Like walking on cobblestones:
An analysis of translator's prefaces in Japanese intralingual translations

Paula Martínez Sirés
Universidad Nihon
paula.martinez@nihon-u.ac.jp

Abstract: This paper explores epitexts and peritexts (prefaces) written by translators to intralingual translations. It carries out a preliminary study on several translator's prefaces (here called 'translatorial prefaces') in the Japanese context to determine the function that said prefaces have within modern Japanese translations (or *gendaigoyaku*) of Japanese classics, to examine translation methodologies and translation issues found in the texts, and to ascertain the level of self-awareness that intralingual translators had with their role as 'translators'. Ultimately, this study aims to contribute new approaches to the ongoing discussion regarding intralingual translation and the study of paratexts, both in the Japanese context and in a broader sense.

Key words: paratexts, translator's preface, Japanese literature, Japanese translation, intralingual translation, translation studies.

Caminar sobre adoquines:
Análisis de los prólogos de traductores en traducciones japonesas intralingüísticas

Resumen: Este artículo analiza epitextos y peritextos (prólogos) escritos por los traductores de traducciones intralingüísticas. Pretende realizar un estudio preliminar acerca de varios prólogos de traductores (referidos aquí como "prólogos traductoriales") en el contexto japonés con el fin de discernir su función en el marco de las traducciones al japonés moderno (*gendaigoyaku*) de clásicos japoneses, analizar metodologías y problemas de traducción en los textos, así como verificar hasta qué punto los traductores intralingüísticos son conscientes de su rol de "traductores". Por último, este trabajo desea aportar nuevos enfoques al debate en curso acerca de la traducción intralingüística y el estudio de los paratextos tanto en el contexto japonés como en un ámbito general.

Palabras clave: paratextos, prólogo del traductor, literatura japonesa, traducción japonesa, traducción intralingüística, estudios de traducción.

Sumario: 1. Introduction. 2. Theoretical framework. 2.2. Rethinking intralingual translation. 2.3. Translator's prefaces. 2.4. The corpus. 3. The analysis of prefaces in Japanese modern translations. 3.1. Analysis of the editor's epitexts. 3.2. Analysis of the translatorial preface in NBZ, vol. 1. 3.3. Analysis of the translatorial preface in NBZ, vol. 2. 3.4. Analysis of translatorial prefaces in NBZ, vol. 3. 3.5. Analysis of translatorial prefaces in NBZ, vol. 7 and vol. 9. 4. Conclusions. 5. Acknowledgements.

1. Introduction

In postwar Japan, during the *Genji monogatari* (The Tale of Genji) boom that was taking place at the time, Masamune Hakuchō wrote in reference to Murasaki Shikibu's work that he felt 'unable to read with any freedom a novel, a *monogatari*, that a ten-year-old girl most likely skimmed right through' (Emmerich 2013: 367). Murasaki Shikibu's Japanese, he argued, was 'not his Japanese –it was as alien to him as French' (Emmerich 2013: 370). This unbearable difference between classical and modern Japanese made him feel as though he were 'walking on cobblestones' (ibid.: 370) when reading the original.

Although intralingual translation has been receiving some attention over the past few years (see Chan 2002 for a study of 'intralinguality' within texts; Berk Albachten 2013, 2015, and 2019 for research on intralingual translation in the Turkish context; Deane-Cox 2014, and Berk Albachten & Tahir Gürçağlar (Eds.) 2018, 2019, for studies on intralingual translation, retranslation and rewriting), modern Japanese translations, or *gendaigoyaku*,[1] have not been comprehensively studied in Translation Studies (hereafter TS). Even though scholarship on issues linked to TS in Japan has steadily increased over the last few years, so as to draw attention to peculiarities that arise from its specific sociocultural and linguistic system (Levy 2011, Sato-Rossberg and Wakabayashi 2012), there is still much room for discussion regarding intralingual translation, its methodology, and the role and visibility of intralingual translators.

The lack of visibility of translators is also an issue that has been raised several times within TS (Hermans 1996, Venuti 1995/2008). Ellen McRae defends the need for their increased visibility by arguing that translators are 'ambassadors between cultures' and remarks the importance of analyzing translator's prefaces as they are 'an excellent locus for disseminating their

---

[1] This research uses the term '*gendaigoyaku*' (現代語訳), although it can also be transcripted as *gendaigo-yaku* (separating the ideograms of 'modern language' and 'translation'). Other authors also use the words *goyaku* (literally, 'language translation'), or *kōgogaku* ('colloquial translation').

understanding to readers' (2012: 80). Within this context, paratexts, such as translator's prefaces or footnotes, are not only starting to prove relevant for the analysis of translation, but they also provide for new frameworks for further research (Batchelor 2018).

This study is not exhaustive and is based on a limited corpus, but it aims to contribute to the discussion that examines intralingual translator's prefaces in order to determine the methodology used in the translation process, and to ascertain their translational identity, if there is one, in intralingual translators.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1. Previous research

A previous analysis of five modern Japanese translations of Japanese writer Higuchi Ichiyō's *Takekurabe* that looked into the translation techniques, approaches, and methodologies used by five modern Japanese translators showed that some modern translations were closer to the original text, rendering the modern Japanese translation more foreignizing for the modern reader, whereas other intralingual translations were closer to the spectrum of adaptation, particularly those aimed at younger readers, thus rendering the texts closer to the target culture (Martínez Sirés 2018: 382).[2] Most interestingly, the comparison of the analysis of intralingual translations into modern Japanese, and interlingual translations into English, Castilian Spanish and Catalan, showed that within intralingual translation we can also find different translation techniques (such as borrowings, amplifications, generalizations) as it also happens when translating cultural referents in interlingual translations.[3]

In spite of this, the analysis of techniques, methodologies, and approaches used in intralingual translations, in general, and in particular modern Japanese translations, has regretfully not been the subject of much debate, and most of the studies have focused on interlingual translations and, recently, intersemiotic translations.

---

[2] Venuti distinguishes between domestication, an 'ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to dominant cultural values' thus suppressing the foreignness of the TT (Venuti 1995/2008: 81); and foreignization, a 'translation method along lines which are excluded by dominant cultural values in the target language' so as to 'send the reader abroad' (Venuti 1998: 309; Venuti 1995/2008: 20).

[3] See Martínez Sirés (2018) for a schematic representation of the typologies and techniques found in the translation of cultural referents in intralingual translations.

2.2. Rethinking intralingual translation

Roman Jakobson is well known for his seminal paper 'On linguistic aspects of translation' (1959), in which he divided translation into three categories: intralingual, interlingual and intersemiotic translation. According to Jakobson, '[i]ntralingual translation or *rewording* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language' (ibid.: 139, emphasis in original). In other words, intralingual translation means changing the source text A (ST A), written in its correspondent source language A (SL A), into a different target text B (TT B), written in the same source language A (SL A).

In intralingual translation, it is then the content of the text that changes 'from one poetic shape into another' (Jakobson 1959: 143), as in when 'producing a summary or otherwise rewrite (…) a children's version of an encyclopaedia (…) [or] when we rephrase an expression in the same language' (Munday 2012: 9). In this category we can find, then, several types of text adaptation, such as children's adaptations (literary classics or difficult texts adapted for children or young adults), 'easy read' adaptations (texts adapted for people with cognitive impairments), and rewritings.

Building on this, modern Japanese translations could be described as a process in which a ST A, written in its correspondent SL A^C where '^{C}' stands for 'classical', changes into a different TT B, written this time in the TL A^M where '^{M}' stands for 'modern'. Here the ST is changed into a new TT through the process of translation, rewriting and adaptation, resulting in a new text different from the original (hence 'ST A' and 'ST B'). The SL and the TL, however, remain the same ('A'). Albeit linguistically, phonetically, or grammatically different, classic languages and their correspondent modern languages are not so different as to be considered completely different languages (hence 'SL A^C and TL A^M). However, even though Jakobson's intralingual translation mainly focuses on rewriting or summarizing a text, it would not be completely accurate to consider the SL found in a classical text as the very exact linguistic system in which the TT is written. Because, in the first place, it was its 'distance' for modern readers that caused the need for a modern translation.

A question arises, however, when considering modern translations of classics. Where should the line be drawn between the source language (SL) and the target language (TL)? Jakobson's criteria to define intralingual translation becomes vague when analyzing classic or old texts in their respective modern languages. Putting himself in the place of TS researchers and scholars, Toury (1995: 31) defends the idea of not basing the choice of object of a study on a preconceived definition of what is a translation, since

that definition will be determined through descriptive studies. The object of study, the translated text, will therefore be a text that has been considered as a translation by the target culture. In other words, a certain text (for instance, an intralingual translation) should be considered a 'translation' because it has been considered so by the researcher in the target culture.

This stance has however been criticized by other scholars (Komissarov 1996, Gambier 1997, Halverson 1997, Hermans 1995, Pym 1998). Yves Gambier's criticism, particularly, raises the problem that some cultural groups may not render certain cultural products (such as adaptations) to be translations, whereas this consideration may change at a different time or by another cultural group (Gambier 1997: 581). This is particularly true in the case of modern Japanese translations or *gendaigoyaku*, since in the Japanese context there are intralingual translators that do not see their works as 'translation', or at least they harbor some doubts regarding the adequacy of considering those TT as 'translation proper', whereas other translators clearly state that their product is a 'modern translation'. These discussions prove that there seems to be a general agreement on the 'blurriness' in delimiting what constitutes a translation, to the point that scholars such as Tymoczko have defended an enlargement of the meaning of the word so it does not ignore cultural diversity and the movement of history (2007). Hence, building on Toury, Gambier, and Tymoczko, I will use the terms 'intralingual translators' or 'modern Japanese translators', rather than 'adapters' or 'rewriters', to refer to the translators (also turned preface writers) of the intralingual translations analyzed.

In relation to this, this study will examine the 'translational identity' of translators in their translator's prefaces. The concept of translational identity usually refers to the identity of those translators who have been referred to as migrant, diasporic, transnational and translingual (Wilson 2017). However, here I will consider translational identity as the sense of self-awareness of the role of being a translator, be it intralingual, interlingual, or intersemiotic.

2.3. Translator's prefaces

In his *Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation*, Gérard Genette defines paratexts as (1) a presenter of the literary work, (2) as an 'undefined zone', and (3) as 'an authorial intention and assumption of responsibility' (1997: 1-3). Genette divides paratexts into two main groups: peritexts, the most typical paratextual elements consisting of messages or images that surround the body of a text (such as title, prefaces, covers); and epitexts, the elements that exist outside the book (such as interviews) (ibid.: 4-5). It needs

to be noted, however, that when Genette refers to paratexts, he has in mind works that have been written by an author, not translated works. This poses a conundrum when discussing agency in translation, as well as when addressing paratexts created by translators, such as prefaces and footnotes.

Genette defines the preface as 'every type of introductory (…) text, authorial or allographic, consisting of a discourse produced on the subject of the text that follows or precedes it' (ibid.: 161), and distinguishes among authorial, auctorial and allographic prefaces. This study will especially look into the functions of 'Statements of intent' (ibid.: 221-224) of the allographic prefaces of modern Japanese translations of Japanese classics, as well as epitexts written by the editor of the collection. Genette defines allographic prefaces as those written by real persons (as opposed to fictional characters, what Genette calls 'auctorial prefaces', ibid.: 179). But instead of being written by the original author, they are written by 'a wholly different (third) person' (ibid.: 179). In these cases, the author or the publisher delegate the writing of the preface to a third party, usually a person of high socio-cultural status that had no direct role in the publishing process of the book (Tahir Gürçağlar 2013: 4). Sometimes, in translated texts, this third party can be the translator.

The study of paratexts in translated works has been gaining recognition over the last few years in TS. More concretely, Jeremy Munday points out that the analysis of translator's prefaces can be an important source to know in more detail the work that goes into producing a translation, such as the actual process of translation composition (2001: 152). Likewise, Rodica Dimitriu posits that prefaces written by translators represent a documentary source to translation researchers when trying to extrapolate information on the translation process, as well as on the translation norms or ideological stance of the translators (2009: 201-203). And, on a similar note, Tahir Gürçağlar defends that translator's prefaces can offer several forms of information regarding culture specific items, as well as explanations on translation's strategies implemented by the translator (2013: 2).

The function of prefaces has also been the object of research (see Dimitriu 2009). This study will rely on Batchelor's typology to assess the functionality of these paratexts, which identifies up to 14 different function categories (Batchelor 2018, pp. 160-161, adapted from Rockenberger 2014): referential, self-referential, ornamental, generic, meta-communicative, informative, hermeneutical, ideological, evaluative, commercial, legal, pedagogical, instructive/operational, and personalization. It should also be pointed out that one paratext may have more than one function.

Translator's prefaces have been the 'most widely studied form of paratexts surrounding translations' (Tahir Gürçağlar 2013: 3). And yet, the discussion as to whether translator's prefaces should be considered authorial or allographic is still ongoing. According to Genette, self-referentiality in the preface is the indispensable condition for considering a translator as an author, but that still does not solve some existing methodological problems. Consequently, Tahir Gürçağlar concludes that prefaces written by translators are neither authorial nor allographic, and that they should be 'handled separately in a category of their own' (2013: 5). Similarly, Deane-Cox (2014: 29) places the translator alongside the other non-authorial contributors to the paratext that Genette explicitly identifies, such as the publisher or third-party preface writers. Both Tahir Gürçağlar and Deane-Cox seem to agree that translations should be considered texts with their own paratexts, rather than the idea suggested by Genette that a translation be considered a paratext of the original text.

In her monograph *Translation and Paratexts* (2018), Kathryn Batchelor critically analyses Genette's theory of the paratext and, after pointing out a series of inherent contradictions, offers a wider definition that aims to include paratexts found in 'physical' texts to digital, web-based, or audiovisual ones by understanding 'text' as any written or spoken words that form a connected piece of work. Batchelor then summarizes the paratext as 'a consciously crafted threshold for a text which has the potential to influence the way(s) in which the text is received' (2018: 142). In this model, she clarifies, 'a translated text would be considered a text in its own right and with its own paratexts, as opposed to being viewed as a paratext to an original text, as in Genette's model' (ibid.: 142). However, Batchelor also defends that the benefits of 'placing translations alongside originals rather than in place of originals' could be of considerable value to analyze the work in question (ibid.: 188). Under her definition, then, translator's prefaces should be considered allographic rather than authorial, following Genette's original categorization.

In this study I will consider the translated texts as texts in their own right, rather than paratexts of the original. However, considering translators as 'authors' of the preface may lead to some terminological confusion, and could invisibilize further the role of the translator writing the preface. For that purpose, and also building from Tahir Gürçağlar's proposal to create a fourth category (2013: 5), I will use the term 'translatorial preface' for those prefaces penned by translators, independently whether there is self-referentiality in the contents of the preface or not, thus giving preference to the authorship of the preface rather than its theme or function. I will hence

consider that these translatorial prefaces have equal standing to third party preface writers.

2.4. The corpus

The corpus of texts being analyzed consists of two epitexts by the editor of the collection, and eight prefaces written by the modern Japanese translators. Postfaces have been categorized as prefaces for clarity. The selected prefaces written by intralingual translators have been taken from the volumes 1, 2, 3, 7 and 9 of *Ikezawa Natsuki-hen: Nihon Bungaku Zenshū* ('Edited by Ikezawa Natsuki: The Complete Works of Japanese Literature', 2014-2020), an anthology of Japanese literature edited by author and translator Ikezawa Natsuki. I have chosen the *Nihon Bungaku Zenshū* Collection (NBZ hereafter) because it offers several modern translations of Japanese classics by different translators, and because there exist several remarks by the editor regarding the objectives and purpose of the modern translations.

Limitations of the present study are that it will only qualitatively analyze translatorial prefaces deemed relevant from the viewpoint of the translation process, methodology, or translatorial identity, hence discarding prefaces that lean towards literary criticism of the translated work.

Further research lines could include the complete analysis of all paratexts and their function, and the creation of a list of themes. Identifying patterns of themes for paratexts specific to translations and cross-referencing them to their functions would prove valuable for translation research, as Batchelor (2018: 161) points out, since it would give a deeper knowledge of what paratexts do (particularly in intralingual translations, a field not yet widely explored), and it would show how patterns in theme and function have changed over time or across different cultures.

3. The analysis of prefaces in Japanese modern translations

3.1. Analysis of the editor's epitexts

It is not always possible to analyze the annotations or comments made by editors of collections, because it may be they have not been included in the paratexts or they simply do not exist. Nevertheless, they can be important in helping to understand the 'purpose' of the translation, its context, and also provide the readers (and researchers) with a direct contact with the editor (or the translator).

Ikezawa Natsuki, the editor of the collection and translator of one of the stories, made a series of remarks in English on the occasion of the 8th

Asian Translation Traditions Conference that took place at the University of London in July 2017. His comments in the book of abstracts, which Genette would refer to as epitexts, state the purpose of said collection and justify the translators' selections:

> Japanese literature has a long history, and the Japanese language has changed rapidly. Therefore, even well-educated people cannot read classical Japanese. To make Japanese classical literature accessible to the contemporary audience, I set out a plan to publish *Edited by Ikezawa Natsuki: The Complete Works of Japanese Literature*. To achieve this goal, I have asked many Japanese authors to collaborate. (Ikezawa 2017: 19)

The intention of the collection then is to make available Japanese classical literature to a wider audience. From Ikezawa's comment we can infer that modern Japanese translations are not necessarily aimed at young readers (i.e., children adaptations of classics) and could be useful even to 'well-educated people'. As for the selection of the translators and translation methods, Ikezawa comments:

> Why didn't I ask national [Japanese] literary scholars? Because writing style matters more than anything else for literary translations. I took care to match authors/translators with the original works. (...) In general, I left the translation to the responsibility of the author/translator, and kept my mouth shut. (...) Scholars? This is no classroom. I want the readers to read [the classics] in their bedroom. So they need to be readable. (ibid.: 19).

He justifies his decision of not employing scholars because he wants translations to prioritize readability (see Chesterman and Wagner 2002 for a discussion on whether translation theory is useful for translators). The purpose of the translations is, then, to be 'enjoyable'. Scholarly translations have indeed their use, but Ikezawa aims at a different target readership, and has a different purpose in mind. It is worth noting that, as an editor, he 'kept [his] mouth shut' so as to not interfere with the translation process. This seemed to work, because in the same conference he mentioned that 'this project has almost been a success' (Ikezawa 2017: 19).

Nevertheless, Ikezawa is also aware that certain readers do not like modern Japanese translations since they differ greatly from the original. Modern Japanese translations have been criticized over the years because of a sense of departure from the original, to the point of even being referred to as 'blasphemous' by author Mishima Yukio. In fact, Mishima talked about

modern Japanese translations as if they were a 'Japanese nymph wearing jeans', something unimaginable that would unsettle the reader. But the fact still remains, as Ikezawa explains, that most Japanese readers cannot enjoy classics of Japanese literature because of the difficulty of the language. From Ikezawa's comments it can be inferred that the existence of modern Japanese translations is rightly justified. It is not to be used as a substitution of the original, but as parallel reading. This aligns to what Batchelor describes as the necessity of placing the translation alongside the original text (2018: 88).

3.2. Analysis of the translatorial preface in NBZ, vol. 1

The first peritext that this study is going to analyse corresponds to the translatorial preface by Ikezawa Natsuki to his modern translation of the *Kojiki* (Records of Ancient Matters), published in the first volume of *NBZ.*

Ikezawa's preface is particularly interesting as it is fashioned after the epistolary style. Titled 'The objective of this translation — Or a letter to Ō no Yasumaro', Ikezawa addresses his preface to Ō no Yasumaro, the compiler and editor of the *Kojiki*, instead of to the target readers. Ikezawa acknowledges in his preface the differences in society, language and culture between modern Japan and the days in which the *Kojiki* was written and realizes that in order to understand how those ancient people lived and thought, he must translate Ō no Yasumaro's words into 'the language of our generation' (NBZ 2014, 1: 5-6). It would not be too far-fetched to think that Ikezawa's desire to create this anthology was, in fact, the answer to this very specific desire.

Following this, Ikezawa starts to ponder about the implications of translating ancient Japanese into modern Japanese:[4]

> I am a word technician, as you were, and I have translated several literary works until now from English, modern Greek or French into Japanese. (....) This is why I thought I could translate from ancient Japanese too, but this proved to be exceedingly difficult. (…) Your Japanese felt way more distant than (…) modern English or French. This bridge was not easy [to cross]. (…) At the end I realized that the familiar straight-up route was the best shortcut to climb up this steep mountain. (NBZ 1, 2014: 6)[5]

---

[4] All translations are my own.

[5]

あなたと同じように言葉の技術者であるぼくは、これまでいろいろな翻訳をしてきました。英語や現代ギリシャ語やフランス語で書かれた文学作品を日本語に移してきました。(...)
それならば古代の日本語を訳すこともできると考えたのですが、これはことのほかむずかしい

Ikezawa thus describes himself as a 'word technician' (*kotoba no gijutsusha*), referring to both the authorial side and the translatorial side of his career. Interestingly enough, and similarly to what Masamune Hakuchō wrote in reference to Murasaki Shikibu's *Genji monogatari*, Ikezawa states that ancient Japanese feels more alien than a foreign language such as English or French. Nevertheless, he decided to go forward and 'cross the bridge' (*kakehashi*). This bridge could be understood as a metaphor for the linguistic and cultural differences between the source culture and the target culture. Intralingual translation is thus understood by Ikezawa as a bridge that needs to be crossed (the expression intercultural bridge comes to mind; or, perhaps in this case, 'intracultural' bridge), or as a mountain that needs to be climbed, with modern Japanese located at the base and classical Japanese at the peak. He becomes a packman that needs to guide his readers to the top of the mountain.

He defines his translation policy ('climbing the mountain') as very unintrusive, trying to 'leave intact as much as [he] could, [Ō no Yasumaro]'s literary style and tone' (NBZ 1, 2014: 6-7).[6] This could be understood as a rather foreignizing approach, since the closer the translation is to the original, the more distant it will feel to the target audience. Nevertheless, he adds that:

> Since I was translating your literary style into modern Japanese, my intention was to make it seem modern. (NBZ 1, 2014: 15)[7]

Ikezawa appears to be against archaizing his translation, choosing instead to make it look 'modern' (*imarashii*, literally 'now-ish'). This remark, however, can be seen as a contradiction to 'leav[ing] intact' the style of the author. This preface could hence be trying to appeal to several types of readers, both the ones that look for a more 'classical' translation, and those who would rather read a more modern, understandable rendering of the text.

Ikezawa also talks about his experience as a translator. Since *Genji monogatari* was 'beyond his abilities', he opted to translate the *Kojiki* after

---

仕事でした。(...)   あなたの日本語とぼくにとって(...)
現代の英語やフランス語よりも遠かったのです。架橋は容易ではありませんでした。(...)
そして結局は険峻を承知の直登ルートが一番の近道らしいと気づきました。
6
ぜんたいの基本方針としてあまり自分の言葉を補わず、あなたの文体ないし口調をなるべく残すことを心掛けました。
[7] 文体についてはせっかく現代語に訳すのだからと今らしくしたつもりです。

the insistence of the editor in chief. It was no easy task, and Ikezawa particularly pointed out the difficulty of translating the genealogy of the Emperor's House, although ultimately, it turned out to be a 'fun' experience (Ikezawa 2017: 19).

3.3. Analysis of the translatorial preface in NBZ, vol. 2

The following peritext corresponds to the translatorial preface by Koike Masayo. It is the preface to Koike's modern translation of *Hyakunin Isshu* (100 Poems by 100 Famous Poets), published in the second volume of Ikezawa's collection (2015).

Koike's translation, as explained in her preface, aims not to merely convey the meaning of the ancient Japanese poems or *uta* (literally, 'songs'), but rather 'to allow [the songs] to be read as "little poems" (*chiisana shi*) written in modern Japanese' (NBZ 2, 2015: 405).[8] Koike also writes about this and the importance of knowing the cultural background and the context of a text before translating:

> I tried to follow the gaze of the old poets in order to see the same things when I translated [this text] from ancient Japanese into modern Japanese. I am not sure whether we were actually seeing the same 'poem', but the direction with which I attempted to look at that 'poem' needed at least to be the same. That was not only a problem of words, [but rather] a more elemental, physical task; in short, the rhythm of my body needed to match [the rhythm of] the poets. (NBZ 2, 2015: 406)[9]

Here, Koike mentions that she wants to see the ST from the same perspective as the old poets. Her aim is to match the rhythm of the TT to the rhythm of the ST, which may look like she is leaning towards a foreignizing approach, but only in appearance: Koike inadvertently decides to not employ free translation or *iyaku* ('translation of meaning' in Japanese, as opposed to *chokuyaku* or 'literal translation') to recreate the ancient poems, and rather adopts a domesticating approach by prioritizing the adaptation of the external appearance (what she calls 'rhythm') from the ancient *uta* format into the modern *shi* poem format. The transfer of meaning and the 'natural flow' of the poems is of secondary importance, which will probably result in a

---

[8] 歌の意味を伝える装置でなく、現代語の「小さな詩」として読めることを目標にした。
[9]

古語から現代語に訳す場合にも、私は古の詩人たちの視線を探り、同じものを見ようと試みた。同じ「詩」を見ているかどうかはわからないが、「詩」を目指そうとするその視線の方向性においては、少なくとも同じではなければならない。それは言葉だけの問題ではなくて、もっと原始的な肉体的作業であり、要は身体のリズムを詩人たちに合わせるということだった。

rather literal translation. She walks a blurry line between adaptation and translation and ends her preface by stating that the 'core' of poetry can be found both in the original poems, as well as in the modern translations (NBZ 2, 2015: 406). She insists on the importance of rhythm for its aesthetic values, but at the same time simplifies the prosodical rigor towards the ST.

3.4. Analysis of translatorial prefaces in NBZ, vol. 3

The next prefaces, published in the third volume of the collection (2016a), correspond to Morimi Tomihiko's translation of *Taketori Monogatari* (The Tale of the Bamboo-Cutter), Nakajima Kyōko's translation of *Tsutsumi Chunagon Monogatari* (The Tales of the Riverside Middle Counselor), Horie Toshiyuki's translation of the *Tosa Nikki* (Tosa Diary), and Ekuni Kaori's translation of the *Sarashina Nikki* (Sarashina Diary).

The first preface is written by Morimi Tomihiko, the translator of *Taketori Monogatari*. He categorizes his 'modern translation policy' (*gendaigoyaku no hōshin*) into two key ideas: (1) not adding things that do not appear in the original as much as possible, and (2) not forcing modern expressions on the text unnecessarily (NBZ 3, 2016a: 488).[10] By this it can be assumed that he will limit the input of extra information for the target reader and will try to keep the TT close to the ST, hence favoring foreignization. Morimi is aware that if he puts too many modern expressions, the target text might get loose and 'run away too far from the original' (ibid.: 488), hence favoring a more archaized text.[11]

Throughout the preface, Morimi reflects upon several passages from *Taketori Monogatari* and explains that his translation aims not only to transfer the meaning of the words, but rather have the readers 'melt inside the story' (*tokekondehoshii*) (ibid.: 488). He wants the TT's target readership to have the same reactions as the ST's target readership; if a scene is supposed to be funny in the original, he tries to recreate that feeling as much as possible in the translation (ibid.: 489). This is consistent with the foreignizing translation approach, and it can also be understood under Nida's dynamic equivalence (1964: 159) and House's 'functionality plus loyalty' principle (1997: 126).

Nakajima Kyōko, the translator or *Tsutsumi Chunagon Monogatari*, agrees in this regard with Morimi and writes in her afterword that 'the most important task for [her], the modern translator, was to properly convey the

---

[10]　　　　現代語訳の方針としては、一、原文にない事柄はできるだけ補わない　　　　／ 二、現代的な表現を無理して使わないという二点を決めて臨んだ。

[11] そうしないと、暴走して、原曲から遠く離れてしまいそうだったからである。

parts flooded by laughter' (NBZ 3, 2016a: 494).[12] Nakajima's translation, however, may appear as being more intrusive, as she admits that she had to adapt the Japanese *uta* poems into modern *tanka* poems, so as to not break the flow of the text (ibid.: 494). Although this decision freed her from using unnecessary footnotes, Nakajima explains that she had to face difficult decisions and, sometimes, was left with no other choice but to omit parts of the original (ibid.: 494). Adapting the *uta* poems into *tanka* poems and omitting parts of a text are domesticating traits, something very common when translating poetry. She also calls herself a '*gendaigoyakusha*', adding the *sha* Japanese ideogram that in this case means 'profession' at the end of *gendaigoyaku*, thus confirming her translatorial identity as an intralingual translator.

In the next translatorial preface, Horie Toshiyuki, the translator of *Tosa Nikki*, talks about the importance of knowing the source culture's context and the need of trying to put himself in the place of the author. He states:

> This is why I purposely tried to imagine the thoughts that led [Ki no Tsurayuki] to write the *Tosa Nikki*. I tried to work under this preamble. (…) [And when suitable] I tried to dig up my 'author' side and write down, when necessary, annotations to my own translation. (NBZ 3, 2016a: 499)[13]

It can be argued that Horie clearly distinguishes his 'translatorial self' from his 'writer self' and, although for most of the time it is his translatorial self that takes the reigns, his 'writer self' also surfaces sporadically when creative writing is necessary, as when writing self-annotations. For instance, in this preface of *Tosa Nikki*, an anonymous work attributed to Ki no Tsurayuki, Horie is very aware of Ki no Tsurayuki's writing style. In the 10th C., when this story was penned, literature was considered to be feminine and consequently Ki no Tsurayuki, a male writer, allegedly wrote this story from the point of view of a female narrator, using the writing conventions of the time. This required the text, amongst other things, to be written in the *kana* syllabary. Horie respects this writing style of the ST and also uses the *kana* syllabary in the translation, thus giving the text a foreignizing approach

---

12

だから現代語訳者としての最大の使令は、この豊かな笑いの含むところを、そのまま読者に届けることだと決意した。

13   そこで私は、あえて土左日記を書くに至った彼   [紀貫之]
の内面を想像し、それを前段に置いてみることにした。(…)、そこに適宜自注をほどこしていく「作家」の姿を浮きぼりにしようと考えたのだ。

by making the target readership get close to the ST's culture. This 'similarity of effect' again brings us back to Nida's theory of dynamic equivalence (1964).

Finally, Ekuni Kaori, the translator of *Sarashina Nikki*, also writes about her translation method in the preface, albeit briefly, by explaining that it is as 'untreated' as possible. Here, the word *mukakōna-yaku* ('not treated', 'not processed') should be understood as the translator's wish to stay as close to the ST as possible. The only major license she admits on taking is the creation of a separation in the story by adding chapters in order to make the reader be more aware of the passage of time (NBZ 3, 2016a: 502).

There is yet again an ambivalence in terms of the approach of the translation: on the one hand, she claims to keep close to the original, which would give the TT a foreignizing air. On the other, she divides the story into chapters to improve readability, which could be seen as a rather intrusive move and, consequently, a domesticating strategy. Regardless, staying close to the ST throughout the translation would shift the balance towards foreignization, in spite of the chapter separation.

3.5. Analysis of translatorial prefaces in NBZ, vol. 7 and vol. 9

The following prefaces correspond to the 7th (2016b) and 9th volumes (2016c) of the anthology. The translatorial preface in the 7th volume is written by Takahashi Gen'ichirō, the translator of *Hōjōki* (The Ten Foot Square Hoot). The translatorial preface in the 9th volume is penned by Furukawa Hideo, the translator of *Heike monogatari* (The Tale of the Heiki).

In his preface, *Hōjōki*'s translator Takahashi ponders about the meaning of 'translation':

> Translating from an ancient language, as when translating from a foreign language, poses a similar question. Actually, since we are [translating from] the same Japanese language, we may not even feel that we are 'translating'. It is just about making closer something that has become a bit distant. This is what 'translating' classics is considered to be. But then, does this not mean that we should not call this 'translation'? (NBZ 7, 2016b: 498-499)[14]

---

[14]

外国語からの翻訳だけではなく、古典からの翻訳もまた、同じ問題を抱えている。いや、同じ日本語であるというだけで、わたしたちは、それをほとんど「翻訳」とすら感じないのかもしれない。少し遠くにいってしまったものを、ほんの少しだけ近くする。そのようなものとして、古典の「翻訳」は考えられている。しかし、それは、ほんとうのところ「翻訳」と呼べないのではないだろうか。

Here, Takahashi reaches a different conclusion than Ikezawa. Even though both translators describe ancient Japanese as something 'distant' (NBZ 1, 2014: 6; NBZ 7, 2016b: 499), Takahashi does not feel that the SL and the TL are different enough for the TT to be considered a translation. He is not 'translating' a text, but rather 'making closer' the things in the ST that felt 'distant' (NBZ 7, 2016b: 498-499).[15] Takahashi is hence inclined to consider his work an adaptation, rather than a translation. His objective is to make the distant ST 'closer' to modern readers, so it could be argued that he favors a domesticating approach.

Takahashi is one of the few translators (or, as he may prefer, adapters) who ponders the most about *gendaigoyaku* translation, in spite of doubting whether it should be called translation proper or not. When doing an intralingual translation, Takahashi does not 'feel' that he is translating because he associates the concept of translation to 'translating from a foreign language', or interlingual translation (ibid: 498-499).

On the other hand, Furukawa, the translator of *Heike monogatari*, appears to be fully aware of his role as a modern Japanese translator. He discusses the translation methods on a linguistic level, like his choice to include several narrators in the story or eliminate the Japanese particle *no* between Japanese family names and given names. Following this, he also discusses how he translated several culture specific items (which he calls 'cultural differences'), such as medieval Japan's age counting system (contrary to nowadays, babies were considered to be one year old on the day of their birth in the 12th century), or that the fact that the story follows the *kyūreki*, Japan's old calendar system. Furukawa thus knows that he is changing the text in two different levels (at least): the linguistic one, and the cultural one. He is also aware of his role as a modern Japanese translator, or *gendaigoyakusha*:

> I wanted to interact with the literary piece of *Heike* as [if it were] a 'modern work'. [I wanted to interact with it] as a modern Japanese translator. In other words, I was fully aware that *Heike* came into existence thanks to several authors and compilers. But if we were to think about this as one single book penned by one single author, like [it is the case with] literary works of nowadays, what things would be uncovered? (NBZ 9, 2016c: 878)[16]

---

[15]

わたしは「『方丈記』を現代語訳にする」ことに関して、いくつかの原則を定めた。その一つは「遠くのものを近くのものにする」ことである。

[16]

私は「現代の」として平家という文学作品に接して見たいと思ったのだ。現代語訳者として。

Furukawa is then facing the ST as a modern Japanese translator, rather than as a rewriter or as an adapter. He does not hesitate to make the necessary linguistic and cultural arrangements to make the TT comprehensible, and even raises the question regarding whether the TT should be considered a translation or an independent text in its own right ('one single book penned by one single author'). Here, Furukawa purposely uses the terms 'one book' (*issatsu*) and 'author' (*sakusha*), as if elevating his translation to the category of 'authorial work', contrary to Genette's premise. Indeed, the issue regarding whether translations should be considered independent works or not has been raised by many scholars, most notoriously by Susan Bassnett (1980), who considers translations as independent products of literature because they end up being so far removed from the original. Whether Furukawa is aware of this or not, the implications of his use of the word 'author' (*sakusha*) lean towards that direction.

4. Conclusions

The analysis of the epitexts and eight translatorial prefaces has proved to be a useful documentary source to determine, at least to some extent, the translation process that translators planned to follow, as well as their level of self-awareness as modern Japanese translators.

The analysis of the editor's comments and translatorial prefaces has shown that the overall approach of these modern Japanese translations was foreignizing (Morimi, Horie, Ekuni and, to some extent, Ikezawa). Ikezawa's style tries to be as close to the original as possible, Morimi wants the readers to 'melt into the story', Horie imitates the style of the author by also using the *kana* syllabary in the translation, and Ekuni tries to create an 'untreated' translation. The analysis shows, then, that the translation methods used in their texts will be –in theory– oriented towards an overall foreignizing approach. However, leanings towards foreignization does not entail making a translation incomprehensible. All of the translators are aware that the TT must be understood by modern readers. In his remarks, Ikezawa also explicitly notes that his intention is to 'make [his translation] seem modern' (NBZ 1, 2014: 15).

From the analysis of Koike and Nakajima's translatorial prefaces it can be inferred that the resulting texts will lean towards domestication. Favoring

---

すなわち、平家が多数の作者、編集者の手を経て成立したと知ったうえで、しかしこれを今の時代の文学作品同様に、一人の作者の手になる一冊だと考えたとしたら、何が炙りだされるのか？

the rhythm over the meaning when translating poetry is rather usual in interlingual translation, so using this same approach in intralingual translations is not surprising. As for Takahashi and Furukawa, the prefaces do not clearly make a stand on which approach they have adopted. Regardless, it is important to note that these conclusions do not necessarily entail that the translators followed their own directives. Further research could include cross-referencing the obtained results with an analysis of the texts in order to ascertain whether the translation methods put forth by the translators were actually implemented in the TT, since sometimes they do not necessarily match (Dimitriu 2009: 199).

Another objective of this research was to establish whether the modern Japanese translators had developed a sense of 'awareness' as *gendaigoyaku* translators, what in this paper I called 'translational identity'. We can conclude that most translators do possess a sense of self-awareness, at least on a spectrum. Ikezawa, Morimi, Nakajima, Horie and Furukawa have clearly developed such distinctive identity: Ikezawa and Morimi, for instance, mention in their prefaces that they have their own 'translation policy'; Nakajima and Furukawa call themselves *gendaigoyakusha*; and Horie reflects on his 'author' and 'translator' persona, clearly distinguishing between them. Koike and Ekuni have a lower level of awareness, although Ekuni mentions the word *mukakōna-yaku* ('untreated translation'), so it could be argued that by admitting that her text is a *yaku* (the ideogram for 'translation' in Japanese), she considers herself to be a translator as well. Takahashi, on the other hand, harbors some doubts as to whether he is performing a translation rather than an adaptation and indirectly questions his role as a 'translator'. For him, a modern Japanese translation is the process of bringing the ST and the TT closer.

As per the function of the selected paratexts, if we follow the typology proposed by Batchelor (2018: 160-161, adapted from Rockenberger 2014), the majority of the prefaces would fall into the meta-communicative function (reflecting on the translation process and its difficulties, like in the prefaces of Ikezawa, Koike, Morimi, Nakajima, Ekuni, Takahashi or Furukawa); the informative function (clarifying internal properties of the text, such as in the translation of poems by Koike, Nakajima and Furukawa); and the hermeneutic function (explaining the text's characteristics as a result of the translator's decisions, like in Koike, Morimi, Nakajima or Ekuni's prefaces). The generic function can also be seen in Morimi, Nakajima, and Furukawa, in the ways that they define the category of the text as a modern translation. These results come as no surprise given the fact that the present corpus was selected on the basis that prefaces dealt with issues regarding

translation processes, translator's choices, and translational self-identification.

Ikezawa's epitexts, his remarks as editor of the collection, should be categorized as evaluative, as they outline the importance of the original work and its need for the translation, thus claiming a 'cultural significance', as Batchelor (2018: 160) would put it; informative, since they clarify internal properties of the book and reveal its intention (to make Japanese classical literature accessible to the contemporary audience); and commercial, since the editor also wanted to make the collection known to the attendees of the conference where the book was presented. They are also meta-communicative, particularly when Ikezawa reflects on his choice as an editor to select certain translators; hermeneutical, as they restrict interpretative options on the target readership ('they need to be readable'); and even instructive, as they guide the reception and use of the product ('the texts should be easy enough to be read without much difficulty in bed') (Ikezawa 2017: 19). The editor's epitexts, like translatorial prefaces, also serve several functions simultaneously.

The increasing number of modern Japanese translations speaks for the need of these texts, a utility that goes beyond making a 'distant' classical text comprehensible. The editor and the translators do not merely wish to cater to the functional part of the intralingual translation, they also hope to provide the final reader with an enjoyable experience. The function of the intralingual translations here is, then, twofold: to make difficult and distant texts accessible to modern readers; and to offer a TT that can be valued for its own cultural and literary merit as a new product separated from the original.[17]

By qualitatively examining the paratexts of several *gendaigoyaku* translations, this study aimed to demonstrate that researching intralingual translations and their paratexts can lead towards interesting revelations that can help enhance the theoretical discussions on intralingual translation, and translation in general.

5. Acknowledgements

---

[17] Other studies have also found another function of intralingual translations: that of making the final reader actually read the ST by sparkling his or her interest with the modern translations, thus closing the translatorial cycle (Martínez Sirés 2017: 146).

References

BASSNETT, S. (1980): *Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.

BATCHELOR, K. (2018): *Translation and paratexts*. London: Routledge.

BERK ALBACHTEN, Ö. (2013): "Intralingual Translation as 'Modernization' of the Language: The Turkish Case". *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 21(2), 257-271.

— (2015): "The Turkish language reform and intralingual translation". In Ş. Tahir Gürçağlar, S. Paker, and J. Milton (Eds.) *Tension and Tradition: The dynamics of translation in Turkey*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 165-180.

— (2019): "Challenging the boundaries of translation and filling the gaps in translation history: Two Cases of Intralingual Translation from the 19th Century Ottoman Literary Scene". In H. V. Dam, M. Nisbeth Brøgger, and K. Korning Zethsen (Eds.) *Moving Boundaries in Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, 168-180.

BERK ALBACHTEN, Ö., & Ş. TAHIR GÜRÇAĞLAR. (Eds.): (2018). *Perspectives on retranslation: Ideology, paratexts, methods*. London and New York: Routledge.

— (Eds.). (2019): *Studies from a retranslation culture: The Turkish context*. Singapore: Springer.

CHAN, L. (2002): "Translating bilinguality: Theorizing translation in the post-Babelian era". *The Translator* 8 (1), 49-72.

CHESTERMAN, A. & E. Wagner. (2002): *Can theory help translators? A dialogue between the ivory tower and the wordface*. London: Routledge.

DEANE-COX, S. (2014): *Retranslation: Translation, literature and reinterpretation*. London: Bloomsbury.

DIMITRIU, R. (2009): "Translators' prefaces as documentary sources for translation studies". *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 17(3), 193-206. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/09076760903255304> [Last accessed: 09/07/2020]

EMMERICH, M. (2013): *The Tale of Genji: Translation, canonization, and world literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.

GAMBIER, Y. (1997): "Review of Descriptive translation studies and beyond, by Gideon Toury." *Meta* 42 (3), 579-586.

GENETTE, G. (1997): *Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation*. J. E. Lewin (Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HALVERSON, S. (1997): "The concept of equivalence in Translation Studies: Much ado about something." *Target* 9 (2), 207-233.

HERMANS, T. (1995): "Revising the classics: Toury's empiricism version one." *The Translator* 1 (2), 215-223.

— (1996): "Norms and the determination of translation: A theoretical framework". In R. Álvarez and M. C. A. Vidal (Eds.) *Translation, power, subversion*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 25-51.

HOUSE, J. (1997): *Translation quality assessment: A model revisited*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

IKEZAWA, N. (Ed. & Trans.). (2014): *Kojiki* [Records of Ancient Matters]. In *Nihon bungaku zenshū* [The complete works of Japanese literature], Vol. 1. Tokyo: Kawade Bunko.

— (Ed.). (2015): *Nihon Bungaku Zenshū* [The complete works of Japanese literature], Vol. 2. Tokyo: Kawade Bunko.

— (Ed.). (2016a): *Nihon Bungaku Zenshū* [The complete works of Japanese literature], Vol. 3. Tokyo: Kawade Bunko.

— (Ed.). (2016b): *Nihon Bungaku Zenshū* [The complete works of Japanese literature], Vol. 7. Tokyo: Kawade Bunko.

— (Ed.). (2016c): *Nihon Bungaku Zenshū* [The complete works of Japanese literature], Vol. 9. Tokyo: Kawade Bunko.

— (2017): "Translating classical Japanese literature into modern Japanese for The complete works of Japanese literature". Conference book for *The 8th Asian Translation Traditions Conference* (5-7 of July, 2017). London: University of London, 1-86.

JAKOBSON, R. (1959): "On linguistic aspects of translation". In L. Venuti (Ed.) (2004): *The Translation Studies reader*, 2nd edition. London and New York: Routledge, 138-143.

KOMISSAROV, V. (1996): "Assumed translation: Continuing the discussion." *Target* 8 (2), 365-374.

LEVY, I. (Ed.). (2011): *Translation in modern Japan.* London and New York: Routledge.

MARTÍNEZ SIRÉS, P. (2017): "Japanese classics translated into modern Japanese: A study on *gendaigoyaku* translations". *Transcommunication 4*(2). Tokyo: University of Waseda, 135-153.

— (2018): *Higuchi Ichiyō in modern Japanese and European dress: Modern Japanese versions (*gendaigoyaku*) of Higuchi Ichiyō's* Takekurabe *and their Relationship with English, Castilian Spanish and Catalan Translations*. PhD dissertation. Tokyo: Waseda University.

MCRAE, E. (2012): "The role of translators' prefaces to contemporary literary translations into English: An empirical study". In A. Gil-Bardají, P. Orero and S. Rovira-Esteva (Eds.) *Translation peripheries: Paratextual elements in translation*. Bern: Peter Lang, 63-82.

MUNDAY, J. (2001): *Introducing Translation Studies*. 1st Edition. London: Routledge.

— (2012): *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and applications*, 3rd Edition. London: Routledge.

NIDA, E. (1964): *Toward a science of translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

PYM, A. (1998): *Method in translation history*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

SATO-ROSSBERG, N. and J. WAKABAYASHI (Eds.). (2012): *Translation and Translation Studies in the Japanese context*. London and New York: Continuum.

TAHIR GÜRÇAĞLAR, Ş. (2013): "Agency in allographic prefaces to translated works: An initial exploration of the Turkish context". In H. Jansen and A. Wegener (Eds.) *Authorial and editorial voices in translation 2: Editorial and publishing practices* (Vol. 2). Retrieved from <https://yorkspace.library.yorku.ca/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10315/26535/YS%20AEV2%20Tahir%20Gurcaglar.pdf?sequence=1> [Last accessed: 09/09/2020], 1-21.

TYMOCZKO, M. (2007): *Enlarging translation, empowering translators*. Manchester: St Jerome.

VENUTI, L. (1995/2008): *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. London: Routledge.

— (1998): *The scandals of translation: Towards an ethics of difference*. London: Routledge.

WILSON, R. (2017): "Forms of self-translation". In N. Monk et. al. (Eds.) *Reconstructing identity: A transdisciplinary approach*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 157-177.