

Emending a Translation into “Scrupulous” Translation: A Comparison of Edward G. Seidensticker’s Two English Renditions of “The Izu Dancer”

KATAOKA Mai

SOKENDAI (The Graduate University for Advanced Studies,
School of Cultural and Social Studies,
Department of Japanese Studies)

This paper will explore how the translation strategy of Edward G. Seidensticker (1921–2007) shifted between his two English versions of “The Izu Dancer” (1954 and 1997). As an undergraduate at the University of Colorado, he majored in English Literature. Seidensticker joined the Navy Japanese Language School during World War II and went to Japan as a member of the U.S. Marine Corps. After the War ended, he gave up the idea he had of becoming a diplomat and started to translate modern Japanese fiction. The literature of Kawabata Yasunari was one of his focuses throughout his career; among the works he translated, “Izu no odoriko” 伊豆の踊子 (The Izu Dancer) is of particular importance. It was the very first Kawabata translation that Seidensticker attempted, and since he revised it at the end of his career, it shows his changing approach and method as he matured as a translator.

Seidensticker published his first English rendition of Kawabata’s “Izu no odoriko” in *Perspective of Japan: An Atlantic Monthly Supplement* in 1954, early in his career as a translator. Bold omissions, interpolations and modulations of the ST (source text, i.e. original text) were made in order to fit the work into the limited space given to him by the editor, but also to tailor it into a more accessible literary form for general readers of that time, who still knew little about Japan. In 1997, however, he retranslated “The Izu Dancer”, this time as an unabridged translation for *The Oxford Book of Japanese Short Stories*. All omitted parts were restored, interpolations removed, and further changes were made to bring the TT (target text, i.e. translated text) closer to the ST.

By comparing these two English translations of “The Izu Dancer,” this paper will illustrate the ways in which Seidensticker’s 1997 translation strategy had shifted from that of 1954, focusing on omissions of subsidiary episodes and characters, and the treatment of culture-specific items (CSIs). I will also demonstrate how a translator’s attitude towards translation can change over time along with the maturation of skills, change in understanding of the ST, and more crucially, the social and cultural context of the time when a work is being translated.

Key words: Edward Seidensticker, Kawabata Yasunari, literary translation, “The Izu Dancer”, *Perspective of Japan*, abridgement, culture-specific items (CSIs), retranslation

Introduction

Translation Strategy and Editors as Quarter

Masters

Missing Episodes, Missing Characters

Dramatizing Dialogue in Japanese Fiction

A Translation That Spoils Readers

Omissions to Avoid Lowering Its Worth

Recovering the Lost Theme and Kawabata's
Literary Quality

Recovering the Texture of the Original

Translation and the Growing Cultural Recognition

The Translator and His Evolution

Towards More Scrupulous Translation

Introduction

In 1954, an English translation of “Izu no odoriko” 伊豆の踊子 (The Izu Dancer) by Kawabata Yasunari 川端康成 (1899–1972) appeared in *Perspective of Japan: An Atlantic Monthly Supplement*, which was published by Intercultural Publications Inc. in co-operation with *The Atlantic Monthly*. The translator was Edward G. Seidensticker (1921–2007), who was later to become renowned for contributing to Kawabata's literary success worldwide, including Kawabata's being awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature. The literature of Kawabata was one of the focuses throughout his career, and among the works he translated, this “Izu no odoriko” was of particular importance—it was the very first Kawabata translation that Seidensticker attempted. Bold omissions that removed a couple of subsidiary episodes and characters, interpolations that explained cultural contexts unfamiliar to readers, and modulations of the source text that allowed more freedom in translation of the meaning, turned the original work into a “story”, in which the plot centred on the main protagonist and the little dancer.¹⁾ The freshness of romance with unattainable love, the depression of the protagonist for being “a misfit, an orphan by nature” and the release from such pessimism were well-preserved in the English version. However, recurrent themes

of Kawabata, such as the contrast of age and youth disappeared. The original text was transformed into a more accessible literary form for English readers and the translator carefully controlled the degree of exoticism acceptable to the targeted general public.

As indicated in Noel Busch's description about the purpose of *Perspective of Japan*, target readers for this issue were Westerners—Americans, in particular—who knew little about Japan.²⁾ With these intended readers in mind, all of the literary translations compiled in this issue were adjusted and edited according to the translation criteria required. Moreover, clarity, simplicity and verbal accuracy—the long inherited editing tradition among *The Atlantic's* editors—were also essential elements that the translator had to take into account.³⁾

The result of this editing process was rather unsatisfactory for the translator. Donald Richie, one of Seidensticker's close friends, confirms that it was “the then-editor of *Atlantic* who forced Seidensticker to remove whole passages,” and he further notes that “the translator had long regretted having been made to do this.”⁴⁾ To restore the translation, Seidensticker retranslated “The Izu Dancer” in 1997 for *The Oxford Book of Japanese Short Stories*, this time as an unabridged version. For this anthology of Japanese short stories, significant changes were made compared with the

first translation. Omitted parts were fully reinstated and culture-specific items were updated. Interpolations were also removed, and nuances of words and the subtleties of Kawabata’s lyrical expressions were captured in a more sophisticated manner. The quality of this revised translation in the last stage of his career shows Seidensticker’s refinement of his skills and maturation as a translator. With a view that a translator’s strategy can evolve over time, this paper aims to illustrate in what way Seidensticker’s translation strategies used in these two renditions of “The Izu Dancer” differ, and it further explores the elements that triggered such changes.

Translation Strategy and Editors as Quarter Masters

Before moving on to discussing the translation strategies employed in these two versions, let us start by revisiting the translation criteria enforced by editors. For translators, it is customary to adjust a translation according to the nature of media in which they are going to publish. In addition to the maximum number of pages or words set by editors to balance the total number of pages of the issue or anthology, the purpose of each media determines translation criteria such as the tonality and the level of clarity that meets the assumed expectation of target readers. James Laughlin (1914–1997), who was one of the editors that Seidensticker worked with, says *Perspective of Japan* was a “collection of sampling of the work of contemporary writers and artists well established in their own countries but still too little known and valued abroad.”⁵⁾ Considering the fact that Seidensticker also participated as one of the editors in this translation project, there is no doubt that he had to take this goal into account and it naturally influenced his translation strategy for “Izu no odoriko.” Then, in

which respect can readers witness translation strategies enforced by this editing criteria, and more crucially, the literary norm that the editors adhered to?

As Seidensticker points out, one problem that arises in translating Kawabata’s literary works is that it is often “difficult to grasp what he is talking about,”⁶⁾ since Kawabata’s writing style is full of ambiguities that emerge from complex sequences of words and lack of subjects in sentences. This potentially could confuse English readers who are used to reading sentences with clear presentation of subjects, and moreover, it does not fulfill the criteria imposed by *The Atlantic*’s editing tradition, which seeks clarity and simplicity of the text. Since the presentation of the host of action is essential in English sentences,⁷⁾ Seidensticker adds subjects which are not present in the original when translating the Japanese literary works into English. Below is a renowned passage often cited as an example of Seidensticker’s mistranslation of the subject. Towards the end of “The Izu Dancer,” the protagonist sees the dancer’s showing a sign of saying good-bye, but she ends up only giving him a slight nod. Seidensticker translated one of the sentences, “さよならを云はうとしたが、それも止して、もう一ぺんうなづいて見せた,”⁸⁾ by adding “I” to supplement the subject, which was not in the original. However, it later becomes clear that the subject added in this 1954 version was a mistranslation, and this sentence, “I wanted to say good-by, but I only nodded again”⁹⁾ was revised in the 1997 version to read “I could see that *she* wanted to say goodbye, but *she* only nodded again” [*italics mine*].¹⁰⁾ Although such a case illustrates that Japanese to English literary translation is prone to misidentification of subjects, it shows how the translator attempted to meet the editor’s preference for clarity in the translation process.¹¹⁾

The translator had to assume potential modifications and comments from the editor's side, to avoid cuts and corrections that could lead to the loss of writing style unique to the author.¹²⁾

There is another inevitable change in translation that needs to be mentioned—modulations to maintain the consistency of the narrative point of view. For example, in the scene when the old woman leads the protagonist to another room to let him dry his clothes, his point of view moves around. In the source text, there is an open fire in the room to which the old woman leads him, and then once s/he opens the sliding door, the heat of the fire flows out (“その部屋には炉が切ってあって、障子を明けると強い火気が流れて来た”¹³⁾). In this case, the scene is portrayed as if the protagonist looks into the room from the ceiling, reminding us of the *fukinuke yatai* 吹抜屋台 method observed in Japanese paintings. The viewpoint of the narrator floats up in the air, yet it instantly goes back to the body of the protagonist as soon as s/he opens the sliding door to feel the heat coming out from the room. Such a point of view that constantly moves around is what Itasaka Gen calls “shifting point of view” (視点の移動) in his *Nihonjin no ronri kōzō* 日本人の論理構造 (The Logical Structure of the Japanese),¹⁴⁾ and translators are required to traverse this difference of perspectives, from the Japanese narrative point of view that freely moves around so that one cannot grasp from which angle or position the narrator is viewing the scene, into that of the English, in which the narrator has to illustrate the scene from one fixed point in an organised manner. As a result of this translation strategy, English readers who are used to consistent narrative point of view will not be confused.

Seidensticker fills this gap by translating this sentence as “[t]he heat from the open fire struck

me as she opened the door.”¹⁵⁾ The first part of the sentence is blended with the latter part by rephrasing the sentence with “the heat” as a subject. On the other hand, J. Martin Holman, another translator of “Izu no odoriko,” faithfully adheres to this shifting narrative point of view in his translation, “[t]here was a hearth in the middle of the floor of her room. When she opened the sliding door, the hot air flowed out.”¹⁶⁾ However, one should keep in mind that the year Holman published this translation (“The Dancing Girl of Izu”) was 1997, when a number of Japanese modern fictions were readily available in the U.S. market. Moreover, unlike the case of Seidensticker, his translation was published in the form of a book, not as a part of magazine targeting general readers.

Sato Hiroaki, a Japanese to English literary translator and a scholar, once related that after a translator submits a translation of a literary work to a U. S. publisher, s/he would receive the copyedited manuscript. Requests from copyeditors vary, yet in addition to the correction of notations to conform with the standard style of the publisher, they tend to ask for rewriting of “obscure texts (*fumeiryō na bubun* 不明瞭な部分)” and “contradictions in the illustration of the scene (*byōsha no mujun* 描写の矛盾),”¹⁷⁾ which are applicable to the cases mentioned above. However, although editors' corrective forces were one of the influences, Seidensticker's translation choices show it was more than just the editor's style and taste.

Missing Episodes, Missing Characters

Apart from translation requirements set by editors, what makes Seidensticker's translation distinctive is the removal of some episodes and characters. In the scene in which the protagonist encounters the old man of a tea shop sitting cross-legged beside an open fire, a clear contrast between

the young protagonist and the old man is drawn. The young protagonist that freely travels around with the troupe highlights the age and ugliness of the man, who has long suffered from palsy, unable to travel to anywhere. Such contrasts of age versus youth, beauty and ugliness, which are essential motifs in Kawabata’s literary works, are completely omitted in Seidensticker’s translation. In the 1954 version, the protagonist led by the old woman to this room, simply sits back behind the fire and dries his kimono alone. In a similar manner, the old woman, who travels back to Mito with her grandchildren, and the day labourers that ask the protagonist to take care of her—all of them are absent. Thus, the chance to demonstrate his goodness acquired through this journey to Izu, and the opportunity to act as a “nice” person just like the dancer once defined him as being “nice”, are completely lost in this earlier translation. As seen in these cases, the translator significantly reduces the variety of secondary characters appearing in his 1954 version, and the complexity of the plot is simplified along with this alternation.

Not only secondary characters, but episodes and interactions among these characters, which seem not directly related to the main plot, are also eliminated. When a man of forty running a poultry business tries to touch the dancer, her mother stops him, emphasizing that “[n]o one has touched her.”¹⁸⁾ This scene serves to further strengthen the image of her purity and virginity. Although the dancer asks the man to read *Adventures of the Lord of Mito* for her, he soon leaves the inn right after this warning from her mother. This is how the distance between the dancer and the protagonist suddenly gets closer when he reads rest of the story to her. However, these details are completely omitted in Seidensticker’s earlier translation. So is the episode related to a walking stick. Looking at

bundles of bamboos, the hero and Eikichi remark that they would be good for walking sticks. Hearing this, the dancer gets a stalk of bamboo for the hero. When Eikichi tells her to take it back as stealing the biggest one would be easily spotted, she comes back to them, this time with another bamboo smaller in size. All these troubles that the dancer took and her conversation with Eikichi are signs of her attraction to the protagonist; however, these scenes are again omitted in the translation. Due to this selective elimination of conversations among secondary characters, the focus on the direct interaction between the dancer and the protagonist speeds up the development of the plot.

Another pattern of omission is the removal of parts that disrupt the smooth development of the plot. For example, the hero imagines the dancer in a dusky room, in which a light hung directly above the sliding doors dimly illuminates his room and the room next to his. The translator deletes this description of the room, where the protagonist thinks of the dancer alone. Such details of the surrounding environment often generate synergetic effects in conveying the emotional states of characters. Nevertheless, this element is removed and the contrast of darkness and light that shows the depth of his struggle thinking about the dancer is reduced. Although one might consider that so many themes, motifs, and details crucial to “The Izu Dancer” are “lost” in the process of translation, these examples illustrate how Seidensticker’s selective removal of these elements mentioned above create the dramatic unity expected for an English story. Because of the absence of secondary characters and subsidiary episodes that could have potentially diverted English readers’ attention, the focus on the main protagonist and the dancer is more closely retained.

Such omissions are not limited to the case of

“The Izu Dancer;” Seidensticker employs a similar strategy of omissions in other abridged translations. In the case of his English translation of “Shōshō Shigemoto no haha” 少将滋幹の母 (The Mother of Captain Shigemoto, 1956), a short novel by Tanizaki Junichirō 谷崎潤一郎 (1886–1965),¹⁹⁾ whereas this story consists of eleven chapters in the original, Seidensticker chose to translate only two chapters (Chapter IX and X). The most frightening and uncanny episode in this work, where the father of Shigemoto visits the graveyard and mediates, followed by the conversation between the protagonist and his father on Buddhist teachings, are the focus of this abridged translation. However, other episodes that serve as prologues for these selected episodes, including the protagonist’s mother’s affair with Heiju and the banquet for the Prime Minister where his mother was taken away, are not translated. In addition, settings such as the historical background of the Heian period and minute details of the lifestyle at court narrated by “the writer” are not included in this translation. Seidensticker also skips the episode in the middle of these two chapters, in which the narrator speaks of a *setsuwa* (Japanese mythical spoken story) that is closely related to his father’s meditation. The secrets of why his father acted in this manner, and the reason for his attraction to the Buddhist teaching that he spoke of are untold in this English translation. The translator explains the reason for this abridgement, saying that since this work tends to digress to an essay-like narrative in the middle of the story, having this type of narrative in the work labelled as a “novel” might confuse English readers. Thus, the abridgement allowed him to enhance the clarity of Tanizaki’s writing style in the original while avoiding this “unusual literary form” according to the Western notion of the novel.²⁰⁾

Seidensticker’s translation strategy that omits

the elements mentioned above shows how the translator fills the gap between the Japanese and the English novel, and how he attempts to meet the needs of general readers of that time, who expect the completeness of an English short novel, even in cases of translated literature.

Dramatizing Dialogue in Japanese Fiction

Having looked at this example of another abridged translation by Seidensticker, the case of “The Izu Dancer” in 1954 shows more dynamic and complex translation strategies are at work. Seidensticker dramatizes the plot and characters, not only through omissions, but also via modulations. Some of the characters in this version have slightly different characteristics from that of the original, and some aspects of their personalities are emphasized to make the plot development and dialogues among characters more engaging. For instance, Seidensticker repeatedly translates *odoriko* as “the little dancing girl” and “little girl” from the beginning of the story, even at the stage when the hero still thinks of her age as around sixteen or seventeen because of the way she dresses herself as at the prime of her beauty. It is not until she runs out to the edge of the platform at the hot spring without covering her body, not even with a towel (Section 3), that he realizes she is still a child. However, in the case of the 1954 version, this repetitive notion of her being “little” highlights her innocence and purity from a much earlier stage. Just like the little dancer, the case of her mother serves as a more significant example of such a characterization. Although she is simply described as *yonjūdai no onna* 四十代の女 (a woman in her forties)²¹⁾ in the source text, she is characterized in Seidensticker’s translation as “[a] stern-looking woman of about forty.”²²⁾ By inserting the adjective “stern-looking,” this assumed characteristic of the

old woman contributes to creating a tension with the protagonist when his distance with the dancer suddenly gets closer in the latter part of the story. It more vividly portrays her cautiousness and protectiveness whenever men approach her daughter.

Another modification that further dramatizes this story can be seen in the change of tonality; their dialogues are transformed into more active exchanges and the level of interaction among the characters increases. As Seidensticker once described that “Japanese are supposed to be suspicious of the too overt emotion,”²³⁾ the range of emotional ups and downs of characters in Japanese fiction is relatively small compared with that of English fiction. In the source text of “The Izu Dancer,” exclamation and question marks are rarely used in the dialogues and emotional dynamics of characters do not appear on the surface. Instead, readers are expected to detect this emotional transition through situational factors such as the flow of narratives, detailed portrayal of characters, and depictions of surrounding scenery. In order to avoid this monotonous tonality in the dialogue, Seidensticker uses exclamation and question marks. Moreover, the briskness of sentences and slightly exaggerated expressions create more interactive dialogues. The warm and gentle invitation of the dancer, “あんなに大きく見えるんですもの、いらっしやいませね,”²⁴⁾ when she sees the image of Oshima Island in the distance, is translated into a more eager invite, as “[s]o big! You will really come, won’t you?”²⁵⁾ By turning the sentence into a shorter expression with an exclamation mark, the degree of her amazement at seeing Oshima is heightened, and her eagerness is well-conveyed by having a tag question at the end of the sentence. Such modulations that transform the dialogue into a more dramatic expression create

more engaging interactions among characters.

These adjustments throughout the translation and omissions described above help to create the dramatic unity in “The Izu Dancer.” This earlier translated English version shows that whereas more literal and direct translation is likely to be perceived as a rather plain text for general readers, Seidensticker’s translation fulfils the completeness as a story expected by English readers of that time. The dramatic unity that emerged from these adaptations in the process of translation turned the text into a more accessible literary form for the English readers who were unfamiliar with Japanese literary works.

A Translation That Spoils Readers

Along with omissions that influence the structure of the story, modulations of details in the earlier translation merit attention, especially in terms of the treatment of Seidensticker’s culture-specific items (CSIs). In this translation of “The Izu Dancer,” one notices there are only a few CSIs such as *samisen* and *Noh* written in italics,²⁶⁾ and despite the fact that a number of cultural terms unfamiliar to the English general public are embedded in this work, readers can follow the story undisturbed by the texture of italics. Seidensticker’s approach to eliminate elements that might disturb the narrative flow can be seen in his avoidance of using footnotes. He also limits the number of Japanese specific terms that are as yet unfamiliar to the English readers by translating these items into more acceptable words. For example, *kikubatake* 菊畑 (chrysanthemum garden) is translated simply as “the flowers” and its specific flower name is not reflected in the English translation. Because it is described with a more general and broader term, the flower garden that readers would imagine would not be of chrysanthemums, but a field covered with

the mix of flowers that they can easily associate with the word, “flowers.”²⁷⁾ Also, for the translation of *go* 碁, Seidensticker uses “checker/chess.” Instead of sitting on tatami mats to enthusiastically play a Go match with the paper merchant, this English version leads readers to imagine that players are sitting on chairs to play chess. As this case has shown, translating CSIs by replacing them with English equivalents was another translation strategy of Seidensticker.

In addition, Seidensticker also omits a number of proper nouns. The hero stays at Shuzenji and Yugashima hot spring, but these details are summarized as that he spent “three nights at hot springs near the center of the peninsula.”²⁸⁾ The sense of Japanese travel to stop by various locations is transformed into the Western style of travel, in which one sets a certain destination. For English readers of that time, these unknown places about which they had no associations, images, or information, surely would have confused them. Thus, the translator controls the frequency of these proper nouns in the text. Although one could supplement these missing associations and information by adding explanatory footnotes, the translator wrote that since the target for this issue was “the general public,”²⁹⁾ he wanted to avoid giving readers needless holdbacks for reading these texts caused by detailed descriptions or footnotes to explain every CSI and the cultural background.³⁰⁾ Whereas Holman (1997) takes a different approach from Seidensticker and faithfully transplants these proper nouns from the source text into the English version, Seidensticker tries to deliver a Japanese image that would be acceptable and accessible for the English readers who knew little about Japan. This use of CSIs that matches with the level of cultural recognition among the general readers of that time (though this relies solely on the

translator’s own perception) will be discussed later in greater detail when this text is contrasted with the full version published in 1997.

Omissions to Avoid Lowering Its Worth

What one cannot ignore in the 1954 version are omissions of scenes that are overtly obscene or regarded as discriminatory in English culture. The problem of bowdlerization is often discussed in the context of translation, especially in the case of translating modern Japanese fiction. Seidensticker is also criticized for such a bowdlerization in the translation of other Kawabata’s literary works. For example in *Snow Country*, the main protagonist, Shimamura tells the geisha Komako how his “finger” remembered her. However, Seidensticker replaces this word with “hand” to rewrite the sentence into a less astonishing expression in English.³¹⁾

Though the degree of bowdlerization was less significant, the earlier version of “The Izu Dancer” was no exception. In the scene in which the dancer reveals her naked body at the hot spring in her childlike innocent manner, in order to say something to the protagonist and Eikichi across the river, the English translation of this scene, “[i]t was the little dancer,” completely dismisses a phrase in the source text, “手拭もない真裸だ”³²⁾ (not even covered with a towel, she was completely naked). Also the sentence right after this, “若桐のやうに足のよく伸びた白い裸身を眺めて,”³³⁾ is translated as “I looked at her, at the young legs, at the sculptured white body.”³⁴⁾ The translator turns her youthfulness, fresh as a young paulownia tree, and suppleness of her long legs into an European-styled sculpture, and her body is transformed from the organic into the inorganic. By taking this approach, Seidensticker avoids using the word *hadaka* 裸 that express the sense of nakedness too

directly, and he portrays the beautifully figured body of the dancer as a “sculpture” that indirectly conveys the image of the nakedness of her body in a more artistic manner. However, the sense of the bareness of her body and her innocence expressed in the original disappears.

Furthermore, Seidensticker removes the portrayal of women that might be morally disagreeable in the target culture. For example, references to dancers, which lower the status of women and can be perceived as offensive and discriminatory, are removed. On their way to Oshima, the dancer runs back to the hero and Eikichi, who were walking far behind the women. She tells them that they found a spring and they are waiting for him to use it first. In the source text, her mother mentions how the water can get dirty once women touch it (“女の後は汚いだらうと思っ”³⁵⁾ However, this part is omitted in this earlier version and Seidensticker translates it as “[w]e didn’t think you would want to drink after we had stirred it up.”³⁶⁾ The specific reference to women is removed, and only the fact that the water becomes muddy once they start stirring it up is translated. Even in the 1997 version, Seidensticker avoids this direct association between dirtiness and women, and he retranslates it as “[w]e didn’t think you’d want to drink after a bunch of women had stirred it up.”³⁷⁾ Although he adds the missing reference to the women, he skilfully integrates two separate elements of the sentence, “手を入れると濁る” and “女の後は汚い,” hiding the expression that lowers women’s status. In one of his essays on translation, Seidensticker argues that “it requires a fundamental decision on how much the translator may tamper with the words of the original to avoid lowering its worth—affronting its dignity, so to speak.”³⁸⁾ For him, these adjustments in the process of translation were necessary to avoid attracting

too much attention to this unique aspect of Japanese culture, which might potentially become a disturbance in delivering the literary quality of this work to English readers.

Recovering the Lost Theme and Kawabata’s Literary Quality

Approximately 40 years later, Seidensticker retranslated the text, this time in full, unabridged form (1997). One of the key changes in this later version was the restoration of missing characters and lost motifs, including the episode related to the old man who was supposed to appear at the beginning of this trip. He now returns to the tea shop, and the portrayal of this character leaves the strong impression of contrasts with the protagonist, which are essential for Kawabata’s literary works. Age versus youth, ugliness in contrast with beauty are now present in this revised version. Although the omission of episodes and characters in the earlier version was selective in order to transform the story into more accessible literary form for an English audience, Seidensticker’s retranslation of “The Izu Dancer” in 1997 scrupulously follows the structure of Japanese fiction that narrates the sequence of events that seems unrelated to the main plot at first glance. By translating the scenes and details omitted in the first version, richer associations of images and motifs are brought to life.

Also, when discussing translations of literary texts, one easily dismisses the fact that a translator’s interpretation can change over the years and that translation strategy may also evolve accordingly. The very first literary work of Kawabata that Seidensticker read was *Maihime* 舞姫, serialized in *The Asahi Newspaper* from 1950, then he moved on to *Yukiguni* 雪国 (Snow Country).³⁹⁾ Although themes of Kawabata’s literature such as the combination of beauty and

ugliness, the contrast of freshness and decay were already interwoven within these stories, it was not until the appearance of *Nemureru bijo* 眠れる美女 (House of the Sleeping Beauties, 1960) that one could confirm these themes as being crucial in Kawabata's literary works. As Biguenet and Schulte remark in *The Craft of Translation* that "[a]ll acts of translation begin with a thorough investigation of the reading process,"⁴⁰⁾ the history of Seidensticker's reading experience, his revisits of the text, and realization of recurrent themes in Kawabata's works over the years, are crucial in considering the shift of his attitude towards translation. Moreover, how his understanding of Kawabata's literature deepened over the years can be observed in Seidensticker's description of Kawabata's writing style. The translator used to consider Kawabata's literary work as a kind of haiku, relating that "he gives us quick glimpses of beauty and with them a chilling suggestion that emptiness lies beyond,"⁴¹⁾ but later, his description of Kawabata's literature changes and it is exemplified as renga.⁴²⁾ He noticed that the gradual development and transition created from the sequence of episodes were vital in delivering the literary quality of Kawabata's works. The restoration in the revised translation allowed him to capture this literary form and its quality.

Recovering the Texture of the Original

In addition to the restoration of omitted parts, Seidensticker also restores the texture of the original and such rearrangements can be seen at the various levels in his retranslation. At the structural level, he followed the rules of English in terms of the division of paragraphs in the earlier version and restructured the paragraphs to keep the logical consistency. However, in the later version, he matches the beginning of a new

paragraph as it is in the source text. Also, symbols such as dashes, dots, and semicolons, which rarely appear or do not appear at all in Japanese texts, are minimized in this retranslation. As can be seen in these adjustments, Seidensticker attempts to bring the translation closer to the literary form of the source language. Also, in the dramatization of dialogues, he shows one of these returns to the original text. Seidensticker deletes exclamation and question marks as much as possible in this later version and dramatic effects created in the earlier version decrease. The translated text is drawn closer to the emotional level delivered in the source text. Although less emotional than it might be, the translator tries to move the text back to the literary form used in the source text.

Along with such a decrease of dramatic effects, Seidensticker recovers the texture of the original in this version through more literal translation. For example, the translation of a sentence, "「ありがとう。」と云ふ言葉が咽にひつかかつて出なかったのだ。"⁴³⁾ was at first translated as "I could think of nothing more appropriate to say."⁴⁴⁾ Here, the interpretation of the Japanese original is used as translation and only the result of the word of thanks being caught in his throat is narrated in this sentence. However, the hero's inability to articulate a word of gratitude for being nervous and upset is not well-conveyed in the English translation. Seidensticker updates this sentence as "I found that a simple word of thanks caught in my throat"⁴⁵⁾ in his 1997 retranslation. "Being caught in my throat" portrays the emotional state of the hero more delicately by using the English equivalent expression. The over-translated sentence is modified to allow readers to interpret the sentence with their own liberty in this updated version.

Another example in which Seidensticker emends the translation into more literal translation can be

observed in his translation of the following sentence:

[ST]: 彼女は眩しさうにくるりと寝返りして、掌で顔を隠したまま布団を迂り出ると、廊下に坐り、「昨日はありがとうございました。」と、綺麗なお辞儀をして[...]⁴⁶⁾

[First version]: Abruptly, still hiding her face, she rolled over, slipped out of bed, and bowed low before me in the hall.⁴⁷⁾

[Revised version]: As if dazzled by the morning light, she rolled over and slipped out of bed, her hands still against her face. Then she knelt on the veranda and thanked me for the evening before.⁴⁸⁾

In the earlier version, the action of the dancer is much swifter and speedier than the original to the extent that it is almost comical. However, in the revised version, the reason for her hiding her face is well-captured by having the phrase, “as if dazzled by the morning light,” and every step of her actions is scrupulously translated. Such a shift of translation strategy shows his changing view towards translation. Referring to “A Model Contract for Literary Translations” (翻訳出版のための模範契約例) suggested by PEN America, Seidensticker mentions the importance of the “exactness” of the translation by arguing that “anything in the original should not be omitted and nothing should be added,” except changes due to linguistic differences.⁴⁹⁾ Such a more disciplined approach towards translation that developed over the years is reflected in this revised translation. As these cases have shown, Seidensticker tried to bring the translation closer to the original as much as possible in this 1997 revised rendition; however, rather than just simply bringing the text back to the source text via literal translation of the surface, he

tries to materialize what is behind it—the text’s attention to the detail, its literary form, and expressions unique to the author and Japanese culture.

Translation and the Growing Cultural Recognition

Not only capturing details of the text, Seidensticker also attempts to incorporate the growing recognition of Japanese culture over the years in the unabridged version. The list of culture-specific items in the glossary of Japanese terms at the end of *Perspective*, which includes words such as *sake*, *Samurai*, and *yen*, reveal how little the American general readers knew about Japanese culture in 1954 compared with today. However, in the 1997 version, changes of perception towards Japanese culture can be observed—it is not a completely foreign culture anymore. Seidensticker stops using italics completely in this version and the degree of foreignness of the text is reduced. He also restores Japanese specific items back to their original forms. The example quoted in the earlier section, “chess” as the translation of *go* 碁 is now replaced with the Japanese original term, “Go”. Similarly, *gomoku narabe* 五目並べ (previously translated as “checker”) in the 1997 version is retranslated as “Go board”. Needless to say, Seidensticker translated *Meijin* 名人 (The Master of Go), which was published by Knopf in 1972.⁵⁰⁾ In addition, the presence of other translations of modern Japanese fiction including Kawabata’s available by then on the English market might have encouraged him to use Japanese terminology more boldly in the later revised version of “The Izu Dancer.”

Not only limited to “Go”, the “flowers” are now turned into “chrysanthemums”, just like the author described the scenery as *kikubatake* 菊畑 in the

original. Change of pronunciation is another point to note; *samisen* is now transcribed and pronounced as “shamisen” with the delicate “h” sound, which is closer to the actual Japanese pronunciation. Seidensticker once mentioned that “since English readers are sufficiently familiar with the lifestyle of Japanese today, you don’t have to ‘spoil’ readers in that manner anymore.”⁵¹⁾ As he points out, if readers are “familiar” with Japanese culture to a certain extent, the translator does not necessarily have to bring the source text closer to the readers in terms of the translation of Japanese specific items.

However, there are some exceptions. In translating *Kawazu no kōjōmushi no musuko* 河津の工場主の息子 (the son of Kawazu-factory owner), Seidensticker omits this specific name of the town in Izu (Kawazu 河津) and translates the phrase as “the son of an Izu factory-owner”—the accessible proper noun is used even in this later version.⁵²⁾ Again, this further highlights Seidensticker’s different approach towards translation in comparison with Holman: whereas Holman puts the emphasis on delivering the image of Japan as it was when this work was written, the focus of Seidensticker was more on the readers. He again matches with the constantly evolving and growing image of Japan by controlling the frequency of the use of such terms. Although moving closer to the source text, Seidensticker still keeps readers in mind even in this revised version.

The Translator and His Evolution

The updates made in this full version were not limited to the restoration of elements essential for conveying the literary value of Kawabata’s literature. Retranslating the “effect” embedded in the text was one of the key improvements in this revised version. Instead of translating the

interpreted meaning, Seidensticker attempts to prioritize reconstructing the effect that delivers lyrical expressions of Kawabata closely intertwined with visual effects, rather than simply narrating one of the possible interpretations chosen for this translation. One of the most challenging phrases to translate, “情緒的な姿が私の胸を染めた” is a good example of this. The two versions are compared below:

[First version] A thoroughly appealing little figure. I felt a bright surge of happiness as I looked down at her.⁵³⁾

[Revised version] The recumbent figure seemed to flow toward me, a surge of light and color.⁵⁴⁾

In the earlier version, his own interpretation of “胸を染める,” “a bright surge of happiness” is used as a translation. However, this is only one of the possible interpretations that the translator selected. The emotion that emerges and gradually grows in this scene is not limited to “happiness”. On the other hand, in the revised version Seidensticker uses “a surge of light and color.” “Surge”, which was also used in the earlier version, gives the image of emotional sensations that the hero felt, but this time, it is a surge of “light and color,” not of “happiness”. By including these two new elements, “light and color,” the phrase aptly captures the visual aspect of the word 染める that involves a wider range of emotions applicable to this scene. Thus, readers can associate this phrase, “a surge of light and color” with a certain type of emotion which is not specified by the translator. Whereas the emotional aspects of the protagonist was the focus in the first version, he sheds light on more tangible aspect of this expression in the later version. By retranslating this phrase as, “[t]he

recumbent figure seemed to flow toward me, a surge of light and color,” he reconstructs a similar effect as in the original, by illustrating the visual aspect of the protagonist’s emotional state.

Seidensticker’s skill in translating the dialogue also improved in the later version. He uses contracted words to render colloquial expressions to differentiate them from the rest of the text, and also to create more dynamic flow in their conversations. In addition to the use of contracted words, he utilizes another strategy to distinguish the dialogue from rest of the text; he adds variance in the word “mother”. In the previous version, in Eikichi’s part, he says “[t]hey couldn’t get away from mother;”⁵⁵⁾ however, it is updated with the capitalized “Mother” in the later version while “mother” rendered in lower-case is still used for the narrative. By using both “mother” and “Mother,” not only does Seidensticker differentiate the conversational language from rest of the text, but it also adds variance to the text.

In addition, years of experience as a translator allowed Seidensticker to make better word choices to capture the meaning of the source text in the retranslation. For example, on the way to Oshima, the hero chooses the shortcut, “胸上りの木下路,” which is steeper, slippery with dead leaves, and hard to climb up. Seidensticker translates this phrase as “so steep now that climbing it was like climbing hand-over-hand up a wall”⁵⁶⁾ in the first version, but later he updates it with “so steep that climbing it was like scaling a wall.”⁵⁷⁾ In the previous version, the sentence was too lengthy, trying to describe the state of 胸上り. However, in the revised version, he summarizes “hand-over-hand up” with “scaling,” which means, “to climb, get over (a wall or the like).”⁵⁸⁾ He found a word that can convey the meaning with just one word, which best corresponds to the nuance in the

original.

In addition to finding a word that encapsulates the nuance of the original, there are fixed translations of words that Seidensticker established through a series of translated works. In the previous version, *rōka* 廊下 tends to be translated as “hall” more often than “veranda.” However, in later works such as *The Sound of the Mountain* (1970), “veranda” is more decidedly used, almost like an automatic conversion, and this translation is also used in the revised version of “The Izu Dancer.” In sum, in the course of his translation experience, he found and utilized consistently certain terms that best describe specific Japanese items.

One last improvement in this revised translation that should not be forgotten is Seidensticker’s correction of mistranslations. Just like other translators cannot avoid mistranslations, Seidensticker was no exception and he updated these mistranslations with more accurate translation, including the correction of the problem of subject mentioned above. Other updates include correcting the translation of “a package of mints” (*kōchū seiryōzai* 口中清涼剤) called Kaoru, that Eikichi bought as a gift for the protagonist, which was previously translated as “a bottle of cologne” in the first version. As these changes have clearly shown, emends made in the 1997 version show not only his changing view towards translation, but also his evolution and maturation as a translator.

Towards More Scrupulous Translation

The focus of translation strategies back in 1954, when Seidensticker introduced “The Izu Dancer” to the English audience, was to produce a translation that acceptable and accessible to the general public. Yet, as he translated more works of Kawabata and other Japanese authors over the

following years, his skill as a translator improved, and in the later unabridged version of “The Izu Dancer,” he attempted to deliver the literary quality of Kawabata literature via scrupulous translation. One of the reasons behind this move towards more literal translation was, the change of the target readers that Seidensticker had in mind when he translated the text. While his focus was more on general readers back in 1954, he wrote in 1991 that of more concern to him were now critics, scholars and writers, describing that there were not numerous “general readers” in the case of Japanese Literature.⁵⁹⁾ The shift of translation strategy across the two versions of the English renditions seems to correspond to this change in attitude towards translation that led him bring the translation closer to the source text. In addition to such a change, other external elements such as the increased recognition of Japanese culture, and the growing availability of modern Japanese fiction by the time of retranslation of “The Izu Dancer,” encouraged Seidensticker to update the translation of CSIs closer to the original, to produce the text that does not “spoil” the audience anymore. This chronological shift of translation strategies between the two versions also reveals how a translation can be influenced and shaped by constant negotiation, not only with the language that one translates the text into, but also with editors and readers who are surrounded by cultures that constantly change.

Note: All translations of passages from Japanese materials are my own.

Notes

1) The letter from Kawabata addressed to Seidensticker shows that Seidensticker worked on this abridgement with the author’s permission. The parts to be omitted were completely left to the translator’s judgment: “Regarding the abridgement

of ‘Izu no odoriko’, I have no *objection*. In terms of the methods and parts to be abridged, I’ll leave it to you,” (Yasunari Kawabata, personal correspondence to Edward Seidensticker, 20 October, 1954).

- 2) Noel Busch, “Japan Speaks to America,” in *Perspective of Japan: An Atlantic Monthly Supplement*, ed. Faubion Bowers et al. (New York: Intercultural Publications, 1954), 4.
- 3) For the history and tradition in editing *The Atlantic*, see *The Atlantic and its Makers* (Boston: The Atlantic Monthly Press, 1919).
- 4) Donald Richie, *Japanese Literature Reviewed* (New York: IGG Muse, 2003), 308. The editor of *The Oxford Book of Japanese Short Stories* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), Theodore Goossen also confirms as follows: “Prof. Seidensticker told me that he was given a set number of words as a maximum, so he had to trim his translation to squeeze it into that space. As a result, he was very happy to restore the translation to its full length for the Oxford collection.” (Theodore W. Goossen, personal communication, 30 May, 2015)
- 5) James Laughlin, “A Gateway to Japan,” in *Perspective of Japan: An Atlantic Monthly Supplement*, ed. Faubion Bowers et al. (New York: Intercultural Publications, 1954), 2. Laughlin was an American poet and also the president of Intercultural Publications Inc. He also founded New Directions, a publishing company in 1936.
- 6) Edward Seidensticker, “On Nagai Kafū and Kawabata Yasunari,” in *Words, Ideas, and Ambiguities: Four Perspectives on Translating from the Japanese*, ed. Donald Richie (Chicago: Imprint Publications, 2000), 23.
- 7) For further description on the lack of subjects in Japanese, see Tetsuo Anzai, *Eigo no hassō* (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 2000). Also, Hiroshi Tsukimoto takes neuroscientific approach in discussing this theme in his *Nihonjin no nou ni shugo wa iranai* (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 2008).
- 8) Yasunari Kawabata, “Izu no odoriko,” in *Izu no odoriko*, (1969: reprint, Tokyo: Nihon Kindai Bungakukan, 1969), 317.
- 9) Yasunari Kawabata, “The Izu Dancer: A Story,” in *Perspective of Japan: An Atlantic Monthly Supplement*, trans. Edward Seidensticker and ed. Faubion Bowers et al. (New York: Intercultural

- Publications, 1954), 18.
- 10) Yasunari Kawabata, “The Izu Dancer: A Story,” in *The Oxford Book of Japanese Short Stories*, trans. Edward Seidensticker and ed. Theodore W. Goossen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 147. This mistranslation of subject is an interesting case that shows a translator can be an influence to the author. It made the author realize that how the lack of subject can lead to ambiguous sentences that invite misunderstandings and confusions of the readers. For the detailed reference, see Yasunari Kawabata, “Izu no odoriko no sakusha,” in *Kawabata Yasunari zenshū vol. 33* (Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1982), 224.
 - 11) Seidensticker, “On Nagai Kafū,” 23. In this talk, Seidensticker says, “you are always conscious of editors. They are constantly looking over your shoulder”. He further mentions the influence of editors as follows: “In the case of a writer like Kawabata, who is sometimes rather murky, you are not allowed to give an adequate representation of this because the editor is there telling you to be clear, telling you to stand up and say what you mean”.
 - 12) For the difference of editing tradition between the U.S. and Japanese publishers, see Hiroaki Sato, *Yakusenai mono* (Tokyo: The Simul Press, 1996), 103. He describes that whereas the editors in the U.S. sometimes suggest the cut of whole chapter or rewriting parts of the text even to the renowned writers, Japanese editors would not take such a step towards the established writers.
 - 13) Kawabata, “Izu no odoriko,” 277.
 - 14) For this “movement of point of view,” see chap. 9 in Gen Itasaka, *Nihonjin no ronri kōzō* (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1971).
 - 15) Kawabata, “The Izu Dancer: A Story,” 12.
 - 16) Yasunari Kawabata, “The Dancing Girl of Izu,” in *The Dancing Girl of Izu and Other Stories* trans. and ed. J. Martin Holman (Washington: Counterpoint, 1997), 5.
 - 17) Sato, *Yakusenai mono*, 103. As one of the examples for contradictions in the illustration of the scene, he notes that how his copyeditor mentioned he could not grasp the composition of the fort portrayed in *Mutsuwa ki* 陸奥話記 (Legends of the Samurai) that Sato translated. For the discussion of consistency/ inconsistency of narrative point of view, see Ann Banfield, *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction* (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982). In the section, “Violations of narrative consistency”, she argues that “[c]onsistency is demanded by the reader of the text, in the sense that it is part of the internalized set of rules with which the reader approaches the text and which creates the expectations he has of it.”: 216.
 - 18) Kawabata, “The Izu Dancer,” 140.
 - 19) Other examples for such an abridgement include, Yukio Mishima, “Death in Midsummer,” *Japan Quarterly* 4.3 (1956): 315–40.
 - 20) Seidensticker, *Nihonbun no honyaku*, 205.
 - 21) Kawabata, “Izu no odoriko,” 276.
 - 22) Kawabata, “The Izu Dancer: A Story,” 12.
 - 23) Edward Seidensticker, “On Trying to Translate Japanese,” in *The Craft of Translation*, ed. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989), 152.
 - 24) Kawabata, ‘Izu no odoriko’, p. 304.
 - 25) Kawabata, ‘The Izu Dancer: A Story’, p. 16.
 - 26) Seidensticker and Anzai, *Nihonbun no honyaku*, 165.
 - 27) Another possible reason for this generalization can be the avoidance of association with exotic and romanticized depiction of Japan prevalent since the pre-war. Pierre Loti’s *Madame Chrysanthème* had a huge impact in shaping the feminized image of Japan in the US. For the further detail, see chap. 1 in Naoko Shibusawa, *America’s Geisha Ally: Race, Gender, and Maturity in Re-Imagining the Japanese Enemy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006).
 - 28) Kawabata, “The Izu Dancer: A Story,” 12.
 - 29) Seidensticker repeatedly mentions this “general readers (*ippan dokusha* 一般読者)” as target for his translation. In later years, such readers are more clearly specified as follows: “[t]he consumer is of course the reader, or the collective body of readers. Its most numerous segment is composed of those called the general readers.” (Edward Seidensticker, “Translation: What Good Does It Do?,” in *Literary Relations East and West: Selected Essays*, ed. Jean Toyama and Nobuko Ochner [Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991], 178). It is also interesting to observe the difference of assumed readers between

- the authors' and that of the translator. See the example of writers such as Murakami Haruki as a comparison. He considers these readers, what he calls as "imagined readers (*kakū no dokusha* 架空の読者)" as "the whole (*sōtai* 総体)" in his *Shokugyō to shite no sakka* (Tokyo: Switch Publishing, 2015).
- 30) Seidensticker and Anzai, *Nihonbun no honyaku*, 134.
 - 31) Donald Richie et al., "Round-Table Discussion," in *Words, Ideas, and Ambiguities: Four Perspectives on Translating from the Japanese*, ed. Donald Richie (Chicago: Imprint Publications, 2000), 83.
 - 32) Kawabata, "Izu no odoriko," 289.
 - 33) *Ibid.*
 - 34) Kawabata, "The Izu Dancer: A Story," 14.
 - 35) Kawabata, "Izu no odoriko," 307.
 - 36) Kawabata, "The Izu Dancer: A Story," 17.
 - 37) Kawabata, "The Izu Dancer," 143.
 - 38) Edward Seidensticker, "On Retranslation," *Japan Quarterly* 7.4 (1960): 490.
 - 39) Edward Seidensticker and Howard Hibbett, "Nihonbungaku no honyakusha, nihonbungaku wo kataru," in *Seiyō no Genji, nihon no Genji* (Tokyo: Kasama Shoten, 1984), 206.
 - 40) John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte, ed., introduction to *The Craft of Translation*, by John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989), ix.
 - 41) Edward Seidensticker, "The Conservative Tradition," in *Perspective of Japan: An Atlantic Monthly Supplement*, ed. Faubion Bowers et al. (New York: Intercultural Publications, 1954), 73.
 - 42) Edward Seidensticker, *Nagareyuku hibi* (Tokyo: Jiji Tsūshin Shuppanyoku, 2004), 211. Such a change of understanding towards Kawabata's writing from being haiku to renga can be seen in his translator's note at the end of "One Arm" published in the *Japan Quarterly* in 1967. In this note, he exemplifies Kawabata's writing as of "renga linked verse" by describing his style as "episodic" and how "tiny lyrical episodes" are strung together. He further emphasizes that "[t]he linking, the relation of episode to preceding and following episode, is more important than the over-all form." (Yasunari Kawabata, "One Arm," trans. Edward Seidensticker, *Japan Quarterly* 14.1. (1967): 71)
 - 43) Kawabata, "Izu no odoriko," 276.
 - 44) Kawabata, "The Izu Dancer: A Story," 12.
 - 45) Kawabata, "The Izu Dancer," 129.
 - 46) Kawabata, "Izu no odoriko," 294.
 - 47) Kawabata, "The Izu Dancer: A Story," 15.
 - 48) Kawabata, "The Izu Dancer," 137.
 - 49) Seidensticker and Anzai, *Nihonbun no honyaku*, 178.
 - 50) It is also worth noting that when *The Master of Go* was published, the underline was added in the title under 'Go' to indicate it as being italicized, but in later versions, this underline was removed.
 - 51) Edward Seidensticker, "Translation of the *Genji monogatari*, Here and There," in *Sekai no naka no nihonbungaku*, ed. Toru Haga, Sukehiro Hirakawa and Keiichirō Kobori (Tokyo: Tokyo University Press, 1973), 128.
 - 52) In response to Etō Jun's lecture for the Japan Society of London, in which he mentioned that cuts of proper names which carry rich connotations in the translation of modern Japanese fictions are deplorable, Seidensticker stresses his view that maintaining all of these "outlandish" proper nouns for most American and European readers in the translation would look "cluttered" and "gibberish." (Seidensticker, "Translation: What Good Does It Do?" 180.)
 - 53) Kawabata, "The Izu Dancer: A Story," 15.
 - 54) Kawabata, "The Izu Dancer," 137.
 - 55) Kawabata, "The Izu Dancer: A Story," 16.
 - 56) *Ibid.*
 - 57) Kawabata, "The Izu Dancer," 142.
 - 58) J. A. Simpson and E. S. C. Weiner, ed., *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2d ed. XIV. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 563.
 - 59) Seidensticker, "Translation: What Good Does It Do?," 178.

Bibliography

- Anzai, Tetsuo. *Eigo no hassō*. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 2000.
- Banfield, Ann. *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982.
- Biguenet, John, and Rainer Schulte, ed. Introduction to *The Craft of Translation*, by John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte, vii–xvi. Chicago: The University of

- Chicago Press, 1989.
- Busch, Noel. “Japan Speaks to America.” In *Perspective of Japan: An Atlantic Monthly Supplement*, edited by Faubion Bowers, James Laughlin, Eleanor Peters, Edward Seidensticker, and Kenneth Yasuda, 4. New York: Intercultural Publications, 1954.
- Howe, M. A. De Wolfe. *The Atlantic and its Makers*. Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1919.
- Itasaka, Gen. *Nihonjin no ronri kōzō*. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1971.
- Yasunari Kawabata. “The Dancing Girl of Izu.” In *The Dancing Girl of Izu and Other Stories*. Translated and edited by J. Martin Holman, 3–33. Washington: Counterpoint, 1997.
- . “The Izu Dancer,” In *The Oxford Book of Japanese Short Stories*. Translated by Edward G. Seidensticker and edited by Theodore W. Goossen, 129–148. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- . “The Izu Dancer: A Story.” In *Perspective of Japan: An Atlantic Monthly Supplement*. Translated by Edward Seidensticker and edited by Faubion Bowers, James Laughlin, Eleanor Peters, Edward Seidensticker, and Kenneth Yasuda, 12–18. New York: Intercultural Publications, 1954.
- . “Izu no odoriko.” In *Izu no odoriko*, Reprint. 275–319. Tokyo: Nihon Kindai Bungakukan, 1969.
- . “Izu no odoriko no sakusha.” In *Kawabata Yasunari zenshū vol. 33*, 209–264. Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1982.
- . “One Arm.” Translated by Edward Seidensticker, *Japan Quarterly* 14.1 (1967): 60–71.
- . Personal correspondence to Edward Seidensticker, 20 October, 1954.
- Laughlin, James. “A Gateway to Japan.” In *Perspective of Japan: An Atlantic Monthly Supplement*, edited by Faubion Bowers, James Laughlin, Eleanor Peters, Edward Seidensticker, and Kenneth Yasuda, 2. New York: Intercultural Publications, 1954.
- Mishima, Yukio. “Death in Midsummer.” *Japan Quarterly* 4.3 (1956): 315–40.
- Murakami, Haruki. *Shokugyō to shite no sakka*. Tokyo: Switch Publishing, 2015.
- Richie, Donald. *Japanese Literature Reviewed*. New York: IGG Muse, 2003.
- Richie, Donald, Edward Seidensticker, Edwin McClellan, Howard Hibbett and John Nathan. “Round-Table Discussion.” In *Words, Ideas, and Ambiguities: Four Perspectives on Translating from the Japanese*, edited by Donald Richie, 69–88. Chicago: Imprint Publications, 2000.
- Sato, Hiroaki. *Yakusenai mono*. Tokyo: The Simul Press, 1996.
- Seidensticker, Edward. “The Conservative Tradition.” In *Perspective of Japan: An Atlantic Monthly Supplement*, edited by Faubion Bowers, James Laughlin, Eleanor Peters, Edward Seidensticker, and Kenneth Yasuda, 72–73. New York: Intercultural Publications, 1954.
- . *Nagareyuku hibi*. Tokyo: Jiji Tsūshin Shuppankyoku, 2004.
- . “On Nagai Kafū and Kawabata Yasunari.” In *Words, Ideas, and Ambiguities: Four Perspectives on Translating from the Japanese*, edited by Donald Richie, 18–34. Chicago: Imprint Publications, 2000.
- . “On Retranslation.” *Japan Quarterly* 7.4 (1960): 487–90.
- . “On Trying to Translate Japanese.” In *The Craft of Translation*, edited by John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte, 142–153. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- . “Translation of the *Genji monogatari*, Here and There.” In *Sekai no naka no nihonbungaku*, edited by Toru Haga, Sukehiro Hirakawa and Keiichirō Kobori, 115–128. Tokyo: Tokyo University Press, 1973.
- . “Translation: What Good Does It Do?” In *Literary Relations East and West: Selected Essays*, edited by Jean Toyama and Nobuko Ochner, 177–184. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991.
- Seidensticker, Edward G., and Tetsuo Anzai. *Nihonbun no honyaku*. Tokyo: Taishūkan Shoten, 1983.
- Seidensticker, Edward, and Howard Hibbett. “Nihonbungaku no honyakusha, nihonbungaku wo kataru.” In *Seiyō no Genji, nihon no Genji*, 205–218. Tokyo: Kasama Shoten, 1984.
- Shibusawa, Naoko. *America’s Geisha Ally: Race, Gender, and Maturity in Re-Imagining the Japanese Enemy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- Tanizaki, Junichirō. “The Mother of Captain Shigemoto.” In *Modern Japanese Literature: An Anthology*, edited by Donald Keene, 387–397. Rutland, Vermont, Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1965.

———. “Shōshō Shigemoto no haha.” In *Tanizaki Junichirō shū*. vol. 2. 343–392. Tokyo: Tsukuma Shobō, 1956.

Tsukioto, Hiroshi. *Nihonjin no nou ni shugo wa iranai*.

Tokyo: Kōdansha, 2008.

Simpson, J. A., and E. S. C. Weiner, ed. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2d ed. XIV. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

エドワード・サイデンステッカーの 翻訳手法とその変遷

— 「伊豆の踊子」の英訳初版および改訂版を例として —

片岡 真伊

総合研究大学院大学 文化科学研究科 国際日本研究専攻

本稿は、第二次世界大戦後に日本文学の英訳に貢献したエドワード・サイデンステッカー（1921–2007）が、川端康成の小説「伊豆の踊子」を英訳・再翻訳するにあたり、どのように異なる翻訳手法を用いたかを考察したものである。サイデンステッカーはコロラドに生まれ、大学で英文学を専攻した後、第二次世界大戦中にアメリカ海軍日本語学校で日本語を学んだ。アメリカ海兵隊の一員として日本の地に初めて足を踏み入れた後、終戦後に一旦外交官を志すもののその道を諦め、英語圏での日本文学の紹介に尽力した。サイデンステッカーが手掛けた翻訳作品のうち、川端文学は彼の翻訳作品群の中核をなすものであり、中でも「伊豆の踊子」は、初期に取組んだ翻訳作品として、また改訂を行なった最後の翻訳作品として、サイデンステッカーの翻訳手法を検討していくうえで欠くことの出来ない作品である。

サイデンステッカーによる「伊豆の踊子」の最初の英訳は、1954年に『アトランティック・マンズリー』の『パースペクティヴ・オブ・ジャパン』と呼ばれる付録冊子に掲載された。大胆な起点テキスト（ST: source text、原文）の削除や省略、調整などを特徴とするサイデンステッカーの訳は、誌内の限られたスペースに掲載するという編集者により課せられた条件のためのみならず、日本のことをほとんど知らない一般読者層を想定した、英語圏でも受容されやすい文体や形式への抄訳・変更を行っている。しかし、サイデンステッカーは、1997年に*The Oxford Book of Japanese Short Stories*のため、「伊豆の踊子」を再翻訳している。この改訂版の英訳文は、省略部分を元に戻し、また加筆を取払うことにより、原文に寄り添った英訳へとその姿形を変えている。

このような変化を含む二つの異なる版の翻訳を比較検討することにより、本稿では、訳者自身が言うところの「読者を甘やかす」翻訳から「几帳面な」翻訳への推移を、主に周縁のエピソードや登場人物の削除、そしてテキスト内の異文化要素（CSIs: Culture Specific Items）に焦点をあて考察する。また、こうしたアプローチに反映されている翻訳者の姿勢の変容についても触れ、翻訳者としてのスキルの向上や原文解釈の深化、そして英語圏での日本文化の認知のされ方の変化などを含む、訳文および翻訳者を取り巻く文化的・社会的背景が翻訳に与えた影響についても論じる。

キーワード：エドワード・サイデンステッカー、川端康成、文学翻訳、「伊豆の踊子」、『パースペクティヴ・オブ・ジャパン』、抄訳、異文化要素（CSI）、再翻訳