれば、自然は永遠に自己運動の過程にあるという哲学である。

安藤昌益以前の思想家はすべて「自然」を「おのずからしかる」と理解した。この場合、認識者は自然の諸現象を外から第三者として眺めている。誰がどうするのをなく、「おのずから」なっていく過程を「自然」と認識し、春に芽吹き夏に花咲くことの自然さを観察する傍観者に止まっている。安藤昌益の場合、自然の生成過程の内部に「直耕者」として参入しているのである。春に蒔けば秋にはたわわに実るという「ヒトリスル」ことの自然さを体得し、それを防げるものを取り除き、自然の自己運動を守り育てることを、自然の内部で「自（われ）も然（す）る」のである。「直耕という生産労働をするのである。自然も「ひとりする」と、認識者も「ひとりする」のであり、彼は傍観者ではなく、「直耕者」という実践者であり、寄生者ではなく生産者である。

安藤昌益の「自然」の語は“nature”という西洋語に接触して思い付かれた翻訳語ではなかった。彼は漢語・日本語の「自然」を「おのずからなる」から「ひとりする」と訓みかえることで、全自然界を意味する言葉に作り替え、新しい「自然」概念を創出した。つまり彼は近世西洋における“nature”概念とまったく同じものを、西洋人の思想系統とは別に、ベーコン・デカルトなどの思想方法とはまったく異なる回路を通じて、日本で独自に創出したのである。

しかし安藤昌益の自然哲学の異例な独創性について、その一門の中では意識され自覚されていたが、その時代に受け入れられず、普及せず、後人によって踏襲されずに終わった。彼の死の一七六二年から一八六七年までの約百年間、自然界の「自然」の語はついに現れなかった。

十八・十九世紀の間、蘭学・西学が受容されてきた。アリストテレス以来の自然学“physic”，オランダ語で“Naturkunde”と訳され、日本の蘭学者は「窮理学」と訳した。一時期、「窮理学」・「窮物理ノ学」・「理学」という語で“Naturkunde”が訳された。一七九六年、オランダ人F. Halmaの蘭仏辞書をもとに作られた日本で最初の蘭日辞書である稲村三伯の『波留麻和解』に“Naturreの訳語として「自然」が登場していたが、しかしこれは例外の用例で、その後の蘭日辞書からは消えれてしまった。英語に関しては、幕末まで最も広く使われた様々な英和辞書にも、“nature”の訳語に「自然」はなかったし、明治に入ってからも「自然」の訳語は明確には現れてなかった。フランス語に関しては、村上英俊の『仏語明要』に“nature”の訳語として「自然・性質」とあるが、これも例外的で広まらなかった。

このように語学辞書でも、自然界の意の「自然」の語は、ちょっと現れてはすぐ消えており、明治に入ってもなかなか定着しなかった。例えば日本最初の哲学辞典である明治十四年の『哲学字彙』にあっても、“nature”の訳語は「本性・性質・天理・造化・宇宙・洪鈞・万有」などであって、「自然」は出てこない。ヘーゲルの『自然哲学』は明治初期に西周によ
「物理上哲学」と訳され、『哲学字彙』でも「天理学」と訳されており、加藤弘之はダーヴィンの“nature selection”を「自然淘汰」と訳したが、その「自然」は「おのずから」の意である。法律用語において、自然法“nature law”を「天律」（西周1866）や「性法」（西周1871・井上操1881）や「理法」（西周1882）と訳していた。ルソーを翻訳した中江兆民によっ
て“nature”的訳語は「万物・庶物・世界庶物・天地万物」となっているが、『社会契約論』を漢文に訳した『民約訳解』において“nature”は「天理」や「天理」や「天命」に当たる。

柳父章によると、自然界の意の「自然」の語が成立するので、明治二十二年頃からである。そこ時に『国民の友』と『女学雑誌』の間で、森鴎外と岩本善治との論争があったが、鴎外の説いている「自然」は全く“nature”と等しいのであり、この頃から自然界の意の「自然」が使われ広まり始めた、と柳父がいう。

このように、自然界の意の「自然」の語は、徳川中期の安藤昌益において例外的に成立していたのを除いて、明治において森鴎外が翻訳語として採用したのを始めとし、それが一般に定着したのは明治中葉の時期であったと見なされる。そこで西洋“nature”的概念が加えられた「自然」という新語が成立したものである。

二、「文明」・「文化」の場合

「文明」という語が文献で現れた時期は「文化」よりもやや早く、「易」では「見龍在田、天下文明」と乾文言や「文明映心、鑽之愈妙」（竜）など、用例が多く残っていた。その意味は「『文』が『明』である状態」、文教の発達や文采の燦然ということを描いている。「文化」という語が漢・劉向の『説苑』では「凡武之興、為不服也、文化不改、然後加誅」（指武）という用例は初見であるように思われるが、「『文』治教『化』」（刑罰や威力を用いないで導き教える）という意味である。いずれも社会や民族の発展を説明しようとする「文明」と「文化」とは、似たような意味を持つため、判然として区別することは容易ではない。

文明、文化の場合は

文明」という語が文献で現れた時期は「文化」よりやや早く、「易」では「見龍在田、天下文明」と乾文言や「文明映心、鑽之愈妙」（竜）など、用例が多く残っていた。その意味は「『文』が『明』である状態」、文教の発達や文采の燦然ということを描いている。「文化」という語が漢・劉向の『説苑』では「凡武之興、為不服也、文化不改、然後加誅」（指武）という用例は初見であるように思われるが、「『文』治教『化』」（刑罰や威力を用いないで導き教える）という意味である。いずれも社会や民族の発展を説明しようとする「文明」と「文化」とは、似たような意味を持つため、判然として区別することは容易ではない。

"civilization"と"culture"とをみよう。"civilization"は、ラテン語のcivis（市民）やcivitas（市民の）、およびcivitas（都市）に由来し、人知が進んで世の中が開け、精神的、物質的に生活が豊かになった状態を意味する。"culture"はラテン語cultura（耕作・育成を意味する）に由来し（英語culture、フランス語culture、ドイツ語Kultur）、耕された芸術や知識のことを意味する。しかし二者の使い方には二つの流れがあるため、はっきりと区別しにくいことも時々起こった。第一は、"civilization"と"culture"は連続したものであり、都市化、高度の技術、社会の分化、階層の分化を伴う"culture"を"civilization"とする。第二は、"civilization"と"culture"を連続したものではなく、かえって対立したものとして捉え、精神的所産を"culture"、物質的所産を"civilization"とする。十九世紀後半、ドイツの民族学者とイギリスの人類学者が第一の用法を提示して以来、人類学者の多くは第二の用法を避けている。第二の用法は、ドイツの哲学、とくに新カント学派の影響を強く受けていた。これは、物質的・技術的文明が累積され発展するのに対して、精神的・価値的な文化は一回限りのものであり、進歩という尺度によっては測れないとする。

明治初期の英和辞書を調べると、"civilization"と"culture"とを収録したものの、前者を「技術・機械の発達や社会制度の整備」、後者を「耕作・育成」というように解釈するのに止ま
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り、「文明」や「文化」との関連性がまだ表わされていなかった。『英和対訳袖珍辞書』（1869）にも『英和対訳辞書』（1872）にも“civilization”を“行儀正シキ、開化”、“culture”を“耕作。育、教導。修善。殖ヤス”と解したのは、その例である。しかし『英和対訳辞書』には“civilized”を“文明ナル。開化シタル”を解し、それは漢語「文明」と接尾辞としての“civilize”とを連結する最初の例と見られる。同時に出版された『和英語林集成』（1872）には“civilization”を“開化。教化”、“culture”を“耕種。修行。教育。教化”と説明し、『英和字彙』には“civilization”を“教化者、開化者、禮文者、通物理者、管物者”、“culture”を“種植之事、耕種之事、種禾者、修徳者、修理者、修文者”と解釈した。このような理解は明治十年代から二十年代にかけての英和辞書に受け継がれ、“civilization”における「開化」の意味と“culture”における「教化」の意味とが重んじられていった。二十世紀の初めに入ると、英和辞典では“civilization”を「文明」、“culture”を「文化」と訳すことが定着しつつあり、『新訳英和辞典』（1902）や『学生英和辞典』（1910）などが例に挙げられる。

しかし和英・和仏辞書のほう、最初から「文明」と「文化」とを区別せず場合は多く、例えば『漢英對照いろは辭典』（1888）では「文明」を「文明開化、Civilization」、「文化」を「人文之開化、Civilization; civilized」と解し、『和英大辞典』（1890）でも「文明」を“Civilization; refinement; social progress; enlightenment”、“文化”を“Culture; refinement; leaving no trace of barbarity or savageness”と解し、『和仏辞典』（1904）でも「文明」と「文化」とを“civilization”解釈した。二十世紀の初めに出版された漢字字典でも、「文明」と「文化」とを互に解する様子が呈する。例えば『熟語新辞典』（1907）には「文明」を“教化開け文物政法の大に良美なることの稱”、“文化”を“威力又は刑罰を用るずして他をさとし導く事。又、學術の進歩すること”と解し、『日本類語大辞典』（1909）には「文明」を“よのひらけゆくありさま、文化、開化”、“文化”を“學問進み世の進化する程度”と解し、『大辞典』（1912）には「文明」を“人智發達シ、野蠻ニ遠ザカツテデアルコト。又、その現象、又は、状態”、“文化”を“文明ノ化育”と解釈した。

このような状況は、明治初年において、「文明」と「開化」という言葉がほぼ並行して使われ始め、二つを結び付けた造語「文明開化」（略称「文化」）は、近代化・西欧化のスローガンとされたことにも関わっているのである。その時期に、前時代の古いものを野蛮未開と否定し、怒濤のように入ってくる西洋文物を摂取することが社会進歩の道であると観念され、福沢諭吉（1834-1901）が《西洋事情》（1866）において初めて「文明開化」を使用した。
し、まさにこの時期の優越的な相言葉となった。「文明開化」の現象は、生活の洋風化として、シャボン・ランプ・洋傘・シャッポ・洋服や洋館・ガス灯、あるいは学校・新聞・雑誌、さらには和洋折衷の建築から牛鍋まで、開化物として流行した。これらは東京、大阪、京都や開港した横浜、神戸など大都市の中心街に際だってみられ、地方には一般化していなかったが、新聞、雑誌、錦絵、出版物などによって、全国の人々の心を魅了した。しかしそこよりも全国民に「文明開化」を実感させたのは、岩倉使節団や海外留学生、雇い外国など、政府の意欲的な西洋文明摂取のもとに展開される開化政策であって、それは学制、徴兵令、地租改正などとなって全国民に降りかかってきた。

一八七五年、福沢諭吉はHenry.T. BuckleのHistory of Civilization in England（1861）、François.P.G. GizoのHistoire de la civilisation en Europe de puis la Revolution francaise（1828）、Francis WaylandのElement of Moral Science）、J.Stuart. MillのConsiderations on Representative GovernmentとOn Libertyを参照しつつ、『文明論之概略』を出版した。その後すぐベストセラーとなって、"civilization"の訳語とした「文明」の語も広く流行した。福沢のこの文明論書が担った歴史的な意味は、近代日本の文明論的な国家戦略を、西洋先進文明国を範型とした文明化＝近代化として明白に規定したところにある。そこで、西欧に既存してきた"civilization"概念における進化論的秩序性を受け継ぎ、「野蛮」（"barbarism"）・「未開化」（"savagery"）との対立的な図式で「文明」の概念が把握されるようになった。"culture"概念の場合、「文明」ほど注目されなかったため、「文化」という訳語は明治の後期にようやく一般に認識されるようになり、そこで漢語「文明」と「文化」との概念は"civilization"と"culture"に含む意味に取られ替えられ、漢語元来のものとの異なるようになり、いわば「新詞」（新しい言葉）として生まれ変わった。後に中国へもこれら「新詞」が逆輸入されて一般的に用いられているようになった。

『辞海』では、古代漢語の「文明」を「文采輝耀」、「civilization」の訳語とする「文明」を「人類の社会が開化される状態、野蛮と相対する」と解釈し、古代漢語の「文化」を「文治教化」、「culture」の訳語とする「文化」を「人類の社会は野蛮から文明へと進んでいく過程で、学問、芸術、宗教、道徳のよう、主として精神的活動から直接的に生み出されたもの」と解釈する。『大漢和辞典』では、古代漢語の「文明」を「文采があり、光り輝くこと。人知が進んで世の中が進んだ状態。人文が発達して光明のあること」とし、古代漢語の「文化」を「刑罰威力を用ひないで人民を教化すること。文治教化」とするが、訳語としての「文明」に関しては説明せず、訳語としての「文化」について、「自然を純化し、理想を実現せんとする人生の過程。即ち、人間が自然を征服支配して、本來具する究極の理想を現実完成せんとする過程の総称。過程の産物は、学問・藝術・道徳・宗教・法律・経済などである」と解釈しつつ、「文化を狭義に、宗教・道徳・學藝等の純粹精神文化と解し、之に対し、技術、又は物質文化を指してふ」という説明を加えた。見ると、『辞海』は「文明」と「野蛮」と対する側面を把握し、「大漢和辞典」は「文化」と「自然」と相対する側面を把握したものと言えよう。

24 石川禎浩：『近代中國의「文明」與「文化」』、京都大學人文科學研究所主編：『日本東方學』（一）（北京：中華書局、2007年）、頁323
25 臺灣中華書局辞海編輯委員會編輯：『辭海』（台北：台灣中華書局、2000年）、頁1358。
26 『辞海』、頁1357。
27『大漢和辞典』、頁5207。
28『大漢和辞典』、頁5234。
三、「哲学」・「理性」の場合

近代日本における「哲学」という語の創出は、西洋哲学の受容と近世より蓄積されてきた朱子学の思惟とを密接に関係している。

周知のように、宋明時代に盛んだ朱子学は、士農工商という身分制度の固定化をねがう徳川幕府にとっては、あつらえ向きの学問体系であり、林家はその中心とされる正統学派であった。日本人は「理学」「窮理学」「性理学」に対する深い教養を持ち合わせていたゆえに、西洋思想体系の輪郭をおぼろげながら理解できるようになった。

"Philosophy"という語は、愛を意味するphilo+知を意味するsophia＝「知を愛する」という意であるが、「哲学」という和製漢語がその訳語として通用される前に、「理学」・「希哲學」・「知学」・「性学」など、いくつかの漢語がその訳語に考案された。しかも「哲学」という語は定着された後、さらに何人かの学者は遺憾の念を表わし、「理学」を使うべきだと、痛切に表明した。

討論に入る前に、まず中国および日本の文献において、"Philosophy"の訳語を簡単な一覧表でみよう。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>人名</th>
<th>書名</th>
<th>翻訳法</th>
<th>時間</th>
<th>人名</th>
<th>書名</th>
<th>翻訳法</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>艾儒略</td>
<td>『西學凡』</td>
<td>意譯:理學、理科</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>日人與傳教士合編</td>
<td>『拉葡日詞典』 (『羅葡日典』)</td>
<td>學文好、萬物理明</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>『職方外記』</td>
<td>音譯:斐祿所費亞、斐錄所、大斐錄之學</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>學文</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>毕方濟</td>
<td>『靈言蠡勺』</td>
<td>費祿蘇非亞</td>
<td>1624-1628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>傅汎際譯</td>
<td>『霄有詮』</td>
<td>意譯:理學、性學、愛知學。</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>李之藻達辭</td>
<td></td>
<td>音譯:斐祿瑣費亞。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>高一志</td>
<td>『修身西學』</td>
<td>費羅所非亞</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>作者</td>
<td>作品</td>
<td>年代</td>
<td>作品</td>
<td>出版物</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>傅汛際</td>
<td>『名理探』</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>蔡鍾</td>
<td>意譯：理學、性學、愛知學。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>音譯：斐祿瑣費亞。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>李之</td>
<td>『斐祿匯答』</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>蔡鍾</td>
<td>1631年</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>高一志</td>
<td>『斐祿匯答』</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>蔡鍾</td>
<td>1635年</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>稲村三伯</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>『波留麻和解』</td>
<td>窮理科</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>宇田川玄</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>『極西検夫爾著異人恐怖傳』</td>
<td>窮理科</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>志筑忠雄</td>
<td>1828-1830</td>
<td>『聞見漫錄』</td>
<td>學師</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>高野長英</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>『外國事情書』</td>
<td>物理學、格智</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>渡邊華山</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>『和蘭字彙』</td>
<td>理學</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>王韜</td>
<td>『西學原始考』</td>
<td>1850-1860</td>
<td>『性理論』</td>
<td>性理論</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>津田真道</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>『性理論』</td>
<td>希哲學、希賢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>津田真道『性理論』跋文</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>『性理論』</td>
<td>希哲學、希賢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>松岡隠書簡</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>『西洋哲學史の考察斷片』</td>
<td>ヒロソヒーの学</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>西周</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>『西洋哲學史の考察斷片』</td>
<td>ヒロソヒーの学</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1863-1864</td>
<td>『開題門』</td>
<td>希哲學</td>
<td>斐畝蘇比、ヒロソヒー</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>村上英俊</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>『彿語明要』</td>
<td>天道之説</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>作者</td>
<td>书名</td>
<td>年份</td>
<td>作者</td>
<td>书名</td>
<td>学科</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>罗存德</td>
<td>『英华字典』</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>堀達之助</td>
<td>『英荷对译袖珍辞书』</td>
<td>理学</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1868</td>
<td></td>
<td>『学舍制案』</td>
<td>玄学</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1869</td>
<td></td>
<td>『舍密局开講之説』</td>
<td>熟考知察学、考察学、性理学</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>西周</td>
<td>『復某氏書』</td>
<td>哲学</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>西周</td>
<td>『百学连环』</td>
<td>希贤学、哲学</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>花之安</td>
<td>『德國學校略論』</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>中村正直</td>
<td>『自由之理』</td>
<td>理学</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1872</td>
<td></td>
<td>『和英語林集成』</td>
<td>学术、理、道、哲学、理学、理学、理论、理科</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>西周</td>
<td>『生性發蘊』</td>
<td>哲学</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>柴田昌吉</td>
<td>『英荷字汇』</td>
<td>哲学</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1874-1875</td>
<td>西周</td>
<td>『東京日新聞』『百一新論』</td>
<td>哲学</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>山本覚馬</td>
<td>『百一新論』序</td>
<td>哲学</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>慕維廉</td>
<td>『格致匯編』『倍根格致新法』</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>中村正直</td>
<td>『明六雜誌』</td>
<td>理学</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>罗存德</td>
<td>『英华和字典』（前书日譯）</td>
<td>理学</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>尺振八明</td>
<td>『斯氏教育論』</td>
<td>理学</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>井上哲次郎</td>
<td>『哲學字匯』</td>
<td>哲学</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>作者</td>
<td>書名</td>
<td>分類</td>
<td>年代</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>艾約瑟</td>
<td>『西學略述』</td>
<td>理學</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>黃遵憲</td>
<td>『日本國志』</td>
<td>哲學</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>顧厚琨</td>
<td>『日本新政考』</td>
<td>哲學</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>顏永京</td>
<td>『心靈學』</td>
<td>格致學</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>李鴻章</td>
<td>上海格致書院考題</td>
<td>格致學</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>鄧觀應</td>
<td>『盛世危言』</td>
<td>智學</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>黃慶澄</td>
<td>『東遊日記』</td>
<td>哲學</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>嚴復</td>
<td>『天演論』</td>
<td>哲學</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>康有為</td>
<td>〈請開學校折〉</td>
<td>哲學</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>梁啟超</td>
<td>『清議報』、『新民覇報』</td>
<td>哲學</td>
<td>1898-1907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>蔡元培</td>
<td>〈哲學總論〉</td>
<td>哲學</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>嚴復</td>
<td>『穆勒名學』</td>
<td>理學</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>蔡元培</td>
<td>翻譯德國科培爾『哲學要領』</td>
<td>哲學</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>公猛</td>
<td>『浙江潮』〈西臘古代哲學史概論〉</td>
<td>哲學</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人物</td>
<td>書籍/文献</td>
<td>設立/書誌</td>
<td>タイムライン</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>張百熙</td>
<td>《欽定京師大學堂章程》</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>《奏定學堂章程》（癸卯學制）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>《學務絹要》</td>
<td>設立「哲學」科目之爭</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>王國維</td>
<td>《哲學辨惑》</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>王國維</td>
<td>《奏定經學科大學文學科大學章程書後》</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

この表で示されるように、十七世紀における中国の宣教師らが書いた書物には“philosophy”を意訳で「理学」や音訳で「斐祿所費亞之學」と表するのに対し、日本の宣教師らがそれを「學文好」・「方物理明学文」・「学文」で表している。ロブシャイト（羅存德）の『英華字典』（1846年中国で出版、1869年日本語訳）では、“philosophy”を「理学・性学」・“natural philosophy”を「性理之學・博物理、格物総智・格物窮理の学」・“moral philosophy”を「五常之理・五常總論」・“intellectual philosophy”を「知学」・“philosopher”を「士・士子・博理者・窮理者」・“a natural philosopher”を「博物士・窮理之士」・“a moral philosopher”を「仁德之士・論五常者」・“Philosophic, Philosophical”を「理学的・理智的・涵養的・純靜」としている。早期の宣教師より一歩進んで、ロブシャイトの理解は明らかに宋明理学を基礎とし、「性理」・「窮理」・「格物」などの語が使われるところ、さらに「涵養」や「純靜」という語にも、深い理学的思想背景が呈されている。

一八六一年、蕃書調所に勤めた西周は、宋学の創始者である周敦頤の『通書』の「聖希天、賢希聖、士希賢」を引用して、「希賢学」か「希哲学」かと迷った後、「希哲学」を選んだ。しかしその後、彼がオランダへと留学し、そこで書いた「開題門」には、“philosophy”を「斐鹵蘇比（ヒロソヒー）」と表記している。彼は「儒」をもって「斐鹵蘇比（ヒロソヒー）」と類比し、それぞれは天道を明らかにし、人極を立つもので、其の実は一なり、と説いてる。しかし「儒」は「文運未だ旺し、日に新らしきこと惟だ乏しい」傾向を見られることに対し、「斐鹵蘇比（ヒロソヒー）」は「諸賢が輩出」し、「証拠が確実にある」ので、「是れ我が亚細亜には未だみることは無し」と指している。

この間に彼が書いた書物には、「希哲学」・「ヒロソヒー」・「斐鹵蘇比」など、意訳か音訳か、漢語かカタカナで表記するかと、かなり迷っている様子が伺える。一八七〇年になると、帰国して政界でも学界でも活躍した彼は、ようやく「哲學」を“philosophy”の訳語に選んだ。人々が“philosophy”概念を理解する際に、親しみを感じるために、朱子学という学問基盤に依拠する一方で、「希」という字をわざわざ除けて違和感を解かそうとしたのであろう。
一八七七年、文部省は新設の東京大学で「哲学科」を設け、一八八一年、井上哲次郎が編纂した『哲学字彙』では「哲学："philosophy"」と定め、ほかの辞書でも大抵このように従い、「哲学」という語が流行し、通用品となりつつあることが分かる。

しかし、上述した表でも見られるように、「哲学」という語が定着する一方で、「理学」こそ"philosophy"の訳語となるべきだという主張も力強いものである。以外でも「格学」や「智学」など、いろいろな提案が出されていった。それに、フランス学に深い造詣を持ち同時に漢学の素養の豊かであった中江兆民は、一八八六年に『理学沿革史』と『理学鉤玄』を出版した。彼は東洋思想と西洋思想との連関を重んじて、その融合を念ずるため、「哲学」という新語には不満な点が多かった。また、「理学」を使うべくして用いなかったことへ遺憾を念を、もっとも痛切に表明したものは、三宅雪嶺である。彼は以下のように指摘している。「若し旧幕時代には明清の学問が今一層入り込んだら、哲学の語が出来ず、理学と称する事のなったろう。明清の紹介が遅く、後に漸く考証が盛んになろうとした所で幕府が瓦解した。清朝の初めに孫奇峯の『理学宗伝』が出て、次に竇克勤の『理学正宗』が出て、いずれも宋儒を主として、支那哲学史と称すべきである。それが我が聖堂を初め、諸藩の学校に読まれたならば、理学というものが如何なる性質のものを知り、“philosophy”に接し、西洋の理学と認める事になったたろう。」つまり、西周による「哲学」の訳から、明・清の学問に対する理解不足なり誤解があったことが分かる。それも蕃書調所において、科学・技術・兵学・醫学を偏り過ぎで、人文科学に関しては工夫されていなかったことも原因にあるという。

西周が選んだ「哲学」、そして中江と三宅とが支持する「理学」。彼らが異なる選択をした原因は、世代・知識教養・学問的趣味などの違いにあったと推測できる。朱子学はまだ深い影響力を持つ徳川後期の社会で成長した西周は、朱子学の用語を警戒心を持ち、その権威を克服しつつ、西洋学術を受容しようとした。彼は「理学」を避け、「希哲学」を選び、「哲学」へ移行したのは、「philosophy」というものが、何かまとまった知識を提供する学問ではなく、すべてのドグマを払拭し、真の知識を獲得しようと熱望する態度であろう。中江と三宅とが、幕末・明治初期の社会における伝統学問と西洋学とを自由に取捨する学風において、その思想体系の比較と結合とに勤めたわけである。そこで、朱子学思想が、西洋化という表象の下で、潜流のように、明治知識人の思想をどれだけ縛るかを分かり得るものであろう。

終わりに代えて

明治の日本人は、西洋世界の基礎を形成している政治経済などの下部構造に関して西欧を発見しただけでなく、それらの上に構築されている西欧が独立に作りだした思想や世界観などのさまざまな観念形態についてはも、東と西の差別、つながり、その基盤などに関して丹念な探究を試みていた。新しい観念が外国から入ってきた時、それを、従来から持ち合っていた言葉で呼ぼうとするならば、そのことは新来の観念を旧来の観念に対比して理解するということを意味している。この場合、二つの観念の間に多少の隔たりがあっても、従来からの言葉が、その内容中に多少の増減修正を加えられて、そのまま新しい観念の名辞として、すらすらと受容され定着した。

「自然」は明治の中期、「文明」と「文化」とは明治の後期、「哲学」はやや早く明治の初期に成立するものと見られるが、その後長い時間を掛けようやく定着するようになっ
た。「自然」・「文明」・「文化」とは、すでに存在した漢語の中から選び出して、西洋概念の訳語に宛てたものであるに対して、「哲学」は新造語のである。それらいずれも適切な訳語の選定であったという見事さのゆえに、新詞として急速に広まり、中国へも逆輸入されるようになった。一言を付言すると、それ以降、「自然」概念が確立された同時に、人間にによる「自然の征服」が開始され、資本による自然の開発が始まった。というよりは自然を脅威・畏伏の対象とせず、利用・開発できる対象と見ることによって、新しい「自然」概念が確立したといえよう。「文明」と「文化」との新概念の成立にも、一方では西洋文明を急ぎでとり入れる姿勢が見られ、一方では伝統文化への関心と保護する姿勢が示されることを言えよう。
Abstract

With reference to Inoue Yasushi’s *Aoki ōkami* (The Blue Wolf, 1960), Ōoka Shōhei criticized Inoue’s attitude toward historical documents in the essay “*Aoki ōkami wa rekishi shōsetsu ka*” (Is *The Blue Wolf* a historical novel?), triggering a ‘debate on historical novel’ in the Japanese bun-dan.

In *Tenpyō no iraka* (The Roof Tile of Tempyō Era, 1958), a novel about the feats of Jianzhen (Jp. Ganjin, 687-763), Inoue Yasushi carefully quotes sources on Jianzhen.

Andō Kōsei, professor at Waseda University, supported the writing of *Tenpyō no iraka*. According to Andō Kōsei’s suggestions, Inoue Yasushi quotes specialised sources on Jianzhen, following the model of Japanese monks who transcribed texts. And, in *Tenpyō no iraka*, Inoue quotes the translation into modern Japanese from the book of Andō, titled *Ganjin daiwajō no kenkyū*.

Thanks to the friendship and cooperation between Inoue and Andō, Jianzhen becomes the symbol of the Sino-Japanese cultural exchange, overcoming the debate on historical novel.
1. 日中友好と「鑑真和上」

鑑真是12年5度におよぶ苦難の渡海行のすえ、みずからは失明し、多くの弟子を失いながらも、8世紀の日本に戒律を伝えた中国の高僧として知られる。鑑真が創建した奈良・西の京の唐招提寺には、奈良時代の制作とされる塗像「国宝・鑑真和上像」が伝わり、鑑真のふるさと揚州・大明寺には、唐招提寺金堂を模した鑑真記念堂が建てられ、「国宝・鑑真和上像」を模した鑑真像が安置されている。

しかし、「鑑真和上」が日中友好の象徴・平和の使者として、広く人々に知られるようになったのは、近年わずか半世紀のことにすぎない。

1957年（昭和32年）12月、井上靖の『天平の甍』が刊行され、この作品が1958年（昭和33年）芸術選奨文部大臣賞を受賞したことが、大きなきっかけであった。

1964年（昭和39年）3月に発行された新潮文庫版『天平の甍』の巻末に掲載された山本健吉「解説」は、当時の様子を次のように記す。

「中国で鑑真の事績をこれほど顕彰する切掛けになったのは、安藤氏の研究と五上氏の『天平の甍』の刺激によるのである。それまでは、まったく知られていなかった鑑真の存在を知り、しかも鑑真を日本に招いた栄叡・普照という日本の二人の学僧を知り、栄叡が雄図半ばに果てた端州の地の龍興寺には、その碑さえ建てるに至ったという。このような鑑真熱は、まったく近々半歳における盛上がりるのである。それは政治的な意味も含めて、中国の親日熱の高まりに一役果たしたのだった。」

「中国で鑑真の事績をこれほど顕彰する切掛けになった」という「安藤氏の研究と五上氏の『天平の甍』」とは、いったい、どのようなものであったのか。

本稿は、鑑真伝のトランス・カルチュラルとして、井上靖・歴史小説『天平の甍』とその原史料である「鑑真伝三部作」、さらに、安藤更正の研究書『鑑真大和上傳伝之研究』の出典関係を跡づける。この三者の表現を一字一句まで比較検討することによって、作家・井上靖と美術史家・安藤更正の密接な交流と協力関係が、今日、日中友好の象徴としての「鑑真和上」を生み出すにいたった経緯の一端をあきらかにすることを目的とする。

2. 井上靖と歴史小説論争


こうして歴史小説家としての名声が高まりゆくなか、1961年（昭和36年）1月の『群像』誌上において、大岡昇平が「『蒼き狼』は歴史小説であるか」（『群像』1961年1月号）を発表し、『歴史小説論争』の火ぶたが切って落ちたのであった。

大岡昇平は、『蒼き狼』に対する世間の高い評価に対して、辛辣な批判を浴びせた。

結論を先にいえば、『蒼き狼』はこれまでの井上靖の小説群と題材に於いて、大差のない小説である。叙事詩的でないし、歴史小説と言えるかどうか疑問である。井上文学の転回点どこか、その限界をはっきり示した作品である。これを見なおす必要があろう。
と指摘した。

成吉思汗が出生の秘密を持ち、モンゴル伝承の「蒼き狼」から霊感を受け、狼を理想として、あの大征服を行った痕跡は全くないこと。従ってこれが歴史小説と言えるか疑問だということ。

第二に、大岡昇平は『蒼き狼』は「歴史小説」ではなく、「いい加減な大衆作品」と指摘した。

小説家はその人物を現代にもはやない条件の間におくことによって、異常な葛藤の中に投げ込む。その葛藤の中に、作者の想像力が生み出すあだかれた「歴史」を創出するのである。従ってこれが歴史小説と言えるか疑問だということ。

一方、五上靖は1961年（昭和36年）２月「自作『蒼き狼』についてー大岡氏の『常識的文学論』を読んでー」（同2月号）を発表、この論争のなかでただ一度だけ、大岡昇平に答えた。

『蒼き狼』という作品の中で書きたかったことは、氏のいわゆる「狼の原理」なるものに他ならぬ。（中略）『蒼き狼』において私が書きたかったものは、歴史ではなく小説である。この作品を読む人には、何とかして人物を作品の中に定着させようとする試みを持った作品であった。

要するに、井上靖にとっての「歴史小説」とは、小説の舞台を、歴史的な場に設定するのであわせ、作者の想像力で「史実と史実の間にいって行」くことが許される、作者の想像力なしには、「歴史小説の成立を妨げることが、歴史的事実の間に介入して来ることが、歴史小説の成立を妨げることが考えられない」という質のものであった。この姿勢は、大岡昇平の「歴史小説」の概念とは相容れぬものであり、それゆえに大岡昇平は厳しい批判を加えたのである。

3. 井上靖『天平の甍』の原史料ー8世紀の三つの鑑真伝ー

『天平の甍』は、8世紀後半に成立した三つの鑑真伝を原史料とする。

山本健吉「解説」は、『天平の甍』の「パン種」として、正史『続日本紀』天平宝字七年五月戊申条、鑑真の物化に際して記された顕著記事（僧伝）を訓読文で引用する。

鑑真来朝の事績は、正史に次のように書かれており、これが小説『天平の甍』の「パン種」である。

（天平宝字七年）亓月戊申。大和上鑑眞遷化。和上ハ楊州龍興寺の大徳ナリ。（中略）天寶二載、留學僧栄叡・業行等、和上ニ白シテ曰ク、佛法東流シテ本國ニ至ル。其ノ教有リト雖モ、人ノ傳授スル無シ。幸ニ願ハクハ、和上東遊シテ化ヲ興セト。辞旨懇至ニシテ、諮請息マズ、乃チ楊州ニ於テ船ヲ買ヒテ海ニ入ル。而ルニ中途ニシテ風ニ漂ヒ、船ヲ打チ破ラレヌ。和上一心ニ念佛シ、人皆之ニ頼リテ死を免ル。七載ニ至リテ、更ニ復タ渡海ス。亦風浪ニ遭ヒテ、日南ニ漂著ス。時ニ栄叡物故ス。和上悲泣シテ失明ス。勝寳四年、本國ノ使適唐ニ聘ス。業行乃チ説クニ宿心ヲ以テス。遂ニ弟子廿四人ト、副使大伴宿祢古麻呂船ニ寄乗シテ歸朝シ、東大寺ニ於テ安置供養ス。（続日本紀、巻廿四）

『続日本紀』の記述はきわめて短小であり、わずかこれだけの史料から鑑真伝を再構築することは困難である。鑑真の事績を詳細に綴った伝に、鑑真の弟子・唐僧思託が成立に深く関わった表A・「鑑真伝三部作」がある。これらは生前の鑑真の謦咳に接しえた同時代の撰者の手になる伝として、鑑真伝の一級資料としての価値をもつ。

思託は、その生涯のうち、唐にあった12年を鑑真の渡海行に費やし、日本に来朝してからの後半生は鑑真伝の撰述に捧げた。奈良時代末から平安時代初期にかけての四半世紀にわたって、思託は三度にわたって鑑真伝の編纂をくりかえしたのである。

表A・鑑真伝三部作（8世紀後半に撰述された三つの鑑真伝）

①天平宝字七年（763）亓月六日鑑真遷化～宝亀二年（771）以前

Daito Denkai shiso meiki daiwajo ganjin den, three volumes, 763-771 A.D., edited by Situo

②宝亀十年（779）二月八日

Todaizao toseiden Biography of the Great Tang Monk Who Ventured East, one volume, 779, by Omi no Mifune and Shituo

③延暦七年（788）二月四日

Enryaku soroku Record of Monks until Enryaku Era, five volumes, 788, by Situo

思託が撰述した最初の鑑真伝は、①思託撰『大唐伝戒師僧名記大和上鑑真伝』三巻（佚書）である。「師僧名記」とあるように、その上巻は中国における鑑真的僧侶の伝を集成した集成僧伝であったことが知られているが、佚しで伝わらない。第二の鑑真伝は、思託の弟子・唐僧思託が成立に深く関わった表A・「鑑真伝三部作」が、これらは生前の鑑真の謦咳に接しえた同時代の撰者の手になる伝として、鑑真伝の一級資料としての価値をもつ。

これによると、まず、思託みずからが「和上行記」、すなわち①『大唐伝戒師僧名記大和上鑑真伝』を述作し、あわせて淡海三船撰の「和上東征伝」を依頼した。したがって、「鑑真伝三部作」はいずれも思託所持の原史料にもとづいており、互いに有機的な関係を有している。鑑真伝を解明するためには、「三部作」全体を厳密に読むことが必要である。

4. 『天平の甍』執筆を支えた安藤更正

山本健吉「解説」は先の引用に引き続き、『天平の甍』の原史料として第二の鑑真伝、淡海三船撰②『唐大和上東征伝』をあげ、「顕著の編纂の史実を井上靖に教示した人物として早大教授安藤更正氏の名
をあげている。

さらに、淡海三船の撰んだ『唐大和上東征伝』がある。鑑真の細部の史実については、氏は早大教授安藤更正の教示を得たらしい。安藤教授が言う、「ことごとく業行が熱中して書いた弘法の経巻を『秘密部』、すなわち密教の経巻や儀軌類であって、若しこれらの経巻が海難のために覆没の厄に遭わなかったなら、日本は仏法大師以前に、すでに正式な密教を持ち得たろうとしたことは、まことに玄人っぽい設定で、ここは生半可な「調べた小説」などで書けることではありません。」（「『天平の甍』をめぐって」）

安藤更正は、本名正輝、大正から昭和にかけて活躍した美術史家である。
1910年（明治33年）6月10日東京牛込御納戸町に生まれ、1919年（大正8年）早稲田中学を卒業、1922年（大正11年）東京外国語学校（現東京外大）仏学科を卒業、1924年（大正13年）早稲田大学文学部仏文科を中退した。その後、会津八一に学び、1925年（大正12年）師である会津八一とともに奈良美術研究会を始め、1925年（大正12年）早期の奈良美術研究会を創設し、1915年（昭和4年）には創刊「東洋美術」を創刊した。1937～1946年（昭和12～21年）まで北京に滞在し、業行の研究を進めるが、その原稿は「引き揚げに際して一切の研究資料と共に、これを留棄したるの止むなきに到つた」「殊に残念なのは、私が各地の踏査中に作製した遺址実測図・測量ノート、撮影した千数を超える真原板等の一切を、帰国に際して勝利に酔ひ痴れた官憲のために破棄されてしまつたことである」という。
1955年（昭和30年）、早稲田大学教授となり、1970年（昭和45年）10月26日、70歳で死去した。
らし合わせつつ、この三者の出典関係を読み解いていくこととする。

まず、鑑真伝冒頭の伝記叙述、鑑真の出身地と出自である。淡海三船撰『唐大和上東征伝』冒頭には、以下のようある。

大和上、諱鑑真、揚州江陽県人也。俗姓淳于、斎弁士髠の後なり。

これに該当する井上靖『天平の甍』と安藤更正『鑑真大和上傳伝之研究』の文章を対照して示すと、次のようになる。両者が一致する語は、一字一句にいたるまでゴチック体で示した。なお、[]内は、当該本文が現代語訳（大意）にはなく、訳などの別の箇所に存在するものである。

表B・鑑真的出身地と出自

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>井上靖『天平の甍』</th>
<th>安藤更正『鑑真大和上傳伝之研究』</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>姓は淳于氏、その家系は春秋齐の弁士、髠の後である。</td>
<td>鑑真、姓は淳于氏、其家系は春秋齐の弁士、髠の後である。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>大和上、諱は鑑真、揚州江陽県に生まれた。</td>
<td>唐天武の垂拱四年（西暦六八八年）に揚州江陽県に生まれた。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>鑑真的幼少時代については史書は何も語っていないが、</td>
<td>大和上、諱は鑑真、揚州江陽県に生まれた。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>唐の崇仏四年は日本の持統二年に当る。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>唐の崇仏四年は日本の持統二年に当る。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>要するに幼年時代の鑑真については、史料全く缺けて之を知る術がないと言はざるを得ない。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>『天平の甍』の文章が、『鑑真大和上傳伝之研究』の大意と非常によく似ていることが確認できよう。ゴチック体で示した箇所は、『唐大和上東征伝』本文にはない表現である。そこで、両者の用語はきわめて近い。こうした表現の類似は、全編わたって確認される。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. 鑑真的出家

これについて、淡海三船撰『唐大和上東征伝』では鑑真的出家が語られる。

表C・鑑真的出家（1）

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>淡海三船撰『唐大和上東征伝』</th>
<th>井上靖『天平の甍』</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>其の父、先に揚州大雲寺の智満禅師に就きて戒を受けて学び、大和上京に随して出家を求む、僧を着て毘沙門に於て、道を学びて龍興寺に於て、後改めて龍興寺と為す。</td>
<td>其の父、先に揚州大雲寺の智満禅師に就きて戒を受け禅門を学ぶ。大和上京に随して出家を求む、僧を着て毘沙門に於て、道を学びて龍興寺に於て、後改めて龍興寺と為す。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

『唐大和上東征伝』本文と『天平の甍』との対照して示す、表Cのようになる。
に請ひて出家を求む。父、 其の志を奇なりと
して許す。　
是の時、大周則天長安元年、詔有りて天下
の諸州に於て、僧を度す。
便ち智満禅師に就きて出家して沙弥と為り、
大雲寺に配住す。
後、改めて竜興寺と為す。
で出家の決心をした。
そして智満を師として沙弥となり、
配せられて大雲寺に住し、
後に竜興寺に移った。

原史料『唐大和上東征伝』の表現を確認したうえで、次に、『天平の甍』と『鑒眞大和上傳伝之研究』の
文章を比較すると、表Dのような表現の一一致を見る。井上靖に比して、安藤更正の文章の方がかなり詳細で
あることに注意しておきたい。

井上靖の文章は『唐大和上東征伝』に近い簡潔な文章であるのに対し、安藤更正は他の鑒真伝からも情報
を補いつつ、詳細に記述している。

7. 鑒真の菩薩戒受戒

引き続いて、『唐大和上東征伝』は、鑒真が菩薩戒を受けたことを次のように述べる。

唐中宗孝和皇帝神龍元年、従道岸律師受菩薩戒。

これを『天平の甍』と対照すると、表Eのようになる。

この簡潔な漢文は、『天平の甍』と『鑒真大和上傳伝之研究』にあっては、表Fのよう表現になる。
8. 鑑真の具足戒受戒

さらに、鑑真的具足戒受戒について、淡海三舨撰『唐大和上東征伝』は次のように記す。

景龍元年、杖錫東都因入長安。共二年三月廿八日、於京実際寺登壇受具足戒。荊州南泉寺弘景律師為和尚。景龍元年、錫を東都に杖つきて因りて長安に入り。其の二年三月廿八日、西京実際寺於にて登壇して具足戒を受く。荊州・南泉寺の弘景律師を和尚と為す。

この漢文体の記述は、井上靖によって、表Gのように作品のなかに摂りいれられる。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>表G・鑑真的具足戒受戒（1）</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>淡海三舨撰『唐大和上東征伝』</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>景龍元年、錫を東都に杖つきて因りて長安に入り。其の二年三月廿八日、西京実際寺於て登壇して具足戒を受く。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>荊州南泉寺の弘景律師を和尚と為す。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

『天平の甍』は、『唐大和上東征伝』にはない記述を多分に有している。これを安藤更正『鑑真大和上傳之研究』の文章と対照すると、表Hのようになる。一見、井上靖の文章の詳細さに比べて、安藤更正の大意のほうが簡潔にみえるが、実際には、表Hの[]内に示したように、安藤更正の同著の註に、この記述を補ってあまりあるほどの箇の説明がある。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>表H・鑑真的具足戒受戒（2）</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>井上靖『天平の甍』</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>景龍元年、二十歳の時、志を立てて巡錫の旅に上り、まず洛陽に入つた。次いで長安に入り、そして二十一歳の時、長安の実際寺於て登壇して具足戒を受く。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>実際寺は朱雀街の西、太平坊の西南隅にある寺で、三論の学者吉藏もここに住し、ここに寂し、浄土門の高僧善導もここに住し、浄土門の髙徳善導もここに住し。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>三論の学者吉藏もここに住し、ここに寂し、浄土門の髙徳善導もここに住し。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>授戒の師は荊州南泉寺の弘景律師であった。弘景は朝廷の帰依深く、則天、中宗の朝より三度勅を被って山を出で、宮中に入り、授戒の師となった。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

安藤更正は、道岸と鑑真的年齢を記している。

年五十有二。
この時奉請の十師等は、西京懸持寺の儀律師、西京薦福寺の道岸律師、荊州揚漢寺の俊律師、西京崇福寺の大禮律師、西京崇聖寺の見聴律師、西京崇福寺の息応律師、西京崇福寺の護法律師、西京薦福寺の恒誓律師、西京薦福寺の志清律師等であった。

この史料は、研究史の上では、1955年（昭和30年）6月と5月、谷省吾が学術誌『芸林』第6巻第3号・4号に連載した論文「鑑真和尚伝の逸文その他—凝然自筆「律宗祖師伝」断簡に関する研究—」において、谷省吾が発見して学界に紹介したものである。1960年（昭和30年）発行の安藤更正の大著には、谷省吾の論文は引用されず、「律宗祖師伝」佚文は引用されている。「鑑真大和上傳伝之研究」の「序」の目次は「昭和二十八年（1953年）十二月盡」となっている。あるいは、安藤更正の失われた第一稿には、この史料紹介が独自になされていたのかもしれない。

9. 鑑真の二京巡遊

このあと、「唐大和上東征伝」には、鑑真がふるさと揚州を離れて、唐の二都である長安・洛陽に遊学し、ついに「江淮の化主」と称される高僧になったことを伝える。

巡遊二京、究学三蔵。後帰淮南、教授戒律。江淮之間、獨為化主。於是興建仏事、濟化群生。其事繁多にして具載すべからず。

これを『天平の甍』本文と対照すると、表Iのようになる。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>表I・鑑真、長安・洛陽に遊学し、江淮の化主となる（1）</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>淡海三船撰『唐大和上東征伝』</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>二京を巡遊し、三蔵を究学す。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>後、淮南に帰りて戒律を教授する。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>江淮の間に独り化主となり、是に於て仏事を興建して群生を済化す。其の事繁多にして具載すべからず。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

『天平の甍』の記述は、『唐大和上東征伝』本文に比べて、かなり詳細である。依拠する史料は、思託による最初の鑑真伝①『大唐伝戒師僧名記大和尚鑑真伝』の佚文「融済律師伝」であった。

鑑真和上乃於長安受戒了。初即稟承満州融済律師、学宣律師『行事鈔』、及『羯磨疏』、『重軽（tm）儀』。律師者、是南山道宣律師弟子也。
鑑真和上、乃ち長安に於いて受戒し、後に、東京に於いて、『華厳二種生死義』を学ぶ。僧侶の『行事抄』及び『羯磨疏』、『重軽儀』を学ぶ。僧侶は、足利南北の道宣僧侶の弟子なり。

この史料も表日と同様、東大寺図書館蔵自筆『華厳二種生死義』裏書に記された『律宗祖師伝』断簡ともっとも1『大唐伝戒師僧名記大和上鑑真伝』の仮文である。

仏教史の論文として、由来と同様、東大寺図書館蔵『華厳二種生死義』裏書に記された『律宗祖師伝』断簡に関する研究として、1955年（昭和30年）6月と5月。井上靖『天平の甍』の刊行は、1957年（昭和32年）12月。安藤更正『鑑真大和上傳之研究』の刊行は、1960年（昭和35年）。『鑑真大和上傳之研究』の「序」の日付は「昭和二十八年（1953年）十二月尽」である。

五上靖が「律宗祖師伝」を知ったのは、おそらく、安藤更正の教示によるものと思われるが、安藤更正が「律宗祖師伝」を知った時期は未詳である。安藤更正自身も、1『大唐伝戒師僧名記大和尚鑑真伝』の佚文を自著に書きとどめていることから、安藤更正は独自に東大寺図書館での調査をおこなったものと推測されるが、谷省吾の論文を知らなかったようである。

表J・鑑真、長安・洛陽に遊学し、江淮の化主となる（2）

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>井上靖『天平の甍』</th>
<th>安藤更正『鑑真大和上傳之研究』</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>青年時代の鑑真は東西両京に於て三蔵の究学に明け暮れた。</td>
<td>これより二京を巡遊し、</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>融済に就て道宣の『四分律行事鈔』『注羯磨』『重軽重儀』を学び、義威について法礪の『四分律疏』を学んだ。</td>
<td>先づ融済に就て道宣の『四分律行事鈔』『注羯磨』『重軽重儀』を学び、次に長安禅定寺の義威に従って法礪の『四分律疏』を学ぶ。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>次に西明寺の遠智に法礪の律疏を、</td>
<td>次に西明寺の遠智に法礎の律疏を受け。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 長安観音寺の大廈にも羯磨を聴いた。 | 長安観音寺の大廈に就て羯磨を聴くこと五遍。

即ち鑑真の学統は、道宣の南山律宗を主とし、傍ら法礪の相部、即ち法礪の学統は、道宣の南山律宗を主とし、傍ら法礪の相部を受け、満意の西塔を奉ずるものである。 |

融済、義威共に、その伝は明らかでないが、遠智、法礪と共に西塔宗の門で、名声は一世に高かった。

開元元年（西紀七一三）は鑑真京洛遊学の七年目である。三十一歳にして『行事鈔』及び『重軽重儀』を、四十歳の時には『羯磨疏』を講じた。

凡そ前後に大律及び疏を講じること四十遍、律抄を講じること七十遍、軽重儀・羯磨疏を講じること各十遍、

一切経を写すこと三部、各々三万三千巻、前後、人を度し戒を授ける事凡そ四万有余。 |

人を度し、戒を授けること四万余人。栄叡、普照が会った頃の鑑真について、

《唐大和上東征伝》は僅かに記している。

一、「江戸に於て化主たり、仏教を興建して群生を浄化し、共に繁多にして親依に載すべきならぬ」

10. 日中友好の象徴・鑑真和上の誕生

以上の考証により、安藤更正と井上靖の連携が、いかに密接であったかがうかがえるであろう。井上靖の
歴史小説『天平の甍』の骨格をなしていたのは、②『唐大和上東征伝』を軸とした「鑑真伝三部作」であり。その理解は、安藤更正の鑑真伝研究であったということはいうまでもない。

そのことは、十分に認識された事実ではあるが、こうして表AからJまでを具体的に比較対照してみると、井上靖の小説の文章と安藤更正の現代語訳（大意）の表現が、あまりにも類似していることに一驚を禁じえない。井上靖が、安藤更正の『鑑真大和上傳之研究』を引き写したのであろうか。そうではない。

安藤更正『鑑真大和上傳之研究』が刊行されたのは、1960年（昭和35年）8月5日であった。これに先だって1958年（昭和33年）、安藤更正は美術出版社から『鑑真』を刊行している。これらふたつの安藤更正の著作よりも、1957年（昭和32年）12月井上靖『天平の甍』の刊行のほうが早いのである。

つまり、1957年（昭和32年12月）刊行の井上靖『天平の甍』の本文を、安藤更正が自著に引き写していたのである。しかし、それは剽竊ではない。ふたりはこのことを了解し合っていたはずである。

『天平の甍』執筆に際して、美術史家・安藤更正は、作家・井上靖に多大なる教示を与えた。一方、安藤更正もまた、作家・井上靖の文章を、みずからの著作のなかに大きく摂りいれることによって、鑑真伝の現代語訳（大意）を格調高いものにすることができた。そして、井上靖にあたえた教示が、自分の研究の成果であることにの効果をしっかりと自著のなかに刻みこんだのであった。

ふたりの友情は、日中交流の象徴としての「鑑真和上」を誕生させた。そして、国交回復へむかう日中交流のふかまりのかた、作家と学者は中国を訪問し、日本と中国の友好の象徴としてその実をあげたのである。

1972年（昭和47年）9月29日、中華人民共和国北京に発された「日本国政府と中華人民共和国政府の共同声明」（日中共同声明）の調印式が行われた。田中角栄・周恩来両国首相がこれに署名したことによって、日本と中国共産党率いる中華人民共和国とが国交を結び、日中国交正常化が実現した。

1996年（平成8年）年5月、井上靖の没後5年を記念して、唐招提寺境内に、井上靖と安藤更生の業績顕彰碑が建立された。石碑には、井上靖の直筆で「天平の甍」と刻まれている。

中国からの引き揚げに際して、永年蓄積してきた研究資料が官憲のために破棄されてしまった安藤更正の無念は、察するに余りある。日中両国民にとって、また、安藤更正にとっても、井上靖にとっても、さまざまな思いを乗り越えての日中友好の実現であり、その象徴としての「鑑真和上」の誕生が、井上靖『天平の甍』であった。
1. 日中友好と「鑑真和上」

鑑真は12年5度におよぶ苦難の渡海行のすえ、みずからは失明し、多くの弟子を失いながらも、8世紀の日本に戒律を伝えた中国の高僧として知られる。鑑真が創建した奈良・西の京の唐招提寺には、奈良時代の作とされる塑像「国宝・鑑真和上像」が伝わり、鑑真のふるさと揚州・大明寺には、唐招提寺金堂を模した鑑真記念堂が建てられ、「国宝・鑑真和上像」を模した鑑真像が安置されている。

しかし、「鑑真和上」が日中友好の象徴・平和の使者として、広く人々に知られるようになったのは、近年わずか半世紀のことにすぎない。1957年（昭和32年）12月、井上靖の『天平の甍』が刊行され、この作品が1958年（昭和33年）芸術選奨文部大臣賞を受賞したことが、大きなきっかけであった。

1964年（昭和39年）3月に発行された新潮文庫版『天平の甍』の巻末に掲載された山本健吉「解説」は、当時の様子を次のように記す。

『天平の甍』は、南都唐招提寺の開祖である唐僧鑑真的事績によって書かれている。

ところで、これは後日譚になるが、今年の秋（筆者注：昭和39年=1964年）、鑑真の一千二百年限を記念する集会が北京と揚州で開かれ、さらに鑑真にゆかりの深い揚州の大明寺には、鑑真記念館が建てられたことになった。そのため井上氏は、鑑真研究の第一人者安藤更正氏等と中国に招かれ、それらの式典・集会に出席した。

中国で鑑真的事績をこれほど顕彰する切掛けになったのは、安藤氏の研究と井上氏の『天平の甍』の刺戟によるのである。それまでは、まったく知られていなかった鑑真的存在を知り、しかも鑑真を日本に招いた栄叡・普照という日本の二人の学僧を知り、栄叡が雄図半ばに果てた端州の地の龍興寺には、その碑さえ建立に至ったという。このような鑑真熱は、まったく近々半歳における盛上がりなのである。それは政治的な意味も篭めて、中国の親日熱の高まりに一役果たしたのだった。

（1964（昭和39）年3月、『天平の甍』新潮文庫）

「中国で鑑真的事績をこれほど顕彰する切掛けになった」という「安藤氏の研究と井上氏の『天平の甍』とは、いったいどのようなものであったのか。

本稿は、鑑真伝のトランス・カルチュラルとして、井上靖の歴史小説『天平の甍』とその原史料である「鑑真伝三部作」、さらに、安藤更正の研究書『鑑真大和上傳伝之研究』の出典関係を跡づける。この二者の表現を一字一句まで比較検討することによって、作家・井上靖と美術史家・安藤更正の密接な交流と協力関係が、今日、日中友好の象徴としての「鑑真和上」を生み出すにいたった経緯の一端をあきらかにすることを目的とする。　

2. 井上靖と歴史小説論争

井上靖の初期の歴史小説には、『漆胡樽』（1950年）、『玉碗記』（1951年）等の短編があり、『風林火山』（1953年）、『染との日記』（1955年）に続く歴史小説が、1957年（昭和32年）『天平の甍』であった。翌1958年（昭和33年）、井上靖は『天平の甍』を芸術選奨文部大臣賞を、1959年（昭和34年）には『文藝春秋』に連載する。さらに、1959年（昭和34年）10月〜1960年（昭和35年）7月には、『元朝秘史』を史料として成吉思汗を描いた『蒼き狼』を『日曜文芸』に連載する。これに続いて、『楼蘭』（1958年）、『敦煌』『蒼き狼』（1959年）刊行、1960年（昭和35年）には『文藝春秋』に連載する『楼蘭』などに每日芸術賞を受賞した。

こうして歴史小説家としての名声が高まりにくなかったのは、1961年（昭和36年）1月の『群像』誌上において、大岡昇平が『『蒼き狼』は歴史小説か』（『群像』1961年1月号）を発表、「歴史小説論争」の火ぶたを切って落とされたのであった。

大岡昇平は、『蒼き狼』に対する世間の高い評価に対して、辛辣な批判を浴びせた。

結論を先にいえば、『蒼き狼』はこれまでの井上氏の小説群と題材に於いて、大差のない小説である。叙事詩的でないし、歴史小説と言えるかどうか疑問である。井上文学の転回点どこか、その限界をはっきり示した作品である。以下これを立証する。

大岡昇平は、第一に、原史料『元朝秘史』が正しく読解できていないために、原作の『改竄
点」が生じたと指摘した。

成吉思汗が出生の秘密を持ち、モンゴル伝承の「蒼き狼」から霊感を受け、狼を理想として、大征服を行った痕跡は全くないこと。従ってこれが歴史小説と言えるか疑問だということ。

第二に、『蒼き狼』は「歴史小説」ではなく、「いい加減な大衆作品」と評した。

歴史小説と称しながら、諸人物の描き方、戦闘の描写、その他アメリカのスペクタクル映画並のいい加減なもので、大衆の口に合うように料理されたに過ぎないこと。

そして、作品を貫く「狼の原理」について、辛辣な批判を浴びせた。

主人公を氏が現代の動物小説から得た狼の観念に引き寄せようとしている。狼の原理は全編に繰り返され、氏の小説家の手腕によって、作品に一応の統一を与えているが、原理には現実性がないから、統一はそらぞらしく、いたるところ破綻せざるを得ない。

すなわち、大岡昇平は「歴史小説」なるものを、史料を正しく読解し、歴史的事実に尊敬を払うこと求めたのである。

小説家はその人物を現代にはやない条件の間におくことによって、異常な葛藤の中に投げ込むようにし、欲望を解放することが出来ることが出来たということ歴史の主幹に加えて上げる、はじめとして可能なのである。歴史的事実に尊敬を払わなければ、イリュージョンは消え、作品は歴史でもなければ、小説でもないという、空虚の中に落ち込む。(中略)歴史小説は必ずしも歴史的事実にかわれる必要はないにしても、人間が歴史を作り、また歴史に作られると言う相互関係がなければ、そもそも人間を歴史的環境に置く必要はないわけではない。

一方、井上靖は1961年（昭和36年）2月「自作『蒼き狼』についてー大岡氏の『常識的文学論』を読んでー」（同2月号）を発表、この論争のなかでただ一度だけ、大岡昇平に答えた。

『蒼き狼』という作品の中で書きたかったことは、氏のいわゆる「狼の原理」なるものに他ならない。氏は『蒼き狼』に於いて私が書きたかったのは、歴史ではなく小説である。少し気負った言い方を許して戴くとすると、私はどの歴史書の説明でも説き得ない成吉思汗という人間の持っているある面を、それを小説化することに於いて解決したかったのである。

井上靖は森鷗外「歴史其儘と歴史離れ」を引いて、自作について次のように述べた。

『楼蘭』は「歴史そのまま」の作品であり、『敦煌』はある意味で「歴史離れ」の作品である。ごく自然な感動、ごく自然な感情、ごく自然な言語で、いわゆる「歴史小説論争」に於いて私が書きたかったのは、歴史小説である。しかし、成吉思汗を語る小説家が、成吉思汗を語る小説を語っていたわけではない。

要するに、井上靖にとっての「歴史小説」とは、小説の舞台を、歴史的な場に設定するものであり、作者がその想像力で「史実と史実の間にいて行」ることが許され、作家の想像力ないしは「作者の解釈が歴史的事実の間に介入して来ることが、歴史小説の成立を妨げる根拠と考えられない」という質のものである。この姿勢は、大岡昇平の「歴史小説」の概念とは相容れないものであり、それに見せ大岡昇平は厳しく批判を加えたのである。

大岡はさらに同1961年3月「成吉思汗の秘密ー常識的文学論（3）ー」（同3月号）で引き続いて批判をつづけるが、井上靖はひたすら沈黙を守りつづけ、「歴史小説論争」は舞台を『読売新聞』に移し、著者がその物語を伝えるに成功することになる。こうして、「歴史小説論争」は、山本健吉「歴史と小説」（『読売新聞』1961年1月18日夕刊）、大岡昇平『『蒼き狼』は叙事詩か」（『読売新聞』1961年1月24日夕刊）、山本健吉『再び歴史と小説について』（『読売新聞』1961年1月31日夕刊）、井上靖『国語問題のために』（『読売新聞』1961年2月6日夕刊）、福田宏年『歴史小説の「真実性」は？ー『蒼き狼』論争への私見ー』（『読売新聞』1961年2月25日夕刊）と展開してゆく。
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Abstract
Recently, the terms “trans-cultural studies and “trans-national studies” have arisen in international forums, leading to some confusion. Trans-national studies are not a special research field, but rather a method deployed when pursuing cultural studies. From ancient times until today, national cultures are generally formed in relation to other national cultures. This is why we have to use trans-national methods for doing cultural studies (Section 1-1). Here we ask questions about how to translate the words of “trans-cultural studies” and “trans-national studies” into Japanese (1-2), what differences there are between “trans-nationalism” and “inter-nationalism” and so on (1-3). Then we consider the transformation of the concepts of “world literature”, “comparative literature”, and also “comparative culture”, as they have been in the past. We conclude that “trans-cultural studies” are not a discipline, nor even a paradigm in a specific field, but rather a method that concerns every field in cultural studies (Section 2).

Further, we seek to outline the background of the concept of “North European Literature”, born at the turn of the twentieth century in Japan. The man who coined the concept is Ueda Bin (Section 3), and his coining of the concept was contemporaneous with both the symbolist movement in Europe from the late nineteen century and the reformulation of the concept of “fine art” not only Japan in but also in “world literature”. All these surveys suggest to us a future direction for the rewriting of literary history in Japan (Section 4). Above all, we confirm here the usefulness of the trans-national and trans-disciplinary methods to literary and cultural studies today (Section 5).
まず、昨今、活発になっているトランス・カルチュラル研究（trans-cultural studies）あるいは、トランス・ナショナル研究（trans-national studies）をめぐって、わたしの基本的な立場を提出し（1-1）、次に、"trans-cultural studies"、"trans-national studies"は日本語にどう訳すか（1-2）、「trans-nationalism」と"inter-nationalism"のちがいはどこにあるのか（1-3）などの問題を整理する。関連して、「世界文学（world literature）」という概念の今日的転換について、従来の比較文学（comparative literature），比較文化（comparative culture）とは、どうちがうのか、その概略をまとめ、"trans-cultural studies"の推進すべき方向について提案する（2）。その上で、その方法に立って、20世紀への転換期に日本に起こった「北欧文学」概念の提出と、その内容、背景について略述し（3）、それが日本における芸術概念の再編成と密接に関連するものだったということに論及する（4）。そして、最後に、わたしが提案する方法の有効性を明確にする。

1. "trans-cultural studies", "trans-national studies"をめぐって

1-1 日本では1990年代に「国境を越える」という語が流行った。一国内に閉ざされた態度を打破ろうとしていわれたのだが、古代から文物、宗教、語彙などの諸文化は「国境を越える」のがふつうだった。アジアでもヨーロッパでも古代帝国の版図は諸民族をまたいで形成されていた。古代帝国間の交通もあった。そして、ヨーロッパでは民族大移動が長く続いた。国民国家のしくみが強力に働くようになった近代以降も、知識層の移動はつづいた。「国民国家」、「state-nationalism」という組織形態自体が、19世紀から20世紀を通じて、グローバライズ化したものが、帝憲主義とそれに対する労働者階級の国際連帯、「inter-nationalism」、先進国における20世紀の大衆社会も、みな「国境を越える」動きだった。それらの動きをとらえるとする研究は、みな当然のこと「国境を越える」ことになる。

ナショナリズムの動向に関心を注ぐと、もうひとつ、20世紀前半から、世界を見渡して「文明圏」に区分する考え方がありなりの力をもったことを見落としがちである。第1次大戦後、「帝国主義の時代は終わった」「国際連盟の時代」になったといわれ、ヨーロッパではナショナリズムを超えた「ヨーロッパの形成」が唱えられた。アジアでも民族独立運動が国境を越えて高揚し、文化相対主義が盛んになったのち、第2次大戦期に日本が唱えた「大東亜共栄圏」構想は、国際圏とその内部における民族文化相対主義とを複合したものです。帝国主義、コミュニズム、ファシズムを超えるという意味が付与されていた。

それゆえ、「国境を越える」ということ自体に何か特別な意味があるわけではない。1990年代に問題提起されたのは「国境の越え方」の議論と（西川長夫『国境の越え方 - 比較文化論序説』1992）だった。国際的な多文化主義（multi-culturalism）の高まりがその背景にあった。ソ連とソ連圏の崩壊ののち、今日、さまざまな文化の“globalization”現象と、それに対する様ざまな水準の“localization”とが複合する“glocalization”の動きが、全世界を覆っている。イスラム原理主義の台頭を経て、イスラム民主主義が高揚しているのも、その表れと見ることができる。

1-2訳語の問題。中国語では”trans-cultural studies”に対して「跨文化学」という語が用いられている。「各国文化に橋をかけて見る」というほどの意味である。かつて”inter-nationalism”は「国際主義」（国際的連帯の意味）と翻訳されているから、それ
とは区別して、”relativise”（相対化する、各国文化を相互比較し、共通性や異質性を見出す）する立場を指している。なお、今日の中国では「国民」という語を避け、ほぼ同義語として「民族」を用い、「国民国家」には「民族国家」という語を用いている。

ただし、「跨」という文字からは2つの文化のあいだを想起しやすい。"trans-cultural studies”といえども、実際のところは、2カ国間の問題に限定して論じる研究者が多いので、さまざまな国を対象にして、多元的に橋をかける研究の道は拓けるはずだ。

日本語では、「文化横断的」と「横断」の語が用いられることもある。この用法は、中国人は了解しにくいという。たとえば、“transcontinental railway”は「大陸横断鉄道」と翻訳するが、これはアメリカ大陸を貫いて走るもので、二つの大陸を跨ぐわけではない。’trans-”は、「交わる」を意味するラテン語起源の語で、多義的であるため、このようなことが起こる。’trans-”は「超える」「超越的」の意味ももつが、「超」は”super”、“ultra”の訳にも用いられ、これが「程度の度外れた」という意味にもなる。アメリカは第二次大戦時期の日本を”ultra nationalism”と呼んだ。「超国家主義」と訳されたが、これが「程度の著しい国家主義」の意味で用いられてきたことはよく知られている。

ただし、「文化横断的」は、”cross cultural”の訳語として選ばれたものかもしれない。これは、いくつかの文化が交叉する像や交叉点を想わせる。これだと、異文化の接触点や面を研究することに限られそうで、必ずしも、多くの文化を見渡す立場を意味しない。それらの理由により、要するに”trans-cultural”、“trans-national”は、翻訳しにくい。それゆえ、日本ではカタカナで用いてよいと思う。

もうひとつ、居住地域の国語以外の言語を用いる人びと（移民や広い意味でのディアスポラ（diaspora）集団、国境線近くの居住者集団など）が記した文学を”trans-national literature”と呼ぶ呼び方がある。ただ、この用法は、ヨーロッパ語圏以外で、バイリテラシー状態にあった地域、前近代の日本、朝鮮などで記された中国語による詩や文章を考慮に入れていない。

なお、日帝支配下の台湾、朝鮮半島でも、言語政策によって、日本語以外に、それぞれ中国語、朝鮮語を公認する”bi-lingual”、“bi-literacy”状態が生じた。その時期にそれらの言語で書かれた文学作品は、先の定義では対象外になるだろう。「満洲国」では、日本語、中国語、蒙古語が「国語」とされていたため、ロシア語の文学だけ、この定義にあてはまることになるだろう。この対象領域を呼ぶ呼び名としての”trans-national literature”に対して、ここにいう”trans-national studies”、“trans-cultural studies”は、あくまでも研究の立場や視角、方法を指すものである。したがって、上記の”bi-lingual”、“bi-literacy”状態における言語作品を、みな対象範囲にふくまれる。

そして、明記しておくなければならないが、”trans-national studies”、“trans-cultural studies”は、専門分野の原理（discipline, paradigm）にならず、したがって特定の分野もふくまらない。
２、従来の比較文学(comparative literature)、比較文化(comparative culture)とは、どうちがうのか

比較文学研究は、近代における各国の国文学(national literature)についての研究が、それぞれの国民性を明らかにすることを目的としていたのに対し、古代、中世、近代における他国文学の受容、影響関係の解明に向かうものであり、19世紀中期から盛んになった。「世界主義」(cosmopolitanism)を標榜したが、実際には、ヨーロッパ中心主義(Eurocentrism)であり、自国文学・文化研究と相互補完的な関係にあった。その自体を整理すると、①古典(ギリシア―ラテン文学間、古典・中世―近代文学間、近代各国文学間の3の領域において(文学は"polite literature")、②作品および作品群、作家、および作家集団の相互関係、③ジャンル、題材、思想、感情、表現法における伝播、③“crénologie”(源泉研究)と“mesologie”(媒体研究)を行うことが掲げられていた。その点において、「国境」を超えない“national literature”(自国文学)研究とは異なり、また、”international literature”(国際文学)研究の内部において、”general literature critics”(一般文学論)と区別される。ただし、19世紀後半には、19世紀前半におこったヨーロッパ内部で起きた知識層の移動などから、文化圏内部における相互影響関係という発想が強くなり、よく知られるゲオルク・ブランドス『19世紀文学主潮』(Georg Morris Cohen Brandes, *Hovedstrømninger i det 19 de Aarhundredes Lieteratur*, 1872-84)は、ヨーロッパ全体の思潮の動きを関係づけて論じた。

このようなヨーロッパの「比較文学」研究の方法がそれとして日本に導入されたのは、ヨーロッパ文学の翻訳紹介やブランドス『19世紀文学主潮』などの紹介よりもかなり遅れ、1930年代になってからである。上記のヨーロッパ比較文学の動向は、フランスのポール・ファン・ティーゲム『比較文学』(Paul van Tieghem, *La Litterature Comparée*, 1931)のもので、岩波講座『世界文学』シリーズの一冊に掲載された野上豊一郎(のがみ とよいちろう、1883 - 1950)の「比較文学論」(1934)ではじめて祖述された。

野上は、そこで英語圏の書物にふれなかったことわっているが、最後の方で、イギリスのリチャード・モールトン『世界文学』(Richard G. Moulton, *World Literature and Its Place in General Culture*, New York, 1930)の序論から、「世界文学とは昔から世界各国に堆積している文学の総和を意味するのではなくて、各人がそれぞれの国民的見地から見た全世界の文学である」という定義を引きながら、各国「国民文学」論に対して比較文学論と一般文学論の関係を論じた部分を紹介している。つまり、自国文学を基準に、それぞれの「世界文学」像を描く立場である。モールトンは、自国文学については「われわれ自身の文学とは、イギリスの作家が英語で書いたものではなくて、英語を話す者の文明がそれ自身で生産したところのものに加えて、世界の他の諸文明から吸収したところのものを以てたもの」と定義している。アメリカはもちろん、アイルランドやインド独立運動の立場から英語で書かれた文藝作品をも「イギリス文学」の内部に抱える考え方である。

ここに、ティーゲム『比較文学』を選んだことに続き、野上豊一郎自身の「世界主義」の立場を示している。その立場から野上は、「最も笑うべきは、国文学者や漢文学者が、自分たちの職業意識もしくは生活手段から、西洋文学者に対して理由なく嫉妬心を持つこと」だと述べている。1930年代に日本に興隆した国粹主義、伝統主義に対抗する姿勢である。
野上豊一郎は、夏目漱石門下の英文学者で、能楽研究者としても知られる。彼自身の能楽研究は、1930年代の国文学および美学のアカデミズムで、中世の禅林に発する「わび、さび」や「幽玄」の美学が「日本的なるもの」として盛んに論じられていたことに完全に背を向け、日本文学の近代化を西洋文学受容に限定している。これは岩波講座『世界文学』そのものの姿勢だった。国粹主義、伝統主義の台頭に対して、「世界主義」を標榜し、近代化すなわち西洋化を対置する、このような立場は、西洋中心主義に対抗して、東洋における国際主義、すなわち東洋主義が台頭すると、混乱に陥り、また容易に反転して日本主導の東洋主義に傾いていった。これが「大東亜共栄圏」構想を支える思想だったのである。そして、第二次大戦後には再び反転して、西洋化すなわち近代化というスキームをつくることになる□。

比較文学研究における、このような「世界文学」と「自国文学」の相互補完関係は、第二次大戦後も、かなり長く維持されてきた。あるいは、いまも。

それに対して、今日、アメリカにおいて行われている”world literature”（世界文学）をめぐる議論は、あたかもRichard G. Moultonが否定した「世界各国に堆積している文学の総和を意味する」ものへ向かおうとしているかのように見える。なぜか。それは、フランス文学、ドイツ文学など各国文学史を学ぶ学生数の減少傾向に歯止めがきかなくなったことから、「文学」の授業の存続をかけて、“world literature”の名のもとに、「世界各国に堆積している文学」をすべて英語に翻訳する教科書づくりのプロジェクトが進行しているからである。東アジア、とりわけ前近代を対象とする研究者たちは、これを自分の研究分野を学生に関心をもってもらえる機会の拡大ととらえ、積極的な取り組みを見せている。だが、これは、諸手をあげて歓迎すべき事態だろうか。

今日、アメリカ英語は、イギリス知識階の英語と競合する面をもちつつ、国際共通語として認定されている。すでにそれは第二次大戦後の理・工・医系のアカデミズムでは定着し、電子メディアによって国際的に流通する体制が整っている。ヨーロッパ各国の人文・社会科学系でも国際発信は英語を採用しつつある。それゆえ、英語訳「世界文学」は、相当の拡がりをもつだろう。

かつて、ヨーロッパにおいて行われてきた世界の地域研究は、それぞれの地域のリテラシーや身につけることを前提にしていた。”Asian Studies”であれば、中国語を共通基盤として行われていた。しかし、第二次大戦後のアメリカの日本研究、そして1980年代ころからはヨーロッパにおいても、その基盤は失われつつある。各国研究、それも各専門分野をめぐるものがもとを細分化してゆく傾向が顕著である。高度成長経済によって注目された日本をめぐる”Japanese Studies”（日本研究）が、そうだった。中国語リテラシーを抜きに、日本語リテラシーのみをもつ研究者が拡大した。

今日、まったく別の理由、国際的な日本のマンガ・アニメ・ブームが土台にして、空前の日本語学習ブームがアメリカ中南部を除く世界各地に見られる。しかし、それとはまったく無関係に、とくにアメリカやオーストラリアでは、”Japanese Studies”が縮小し、”Chinese Studies”へとシフトしてゆく傾向が見られる。中国のプレザンスが国際的に大きくなったことが、その理由である。

他方、とりわけ、たとえばアメリカの社会学などに顕著に見られるのは、世界の各地に
普遍理論を適用し、ケース・スタディー（case study）を行うことである。そこにおいては、世界各地の言語の習得を抜きに、従って、英語に翻訳された各地域の文献とフィールド調査によって研究が行われることになる。これにともない、1990年代に、たとえば沖縄をフィールドにする文化人類学で、沖縄および日本において行われてきた研究から、引用文献を明示することなく、データだけが用いられたことが問題にされたことがある。この場合には、現地語で記された文献が、フィールド調査によって現地で手に入れた情報（information）のひとつとして扱われたのだった。今日、進行している"world literature"のプロジェクトが展開してゆけば、当該言語のリテラシー抜きに、英語だけで行われる研究、また現地語文献を"information"のひとつとして扱う研究の方向は、東アジアの「歴史」や「文学」においても進むだろう。東アジアの人文科学系の研究者にとっては憂慮すべき事態といえよう。

ただし、今日の英語圏における翻訳理論は、知識人の文化多文化主義（cultural pluralism）、ないしは多文化主義（multi-culturalism）を反映して、翻訳対象の異文化性を際立たせる方向、英語表現のコードを一定程度侵犯するような"creative"（創造的）と称される翻訳を推進する傾向を強めようとしている。それゆえ、英語訳「世界文学」は、各地の地方性をそれなりに抱えこんで進展することになるだろう。これも「文学」における「国境の越え方」のひとつといえるだろうか。今後、検討に値する課題になろう。

この翻訳理論は、1980年代に盛んになったポスト・コロニアル研究（post-colonial studies）と密接に関連しながら明確にされてきた。植民地時代を経たのちの地域研究は、早くからそれぞれの地域の特殊性の解明が肝要であることが指摘されていたのだが、大英帝国支配下のインドをモデルにした植民地主義一般の公式にとどまる傾向が続いている。とくに東アジアに展開した日本帝国主義の政策の実際には踏み込んでいるとはいがたい。

それは領土内の異民族に日本国籍を与え同化を進め、また植民地における居住民族の構成を考慮して少数民族を「優遇」したり（台湾）、1920年代には文化相対主義を受けた政策を展開したり——当然、そこには「親日」派が育成される（台湾、朝鮮半島）、また旧清朝帝政派と結んでつくった「満洲国」では、「民族協和」を「国家」原理とするなど、タテマエは抱合的でありながら、実際の社会生活においては差別を行なうものだった。いわば「抱きしめて差別する」政策である。日本の「内地」における”minorities”に対しても、表面は「優遇」しつつ、実際にはおぞましいほどの差別がなされた。

そして、日中戦争では、次つぎに傀儡政権を立て、それらの連合による「東亜新秩序」を画策していった。他方、1938年前後から領土内では、「皇民化」という名の帝国民化、強力な同化政策を展開していた。このように、その時期は、また地域によって互いに矛盾するような政策がとられてきたため、それに対するリアクションも様々な立場と様相において展開した。それらの地域の特殊性に立ち入りつつ、総合的に評価する研究は、これまで必ずしもよくなされてきていな。

たとえば「満洲国」では、共産主義に追われたロシア人、ナチスに追われたユダヤ人など、ヨーロッパからの亡命を積極的に受け入れた。彼らにとって、そこは一時の的にせよ、パラダイスだった。といっても、それは亡命のできた人片にとって、である。そして民族単位の考察は、しばしば民族内の階級差などの矛盾を隠す。しかし、それは国際的に孤立した日本がとった反共政策、反アングロ・サクソン政策であり、人口の上では多数派の漢民族の
抑圧の上に成り立つものだった。

要するに、これまでの左右のナショナリズム、また「世界主義」や西洋主義、東洋主義、文化相対主義などの様ざまな動きを相対化することを抜きにしては、歴史的な反省はなしえない。このような方向こそが、われわれが向かうべき、"trans-cultural studies"、"trans-national studies"にほかならない。

そして、この立場は、日本における「人文・社会科学」という学問の"strategy"そのものの対象化に向かう。専門性を超えて、自らの専門的立場をも相対化する"trans-disciplinary approach"を志向することになるだろう。その必然性は次に、20世紀への転換期の日本における「北欧文学」概念の提出という課題について論じるなかでも、明らかになるはずである。

3、20世紀への転換期の日本における「北欧文学」概念の提出

日本において「北欧文学」という概念を最初に提出したのは、明治期に世論形成をリードした博文館の巨大雑誌『太陽』の臨時増刊「19世紀」(第6巻8号、1900年6月)に掲載された上田敏(うえだ びん、1874 - 1916)による「19世紀文藝史」(原題「文藝史」)であった。それ以前、人文学全般のなかに「北欧」という語は、『北欧血戦余塵 泣花怨柳』第1巻(忠愛社、1886)が知られていた。森體訳トルストイ『戦争と平和』(Война и мир, 1865-69)である。これは単に地域を指しているものだった。

上田敏「文藝史」の「文藝」とは、「文学」——当時の概念における「純文学」(文字で記された言語芸術)を中心にしているが、哲学、歴史にも目配りしていると「美術」とをあわせているもの。構成は「序論」、第1章「19世紀の英文学」、第2章「19世紀の仏蘭西文学」、第3章「19世紀の独逸文学」、第4章「伊太利亜、西班牙、葡萄牙、波蘭、露西亜、丁抹、瑞典、那威、英語、匈牙利、新希臘文学」、第5章「19世紀の絵画」、第6章「19世紀の彫刻」、第7章「19世紀の建築」の7章立てになっている。上田敏、数え26歳のときの執筆で、その内容は骨格をEncyclopædia Britannicaに頼りながらも、自身の勉強と読書体験を加えている。なお、上田は、若くして、いちはやく同時代のヨーロッパ文藝事情に目を向けたひとりである。

さて、「北欧文学」という語は、どこに出てくるか。第4章の内を、「1伊太利亜」、2「西班牙」、3「北欧文学」、4「東欧文学」、5「新希臘」の5部に分けている。その「北欧文学」の項では、「北欧スラアブの文学」と総称し、ポーランド、ロシア、デンマーク、スウェーデン、ノルウェー、オランダ、ベルギーの順に、かいつまんだ紹介を行っている。とすれば、この「北欧文学」は、単なる便宜にすぎず、概念化されているとはいがたい。だが、必ずしも、そう言えばすまされないところもある。全体にバイロンの影響を指摘しつつ、「愛国の情」「高遠の想」「幽聳」をあげているのが特徴である。アンデルセン(Hans Christian Andersen、1805 - 75)の「メルヘン」(Märchen)にふれるのは当然としても(森鷗外は『しがらみ草子』で翻訳を発表中)、ポーランドでは、第一にロマン派の国民詩人、アダム・ミッケヴィチ(Adam Bernard Mickiewicz 1798-1855)をあげ、「民謡の研究」に基づく作品群にふれ、ロシアのプーシキン(Aleksandr Sergeyevich Pushkin, 1799 - 1837)の源流にも「民謡」を指摘し、デンマークのエーレンシュレーゲル(Adam Gottlob Oehlenschläger, 1779～1850)に北欧神話の題材、スウェーデンのエサイア
ス・テグネル（Esaias Tegnér, 1782-1846）についても神話小説『フリティヨフス・サガ』（Frithiof's Saga, 1825）をあげている。ドストエフスキー（Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoyevsky, 1821-81）、ツルゲーネフ（Ivan Sergeyevich Turgenev, 1818-83）、イプセン（Henrik Johan Ibsen, 1828-1906）については、彼らの「自然主義」に言及しているが、比重は低い。「ドイツ文学」中、6「近年の文学」において、上田は明確に「自然主義」の浸透に対して、批判するような見解を加えている。

この傾向に、当時の百科事典の記載の反映と、上田敏とその周辺の志向がどの程度しているかについて、いま、立ち入る余裕がない。ただ、「序論」に、19世紀文芸史の特徴として、「自由奔放の気、精緻深遠の相」の著しいことをあげ、「人間内部生命の狂爛は澎湃として」「古来の桎梏を数とせざる観あり」と述べていることを紹介しておく。言い換えると、ロマン主義から象徴主義に向かう傾向を重視し、好意的に紹介していることになる。なお、「内部生命」（inner life）は「宇宙の生命」に対する語で、上田敏が参加した『文学界』を率いていた北村透谷（きたむら とうこく、1868-94）の造語だが、上田敏は、ここでは、それに「人間」を冠して用いている。

『太陽』臨時増刊「19世紀」は、日本人がはじめて「世紀」の転換ということを意識したとき、ヨーロッパ19世紀の動向を概観し、かつ知的青年たちに、同時代思潮に目を向けさせる役割を果たしたこと、その影響のひろがりと深さは、計り知れないものがあることは、特に言われてきた。だが、個々の記事について、それがどこまで具体的に指摘できるかというと覚束ないのが現状である。上田敏「19世紀文芸史」についても、その影響が及んだ範囲をはかった研究は、まだなだらないだろう。

まず、これによって、「北欧文学」なる概念が、一躍、ひろまったというわけにはいかない（筑摩書房版『明治文学全集』索引の「北欧」の項は、先の『北欧血戦余塵 泣花怨柳』について二葉亭四迷の言及のみあげている）。だが、ここにあげた「愛国の情」「高遠の想」「幽聳」（「19世紀文芸史」中、他に「幽麗」「幽婉」などの語を見る）などの評言、および「神話」「民謡」への着目が、『19世紀文芸史』中、英・仏・独・露などの項よりも一段と「北欧文学」の項に顕著に現れていること、それらが上田敏自身に、そして、彼が前後してから変わってゆく『帝国文学』『明星』『白百合』などの同人たちに与えた影響は決して看過できないこと、そして、それが20世紀前期に日本に起こった芸術概念の転換にかなりの役割を果たしたこと、注目に値しよう。以下、関係する動きを列挙しておく。

①詩人、劇作家として、メーテルランク（Maurice Maeterlinck, 1862-1949）の献訄紹介は、すでに同人雑誌等に現れていたが、それに拍車をかけたであろう。②ベルギーのヴェルハーレン（Emile Verhaeren, 1855-1916）の名はまだ見えないが、上田敏自身が、すぐにも『明星』に訳出し、そこに『象徴詩』の名を用いたことが知られる。③また、スウェーデンのストリンドヴェリィ（Johan August Strindberg, 1849-1912）に注目しておきたい。④他の地域でいえば、ドイツ文学では、ハウプトマン『沈鐘』（Gerhart Hauptmann, The Sunken Bell, 1897）をあげ、神秘的傾向を紹介している。このかつて「自然主義」の傾向を示した劇作家が神秘的幻想的な作風に転換したことは、やがて、この作品が戦雲竹風、泉鏡花によって翻訳され（1908）、日本文芸における「自然主義」を衰退に向かわせ、神秘的象徴主義への傾斜を促すことになる。④「民謡」については、上田敏自身がヨーロッパ象徴主義詩の翻訳に際して、江戸時代の「民謡」研究を手がけ、「文庫」に横瀬夜
雨らが民謡調の詩を載せ、北原白秋らによる小唄ブームを引き起こす。⑤民俗神話については、『白百合』を中心に、岩野泡鳴らが日本の神話を題材にした詩をつくる。⑥それらを含め、上田敏の翻訳詩集『海潮音』（1905）の刊行につながる流れが、このエッセイのなかに準備されている。⑦『帝国文学』で上田敏與編集同人だった塩井雨江による『新古今和歌集詳解』に『日本の象徴主義』とでもいうべき解釈が生みだされる。総じていえば、日本文藝のうちに神話主徳上の傾きの強い「象徴主義」への志向が育ってゆく過程に、なんらかの寄与をしたことは否定しえないだろう。

4．20世紀前期の日本における芸術概念の再編成

4-1. 日本近現代文藝史の展開における象徴主義受容の意味

次に、上田敏「19世紀文藝史」が発表された時期は、日本近代文学史において、どのような時期にあたるかを、明らかにしよう。①そもそも明治中期における「日本文学史」の発明、日本の文学伝統なるものの創造は、ヨーロッパの近代国民文化主義が生んだ各国文学史（人文史）を受けとめるところに発していた。それは西洋近代の「国民文学」（national literature）——中義の“literature”で、ほんの“the humanities”——の考え方を受けとり、1890年前後に、ヨーロッパ諸国より長い歴史伝統を誇る「日本文学」の独自の組織化に向けたものである。ヨーロッパ語の“literature”の広義は、文学による記述一般なるわち著作、中義は神ではなく、人間にかんする学術すなわち人文学、狭義は文字で記された高尚な言語芸術。この狭義については、1770年代のイタリアではじまり、ヨーロッパに広がるが、19世紀半ばでもかなりの抵抗があった。ヨーロッパ近代の「人文学」と日本の「人文学」（大学の「文学部」の「文学」）とのちがいは、次の三点にまとめられる。（ⅰ）神学部にあたる学部をもたず、古代神話や神宗教（神・仏・道）を抱えこんだこと。これは「人文学」と宗教とが相互浸透する制度的基礎になった（欧米では、聖典や宗教思想の研究はキリスト教神学や宗教学の範囲である。自国語の歴史にとって重要な意義で、もつ『聖書』の自国語訳やレトリックの観点から宗教家が読取る「文学史」に入れる）。（ⅱ）知識階層が時代による変化はあれ、長く「漢文」（中国語の語順を基準にした文章）と日本語のバイリテラシーを保持してきたため、民族複合国家ではないのに、自国語以外の「漢文」の記述を含めること。狭義の「文学」（polite literature）だけでなく、多彩な“popular literature”（民衆文学）をふくむこと。これらは、のち、文学で記された言語芸術という観念——狭義の「文学」——が浸透し、その専門家集団（今日の文壇）が1910年を前後する時期に形成されるにつれて変化するものの、その基本的な編成は今日でも変わっていない。

②文芸の近代化は、漢詩や和歌、民謡、獻作、俳諧、歌舞伎など伝統的文芸や芸能を支台に「伝統改良運動」としてなされた。それには古典の言語表現を「言語芸術」として再評価する動きが伴っていた。そして、明治中期に日本の文学界が西洋のロマン主義美学や象徴主義文藝を受容し、東洋文化を積極的に再評価する動きが、日露戦争を前後する時期からはじまる*。さらに、この時期に上田敏「19世紀文藝」が発表されたのである。

*美術では岡倉天心『東洋の理想—日本美術を中心として』（The Ideals of the East with Special Reference to the Art of Japan, 1903）がよく知られるが、それは道教の「気」の観念を宇宙
に満ちる「生命」に置き換え、それを見極めるとして雪舟らの山水画を日本の「近代美術」と賞賛した。天心の美学はヘーゲル美学を改作したものだが、暗示的表現に関心をもってい
る。ドイツの気分象徴論の高まりを受けてのことだろうか。類する動きは「文学」にも起こ
っていた。たとえばドイツで一般言語学を学んで、とにドイツ流の言語ナショナリズ
ム——一民族一言語観——を身について帰り、のちに「国語学の父」と称されることになる
上田万年は、20世紀の転換期に織田得能『法華経談議』(光融館、1899)「序」で、「我国文
学と最密接なる関係ある法華、維摩の二経」、とに『法華経』について「その文辞の巧妙
なる、文学上の結論価値亦極めて饒多なるをや」という。とに物語性豊かなる話群を豊富に
もつことをいうのだろう。そして「そもそも法華経の如き是世界の文学なり。万世不朽の文
学なり。東西文明の混合融合せんとする今後に於ては、更に一層の研究を要すべきものな
り」と述べている。

日本的人文学が宗教を内包していたことは先に述べた。西洋近代でもユダヤ-キリスト教
の聖典は、唯一絶対の書物とされ、それゆえそれを「文学」(literature, literature等)と
して扱う態度は、少数の個人においてなされてきた。たとえば野上豊一郎が「比較文学論」
の中で紹介しているリチャード・モールトン『世界文学』は、「世界文学」の「聖典」とし
てユダヤ教、キリスト教の聖書をあげているが、それらの本質は神学にあるとし、それらの
原初の形式やそれらの諸要素が、西洋文藝の源泉の役割を果たしているという意味において
述べている。これは、各民族の神話がそれぞれの文学の題材や表現形式の源泉になっている
というのと同じである。聖書に記された神話を信仰から切り離し、文学すなわち言語芸術と
して扱うなら、ヨーロッパ近代でも、長いあいだ、無神論者のそしりを受けた。その反面、
ヨーロッパ近代においてキリスト教にとまって邪教に属するギリシア・ローマ神話やそれぞれ
の土地の神々の伝説が芸術の名において享受された。

そして、ここに「東西文明の混合融合せんとする今後」と述べられた展望は、1910年代に
は「西洋と東洋の調和」や「西洋と東洋の結接点としての日本」が盛んに唱えられる傾向を
予見するものだった。

4-2. 象徴主義受容について

日本の文芸におけるヨーロッパ絵画における印象主義の受容は、1900年を前後する時期に、
国木田独歩「武蔵野」(「今の武蔵野」1898)、徳冨蘆花『自然と人生』(1900)、正岡子
規の俳句に顕著にみられる。ただし、文章なので時間の経過に伴う印象(情景)の変化を書く
ことになる。その流れの上に、詩人で彫刻家の高村光太郎は「緑色の太陽」(1910)で「太陽
が本当に緑色に見えたら緑色に描いてよい」と宣言、地方色の尊重とともに、かなり大きな
流れをつくる。

他方、森鷗外『審美新説』(1900)が、ヨーロッパにおいて「自然主義」が退潮し、神秘的
象徴主義が興っていることを告げるドイツの哲学者、フォルケルトの時評を紹介し、これに
導かれて、1900年代に、印象主義と交錯しながら、象徴主義への関心がしたいに高まってゆ
く。長く日本における「自然主義」のように扱われてきた田山花袋、長谷川天渓らにもその
関心と傾斜は見られる。マラルメの詩風に触発された象徴詩を書いていた岩野泡鳴は『神
秘的半獣主義』(1906)を発表、世界は「宇宙の大霊の表象」とするスピリチュアリズムの立
場から、刹那の感情の高まりこそがすべてと論じた。情熱ドイツの新しい哲学や芸術の動き
も知って帰国した島村抱月は「新自然主義」「純粋自然主義」の名で、宇宙の生命を観照す
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るところに美の神髄があると論じてゆく。

*明治期の日本において実証主義(positivism)や実験主義(experimentalism)は、ひろく浸透しなかった。その理由は、ヨーロッパにおける宗教にせよ、科学にせよ、「真理」に属することが、日本では、みな朱子学の「天理」の観念で受け止められ、また社会進化論や生物進化論と入り混じったためであり、さらには19世紀後期からヨーロッパ物理学の主流をなししたエネルギー元論から派生した「宇宙の生命エネルギー」という観念を至上の原理とするエルンスト・ヘッケル(Ernst Heinrich Philipp August Haeckel, 1834-1919)やベルクソン(Henri-Louis Bergson 1859-1941)の哲学を東洋思想でうけとめた大正生命主義が隆盛したためである。そして、印象や感覚、意識こそが認識の基礎であるとする考え――のちに現象学として展開する意識現象やその向きについての関心――は、志賀直哉「城崎にて」(1917)に代表される随筆形式を基本とする「心境小説」を生みだが、それが極めて特殊な形態の「私小説」である。と宇野浩二らの文壇人によって公認されるのは、1925年前後のことである。ただし、佐藤春夫『田園の憂鬱』(1919)のように主人公=語り手の心境を主にしつつ、彼の境涯が読者に理解できるように語られるものもあり、ヨーロッパの“Ich Roman”や告白をヒントにつくられた一人称視点の語りを主にするが、主人公の外見、身分、職業などを明示する「私小説」との境界は必ずしもはっきりしない。そのために、のち、とくに戦後に、形態上のちがいに注意をはらわずに混同されてきた。

それまで、フェノロサ「美術真説」(Ernest Francisco Fenollosa, 1882)、中江兆民「緯氏美学」(1883)とともに、美術に対する基本的立場が、スピリチュアル美とヘーゲル美学に立ち、造形性を強調するフェノロサと、名作の模写をもって訓練とするアカデミズムに対し、自然やリアルな対象の描写を推進しようとするユージーヌ・ヴェロン(Eugénie Veron, Esthetics, 1878)とはまったく異なるものの、「象徴」の語を原始的な観念の造形表現に用いていた。だが、前記した動きによって、象徴および象徴表現に価値転換がおこった。この動きは、思想におけるネオ・ロマンティシズム、ネオ・イデアリズム、芸術におけるアーリイ・モダニズムの移入と混じりあいながら、またドイツの感情移入美学の受容を伴いながら、生命原理主義の思潮を背景に「生命の(象徴)表現」という理念を生んでゆく。

そして、この動きは、インドの詩人、タゴール(Rabindranath Tagore, 1861-1941)のノーベル文学賞受賞(1913)に端的に示されるように、芸術の枠内において、キリスト教が異教として扱ってきた諸宗教の解放が国際的になされてゆくことと軌を一にしており、日本では、アジア主義を高まらせ、とくに禅宗の僧侶が精神生活上の信条にしていた「わび、さび」や「幽玄」を「中世美学」として日本の伝統の中心におき動きをつくってゆく。

*ロマン主義後期において、フランスのジェラール・ド・ネルヴァル『オーレリア』(Gérard de Nerval, Aurélia ou le rêve et la vie, 1855)が古代エジプト神話の世界を狂人の妄想とい
う形をとって展開した。だが、イギリスにおいては、フランス象徴主義の巨匠、マラルメがロンドン講演（1892）で文芸による精神革命の主張を“cult”という語を用いて行い、それもひとつの契機となり、産業革命に背を向けた詩人、銅版画家のウィリアム・ブレイク（William Blake, 1757 – 1827）が展開した秘教的神秘主義の世界がサミュエル・バトラー・イェーツ（William Butler Yeats, 1865 － 1939）らによって発掘、称賛されていった。ヨーロッパにおける神秘的象徴主義の高まりは、一方でメーテルランクらの普遍的な神秘主義への傾きを盛んにし、他方、イギリス帝国主義に対するアイルランドやインドのナショナリズムの支柱にもなった。だが、日本の場合には、西洋近代を超える日本主義や東洋主義になる。佐藤春夫「『風流』論」（1924）は、自我の紛糾をテーマとする西洋近代小説に対して、芭蕉を頂点とする日本の「無常美観」によってそれを超克することを目標にかかげた。そして、日本の俳谐がヨーロッパ・モダニズム詩に刺戟を与えることを察知した萩原朔太郎は「象徴の本質」「世界に冠たる日本の象徴主義」を宣言する。1930年代の岡崎好恵や大西克礼の中世美学礼賛は、その延長上にあった。

上田敏は、1900年代前半に、この動きを高まらせる役割を果たした。フランスの高踏派から象徴詩への動きを中心に、ヨーロッパの象徴詩の範囲を広くとって翻訳詩を文芸雑誌に矢継ぎ早に発表、『海潮音』（1905）にまとめて刊行したことはよく知られる。帝国大学時代からの上田敏の親友、塩井雨江（しおいうこう1869-1913）は、それまではほとんど顧みられることのなかった『新古今和歌集』と取りくみ、『新古今和歌集詳解』（1904）を著し、これを象徴表現として鑑賞する道をひらいた。日本で最初の象徴詩集とされる蒲原有明『春鳥集』（1905）は、その序文で、象徴主義の詩を、芭蕉俳諧を引きあげ出し、宇宙のおおもとを平易なことばで開示するものと解説し、以降、象徴詩人たちのあいだに芭蕉崇拝を強くしてゆくことになる。

また上田敏は、象徴詩の翻訳紹介を手がける際、民謡調の翻訳に江戸時代における小唄集を利用した。ヨーロッパの近代ロマン主義の詩に刺戟を受けた落合直文（おちあい なおぶみ、1861 - 1903）は、中世歌謡の「今様」様式を「改良」として「新体和歌」を創始し、これが新体詩の主流をなしていたが、1910年代に横瀬夜雨（よこせ やう、1878 － 1934）、北原白秋（1885-1942）らが小唄流の詩をつくり、これが「新民謡」の作詞の基礎になり、やがてレコードやラジオを媒体にした歌謡曲へと展開した。

小説においては、20世紀への転換期に国木田独歩、蒲原有明が蒲松齢『聊斎志異』（自序1679、刊行1766）の翻訳に着手し、その動きはすぐに『三言』など白話小説の受容へと展開した。1910年代の佐藤春夫（1892-1964）、芥川龍之介（1892-1927）、谷崎潤一郎（1886 – 1965）らの作品世界の一方の根方は、その流れに浸っていた。たとえば芥川龍之介「蜘蛛の糸」（1918）がインドの仏教説話に、「杜子春」（1920）が中国の民間伝承に題材をとっていることなどよく知られる。

また元大名家に秘されていた世阿弥（1363？ – 1443）の著作が発見され、それまで僧侶の作のように思われていた能楽の本格的な研究がはじまった。野上豊一郎の能楽研究も、この流れに触発されたもので、能楽が神仏など習慣した宗教芸能であることをよく承知しながら。
それを芸術として論じる態度が明確である。これは「芸術」という西洋近代が生んだ概念が、近代を超えて普遍性をもつと考える近代主義の倒錯である。

これらの流れを受けて、1920年代には文化相対主義の立場がひろがるにつれ、北原白秋らが朝鮮人の詩人、金素雲（1907-1981）による翻訳『朝鮮民謡集』（1929）の刊行を支援し、朝鮮半島の民間伝承を田中貢太郎（1880-1941）が、二篇だけだが翻訳したりした。先の中国の民衆小説の翻訳も、1920年代後半には、ある勢いをもつに至る。だが、これら文化相対主義に立ち、西洋文化に対して日本やアジアの伝統文化、民衆文化を評価する動きは、20世紀前半を通じて日本がアジアに対する帝国主義的膨張を行ったために、それに一定の反発を示したり、同調したりと、様々な屈折をはらんで展開した。

5. ドラマネラル文化論に何ができるか

要するに、ヨーロッパ文学を日本の伝統をリセプターにして受容し、伝統の再組織化や古典の再評価が起こり、1930年代の伝統主義の高まりを生んでいた大きな道筋が見えてくる。伝統思想をリセプターにして新しい西洋思想を受け取り、また国内にひろめようとする動きは社会主義思想にも見られる。よく知られるように、河上肇『貧乏物語』（1917）序文は、「まさに孔子の立場を奉じて富を論じ貧を論ぜしつもりである」と述べている。もちろん、1910年の大逆事件以降、一切の社会主義思想が弾圧されていた時期のことである。幸田露伴が『修省論』（1914）で、儒学を基にして「互扶互持の対等関係」を説き、「使用する者の苦楽、使用さるゝ者の苦楽」中では、「利福の比例の不一致」を説き、過激な社会主義が起こるのも当然、資本主義の不対等性を示すものであることや、最後の「生産力及び生産者」では、資本制をはめても当然、資本の個別性をも見破り、「資力の圧迫に対して個人の自体を保たんとするに本づく思想や感情が何の危険思想であろう」と、ストライキやサボタージュの正統性を説き、また日本は帝国主義の道をすすんではならないと明確に論じたひそみになったものかもしれない。だが、これらに社会主義思想のリセプターとして、あるいはそれを喧伝する際の道具として、儒学の伝統が働いていることも明らかである。

このように、いわゆる東洋の伝統的宗教や思想の働きを「伝統の惰力」（坪内逍遥）や「要らない肥料」（小林雄）と退けることなく、西洋の宗教とともに、あるいは自然科学や唯物論哲学の働きなどとともに、横並びにして見渡しうる立場を築くこと。ここに、トランス・ナショナル人文学が、これまでの様々な研究態度もなしえなかった研究を進展させる大きな可能性がひらけるだろう。これは伝統を比較的容易に立ち上げるのと、おそらく東アジアの人文諸学の研究者たちが筆頭で、次にヨーロッパにおいて西欧中心主義から脱しようと努力している研究者たちだろう。アメリカでは社会から相当の抵抗を受けるにちがいない。

そして、このような宗教伝統の働きに着目するなら、日本では西洋の知のシステムを受容しながら、独自のシステムを築いていたこともあきらか。帝国大学は神学部をもたずに発足した。また、その発足時から世界に先駆けて工学部を抱え持っていた。これは東アジアでは伝統的に技術の価値が相対的に高く、イギリスにおけるエネルギー工学の発展をいち早く察知し、そして富国強兵政策の推進に役立てようとしたからだった。またヨーロッパ語圏では今日でも稀な農学部を、創設3年後からもっていた。これはドイツで化学と生物学による農

6 鈴木貞美『生命観の探究』（2007）第五章五を参照。
学が大学で展開していたのを取り入れたもの。これらにはそれぞれに異なる思想的、歴史的な条件が働いているが、この制度は日本の近代化過程に大きな役割を果たし、今日に及んでいる。それだけでなく、台湾、朝鮮半島、そして中国大陆にも輸出されもした。

その後、大学制度は、それぞれの国情によって変化し、今日にいたっている。とくに第二次大戦後に大学制度が国際的に変化したことによって、当時の日本の総合大学の特殊性がはっきりしなくなってしまっているが、それについて考えることは、われわれ自身が身を浸している知のシステムを改めて対象化すること、足許をよく見つめることに帰着する。トランス・ナショナルは、同時に必然的にトランス・ディシプリン（trans discipline）になるゆえんである。それは既存の制度や知の枠組みから二重にトランスするような無理を各自に強いわけではない。どちらかの立場を選んだとたんに同時に成立するはずのことである。そして、今日、国際的に研究と高等教育の再編が問われている。

冒頭にふれたアメリカの「世界文学」プログラムもそのひとつといえる。その"world literature" は、著作一般を意味する英語"literature"の広義の意味へと拡大され、古代から現代にいたる「文学」概念の地理的歴史的な組み換えの歴史など、やすやすと越えられてしまう。いや、それは、文字にかかわるその原義を超えて、口伝えされてきたもの、"oral performance" もその一翼に組み入れるだろう。つまり概念の組み換えを伴って事態は進行するだろう。まさに新たな「世界文学」の誕生である。

この事態がトランス・ナショナルにしてトランス・ディシプリンな態度の展開なのではない。このような事態そのもの、またそれが引き起こす知の変化を考察する立場こそが、トランス・ナショナルにしてトランス・ディシプリン的な文化論の追究であるということを明確にしておきたい。

（なお、本稿は、2011/2/26 日文研で行われた日文研—ヨーテボリ大学共催の国際シンポジウムの報告をまとめなおしたものである。2011/06/10）