Theorizing in Unfamiliar Contexts:

New Directions in Translation Studies

James Luke Hadley

Submitted for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of East Anglia

School of Language and Communication Studies

April 2014

ABSTRACT

This thesis attempts to offer a reconceptualization of translation analysis. It argues that there is a growing interest in examining translations produced outside the discipline's historical field of focus. However, the tools of analysis employed may not have sufficient flexibility to examine translation if it is conceived more broadly. Advocating the use of abductive logic, the thesis infers translators' probable understandings of their own actions, and compares these with the reasoning provided by contemporary theories. It finds that it may not be possible to rely on common theories to analyse the work of translators who conceptualize their actions in radically different ways from that traditionally found in translation literature. The thesis exemplifies this issue through the dual examination of Geoffrey Chaucer's use of translation in the *Canterbury Tales* and that of Japanese storytellers in classical Kamigata rakugo. It compares the findings of the discipline's most pervasive theories with those gained through an abductive analysis of the same texts, finding that the results produced by the theories are invariably problematic.

The thesis demonstrates that understandings of translation practice have been given to change over time, and vary substantially across cultures. Therefore, an individual theory is unlikely to be able to rationalize particular practices or features of translations irrespective of the cultural context in which they are found. Abductive logic aims to describe translations in particular, rather than translation in general. It can be used to infer factors that may have influenced translators' understandings of the roles their texts will take, and hence, their aims in translating. Many theories tend to be underpinned by inductive logic, which essentially restricts textual analysis to the application of pre-defined labels of translation phenomena. Abductive logic forms hypotheses based on the context in question, going far beyond this kind of textual categorization.

CONTENTS

Chapter 2

Help or Hindrance: Using Contemporary Theories to Analyse Chaucer's Translations

Chapter 3

Interweaving Ideas and Worlds: Rakugo and Planned Selection in the Translation Process

Chapter 4

Reasoning at Cross Purposes: The Reconciliation of Theory and Practice

References

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWELDGEMENTS

I would like begin by thanking my research supervisors, Dr Alain Wolf, Dr Matthew Woodcock, and Dr Valerie Henitiuk, whose guidance and generosity have taught me so much. Dr Wolf in particular has become a friend as well as a supervisor. He has guided me, while simultaneously allowing me to learn from my own mistakes in an amazingly skilful way. Dr Woodcock's input has also been invaluable for my development. He has been generous with his time and understanding when I have struggled. Dr Henitiuk kindly gave me her own perspective on my work, providing comments that were of great encouragement.

I would like to thank the other members of the School of Language and Communication Studies, staff, students, and administrators who have always been supportive and encouraging. I would also like to thank those members of the School of Literature, Drama, and Creative Writing I have had the good fortune to meet and discuss my work with.

I owe a great debt of gratitude to the Humanities Faculty and the School of Language and Communication Studies for generously funding my research. I am well aware of my great good fortune in being in the currently small proportion of PhD students that are not required to struggle to finance their studies.

I would also like to thank the attendants and members of the various conferences, symposia, and research groups I have had the opportunity to engage with. These people have underlined for me the cooperative aspects of research.

INTRODUCTION

This thesis will draw together a study of translation in the traditional Japanese form of storytelling known as Kamigata rakugo with a study of Geoffrey Chaucer's medieval use of translation in the creation of the *Canterbury Tales*. The aim will be to observe if the style of text analysis most favoured by contemporary translation studies is equally useful in these two cases.

The aim of this introductory chapter is to illustrate what the main topics of this thesis are, how they will be addressed, and for what reasons. It will begin by illustrating the objective of the thesis, by identifying the dialogues and issues it addresses, and by expanding on the questions to be asked and their importance (8). Next, it will move on to introduce the material of study in the form of the two translation case studies to be examined in detail (18). Finally, it will illustrate the ways in which this material will be used throughout the thesis to ask if the approach to studying translation that is currently most widely used is equally applicable, irrespective of translation context (27).

The Objective

This study joins a small but developing turn, which appreciates that translation studies' historical focus on contemporary, European forms of translation is disadvantageous for the discipline to achieve its full potential. Perhaps the most vocal, and best-known proponent of the sentiment that translation studies should actively expand its field of enquiry is Maria Tymoczko, who has repeatedly advocated an increased focus on forms of translation derived from historically underrepresented contexts (Tymoczko, 2007, 2009). Tymoczko is supported by a growing interest in translations produced in the past and the subject of translation history (see for example Bassnett and Lefevere, 1990, O'Sullivan, 2012, Pym, 1998)[1]. She is also joined by scholars such as Judy Wakabayashi and Martha Cheung, who have become well known for working on translations involving the Japanese (for

---

[1] Please note that O'Sullivan's work is referenced here to indicate the entirety of the second issue of *The Translator 2012*, a special edition entitled *Rethinking Methods in Translation History*. This journal is introduced by O'Sullivan's work referenced here, which also explores translation history as an object of study in more detail.

example Wakabayashi, 1998, 2008, 2012) and Chinese (for example Cheung, 2005, 2009, 2011) languages respectively. The move away from Euro-centrism has been demonstrated and aided by the publication in recent years of such volumes as Ricci's *Translation in Asia: Theories, Practices Histories* (2011), Wakabayashi and Kothari's *Decentering translation studies : India and beyond* (2009), and special issues of the journal, *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication* 2009, entitled *Chinese Discourses on Translation* (15:2) and *Nation and Translation in the Middle East* (15:1)[2].

However, a potential risk presents itself. This broadening of translation studies may achieve little more than applying existing, domestic notions to "exotic" contexts. As will be explored below, much literature in contemporary translation studies still takes the form of a case study of translations produced in temporally and culturally domestic contexts. It remains to be seen if the same approach can be adopted for the analysis of large numbers of translations produced in a more diverse array of contexts. This thesis will attempt to address this question. It will observe the ways translations are most widely studied and the kinds of translation contexts that enjoy most attention. It will then attempt to discern to what degree the same methodologies are transferable to kinds of translation contexts that are less well represented.

In asking if the approach used to analyse translations is transferable to all contexts in which translations appear, this thesis will necessarily explore the foundations on which this approach is built. It will address issues of cultural or temporal specificity that might tend to incline the discipline towards a certain type of translation. It will explore any factors taken for granted and ask if these are truly universal to all translations. It will also explore the use of theory in translation studies as a central feature of the approach and ask to what degree this theory lends itself to translation in under-represented contexts.

Corpus Analysis

In order both to qualify and quantify the generalizations that a thesis of this kind will almost necessarily make, a corpus of papers was compiled that will create an impression of the state of the discipline at present. Its purpose is to define what is

---

[2] Please note that both of these special editions feature in this study's contemporary translation studies corpus (see 19)

currently being studied in translation studies, and how. In order to make this corpus as representative of the discipline as possible, it maximised the size of data by restricting sampled papers to journal articles. The articles are qualified as "contemporary" on the basis that they were all published during the five-year period prior to the completion of this thesis (2008-2013). Finally, in order to qualify the papers as representative of the field of translation studies as a global discipline, rather than its study within one country or region, only journals with a generalized focus and the highest of rankings were selected. In 2011, the ERIH (European Reference Index for the Humanities) allocated only two journals in the general study of translation its highest rating of INT1[3]. These two journals are *Target* and *The Translator,* both of which stress in their mission statements their aim of describing translation in general, and occupying the cutting edge of the discipline[4].

These various stipulations created a corpus of 318 papers that were analysed in terms of the approach taken to the study of translation. Papers were discounted from this analysis in the event that they did not discuss translation phenomena directly. Thus, 10 were discounted because they reflected on the state of the discipline in general or were introductions to special editions, and 156, because they were book reviews. From this initial corpus, 152 articles remained to be analysed in depth[5].

This analysis aimed to discern patterns in the study of translation, and so, assessed the papers in terms of the languages and historical periods on which they focus, their definitions and assertions regarding translation, and the use of theory as a means of analysing translations.

Case Studies

By far the most popular style of study in this corpus is the case study. The case study-style of enquiry as it exists in contemporary translation research is derived from the model employed in the social sciences (Susam-Sarajeva, 2009: 38). Generally speaking, this approach entails the exploration of real-world, human

---

[3] INT1 is defined as "international publications with high visibility and influence among researchers in the various research domains in different countries, regularly cited all over the world" (www.esf.org)

[4] For the mission statements of each of these journals, see the appendix (page 225)

[5] The full list of analysed papers, together with the findings relating to them can be found in the appendix (page 234)

activities, which can only be studied in context because the contexts and activities are so tightly intertwined that their precise boundaries are difficult to establish (Gillham, 2000: 1). They, therefore, involve flexible, open-ended, and close examinations of a small number of units of analysis, with particular focus on the contexts in which they occur (see Susam-Sarajeva, 2009: 39).

Case study-style research has been very enthusiastically adopted within translation studies and is often used to bring new perspectives on translation theories without necessarily challenging them. Susam-Sarajeva (2009: 37) notes the frequency with which postgraduate students adopt the case-study model as their principle or sole form of enquiry. Indeed, the fact that this tendency is by no means limited to postgraduate students is borne out by the corpus examined here, of which some 83.55% (127 articles) made use of some form of case study. This large sample size also illustrates the flexibility of the case study model in translation studies. Most frequently, the articles focus on a single translator or style of translation, or even a single text, and use their analysis to infer particular features that can be generalized to related texts (see for example Boase-Beier, 2011, Lee, 2011b, Wohlfart, 2009). In other cases, the articles approach a subject from the opposite perspective, identifying particular features to be examined, forming hypotheses, and then locating translated texts or corpora for use as examples (see for example Károly, 2010, Ramón and Labrador, 2008, Rossette, 2009). In still other cases, a particular notion is identified, and translations that illustrate it are offered as examples (see for example Hirsch, 2011, Kruger, 2011, Meifang and Li, 2009). In all of these variations, the common feature is the inductive inference that what is shown to be true in one case or set of examples is generalizable to some degree.

With this goal of generalization in mind, the analysis moved on to assess to what degree the sample of translated texts that are analysed in the corpus can be described as representative of translation in general. An obvious way to assess the degree of generalization or inclination towards particular contexts was to assess the languages between which translation occurred in the corpus.

Languages Studied

Cataloguing those languages that enjoy most attention in the corpus is a way of inferring the languages that do not enjoy a significant amount of attention. It also

goes some way to demonstrating the degree to which the discipline can be described as being inclined towards translation in particular contexts[6].

This part of the analysis found that 43 of the articles examined translations from two or more source languages, and 31, from two or more target languages. 29 articles examined translation with no reference to a specific source language, and 25 articles with no reference to a specific target language. The remainder exhibit a definite inclination towards the study of translation in European contexts. 43.09% of the articles analyse translations into, from, or between European languages. Moreover, within this focus on European contexts, English is the clear favourite, enjoying the attention of 22.04% of the papers as a named source or target language. This overwhelming focus on English is, perhaps, in part because it is a publishing language for both of the journals[7]. The degree of focus on other individual European languages is much less significant but still weighted to the west of the continent. The most well represented European languages after English were French, Spanish, and German, which were identified as the source or target language in 2.96%, 3.95%, and 3.29% of articles respectively. Languages from southern regions of Europe, such as Italian and Greek were identified in 1.64% and 0.33% of articles respectively. Those from eastern regions, such as Polish and Russian were identified in only 0.99% and 0.33% of articles respectively.

Considering this 43.09% focus on explicitly European languages in conjunction with the 42.38% of articles that did not identify one specific source or target language, it is possible to calculate that only 14.80% of the papers in this corpus examined translation between two named non-European languages. This relatively small figure is, perhaps, doubly surprising given the presence of two special issues of *The Translator* (2009) entitled "*Nation and Translation in the Middle East*" (15:1) and "*Chinese Discourses on Translation*" (15:2) in the corpus.

Interestingly, a similar figure of 16.56% can be reached if the linguistic contexts are examined in terms of current geopolitical importance, as opposed to merely geographical origin. The relative geopolitical importance of a given language can be

---

[6] The results of this corpus analysis are tabulated in the appendix (228).

[7] *The Translator* only publishes in English (www.stjerome.co.uk). However, *Target* also accepts submissions in a few other European languages, namely Spanish, German and French (www.benjamins.com).

measured simply in terms of whether or not it is one of the official languages of the UN. The logic is that the official languages of the UN are chosen to represent "political power, rather than any principle of equity" (Kontra, 1999: 35). Thus, the UN's official languages are not those with the largest numbers of speakers, but those backed by the greatest geopolitical force. The languages in question are Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish (www.un.org). These six UN languages were identified in 41.06% of the papers in this corpus, with Chinese being the focus of 6.25% of the articles and Arabic, 4.28%. Indeed, linking geopolitical power and a language's occurrence in the corpus demonstrates a far stronger correlation than, for example, the total number of speakers. What is overwhelmingly apparent if the statistics are observed from this perspective is the low representation of very widely spoken languages such as Hindustani (0%), Bengali (0%), Punjabi (0%), Japanese (0.33%), and Portuguese (0.99%). Moreover, this overwhelming focus on a very small number of languages means there are an estimated six thousand living languages[8] underrepresented or unrepresented in the discipline. It is also worth asking about extinct languages or earlier forms of modern languages, which are not included in the estimate of six thousand.

Historical Translations

In order to address this question without losing sight of the corpus' purpose of identifying underrepresented forms of translation, a second analysis was conducted on the papers in the corpus, asking during which historical period each paper's case texts were produced.

The aim was not to catalogue the translations definitively, but to ascertain to what degree the corpus is inclined towards translation in a near-contemporary context. "Near-contemporary" was given the generous interpretation of the past 100 years, meaning that a paper was categorized as dealing with historical translation if the target text in question was first produced at any point prior to 1913. In the event that numerous translations are discussed in one paper that straddle this borderline, the paper is categorized as dealing with historical translation. Nonetheless, the number of articles in the corpus categorized as focusing entirely on translations from the

---

[8] In 2009, Ethnologue surveyed a total of 6,909 living languages, and classified 473 of these as extinct or "nearly extinct" (Lewis)

recent past was as high as 104 articles (68%). There were only 28 articles (18%) that could be categorized as historical and a further 20 (13%) that discussed translation from an a-temporal perspective[9].

To correlate these findings with those above, regarding the relative instances of particular languages, this analysis found no instances of historical translations being discussed without any mention of a specific language. It found 12 cases of a variety of source or target languages being discussed in one paper, which leaves 28 articles with a potential to discuss 56 separate languages. Here, there is a greater spread of languages than the analysis above, where historical period was not taken into account. A total of 44 languages are represented, 28 (63.64%) of which are European languages, meaning that only 8 articles, or 2.65% of the whole corpus discussed historical translation with no direct focus on a European language.

Definitions

The analysis also aimed to discern the degree to which translation as a process is defined within the corpus. It was reasoned that if translation is defined, there is an implicit acknowledgement that the word can be used in more than one way.

Interestingly, the number of articles with no explicit definition of translation was as great as 125 or 82.24% of the corpus. In 8.55% of the corpus (13 articles), an implicit definition of translation could be inferred from the discussion, but only 14 articles (9.21%) explicitly defined their interpretation of an act of translation either generally or specifically. Very few of the articles that did define translation did so as a matter of course. Instead, there was a definite trend to use a definition or partial definition as an enthymeme for the paper's argument. An example is found in Boase-Beier (2011: 175), who confidently asserts that "[t]ranslation is never merely a transfer of language and the connotations of language".

This part of the analysis also observed if the papers acknowledged the existence of multiple forms of translation directly. The number of articles in this corpus that did so was 14 (9.21%). Those, which made some indirect implication that there may be

---

[9] An a-temporal perspective here means that 13% of the studies saw no need to qualify a use of translation in terms of the specific time-period in which it functions. This lack of qualification implies an assumption that translation is and always has been a static entity. This figure can be compared with the 25 studies (17%) that discussed translation with no reference to either a specific source or target language.

more than one interpretation of translation, totalled 7 articles (4.61%). The remaining 131 articles (86.18%) made no attempt to acknowledge the possibility that other kinds of translation could exist.

Theory

Having found this general lack of interest in seeking to define what is meant by translation in the corpus, the analysis moved on to investigate its prevailing approach to the study of translation.

By far the most widely spread approach to the analysis of translated texts is the use of translation theory. 48.03% (73 articles) make direct reference to "translation theories" or "theories of translation"[10]. As already observed, these theories are most often employed in order to posit some degree of generalizability. Theories are often used as explanations for a particular phenomenon within a translation. Thus, the translation is offered as evidence that the theory can be used in other similar cases.

Because of this use of translations as examples, theories in translation studies are generally not challenged, refuted, corroborated, nuanced, or supported. Rather, they are most often "applied" to a particular case (see for example Cheung, 2009: 233, Morini, 2008: 47, Weissbrod, 2009: 62). As a result, theory within translation studies might be seen as something similar to a formula for predicting the effects of translation phenomena, as opposed to an account of observed phenomena to be refined by experimentation[11]. In this way, a number of theories of translation might be conceptualized in a relatively simplistic, almost algebraic manner that tends to downplay the importance of the scholar's own perspective. The studies in question define given features, which their authors interpret as having a particular effect on a text[12], and then comment on, or even categorize a translation based on the presence

---

[10] This figure also includes those articles, which spoke specifically about a particular notion such as explicitation as a theory. It does not include those studies which spoke of "theoretical frameworks" or those which used the word "theory" or its derivations in a colloquial sense as in "The five options outlined above summarize the choices that are *theoretically* available to song translators" (Franzon, 2008: 396) (original emphasis)

[11] This notion that translation studies theories tend to be employed in a formulaic way, and the implications of such a tendency will be further explored in Chapter 4

[12] Although the elements identified in this approach usually only have the identified effect in a subjective sense and to a subjective degree, the issue of the author's subjectivity is almost never addressed.

or absence of these features[13]. A good example theory to illustrate this approach is foreignization (engaged with directly by Hanna, 2009, Lee, 2011b, and Selim, 2009b), in which elements that betray the foreign origins of a text are described or defined and, if located within a translation, are used as evidence to categorize the text in question as foreignizing. The antithesis of this theory is domestication, in which features that appear to appropriate the text to the target culture are sought, and if found, the translation is categorized as domesticating. These two theories, which ostensibly describe diametrically opposing translation strategies, tend to be invoked in tandem as polar extremes on an imagined spectrum of foreignness (see for example Chang, 2009: 314, Golden, 2009: 396, Strowe, 2011: 53).

Foreignization and domestication are extremely well represented in the corpus. They are certainly two of the most frequently invoked theories and, as has already been illustrated, are central to many papers' arguments. A number of other theories also enjoy some treatment within the corpus. One example is polysystems theory, which is discussed by Chang (2011), Fung Chang (2008), and Lambert (2009). Another example is skopos theory, engaged with by Martín de León (2008) and Nord (2012). Similarly, shifts enjoy some attention by Meifang and Li (2009), and Wang (2009). However, perhaps the only theory that rivals domestication and foreignization in terms of popularity in the corpus is explicitation, which takes the focus of a very wide range of papers, including Haddadian Moghaddam (2011), Hirsch (2011), Jooken and Rooryck (2011).

Conclusions of the Analysis

The analysis of this corpus of studies has yielded empirical results and observations that have been used to form an impression of current trends within translation studies. The aim was to discern what is being studied in the discipline and how it is being studied. The answers to these questions will be used to ask if the same approach can

---

[13] Examples of this kind of feature-seeking study are plentiful and extremely varied. These examples include Becher's (2011) study on connectives in German translated texts, which he interprets as having an explicitating effect; Ramón's (2008) examination of English-language "–ly adverbs" and their translation as "–mente adverbs" in Spanish, which she interprets as being overly formal; and Asscher's (2010) exploration of the use of amplification in the translation of British humour into Hebrew, which he interprets as having a less successful comic effect than the alternatives.

be applied to translation contexts that currently occupy a peripheral position within the discipline.

In terms of what is studied, the analysis found an overwhelming focus on contexts that involve European languages and a similar focus on languages backed by significant geopolitical influence. It found very little interest is shown in Asian[14] contexts, apart from those relating to the two Asian UN languages, Chinese and Arabic. Similarly, it identified the languages indigenous to North or South America, Africa, and Australia as consistently underrepresented[15]. In terms of the historical context of study, there is a similar focus on what might be called the domestic. The vast majority of papers in the corpus are entirely focused on near contemporary contexts with only a small number examining translations produced more than a century ago. An even smaller number examine a case of historical translation in a purely non-European context.

In terms of how these contexts are studied, the analysis found an overwhelming focus on employing case studies to focus closely on particular translators or translations. It also found that many papers take it for granted that translation requires no definition. It found that among those papers that do define translation, the definition is often used to illustrate an argument, rather than as its basis. Finally, the analysis found that contemporary translation studies strongly favours the use of translation theory to describe its cases. Many papers were found that do not aim to test theories with the use of case studies but, instead, describe cases in terms of

---

[14] Note that the total number of speakers of an Asian language seems to be much less influential than geopolitical power concerning each language's treatment within the corpus. Note for example that Chinese is relatively well represented, appearing in 19 instances (6.25% of corpus) as either the source or target language in a case study. Conversely, Hindi/Urdu, Punjabi, and Bengali all went unrepresented within the studies dealing with explicit language pairs**.**

[15] Please note the problematic nature of categorising languages according to geography. Here European languages, for example, are interpreted as those, which first developed on the European continent. This definition includes English, for instance, although English is spoken as a native language in numerous non-European contexts. Similarly, Arabic was defined as an Asian language because it first developed on the Arabian Peninsula. This simplistic categorisation becomes problematic in relation to studies such as Hanna (2009), which focuses on translations of Shakespeare in Egyptian vernacular Arabic.

theories. Thus, the veracity of a given theory is often of lesser interest within the discipline than its practical applications.

This analysis has found that the papers in this corpus exhibit a large degree of cultural and temporal specificity. These findings add weight to the question asking if the approaches used to analyse translations are equally applicable to cases outside this relatively select set of contexts. This thesis will use these findings to guide its use of case studies by choosing translation contexts that do not conform to the specificity identified in the corpus. The contexts identified will then be analysed as case studies, using the translation theories identified as most prevalent within the corpus. The aim will not be to attempt a correlation, or refutation of the theories themselves. Instead, the aim will be to ask to what degree the approach that employs these theories is capable of analysing translations produced in contexts dramatically different from those conventionally appearing in translation literature. The inference is that because this analysis has shown translation literature to be representative of practice in a relatively select set of cultural and temporal contexts, it may be inappropriate to use findings based entirely upon it to project global truths. Bearing Tymoczko's (2007, 2009) sentiments regarding the expansion of the discipline in mind, this thesis will explore translation studies' theoretical approach and ask if it is ready to be used to analyse translations in broader contexts.

The Material

The aim is to ascertain the degree to which a method of analysing translations is transferable to cases that are not frequently studied as such. Therefore, the approach used to examine the translations should conform to the pattern observed in the corpus, while the contexts themselves should not. Thus, it is important that certain elements of this thesis actively conform to the tendencies noted in the analysis above while others differ from them.

The analysis found an overwhelming focus on near-contemporary contexts involving the languages that happen to be represented by most geopolitical power at present. Therefore, the contexts studied in this thesis should be drawn from other examples of translation practice. One case will primarily emphasize contexts that are underrepresented in historical terms, while the other will emphasize contexts that are underrepresented in cultural and linguistic terms.

First to be analysed will be that of the *Canterbury Tales* by Geoffrey Chaucer. Second, will be a Japanese form of storytelling known as classical Kamigata rakugo. These particular cases have been selected, partly because neither is represented in any of the papers analysed in the corpus, and partly because they share similar text types without being obviously related in any way. The lack of a clear relationship between the two cases is important, since it means that any similarities found between the two cannot be attributed to contact between them[16]. The following sections will illustrate the contexts, in which these sets of translations were produced.

Geoffrey Chaucer and the *Canterbury Tales*

Geoffrey Chaucer was born in 1343 into a merchant family, trading in wine on what were then the outskirts of London (Butterfield, 2006: 14). These ostensibly lowly beginnings, and the fact that he remained for much of his working life in the same area did not detract from Chaucer's social position within Medieval England. Between 1374 and 1386, Chaucer worked at the Custom House, the clearing house for the sale and purchase of wool and cloth (Butterfield, 2006: 14). He was appointed controller of imports and exports, an extremely important role at the time, given that wool and cloth were England's main exports (Rossignol, 2007: 8). This was just one of the governmental positions that Chaucer held. Other roles included Justice of the Peace, member of Parliament for Kent, Clerk of the King's Works, and deputy forester for the royal forest of North Petherton in Somerset (Forgeng and McLean, 2009: 6). These highly prestigious positions go some way to illustrating the circles, in which Chaucer moved professionally. They show his connections with the highest echelons of Medieval English society, and simultaneously, bring him into contact with a variety of other social strata.

Chaucer's literary career was similarly positioned between the patronage of the country's elite and subject matter drawn from a range of other circles. He is believed

---

[16] The purpose of examining unrelated cases is to achieve what Doheny-Farina and Odell (1985: 508) describe as "theoretical triangulation", in which data are examined from a variety of theoretical perspectives. The purpose of this kind of approach is to increase the possibility of locating negative cases and countering any biases inherent in a single approach (Doheny-Farina and Odell, 1985: 510). Triangulation can be said to add confidence to any results by mediating between the various sources employed until consensus is achieved rather than relying on the interpretation of a single perspective (Denzin, 1970: 472).

to have first secured royal patronage for a literary work prior to around 1370 when he produced his *Book of the Duchess*. This long elegiac poem was commissioned by John of Gaunt, presumably to mark the death of his first wife, Blanche, Duchess of Lancaster. John of Gaunt (1340-1399) was the third surviving son of Plantagenet King Edward III (Sargeant, 2010: 14). He wielded significant influence over the crown during his lifetime as the uncle of the young King Richard II (1367-1400) (see Gillespie, 1997: 199), who ascended the throne at the age of ten (Bowers, 2001: 84).

Around the same time, Chaucer is believed to have begun collecting material for what would become the *Canterbury Tales*, which had certainly taken shape by 1387. He continued to add stories to the collection for the next thirteen years until his death in 1400 (Forgeng and McLean, 2009: 6). The *Canterbury Tales* is a collection of 24 tales, framed by an overarching narrative of a party of 30 men and women that includes a fictionalized version of Chaucer himself. This collection of individuals, who represent a large number of medieval social strata are depicted travelling together on pilgrimage from Southwark to the shrine of Thomas Becket at Canterbury Cathedral (see Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 23, 16-27). Within this frame narrative, the Chaucer character/narrator explains that the pilgrims have agreed to pass the time by telling each other stories, two on the way to Canterbury, and another two on the way back (see Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 36, 791-794). The pilgrim who is deemed to have told the tales with most "sentence" and "solaas", that is, significance and pleasure (see Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 36, 798) will win a supper, at the others' expense. The competition's judge is to be Herry Bailly, from whose inn the pilgrimage sets out, and who serves as host and guide during the journey (see Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 36, 796-806).

The Linguistic Context of Chaucer's Translation

Chaucer lived in an England that was far from monolingual. The linguistic topography of the country during the Middle Ages was shared between three languages, each of which was employed at specific times and for specific purposes. Latin was the international language and the lingua franca of the church and academia, French was the language of literature, law and the government, and English was the vernacular language, used for most mundane interactions (K. Taylor, 2005: 302). Chaucer drew on an impressive array of textual sources in the composition of the *Canterbury Tales*. These sources were focused on, but not limited

to the three languages with which he would have come into routine contact in England. He also made some use of texts in Italian, which he may have acquired during his early years in the wine trade, or on at least two official visits he made on behalf of the king in 1372 and 1378 (Windeatt, 2005: 137). Chaucer's target language was Middle English, which is considered distinct from modern English in this thesis, particularly because of its low prominence in Chaucer's lifetime, both internationally and among the English upper classes (K. Taylor, 2005: 301).

This low prominence began to change towards the end of Chaucer's life, however. Chaucer was one of the early pioneers of using Middle English as a literary language and subsequent generations went on to make much more widespread use of the language for high literature. In acknowledgement of this pioneering role, Chaucer has been posthumously styled "the father of English literature" (see for example Jayapalan, 2001: 17), and the *Canterbury Tales* have been called his "crowning achievement" (see for example Ashley, 1974: 143). With these imposing accolades in mind, it is not surprising that Chaucer, the *Canterbury Tales,* and their cultural contexts have been the subject of a great deal of scholarly interest.

This thesis will engage directly with a number of topics that run through this body of research. The most important of these topics is the substantial research that has identified the source texts to the various *Canterbury Tales*. A whole strain of scholarship has been entirely devoted to the identification of these possible sources. This research typically focuses on an individual tale and the possible candidates for its source texts, evaluating the likelihood that one was used rather than another. One invaluable such resource for this thesis is Correale and Hamel's hugely important *Sources and Analogues of the Canterbury Tales*, which reconnects and summarizes this huge body of research. Over two volumes (2002, 2005), Correale and Hamel bring together some of the most prominent scholars working on individual tales in order to illustrate the current state of understanding. This thesis will also draw on a large number of other books and individual journal articles, which engage with closely related topics [17] . Such, topics range from investigations of particular

---

[17] It is worth noting that as in any discipline, certain scholars within Chaucer studies have advanced thinking a great deal on one particular tale or feature. A key example is Sheryl Reames, whose writings span more than two decades' work on the Second Nun's Tale and a massive advance in

utterances in a given tale as in Breeze's (2002) attempt to locate the precise Breton town in which the *Franklin's Tale* is set, and Kolve's (1981) exploration of religious iconography in the *Second Nun's Tale*, to Taylor's (2005) examination of the tales with respect to the emergence of civil discourse in the Middle Ages.

As a case study, however, the thesis' engagement with Chaucer's translation activities cannot be limited to a study of the texts he produced. It will also be important to gain an understanding of the cultural context in which Chaucer produced his work. For this reason, research on Chaucer as a person will also be crucial. Examples include Magoun (1955), who analyses the international contexts in which Chaucer and the *Canterbury Tales* can be understood; Fisher (1981), who describes the adoption by Chaucer of French-language forms of text production in his English-language works; and Beidler (1999), who examines the debate regarding Chaucer's apparent use of the Decameron as a source or antecedent text.

The foundations built by this substantial body of research will allow this thesis to consider a broad range of factors that may affect the use of translation theory on the *Canterbury Tales* as a case of translation. Of particular focus will be any assumptions made by theory, which will be compared with Chaucer's practices and context.

Koten Kamigata Rakugo

The same will be true in the analysis of the second case study. The term koten Kamigata rakugo (古典上方落語) describes a specific tradition of Japanese rakugo (落語) storytelling. Rakugo is a form of storytelling that has been present in Japan since at least the mid-17th-century (Morioka and Sasaki, 1990: 8). Stories produced relatively recently are categorized as *新作 (shinsaku)* [newly made], or *創作 (sōsaku)* [creative], while those produced prior to the beginning of the Meiji period (1868-1912) are categorized as *古典 (koten)* [classical] (Morioka and Sasaki: 9). The tradition has two main centres, and the names for the distinct cultural heritages of each centre reflect their pre-modern origins. Each continues to be associated with the Edo period name for its local region. The heritage of the Tokyo area is referred to as

---

understanding of the tale's relationship to its sources (see for example Reames, 1980, 1985, 1990, 2002).

Edo rakugo (江戸落語), while that of Kyoto and Osaka is known as Kamigata rakugo (上方落語).

Rakugo is a performing art. Performances involve a single storyteller occupying the stage at a time, seated in the formal 正座 (*seiza*) style, and telling a story while armed with only a 扇子 (*sensu*) [folding fan] and 手拭い *(tenugui)* [hand towel] as props. These props, or 道具 (*dōgu*) are employed in highly imaginative ways to depict items as varied as books, letters, stones, potatoes, sake wine bottles, tobacco pipes, hair brushes or chopsticks (Morioka and Sasaki, 1990: 33). For the past two centuries, rakugo stories or 噺 (*hanashi*) have traditionally been performed at 寄席 (*yose*), or rakugo theatres. These *yose* are often purpose-built halls with traditional decoration, but the term can be used to describe any venue hosting more than one storyteller (Brau, 2008: 155). Historically, the rakugo repertoire has included a wide variety of genres. However, the stories that continue to be told today are almost always humorous in nature and can all be categorized under one of four very broad subgenres: 人情噺 *(ninjō-banashi)* [stories of human emotions], 音曲噺 *(ongyoku-banashi)* [stories involving music], 芝居噺 *(shibai-banashi)* [stories inspired by kabuki plays and acting style], and 怪談噺 *(kaidan-banashi)* [ghost stories] (Morioka and Sasaki, 1990: 63).

This thesis will focus on the classical repertoire of stories from the Kamigata region. While the *shinsaku* and *sōsaku* stories are often personal or specific to a given performer or family, the *koten* stories can be thought of as canonical and shared by all rakugo performers (see Brau, 2008: 68). The vast majority of performers include some classical rakugo in their own repertoire and some are clearly of great antiquity (Morioka and Sasaki, 1990: 32).

A historical link between classical rakugo storytelling and the Buddhist preaching of exemplar tales has been established (Sekiyama, 1964: 320). The history of this preaching tradition in Japan stretches back some 1,400 years, beginning in the Asuka period (538-710), when Buddhism was first promulgated throughout the country (Morioka and Sasaki: 211). The point in history, at which this preaching tradition becomes recognisable as rakugo, however, is in the mid-17th-century, when figures such as 露の五郎兵衛 (Tsuyu no Gorobē) (1643-1703) and 米沢彦八 (Yonezawa Hikohachi) (d. 1714) began attracting large audiences for their performances in

public places such as temple grounds (Brau, 2008: 61)[18]. Another early forerunner of the rakugo tradition was 鹿野武左衛門 (Shikano Buzaemon) (1649-1699), a native of Osaka but a forefather of Tokyo's Edo rakugo (Brau, 2008: 61).

While Tsuyu no Gorobē and Yonezawa Hikohachi began telling stories in the open-air, public areas of Kamigata, the performances of their counterparts in Edo were restricted to private audiences, especially assembled in *座敷 (zashiki)* [formal parlours] (Brau, 2008: 61). This seemingly minor difference had a lasting effect on the ways that the respective traditions have developed. Today, Edo Rakugo retains its more formal, restrained character, while the delivery style of Kamigata rakugo continues to echo its street-culture origins. The Kamigata rakugo stage retains certain features that are not seen in Edo performances. These features are the *見台 (kendai)*, a small wooden table at which the performer sits, the *膝隠 (hizakakushi)* [knee hider], a low screen placed just in front of the kendai, and *小拍子 (kobyōshi)*, which are small wooden blocks placed on the *kendai*. These blocks are used to make a noise, either for dramatic effect, or for emphasis, when sharply struck on the *kendai*. The employment of these objects has been part of the standard tradition in Kamigata rakugo since before 桂文治 (Katsura Bunji) (1773-1815) opened the first *yose* in the precincts of 坐摩神社 [Zama/Ikasuri Shrine[19]] in Osaka in 1798 (Morioka and Sasaki, 1990: 247), which coincidentally was the same year that 岡本万作(Okamoto Mansaku) and 三笑亭可楽 (Sanshōtei Karaku) opened the first *yose* in Edo (see Brau, 2008: 63). It appears very likely that at least some of these objects are derived from the open-air performances of early Kamigata rakugo. In particular, it is easy to see that using wooden blocks to make a sound may encourage a greater number of spectators.

Another element of the Kamigata tradition is the adopted surname 桂 (Katsura). Prior to opening the first *yose*, 伊丹屋惣兵衛 (Itamiyasōbē) took the stage name 桂

---

[18] For a more thorough history of the interim period and for further information on the history of preaching in Japan and the lasting influence that this continues to have over features of rakugo, see (Morioka and Sasaki, 1990: 211-231)

[19] Note that the toponym 坐摩神社 is formally read as "Ikasuri Jinja". However, it is more frequently known by the colloquial reading, "Zama Jinja"

文治 (Katsura Bunji), and thus, established one of the most famous lineages[20] of storytellers in Kamigata rakugo (Anada, 1977: 171)[21].

Two of the best-known and most highly respected members of this family in recent years are 桂枝雀 (Katsura Shijaku)[22] (1939-1999) and his former teacher, 桂米朝 (Katsura Beichō) (b. 1925). Beichō was declared a 人間国宝 (Ningen Kokuhō) [living national treasure] in 1996 for his contributions to traditional culture. Similarly, Shijaku was extremely well-known and widely admired, especially for his enthusiastic performances of koten rakugo (see Yasufumi and Yoshinori, 2008: 123). These two storytellers[23] will be central to the rakugo case study. They both have significant numbers of published works on the subject, including transcripts of their versions of various stories. These script books contain a total of 159 stories (61 in Shijaku's 5 books and 98 in Beichō's 8 books), which are a combination of *shinsaku* and *koten* stories. There is considerable crossover in terms of the koten stories listed in each storyteller's books, which, coupled with the fact that Shijaku was taught the majority of his koten repertoire by Beichō, will be important for the stories' analysis within this case[24].

---

[20] Rakugo continues to exercise a strong tradition of professional adoption as used by many other traditional art forms and trades in Japan. According to this tradition, a 弟子 (deshi) [apprentice] is given a name by his or her 師匠 (shishō) [master], which acknowledges the apprentice's professional lineage. Customarily, this adoptive name consists of the *shishō's* surname and at least one character from the *shishō's* first name. In this way, the *deshi's* immediate predecessor is acknowledged as well as the school to which he or she belongs.

[21] For a list of the main rakugo storyteller families, see Morioka and Sasaki (1990: 310)

[22] Katsura Shijaku was born as 前田達 (Maeda Tōru) (Yasufumi and Yoshinori, 2008: 123) and on entering apprenticeship under Beichō, was initially given the name 桂小米 (Katsura Koyone) (Matsumoto, 1996: 84). This name conforms to custom by explicitly linking him to Beichō (米朝) (小 meaning little and 米 meaning rice or Beichō). Later, in 1974, he changed his name again to "Shijaku" (Matsumoto, 1996: 83) in homage to the famous Kamigata rakugo story teller of that name (1862-1928).

[23] Rakugo storytellers are technically referred to as 落語家 (*rakugo-ka*) or 噺家 (*hanashi-ka*), where the suffix 家(ka) carries the meaning of professional or expert.

[24] For a thorough breakdown of the stories, their classifications as *shinsaku* or *koten*, and their degree of crossover, see appendix (227)**.**

Introduction

Rakugo in general has only received a small amount of scholarly attention to date, whether in English or Japanese. Almost all of this attention has been focussed on the Edo tradition, with Kamigata rakugo enjoying only a comparatively small amount. As a result, this case study will necessarily draw to some extent on literature analysing the Edo tradition or rakugo in general in order to inform the case's context.

The most comprehensive and authoritative English works on Rakugo are both comparatively recent publications by Morioka and Sasaki (1990) and Brau (2008). These two works employ very different strategies to describe the rakugo tradition. Morioka and Sasaki employ an encyclopaedic analysis of the various categories and types of story in order to introduce the tradition's textual elements, while Brau's study has more of an ethnographic or anthropological style. It illustrates the author's personal experiences with rakugo practitioners. Brau has also produced a chapter (Brau, 2006) for *Text & Presentation* (Constantinidis, 2006), which is heavily textually focused, and also links the rakugo tradition to other performing art forms native to Japan unlike many, which tend to separate Rakugo from other forms such as Kabuki and Nō. Other generalized studies on the rakugo art from include Sweeney (1979), Sasaki and Balkenhol (1979), and Sasaki and Morioka (1981), which all introduce rakugo as a form of traditional storytelling that is not well-known outside Japan. These papers will be drawn on to illustrate the case study's context. Other studies take an arguably more focused perspective on rakugo, and analyse it in terms of the art form's relationship with historical individuals as in Heinz and Miyoko (1983), who examine an Australian man called Henry Black (1827-1880), who was initiated into the rakugo story-telling world and became one of its celebrities. Others, such as Reider (2000) and Shores (2008), deal with particular stories or kinds of story. Still others look at the way that rakugo has been affected by technological and cultural advances such as the invention of a Japanese form of shorthand (see for example Miller, 1994).

Japanese scholarship on rakugo also tends to focus on Edo more than Kamigata. However, a part of the scholarship that has been done is the production of several large compendia of story summaries. These summaries explicitly outline the traditional differences between renditions of a given story in the Edo and Kamigata traditions, and give some indication of the sources for the texts. Of these summaries, this thesis will focus on Ui (1952) and Noguchi (2008) because of their focus on both the koten repertoire and the Kamigata tradition. Other scholarship that will be

employed is that of Katsura Beichō himself in his 上方落語ノート [Notebook of Kamigata Rakugo] (1978), which is a series of rakugo-related anecdotes, recollections, and observations by the author. Much of this existing rakugo scholarship focuses on the performance element of the tradition. Allusions to the source texts of a given story are often little more than notes and detailed textual analyses of source and target are rare. One notable exception is the Chinese scholar Li (2012), who analyses a number of rakugo, translated from Chinese.

These various sources will be drawn on to inform this thesis' understanding of the texts, as well as the contexts in which they appear. A full understanding of these contexts is, of course, important for a fair consideration of whether the approach to studying translation observed in this thesis' corpus can be applied to unusual contexts in general.

The Approach

The aim of this thesis is to analyse the two case studies illustrated, using an approach derived from that shown to be popular in the corpus of contemporary translation studies literature. The corpus of contemporary literature will be drawn on as a sample of current translation-related thought, with which the practices at work in the two cases can be compared. This sample has provided the theories to be used and will also guide the ways in which they are used and interpreted. Furthermore, the sample will allow the assertions and assumptions relating to the nature of translation made in each case to be compared.

One key issue, which may have had an influence over the variety of contexts represented in the corpus is the way that translation is defined. If the term is translated overly broadly, there is a potential that it could be used to describe any form of text production. Conversely, if it is defined too narrowly, there is a similar potential that certain contexts be overlooked. One of the scholars whose definitions of translation are most often drawn on in the corpus is Roman Jakobson (see for example Corrius Gimbert and Zabalbeascoa, 2011: 115, Golden, 2009: 377, R. Wilson, 2011: 245). Jakobson is best remembered in the corpus for his paper entitled *On the Linguistic Aspects of Translation* (1959/2004). Within this paper, Jakobson famously describes three subcategories into which translation can be divided; intralingual, interlingual, and intersemiotic (Jakobson, 1959/2004: 114). Intralingual translation is described as "*rewording*", and intersemiotic translation as

"*transmutation*", but interlingual translation is given the special privilege of being described as "*translation proper*" (emphasis in each quote is original) (Jakobson, 1959/2004: 114). For Jakobson then, interlingual translation is what we tend to think of when we hear the word "translation", although it is difficult to untangle practices like "*rewording*" from "*translation proper*" definitively.

   Irrespective of whether or not Jakobson's interpretation of translation practice can be thought of as representative of a consensus at the time of writing, it is clearly representative of a large number of contemporary translation scholars' interpretations of the term. The continued presence of Jakobson's definition of translation, with its partiality towards interlingual translation, may also be one of the contributing factors to a sentiment that *translation proper*, which involves "adequate interpretation" and "equivalent messages" (Jakobson, 1959/2004: 114), is in some way more ethically viable than what could be called adaptive practices. This ethical sentiment is strongly influenced by notions of fidelity to the source text, which is also an idea drawn on by Jakobson (1959/2004: 116). The fewer adaptive practices employed in a translation, the more faithful it is perceived to be, and so, a better representation of its source text. Adaptive practices are also seen as methods to be employed by translators in cases of perceived necessity. As the title of Jakobson's paper would suggest, his primary concern was linguistic rather than textual. However, the subject of adaptation prompted him to make one of his better-known statements: "Languages differ essentially in what they must convey and not in what they may convey" (Jakobson, 1959/2004: 116). Hence, Jakobson condones the adaptation of definite or indefinite articles, tenses, and grammatical gender, only in cases necessitated by perceived lacunae between the grammatical structures of the source and target languages[25]. Krebs (2012) demonstrates the fact that this ethical dimension to adaptive processes continues in contemporary studies, and shows the ways that attitudes towards texts vary, depending on whether they are labelled as

---

[25] Jakobson's sense that adaptation is sometimes unavoidable, rather than a legitimate strategy is illustrated in his choice of language. In the section of Jakobson's paper where he discusses the use of adaption, the number of imperatives employed such as "must", "obligatory", "need" and "required" is notable. Out of a total of nine sentences in the passage, only three are not written in the imperative mood and these three are, like the rest of the passage, littered with negatively marked words such as "loss", "deprive" and "unfavourable" (see Jakobson, 1959/2004: 116)**.**

translations, adaptations, or one of a host of synonyms. She (2012: 61) discusses the historical difficulty of rendering any definitive distinction between translation and adaptation. One could surmise from her work that what separates the two practices is much less a question of the ways each category of text is produced, and more a question of the ways that each is appraised in terms of fidelity to the source. Krebs (2012: 62) states that although the theoretical boundaries between translation and adaptation have been explored, as yet, no clear-cut distinction has been identified. This being the case, it is perhaps surprising that contemporary scholars working within translation studies frequently make passing reference to the notion of adaptation as a separate entity (see for example Krein-Kühle, 2011: 393, Vandepitte et al., 2011: 277, Yeung, 2008: 274). This strong tendency to refer to adaptation as a distinct practice within studies of translation suggests that the discipline in general does entertain some kind of notional separation between the two practices. However, a clear definition of where one ends and the other begins is anything but forthcoming (Perteghella, 2008: 50).

 Perhaps this notional distinction is related to the theory of equivalence. Equivalence has enjoyed overwhelming popularity in translation studies since the discipline's formation, but has more recently come to be seen as problematic, and declined sharply in popularity (Chesterman, 1997: 9-10). The main features of equivalence that make it problematic as a tool of analysis are the large number of potential interpretations of the term, and its heavy dependence on the subjective perspective of the translator and target reader. This inherent subjectivity and multifariousness means that even the formulation of a satisfactory definition of equivalence is a formidable task. As it is used for the purposes of distinguishing between translation and adaptation, equivalence describes the relationship between a source text and its translations, but not its adaptations. Sanders (2006: 19) suggests that while translations are seen as representing their sources in the target language, adaptations are "reinterpretations of established texts in new generic contexts […] with relocations of […] a source text's cultural and/or temporal setting, which may or may not involve a generic shift". A translated text is frequently seen as having an equivalent function to the source from which it is derived, whereas the target text that is the product of adaptation is seen as serving some different function (see Krein-Kühle, 2011: 393). However, this distinction immediately becomes problematic, given that it implies that translations do not have any function of

reinterpretation. Indeed, some would argue that "the relocation of a source text's cultural and/or temporal setting" are fundamental parts of the translation process (see for example Venuti, 2004: 310). Moreover, the highly subjective and fluid distinction of an "equivalent function" raises more questions than it answers. These questions include, how to demonstrate that two texts have precisely the same function or functions (see Chesterman, 1997: 131), how to prove that two texts definitely do not have equivalent functions for different audiences (see Chesterman, 1997: 124), and how to prove that functions are objectively equivalent for distinct audiences (see Gutt, 2000). Consideration of these kinds of questions erodes any supposition that there is a clear distinction between translation and adaptation. Equally important is the fact that the two processes are rarely seen as functioning independently of each other. A literary translation almost necessarily includes a certain number of adaptive strategies, if only on the semantic level, and similarly, an adaptation almost necessarily includes a certain amount of translation if only on the lexical level.

Scholars such as Lefevere (1981: 71) have sidestepped the issue altogether by including practices of both translation and adaptation under the umbrella term "refraction", together with others like criticism[26]. Lefevere's idea is that all of these practices "tamper" with a source text in order to make it fit a given purpose. He points out that a reader most often encounters a refraction of a text first, rather than the text itself, in the form of an oral recommendation, advertisement, or academic interpretation (Lefevere, 1981: 73). However, Lefevere's avoidance of the notional translation-adaptation dichotomy does not separate itself from the same ethical concerns illustrated above because he chooses to use the word "tamper". His description is another example of the idea that adaptive strategies shift a text away from its intended purpose and reflect the lower degree of acceptability historically assigned to adaptation as a process, perceived as being invasive. Perhaps the difficulty in defining the separation between adaptation and translation explains the generally limited amount of scholarship on the subject. The scholarship that has dealt

---

[26] Similarly, Steiner, in his hugely influential work *After Babel* (1998) conceptualises a translation as any form of comprehension. However, it could be argued that this definition is overly broad, since it would, potentially encompass all forms of text production and consumption. It is debatable how useful an overly broad definition can be in respect of the application of theory.

with the subject in depth appears to have further problematized, rather than accentuated, any notional distinction (see Susam-Sarajeva, 2008: 189).

Perhaps the lack of current academic debate on the subject is illustrated best by the entry on adaptation in *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (Baker and Saldanha, 2008). This work is arguably the most comprehensive and authoritative encyclopaedia of research in the field of translation studies. It is spread over some 697 pages, covering a vast array of translation-related topics. However, the *Encyclopedia's* entry on adaptation occupies only 3 of these (see Bastin, 2009). Much of this passage concerns itself with adaptation as one of a number of "strategies" employed by translators (Bastin, 2009: 3), which can be categorized in a number of "modes", including "omission", "expansion", "creation", and "updating" (see Bastin, 2009: 4-5). Bastin's approach here is highly reminiscent of Vinay's and Darbelnet's *A Methodology for Translation* (1958/2004). As a result, it is easy to conclude that the notion of adaptation has developed very little during the fifty-year interim separating these two works. Adaptation is not limited in Bastin's text to plugging the lacunae between languages. It is also described as a global strategy. However, even this description revolves around some perceived necessity on the part of the translator. Bastin makes use of marked words, such as "intervention" and "sacrifice" (see Bastin, 2009: 5). This choice of language is reminiscent of that of Jakobson's work. Both demonstrate an underlying sentiment that adaptation is in some way undesirable. These words also form part of another widespread tendency within the discipline. Translators are often depicted as having a somewhat unrealistically large degree of power. The tendency is to assert in categorical terms that a translator has had some sort of direct influence over the source text. Translators are seen as having the ability to "change" the source text. Similarly, a translator that has employed an adaptive strategy is described as having "changed" a particular element (see for example Alvstad, 2008: 234-242, Inggs, 2011: 84-85, Yeung, 2008: 278-285). Other words that belie the same sentiment include "alter" (see for example Haddadian Moghaddam, 2011: 217, Lu, 2009: 328-337, Mackintosh, 2010: 48-64), and "manipulate"(See for example Inggs, 2011: 80, Lu, 2009: 329, Yangsheng, 2009: 247). Moreover, these words are joined by direct, if casual assertions, such as "[t]he word 'manipulation' in translation means any deliberate or unconscious alteration of the source text" (Lu, 2009: 328) and "scholars have been asking for hundreds of years, can the translator add to, omit from, or in

any way alter the source text?" (Shamma, 2009: 78). Of course, neither the practices of translation nor adaptation have a tangible effect over the source text, they merely affect the production of the target text. The production of one text does not necessarily entail the alteration, defilement, or destruction of another, even if the former is a translation of the latter, but the tendency to state that it does is fascinating and indicative of the way that translations are conceptualized.

Of course, this conception that the production of a target text can have a tangible effect over its source is linked to the ways that target texts are consumed[27] and perceived in the cultural contexts that are most well represented in the corpus. Translation is seen fundamentally as a form of mediation (see for example Becher, 2011: 42, Boase-Beier, 2011: 175, Kruger, 2012: 356, Olohan and Salama-Carr, 2011: 185, Pięta, 2012: 322). It is a way of making a source text available to a new target audience, or a way of giving a particular target audience access to an otherwise obscure text. Even intralingual translation is associated with the rendering of archaic or dialectical texts into standardized or modern linguistic forms. This notion of mediation goes some way to explain why, as already explored, adaptive strategies are often associated with a perceived necessity. If the goal of translation is to mediate between source text and target audience, mediation would be the prime factor driving any perceived need for adaptation.

While there is strong evidence for some kind of notional separation of translation from adaptation in the corpus, it is ill defined and highly variable across papers. Even works external to the corpus that deal with the issue directly do not offer any definitive guidance on the ways or reasons the two practices or categories should be treated as separate. To the contrary, they tend to suggest that to set up any distinction is, in itself problematic. For these reasons, this thesis will not subscribe to the corpus' tendency of portraying adaptation as a separate and less ethically viable practice than translation. It will use the two words interchangeably on the basis that, thus far, no generally accepted distinction has been formulated.

A key element of the approach extracted from the corpus analysis above that will be employed within this thesis, however, is the use of translation theory to analyse case studies. In order to make this analysis practicable, and its results meaningful,

---

[27] This thesis will refer to texts being "consumed" rather than "read" in order to acknowledge oral texts. For the same reason, it will refer to target "audiences" instead of target "readers".

this analysis will limit itself to the three theories identified as enjoying the most prominent positions within the corpus. These three theories are explicitation, foreignization, and domestication. The following sections will explore the debates surrounding these theories and their uses in the corpus.

The Explicitation Hypothesis

The explicitation hypothesis, as it has been known since the notion was first formulated by Blum-Kulka (1986/2004), "postulates an observed cohesive explicitness from SL to TL texts regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved" (Blum-Kulka, 1986/2004: 19). More broadly, explicitation is a notion inherited from pragmatics, positing that translated texts are inherently more explicit than their sources. In studies employing this theory, elements of the texts are identified, which demonstrate that the target text contains less potential for ambiguity than its source, and so, it is argued that the translator has, consciously or not, made the range of potential interpretations of the target text more limited than those of the source. The explicitation hypothesis was not the beginning of the theory's story in the context of translation studies[28]. Very early in the formation of the discipline, scholars were observing the practice of elaborating arguably implicit interpretations from a source text in the process of creating their target texts. Vinay and Darbelnet (1977: 164) speak of translations in terms of losses and gains, with explicitation linked to elements gained through the translation process:

> Nous dirons donc qu'il y a gain lorsque la traduction explicite un élément de la situation que LD laisse dans l'ombre. Une phrase qui marque un gain se suffit davantage à elle-même, elle rétablit les sous-entendus ou rappelle ce qui a été dit précédemment. Et parce qu'elle dépend moins, pour sa compréhension, du contexte ou de la situation, elle dispense le lecteur de s'y reporter.

---

[28] The word "theory" is not generally employed to describe explicitation in the corpus. Rather the notion is usually collocated with the pseudo-scientific term "hypothesis". However, because of the inherent subjectivity of the notion, and the ways that it is employed, there appears to be very little reason to define explicitation as anything more scientific or objective than any of the other theories examined here. As a result, this study will treat "hypothesis" as a part of explicitation's title, but will remain consistent in referring to the explicitation hypothesis as a theory, along with domestication and foreignization.

[We will say, therefore, that there is a gain, whereas the translation explicitates an element of the situation that the source language leaves in the shadows. A gain-making sentence is more self-sufficient. It re-establishes implications or recalls what has been said previously. Moreover, because it depends less on the context or situation for its comprehension, it allows the reader to dispense with the necessity of referring to it directly.]

The equation of gains with explicitation and losses with implicitation has remained relatively static over the theory's development. Dimitrova (1993) uses hyphenation to cement the link, describing "addition-explicitation" versus "omission-implicitation". However, the majority of the theory's treatment has simply described it as "explicitation". What is clear from the corpus is that references to earlier descriptions of explicitation by, for example Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/2004, 1977) and Berman (1985) enjoy far less attention than the empirically orientated approach introduced by Blum-Kulka (1986/2004), with which many papers engage directly (further examples include Becher, 2011: 29, Jiménez-Crespo, 2011: 6, Vandepitte et al., 2011: 296).

Blum-Kulka reconceptualized the strategy as a necessary element of the translation process, suggesting that explicitation may be a universal feature of translated texts. This claim to universality continues to spark a certain amount of interest and debate (see for example Becher, 2011, Jiménez-Crespo, 2011, Pápai, 2004) and is not unique to explicitation. In addition to explicitation, Baker (1993, 1995, 1996) has described three other proposed universals of translated language: simplification, normalization/conservatism and levelling out (see Olohan, 2003, Zanettin, 2012 for overviews) (Kruger, 2012: 356).

In pre-hypothesis articles describing explicitation, the term is used quite generally to denote the stylistic practice in translation of glossing or embellishing elements of a translated text. This practice occurs where habits, customs, or traditions are mentioned that are assumed to be particular to, and commonly understood by the source culture but not by the target culture (see for example Vinay and Darbelnet, 1958/2004: 342). Post-hypothesis explicitation studies, by contrast, have benefited from advances in computer technology, and consequentially, dramatic advances in both the availability, and quality of corpus-based studies of translation (see for example Alcina, 2008). As a result, many later studies focused on explicitation emphasize empirical or statistical data in nuancing an understanding of the term.

They interpret it less as a conscious translation strategy, employed by translators to better expound the meaning of particular utterances they interpret as overly erudite for their target readerships, and more as translators' unconscious use of syntax and grammar in such a way that favours their own subjective interpretations of source texts[29].

The idea of explicitation as a translation universal has also constituted the foundation on which complementary theories have been formulated. These secondary theories include the "asymmetry hypothesis" of Klaudy (2001), which postulates that explicitation in the L1 – L2 direction is generally not counterbalanced by implicitation in the L2 – L1 direction because translators tend to avoid the introduction of optional implicitation. Other offshoots of explicitation's perceived universalism are the observations of Heltai (2005: 68) that translated texts can be more difficult to read than source texts. Heltai (2005: 69) notes the possible contradiction between translators introducing grammatical redundancy into translations in order to make the texts more explicit, and simultaneously increasing the amount of effort required on the part of the reader to process the text.

Considering the relatively small number of contexts examined in the corpus, universalism also has potentially negative effects for the study of translation. These issues stem from the fact that a discipline that is overly focused on a relatively select set of contexts may be ill equipped to describe features of translation in general. In turn, if the universality of explicitation were to become generally accepted, it could be used as grounds by which translation is defined. Potentially, such a definition may lead to translations being ignored by the discipline. The reasoning might follow the pattern below:

> If a text exhibits explicitation, then it is a translation.
> Text x does not exhibit explicitation.
> Therefore, text x is not a translation.

Clearly, this argument is invalid. It corresponds to the logical fallacy known as *denying the antecedent*, which describes the reasoning pattern below:

> If A, then B.

---

[29] For a classic example of this kind of study, focusing on the use of the optional "that" in reported speech in English as a suspected form of unconscious explicitation, see Baker & Olohan (2008)

Not A.

Therefore, Not B (M.B. Burke, 1994: 24)

Below is a parallel argument that illustrates the sense in which this kind of argument is invalid:

If a text is written in Chinese script, then it can be reproduced electronically.

Text x is not written in Chinese script.

Therefore, text x cannot be reproduced electronically.

Of course, this kind of definition is not being proposed. However, it is closely related to the practice of extrapolating universals from a relatively small sample. Potentially, the presence of such proposed universals might encourage the equation of superficially similar practices with theories that rationalize phenomena in terms inappropriate to the context in question. This concern that theories accurately describe the causes of phenomena will be central to this thesis' analysis of the two case studies with the three theories. It will be the basis of the thesis' exploration of how appropriate the approach to studying translation observed in the corpus is for analysing translations from diverse contexts. This application of theory to each case study is also complemented by the remaining two theories selected.

The Foreignization-Domestication Dichotomy

As already illustrated, a large number of articles in the corpus engage with the theories of domestication and foreignization, which are notionally mutually exclusive, and hence, dichotomous.

The relative novelty of terms like foreignization and domestication within the discipline may lead one into the mistaken belief that the notions these terms address are equally contemporary. In fact, the question of whether a translator should adopt a translation strategy that generally adheres to the norms of the source or target culture has unquestionably persisted for longer than translation studies has existed as a distinct discipline. In recent years, the most visible champion of the debate and equally vocal proponent of translator adherence to source culture norms, or foreignization is Lawrence Venuti. Venuti draws his chief inspiration from the 19th-century Prussian Romantic theologian and philosopher, Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834), who, in his thesis *Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens* [*On the Different Methods of Translating*](1813) illustrates his understanding of

translation within a metaphor of movement. In this metaphor either "der Uebersezer läßt den Schriftsteller möglichst in Ruhe, und bewegt den Leser ihm entgegen; oder er läßt den Leser möglichst in Ruhe und bewegt den Schriftsteller ihm entgegen" (Schleiermacher, 1813: 47) [the translator leaves the author in peace as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him; or he leaves the reader in peace as much as possible and moves the author towards him]. Schleiermacher's study is itself a systematic exposition of the Romantic concept of translation[30], manifest in the theory and practice of August Wilhelm Schlegel (1767-1845) (Kittel and Poltermann, 2008: 417). While Schlegel advocates domestic norms, however, Schleiermacher champions the opposite extreme of the dichotomy. Schlegel believes that translations should ideally contain every detail of their sources, while simultaneously adhering to target culture norms (Kittel and Poltermann, 2008: 416). Schleiermacher, on the other hand, believes that to translate in such a way is to miss something profound. Schleiermacher insists "der eigentliche Zwekk alles Uebersezens möglichst unverfälschter Genuß fremder Werke, durch eine Methode erreicht werden kann, welche dem übersezten Werke ganz und gar den Geist einer ihm fremden Sprache einhauchen will" [the fullest possible unadulterated pleasure of translated texts can be achieved with a methodology that insists on inspiring the translated work with the spirit of a language that is foreign to it]. Just as the Romantic Movement was not restricted to the German language, the dichotomy between foreign and domestic can also be found elsewhere, voiced by Schleiermacher's near contemporaries. Scottish lawyer, writer, and professor, Alexander Tytler (1747-1813) expresses a very similar sentiment to that of Schlegel in his *Essay on the Principles of Translation*. He affirms that "[t]he style and manner of writing in a translation should be of the same character with that of the original," (Tytler, 1790: 63). Similarly, he states that "[a] translation should have all the ease of original composition, a translator ought always to figure to himself in what manner the original author would have expressed himself, if he had written in the language of the translation" (Tytler, 1790: 107).

The foreignization-domestication dichotomy's strong presence in the corpus reflects its prominence in the discipline in general. However, the rationale behind producing a foreignized text has shifted in the hands of Venuti from

---

[30] For a more thorough exploration of the influence of German Romanticism on the early foreignization-domestication dichotomy see Bernofsky (1997).

Schleiermacher's unapologetic method for imbuing translated texts with Romantic exoticism. It has become a stratagem for championing the cause of the apparently under-acknowledged, under-appreciated, and under-paid translators of the current Anglo-American context (Venuti, 2004: 307-313). For Venuti (2004: 308), foreignization embodies a form of *resistance*, by which translators oppose the status quo. His assertions are not universally accepted, however. They are challenged and the nebulous identity of the supposed targets of this *resistance,* called into question by Tymoczko (2007: 210), who offers an extensive list of potential opponents, at whom this *resistance* may or may not be targeted. Tymoczko (2007: 253) also points out the problematic nature of generalizing notions such as "foreign" and "domestic" within a practice as multifarious and subjective as translation. Even if consideration is limited to a single text type, there are potentially as many distinct ways of both interpreting and realising such ideas as "natural sounding" and "foreign sounding" as there are translators. Therefore, ideas like foreignizing and domesticating are impeded by a certain vagueness or wooliness when it comes to real practice. Predictably, this vagueness is multiplied when one goes on to consider the potentials for interaction between these ideas and the huge array of applications to which translation is put.

With only a small amount of effort, the same dichotomy can be aligned with what Chesterman (1997: 12) describes as the supermeme of "Free-vs-literal". In Chesterman's discussion of five apparently all-pervasive notions, or supermemes, in translation studies, he illustrates the dichotomy between translating in a way that sticks rigidly to the stucture or norms of the source language or text, compared with sacrificing some adherence to the source text in favour of target language norms (Chesterman, 1997: 12). Chesterman (1997: 13) rightly points out that this dichotomy has the power to prejudice the study of translation because it turns the exercise into little more than a critique on translators' adherence to the literality of a source text[31].

The foreignization-domestication dichotomy persists despite the concerns of Tymoczko and others (for example Boyden, 2006) regarding the difficulty of

---

[31] Chesterman neglects to acknowledge, however, that literality is also an inherently subjective a notion. Any translation is only as literal a reproduction of its source as it is perceived to be.

defining the points at either end[32] of the notional spectrum. That is, how many foreignizing features must a text exhibit to be described as foreignizing? The discipline, therefore, appears to have reconciled itself to some degree with the underlying subjectivity of not only many of its theories, but also their use in analysing case scenarios. There appears to be little obstacle to translation scholars describing a translation as "foreignizing" (see for example Hanna, 2009: 176, Sihui, 2009: 277, Wright, 2010: 26) or "domesticating" (see for example Inggs, 2011: 81, Shamma, 2009: 79, Valdéon, 2010: 91), even though it might be prudent to couch these kinds of categorization on the fact that they are the scholars' own subjective interpretations of the texts or their apparent translation strategies.

In practice then, the theories of domestication and foreignization, considered in tandem, appear to be applicable to the same range of contexts as explicitation. However, where explicitation has been overtly equated with universality in translated texts, the same appears to be merely implied by the foreignization and domestication's status as dichotomous terms. The inference is that if only two options exist, then all translated texts must subscribe to one or the other to some degree. Prior to Venuti's adoption of the notions, and formulation of the terms, the idea that these were the only two options open to a translator was expressed directly by Schleiermacher. He very confidently asserts that "es außer diesen beiden Methoden keine dritte geben könne, der ein bestimmtes Ziel vorschwebe. Es sind nämlich nicht mehr Verfahrungsarten möglich. Die beiden getrennten Partheien müssen entweder an einem mittleren Punkt zusammentreffen [...]" (Schleiermacher, 1813: 48) [there is no third method, apart from these two that may serve some particular end. The two separate parties must be brought together at some point between the two [...]]. For Schleiermacher then, domestication and foreignization constitute a definite, inescapable dichotomy for translators. Therefore, any translated text will necessarily domesticate or foreignize to some degree, whether the translator or reader is aware of it or not.

---

[32] The two extremes of this dichotomy could even be described as impossible because of the ultimate indeterminacy of utterances (see Quine, 1960: 221). It is not possible to produce of a target language text, in which all elements are definable as either wholly domestic or wholly foreign in an objective sense.

One of the aims of this thesis will be to discern if a dichotomy is the correct way to describe the relationship between foreignization and domestication. It will ask if the terms' status as constituting a dichotomy could be an effect of the cultural specificity of contexts examined in the discipline rather than the mutual exclusivity of the notions they describe.

Theory and Case Analysis

Of course, this thesis is no different from any other study analysing texts with translation theories in that it cannot claim any objectivity in its choices of classification. Each of the theories used is posited on an individual's subjective perspective on texts and their relationships. This thesis will subscribe to the approach used in the corpus, of defining those elements to be examined, and what features of those elements would affect their theoretical categorization. However, this approach defines subjectivity but does not obviate it. For instance, if a particular scholar interprets a more extensive use of grammatical connectives to be indicative of explicitation, then a study by this scholar of a translation that happens to use more connectives than its source will necessarily qualify as explicitating (see e.g. Becher, 2011: 29-30). Conversely, in a study using the same theory by another scholar, for whom connectives are of no importance, the features that qualify explicitness will be defined differently and so, any higher occurrence of connectives is unlikely even to feature[33]. Therefore, the presence or absence of features, described by one scholar as making a text more or less explicit would not necessarily support or oppose the translation's description as explicitating for another scholar. Subjectivity is apparent in all of these theories in terms of the textual features that are initially defined as making it more or less explicit, foreignizing, or domesticating. Just as no given word contains any intrinsic meaning, there is nothing intrinsic about the degree of explicitness, for example, of any given utterance or textual feature (c.f. Quine, 1960). Thus, what for one scholar may appear to be the quintessentially foreignized text, for

---

[33] Consider, for instance, the fact that Becher (2011), Hirsch (2011), and Jiménez-Crespo (2011) all analyse translations with explicitation. However, while connectives are the focus for Becher (2011), the only reference either Hirsch (2011) or Jiménez-Crespo (2011) make to them is merely in passing (see Hirsch, 2011: 188).

example, may appear to be only moderately foreignizing to another[34]. These are the reasons that this thesis will subscribe to the canon's use of definition in order to use theories in a meaningful way.

In terms of the treatment of foreignization within the thesis, the primary aim will not be to critique the case translations in terms of lexical choice or syntax unless quantifiable evidence is available. This reliance on evidence external to the texts themselves is based on the fact that both of the case studies are culturally and linguistically external to the cultural context in which the thesis is produced. As a result, the application of the foreignization theory will be focused on tangible elements of the translations that estrange them from the respective target cultures in some way. Such estranging elements might include direct references to the source culture, terms specific to the source culture and novel to the target culture or features that illustrate the translations' statuses as target texts.

The theory of domestication will be employed in a very similar way. The focus will not fall on notional standards of language use. Instead, the aim will be to discern if the translators have made efforts to efface or minimize the prominence of the source-target relationship from the target audience's perspective.

The use of the theory of explicitation will also necessarily differ slightly from its prevailing use in the corpus. As already illustrated, explicitation is one of the theories that has benefitted from advances in computer technology and scholars' expanded ability to produce statistical results, based on parallel text analysis[35]. However, this approach relies on a number of assumptions. It assumes that features of a text, such as punctuation, can be mapped from one language to another and

---

[34] A good example is found in Pym's review of Venuti's work (Pym, 1996), wherein Pym frankly admits to having missed a large number of the supposedly foreignizing elements in a particular translation by Venuti from Italian. Venuti (2004: 301-302) makes a lengthy argument for the foreignizing effect of the text and uses it to illustrate the theory of foreignization. However, the fact that Pym openly states that the features did not cause any generally foreignizing effect for him and, in fact, that he would not have even noticed them without Venuti's elucidation (see Pym, 1996: 171), shows the overriding influence of perspective in the categorisation of elements corresponding to a particular theory.

[35] The papers in the corpus that use a statistical approach to produce results, rationalised in terms of explicitation included Hirsch (2011), Jiménez-Crespo (2011), Becher (2011), Károly (2010), and Jooken and Rooryck (2011).

compared directly. Secondly, and more importantly for this thesis, it relies on the target text being a close and full parallel of its source. However, since this thesis will not subscribe to any differentiation between adaptations and translations, it is eminently possible that the target texts will not parallel their sources' structures. As a result, this thesis will not apply the theory of explicitation from statistical analysis of translations, compared with their sources. Instead, the thesis will focus on what Vinay and Darbelnet (1977: 164) call "gain". It will examine elements of the target texts acquired as part of the translation process and explore their effects.

The analysis of each case study will draw on large amounts of secondary literature to inform the contexts in which the translations were produced. This secondary literature will be used to infer the factors that prompted the respective translators' actions. These factors will then be compared with the results expected by each theory. This secondary literature will also be used to counterbalance the subjective nature of the analysis with a variety of perspectives.

An important feature of the analysis process of this thesis is that the two case studies are conceived as separate entities. The aim is not to compare or liken the case studies to one another. Rather, the aim is to use the two case studies as examples of translation contexts that are underrepresented in the contemporary corpus of translation studies, and ascertain to what degree the approach to studying translations in that corpus remains valid. Having established the relative validity of the approach in these two cases, the thesis will move on to examine the factors relevant to each case study's context that may have an influence.

Abductive Reasoning

The comparison of theory with case study context described above will be achieved with the help of a kind of reasoning that is quite unlike the inductive and probabilistic logic employed by the theories examined above. This method will provide a way of extrapolating the understandings of translation held by the translators in each case study by comparing target texts directly with their cultural contexts with no recourse to extant theories. The method is known as abductive reasoning, which attempts to ascertain the parameters under which a particular phenomenon may come into being.

Introduction

Abductive reasoning was developed by the American philosopher and logician, Charles Sanders Peirce (Flach, 2000: 5). It was presented in its current form in one of his 1903 *Harvard Lectures on Pragmatism,* entitled *Pragmatism as the Logic of Abduction* (reproduced in Peirce, 1998: 226-241). The logic of abduction follows the pattern below:

> "The surprising fact, C, is observed;
>
> But if A were true, C would be a matter of course,
>
> Hence, there is reason to suspect that A is true." (Peirce, 1998: 231)

This pattern demonstrates that abductive reasoning begins not with a set of known parameters or assertions but with an observed noteworthy phenomenon. The most likely cause of this phenomenon is then abducted from the surrounding circumstances.

This kind of reasoning is an approach that has been adopted by humanities disciplines that include historical linguistics (McMahon, 1996: 94), anthropology, and archaeology (Turner and Risjord, 2007: 531). It allows the observation of case studies as subjects of study intimately intertwined with their cultural contexts. Semiotician, Umberto Eco (1994) has also illustrated the important function that abductive reasoning serves in a large number of practices where rationalizing or assigning meaning to phenomena is important. Such practices include criminal investigations, medical diagnoses, literary interpretation and scientific discovery (Eco, 1994: 160).

Of course, abductive reasoning, like any other form of ampliative reasoning does not yield results that are guaranteed, providing that all the premises are accurate (B. Gower, 1997: 14). Instead, it is a way to infer an explanation for a particular phenomenon, which can then be compared with results extracted from a similar case. Put another way, "abductive reasoning only produces hypotheses to be tested" (Anderson et al., 2005: 10). Thus, this kind of approach does not assert a definitive answer but suggests a plausible explanation to rationalize a given phenomenon. As a hypothesis-generating approach, the usefulness of abductive reasoning is hinged on the inferences created being open to experimental verification (Peirce, 1998: 235). However, this necessity does not imply that the hypotheses must produce objective, empirically testable results.

> Induction "infers the existence of phenomena such as we have observed in cases that are similar," while abduction "supposes something of a different kind from what we have directly observed, and frequently something which it would be impossible for us to observe directly" (Fann and Peirce, 1970: 9)

Because this kind of reasoning looks for the most economical explanation for a given phenomenon, it produces hypotheses that are directly related to the case study or example in question, unlike induction, which aims to produce generalizations (Flach, 2000: 16, 17). Many translation studies theories are inductive. They make conclusions based on styles of translation, and induce that the same findings are applicable to other translations of that style.

> [I]nduction may be said to be an inference from a sample to a whole, or from particulars to a general law; abduction is an inference from a body of data to an explaining hypothesis, or from effect to cause, "The former classifies, the latter explains" (Fann and Peirce, 1970: 55).

Thus, abduction is useful in testing the degree to which the generalizations produced by translation theories' inductive approach are applicable to a particular set of cases. It will be used here as an interpretation that can be compared with the results predicted by each theory.

Conclusions

The purpose of this introductory chapter has been to illustrate the stimulus for the thesis, the niche it occupies, and the questions it seeks to answer. It has also given a brief overview of the material that will be used to go about exploring the various questions, and shown the approach that will be used to do so.

In terms of the factors that warrant the thesis, the corpus' analysis of a large body of contemporary translation literature found a high degree of focus on translations produced in a relatively select set of cultural and historical contexts. It also found that there is a move within the discipline towards a more inclusive outlook. However, what remains unclear is if the ways translation is traditionally analysed, critiqued, and discussed are compatible with the potential diversity of practices extant across all cultures and periods. With this abiding focus on a select set of contexts in mind, together with the apparent interest in a greater degree of inclusivity, the main

question the thesis seeks to explore is to what degree the tools of analysis currently used in translation studies can be maintained if the subject of study is to expand.

The relative degree of variation among the translation contexts discussed in the discipline was established through analysis of the corpus, which categorized its constituent papers in terms of the source and target languages examined, as well as the time-periods to which the translations belong. Alongside this examination of the cases discussed by each paper, the corpus analysis also categorized the ways they approached their exploration of the translations in question. The results of this analysis were clear in terms of the most popular languages, time-periods, and methodologies within the corpus.

Using the results of this analysis, two case studies were selected on the basis that they are both unrepresented in the corpus. Moreover, the types of context to which these case studies belong were identified as generally underrepresented in the corpus. The least well-represented types of context were those centred on non-European languages that are not also official languages of the UN, and those appearing during historical periods prior to the early 20th century.

The first case that will be examined is Geoffrey Chaucer's use of translation in the *Canterbury Tales*. Chaucer will be used as an example of 14th century translation practices. The ways that he and his contemporaries might have perceived their own actions will be explored by examining Chaucer's attitudes towards his source texts and the relationships his target texts have to them. The second case study will centre on the part played by translation in Japanese rakugo storytelling. Here again, the ways translation is conceptualized by the various text producers active in the rakugo tradition will take the focus. In both cases, elements or features of the target texts will be identified that are in some way noteworthy or idiosyncratic of the translators' approach to their actions. The factors that led the translators to produce these elements or features will then be explored.

The aim will be to ascertain if the translators in these two case studies are approaching the act of translation in a manner that is clearly similar to that illustrated by the articles in the corpus, and thus, if the approaches espoused and exemplified in the corpus are transferable to these cases. This aim will be achieved by observing a number of noteworthy phenomena in the translated texts, using a variety of secondary literature to construct an impression of each case study context, and through abductive reasoning, asking what stimuli in the case contexts might make

the observed phenomena expectable. These results will be compared with the factors predicted by the theories identified as being most influential in the corpus. This comparison will make it possible to examine the veracity of inferences made when translation theories are brought to bear on case studies that are dramatically unlike those which enjoy most attention. Thus, it will be possible to examine the extent to which the discipline's established approach can be maintained if its turn away from the historic focus on select languages and time-periods continues.

It may be that translation studies up until this point has been able to do full justice to translation practice in general, despite its historical focus on a limited set of interrelated examples. On the other hand, such a historical focus does imply that translation studies has tended to occupy itself with several facets of translation practice, and that there remain large areas of research that have not yet been explored. Through exploring forms of translation that are otherwise underrepresented in the discipline, this thesis will actively engage with the potential that forms of translation differing radically from those exemplified in the corpus exist. It will begin by asking if the conception of translation as mediation, which permeates through the corpus is also apt to describe Chaucer's approach to translation.

CHAPTER 1

Mediation or *Excogitatio*:
The Relationship of Chaucer's Translations to their Sources

Introduction

In the introductory chapter (32), it was established that translation is frequently perceived as a form of mediation[36] between source text and target audience. Translation is a way of making a text available to a new target audience, or conversely, of giving a particular target audience access to an otherwise obscure text. It was inferred that this goal of mediation, assumed by translators and their texts, is often one of the chief factors that drives the adoption of adaptive strategies. It was found that these adaptive strategies are often prompted by a perceived necessity on the part of the translator to reflect some effect in the source text. That is, if mediation between source and target cannot be achieved satisfactorily through simple means, ones that are more inventive become necessary.

This conception of translation as mediation appears to be fundamental to the discipline at present because it guides our understanding of what translated texts are, the ways that they are produced, and how they are likely to be consumed. The primary aim of this chapter is to establish if Chaucer's approach to translating exhibits the same focus on mediation. In doing so, it will establish if the conceptualization of translation that underpins contemporary translation studies' approach is transferable to Chaucer's texts. In order to inquire if translation in the *Canterbury Tales* exhibits a role of mediation, the chapter will examine the relationships between individual tales and their sources. It will begin by considering further the ramifications that aiming to mediate between different languages and cultures may have on the strategies employed by translators. Subsequently, examples will be drawn from the *Canterbury Tales* that will be assessed in light of the notion of mediation. Thus, through comparison of Chaucer's translations with his sources,

---

[36] This notion of mediation will also be much more fully explored in Chapter 4 (145).

this chapter will use abductive reasoning to ask if the most efficient way to conceptualize the translation activity in question is in terms of mediation.

Mediation and Target Audience Perspective

It is perhaps natural to infer that if translation is a form of mediation between source texts and target audiences, one feature of the translation act will be a goal of attempting to make the target text perceptibly more approachable to the target audience than the source text is. Perhaps the most conspicuous example of this kind of mediation in translations is the practice of rendering the target text in a language known to the target audience. This practice is acknowledged in Jakobson's (1959/2004: 114) description of interlingual translation and Blum-Kulka's (1986/2004: 291) description of translation as "an *act of communication*" (original emphasis). Beyond the purely linguistic sense, however, there is another aspect to the concept of mediation, which addresses the target audience's assumed degree of acquaintance with the source culture. This second perspective on mediation has come to be referred to as 'intercultural communication', a term coined by E. T. Hall in *The Silent Language* (1959). This notion, that translators are cultural mediators, who employ a variety of linguistic and non-linguistic skills while translating has become pervasive in translation studies (see for example Katan, 2003, 2008, Limon, 2010, Wilss, 1999). Furthermore, the idea that intercultural communication is a necessary part of translation underpins a number of translation studies theories. Most crucially for this thesis, it is clearly the foundation of explicitation, foreignization, and domestication. However, the understanding of translation as a form of mediator-guided communication also informs the arguably broader theory of *norms* as proposed by Toury (1995/2004). *Norms* describe the differences in linguistic and cultural assumptions between source and target audiences. The theory predicts that a translation will exhibit adjustments to compensate for the disparity between cultural and linguistic systems. Therefore, translation is not perceived as being limited to purely linguistic terms, in which comprehension is the sole concern (Toury, 1981: 16), but is seen as a cultural interaction, in which the success of a text is also hinged on its accessibility for the target audience (Toury, 1995/2004: 199).

Accessibility, like mediation implies facilitation (Englund Dimitrova, 2005: 30). Translation as a form of mediation is seen as a way of assisting the target audience to

access the material contained within the source text. Conceivably, this mediation might take the form of altering the entire cultural milieu in which a text is set, in order to facilitate its appreciation by target audiences. Chaucer too, exhibits a practice of transposing stories out of the settings described in their sources. He thoroughly removes any mention of the original setting and constructs an elaborate alternative for his translation. Of course, whether he acts in this way in order to facilitate mediation or for some other aim is another question.

Translating to Improve Accessibility

A good example of Chaucer's practice of extracting a story's material from its setting is found in the *Franklin's Tale*, which Chaucer removes from the Neapolitan setting of its source text. What is confusing, perhaps, is the setting Chaucer selects for his translation. He chooses to adapt the tale not to a domestic setting, or one that is likely to have been particularly well known by his target audience, but the somewhat more recondite setting of ancient Brittany. Chaucer also chooses a medium to convey his translation that is notably different from that of his source. He opts to replace the prose *romance* style of the source text with a form of ballad known as the *lay*, a text-type that would most likely have been less familiar to his target audience[37]. The source in question is called *Menedon's Story* and can be found in the *Questioni d'Amore*, one of the component sections of Boccaccio's *Filocolo* (Edwards, 2002: 212). As with many of Chaucer's translations, the identification of a single source text, and its parallel comparison with Chaucer's text is a problematic matter that will be explored in some detail below. However, the *Filocolo* is described as Chaucer's source here on the basis that it appears to have supplied the majority of the events in Chaucer's translation. The course of events described by both translation and source text are, indeed, very similar. Both describe characters acting within the constraints of the medieval ideal of courtly love (see Paris, 1883). Both see a man suffer by attempting to acquire the unattainable love of a married woman.

On the linguistic level, however, the texts have less in common. In terms of both stylistics and cultural specificity, Chaucer's translation is by far the more intricate.

---

[37] Riddy (2000) examines a variety of English-language *romances,* dating from Chaucer's career or just prior to it. She shows that the *romance* was a popular medium, particularly for telling stories on the theme of domestic life.

Chaucer begins the tale by explicitly defining its setting, as "[i]n Armorik, that called is Britayne" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 178), and is very thorough in remaining consistent in his application of the tale to its new setting. He adjusts the narrative style, character names, and other culture-specific elements appropriately (Edwards, 1999: 226, 2002: 214). The tale is adjusted to an appropriate verse form, and details are altered to correspond more closely to its new Bretton setting. The excerpts of the source, followed by Chaucer's text below demonstrate the effect that this new setting has on the tale's centrepiece, in which the lady tells the man pining for her the impossible ends he would need to go to before he could hope to receive her affections:

> Ella disse che volea del mese di gennaio, in quella terra, un bel giardino e grande, d'erbe e di fiori e d'alberi e di frutti copioso, come se del mese di maggio fosse, fra sé dicendo, "Questa è cosa impossibile: io mi leverò costui da dosso per questa maniera. (from Il Filocolo, ed. Antonio Enzo Quaglio, Vol. 1 of Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio, ed. Vittore Branca, reproduced in Edwards, 2002: 221)

> [She said that she wanted, in the month of January, in that land, a beautiful garden and large, of grasses and flowers, and trees and many fruit, as if it were the month of May. She said "This is an impossible thing: I will relieve myself of him in this way]

> Looke what day that endelong Britayne| Ye remoeve alle the rokkes, stoon by stoon,| That they ne lette ship ne boot to goon
> I seye, whan ye han maad the coost so clene| Of rokkes that ther nys no stoon ysene,| Thanne wol I love yow best of any man (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 181)

This example shows that Chaucer did not limit himself to transposing only those elements that would be incongruous with the new setting, but arguably made the tale more specific to its new setting than the source text was to its own.

Thus, Chaucer translates this text from one non-domestic setting to another. Simultaneously, he translates both the language from its Italian source to an English target, and the prose source to a verse target. In translating the text into English, Chaucer's text undoubtedly makes the material more accessible to an English-speaking audience than its Italian source. However, because he also elaborates on the culture-specific details, the degree to which this accessibility is achieved beyond the

purely linguistic level is arguable. Chaucer makes use of specific place names, such as Pedmark [Penmarch] and Kayrrud, which may have been almost entirely unfamiliar to his target audience. Indeed, this lack of familiarity on the part of both the target audience and Chaucer himself is illustrated by the tale's description of Penmarch's rugged coastline and treacherous rocks. These rocks are of pivotal importance to the story, and while it is accurate to describe Brittany as rocky, the high shore and the outlying rocks that are also described in the tale (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 180) fit no precise location in Brittany (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 897). It may be, therefore, that even Chaucer was not personally familiar with the region he was describing in the *Franklin's Tale*, and his target audience may not have been knowledgeable enough about the tale's setting to spot the inaccuracy. This notion that the ancient Breton setting of this tale was, to some extent, exotic to both Chaucer and his target audience is supported by his repeated references, not to Celtic mythology, but to classical Greek and Latin mythology as will be explored further in Chapter 2 (87).

Of course, the inclusion of some unfamiliar place names and incongruities in terms of culture and geography does not necessarily hinder the comprehension of a target audience. The tale's message can be understood without any knowledge of the location of Kayrrud, for example. However, from the perspective of intercultural communication and mediation with the aim of facilitation, these elements could be most easily seen as obstacles to the accessibility of the translation to Chaucer's English target audience, since they actively introduce problematic features.

Even on the linguistic level, Chaucer makes choices that do not necessarily assist the consumption of his translation by the target audience. The form of poetry that Chaucer selects for this tale is another element with which both Chaucer and his target audience appear to have been less than intimately familiar. Rather than retaining the source text's prose form, or adjusting the text to a verse form that was widely-known, Chaucer adapts the text to a Bretton *lay*. In doing so, he employs a text type that was at least novel for his audience. In part, this novelty is illustrated by the fact that the tale begins by describing this ballad form:

> Thise oldee gentil Britouns in hir dayes| Of diverse aventures maden layes,| Rymeyed in hir firste Briton tonge,| Which layes with hir instrumentz they songe| Or ells redden hem for hir pleasaunce;| And oon of hem have I in remembraunce (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 178)

The addition of this description at the very beginning of the tale's prologue suggests that Chaucer did not assume his audience entirely familiar with the *lay* as a text type. He does not feel the need to use the prologue to any of the other *Canterbury Tales* to describe its text type in this way. Therefore, if the *lay* form had been widely known, it seems likely that this explicit description of the *lay* genre and its background would have been redundant. On the other hand, if the *lay* text-type were something exotic to Chaucer's target audience, it is quite natural that a gloss of this kind may be perceived as beneficial. This argument is supported by evidence provided by Beston (1974: 319), who notes that the *lay*, along with the French *romance* enjoyed a short revival of popularity in 14th-century England. However, based on the small number of surviving English examples, he goes on to demonstrate that the *lay* was almost certainly not widely known amongst English audiences at the time Chaucer produced his translation (Beston, 1974: 320). Indeed, Beston (1974: 330) compares the *Franklin's Tale* to French *lays*, and concludes that Chaucer's own acquaintance with the form was "slight".

As a result, equating Chaucer's translation in the *Franklin's Tale* with mediation is problematized. Although the language of the text's composition, being English, has arguably made it more accessible to Chaucer's English-speaking target audience, both the tale's text type and the setting employed are demonstrably at least as foreign to Chaucer's target audience as those of the source text. Consequently, if Chaucer's aim was to alter these features in order to mediate, such that unfamiliar, foreign elements could be replaced by familiar, domestic ones, his strategy seems to have been unlikely to succeed.

Mediating by Glossing

A very similar shift also occurs in the *Shipman's Tale*, which is transposed from its sources' northern Italian setting to a location just north of Paris. Opinion has been divided, historically, regarding Chaucer's source text for this tale, partly because of his lack of attribution, the tale's French setting, and, tangentially, because of a lack of evidence that Chaucer ever owned a copy of Boccaccio's *Decameron*. Beidler (1999) has convincingly argued that since *Decameron 8.1* is the closest "hard

analogue"[38]to Chaucer's tale found so far, it is counterproductive to discount it on the grounds of a lack of conclusive evidence. Scattergood (2005: 567) adds *Decameron 8.2* to the debate as another analogue, although the number of concrete similarities between this text and Chaucer's are far fewer. Both texts are set in northern Italy, however; *Decameron 8.1* in Milan (Scattergood, 2005: 571) and *Decameron 8.2* in the Florentine village of Varlungo (Scattergood, 2005: 575).

Unlike the *Franklin's Tale*, with its tendency to include elements apparently not well known by either Chaucer or his target audience, the *Shipman's Tale* exhibits a profound understanding of the world of French mercantile practices it depicts. For this reason among others, the tale was long assumed a translation of some obscure French fabliau (Beidler, 1999: 43, Scattergood, 2005: 566):

> But so bifel, this marchant on a day| Shoop hym to make redy his array| Towards the toun of Bregges for to fare To byen there a porcioun of ware;| For which he hath to Parys sent anon A messenger […] (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 203)

Certainly, these mercantile details were not acquired from either of the Italian sources identified above, of which the first mentions a merchant only in passing, and the second features not merchants, but labourers: "Ora avvenne| che tra l'altre sue popolane che prima gli eran piaciute, | una sopra tutte ne gli piacque, che aveva nome Monna| Belcolore, moglie d'un lavoratore che si facea chiamare| Bentivegna del Mazzo [...]" (Boccaccio, 1820: 675) [Now it happened that, among the folk who pleased him, there was one above all the rest, whose name was Mona Belcolore, the wife of a labourer who was known as Bentivegna del Mazzo […]]. A much more likely source of this information about mercantile practices appears to be Chaucer's own experiences. His father and grandfather were both successful vintners or wine

---

[38] Beidler (1999: 41-42) proposes the new terminology of "hard analogue" and "soft analogue" to describe texts, which cannot be definitively proven to have served as the source text for a particular translation, but show remarkable similarities to it. A "hard analogue" is essentially a source text in all senses apart from that there is a lack of tangible evidence that the translator ever used it. Conversely, a "soft analogue" is a text that, despite its close textual similarities to the translation, may have been difficult or impossible for the translator to have used as a result of factors such as chronology. It should be noted that because of Chaucer's general lack of attribution of his translations, many of what are generally considered his sources would be defined as "hard analogues" in Beidler's terminology.

merchants (Rossignol, 2007: 61), and Chaucer himself was appointed responsible for England's import and export duties of wine and other merchandise not covered by wool customs (Rossignol, 2007: 8).

The *Shipman's Tale* recounts a story of deception, in which the frivolous wife of a miserly merchant approaches a monk with whom the merchant is good friends to ask for a one hundred frank loan to pay off her debts. Without the wife's knowledge, the monk borrows the money from her husband. Later, when the husband asks the monk to repay the loan, he replies that he has already given the money to the wife. Subsequently, when the husband asks his wife, she says:

> […] he hadde yeve it me bycause of yow| To doon therwith myn honour and my prow,| For cosynage, and eek for beele cheere| That he hath had ful ofte tymes here.| […]Ye han mo slakkere dettours than am I!| For I wol paye yow wel and redily| […]Ye shal my joly body have to wedde;| By God, I wol nat paye yow but abedde! (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 208)

This farcical confusion over payments illustrates Chaucer's thoroughness in transposing his translation out of the setting of its source. The events are closely modelled on *Decameron 8.1*, although here, the sum borrowed is not a hundred franks, but two hundred gold florins and the merchant's trip is not to Bruges, but to Genoa:

> "Tornato Guasparuolo da Genova, di presente Gulfardo, avendo appostato che insieme con la moglie era, se n'andò a lui e in presenza di lei disse: "Guasparruolo, i denari, cioè li dugento fiorin d'oro che l'altrier mi prestasti, non m'ebber luogo, per ciò che io non potei fornir la bisogna per la quale gli presi: e per ciò io gli recai qui di presente alla donna tua e sì gliele diedi, e per ciò dannerai la mia ragione.." (Scattergood, 2005: 573)
>
> [On Guasparruolo's return from Genoa, straight away, having ascertained that his wife would be there, Gulfardo went to him and said in front of her: "Guasparruolo, the money, the two hundred gold florins that you lent me the other day. I didn't need them, because I could not do the business that I borrowed them for, and so I brought them back here and gave them to your wife. Therefore, cancel my debt]

Chaucer's translation in the *Shipman's Tale* also exhibits a tendency to increase culturally specific details that is similar, but more pronounced to that seen in the *Franklin's Tale.* As a result, Chaucer's tale is much longer than either of his sources.

One reason for this disparity is that, unlike the source texts, throughout the tale, Chaucer continually reinforces the idea that the story is set in France, and that the husband and wife involved are a mercantile family. This fact is of greatest significance when we consider that Chaucer's target audience is believed to have been a mixture of the elite of the city of London and a small number of highly literate scholars (Strohm, 1989: 50), neither of whom would have identified themselves in large numbers with the mercantile classes[39]. As a result, it appears fairly clear that Chaucer's supplementing this tale with additional details had little to do with his audience having a greater degree of understanding of a merchant family's way of life than that of Boccaccio's *Decameron*. Thus, these details can be assumed to have little if any connection with insuring the comprehension of the target audience, nor do they obviously unlock otherwise implicit elements that are pivotal to the story. Rather, the aim in expanding the target text in this way appears to be to produce a new reaction to an existing story. The example above demonstrates the length at which Chaucer describes the merchant's journey to Bruges. The expanding tendency that runs through the translation is illustrated if this example is compared with the same event's relatively cursory treatment in *Decameron 8.1*:

> La donna, anzi cattiva femina, udendo questo fu contenta, e mandogli dicendo che Guasparruolo suo marito doveva ivi a pochi dì per sue bisogne andare insino a Genova, e allora ella gliele farebbe assapere e manderebbe per lui. (Scattergood, 2005: 571)
>
> [The lady, or rather the wretched woman, was glad to hear this, and sent word that her husband, Guasarruolo had to go on business as far as Genoa in a few days, and then she would let him know and send for him]

The evidence of such a clear goal of not only transposing the stories to settings distinct from those of either the source texts or target audience, but also adding a large amount of material to the translation to support this new setting is difficult to reconcile with the notion of translation as a fundamentally mediating practice. If Chaucer had intended to mediate, a certain amount of additional explicatory material

---

[39] Pounds (2005: 140) Observes that highly successful merchant families from the city would retire to the countryside, buy a small estate and join the ranks of the gentry, but would subsequently disassociate themselves with their mercantile origins.

may be expected. However, the approach exhibited in the *Shipman's* and *Franklin's Tales*, demonstrates little, if any, intention to represent or recreate the source texts. Rather, Chaucer appears to have appropriated the events described by the source texts and actively attempted to produce something radically new from them. In turn, this focus on innovation sets Chaucer's translation strategy apart from the mediation-based notion of facilitating a target audience's experience of a given source text.

Mediation and Source Text Perspective

The inference that Chaucer's aim in translating may have been more one of innovation than mediation is supported by evidence in other tales. The *Clerk's Tale* differs from both the *Franklin's Tale* and the *Shipman's Tale* in that it maintains the source's Piedmontese setting. It differs from its source, however, in the respect that it directly challenges the historical tendency to interpret the story it recounts in allegorical terms.

The *Clerk's Tale* is a story that depicts a certain ideal of the medieval wife. Griselda is a peasant woman, who is taken in marriage by Walter, Marquis of Saluzzo, in order to provide the latter with an heir. The story describes how Walter tests his wife by kidnapping her children and claiming they have been put to death, having his marriage to Griselda annulled, and forcing her to prepare the wedding celebrations for his new wife. Griselda is uncomplaining in the face of all of these tests and so, Walter is placated. She is ultimately remarried to him, and reunited with her children. The tale ends by stressing that "[f]ul many a yeer in heigh prosperitee| Lyven thise two in concord and in reste" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 152).

There are a several hard and soft analogues of the Griselda story that may have served the source text to this tale. Farrell and Goodwin (2002: 101) name the two most likely candidates as *Historia Griseldis* by Petrarch, and an anonymous French text, known as *Le Livre Griseldis*. The French text is itself a translation of Petrarch's Latin version (Farrell and Goodwin, 2002: 101). In turn, *Historia Griseldis* is a translation of the last story in Boccaccio's *Decameron*. Thus, these various translations of this story form a complex web of retellings, produced within a relatively short amount of time.

From the perspective of translation as mediation, one of the main features of interest in this text is the way that successive versions, beginning with Petrarch's

tend to accentuate the sense of intrigue over their sources (Farrell and Goodwin, 2002: 104). The examples below illustrate this growing suspense, by tracing the treatment of a single scene from one version to the next. The scene in question describes Griselda's separation from her infant daughter. The sequence begins with Boccaccio's Italian, then moves on to Petrarch's Latin and finishes with Chaucer's English:

"Egli m'ha comandato che io prenda questa vostra figliuola, e ch'io ...; e non disse più. La donna udendo le parole, e vedendo il viso del famigliare, e delle parole dette ricordandosi, comprese che acostui fosse imposto che egli l'uccidesse: (reproduced in Wagner and Boccaccio, 1826: 238)

[He has commanded me to take this daughter of yours and ...; and said no more. The lady heard his words, and seeing the face of the servant, and remembering the words she had been told earlier, understood that he had been commanded to kill her daughter]

Iussus sum hanc infantulam accipere, atque eam – Hic sermone arrupto, quasi crudele ministerium silencio exprimens, subticuit. Suspecta viri fama, suspecta facies, Suspecta hora, suspecta erat oracio, quibus etsi clare occisum iri dulcem filiam intelligeret, nec lacrimulam tamen ullam nec suspirium dedit. In nutrice quidem, ne dum in matre, durissimum. (reproduced in Farrell and Goodwin, 2002: 121)

[I am commanded to take this child and -." He stopped, as if he were expressing his cruel assignment silently. The man's reputation was suspicious. His expression was suspicious. The time was suspicious and his demand was suspicious. She was left in no doubt that her dear daughter was going to be killed. However, she let forth neither tears nor sighs. Behaviour like this would be stern in a nurse, not to mention a mother]

"This child I am commanded for to take" | And spak namoore, but out the child he hente| Despitiously, and gan a cheere make| As though he wolde han slayn it er he wente.| Grisildis moot al suffer and al consente,| And as a lamb she sitteth meke and stille,| Ad leet this crueel sergeant do his wille.

Suspecious was the diffame of this man, | Suspect his face, suspect his word also;| Suspect the tyme in which he this bigan.| Allas! Hir doghter that she loved so,| She wende he wolde han slawen it right tho.| But natheless she neither weep ne syked,| Conformynge hire to that the markys liked.

> But atte laste to speken she bigan,| And mekeley she to the sergeant preyed,| So as he was a worthy gentil man,| That she moste kisse hire child er that it deyde.| And in hir barm this litel child she leyde| With ful sad face, and gan the child to blisse,| And lulled it, and after gan it kisse. (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 144)

What is clear is the trend towards drawing out the Griselda character's suffering in this scene. Boccaccio's Italian description of the mother being forced to give up her child to execution appears almost perfunctory. By contrast, Chaucer's version builds on Petrarch's anaphoric use of the word "suspecta" [suspicious] to emphasize the pathos of the passage even further than the Latin version.

Petrarch's text gained popularity much more rapidly than Boccaccio's. By as little as a decade after Petrarch's death in 1374, it had already served as source to two French translations (Farrell and Goodwin, 2002: 130). These translations are Philippe de Mézières' *Le Miroir des Dames Mariées,* and *Le Livre Griseldis*, mentioned above (Farrell and Goodwin, 2002: 130). Farrell and Goodwin (2002: 130) go on to point out that de Mézières appears to have used the *Livre Griseldis* to inform his own translation. The two texts exhibit a number of corresponding variations from the Petrarchan text, as well as similarities in lexicon and sentence structure. The following example from Petrarch's text describes Griselda's elation when she is reunited with her children:

> Hec illa audiens, pene gaudio exanimis et pietate [amens] iocundissimisque cum lacrimis, suorum pignorum in amplexus ruit, fatigatque osculis, pioque gemitu madefacit (Historia Griseldis, Petrarch, reproduced in Farrell and Goodwin, 2002: 129)
>
> [Hearing this, she was almost overcome with joy and [frantic] devotion, with tears of delight, she hurriedly gathered them into her arms, wearied them with kisses, and covered them in her tears.]

When this Latin version is compared with the later French versions, however, it is clear that Griselda's joy has been exaggerated somewhat, such that in both texts she is portrayed as fainting:

> Et quant Griseldis oÿ ces nouvelles, toute pasmee et avenoiee, ainsi que le marquis l'avoit embrassié, se laissa cheoir. (*Le Livre Griseldis*, reproduced in Farrell and Goodwin, 2002: 165)
>
> [And when Griselda heard this news, felt faint and dizzy, just as the marquis took her in his arms, she swooned]

> Griseldis ne put supporter tant de joie à la fois. Elle tomba sans connaissance. Quand les secours qu'on lui prodigua lui eurent fait reprendre ses sens, elle prit les deux enfants, les couvrit de baisers et de larmes et les tint longtemps serrés sur son cœur. (Griseldis, de Mézières, reproduced in Tarsot et al., 1914: 53)
>
> [Griselda was overjoyed. She fell unconscious. When she was revived and had regained her senses, she took the two children, covered them with kisses and tears and long held them tightly against her heart.]

Chaucer also appears to have drawn on the interpretation provided by the *Livre Griseldis* to enrich his translation from Petrarch's text. In his translation too, Griselda swoons when she is reunited with her children:

> Al sodeynly she swapte adoun to grounde.| And in hire swough so sadly holdeth she| Hire children two, whan she gan hem t'embrace, [...] (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 151)

However, Chaucer also links his own translation to Petrarch's text explicitly. In the prologue to the tale, he has the clerk narrator say "Fraunceys Petrak, the lauriat poete,| Highte this clerk, whos rethorike sweete| Enlumyned al Ytaille of poetrie,|[...] That taught me this tale, as I bigan" (31-33 Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 137). This is an uncharacteristically direct attribution for Chaucer in the *Canterbury Tales*. It is, therefore, ironic that the evidence above strongly suggests that Chaucer's source material is by no means limited to the text he accredits, but also includes other translations of the same story.

With this complex set of interrelationships between the antecedent texts to the *Clerk's Tale* in mind, it is perhaps surprizing that Chaucer chooses to omit a feature that runs throughout so many versions of the story. This feature is a strongly allegorical interpretation of Griselda's tranquillity in the face of Walter's various tests. The first signs of this allegory appear in Petrarch's translation, which even includes a passage at the end of the story, casting it as an exemplum of Christian virtue or a model for wives (Farrell and Goodwin, 2002: 104):

> Hanc historiam stilo nunc alio retexere visum fuit, non tam ideo, ut matronas nostri temporis ad imitandam huius uxoris pacienciam, que michi vix mutabilis videtur, quam ut legentes ad imitandam saltem femine constanciam excitarem, ut quod hec viro suo prestitit, hoc prestare deo nostro audeant [...] (From

Petrarch's Epistolae Seniles XVII.3, reproduced in Farrell and Goodwin, 2002: 125)

[This story has been unravelled in another style, not so much to encourage the women of our own time to imitate the patience of his wife, which hardly seems changeable to me. Rather, in order to inspire readers to imitate the womanly constancy she showed to her husband, but towards God […]]

The French translations do more than simply incorporate this allegorical slant. Both of them enhance it by vilifying Walter and expanding the concluding note on the allegory of the tale (Farrell and Goodwin, 2002: 132, 166). De Mézières also chooses to include the translation as the fourth and final book of *Le Livre de la Vertu du Sacrement de Mariage [The Book on the Virtue of the Sacrament of Marriage]* and so, directly compares it with other texts that treat allegorical themes of good wifely practice.

Chaucer's translation can be thought of as a direct challenge in the form of parody to this increasing tendency to interpret the Griselda story as an exemplum for medieval wives. The *Clerk's Tale* ostensibly retains the tone of an exemplum, but exaggerates it to the point of mockery: "I trowe that to a norice in this cas| It had been hard this reuthe for to se;| Wel myghte a mooder thane han cryd 'allas!'| But natheles so sad stidefast was she| that she endured al adversitee," (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 144). The flow of the text is also continually interrupted by the narrator, who periodically interjects to condemn Walter's actions: "This Markys caughte yet another lest| To tempte his wyf yet ofter, if he may.| O nedelees was she tempted in assay!| But wedded men ne knowe no mesure, What that they fynde a pacient creature" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 145). However, it is when the tale ends and Chaucer tackles the explicit statement illustrating the story's allegorical interpretation that Chaucer's text stands most emphatically alone. Chaucer does not omit this passage, but includes it in a form that parodies the version produced by de Mézières:

O noble wyves, ful of heigh prudence,| Lat noon humylitee youre tonge naille,| Ne lat no clerk have cause or diligence| To write of yow a storie of swich mervaille| As of Grisildis pacient and kynde,| […] Be ay of chiere as light as leef on lynde,| And lat hym care, and wepe, and wrynge, and waille! (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 153)

Finally, when the tale is finished and the focus returns to the *Canterbury Tales'* frame narrative, Chaucer continues to deny any allegory in the story by drawing attention to the unobtainable standards espoused by his predecessor translators. He compares the saint-like actions of Griselda with a less idealized woman. Chaucer has the merchant narrator begin his own tale with a personal response to the *Clerk's Tale*, which says "[t]her is a long and large difference| Betwix Grisildis grete pacience| And of my wyf the passing crueltee" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 153).

In the *Clerk's Tale*, therefore, Chaucer has gone to great lengths to create a novel interpretation of the story's material without descending to the level of farce. His retention of the arguably obscure Piedmontese setting of his tale complements the inference that his adoption of a Breton setting in the *Franklin's Tale,* or that of St Denis in the *Shipman's Tale* had little to do with his audience's familiarity with each location or its culture. Moreover, his animated refutation of the traditionally allegorical interpretation of the Griselda story as a model for wifely virtue complements the inference that Chaucer's aim was primarily to innovate.

Separating Story from Message

Chaucer produces a similar effect in his translation of the *Second Nun's Tale*. Indeed, the subject of this tale is similar to that of the *Clerk's Tale*. The *Second Nun's Tale* is a hagiography, recounting the life story of an early Christian martyr, called Saint Cecilia. The story describes Cecilia living in pre-Christian Rome, and defying the authorities by converting a number of individuals to Christianity. She is described continuing to preach even while her own death sentence is being carried out (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 269). As will be illustrated below, this story was extremely popular during Chaucer's lifetime, and conveyed within a large number of texts in various European languages. For this reason, it is logical to infer that the story would have been well known throughout medieval Europe. It is, perhaps surprizing, therefore, that Chaucer approaches this translation in a similar way to that seen in other tales, and actively introduces innovation. Chaucer achieves innovation in this tale in a way that reflects the *Clerk's Tale*. He challenges the accepted interpretation of the main character, not by undermining the tale's credibility, but by subtly enhancing pre-existing elements. In this way, Chaucer is able to mould his female saint protagonist into a much more assertive, argumentative, and active

individual than is appreciable from the source material. As a result, the message conveyed by Chaucer's translation is one of single-minded resistance to religious oppression, while his source material rather describes the tragic victimization of a woman, murdered for her beliefs.

The story of Saint Cecilia appeared as the Latin text *Passio Sancta Caeciliae* sometime between the late 5th and early 6th-century (Reames, 1990: 337). It was subsequently incorporated a number of times into successive collections of hagiographies, as well as liturgical materials, used on Saints' feast days. Naturally, some of these liturgical retellings were more widely used than others. One of the more obscure versions is known as *In Festo Sancte Cecilie Virginis et Martyris,* which was used only at Matins on St Cecilia's feast day (Reames, 2002: 494). The text's author is unknown and is not mentioned in any surviving breviaries of any British rite (Reames, 2002: 494). Indeed, since it acted as one of Chaucer's sources, it is interesting that this text has so far been found only in breviaries and office lectionaries written for the Vatican, the Franciscans and other communities that adopted the use of the Roman Curia [Consuetudinem Curie Romane]. (Reames, 2002: 495)

Another antecedent text for this tale stands in stark contrast to the relative obscurity of this liturgical text. Indeed, among medieval collections of hagiographies and even among medieval texts in general, there are few that can rival de Voragine's *Legenda Aurea* in terms of popularity (Reames, 1985: 3). The text survives in some 800 Latin manuscripts and many dozens of translated texts in every vernacular in Europe, dating from between the 13th and 15th-centuries (Reames, 1985: 4). Subsequently, the text would become one of the first books to be printed in Latin, and its French and English translations by Jean de Vignay and William Caxton respectively would enjoy the same honour in their respective languages (see Blake, 1991: 27, Butler, 1899: 12, and Walsby, 2011: 37). *In Festo Sancte Cecilie Virginis et Martyris,* and the Cecilia legend in *Legenda Aurea* are both Latin texts that employed *Passio Sancta Caeciliae* as their sources, each adapting the story according to the requirements of their respective target audiences. For the *Legenda Aurea*, this audience consisted chiefly of clerics belonging to the Dominican order, who would rely upon it as source material for retellings to illustrate lessons to the laity (Reames, 1985: 101). The target audience of *In Festo Sancte Cecilie Virginis et Martyris*, by contrast, consisted of members of monastic orders (Reames, 2002: 495). As a result,

each text focuses on, and emphasizes particular elements of the story, while omitting or editing others. Put very generally, *In Festo* spends more time describing the activities of the saint, while the *Legenda Aurea* puts more emphasis on passages of doctrinal discourse (Reames, 2002: 495).

As a result of the overwhelming success of the *Legenda Aurea* during the medieval period, its somewhat heavier style of retelling the story (Reames, 1985: 205) can be thought of as having become the orthodox, or at least, the most frequently encountered version of the story by the time Chaucer came to produce his own translation. Chaucer, however, did not subscribe to either the arguably dry style employed by de Voragine, or the more active style of *In Festo*. Instead, he appears to have synthesized the two texts in order to create a depiction of the Saint that is not only animated, but also argumentative.

This synthesis was not achieved by interweaving the two texts throughout Chaucer's tale. Rather, it was achieved in an arguably simpler way, by employing one text for the source of the first half of the translation, and the other for the second half. This approach to translation meant that the more brisk sequences at the beginning of the text, involving Cecilia's early life and wedding, her husband's encounters with an angel and the pope, and the conversion of her brother-in-law to Christianity are all translated from the *Legenda Aurea*. Conversely, the various dialogues between the saint and the Roman officials, the account of Cecilia's conversion of her gaoler's whole household, her sentence, and ultimately, execution are all translated from *In Festo*.

Apart from direct textual comparison, there is another clue that a shift in translation activity occurs around line 342-4 (Reames, 1978: 114). The reason that this change is even perceivable is that unlike any of his sources, which are all in prose, Chaucer chose to render his translation in the complicated verse form known as *rhyme royal*, which is a seven line stanza, consisting of an a-b-a-b-b-c-c rhyme scheme[40]. The difficulty of translating into such a complex rhyme scheme makes it reasonable to infer that an individual would require a substantial amount of practice in order to achieve naturalness of expression. Indeed, the level of skill apparent in each of the two halves differs to such a degree that it has been suggested Chaucer produced the first half of this tale several years before the second (Reames, 2002: 496). Put simply,

---

[40] The *rhyme royal* stanza is more fully explored in Chapter 2 (106) and revisited in Chapter 4 (162).

in the first half, Chaucer compartmentalizes the story into units, each of which are treated within a discreet, self-contained stanza. As a result, Chaucer is also required to draw out some passages, and occasionally even resort to repetition (Reames, 2002: 496). Consider the repetition in the example below, which creates the tautology that if one is slain, one will die:

> And if that he may feelen, out of drede,| That ye me touche, or love in vileynye,| He right anon *wol sle yow with the dede*,| And in youre yowthe *thus ye shullen dye*;| And if that ye in clene love me gye,| He wol yow loven as me, for youre clennesse,| And shewen yow his joye and his brightnesse. (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 264, emphasis added)

Conversely, in the second half of the tale, there is no such compartmentalization. Instead, themes and events flow from one stanza to the next in a much more fluent style. As a result, unwieldy repetition ceases (Reames, 2002: 496):

> It were ful hard by ordre for to seyn| How manye wondres Jhesus for hem wroghte;| But ate laste, to tellen short and pleyn,| The sergeantz of the toun of Rome hen sought,| And hen biforn Almache, the prefect, brought,| Which hem apposed, and knew al hire entente,| And to the ymage of Juppiter hem sente,
>
> And seyde, "Whoso wol nat sacrifise,| Swape of his heed; this my sentence heer." (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 267)

While this shift in competency supports the inference that Chaucer employed more than one source text in the production of the *Second Nun's Tale*, the effect of this jump from one source text to the other was to create a version of the Saint Cecilia legend that is unlike any of its antecedents.

In much the same way as the *Clerk's Tale*, the impression that the *Second Nun's Tale* creates from its protagonist is one quite unlike that of either the orthodox impression of one source text or the divergent impression of the other. Furthermore, much like the *Franklin's Tale*, the *Second Nun's Tale* does not appear to anticipate the cultural understanding of the target audience. If it is compared with other medieval vernacular translations of the same text, Chaucer's text demonstrates a notable tendency to retain elements that are particular to ancient Rome, as will be explored more fully in Chapter 2 (82). These elements include a description of the character Almachius as "the prefect" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 267), unlike other medieval English translations of the Cecilia legend such as those found in the

anonymous *Gilte Legende* and *Ashmole 43* (see Lovewell, 1898: 88). Instead of using the Latin-derived "prefect" as Chaucer does, these two earlier English translations describe Almachius as the "provost" or "justice", using more common domestic French-derived terms. Similarly, Chaucer uses expressions like "Gooth forth to Via Appia" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 264), where the two other translations both render the toponym as "the Appian way" (see Hamer and Russell, 2007: 652, Lovewell, 1898: 74). All of these elements add to the picture of Chaucer as a translator who was, in some senses, less concerned about pandering to his target audience's grasp of the minutiae of his text, and more interested in creating an impression of the text's characters that is unlike any of those produced by his predecessor text producers. Indeed, Chaucer's actions illustrate that the inherently mediation-based conception of translation even pervades the discipline's terminology. Terms such as 'target text' do not appear fully appropriate to describe his approach to translation. The image of a target implies an aim of mediation on the part of the translator, with the source text as the starting point and the translated text as the text aimed at in order to reach a specific target audience or reader. Chaucer appears to have been much less interested in the conveyance of a source text to a particular audience or reader, and much more interested in ways he could produce something new through translation.

Mediation and Translating Faithfully

A factor that further problematizes the contemporary use of terminology such as source and target texts is the fact that the *Shipman's Tale* and the *Second Nun's Tale* are not alone in the *Canterbury Tales* in drawing directly from more than one source text. In many cases, as with the *Clerk's* and *Franklin's Tales*, Chaucer employs a primary source text for the main body of the story, and a number of secondary sources, which may be translations from the same primary to inform the creation of his own translation. In cases such as the *Merchant's Tale,* however, Chaucer's use of multiple source texts is more complex. Here, Chaucer also incorporates scenes that are particular to one or more of the secondary sources into his translation and so, embroiders his texts in an innovative way.

The *Merchant's Tale* examines the theme of marital fidelity. It involves an elderly bachelor called January, who is introduced deliberating on the subject of marriage

and the best kind of woman. Eventually, January decides to get married, and chooses a girl called May as his bride. Subsequently, January loses his sight and has May remain by his side at all times to assist him. Meanwhile, May finds herself drawn to Damian, one of January's servants, and seeks a way to be alone with him. Damian hides in January's garden, and when May and January arrive, Damian meets May in the branches of a pear tree. January finds his sight is suddenly restored to him just in time to see May and Damian together in the pear tree. In response to January's understandably angry protestations, the ingenious May replies:

> […] Sire, what eyleth yow?| Have pacience and resound in youre mynde.| I have yow holpe on bothe youre eyen blynde.| Up peril of my soule, I shal nat lyen,| As me was taught, to heele with youre eyen,| Was no thyng bet, to make yow to see,| Than strugle with a man upon a tree (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 167).

Antecedents to this comical tale are attested in a large number of European and Arabic texts (Thompson, 2005: 480). However, Chaucer's translation is unique in the sequence of events it relays, the resulting allegory, and the sense that January brought about his own misfortune by choosing a wife who is too young for him. Regarding the primary source for this tale, direct links have been drawn between the *Merchant's Tale* and *Novella LVII* of the Italian story collection known as *Le Cento Novelle Antiche,* or alternatively, *Il Novellino* (Dempster, 1936: 154). *Novella LVII* includes many of the events and particulars of Chaucer's tale, including the rich man, the pear tree, and even the wife's quick-witted response:

> Alora disse a la donna: Che fate voi co' cotesto homo? non è onore ned a voi ed a me, et non è lealtà di donna. Et la donna rispuose incontanente di subito, et disse: S'io non avessi fatto chosíe con chostui, tue non n'averesti mai veduto lume. (from Guido Biagi, ed., Le Novelle Antiche dei Codici, reproduced in Thompson, 2005: 521)
>
> [Then he said to the lady: What are you doing with this man? This is not honourable to you or I, and it is not fitting for a lady. And the lady replied immediately, and said: If I had not done this thing with him, you would never again have seen light]

Skeletally similar as these two texts are, however, a number of important elements of the *Merchant's Tale* are not present in *Il Novellino*. Notably, these elements

include the sense that May is not entirely to blame for her actions, the fact that January is of considerable age, that the marriage is one of convenience due to January's wealth, and that May is disappointed with January's efforts on the wedding night. However, the fact that these elements are not to be found in *Il Novellino* does not mean that they are the products of Chaucer's imagination. All of these elements can be found scattered across other antecedent texts. For example, January's wealth, and the relevance of the wedding night to marital infidelity can be found in *Decameron 2.10*:

> La quale il giudice menata con grandissima festa a casa sua, e fatte le nozze belle e magnifiche, pur per la prima notte incappò una volta, per consumare il matrimonio, a toccarla; e di poco fallò che egli quella una non fece tavola: il quale poi la mattina, ciccome colui che era magro e secco e di poco spirito, convenne che con vernaccia e con cenfetti ristorativi e con alri argomenti nel mondo si ritornasse. (Boccaccio and Foscolo, 1825: 217).
>
> [The judge brought her home with great ceremony, and organised a spectacular wedding ceremony, but on the first night, when he made to consummate the marriage, things did not go in his favour: for in the morning, his frame was lean, dry, and withered, and could only be restored with vernage and with artificial restoratives and with other remedies.]

Despite Chaucer's extensive expansion and accentuation during translation, this passage can still be compared directly with a correspondent in the *Merchant's Tale*:

> Soone after that, this hastif Januarie| Wolde go to bedde; he wolde no lenger tarye.| He drynketh ypocras, clarree, and vernage| Of spices hoote t'encreessen his corage;| […] Thus laboureth he til that the day gan dawe;| And thane he taketh a sop in fyn claree,| And upright in his bed thane sitteth he,| […] The slakke skyn aboute his nekke shaketh| Whil that he sang. So chaunteth he and craketh (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 161).

Additional elements can also be found in *Decameron 7.9* (Beidler, 1973: 270-271), which also contains the theme of marital infidelity and a pear tree. However, none of the sources mentioned thus far include material that could have served as the source for January's deliberation on brides, which makes up almost one third of the tale's full length. For the main source of this part of the tale, we must look to an entirely different kind of text and a different language.

Small sections of this deliberation are derived from shorter texts, such as *Epistola adversus Jovinianum* by St Jerome, and *Liber Consolationis et Consilii* by Albertano of Brescia. However, much of what is expressed in January's discourse on marriage is inspired by *Le Miroir de Mariage* by Eustache Deschamps (Thompson, 2005: 479). This text is a long French poem, in which a number of allegorical characters discuss the question of marriage (Thompson, 2005: 481). There is some evidence that Deschamps may have still been working on the *Miroir* after Chaucer's death in 1400, and so, Chaucer may have used some earlier, incomplete version of the text as his source[41] (Deschamps et al., 2003: 34-35). As a result, it is difficult to draw direct parallels between the complete version of the *Miroir* and the *Merchant's Tale*. However, it is equally difficult to deny the close resemblance of certain passages, including the following excerpt on advice. Deschamps' text is followed here by the corresponding section in the *Merchant's Tale*:

> Et si me samble que je vis,| Comme je fu enfant d'escole,| De Salemon une parole,| […]Qu'om ne doit nulle chose faire| Sanz conseil, car qui de lui euvre,| A bonne fin vient de son euvre […] (Deschamps et al., 2001: 19)
> [And it seems to me that I saw,| When I was a child at school,| A saying of Solomon,| […] That a man should not do anything| Without advice, for he who works on advice| Achieves good things from his works […]]

> To weyven fro the word of Salomon.| This word seyde he unto us everychon| 'Wirk alle thing by conseil,' thus seyde he,| 'And thane shaltow nat repente thee' (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 157).

All of the other tales examined thus far have tended to focus on secondary source texts of a similar text type and genre, or even analogues of the same story. The *Shipman's Tale*, for instance, used two sources that both focused on the themes of a wife's infidelity while her husband is otherwise disposed. Similarly, the *Second Nun's Tale* was translated from two adaptations of a single source text. By contrast, the use for a large proportion of the fabliau-style *Merchant's Tale* of a long, satirical

---

[41] This relationship between the *Merchant's Tale* and the *Miroir de Mariage* is a good illustration of Beidler's (1999) notion of the "soft analogue". It is problematic to claim that Chaucer used the *Miroir* as his source because it was not published until the year of his death. However, this does not mean that Chaucer did make use of the text in some prior, incomplete form.

poem as the source demonstrates that Chaucer did not limit his choice of source to closely related texts in terms of text type or genre.

This kind of eclectic gathering of materials from a variety of source texts clarifies our image of Chaucer's intentions in translating. It appears that Chaucer's focus in translating had much more to do with the production of the translation itself, rather than some perceived duty to the source material and the target audience's access to it. This inference is supported by the fact that the England that Chaucer inhabited was anything but monolingual[42]. Indeed, Chaucer's engagement with many French and Latin sources is significant, given that these, along with English were working languages for the groups identified above as Chaucer's audience (Crespo, 2000: 24). If Chaucer had any notion of mediating between obscure source texts and his target audience, his choices of source languages and in many cases source texts was at best confusing. Frequently, the texts Chaucer uses as his sources are very widely attributed, and written in languages that his audience would have understood. Examples of these very well-known sources include the *Legenda Aurea*, which Reames (1985: 3) goes so far as to call a "best seller" and a "medieval institution"; and various works by Petrarch, whose fame during his own lifetime is described by Rossiter (2010: 134) as "immense". As a result, it seems reasonable to infer that if Chaucer's goal had been to mediate between his audience and the source texts he used, his role would have been more one of librarian or book distributor than translator. The creation of new, English-language texts in these cases would have been largely redundant.

An Alternative to Mediation

If Chaucer's goal was not to mediate then, what could it have been, and how does it relate to the work of his contemporaries? Having identified both the context in which Chaucer's translations were produced and a number of prominent phenomena within those texts, abductive reasoning challenges us to go on to ask what in Chaucer's cultural context might have prompted his actions. The noted features of Chaucer's translation practice have included an eclectic adoption of source material from a variety of source texts, shifts in pivotal elements of various stories such as their

---

[42] The multilingual nature of medieval England was illustrated in the introductory chapter (20)

settings in a way that does not necessarily promote target audience comprehension, and the act of deliberately drawing out already long and repetitious passages. The aim, therefore, is to ask which feature of medieval thinking, if accepted by Chaucer, would have encouraged practices such as those observed above, and so, make them predictable.

One notion of particular relevance in this respect is known as *excogitatio*. Medievalist Robert Edwards (1999: 228) describes this originally classical notion, which Chaucer, Boccaccio and their contemporary text producers inherited, not as a form of textual appropriation, but creation. Confusingly perhaps, *excogitatio* [from thought] is not the same as originality in the contemporary sense. It was an established procedure in the middle ages for working existing material into new forms. The procedure begins with a critical reading of the source text. The translator notes what has been said, and crucially, what has not. Subsequently, a target text can be produced that builds primarily on those avenues that have not yet been explored. Evidence that this classical conception of text production remained current into the Middle Ages can be found in the work of Geoffrey of Vinsauf, who was active around year 1200 (Parr and of Vinsauf, 1968: 38). Chaucer draws directly on the work of this medieval grammarian in his *Troilus and Criseyde* (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 1030), and the evidence above suggests that he also subscribes to his advocacy of being silent where the source text speaks, and speaking where the source text is silent (see Edwards, 1999: 28):

> Primus modus est ne moremur ubi moram faciunt alii; sed, ubi moram faciunt, transeamus, ubi transeunt, moram faciamus. […]. Secundus modus est ne sequamur vestigia verborum, […] sed universitatem materiae spéculantes ibi dicamus aliquid ubi dixerunt nihil, et ubi dixerunt aliquid, nos nihil ; quod etiam prius, nos posterius, et e converso; […](Geoffrey of Vinsauf, reproduced in Faral, 1924: 309-310)

> [The first mode is that we do not delay where others delay; but where they delay, let us go on; where they go on, let us delay. […]. The second mode is that we should not follow the pattern of the words, […] but rather looking at the whole of the material, let us say something at that point where they have said nothing, and where they have said something, we will say nothing; what they said first, let us say later and conversely; […]] (translated in Parr and of Vinsauf, 1968: 85)

Furthermore, by observing Chaucer's translation methodology in cases such as the *Merchant's Tale* above, where more than one source text has been drawn on, it is possible to infer that Vinsauf's idea of not following the "vestigia verborum" [tracks of the words] worked on a number of different levels. Chaucer's translations innovated on all of their sources concurrently, and his texts produced effects that differed from those of all of his source texts, not merely the main or primary source. Furthermore, in cases such as the *Clerk's Tale*, where a story has been translated a number of times prior to Chaucer, each creating a number of different innovative interpretations, Chaucer's own text still aims to unlock a fresh understanding from the text.

Geoffrey of Vinsauf's theorizing of text production builds on that of his classical predecessors such as Cicero, who, in *De Inventione* (1.7.9) was an earlier champion of the notion of *excogitatio*:

> Quare materia quidem nobis rhetoricae videtur artis ea, quam Aristoteli visam esse diximus[…], inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria, pronuntiatio. Inventio est excogitatio rerum verarum aut veri similium, quae causam probabilem reddant.
>
> [Therefore, those appear to us to be the proper materials of rhetoric indeed. As we have said, these appear to be described by Aristotle. These are the divisions of rhetoric […]: Invention; Arrangement; Elocution; Memory; Delivery. Invention is imagining[43] and selecting things that appear true and probable […]]

A notable absence from both of these conceptualizations of text production is the notion of fidelity to a source. Instead, Geoffrey of Vinsauf's text in particular appears to describe ways that translation was used to create original texts. In this way, translations were not inherently secondary to their sources but were also not seen as superseding them. Excitingly, the methodology illustrated in these theoretical texts of "amplifying themes and incidents left undeveloped in […] sources, and […] abbreviating material therein developed at length" (Gallo, 1971: 224) appears to be very clearly exemplified in Chaucer's own translation activities. Parr (1968: 32) describes the relationship of practice in medieval poetry and theories such as those of Geoffrey of Vinsauf:

---

[43] Please note that "excogitatio" has been translated here as "imagining".

> Medieval poetry was typical and idealized; its making for the most part was a process of fitting the ideal into proper form. The form like the matter idealized came to be fixed, and because technique itself seemed to be the only freedom for the practicing poet, he aimed at formal perfection. Poetry became an arrangement of intellect and the work the poet made came to be judged by the perfection of his form.

Thus, text production was predominantly appraised in terms of the degree to which it conformed to theory. One powerful testament comes from Eustache Deschamps, Chaucer's contemporary, source author for part of the *Merchant's Tale*, and analogue for part of the *Wife of Bath's Tale*. The famously Anglophobic Deschamps even wrote a panegyric to Chaucer's skill as a translator, saying "[…] Eustaces sui, qui de mon plant aras:| Mais pran en gré les euvres d'escolier| Que par Clifford de moy avoir pourras,| Grant translateur, noble Geffroy Chaucier! […]" (*Grant Translateur, Noble Geffroy Chacucier*, reproduced in Deschamps et al., 2003: 85-86) [I am Eustache, you will have some of my plantings| But take graciously my school-boyish work| Which will reach you through Clifford| Great translator, noble Geoffrey Chaucer!]

Conclusions

This chapter has used abductive reasoning to analyse Chaucer's translation practices in the Canterbury Tales. Specifically, it has aimed to ascertain if mediation in the sense seen in this thesis' corpus can be used to describe Chaucer's attitude to translation. Using the interpretation of abduction illustrated in the introductory chapter (42) this chapter highlighted features that characterize Chaucer's translation practices, and then attempted to find the conditions that, if present, would make these features to be expected. Within this analysis, the chapter examined a variety of practices that could be viewed as idiosyncratic of Chaucer's translations. These practices include shifting a tale from one exotic setting to another, employing multiple source texts in the creation of a single translation, and expanding greatly on the detail contained in a source text with no apparent goal of improving target audience comprehension.

When the chapter examined the conditions that might make translation activities like these predictable, it began by asking if a culture of mediation, in which translations are made to function as representations or re-creations of their source

text is a realistic candidate. However, given that such practices are not in evidence within any of the corpus' mediation-based case studies, it appears highly unlikely that the practices would be the direct product of this conceptualization of translation. Rather, it was found that in a culture conceptualizing translation in terms of the notion of *excogitatio*, wherein the aim of a translation is to produce an innovative interpretation on source material, all of the identified features and practices are predictable.

In order to reach these conclusions, the chapter examined the notions of mediation and *excogitatio* in detail. It found that where translation is viewed as a form of mediation, it is often perceived as a way to reconcile an otherwise inaccessible source text with an interested target audience. Conversely, in a culture of translation that pivots on *excogitatio*, the translation is under no obligation to represent the source text to the target audience, or create functions that parallel for the target audience those that define the source text. On the contrary, the *excogitatio*-based understanding of translation urges translators not to follow the source text's lead but to take every opportunity to depart from it that arises.

Thus, while Chaucer's translation activities appear at best curious when viewed through an understanding of translation centring on mediation, they seem much more logical, and highly conducive to an understanding of translation that revolves around *excogitatio*.

With these findings in mind, it appears most likely that in translating, Chaucer had little or no intention of mediating between source and target in the sense of making a text available to a new audience. Rather, it appears abundantly likely that Chaucer's intention was to make something new from antecedent material. He achieves this innovation by altering settings, characterization, and versification, as well as by introducing material from other sources. In many cases, Chaucer retains acquired cultural specificities, but elsewhere, he adds new ones that can be arguably more particular to the chosen setting. The effect is to create a collection of translations with a highly variable and complex set of relationships to their sources, as well as to one another.

What are the implications of this innovating strategy for the study of Chaucer's texts as translations? Do the theories present within contemporary translation studies allow for a form of translation in which mediation is not the goal? Armed with the findings of this chapter, that Chaucer's translation activities should most properly be

viewed as innovations of, rather than mediations for their source texts, Chapter 2 will observe the ability of contemporary translation studies theories to analyse Chaucer's texts. Chapter 2 will work on the understanding that mediation is currently the prevailing conception of translation and may have been influential in the formulation of these theories. It will attempt to discern if these theories' assumption that mediation is the presumed goal of the translator has implications for their ability to analyse a translation strategy that has been found to be non-mediating.

CHAPTER 2

Help or Hindrance:

Using Contemporary Theories to Analyse Chaucer's Translations

Introduction

Chapter 1 examined the relationships between Chaucer's translations and their source texts. It found that Chaucer and his contemporaries saw translation not as a form of mediation, but as a way to innovate on extant material. The originally classical notion of *excogitatio*, or speaking where the source text is silent and remaining silent where the source text speaks, was noted as a remarkably helpful way to understand how Chaucer might have conceptualized his actions.

This chapter will consider the impact the difference between a mediating strategy and one of *excogitatio* may have on the use of theory in analysing Chaucer's translations. It will explore to what extent explicitation, foreignization, and domestication, the translation studies theories identified in the introductory chapter as dominant, can be used to describe Chaucer's translation strategies. It will observe the features of Chaucer's translations that correspond to features predicted by the respective theories, and ask to what extent these theories can be used to analyse a form of translation that has the notion of *excogitatio* at its centre.

Explicitation and Innovation

Of all of the *Canterbury Tales*, The *Tale of Melibee* is, perhaps, the text that appears to demonstrate more clearly than any other Chaucer's use of explicitation. The tale is a translation of the work known as *Le Livre de Melibée et de Dame Prudence,* written *by* Dominican friar Renaud de Louens in 1337 (Askins, 2002: 321). This French text is, in turn, a translation of the Latin text *Liber consolationis et consilii*, which was written by the Italian jurist Albertano of Brescia in 1246 (Askins, 2002: 322). This Latin treatise, like the *Legenda Aurea* observed in Chapter 1 (69), is extremely widely attested in surviving medieval manuscripts. There are at least 35 manuscripts containing the Latin source text, 140 containing a translation into a

European vernacular other than English, and some 64 containing Chaucer's English translation (Askins, 2002: 322).

Chaucer's tale centres on a man called Melibee, who arrives home to find that his wife, Prudence has been beaten by three of Melibee's enemies, and their daughter has been attacked and left for dead. What ensues is a discussion between the man and wife, in which Melibee's impassioned reaction to the affront is countered, and ultimately quelled by the more pragmatic approach of Dame Prudence:

> Whanne Melibee hadde herd the grete skiles and resouns of dame Prudence, and hire wise informaciouns and techynges,| his herte gan enclyne to the wil of his wif, considerynge hir trewe entente,| and conformed hym anon and assented fully to werken after hir conseil,| and thonked God, of whom procedeth al vertu and alle goodnesse, that hym sente a wyf of so greet discrecioun. (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 239)

Since the narrative elements of the tale are dwarfed by the ensuing debate, it is reasonable to infer that the main function of the story is simply to encapsulate the discussion. Nonetheless, it is significant, perhaps, that the setting chosen for this encapsulation is that of a family home, as this means the wise Prudence is directly comparable to wise, heroic, or stoic wives in other of Chaucer's tales. A notable example is Griselda from the *Clerk's Tale*, who, as illustrated in Chapter 1 (61), is directly and favourably compared with the Merchant narrator's own wife. Indeed, Chaucer treats Dame Prudence in a remarkably similar manner. Just as Griselda is praised in the prologue to the *Merchant's Tale*, in the prologue to the *Monks' Tale*, the Host, directly compares Prudence with his own wife:

> I hadde levere than a barel of ale| That Goodelief, my wyf, hadde herd this tale!|For she nys no thing of swich pacience| As was this Melibeus wyf Prudence.| By Goddes bones, whan I bete my knaves,| She bryngeth me forth the grete clobbed staves,| And crieth, 'Slee the dogges everichoon,| And brek hem, bothe bak and every boon!' (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 240)

Askins (2002: 324) notes that this distinctly domestic setting is one of the features that resulted from innovation on the part of de Louens' French translation. Unlike the French and English translations, the Latin source text does not limit itself to discussing forgiveness, but examines a variety of other issues:

related to public policy, such matters as defence spending (chapter 35), the kind of thinking that should inform declarations of war (chapters 46–48), and policy towards the poor (chapter 45). She also discusses the value of scholars and scholarship (chapter 10) and herself offers abstract, scholastic discussions of such matters as prudence (chapter 6–9), the nature of power (chapter 36) and the will of God (chapter 38). (Askins, 2002: 324)

However, the fact that de Louens included an innovation that Chaucer also incorporated does not fully describe Chaucer's own treatment of the text. Chaucer does omit a sizeable amount of material from his translation. Nonetheless, Chaucer's text has frequently been noted for its stylistic and structural similarity to its French source (see e.g. Rossignol, 2007: 261). Compare, for example, the similarities between the passages below. These passages are taken from de Louens' and Chaucer's texts respectively, in which Prudence encounters the men who assaulted her and conveys their sentiments to Melibee:

> Dame Prudence, quant ot oÿe la response d'eulz, si leur commande aler en leurs lieux secretement, et elle d'autre part retourna vers Mellibee son seigneur et lui reconta comment elle les avoit trovez repentans et recognoissans leurs pechiez et appareilliez de souffrir toute pene, requerans sa pitié et sa misericorde. (reproduced in Askins, 2002: 402)
>
> [Dame Prudence, when she had heard their response, ordered them to go and conceal themselves, and for her part, she returned to Mellibee, her lord and told him how she had found them repentant and acknowledging their sins and ready to suffer any pain, imploring him for his pity and his mercy]

> Whan dame Prudence hadde herd the answeres of thise men, she bad hem goon agayn prively;| and she retourned to hir lord Melibee, and tolde hym how she foond his adversaries ful repentant,| knowelechynge ful lowely hir synnes and trespas, and how they were redy to suffren al peyne,| requirynge and preiynge hym of mercy and pitee. (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 237)

This example not only demonstrates the very close parallels that can be drawn between Chaucer's translation of the Melibee story and that of de Louens. It also illustrates an idiosyncrasy of Chaucer's translation strategy in using two synonyms to translate a single term.

Collocation as Gloss

The examples in the passage above are "synnes and trespass" to translate "pechiez", and "requiriynge and preiynge" to translate "requerans". This feature can comfortably be described as an idiosyncrasy because of the frequency of its occurrence in the text. In Chaucer's translation, this kind of collocation occurs at least 114 times in 919 lines, or, on average, a little over once every eight lines. However, not all of these collocations are unique to Chaucer's translation. Comparison of the examples above shows that de Louens also makes use of the same kind of collocation, which Chaucer has appropriated into his own text. Specifically, de Louens ends this passage with the words "sa pitié et sa misericorde", which are translated by Chaucer as "mercy and pitee". By comparing the phrase with its correspondent in the Latin source, it is possible to ascertain that this collocation is an addition by de Louens:

> Adveniente itaque termino constituto, prædicti adversarii cum juratoribus suis ad curiam domini Melibei accedentes, flexisque genibus suis fusisque lacrimis ad pedes dicti domini ac dominæ Prudentiæ prostrati dixerunt: Ecce venimus huc parati in omnibus et per omnia vestris obedire præceptis Verumtamen, licet indigni, vestram exoramus dominationem, quatenus, erga nos non exercentes vindictam, sed potius placabilitatem, clementiam et pietatem, nobis subditis vestris donare dignemini indulgentiam. (Sundby, 1873: 125)
>
> [When, therefore, at the appointed time, his enemies came to the court of Lord Melibei. They fell on their knees in tears at the feet of the said Lord, and Lady Prudence. Lying prostrate, they said 'Behold, we have come here to obey your commandments, we are ready for anything and even though we are unworthy, beseech your lordships, not to exercise your vengeance upon us, but, rather, deign to bestow your good will, and mercy, and piety, upon us who are within your indulgence.']

Comparison of de Louens' text with the passage above shows that de Louens' text contains two terms, "pitié" and "misericorde", while his source contains three, "placabilitatem", "clementiam" and "pietatem". As a result, a swift conclusion would be that de Louens has omitted a term. However, closer consideration of the terms may suggest instead, that de Louens has omitted two of the three terms and expanded the remaining one into his own two. This inference is derived from the sense of forgiveness or clemency denoted by "pitié" and "misericorde", the two terms chosen by de Louens. Of the three terms used by his source, namely,

"placabilitatem", "clementiam" and "pietatem", only the second carries the same sense, while the other two denote goodwill or placability, and piety respectively.

Chaucer's approach of expanding terms in his own translation appears very similar to de Louens' strategy. He also exhibits a tendency to use a direct cognate of the French source word as the first term in a given collocation. Examples include "joyous and glad" to translate "joyeux", "their obligaciouns and their boondes" to translate "leur obligation", and "debonaire and meeke" to translate "debonnaires". This tendency has led to an inference that Chaucer's aim in including these collocations is to make his translation approachable to as broad an audience as possible (K. Taylor, 2005: 312). This inference is based on the multilingualism of Chaucer's target audience (see 20) and the fact that as the examples above show, the collocations often involve one word of Latinate origin, while the other is often of native English, and hence, Germanic origin. The conclusion is that since Latin, French, and English were all working languages in medieval England, Chaucer was using these collocations as a kind of gloss for the various language communities in his target audience. A medieval individual whose native language is English may have found "bond" more easily comprehensible than "obligation", while the obverse may have been true for a native speaker of French.

This glossing is, of course, closely comparable with translation studies' explicitation hypothesis. Explicitation predicts that target texts will include a certain amount of redundant material to assist the comprehension of the target reader (Pápai, 2004: 144). This material may range from words and sentences used to gloss utterances, down to a variety of uses of grammar and punctuation to simplify the text (Englund Dimitrova, 1993: 114-115).

Since Chaucer omits a sizeable amount of material from his translation, it would be problematic to compare the two texts in this way, and infer which is the more explicit on a purely empirical basis. However, the example below demonstrates the high degree of similarity between certain passages of Chaucer's text and its French source in terms of grammar and lexis:

> "Certes," dist Mellibee, "je l'entens ainsi: car comme ilz m'ont fait un contraire, que je leur en face un autre. Et pour ce qu'ilz se sont vengez de moy et m'ont fait injure, je me vengeray d'eulx et leur feray injure, et lors auray curé un contraire par autre contraire." (Askins, 2002: 367)

["Indeed", said Mellibee, "I understand it thus: in the same way they have done me a wrong, I will do another to them. And since they have avenged themselves on me and done me wrong, I will avenge myself on them and will do them wrong, and then I will have righted one wrong with another wrong."]

"Certes," quod Melibeus, "I understonde it in this wise:| that right as they han doon me a contrarie, right so should I doon hem another.| For right as they han venged hem on me and doon me wrong, right so shal I venge me upon hem and doon hem wrong;| and thane have I cured oon contrarie by another." (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 226)

It is plain that Chaucer takes great care to imitate his source text closely in this example. It also exhibits one of Chaucer's glossing techniques. He uses the French-derived word "contrarie" to translate "contraire", and the Germanic "wrong" to translate "injure". In this way, because the two sentences containing these words have such similar senses, it would be possible for target audience members to infer the meaning of either of the words from its context, collocated with the other.

With all of this glossing practice in mind, it seems clear that explicitation has occurred within the *Tale of Melibee*, especially within its use of collocations. The idea that Chaucer deliberately explicitated the meaning of one of his texts and included a range of words to ensure the comprehension of a wide audience implies that he was attempting to mediate between source text and target audience. However, Chapter 1 (73) established that the concept of mediation is problematic when considering Chaucer's translations, because they aim to innovate on the material in a source text, rather than transmit it. Can it be that the collocations here actually have more to do with this innovating strategy than with any notions of inclusivity or ease of comprehension?

In fact, there are several obstacles to declaring that Chaucer's aim in using collocation is to ensure the comprehension of both native French and native English speakers. The most important of these is the fact that not all of the collocations include words of both Latinate and Germanic origins. Examples of collocations of only Latinate terms include "the peynes and the tribulaciouns" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 231), "his richesse and of his moneye" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 232) "sentence and juggement" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 238). Conversely, examples

of collocations of only Germanic words include "he troweth and beleveth" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 231), "of the wrong and of the wikkednesse" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 210), and "I knowe and wite" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 238). As a result, if a number of the collocations can be used for the purposes of explicitation for various language communities, there is a similar number that certainly cannot.

Another issue is that many of the words used in collocations appear at other points in the tale, not necessarily as part of a collocation. An example is the word "juggement". This word appears in four instances other than the one mentioned above. In the first instance the word appears alone (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 219). In the second, it is collocated with "arbitracioun" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 237). In both of the final two instances, the word occurs alone (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 239). If then, Chaucer's intention was to ensure the comprehension of all the language communities in his audience, what is the function of these non-collocated terms, and collocations of terms of similar provenance?

Similarly, why would Chaucer want to use inclusive language in this part of the *Canterbury Tales* and no other? Chaucer does not alter his lexis significantly in the *Tale of Melibee*. However, his use of collocation is most exaggerated in this tale. For instance, the word "juggement", is used 14 times throughout the *Canterbury Tales* apart from its five instances in the *Tale of Melibee*. However, in none of these other instances is the word part of a collocation (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 35, 36, 87, 97, 106, 137, 192, 289, 291, 300, 303, 305, 323, 402). Indeed, the heavy tendency to collocate is not a notable feature of any of the other tales.

All of this evidence appears to act as a barrier to inferring the reason Chaucer would have felt the need to explicitate in a very select set of circumstances, but not in others. It seems clear that the only conclusion that can be drawn regarding the reason for the occurrence of so many collocations in the *Tale of Melibee* is the innovating translation strategy apparent in all of the other *Canterbury Tales*. In this case then, it is possible to conclude that explicitation, or a practice ostensibly similar to it is used in the *Tale of Melibee,* although its function is something very different from that described in the contemporary explicitation hypothesis.

Foreignization and a Foreign Setting

Arguing that Chaucer's use of an explicitation-like practice in the *Tale of Melibee* did not function as a gloss, aiding the comprehension of a linguistically diverse target audience is not the same as denying this diversity, or the possibility that some vocabulary may not have been immediately familiar to the entirety of his audience. It is difficult to imagine a translator having complete confidence that all of the target audience will immediately understand all words used in a target text. Even more problematic is to predict the comprehension of foreign borrowings, and to ascertain where these fit in the norms of the target language, particularly one as heavily intertwined with another as Middle English was with French.

If it can be demonstrated that Chaucer has subverted target norms through his use of foreign borrowings, it will be possible to argue that he employed a foreignizing strategy. Furthermore, this argument will be supported by any other features of his texts that draw attention to their status as translations.

Being derived from a source composed in Latin by the 11th-century Lombard, Albertanus of Brescia, the *Tale of Melibee* presumably has a classical or early medieval Italian setting. However, the text contains very few if any statements or clues that relate it to any particular region or time-period. The ambiguity of its setting is possibly an effect of the fact that, as has already been noted, the story in this tale is of much lesser prominence than the debate it frames. However, the same vagueness is not in evidence in all of the tales that are ultimately derived from Latin stories. By comparison, the *Second Nun's Tale* makes its setting abundantly clear. It begins: "This mayden bright Cecilie, as hir lif seith,| Was comen of Romayns and of noble kynde,| And from hir cradel up fostred in the feith| Of Crist, and bar his gospel in hir mynde" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 264). Allusions to this ancient Roman setting are also not limited to the first few lines of the tale. The setting is continually reinforced throughout:

> But atte laste, to tellen short and pleyn,| The sergeantz of the toun of Rome hem soghte,| And hem biforn Almache, the prefect, broghte,| Which hem apposed, and knew al hire entente, |And to the ymage of Juppiter hem sente,
> (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 267)

Features that identify the text with Rome are particularly numerous in this example. They include an overt reiteration, a use of the particularly Roman title of "prefect", and a reference to the ruler of the Roman pantheon, Jupiter. Furthermore, not all of

these features are directly inherited from the Latin source text. Below is the passage in the source text that corresponds with the extract above:

> Denique tenti ab apparitoribus, prefecto urbis Almachio presentantur. Qui post plurima audita et responsa jussit carnificibus ut ab eis ducerentur ad pagum ubi erat staticulum Jovis, et si noluissent sacrificare ambo sententiam capitalem exciperent. (Reames, 2002: 523)
>
> [Finally, they were arrested by officers of the city prefect Almachius and presented to him. After a lengthy exchange, he ordered that they be led to a village where there was a small statue of Jupiter, and if they refused to sacrifice, they would both receive capital punishment.]

It is clear that while the mention of Jupiter here has clearly been inherited from the source text's reference to "Jovis", the direct reference to Rome, where the source text only mentions "ubi" [the city] acts to explicitly remind the target audience of the setting. More interesting, however, is the adoption of the word "prefecto" by Chaucer as "prefect". Here Chaucer chooses to import the Latin term, in an act that the Oxford English Dictionary lists as its first attested use in English. He could have opted for any number of alternatives, as earlier English translators of the Cecilia legend had. These earlier translators include the anonymous translators of the *Gilte Legende* and the manuscript known as *Ashmole 43*, who translate the word as "provost" and "justice" respectively (Hamer and Russell, 2007: 655, Lovewell, 1898: 82). A very similar state of affairs occurs a little later in the tale, when Chaucer borrows another Latin term:

> Oon Maximus, that was an officer| Of the prefectes, and his corniculer,| Hem hente, and whan he forth the seintes ladde,| Hymself he weep for pitee that he hadde.| Whan Maximus had herd the seintes loore,| He gat hym of the tormentoures leve,| And ladde hem to his hous withoute moore (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 267),

The use of the word "corniculer" here is clearly derived from the cognate word in the corresponding passage of the Latin text:

> Tunc gloriosi martyres, tenti a Maximo corniculario prefecti, ducebantur ad pagum. Qui cepit flere super eos, et post multa que a sanctis audivit, cum impetrasset a carnificibus, duxit eos in domum suam. (Reames, 2002: 523)

[Then, the glorious martyrs were arrested by Maximus, the prefect's cornicularius, to be led to the village. And he began to weep over them. And after hearing many things from the saints, he got permission from the executioner, and brought them to his house.]

The word "corniculer" or "corniculario" is another word that is not attested in English writings prior to the translation of this text, and again, the word is not borrowed in earlier translations of the same text. Instead, the translator of the *Gilte Legende* simply omits the title (Hamer and Russell, 2007: 658), while the translator of *Ashmole 43* renders it as "gailer" (Lovewell, 1898: 84). In this way, Chaucer's audience is continually reminded of the non-domestic setting of the tale, something that is of pivotal importance for a correct understanding of its final scene. This scene depicts the tale's protagonist, Saint Cecilia, being sentenced to death by decapitation, but only after her initial sentence fails:

> And he weex wroth, and bad men sholde hir lede| Hom til hir hous, and "In hire hous," quod he,| "Brenne hire right in a bath of flambes rede."| And as he bad, right so was doon the dede;| For in a bath they gonne hire faste shetten,| And nyght and day greet fyr they under betten.
> The longe nyght, and eek a day also,| For al the fyr and eek the bathes heete| She sat al coold and feelede no wo (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 269).

The practice of executing aristocratic Romans in the bathhouse has a historical basis. It is suggested that this form of execution was employed because of the relative dignity it afforded the victim (Kolve, 1981: 142). The bath in question functioned by means of a hypocaust, meaning that the victim was not boiled to death, but was shut up alone to be smothered by the atmospheric heat and vapour of the building, as can be seen in the source text:

> […] iratus vehementer Almachius jussit eam ad domum suam reduci, et in domo sua flammis balneariis concremari. Cumque fuisset in calore balnei inclusa, et subter incendia nimia lignorum pabula ministrarentur, die integro et tota nocte quasi in loco frigido sic illibata perstitit sanitate, ita ut nulla pars membrorum eius saltem sudoris signa laxasset. (reproduced in Reames, 2002: 515)
> [[…] Almachius was very angry. He ordered that she be brought back to her own house, and be burnt up in the flames of the baths. When she had been shut up in the heat of the baths, a great fire was lit underneath and fed with firewood

for an entire day and night. However, as if in a cold place, she remained so unaffected that no part of her body showed the least signs of sweat.]

This passage has been interpreted in a variety of ways by medieval translators of the legend. Frequently, the reference to a bath and great heat seems to have led translators such as the producer of *Ashmole 43* to the impression that the saint had indeed been boiled to death:

> Þþis iustise was for wraþþe wod. He het þis maide take| And led hire into an
> oute hous; and grete fure þerinne make| And sette þer on a led ful of watere. And
> al amide hire caste| And seþe hire while þer wolde alime. Ihol of hire ilaste
> (Lovewell, 1898: 89)

It appears most likely that this interpretation was influenced by the fact that by the Middle Ages, baths were no longer the elaborate buildings of classical antiquity. Instead, a bath to Chaucer and his contemporaries would have consisted of a portable tub full of water (Saunders, 2005: 110). Of course, the fact that the translation reads in this way is no evidence that it is the only way that the medieval translator interpreted it. Given that he also chooses to elaborate on the bath scene, it may be that the translator of *Ashmole 43* deliberately intended to make the story's Roman setting less prominent in his translation. Assuming that all of the translators had the choice to either condense or dilute the ancient setting of the story in translating this passage, Chaucer is in the minority in choosing to highlight it.

Thus, this is another instance of Chaucer's effort to identify the classical Roman setting of his tale. If Chaucer had adopted a similar approach to his near-contemporaries and made less effort to underscore the setting, it is possible that this passing reference to a classical-style bath, as opposed to a medieval-style one could have been missed.

Accentuating the Foreign

This kind of foreignizing strategy can also be found in a number of the other *Canterbury Tales*. Both the *Franklin's Tale* and the *Shipman's Tale* make repeated references to their non-domestic settings, both directly and implicitly, with the use of similar cultural signposts to those used in the *Second Nun's Tale*. The setting in the *Franklin's Tale* is established in the first lines of its prologue: "Thise olde gentil Britouns in his dayes| Of diverse aventures maden layes,| Rymeyed in hir firste

Briton tonge" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 178). It is then reiterated and elaborated twenty lines later in the first line of the tale proper: "In Armorik, that called is Britayne,| Ther was a knyght that loved and dide his payne" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 178). Again, seventy lines later: "Nat fer fro Pedmark, ther his dwellyng was,| Where as he lyveth in blisse and in solas" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 179). And again, after another five lines: "Til that the knyght of which I speke of thus,| That of Kayrrud was cleped Arveragus" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 179). Chaucer continues this strategy of subtly, but insistently reminding the target audience of the exotic setting of the story with the ultimate goal of identifying the tale's centrepiece with Brittany's rocky shoreline:

> This subtil clerk swich routhe had of this man| That nyght and day he spedde hym that he kan| To wayten a tyme of his conclusioun;| This is to seye, to maken illusioun,| By swich an apparence or jogelrye -| I ne kan no termes of astrologye| That she and every wight sholde wene and seye| That of Britaigne the rokkes were aweye,| Or ellis they were sonken under grounde (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 184).

Using a very similar approach, the non-domestic setting of the *Shipman's Tale* is explicitly established in its first line: "A marchant whilom dwelled at Seint-Denys,| That riche was, for which men helde hym wys" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 203). It is subsequently reinforced after less than sixty lines: "For which he hath to Parys sent anon| A messager, and preyed hath daun John| That he sholde come to Seint-Denys to pleye| With hym and with his wyf a day or tweye,| Er he to Brugges wente, in alle wise" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 203). The setting is also continually reiterated in less explicit ways, such as the vivid descriptions of the protagonist's daily life (Nicholson, 1978: 585) and the use of specific monetary currency as noted in Chapter 1 (54).

Furthermore, the tale's link with the French language is augmented by its peppering of frequently cryptic, bilingual puns. In true *fabliau* style, most of these puns revolve around parts of the characters' anatomies. One example is the pun on the English word "cozen" and the French word "cousinage" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 911, R.M. Fisher, 1965: 168-170). The monk character proposes to cozen, or betray the bonds of cousinage, or kinship he has with his mistress' husband in order to consummate their affair:

> Nat for no cosynage ne alliance,| But verraily for love and affiance."| Thus been they sworn, and heerupon they kiste,| And ech of hem tolde oother what hem   liste. "Cosyn," quod she, "if that I hadde a space,| As I have noon, and namely in this place, […] (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 204)

Thus, in the *Shipman's Tale*, the explicitly French setting is constantly reinforced, not in order to ensure that an element of the story is correctly understood or because some part of the story pivots on a specific topographical feature, but in order to prime Chaucer's trilingual target audience for the complex interlingual puns that run throughout the tale.

What is particularly interesting in the cases of the *Franklin's Tale* and the *Shipman's Tale* is that the setting Chaucer goes to such great lengths to underscore through his various foreignizing strategies is, in neither case, the same setting as his source text, or the context, in which the source text originates. As explored in Chapter 1 (52), both the *Franklin's Tale* and the *Shipman's Tale* can be reasonably assumed to be translations of texts by Boccaccio. The settings of both source texts are in Northern Italy, Piedmont for the *Franklin's Tale*, and the Florentine village of Varlungo for the *Shipman's Tale*. Thus, Chaucer's foreignization strategies in these two tales are deceptive. Moreover, in the case of the *Franklin's Tale*, several of the details that are used to foreignizing effect are not entirely appropriate for the chosen setting. Perhaps the most obvious of these incongruities for a contemporary reader is the fact that the story is littered with references to classical mythology:

> He seyde, "Appollo, god and governour| Of every plaunte, herbe, tree, and flour,| That yevest, after thy declinacion,| To ech of hem his tyme and his seson,| As thyn herberwe chaungeth lowe or heighe,| Lord Phebus, cast thy merciable eighe| On wrecche Aurelie, which that am but lorn. (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 182)

These frequent references to classical mythology are clearly intended to define the tale's temporal setting, in the same way that references to topographical features identify its geographical setting. Making these links to characters of the ancient world identifies the story's setting as ancient. The ancient setting is also strongly complemented by the tale's description as a *lay*, since *lays* are generally set in the distant past (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 14). The issue, however, is that the classical

mythology drawn on here is derived from the Mediterranean civilisations of Greece and Rome, rather than from the Celtic context, in which the story sets itself in Western Brittany. Similarly, Chaucer appears to have obtained the names for many of this tale's characters from the *Historia Regum Britanniæ* by Geoffrey of Monmouth (Archer, 1950: 318). One example is "Arveragus", the name of the male protagonist, which is a Latinization of the name of a possibly legendary British king, contemporaneous with Roman Emperor Claudius (10BC-AD54). Another example is the name Aurelius, which is a Latinized name that was common among the ancient Romano-British (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 898). Although much of the information it contains has since been shown to be mythical (Bell, 2000: 14), during the Middle Ages, the *Historia Regum Britanniæ* would have been the most authoritative source Chaucer could have referred to regarding Celtic history (Bell, 2000: 14). Its subject is not a study of a pan-Celtic identity but, as the title suggests, the often legendry Celtic kings of Britain, from Brutus the Trojan to the Saxons Hengist and Horsa (see Monumetensis et al., 2007).

Chaucer uses the information contained in this work to inform his foreignizing strategy in the *Franklin's Tale*. In doing so, he capitalizes on the enormous popularity of Geoffrey of Monmouth's work in Medieval Europe (Monumetensis et al., 2007: vii) by linking this tale to the accepted knowledge of his contemporaries regarding the ancient Celts. In this way, Chaucer gives the ancient Breton setting of his tale credibility amongst his contemporaries and so, bolsters the claim of the tale's prologue that the story is translated from a Breton *lay*: "oon of hem have I in remembraunce,| Which I shal seyn with good wyl as I kan" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 178). Even this statement itself can be interpreted as part of Chaucer's foreignizing strategy. Few features can call attention to the fact that a text has been translated more directly than an explicit assertion to the effect.

Categorizing Chaucer's strategy as foreignizing, however, raises a similar kind of problem to those raised when analysing the *Tale of Melibee* with the explicitation hypothesis. Foreignizing features, as they are predicted by the theory are rationalized by a very clearly defined aim. Translators are seen as employing foreignizing techniques in order to highlight their own role in the communication of texts from one culture or language to another (Venuti, 2004: 1-2). However, as established in Chapter 1 (70), not only Chaucer's aim, but also the generally accepted role of medieval translators was to innovate rather than mediate. Translators were not

expected to act as target language representatives of their source authors, and as a result, target audiences are unlikely to have equated a translated text with its source. In other words, the contemporary state of affairs in which translators and their work are viewed as secondary to their sources in terms of literary merit would not have arisen because translation was viewed as a way to create a new text, as opposed to re-render an antecedent.

With these facts in mind, the notional similarities between Chaucer's strategy and foreignization dwindle. Chaucer certainly does go to some lengths to ensure that his target audience is left in no doubt that the tales are translations, and that their settings are distinct, geographically and temporally, from medieval England. However, it is highly unlikely that he does so in order to underscore his own role as a translator. In the case of the *Second Nun's Tale*, his exaggeration of the ancient Roman setting appears to be largely practical. He continually reminds the target audience that the setting is ancient Rome in order that particularities of the story are understood without further elaboration. In the case of the *Franklin's Tale*, Chaucer is required to ensure his target audience does not forget that the setting is ancient Brittany in order that the centrepiece of the story, involving the removal of all the rocks from a particularly rocky Breton shoreline, makes sense. Finally, in the case of the *Shipman's Tale*, the French setting is reiterated in order to prime the target audience for the complicated and often cryptic English-French bilingual puns that add so much to the richness of the tale's interpretation. In each case, Chaucer's strategy, though ostensibly similar to foreignization, has been deployed for a different reason, and has a different effect than that predicted by the contemporary foreignization theory. These reasons invariably complement the findings of Chapter 1 (72-73) that Chaucer's aim was to innovate on source material, as opposed to act as a mediator between it and the target audience.

Domestication and Domestic Norms

The introduction to this thesis observed that foreignization and domestication tend to be conceptualized in binary terms (16). If a translation is not categorized as foreignizing, it follows that it is domesticating. This being the case, since it is at least problematic to describe Chaucer's translation strategy as foreignizing, the next

question to present itself is, do Chaucer's translations exhibit a domesticating strategy?

Keeping in mind the way that Chaucer places a number of tales in settings that are entirely distinct, geographically and temporally from those of their sources, an important point to consider when asking if Chaucer has a domesticating translation strategy is the origins of those tales that are set in medieval England. If Chaucer can be shown in his translations to have replaced the source culture with that of the target in his translation, a clearly domesticating strategy would be in evidence. Indeed, a number of the *Canterbury Tales* are set in England. Examples include the *Reeve's* and *Miller's Tales*, which are set in Oxford (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 68) and Trumpington, near Cambridge (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 78) respectively, as well as the *Wife of Bath's Tale*, which is set at the court of King Arthur (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 116). However, there is also a clear trend among those tales that are set in England, either to employ an extremely large variety of source material, as in the case of the *Wife of Bath's Tale* (Withrington and Field, 2005), or to draw on sources that are very widely distributed throughout the languages and cultures of Europe, as in the cases of the *Reeve's* and *Miller's Tales* (Beidler, 2002: 23, 2005: 249). In either case, the investigation is problematized by an inability to identify a single or main source text definitively, with which the setting of the translation can be compared. As a result, it is clear that, although the very fact that some of Chaucer's translations are set in England shows that his translation strategy does have a domesticating strain, defining the extent to which Chaucer intended to normalize his foreign source texts to the target culture is not possible with these texts alone.

As pointed out in the introductory chapter, one of the shortcomings of both domestication and foreignization is that neither has any clear cut-off point (39). It is unclear how few domesticating features a translation can exhibit and still be described as domesticating. Rather unhelpfully in this respect, Venuti (2004: 204) even boldly asserts that "translation is domestication". Venuti is referring to the fact that in rendering a text into the language of the target audience, translation necessarily makes a text more closely identifiable with the target audience than its source. It is difficult to dispute this statement if translation is viewed as a process of mediation. However, as we have already seen, Chaucer's translation is not a form of mediation. Furthermore, Venuti's statement implies that the target audience is

monolingual, or at least, incapable of reading the source language. However, as we have already seen (20), Chaucer's target audience was not monolingual, and particularly in the cases of the many translations made from French texts, would have been eminently capable of reading the source texts. In fact, not only was the reading of French not unusual, it was the norm. Therefore, simply because it is written in English, it may be that Chaucer's writing actually defies a significant norm of late 14th-century England. As J.H. Fisher (1992: 1168) puts it "From the Norman Conquest until after 1400, French was the official language of England-not because any law had been passed to make it so but because it was the native language of all those who held office."

J.H. Fisher (1992: 1170) goes on to demonstrate that although by 1360, when Chaucer would have been active, much oral exchange in commerce and government would have been carried out in English, written records continued to be predominantly in French or Latin. Literature from the period exhibits a very similar state of affairs. Baugh and Blake (2002: 113) note that only from the middle of the 14th-century on, did English come to be adopted as a vernacular by all classes in England. At precisely the same time, the country saw a sudden shift in terms of the numbers of literary texts produced in the medium of English.

The beginning of Chaucer's literary career coincides with this shift. *The Book of the Duchess*, his first major work, was completed in the late 1360s (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: xxiv). Chaucer's career can be seen as riding the tide of change that saw English remerge as a literary language. The shift did not become the norm until around 1400 (Baugh and Blake, 2002: 144), the same year as Chaucer's death, and has been called the "Period of Great Individual Writers" (Baugh and Blake, 2002: 191). Among the writers of this period, Chaucer is perhaps merely the most well-known. His near contemporaries include other pioneers in English literature, such as the so-called Pearl Poet, John Gower, and William Langland. Indeed, in Gower's first English-language work, *Confessio Amantis*, which dates to around 1390, he expresses his reasons for writing in English: "for that fewe men endite| In oure Englishe, I thenke make A boke for Englondes sake" (J. Gower and Pauli, 1857: 2). Thus, the categorization of Chaucer's translation strategy is further complicated by the fact that, in choosing to write in English, Chaucer was subscribing to an opposition, albeit a forceful one, to the norm of English speakers choosing French or Latin as the language of literary composition. Therefore, Venuti's sentiment that all

translation is necessarily domesticating is heavily problematized by the fact that Chaucer's translations break target norms, in being written in the least prestigious language of the three available. Therefore, Chaucer's translation strategy paradoxically defies simple categorization as domesticating by being conducted in the domestic language.

The Difference between Domestication and Appropriation

  The fact that Chaucer was not completely alone in beginning to redevelop English as a literary language also gives us the opportunity to observe whether his own practices differ greatly from those of his contemporaries or predecessors. If Chaucer's handling of his target texts clearly follows tradition, the fact that he contravened a norm by using English in the first place will be mitigated to some degree.

  In terms of prosody, Chaucer's near contemporaries such as William Langland and the Pearl Poet adhere to the native English poetic tradition known as alliterative verse. Alliterative verse is the only kind of poetry that is seen in English texts from the period up until the Norman Conquest of England in 1066 (DeFord and Harriss, 1971: 183). It is a link between Old English and the other members of the Germanic language family such as Old Norse, which shares a similar tradition, as illustrated by *Háttatal* in the *Prose Edda* by Snorri Sturluson (see Sturluson et al., 1848). Whereas rhymed verse primarily uses syllable counts and patterns of end-rhyme to structure a poem, alliterative verse, as its name suggests, relies on alliteration and stress patterns. In this kind of poetry, rhyme can be used as a device (McKie, 1997: 820), in much the same way that alliteration is a device that continues to be used in rhymed poetry. However, rhyme is not a fundamental feature of the alliterative verse form and does not feature in the majority of texts. Instead, each line is split into two by a caesura, or pause, and given rhythm, typically by two stressed syllables in each half-line. Alliteration is used in conjunction with these stressed syllables to bind the two half-lines together. Normally, three of these stressed syllables will alliterate, while the remaining one does not (Suzuki, 2004: 8). Below is an example line, taken from the opening passage of *Piers Plowman*, by Chaucer's contemporary, Langland (reproduced in Langland and Skeat, 1879: 1):

>   In a *so*mer *se*son| whan *so*ft was the *so*nne

In this example, stressed syllables have been marked in italics, alliterating syllables have been underlined, and the caesura, indicated with a vertical bar. The passage is continued below, to show how the pattern continues throughout the poem:

> I shope me into shroudes as I a shepe were,| In habite as an hermite vnholy of workes,| Went wyde in þis world wondres to here| Ac on a May mornynge on Maluerne hulles| Me befel a ferly, of fairy me thouȝte; (Langland and Skeat, 1879: 1)

Chaucer makes limited use of alliteration as a device, rather than as a fundamental feature of his verse. Below is an example of Chaucer's use of alliteration, found in the *Knight's Tale*:

> In goon the speres ful sadly in arrest;| In gooth the sharpe spore into the syde.| Ther seen men who kan juste and who kan ryde;| Ther shyveren shaftes upon sheeldes thikke;| He feeleth thurgh the herte-spoon the prikke (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 60).

Note that this poem makes sporadic use of alliteration, but consistently uses end-rhyme and iambic pentameter, neither of which would have been common in English alliterative verse. Thus, unlike his near contemporaries, Chaucer did not attempt to revive what he refers to as "geeste" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 216), the heavy alliterative verse form of Old English that can be considered the language's domestic norm. Quite to the contrary, by far Chaucer's most well-known direct reference to the traditional form of alliterative verse is mocking in tone: "But trusteth wel, I am a Southren man;| I kan nat geeste 'rum, ram, ruf,' by lettre" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 287). Instead of subscribing to this tradition then, along with his friend Gower, Chaucer was one of the early pioneers of using the end-rhyming, syllabic verse forms of the Romance languages (O'Neill, 2010: 53).

One of the forms that is often associated with Chaucer is the complicated, seven-line stanza known as *rhyme royal*. Chaucer uses *rhyme royal* in a number of the *Canterbury Tales*, including the *Man of Law's Tale*, the *Clerk's Tale*, the *Prioress's Tale*, and the *Second Nun's Tale* (Dean, 1991: 252). Rhyme royal describes a strict schema, such that the seven lines of each stanza rhyme in the pattern a-b-a-b-b-c-c (Stevens, 1979: 62). The example below, taken from the prologue to the *Man of Law's Tale*, demonstrates this pattern:

a) hateful harm, condicion of poverte!

b) With thurst, with coold, with hunger so confoundid!

a) To asken help thee shameth in thyn herte;

b) If thou noon aske, with nede artow so wounded

b) That verray nede unwrappeth al thy wounde hid!

c) Maugree thyn heed, thou most for indigence

c) Or stele, or begge, or borwe thy despence! (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 88. Line identification added)

Because of their similar names, as well as similarities in their constructions, connections have historically been made between *rhyme royal* and the more complex French verse form known as *chant royal* (Dean, 1991: 251), which consists of eleven-line stanzas, rhyming a-b-a-b-c-c-d-d-e-d-E (Stevens, 1979: 63). The suggestion is that Chaucer, or one of his contemporaries may have adapted *rhyme royal* from the French form.

Chaucer certainly pioneered the use of a number of other French poetic forms in English literature. He famously introduced, the *ballad*, *romance*, and *fabliau* (Delisle and Woodsworth, 1995: xiv), of which he makes extensive use in the *Canterbury Tales*. Indeed, of all the stories in the *Canterbury Tales*, only one, the *Tale of Melibee* is fully in prose. All of the other tales make use of some form of end-rhyme although a majority of their sources are in prose. This overwhelming use of end-rhyme is strong evidence of Chaucer's keenness to have English adopt a Latinate, and especially French-inspired style of poetry, even though, as Chaucer observes, rhymes are far less numerous in the English lexicon than in the French: "And eke to me it ys a gret penaunce,| Syth rym in Englissh hath such skarsete,| to folowe word by word the curiosite| of Graunson, flour of hem that make in Fraunce" (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 649). Hence, the *Canterbury Tales* and their varied uses of predominantly French-inspired verse forms can be seen as a part of Chaucer's aim to improve English literature by bringing it closer to French styles.

It is, however, important to continue to consider this use of French poetic forms in the English language as they relate to norms, and so, issues of domestication. Once again, we are faced with a complicated situation in that much, if not all of Chaucer's audience would have been at least familiar with these French poetic forms. However, they would not have been familiar with their use in the English language. Naturally, it is important to acknowledge the difference between a target audience being

familiar with a practice, and the same practice being the norm in a given cultural or linguistic setting. A target audience may be intimately familiar with a particular kind of poetry, but this does not mean that the same kind of poetry corresponds to domestic norms if taken out of its usual context. In composing English-language poetry using Latinate styles of verse, Chaucer does precisely this. He removes the verse forms from their normal context.

For these reasons, it is also extremely problematic to argue that Chaucer had a domesticating translation strategy in general. If we ignore the highly simplistic fact that Chaucer translates for an English audience into the English language, we find that not only his choice of language but also the kind of text he produces subvert the norms of his time. He uses English when that language has only recently become universally spoken throughout the country and has only a small body of high literature written in the preceding three centuries. At the same time, he shuns the native tradition of English alliterative verse, and instead, adopts predominantly French poetic forms into the English language. In this way, he blurs the lines between the historical uses of the two languages, or to put it another way, subverts the norms of the time.

Conclusions

Building on the findings of Chapter 1, this chapter has examined Chaucer's translation strategies in the *Canterbury Tales* with direct reference to contemporary translation theories. In Chapter 1, Chaucer's translation strategy was shown to have little if any relation to the contemporary preoccupation with translation as a form of mediation. The aim here was to ascertain if the disparity between mediation-based and *excogitatio*-based approaches to translation has any ramifications on the use of theory to analyse case studies.

This chapter has called on further examples of features and practices that could be described as idiosyncratic to Chaucer's translation strategy, each of which ostensibly corresponds to one of the contemporary theories identified as hegemonic in the introductory chapter's corpus analysis (15). The rationalization for each feature, provided by the respective theories was compared with the findings that abductive reasoning produced in Chapter 1. Interestingly, at no point did the results generated by the theories correspond with the findings produced by abduction.

The theories consistently tend to rationalize the occurrence of each phenomenon in terms of mediation. Mediation appears to constitute one of the fundamental syllogisms on which the theory's inductive reasoning is based. Chapter 1 has already shown that it appears highly unlikely that mediation featured in Chaucer's conceptualization of his translation activities. Thus, the theories' insistence that translation is a form of mediation makes them problematic for the study of Chaucer's translations. Chaucer has been shown to make some use of glossing practices in the *Tale of Melibee*. However, these glosses are so specific in terms of the tale and the character using them that they cannot be aligned simply with any inferred goal of expounding the source text's otherwise obscure meaning, or, in the theoretical terminology, explicitation. Similarly, there are numerous examples of Chaucer including features that highlight his role as translator, the role of his texts as translations, or the origin of the material as foreign. He includes numerous foreign words, he goes to great lengths to highlight the non-domestic setting of individual tales, and he even directly links tales to source authors in select cases. However, there is no evidence to suggest that any of these features occur in order to foreignize. Foreignization can be seen as a reaction to the mediation-based view of translation and the acquiescent attitude towards the demands of source texts and target audiences it almost necessarily promotes among translators. In this way, the disparity between an understanding of translation based on mediation and one based on *excogitatio* is important, since no such acquiescent attitude is implied or in evidence in the latter. As can be inferred from Geoffrey of Vinsauf's descriptions (70), translations produced under the influence of *excogitatio* are not inherently secondary to their sources. Thus, the conditions under which the foreignization theory would come into being are not in evidence in Chaucer's context, and so, cannot be applied to his translations unproblematically.

Domestication is problematic in precisely the same sense. This theory infers that as part of the mediating goal of translators, measures will be taken within a translation to normalize the target text's use of such features as language, genre, or prosody to conform as closely as possible to the conventions of the target culture. If, however, as in the case of the *Canterbury Tales*, mediation is absent, the same inference cannot be made with any degree of confidence. Within this chapter, questions have been raised regarding what can reasonably be described as the accepted norms of the English of Chaucer and his contemporaries, based on the fact that the language was

only in the process of being newly readopted for use in high literature. Even if this were not the case, however, it is eminently possible to infer that Chaucer probably made use of these features as a part of his generally innovating translation strategy. To attempt to align the features with domestication then is to ignore the comparable number of features that Chaucer makes use of, which do not conform to any identifiable antecedent English language convention. Thus, to reason that Chaucer in any way attempts to appropriate foreign texts into his own literary system is to ignore the linguistic relationships that existed in his lifetime, the state of middle English as a developing language for high literature, and, most importantly, the *excogitatio*-based understanding of translation that underlies his work.

Thus, the use of those theories identified as dominant in contemporary translation literature in the analysis of the *Canterbury Tales*, and by extension the translating culture of 14th century England has been shown to be at least questionable. In each case, the use of theory tends to be limited to applying simplistic labels to textual features. Anything beyond this decidedly superficial use of theory demonstrates that the rationalization offered by each theory is manifestly at odds with medieval culture and practice. This finding has potentially far-reaching ramifications for the study of translation in general. The introductory chapter found the discipline's focus of attention to fall on a set of contexts that can be defined in relatively restricted cultural and temporal terms, which are frequently analysed with an even more select collection of theories. Thus, it is, perhaps, not surprizing that when the same theories are brought to bear on translations from a dramatically different context there is an apparent lack of compatibility. The potential ramifications occur when the corpus' degree of apparent specificity is considered fully. It may be that the *Canterbury Tales* are not alone in being problematic for the same theories, and by extension, the discipline's accepted approach to examining translations. If *excogitatio* and mediation are both considered as ways of conceptualizing the act of translation it may be that others also exist.

Chapter 3 will explore the rakugo tradition with these potentials in mind. It will ask if the same theories are more compatible with rakugo's approach to translating than they are to Chaucer's. If it can be established that rakugo bears some similarity to either mediation or *excogitatio*, it may be that there is a quantifiable set of ways to conceptualize translation and that *excogitatio* is simply incompatible with the theories influenced by mediation. On the other hand, if rakugo's use of translation is

radically different from both *excogitatio* and mediation, it may be that the ways of conceptualizing translation are more varied and numerous than can be definitively ascertained here. The potential implication is that there may exist large bodies of translated literature hitherto unstudied as such because of their lack of a mediating role.

CHAPTER 3
Interweaving Ideas and Worlds:

Rakugo and Planned Selection in the Translation Process

Introduction

The first two chapters of this thesis examined the translation techniques used by Chaucer in the *Canterbury Tales*. Chapter 1 focused on the relationships between Chaucer's target texts and his sources. Chapter 2, on the application of contemporary translation studies theories to these texts. The first chapter discussed the notion of *excogitatio*, which encouraged medieval text producers to remain silent where their source texts speak, and speak where their source texts are silent. It observed that this originally classical concept is a useful way of rationalizing the range of techniques employed by Chaucer. In the second chapter, it was found that as much contemporary translation literature ascribes a mediating role to translation, so do explicitation, foreignization, and domestication, the three theories explored throughout this thesis. As a result, because *excogitatio* does not constitute a set of mediating practices between source text and target audience, the use of these theories tends to produce incongruous results when used to analyse Chaucer's translations.

This chapter will move on to see if similar results occur in the case of an entirely unrelated form of translation. It will explore the processes of text production and transmission in classical Kamigata rakugo, primarily to ascertain if the underlying strategy is one of mediation. The chapter will use abductive reasoning, alongside theory in order to ascertain if translation strategies used in producing rakugo are more easily analysed with the theories than are the *Canterbury Tales*.

Chinese Texts Read in Japanese

The Edo period is the name given to the time when rakugo developed into the form of storytelling still known to contemporary audiences. Many of the early stories have Chinese source texts, which are translated into colloquial Japanese for performance. What is notable, however, is the sharp contrast between this form of translation and

the mediating method used by the Japanese to read Chinese texts during this long period of national seclusion.

In 1635, Shogun Tokugawa Iemitsu (徳川家光) (1604-1651), issued the third and most momentous of his 鎖国令 [Closed Country edicts]. These edicts worked to separate the Japanese from the outside world. They banned overseas travel by Japanese nationals, the practice and evangelization of Catholicism, the presence of non-Japanese nationals on Japanese soil, and international trade with Japan. These proscriptions were enforced with the utmost seriousness, and the only exceptions to the final two proscriptions were strictly limited to a very select number of predefined locations and nationalities. Western trade was almost exclusively limited to Dutch ships, which were permitted to dock on the especially constructed artificial island of Dejima in the bay of Nagasaki (Kazui and Videen, 1982: 284) , on the west of the Japanese archipelago.

Prior to the adoption of this policy of self-imposed estrangement from the outside world, Japan had enjoyed a period of flourishing trade with a wide range of foreign nations. Iemitsu's predecessor and grandfather, Tokugawa Ieyasu (徳川家康) (1543-1616), the founder of the Tokugawa Shogunate, had fostered trade partnerships among Japan's neighbouring countries. Notable among Japan's trading partners were Korea; Tonkin, in modern-day Thailand; Annam and Ayuthaya in modern-day Vietnam; and the Philippines (Laver, 2011: 2). Trade was also not restricted to Asian countries. Ieyasu warmly welcomed European traders from Spain and Portugal, the Netherlands and England, although he was equally keen to separate welcomed trade from prohibited missionary activities (Laver, 2011: 2).

Japan's international relations prior to 1635 had a pervasive effect on many aspects of Japanese culture. Historically, many religious, political, and technological advancements had found their way to Japan from abroad (Meyer, 1992: 84-85). A sizeable number of these advances originated in China. From between the 7th and 10th-centuries, China, was acknowledged as possessing cultural and technological superiority over its neighbours (Kang, 2010: 33-42). In acknowledging this superiority, China's neighbour states gradually modified their own native culture to resemble that of China (Haarmann, 2005: 1526). In this way, intentionally or otherwise, China exerted a Sinicizing effect over its East-Asian neighbours (Kang, 2010: 33-42). In the case of Japan, this Sinicization led, amongst other things, to an

embracement of Buddhism and Confucianism (R.E. Carter, 2001: 77); an adoption of the Chinese writing system, which would later be adapted for use in the Japanese vernacular (Seeley, 1991: 60); and the production of valuable commodities (Atwell, 1986: 225) such as silks, tea, and works of literature. Chinese Literature had a massive effect over the social and linguistic topography of Japanese society, forming an educated elite, proficient in the Chinese language (Smits, 2007: 122). In turn, the growing knowledge of Chinese among the literate Japanese led to a mass incorporation of Chinese vocabulary into the Japanese lexicon. This incorporation continued over a protracted period and has resulted in over half of the modern Japanese vocabulary being of Chinese origin (Takada, 1989: 106).

Interestingly, however, this taste for literature in a language that is unrelated to Japanese did not lead to widespread translation projects of the kind seen in the comparable situation in Europe during the protestant reformations of the 16th-century. Rather, the Japanese exploited the logogrammatic nature of the Chinese writing system to develop a peculiar method of reading the source texts in the target language. This method came to be known as 漢文訓読 (*kanbun-kundoku*) [Chinese text[44], Japanese reading]. The *kanbun-kundoku* method employs diacritics called 訓点 (*kunten*) and 返り点 (*kaeriten*), which are added to the source text to indicate the order in which a sentence's constituent ideograms should be read in order to be intelligible in Japanese (Meldrum, 2008: 43, Wakabayashi, 2005: 121). These diacritics are placed in predefined positions, to the bottom-left of a character to indicate its position in the sentence, and to the right to indicate its grammatical function and/or pronunciation (Miwa, 2000: 10-22).

Below is an example taken from the 論語 *(Lúnyǔ)[Analects of Confucius]* (reproduced in Miwa, 2000: 24). An English translation is: "is it not a great joy to put what you have learned to good use and then go on to learn even more?"

---

[44] It should be noted that the Chinese language referred to here is not the vernacular, but Classical Chinese, which is still referred to as 漢文 (kanbun) in Japanese today.

(1) 学而時習之、不亦説乎

(2) 学而時習 レ之、不ニ亦説一乎
（ヒデ　ニ　ヲ　　　よろこ　バシブ）

(3) 学びて時に之を習ふ、亦説ばしからずや。

(4) 教わったことを折にふれて復習する、なんと喜ばしいことではないか。

The text is read vertically from right to left and shows the potential stages of rendering. (1) is the Classical Chinese source text, transliterated in modern Chinese as "Xué ér shí xí zhī, bù yì yuè hu". (2) is the same Chinese version with diacritics added. An individual trained in *kanbun-kundoku* would recognize that this sentence is read "Manabite toki ni kore wo narau, mata yorokobashikarazu ya" and understand the meaning. (3) is the sentence rewritten in the Japanese word order, with pronunciations added. This approach, known as 漢文読み下し [kanbun transliteration] could be read by an individual without training in *kanbun-kundoku* (Wakabayashi, 2005: 121). Finally, (4) is the sentence translated into modern Japanese. The sentence is transliterated as "Osowatta koto wo ori ni furete fukushū suru, nanto yorokobashī koto dewanai ka" This example demonstrates that *kanbun-kundoku* often renders a phrase into a kind of meta-language (Notehelfer et al., 2004: 89), which is intelligible, but not necessarily natural to a Japanese speaker.

The *kanbun-kundoku* method has been the subject of some debate, concerning its categorization as either a form of translation or a kind of reading, especially since it potentially requires an intermediary to interpret the text and insert the diacritics (Levy, 2011: 23-24). This method, therefore, is an excellent example to inform our understanding of the notions of intercultural and interlingual mediation. *Kanbun-kundoku* acts as a proxy, through which a target audience can access the source text without the construction of an entirely new target text. Moreover, its presence in Japan was of pivotal importance after international borders were closed, since it

meant that Chinese texts that had already been imported could continue to exert an effect even though travel to China was no longer permissible.

It is natural to assume that a country with closed borders would develop a xenophobic attitude towards vestiges of foreign cultures present within its territory. However, the Edo period actually saw a gain in prominence for Chinese studies (Seeley, 1991: 128). As a result, not only did texts composed in Chinese remain accessible to the Japanese, they also continued to exert a strong influence over Japanese society in general throughout the period (Gerhart, 1999: 40). Furthermore, Chinese continued to be the language of science within Japan, which created a tradition of Japanese individuals using *kanbun-kundoku* to write large bodies of literature in Chinese (Burns, 2003: 37).

Japan's closed country policy lasted over two centuries until 1854, and so, ended only 14 years before the end of the Tokugawa family's rule as shoguns in 1868. Their rule is now variously described as 徳川時代 [The Tokugawa Period] and 江戸時代 [The Edo Period], after their capital city, which was renamed Tokyo when their rule was overturned.

Where *kanbun-kundoku* can be described as creating the illusion that a Japanese reader is able to approach Chinese texts directly, annotating the source text, but leaving it otherwise unchanged, translation in rakugo of the same Chinese texts creates no such illusion.

Rakugo Translated from Chinese

One example of a 古典 (koten) [classical] rakugo that is translated from a Chinese text is also one of the most widely known of the koten rakugo from the 上方 (Kamigata) region, which incorporates the cities of Kyoto and Osaka. The rakugo is entitled *饅頭こわい (Manjū Kowai)[Afraid of Manjū]*. It centres on the comic notion of an individual having a mortal fear of the steamed buns known as manjū, and is summarized below:

> 四五人集まって居る所へ、やせた色のわるい男が、片息に成てがたが
> たとふるへて来て、あとから饅頭売が参りますが、私にあの饅頭がどう
> も怖しくてなりませぬ。どこぞへかくしてくださいへば、物置へかくし
> て、いたづらに右の饅頭を買って、盆へ杉形に積上げ、物置の内へ入れ

て、戸をぴっしゃりたてて押へて居るに、久しく過ても音も沙汰もなし。もしこハがって死はせぬかと、開けて見れば、饅頭はのこらず食て、口なめずりをして居るゆへ、てまへハあまり怖がつたから、おどしに入たが、そう食て仕廻たのハ、どこがこわいのだといへば、アイ此上ハ茶が二三ばい、怖ふござる。 (Ui, 1952: 403)

[I was gathered with four or five people, when a thin, shivering man with pale skin came rushing towards us. He said 'a manjū seller is coming. I am terribly afraid of those manjū. Please hide me somewhere!' We hid him in our storage room and then mischievously went and bought the manjū he had been trying to escape from. We piled all the manjū up on a tray, tall as a cedar tree, and put them inside the storeroom with him. Then we slammed the door closed and held it. We waited and waited for the noise and commotion, but there was none. We started to fear that the man would die of fright, so we opened the door and saw that he had eaten all of the manjū and was licking his lips. At this, I said 'we put those in here because you were afraid of them, but you have eaten them all up! What are you really afraid of?' He replied 'well after that, I would be afraid of two or three cups of tea']

The source text of this story is a short aside in the 五雑俎 *(Wǔzázǔ)[Five Miscellanies]* by 謝肇淛 (Xiè Zhàozhè) (1567-1624) (Ui, 1952: 403). This text belongs to the literary tradition of China's Ming dynasty (1368-1644), although the precise date of its composition is uncertain (Hayashiya and Katsura, 1990: 342). The story as it is relayed in this source text is as follows:

有窮書生欲食饅頭，計無從得。一日，見市肆有列而鬻者，輒大叫仆地。主人驚問曰：「吾畏饅頭。」主人曰：「安有是？」乃設饅頭百枚，置空室中，閉之，伺於外，寂不聞聲；穴壁窺之，則食過半矣，亟開門，詰其故。曰：「吾今日見此，忽自不畏。」主人知其詐，怒叱曰：「若尚有畏乎？」曰：「更畏臘茶兩碗爾。」 (reproduced in Shen, 1991: 43)

[There was a poor student who wanted to eat manjū. But he could not afford them. One day, he came across a stallholder selling manjū. Letting out a cry, he fell to the ground. The stallholder was shocked and asked what is wrong. The student replied 'I am afraid of manjū!' The stallholder asked 'how can you be?' The stallholder put the student in an empty room along with a hundred manjū, closed the door, and waited outside. Hearing nothing but silence, he peered through a hole in the wall and saw that the student had already eaten half of the manjū. He flung open the door to confront the student, who said 'Having seen

these manjū today, I realised that I'm actually not afraid at all'. The stallholder

realised that he had been tricked and asked angrily 'so is there anything that you

are afraid of?' The student said 'suddenly, I am afraid of two cups of *là* tea']

While the skeletal similarities between these two stories do not require illustration, it is interesting to note that almost all of the particulars relating to each version's characters and settings differ markedly, apart from that the object of the trickster's feigned terror is manjū in both texts[45]. For this reason, it is difficult to imagine a mediating strategy behind this kind of translation. The unlikelihood that the translator of this rakugo had an intention to mediate between source text and target audience is further illustrated by the difficulty of describing the texts in terms of such theories as explicitation, foreignization, or domestication. The story does not explicitate because the only cultural artefact that is common to both texts is the manjū, which are present in both cultures and so, not explained. For a similar reason, it does not foreignize, because foreignization implies the retention of non-target language norms or specifically source language words, neither of which appear in the Japanese rendering. Moreover, the text does not replace source-specific norms and words with target-specific equivalents, but rather, removes the story to an unrelated situation. The Chinese stallholder is not replaced with a Japanese correspondent, but removed in favour of a group of friends, meaning that it is equally difficult to argue the presence of domestication.

Stories of Japanese Origin

A great many rakugo stories are not the products of interlingual translation from Chinese, but intralingual translation from other texts already present within the Japanese language. There is a large body of rakugo stories that are categorized as 芝居噺 (*shibai-banashi*) [play stories], which incorporate stories or scenes from traditional kabuki plays. A common feature of this kind of story is the general tendency to parody. This parody can be directed at the play in question or the kabuki art form in general (Furukawa, 1984: 94,

---

[45] A very similar example of a translation from a Classical Chinese text to a rakugo can be found in the text known as まわり猫 [Circuitous Cat]. The textual relationships in this translation are illustrated in the appendix (page 234).

Kadooka, 2013: 50). One of these *shibai-banashi* is the story of 猫の忠信 *(Neko no Tadanobu) [Tadanobu the Cat]*, which appropriates the hugely famous story of 義経千本桜 *(Yoshitsune Senbon Zakura)[Yoshitsune and the Thousand Cherry Trees]* (B. Katsura, 1978: 185). The parody in this story begins with its title, which recalls the main character of the play, who is variously called 源九郎 (Genkurō), or 狐忠信 (Kitsune Tadanobu) [Tadanobu the fox] (B. Katsura, 2002e: 8). The story is by no means limited to the rakugo and kabuki art forms, where it is one of the three most frequently performed plays (Cavaye et al., 2004: 29). It was originally composed for jōruri (S. Katsura, 2006d: 292), a kind of story-telling that is chanted and accompanied by music (Lancashire, 2011: 81). However, the story is also found in the repertoire of gidayū puppetry (S. Katsura, 2006d: 292). The kabuki text focuses on Tadanobu the fox, a magical creature[46] that is able to assume human form. He does so in order to retrieve a drum, which has been made from the skin of his parents. The rakugo parodies this story by appropriating the idea of a shape-shifting animal and a musical instrument made from the skin of its parents, but replaces the fox with a cat, and the drum with a shamisen[47]. The kabuki story is one that famously involves an emotional scene of the fox describing his inability to fulfil his filial obligations to his deceased parents on account of their bodies having been used to make a drum (Ohnuki-Tierney, 2002: 46). The corresponding element of the rakugo parodies the emotion of this scene, as well as the characteristic way that lines are delivered in kabuki, by having the cat protagonist proclaim in a matter of fact way "私はあの三味線のォ〜…子でございます！" [I am the son of that oh-… shamisen!] (S. Katsura, 2006d: 289).

---

[46] Foxes are present in a great deal of Japanese folklore as creatures with the ability to shape-shift (T.W. Johnson, 1974: 40). They are frequently portrayed using their magical powers to trick unsuspecting humans.

[47] The shamisen is a Japanese string instrument akin to the banjo, the main body of which is indeed, traditionally made from cat skin (Seigle, 1993: 171). It should also be noted that traditional Japanese folklore also contains a sizeable number of accounts of *bakeneko*, which are shape-shifting cats that are portrayed in a similar way to foxes (Casal, 1959: 62).

While the vast majority of rakugo stories are comic, not all of them are parodies. There are examples of rakugo stories that employ as their sources well-known texts from other art forms that are translated in such a way as to create humour, but not to parody. Brau (2006: 26) shows how the rakugo entitled 明烏 *(Akegarasu)[A Crow at Daybreak]* is a translation of an older *shinnai* ballad, known as 明烏夢泡雪 *(Akegarasu Yume no Awayuki) [A Crow at Daybreak, A Dream of Light Snowfall]*, one of the most highly regarded works of its genre. Perhaps it is this popularity that prompted the translation of the work into the repertoires of kabuki (Hare, 1993: 117) and rakugo. However, the translation was not one that maintained the tragedy of the source text, in which desperate lovers are forced into double suicide by their hopeless situation. Rather, the target text is a quirky comedy, in which a young man is tricked into going to the infamous pleasure district (Noguchi, 2008: 158). Interestingly, this violent shift from tragedy to comedy does not parody or mock the source text. Rather, the target text adapts its source to an entirely different mood.

There is a similar practice in evidence in a number of other rakugo, in which the source text is not alluded to, or parodied, but is in fact, incorporated as a part of the target text. These rakugo often have their sources in well-known *tanka* poems[48], which are incorporated into the rakugo, with their interpretation used as a crucial part of the story. One example is 崇徳院 *(Sutokuin),* which pivots around a *tanka* from the 11th-century. In the story, the first line of this well-known poem is left behind by a young woman, and found by a young man, who subsequently interprets her feelings based on the remainder:

> 花時の生玉明神の掛茶屋で、若旦那が所も知らず名も知らぬ譲さんを見そめる。相手も憎からず思ってか、「瀬をはやみ岩にせかるる滝川のわれても末は逢わんとぞ思う」の崇徳院の歌を、金扇 に書き残して去ったのは、いつかまたお目にかかれますように、との心と思われた。これから若旦那の恋わずらい。出入りの喜イやんが意中を打診した結果、腰弁で譲さんの身もとさがしに、毎日大阪中を歩きまわる。目をつかたんが人の集まる髪結床だが日に三べんもヒゲを剃っては顔がヒリヒリする。

---

[48] Occasionally referred to with the more generic term waka, the tanka is a thirty-one sound poem with a long history of use in formal Japanese courtship (Lowitz et al., 1994: 10).

やがて順番を待ちながら、手代風の男の話を聞くともなく聞けば、その家の譲さんが恋わずらいで発端はこうこうと、似たようなことをいっている。てっきりこいつにきまったと、喜イやんいきなり手代の胸ぐらにつかみかかって「さあ、その譲さんの居所をぬかせ」。目が血走っているので手代はビックリ、わけもわからず争うはずみに、瀬戸物屋の荷を倒して商い物がこっぱみじんになった。床屋の親方が仲裁に入って双方の事情がわかり、どちらもめでたしめでたしとなったが、めでたくないのは瀬戸物屋。「商売物をどないしてくれるのや」とねじこまれたが喜イやん少しもさわがず、「どっちも大店や。われても末は買わんとぞ思う」

[During the flowering season at a tea hut at Ikudama shrine, the young master spotted a young woman but didn't know her name or where she came from. She had also noticed him and liked what she saw. She wrote on a gilded folding fan "The river, never ceasing to move, may be split in two by a boulder, but its two halves will surely re-join downstream", a poem by Sutokuin. Then she left. The man took this to mean that the girl hoped to see him again. Straight away, the man became lovesick, pining over the girl. When Kii-yan, his journey man managed to get him to say what was wrong, he was sent as an errand boy to walk around Osaka every day until he found the girl. Hoping to find someone who had seen her, he hung around a barber's shop, but after having his third shave of the day, his face was raw and tender. While he was waiting for his turn again, he couldn't help but overhear a man who looked like a household reeve talking. The man said that the young woman of the house where he worked had suddenly become lovesick. This sounded familiar to Kii-yan and he put two and two together. In a flash, Kii-yan grabbed the reeve's lapels and said "oi you, show me where this young woman is". The reeve was surprised, not least by Kii-yan's bloodshot eyes. He didn't understand what was going on and in the ensuing struggle, happened to knock over the pots in a ceramic shop, smashing them into smithereens. The shop owner decided to act as mediator and asked for both parties' stories. Having heard each other's plights, everyone was as happy as could be. Except, that is, for the shop owner who said "you had better pay for my goods somehow". But Kii-yan wasn't flustered at all. He said we're both from big houses. Whatever has been broken we'll settle up for eventually."]

What separates this kind of incorporation from simple intertextuality is the fact that not only are the poem and its meaning pivotal to the story itself, but the *ochi*[49] is a pun on the poem's concluding line, while the title is the name of the poem's composer (B. Katsura, 2002c: 69, Noguchi, 2008: 132-133). The ochi is a defining characteristic of a rakugo performance and can be thought of in similar terms to the punch line of a joke (Sweeney, 1979: 49), although its functions are more complex.

As pivotal for the ochi if the poem were removed from this text, there would no longer be any story. The poem can be thought of as both source text, and an integral part of the target text. A very similar example is found in 猿丸太夫 (*Sarumaru no Daifu*):

> ある者、高尾へ紅葉見に行き、戻りに駕籠を借りてけり。駕籠かきい ふやう、「旦那、高尾へお出なら、さぞお歌があつたであろ」といへば、 「いかにも歌をよんだ。奥山に紅葉ふみわけ鳴く鹿の声聞く時ぞ秋は悲 しき」「さてゝ、わたしらは何も存じませぬが、面白さうにござる」と いひゝ、程なく堀川の辻へ来りければ、辻の駕籠の者、「八兵衛、よい 旦那のせた」といへば、駕籠かき「よい旦那か、猿丸太夫さんじや」(Ui, 1952: 215-216)

> [Having been to see the autumn leaves in Takao, a man hired a rickshaw for the journey home. The ignorant rickshaw driver said to him 'Mister, since you've just come from Takao, you must have a few poems'. So the man recited this poem to him. 'Deep in the mountains, with crimson leaves underfoot, I hear the cry of a deer and am struck with the sadness of autumn.' The rickshaw driver said 'I see, well I don't know anything about poetry but it sounds alright to me'. Later on, when he arrived at the river crossing at Horikawa, the ferryman asked him, 'have you had any good fares today?' the rickshaw driver said 'good fares? I've been pulling along Sarumaru no Daifu!']

The parodying style of *shibai-banashi,* and the way that rakugo occasionally incorporate their source texts may belie a generalizable factor in the relationship between rakugo stories and their sources. To parody is to make the relationship between source and target text overt. A text cannot successfully be parodied unless it is recognized and known by the target audience. Hence, to parody is to extract

---

[49] The ochi is rarely the climax of the performance, but tends, instead, to tie up the story (Brau, 2008: 48)..

features of a text continually, and subvert them within a target text. Similarly, if a source text plays an integral part in the target text, the understanding of the target text is hinged on an understanding of the source as the lines separating the two texts are blurred. It is unclear in such a case if the translation can be defined unproblematically as mediating, given that an understanding of the source text is assumed. This notion of simultaneously referring to source text and target interpretation is reminiscent of *kanbun-kundoku*, which allows a target reader to refer directly to both the source text and another individual's interpretation in the form of diacritics. Rakugo translated from Classical Chinese texts do not make any overt reference to their source texts or any assumption that target audiences will know them. However, they also do not demonstrate any intention to represent their source texts in the target language. Similarly, the parodying practices of *shibai-banashi* and those stories that incorporate poems appear to assume audience familiarity with the source text and its paratext[50].

This assumed prior familiarity with the source is incompatible with a mediating conception of translation, which would, instead, aim to represent or recreate the source text, and so, employ strategies to mitigate for the target audience's lack of familiarity with the paratext. With these factors in mind, it appears plain that the translation techniques employed in creating rakugo stories demonstrate minimal interest in acting as a mediator between source text and target audience.

To consider the theories of domestication, foreignization, and explicitation in these cases then is to overlook this lack of a mediating role in rakugo. Domestication and foreignization imply mediation and describe alternative approaches to it. Domestication is target norm-emphasizing mediation, while foreignization is mediation with an emphasis on the mediating role itself, and by extension, source norms. The theories of domestication and foreignization are further problematized in cases such as these, involving intralingual translation. Domestication is particularly problematic in these cases as it is difficult to imagine how one could domesticate an already domestic situation. However, it could be suggested that in particular, the

---

[50] The interpretation of the notion of paratext used here is the same as that described by Genette (1997: 1), who sees the extra-textual elements that accompany a text as pivotal for its interpretation. Here it is argued that the target audience of the rakugo stories are assumed to be familiar with the paratext of the stories' sources, since the stories make humorous reference to them.

forms of parody observed here constitute a kind of foreignization, because they highlight the relationship between the source and target texts. For the same reason, it could also be argued that by overtly mimicking the delivery style of kabuki actors in *shibai-banashi,* rakugo introduces non-domestic norms, a classic strategy of foreignization (see Venuti, 2004: 20).

However, because rakugo stories appear to assume audience familiarity with the source texts, the fact that the target text is based on a source is already overt. As a result, the aim of applying foreignization, which is to prevent the translator's role from being overlooked (Venuti, 2004: 34), does not apply and so, application of the theory becomes problematic.

The case of explicitation is no less problematic, since, among the three theories examined here, it is possibly the one that is most overtly based on the notion of translation as a form of mediation (see Blum-Kulka, 1986/2004: 21, Pápai, 2004: 144). It could be argued that in cases where the source text is a poem, by including the whole source text in the target, the remainder of the target text functions to explicitate an interpretation of the source. However, here again, because an understanding of the source text is assumed in many cases, and because the interpretation provided by the story is almost always comical, it is more accurate to describe the target text as a subversion than an explicitation.

One Storyteller to Another

As with any art form that is primarily transmitted orally, the initial creation of a rakugo target text is only a part of the story. Of equal interest is the transmission of stories from teacher to student, or alternatively, the translation of a teacher's texts by students. There is an important effect on this translation, caused by the audience's assumed familiarity with the story's source material. This effect is that if each storyteller were to recount the story verbatim, its appeal as an entertainment medium would soon wane (Tatekawa, 2000: 33). If, on the other hand, a story is unique in some respect to each storyteller and performance, an ephemeral quality is lent to the art, which will continue to draw in audiences, already familiar with the stories told. Some degree of flexibility is attributable to the variable time constraints of particular performances (Brau, 2008: 48). However, the vast majority of the variety observable

across storytellers and performances is much less simplistic than the abridgement one would predict from a performance squeezed into a given time slot.

This variation occurs not only in the events described in any given story, but also the description thereof, which varies to such a degree that even comparison of performance transcripts of storytellers as closely related as Beichō and his former student Shijaku show few if any verbatim correspondences[51].

An example of the ways that storytellers vary language and detail within a story can be found in the rakugo entitled *池田の猪買い (Ikeda no Inoshishi Kai) [Shopping for Boar in Ikeda]*. Below is an extract from this story as it is told by Beichō, in which the character named Jin is trying to clear up some confusion about which direction the main character should walk in order to get to Ikeda[52]:

> 甚　「[...]大阪から池田へ行くのに、なんで一ぺん和歌山を回らんな
> らんねん。それがお前、いらんことやちゅうのや、いらんことは
> しゃべるもんやないで、ほんまに。わからんだら、たずねなはれ、
> な。問うは当座の恥、問わなんだら末代の恥ちゅうことがあるの
> やさかい。うちとこの表、出たらこれが井池筋や、なあ。こいつ
> を北へドーンと突き当たる。」(B. Katsura, 2002a: 70)

> [Jin　"Why would you need to head back to Wakayama[53] to get from Osaka to Ikeda? What a stupid thing to say, don't say such stupid things. They say that the shame of asking passes in a moment. On the other hand, the shame of not asking, and living in ignorance lasts a lifetime. If you go out of the house through the front door, you'll find yourself on Dobuikesuji[54], right? Then you've got to follow that road north until you reach the end."]

Shijaku (2006c: 135) acknowledges having learnt and received guidance on the telling of this story from Beichō. However, as the corresponding excerpt from Shijaku's own version below demonstrates, learning a story in rakugo does not imply

---

[51] These two storytellers and their relationship are introduced on page 25.

[52] Ikeda is a city in the north of Osaka.

[53] Wakayama is prefecture to the south of Osaka.

[54] Dobuikesuji is a street in Osaka. Osaka's layout historically follows a grid pattern. The "suji" (筋) suffix indicates a street that runs north-south, in contrast to a "tōri" (通り), which runs east-west (Yamashita, 1987: 56).

learning to reproduce it. Shijaku's version greatly expands on the idea of asking for help. Where Beichō's version neatly uses a proverb, Shijaku repeatedly uses the word "わかる" (wakaru) [understand] for comic effect. He also makes characteristically greater use of dialogue between the two characters than Beichō:

甚　「[…]大阪にいる人間が、池田へ行くのに、何で一ぺん和歌山
　　回って行かんならんねん。どんならんで、ほんま。わからんね
　　やろ」

○　実、わかりませんねん」

甚　「わからなんだら、尋ねなはれ。どんならん、ええ？わからん
　　ことを正直にわからんと尋ねることは決して恥かしいこっちゃ
　　ないぞ。わからんことをやで、わかったような顔をする、これ
　　がわからんということじゃ。わからんことをわからんと正直に
　　言うのは、決してわからんこっちゃない。わからんことをわか
　　ったような顔をする、これをわからんと言うねん。わかったか」

○　「わからん」

甚　「何を言うてんねん、やかまし。とりあえず家、表へ出なはれ。
　　これが井池筋じゃ」(S. Katsura, 2006c: 108)

[Jin […] "Why would someone in Osaka want to go back to Wakayama to get to Ikeda? For goodness sake. you don't understand do you?"

○　"To be honest, I don't understand."

Jin　"If you don't understand something you must ask. How stupid. There's no shame in being honest when you don't understand something and just admitting that you don't understand it. It's much better than pretending you understand when you don't understand. Saying honestly that you don't understand something you don't understand is better than pretending there's nothing you don't understand. Rather than pretending you understand something you don't understand, just say you don't understand. Do you understand?"

○　"No, I don't understand."

Jin　"What do you mean? For goodness sake! To start with, go straight out of the house you will be on Dobuikesuji."]

Variation also frequently occurs across storytellers' use of detail. As in the example above, a large number of classical rakugo are categorized as *tabibanashi* [travel stories] (旅噺) that often involve unwitting commoners who farcically meet endless

troubles while they journey across the countryside. Shores (2008: 107) notes the function of these travel stories in early modern Japan. He points out that "[*t*]*abibanashi* were humorous, but also spoke to the commoner class of the varied geographical and cultural landscapes that surrounded them" (Shores, 2008: 107).

Almost inevitably, these *tabibanashi* frequently mention definitive distances, using the *ri*. The *ri* was the standard unit of measurement in use in Japan between the late 7th-century and the official adoption of the metric system in 1951 (Frédéric, 2002: 788). The measurement itself varied substantially between regions, but was officially recognized as comprising 36 chō (3,927m) (Frédéric, 2002: 788).

In a manner reminiscent of this regional variation in reckoning a unit of measurement, storytellers are anything but consistent in their descriptions of distance. The rakugo entitled 夏の医者 *(Natsu no Isha) [Summertime Doctor]* illustrates the potential variation, even between closely related storytellers. Here, Beichō describes the distance a man has to walk to fetch a doctor for his sick father as "山越しの三里半" [three and a half *ri* over the mountains] (B. Katsura, 2002e: 204). Conversely, in Shijaku's version, the distance expands to "山越しの八里半" [eight and a half *ri* over the mountains] (S. Katsura, 2006b: 338). These variations between storytellers are also by no means limited to distance. Below is the summary of *Summertime Doctor*:

> 藪医者療治の帰るさ暑さに困り、陰に涼み居たりしを、蟒蛇来って何の苦もなく呑みにけり。医者腹の中にて工夫し、懐中の茶碗より巴豆大黄の類をまきちらしければ、腹中大いに鳴り渡り医者を立くだしにくだしけり。医者大いに喜び、帰らんとせしが薬箱をうはばみの腹の中に忘れたり。これはしたりと又うはばみが前に畏り「ヤイうはばみ、今一度おれを呑んでくれい」といへば、うはばみ大音にて「エヽ、医者を見ても胸が悪い」(Ui, 1952: 332)

> [A quack was on his way home from treating a patient one day when he started to suffer from the heat. While he took a rest in the cool of the shade, an uwabami came along and promptly swallowed him whole. Inside the uwabami's stomach, the doctor came up with a plan. He took out a bowl of purging croton, some rhubarb and other things from his pocket and started sprinkling them about. The stomach gave a loud noise and purged itself of the doctor. The doctor was overjoyed, but when he came to continue on his way home he realised that he had left his medicine box inside. The uwabami had learned his lesson though, so

when the doctor said "Oi uwabami, can you swallow me again?" the uwabami
replied loudly "Just looking at you makes me feel queasy"]

This summary does not include any of the episodes leading up to the doctor's reason for travelling over the mountains, and also states that the doctor is on his way home, rather than on his way to the patient as in Beichō's and Shijaku's texts. In the versions of both of these storytellers, a man crosses the mountains to fetch a doctor for his sick father. However, even the particulars leading up to this point in the story differ between the two versions. Shijaku's version includes an entire scene that is not present in Beichō's. This scene depicts family members crowding around the protagonist's father, who has suddenly been taken sick. They discuss where a doctor can be found, and conclude that the protagonist must be sent over the mountains to the next village (B. Katsura, 2002e: 201-203).

Can it be that this kind of discrepancy between texts is simply the result of imperfect recall of the story on the part of the storyteller? This question implies that since rakugo traditionally makes no use of written materials, passing stories from teacher to student verbally (Brau, 2008: 132), errors may appear as a result of imperfect memorization.

The training of a rakugo storyteller typically lasts a considerable number of years (Sweeney, 1979: 37). During this period, a student shadows his or her teacher and works as a domestic servant as well as professional assistant (Brau, 2008: 116-127). Through this close personal relationship, the student is immersed in the world of rakugo, and receives optimum opportunity to absorb stories while listening to the performances of senior story-tellers, a practice known as 聞き覚え (*kikioboe*)[remembering by hearing]. The student's learning is further supplemented by formal rehearsals, or お稽古 (*o-keiko*)(Brau, 2008: 130), during which, the teacher ensures that the student has fully grasped the story. In order to confirm the student's grasp of a story, some teachers even insist on verbatim reproduction in the initial stages, before performance is considered (Brau, 2008: 132). As a result, it is safe to say that a great deal of emphasis is placed on the importance of a story being learnt properly from the outset, which suggests that the reason for large degrees of variation is something other than error. It seems more likely that in order to maintain audience interest in a story, variation is consciously added and so, although a student

may initially be encouraged to acquire the teacher's version of a story, its re-creation is not the ultimate goal (Brau, 2008: 97).

Similarity and Variety

Both Beichō (2002e: 198) and Shijaku (2006b: 349) state that they learned *Summertime Doctor* from an older storyteller called 橘ノ円都 (Tachibana no Ento). Therefore, what we have in the transcripts of the two storytellers' texts is not a source and target text, but two targets. By observing the similarities and disparities between the two texts, we are able to observe the degree of variation that is liable to occur between contemporaneous versions of the same text.

Both of these texts vary to a notable degree from the story's summary quoted above. Their common narrative begins with a young man whose father is ill. The man travels some distance to find the doctor who, after a deal of persuasion, agrees to go with the man to treat the father. While on the journey over the mountains, the two men come across what they believe to be a fallen tree on the path. This tree turns out to be a mythical giant snake, called an 蟒蛇 (uwabami)(Volker, 1950: 146), which swallows them before either of them realize. In a farcical manner, the doctor gives the man medicine to spread on the inside of the snake's stomach and the two men are expelled. The story's conclusion or *ochi* consists of the doctor realising that his medicine box has been left inside the snake and asking to be swallowed again. The uwabami refuses, complaining "夏の医者は腹にさわる" (B. Katsura, 2002e: 211, S. Katsura, 2006b: 347) [summertime doctors irritate my stomach[55]].

This small number of commonalities between the two texts implies a large number of dissimilarities. Fundamental differences are as structurally important as the introductory scene in Shijaku's version, illustrated above. Further examples include Beichō having the doctor reminisce at length on his youth, spent with a now elderly female owner of an inn in the young man's village; and Shijaku having the doctor constantly complain about the young man's loud voice, and making the young man

---

[55] This ochi reflects the fact that in both versions, the doctor observes that "夏のチシャは腹にさわる" [summertime lettuce irritates the stomach]. A pun is formed therefore between チシャ (chisha)[lettuce] and 医者(isha)[doctor]. An ochi formed by a pun is one of the categories by which rakugo are catalogued and categorised (Nobuhiro et al., 2003: 53).

promise to bring his heavy medicine box back for him whether his father dies or not. Conversely, the doctor in the Beichō version simply assumes that the young man will carry it one way, and the doctor deliberates on staying overnight at the local inn, run by his old friend (B. Katsura, 2002e: 204-205).

The goal of a rakugo storyteller in recounting a story then is not merely a kind of mediation between the time constraints of the performance, the comprehension of the audience, and some archetypical version of the story in question. Rather, elements of the source text taught to the storyteller during training are interwoven with other, non-derived elements. As a result, it is overly simplistic to describe examples such as the descriptions of the medicine in *Summertime Doctor* in terms of explicitation. Here, Beichō describes the medicine as a "下し薬" [laxative] as well as a powdered medicine, using the synoyms "散薬" and "粉薬" (B. Katsura, 2002e: 208-209), where Shijaku uses only the first term (S. Katsura, 2006b: 344). In cases where mediation is the underlying aim, it would be reasonable to assume that Beichō had included the synonyms in order to ensure that the nature of the particular medicine mentioned in the source text is completely clear. In the case of rakugo, however, it is just as likely that the source text referred to a liquid medicine, or neglected to specify a particular kind of drug as Shijaku does, and therefore, this whole passage is of Beichō's own invention.

If a text in rakugo is, indeed, not constrained by any notion of drawing on some archetypal rendering of the story, and therefore, lexical choice, as well as characterization and plot are open to a great degree of variation among storytellers, the question of what a text in rakugo consists of naturally presents itself. If all or many elements of a particular story are liable to vary between contemporaneous tellers, it might be argued that the only defining constant is the story's title.

Creativity and the World of the Story

This examination of rakugo has illustrated a number of features that could be described as characteristic of the tradition's uses of translation. Abductive logic, as illustrated in the introduction (42), prompts an examination of these features in conjunction with the Japanese context in order to attempt to ascertain the factor or factors that would make these features a matter of course. Thus, this analysis, much like that of Chapter 1, will attempt to ascertain a conception of text production that

would have caused translation to be used in the ways identified above. This chapter has noted rakugo's use of very short Classical Chinese texts in the creation of full rakugo, though the target texts differ in almost every detail of the story from their sources. It has also observed the tradition's use of parody, in which texts already present in the Japanese literary system as plays, ballads, or stories are rendered into rakugo with often dramatically differing moods and delivery styles. The chapter has explored rakugo's tendency to incorporate a source text fully into the resultant target. It has noted that in these cases, knowledge of the source text is assumed by the translation, meaning that the target text cannot be seen as expounding particularly erudite passages. Instead, the source text becomes an integral part of the translation and the story comes to revolve around it.

As noted above, there is a commonality between all of these noted features. Each tends to raise questions pertaining to the amount of material a translation is expected to derive from its source text. The oral tradition of story transmission from teacher to student outlined above, and the substantial differences between related storytellers' versions it creates adds further to questions relating to what the title of a rakugo actually indicates.

Such a highly liberal and flexible conception of what distinguishes a retelling from a distinct story is not unique to rakugo among Japanese art forms. There exists a long-standing distinction in the Japanese literary tradition of describing elements or features as either 世界 *(sekai)* [world] or 趣向 *(shukō)* [idea]. These concepts categorize those elements of a text that are constant, and those which are variable respectively (Yiu, 1998: 79-80). The dichotomy's precise antiquity is difficult to ascertain, as the terminology has not remained constant. Quinn (2005: 380) shows the prominence of the idea in the work of the pre-eminent aesthetician and playwright 世阿弥元清 (Zeami Motokiyo) (c 1363- c 1443). Zeami uses the metaphor of a seed (Parker, 2006: 20) to represent the *sekai* elements of a source piece, from which the *shukō* elements, and hence, the target text grow. Later, in 1801, a writer working under the pseudonym Nyūgatei Ganyū (入我亭我入) wrote the Kezairoku (戯財録) (Parker, 2006: 30). Here, he likens the writing process to that of weaving cloth. Within this new metaphor, the *sekai,* or constant elements are likened to the warp threads that run throughout a piece of fabric and bind it together (Parker, 2006: 34). The *shukō* elements are likened to the weft threads that intersect the warp

and create interest in the fabric (Parker, 2006: 35). Thus, the etymologically-related text and textile can be seen in the same light in this case. Both rely on the use of constant elements that have a binding and linking effect over the whole, as well as variable elements that bring interest and novelty to the piece.

Sekai and *shukō* were formalized as dichotomous terms for constants and variables as recently as the late 18ᵗʰ-century, when they acquired their current meanings in kabuki theatre (Gerstle, 2000: 50). Here, *sekai* describes common elements of a play's various renditions. These elements may include the rough temporal or geographical setting of a piece, the main characters, or the sequence of events. Conversely, the *shukō* elements constitute embellishments, those elements of the work that are specific to a given rendition and will be potentially unique to it (Brau, 2006: 24).

The idea of an established dichotomy between constant and variable elements in text transmission is helpful for understanding the various practices observed above. It explains why stories that were translated from Classical Chinese source texts tend to have only a tentative relationship with their sources, often differing in terms of plot, characterization, and styles of description. Similarly, it explains why those texts that are translated from Japanese language texts, such as plays and poems, tend to have a dramatically different approach to the story in question, or tell a different story using the same characters. Finally, it explains why the versions of a story told by the two closely related storytellers encountered here could differ to such a degree and in such a way that cannot be simplistically attributed to imperfect recollection. All of these examples demonstrate not only the widespread use, but also the flexibility of the *sekai-shukō* approach. They show that the constant *sekai* elements can be limited to as few features as the rough temporal setting of a piece and its main character, while the variable *shukō* elements can include anything from the number of characters in a story, to the structure of the plot.

The wide-ranging applications of the *sekai-shukō* approach are well attested in Japanese art forms, particularly those, like classical rakugo, which date from the Edo period. It was used in a wide variety of forms of text production, ranging from the creation of *haikai* poetry to the popular spectacle of kabuki theatre (Saltzman-Li, 2010: 138, Shibata, 2009: 27). The approach makes it possible and acceptable to draw on extant, potentially well-known texts as sources, while avoiding the repetition or predictability that may otherwise be anticipated from reproducing such

works. Through the notion of *sekai,* elements of the source text to be retained are identified and reproduced, while *shukō* elements make up the remainder of the target text and potentially create a highly novel version of the story.

Abductive reasoning naturally leads us to the impression that if this highly influential understanding of text production influenced rakugo early in its formation, it would have made all of the practices identified above predictable. Seen through the lens of an intention to produce interest by interweaving derived and original elements, rakugo's use of translation appears far more idiosyncratic and systematized than if translation is viewed mainly as a means of conveying source material to target audiences.

Conclusions

This chapter has examined the uses of translation in rakugo storytelling. Concurrently, it has examined the ability of the approach to studying translation that currently enjoys most prominence to generate meaningful findings on the texts. Whereas chapters 1 and 2 examined Chaucer's approach to translation in relation to abductive reasoning and the translation theories respectively, this chapter has contrasted the findings of abductive reasoning with the use of theories in the study of rakugo.

The theories were shown wanting in their abilities to rationalize such features and practices as freely altering details that are seemingly inconsequential to the text's comprehension; adding or subtracting passages, scenes, or characters; and using the translation to parody or otherwise openly discuss the source texts in the translation. On the other hand, abductive reasoning found that if the translation practices used in rakugo were conceptualized as pivoting on a synthesis of inherited and invented elements, such as that described by the dichotomous terms of *sekai* and *shukō*, all such phenomena could be expected.

These findings suggest that like mediation and *excogitatio*, the conceptualizations of translation already found to have exerted an influence over text production, the *sekai-shukō* dichotomy should also be recognized as a distinct understanding of translation practice. The implication is that it is beyond the scope of this thesis to quantify the number of discreet understandings of translation to have existed throughout the world, though these understandings are evidently far from limited to

mediation. This topic clearly holds great potential for future research, given the number of historical and cultural contexts that have not, hitherto been the subject of extensive translation research.

In the case of rakugo, as with the *Canterbury Tales*, the feature of contemporary translation studies' approach to analysing texts that appears to be most problematic is its insistence on rationalizing the practice as a form of mediation. Chapter 2 saw that at best the theories could be used to label features of the various texts, although the ways each accounted for those features was invariably inconsistent with the context of medieval England. This chapter has found that translation practices in rakugo are arguably less easily reconciled with the theories, even as labels.

In a manner reminiscent of Chapter 1, this chapter has found numerous instances of features that ostensibly may be comparable with those described by each theory. However, in each case, analysis by the theory is hampered by the distinct approach to translation apparent in rakugo. Like Chaucer, rakugo storytellers exhibit no apparent intention or goal of mediating between the source text and the target audience. Rather, the storytellers' intention in translating appears to be to include a finite number of features derived from the source text, but to interweave these with novel features. Translation in rakugo is then, not a way of telling a new version of an extant story, but a way of integrating derived and original elements into a new text.

This approach appears extremely eclectic in its acquisition of source material. Source texts range from Classical Chinese commentaries and storybooks, to poems, ballads, and plays in Japanese. Even the overall message of these source works appears to wield very little influence over the ultimate nature of the rakugo story. The form of translation rakugo uses makes it quite feasible to render elements from a tragic or otherwise sombre story into a farcical comedy. Thus, any notion that translation is a way to represent, re-create, or in any other sense, mediate for a source text appears entirely incompatible with the textual relationships it constructs.

These findings support those of Chapter 1, and the inference prompted by the introductory chapter's corpus analysis that translation studies as a discipline may not benefit from its apparent focus on a limited set of cultural and historical contexts. It appears increasingly likely that an overriding focus on particular contexts might cause the theories and assumptions to be relatively specific to those contexts, and hence, not representative of translation in general. The results of these first three chapters suggest that the apparent lack of sympathy between the theories and the two

case studies is a product of the theories' assumption that translation is a fundamentally mediating practice. Abductive reasoning has shown that translation in rakugo most probably functions in terms of the *sekai-shukō* dichotomy. Similarly, it has shown Chaucer's translation activities to be most efficiently described in terms of the notion of *excogitatio*. However, since only mediation was shown to enjoy any substantial attention in the corpus, it may be that the theories have been built on the assumption that translation is mediation, meaning other conceptions, such as *sekai-shukō*, or *excogitatio* may not have been taken into consideration.

Chapter 4 will move the focus of analysis onto the apparent lack of sympathy between the forms of translation in evidence in rakugo, in the *Canterbury Tales*, and in the corpus. It will attempt to ascertain if this lack of sympathy is insurmountable, or if the theories can indeed be made more useful for the analysis of translations not based on mediation. It will use the examples of Chaucer and rakugo to attempt to discover what prevents the theories from yielding meaningful results in the analysis of non-mediating translations. It will then ask if the theories and non-mediating forms of translation are irreconcilable or if there is a solution to bridge the apparent lacunae between them.

CHAPTER 4

Reasoning at Cross-Purposes:

The Reconciliation of Theory and Practice

Introduction

In Chapter 3, it was found that the contemporary translation theories of domestication, foreignization, and explicitation are not only problematic when used to analyse the translations of Chaucer and his contemporaries. The chapter also saw that rakugo similarly resists simple analysis by these same theories. Furthermore, rakugo, like the *Canterbury Tales,* was found to be fundamentally based on a goal quite distinct from the contemporary concern for mediation between source text and target culture. This chapter will attempt to ascertain precisely why it is problematic to use these theories to analyse translation in the *Canterbury Tales* and rakugo. It will explore the sorts of results that may be predicted by the respective theories and compare these with the results that have actually been found. Subsequently, the chapter will move on to clarify the mediation paradigm further, and analyse the impact this way of conceptualizing translation has on theories and their application. This understanding of mediation as a paradigm will be compared with others that have been shown to inform our understanding of the mechanics of translation in each case study, namely, *excogitatio* in the case of Chaucer and the *sekai-shukō* dichotomy in that of rakugo. This comparison will be used to explore whether there is a way to reconcile theory and practice in each case or if contemporary theories are only effective for studying translations produced within the contemporary, mediation-based paradigm.

The chapter begins to address this issue by considering the explicitation hypothesis, the kinds of results it predicts, and those it has produced in prior chapters when used in conjunction with rakugo or the *Canterbury Tales*.

Expected results and actual results

The explicitation hypothesis implies that patterns of expansion observable in a target text when it is compared with a source text occur as a result of the translator's

conscious or unconscious will to communicate the contents of the source text to the target audience (Blum-Kulka, 1986/2004: 18, 32, Englund Dimitrova, 2005: 58). Expressing the theory in this way highlights the fact that mediation lies at its heart. In chapters 2 and 3 (75, 105), we saw that although very similar patterns of expansion may be observable in the translation traditions of Chaucer and rakugo, the mediation-based rationalization, central to the explicitation hypothesis, produces results that are incompatible with the contexts in which the translations in question are generated. Explicitation implies that instances of behaviours such as glossing or extended descriptions are the results of translation's communicating process between source text and target audience (Blum-Kulka, 1986/2004: 20-21). However, it was found that this idea of communication is inappropriate for either Chaucer's translations or those of rakugo because neither of these traditions have a goal of mediation. Thus, the theory assists in identifying categories of patterns that may appear in a translated text, but the function of these patterns that the theory provides is based on mediation and hence, most apt for the study of translations which also fulfil a mediating role.

A very similar situation arises when foreignization is used to try to understand the functions of features in either rakugo or the *Canterbury Tales*. Foreignization posits that features of translations that defy target norms or highlight the status of the texts as derived result from a conscious choice on the part of translators to illustrate their own role in the mediating process (Hatim and Mason, 1997: 121, Venuti, 2004: 20, 102, 198). Clearly, however, in cases where translators do not see their roles as fundamentally ones of mediation this theory's ability to rationalize the occurrence of norm-defying features is compromised. Much as with the explicitation hypothesis, the fact that the underlying motivation for the occurrence of a given textual feature cannot satisfactorily be explained by foreignization does not preclude the occurrence of those same features. Both the *Canterbury Tales* and rakugo stories have been shown to exhibit features that emphasize the fact that the texts are derived from sources. However, in neither case is the occurrence of such features indicative of the translator's wish to illustrate the mediating process for the simple reason that there is none to illustrate.

Domestication too, can be thought of as a mediating process that is most strongly inclined towards the target culture. The theory suggests that features particular to the target text that do not directly emphasize its nature as a translation occur as a result

of the mediating process (Venuti, 2004: 5, 70). Thus, within mediation-based translation, domestication will often be closely related to target norms and notions of target audience comprehension or acceptance (see for example Chesterman, 1997: 176, Nida, 1964/2004: 128). In cases where mediation is not the central aim, therefore, much as in the case of foreignization, the ability of domestication to add understanding to these patterns of word usage is hampered by the theory's focus on translation's assumed mediating role. In both rakugo and the *Canterbury Tales* there are numerous patterns of word usage particular to the target text (105, 81). However, it would be highly problematic to argue that these patterns occur because of the translators' intentions to appropriate the texts for the target culture.

If then, the application of all three of the theories to these two non-mediating forms of translation is equally, and for similar reasons, problematic, we are faced with the choice of either concluding that these theories are of no use in such cases or asking what, if anything can be done to make them more useful. If we conclude that they are of no use to these cases, the potential implication is that these theories are equally incapable of assisting the study of all non-mediating forms of translation. If we accept, however, that the commonality between each theory is an assumption that mediation is the goal of translation and that this assumption is what is problematic in these two cases, it may be possible to take account of this assumption when the theory is used.

It appears plausible that there exists a mediation paradigm[56], which asks and answers questions relating to mediation. It has been found, however, that these questions and answers are not necessarily transferable to translations produced outside this paradigm. In order to explore the possibility that the contemporary translation tradition is encapsulated within a mediation paradigm, it is first necessary to explore exactly how mediation is conceived, and so, what the assumption is that these theories are built on.

---

[56] The word "paradigm" is used here in a similar way to that put forward by science historian, Thomas Kuhn (1962). It describes a generally accepted worldview, or a conceptual or methodological model that underlies the theories and practices of a discipline at a particular time (Kuhn, 1962: 10). Thus, it has been demonstrated that translation practice is frequently equated with mediation in recent literature. It is, therefore, understandable that mediation also tends to underpin the analysis of translation in the same body of literature.

Traditions and Understandings of what it means to Translate

The introductory chapter's corpus analysis of contemporary literature found a high occurrence of references to translators as mediators and translation as a mediating practice (see for example Becher, 2011: 40, Lee, 2011a: 92, Simon, 2012: 130, Skibińska and Blumczyński, 2009: 50, R. Wilson, 2011: 245). There is also substantial evidence of the same conceptualization throughout the discipline, and crucially, in the writings of scholars whose work might be described as canonical (see for example Bassnett, 2006: 149-150, Bassnett and Lefevere, 1990: 142, Blum-Kulka, 1986/2004: 21, Chesterman, 1997: 165, Toury, 1995/2004: 199). Terms like mediating and mediator are, however, subject to a certain amount of interpretation. It is, therefore, helpful to observe other, complementary metaphors that appear in the corpus to ascertain how this mediation is perceived as functioning. Within the corpus, it is possible to find any number of metaphors in which translation is described in terms of physical mobility. Translation is described in terms of "transit" (R. Wilson, 2011: 238) and as a form of "[m]ovement across languages" (Simon, 2012: 130). Translators, as actors are seen to "carry across" (Rossette, 2009: 104) or "transfer" (Martín de León, 2008: 6, Wohlfart, 2009: 272) features from source to target texts. However, although the notion of mediation is very widely employed and metaphors describing the physical movement of texts, common, there is a notable difference in the way this movement, and by extension, mediation is characterized.

One notable understanding of this mediating role is that of providing a target audience access to an otherwise obscure text. This form of mediation is also likened to a "proxy" (Baker, 2010: 218, Boase-Beier, 2011: 175). The perception is that translators "relay" the sentiments or meanings contained within the source (Gürçağlar, 2009: 55, Strowe, 2011: 53). In this way, translation, and by extension, the translator is viewed as a "conduit" (Gürçağlar, 2009: 55) through which textual data may pass. Martín de León (2008: 7) engages directly with this conduit metaphor, asserting: "the translator, extracts the contents from a source–language text in order to introduce them into the pertinent signs of another language and, thus, transmit them to the receiver". Hence, a translation is perceived, not as a text in its own right, but as something like a cipher or key to the otherwise indecipherable source text.

The other very prominent understanding of the mediating metaphor within this corpus describes the movement in translation being initiated in the target literary

system. Here, translations are seen as texts that "recreate" (Martín García, 2008: 125, Pinto, 2009: 299), "reproduce" (Franzon, 2008: 376, Martín García, 2008: 124), "render" (Marco, 2010: 273, Shamma, 2009: 74, Tercedor, 2010: 182, Vlachopoulos, 2008: 107), or "reflect" (Kayyal, 2008: 64, Venturi, 2009: 333) their sources in the target context. Thus, translation here is perceived as a means by which a source text can be "imported" (Taivalkoski-Shilov, 2009: 308)[57] into the target literary system. In this way, a translation is seen as a version of the source text that is produced especially for the target culture.

These two understandings of the mediating role of translation, one on the behalf of the source text, and the other, on behalf of the target audience, are remarkably reminiscent of the dichotomy between foreignization and domestication. That is, translation can be conceptualized either as a way to access a foreign text or as a way to appropriate it. Similarly, the process of translation can either be achieved in such a way that the foreign nature of the text be emphasized or deemphasized. An interesting avenue for future research would be to explore any possible correlation among translators between a desire to highlight the otherness of translated texts and an understanding of translation as a means to access foreign texts rather than appropriate them.

The earlier chapters' exploration of translation as used by Chaucer and rakugo storytellers has provided evidence that other conceptualizations have also influenced text production. Chaucer and other medieval authors inherited and developed theories of text production from the classical world. The importance of these theories for the medieval consumption of authors' work can scarcely be overstated, as they were viewed not as an abstraction, but as an ideal, with which any work could be compared (see 72). One element of these medieval theories of text production that is noteworthy from a contemporary perspective is the apparent lack of importance that is placed on any distinction between originality and derivation. When Chaucer was active, not only was originality not the ideal, its importance appears to be minimal (A. Bennett, 2005: 45). However, simply because originality was not held in the same high esteem it would acquire with later generations does not mean that the aim was, instead, to reproduce antecedent texts in full. Rather, the polarity between

---

[57] Please note that this reference to importation is itself a reference to the same notion, expressed by Lefevere (1998: 41-42) and Toury (1995: 29).

translation and original writing as they are understood by contemporary text producers and consumers appears to be absent (Bruns, 1980: 120). This absence means that most texts produced at this time can be assumed to be derived, to some extent, from at least one antecedent text, but will most likely differ profoundly from these texts. This conceptualization of text production, in which translation and originality can be thought of as the fundamental ingredients of a text, is encapsulated within the medieval notion of *excogitatio* and its urging not to follow the tracts of the words (see 70). Because of this refusal to give voice to the source text in translation *excogitatio* is not only clearly distinct from mediation, it could even be described as its antithesis[58].

Given that, in medieval text production, the target text is not the product of a process of mediation, it is not as clearly subservient or acquiescent to its source. The translation has not been produced as an alternative to the source text, and so, has not been constrained by mediation-based concerns, such as the effort to contort the source in order to appease target norms. Therefore, the medieval translation presumably had the capacity to commensurate or even exceed the esteem afforded to its source(s), not merely as a representative of the source text or an iterance of the same textual entity, but as a discreet creation. In this sense, Chaucer and his contemporary translators produced texts that can be said to have engaged directly with their sources. Judging from the advice of medieval theoreticians like Geoffrey of Vinsauf, medieval target texts aimed to produce a reaction that is unlike that produced by any other version of the story in question. Translations would also regularly include material gleaned from other texts and omit material from the primary source (Beidler, 1999: 41). As a result, the source and target can be seen here as having a more dialogic relationship than in a mediating tradition[59].

Text production in rakugo has also been shown to function in a way that is quite unlike any of the other understandings of translation illustrated above. Here, text producers appear to have been heavily influenced by the theories of adaptation developed in traditional forms of Japanese theatre (117). During the same period, Japan's international borders were closed and the vast majority of foreign-language texts within the country would have been composed in Classical Chinese. The

---

[58] For a much more thorough exploration of literary voice, see Bakhtin and Emerson (1984).

[59] Again, for a more thorough exploration of dialogism, see Bakhtin and Emerson (1984).

Japanese developed a system for deciphering these Chinese texts that, while mediating (Mizuno, 2012: 94), is quite different from the contemporary translation observed above. Here, instead of producing a new target text with the aim of conveying the information stored in the source text, the method was rather to add diacritics to the Chinese characters to describe their placement in a sentence (see page 101). With this method, the end product ignored Japanese norms (Mizuno, 2012: 96), but created a meta-language, which mediated between source text and target reader. The presence of this mediating form of text consumption did not heavily influence storytellers' sense of loyalty to the same Classical Chinese texts when they translated them into rakugo. These new translations cannot simplistically be described as mediating between their source texts and their Japanese target audience, and so, are conceptually distinct from one of this period's most important forms of translation in Japan. The methodology they used, based on the long-standing distinction in Japanese art forms between constants and variables, selects elements of the source text to appropriate, and interweaves these with elements that are novel. Thus, translation is seen as a process of extrapolating a world (*sekai*) from the source text into which novel features and episodes (*shukō*) are added.

Chaucer and his contemporaries, classical rakugo, and contemporary translation literature all represent quite different traditions, or ways of conceptualizing translation, both in terms of their theorization of the practice and in the practice itself. These lacunae between the various understandings of what translation is and the ways it functions may be the factor that causes the unexpected results produced when theories from one tradition are used to understand another. A theory produced in one paradigm may make assumptions that are appropriate for its own understanding of what translation is but inappropriate for another. It has already been shown that the contemporary theories used here all appear to assume that translation functions as a form of mediation. However, as has also been shown, elements that ostensibly resemble those anticipated by the same theories do appear even in non-mediating contexts although they may function in different ways.

In a context where translation functions as a form of mediation, it is acceptable to infer that a translator glosses particular words or elements, for example, in order to facilitate mediation. The translator employs this technique in order to convey to the target audience the translator's interpretation of the source text most effectively. In a case such as that of Chaucer's translations, however, where mediation is not the aim,

a similar technique may still be in evidence, but the reason it occurs will most likely be different. We saw in Chapter 2 (77) that Chaucer uses glossing to a very pronounced degree in the *Tale of Melibee*. However, this glossing does not occur in order to promote linguistic inclusivity, but because of Chaucer's own understanding of translation, outlined above. Therefore, terms such as "explicitation" may be deemed inappropriate for non-mediating translation, since they describe the effect of the technique only in a mediating translation. A mediating translator uses practices like glossing in order to make an element explicit. Translators in the two non-mediating traditions explored here include ostensibly very similar forms of expansion, but guided by their own respective paradigms. In the case of Chaucer, this paradigm is *excogitatio*, while in the case of rakugo it is the *sekai-shukō* dichotomy.

A very similar state of affairs also occurs when the notions of foreignization and domestication are brought to bear on forms of translation produced outside the mediation paradigm. In each case, what problematizes the use of the theory is the fact that it assumes translation has a mediating goal. Domestication assumes that good translation is a matter of conveying source material while subscribing to target culture norms in order to reconcile the source text with a new context. Foreignization, on the other hand, assumes that good translation is a matter of conveying the source material in such a way that subscribes only to those target norms necessary for comprehension in order to prevent the source text being fully reconciled, and hence appropriated by the target culture. If the idea of translation conveying the content of the source text is removed from either of these theories, what is left is a process of nearing or distancing source and target, for no obvious reason.

In the case of rakugo, for example, we have seen in Chapter 3 how the tragic story of *A Crow at Daybreak, A Dream of Light Snowfall* has been translated into the comic rakugo *A Crow at Daybreak* (page 107*)*. Given that the vast majority of rakugo are comical, it could be argued that this transition occurs to domesticate the story to the target norms and hence, distance target from source. However, since the target text makes no effort to relay all or even most of the material contained within its source, and, perhaps more importantly, since both texts are in the same language, it is clear that domestication does not occur here in order to facilitate communication between source text and target audience. Similarly, we have seen how *Tadanobu the Cat* and other *shibai-banashi* employ the norms of kabuki theatre in order to

highlight the source-target relationship and hence, foreignize (105). Again, however, since material that is common to the source and target texts is so scarce and scattered, it is clear that this highlighting action occurs for some reason other than to illustrate the translation's role as a means of understanding the source text. In each case then, it is the assumption that translation is a form of mediation that constitutes a lacuna between the traditions and obstructs the application of theory to practice. Does the existence of this lacuna mean, therefore, that theories within the contemporary, mediation-orientated tradition of translation are of no use for considering forms of translation that do not mediate in the ways illustrated above?

Bridging the Lacunae that Separate Traditions

An interesting point worth underscoring is that the lacuna between each theory and the practice in question appears to be constant. The lacuna between explicitation and Chaucer's translations is the same as that between Chaucer's translations and foreignization. In both cases, it is the rationalization of the process rather than the observation of the process itself that is difficult to reconcile. Chaucer has been shown to gloss and expand his texts greatly, which, in mediating translation, would normally correspond to explicitation. However, because the explicitation hypothesis rationalizes these processes in terms of mediation, and so, concludes that they occur because of the translator's wish to convey the source material fully, the rationale proposed by the theory is at odds with Chaucer's practices. In each case then, the lacuna occurs not in describing what happens in a given practice, but in extrapolating reasons behind why it happens[60]. If the ways that the theories perform this extrapolation can also be adjusted, it may be that they can be made more efficient in the analysis of non-mediating translations. What is proposed here is a more adaptive approach to the use of theories, such that the notion of mediation can be removed from the equation and replaced by a rationale that is appropriate to the tradition in question.

Explicitation

---

[60] An example of a study that problematically aims to examine Chaucer's translations with contemporary theories is (Long, 2010).

In the case of explicitation, this adjustment means that the base equation would be reduced to an observation of patterns of expansion within the translated text. When put to work to understand a translation from the contemporary tradition, the notion of mediation would be inserted. This would infer that the identified patterns of expansion occur because of the translator's goal of most effectively mediating between source and target text. If the same theory were put to work to understand a translation from Chaucer's tradition, however, what is added is not mediation, but the notion of *excogitatio*. In this case then, the formation of a lacuna is avoided and the theory would infer that the patterns of expansion occur because of the translator's goal of creating an interpretation of the source material that has not previously been explored.

In Chapter 2 (75), we saw the extensive use to which Chaucer puts explicitation-like features in the *Tale of Melibee*. We saw that this tale makes use of collocations to a very great degree and that these collocations may be interpreted as mutual glosses by which the various language communities of medieval England might comprehend the text most fully. It was also found, however, that this interpretation of the practice is fundamentally linked with mediation-based notions of explicitation in which the aim is to convey the meanings present within the source text fully. Since Chaucer's translation tradition was found not to be fundamentally based on mediation, it was reasoned that this interpretation of the practice does not square fully with the context in which the translation was produced and the functions it fulfilled. If then, the theory of explicitation is to be put to use in understanding Chaucer's translation practices, what must be adapted is its mediation-based presumption that translations aim to convey the contents of their sources. This omission of a presumed goal essentially reduces the theory to an observation of specific patterns of expansion and stops short of rationalizing the occurrence of the patterns. Such observation by itself, however, tells us very little about the functions of these patterns. Rationalization exists in order to make the observed patterns meaningful. Therefore, in order to understand fully why a pattern of expansions exists within a Chaucerian translation, it is logical to insert the notion of *excogitatio*, which has been shown to describe Chaucer's translation practices closely.

Armed with this new *excogitatio*-based theory of explicitation, Chaucer's patterns of glosses and expansions in the *Tale of Melibee* take on a new definition and a clearer function. It becomes clear that the vast majority of these collocations occur

within dialogue pertaining to the character Dame Prudence and hence, that they may function as a form of characterization that accentuates her already pleonastic diction for stylistic or rhetorical effect. The example below demonstrates this characterization in the high level of redundancy that is idiosyncratic of Dame Prudence's rhetoric. Comparison of this extract with the French and Latin sources[61] illustrates Chaucer's use of the form of explicitation identified above as a central feature of this characterization that goes far beyond collocation:

> "A," quod dame Prudence, "ye seyn youre wyl and as yow liketh,|but in no caas of the world a man sholde nat doon outrage ne excesse for to vengen hym.| For Cassidore seith that `as yvele dooth he that vengeth hym by outrage as he that dooth the outrage.'| And therfore ye shul venge yow after the ordre of right; that is to seyn, by the lawe| and noght by excesse ne by outrage.| And also, if ye wol venge yow of the outrage of youre adversaries| in oother manere than right comandeth, ye synnen.| And therfore seith Senec that `a man shal nevere vengen shrewednesse by shrewednesse.'| And if ye seye that right axeth a man to defenden violence by violence and fightyng by fightyng,| certes ye seye sooth, whan the defense is doon anon withouten intervalle or withouten tariyng or delay,| for to deffenden hym and nat for to vengen hym. (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 232)

The new interpretation of this single practice is just one of the applications to which this modified version of the explicitation theory can be put. It would conceivably be possible to go on to use the same theory across a number of Chaucer's translations and so, discover further ways in which patterns of expansion have been used as a part of Chaucer's *excogitatio*-based tradition of translation.

This particular modulation of explicitation is, of course, peculiar to the study of target texts produced within an *excogitatio*-based translation tradition. The results it would produce if brought to bear on mediation-based translations would be equally illogical to those produced by the unmodified version of explicitation with respect to Chaucer's translations. Similarly, this *excogitatio*-based modulation of the theory would be of no use to understand translation in the context of rakugo.

In order to use the theory on rakugo texts another modulation is required. This modulation also removes mediation from the equation, but replaces it with the *sekai-*

---

[61] For Latin and French sources for this passage, please see appendix (236).

shukō dichotomy. When done, the theory predicts that the patterns of expansion occur because of the translator's goal of interweaving derived and novel elements within the target text. The example below, taken from the rakugo 骨釣り [*Bone Fishing*] illustrates a use for explicitation in rakugo translation. *Bone Fishing* is translated from an entry entitled 学様 [*Payment in Kind*] in the Ming Dynasty Chinese collection of humorous stories called 笑府 [*Ministry of Laughter*] by Féng Mènglóng (馮夢龍) (1574-1645) (Ui, 1952: 189-190). The source text reads:

> 有於郊外見遺骸暴露、憐而瘞之。夜聞叩門聲、問之、應曰、妃。再問、
> 曰：妾楊妃也、遭馬嵬之難、遺骨未收、感君掩覆、來奉枕席。因與極歡
> 而去。鄰人聞而慕焉、因逼覓郊外、亦得遺骸瘞之。夜有叩門者、問之、
> 應曰、飛。曰：汝楊妃乎。曰：俺張飛也。其人懼甚、強應曰：張將軍何
> 為下顧。曰：俺遭閬中之難、遺骨未收、感君掩覆、將以粗臀奉獻。
> (reproduced in Muto, 1970: 20)
>
> [A man came across some human remains while he was on the outskirts of the city. He felt pity for them and decided to bury them. That night, he heard a knocking sound. He asked who was there, and a voice replied "Fei" (princess). He asked again and the voice replied "I am Imperial Concubine Yang, I perished in Mawei. I am grateful for your kindness to my remains. Duly, I have come to your bed to make myself at your service." Thus, they passed a thoroughly pleasurable night together. A neighbour, hearing this exchange hoped for a similar experience. Therefore, he searched the countryside far and wide until he found another set of remains, which he duly buried. As night fell, a figure appeared. The man asked who was there and the reply came "Fei" (leap). He asked "are you Princess (Fei) Yang?" The voice said "I am Zhou Fei". At this, the man cursed himself in the extreme. As stoutly as he could, he replied, "General Zhou, what can I do for you?" He said" I perished in Langzhong, I am grateful for your kindness to my remains. Duly, my rough buttocks are at your service.]

If the form of translation in question were one of mediation, it would be reasonable to expect a certain amount of explicitation in this text to ensure the communication of the fact that the apparitions introduce themselves using homophones of the syllable "fei", as demonstrated by the gloss translation above. Equally, it is to be expected that a mediating translation may make some effort to expand on the names of the two apparitions, which the source author appears to assume are so well known

that further explanation is unnecessary. This assumption is particularly easy to understand because both are figures of some note within Chinese history, though not necessarily well known outside that country. Yang Guifei (楊貴妃) has an abiding reputation in China, in part because of her tragic demise (Benn, 2004: 10), which is hinted at in the story, but also because she is remembered as one of the 四大美人 [Four Great Beauties], who are famous for using their physical presence to influence the political leaders of their times (Xu and Feiner, 2007: 312). General Zhang Fei (張飛), on the other hand, is a well-known figure, who played an important military role during China's Three Kingdoms Period (220-280) and is immortalized in the classic 14th century novel 三国志演義 [*Romance of the Three Kingdoms*] (Besio and Tung, 2007: 10). The rakugo translation does indeed expand greatly on the female apparition's story. However, its treatment of the material is quite different from the source. Below is an extract of the rakugo, from the point when the female apparition appears:

> 　私の申しますこと、一通り、お聞きなされてくださりませ。......私はもと、島ノ内の袋物屋の娘でひなと申します。さる年の流行病に父母相次いで世を去り、親類の者が親切ごかしに世話をやき、三代続いた家も屋敷も人手に渡り、私には心に染まぬ縁談を押しつけられます。余りの悔しさ情けなさに両親のもとへ参ろうと木津川へ身を投げましたが、身寄り頼りの無い悲しさ、浮かびもやらで今日が日まで水一口の手向けもなくムクロを沈めておりましたが、今日、あなた様のありがたいご回向にあずかり、浮かぶことができまする。せめてお礼に参上いたしました。お寝間のお伽なと、勤めさせてくださりませ。(B. Katsura, 2002b: 204-205)

　[I will tell you what I am called, but please hear my whole story.… My name is Hina and I am originally a daughter from a family that sells bags in Shimanouchi. My mother and father left this world, one after the other, in an epidemic in the year of the monkey. I was thus, left at the mercy of my relations. I saw the house and grounds that had been in our family for three generations pass into others' hands and I was accosted with marriage proposals of convenience. In my bitter chagrin and misery, I gained leave to visit my parent's grave, but instead, threw myself into the Kizugawa River. As, to my misery, my relations had proved so undependable, it was also uncertain whether I would float or sink. Thus have I been in a state of unrest ever since, without as much as a sip of water to help my

body on its way beneath the river. That is, until today, when you showed my remains such kindness as to provide me with a funeral rite that has allowed my soul to be at peace. The least I could do was to pay a visit and thank you. I shall attend upon your bed chamber tonight and make myself at your service.]

This expansion seems impossible to reconcile with explicitation if mediation is retained as its central goal. If, however, the expansion is considered in conjunction with rakugo's underlying *sekai-shukō* methodology, it is possible to reconcile theory with practice as outlined above. By doing so, the benefit for the study of rakugo as a form of translation is that the theory becomes a tool for a systematized understanding of the distinction and functionality of shukō elements as they relate to the source text. That is, without the theory, it is possible to observe that a rakugo translation retains certain source elements and interweaves these with novel ones. However, with the modified version of explicitation, it is possible to dissect the text and gain a much more nuanced understanding of the interplay of these two kinds of elements and hence, a more profound understanding of rakugo as a translating tradition.

Foreignization

A similar state of affairs occurs in the case of foreignization. The rakugo known as 延陽伯 (*Enyōhaku*) pivots on misunderstandings that arise when a newlywed couple meet for the first time after having a traditional arranged marriage. These misunderstandings stem from the wife's use of archaisms, and Chinese borrowings that are "不自然" [unnatural] (S. Katsura, 2006d: 147) in spoken dialogue from the Edo or modern periods. The centrepiece of these misunderstandings involves the wife's response when her new husband asks her name. The reply is so meaningless to her husband that he takes her whole answer for an absurdly long name, and proceeds to repeat the phrase time and again when imagining the trouble he will have when speaking to his new wife even in quotidian situations. The phrase in question is quoted below with a gloss translation:

> なに、わらわの姓名なるや、わらわ父は元京都の産にして、姓は安藤、名は慶三。字名を五光と申せしが、我が母、三十三歳の折ある夜、丹頂を夢見、わらわを孕みしがゆに、たらちねの胎内を出でしころは鶴女鶴女と申せしがこれは幼名。成長の後これを改め延陽伯と申すなり。(S. Katsura, 2006d: 140-141)

> What, my name? My father was a native of Kyoto, born to the Ando family and given the name Keizo. He was a teacher of letters. One night, when my mother was in her thirty-third year she saw a crane in a dream. She fell pregnant with me immediately afterwards and as a result, she gave me the nickname Tsurujo Tsurujo (Crane-girl Crane-girl). I no longer use this name since I grew up but am called Enyohaku.

This centrepiece to the story joins a number of other utterances by the wife that contravene the norms of early modern or contemporary spoken Japanese. Indeed, the wife in this rakugo scarcely produces any utterances that are readily comprehensible to a contemporary audience. In a mediation-orientated translation paradigm, it would be reasonable to assume that these contraventions of target language are either a reflection of a corresponding pattern of unusual language use in the source text or a foreignizing strategy. The source text of this rakugo is called 推はちがふた [*Mistaken Conclusions*] and appears in the 17th-century collection of stories entitled 醒睡笑 [*Laughing to Banish Drowsiness*] (Ui, 1952: 107). *Mistaken Conclusions* however, although it does pivot on the issue of language usage and misunderstandings, does not contain any passage that parallels closely with the centrepiece of *Enyōhaku* quoted above (see Muto and Oka, 1975: 146). Hence, this centrepiece cannot be described as a re-creation of an effect created by the source text and so, in a mediating translation paradigm, it would be logical to infer that the very peculiar use of language is intended to make some kind of statement to the target audience and thus, foreignize. However, the occurrence of a central passage, on which the remainder of the target text hinges, though it does not directly correspond to any element in the source text is extremely difficult to reconcile with translation as mediation and hence, with foreignization as a device for highlighting the role of a mediating translator. Conversely, if mediation is removed from the notion of foreignization and replaced with the *sekai-shukō* dichotomy, the translation practice can be reconciled with the theory.

Here then, the translation has adopted the source text's theme of linguistically based misunderstandings as well as the archaic language, in which it is composed as part of the *sekai,* and has interwoven this with certain events with no correspondents in the source text that constitute the *shukō*. In a similar way that the mediation-based conception of foreignization describes a particular translation's approach to mediation then, foreignization, when adapted for use on rakugo translation describes

in detail the translator's strategy in combining *sekai* and *shukō* elements. It is possible that such detail would be obtainable without the theory. However, armed with the theory it becomes increasingly possible to observe patterns across texts and translators within the same tradition.

An adapted version of foreignization can also be extremely useful for considering groups of Chaucer's translations that exhibit similar patterns. One notable example is that of the high incidence in Chaucer's texts of what Francis (1953: 1126) describes as "self-conscious abbreviation". With this device, Chaucer draws to the attention of the target audience the fact that a passage of the source text is not being included in the target text (Francis, 1953: 1135). Chaucer's use of this device is extremely widespread in the *Canterbury Tales* and takes a variety of forms. These forms range from narrators lamenting their inadequacy of skill to provide an adequate description to a judgement that the inclusion of the full description would be detrimental to the aesthetic of the text. Several examples of the former practice are found in the *Knight's Tale*, which contains descriptions of three temples to the classical deities Venus, Mars, and Diana. Each one of these descriptions is cut short by an admission that it is too much to do them justice. Below is the example from the description of the temple to Venus:

> Lo, all thise folk so caught were in hir las,
> Til they for wo ful ofte seyde "allas!"
> Suffiseth here ensamples oon or two,
> And though I koude rekene a thousand mo.
>   The statue of Venus, glorious for to se,
> Was naked, fletynge in the large see,
> And fro the navele doun al covered was
> With wawes grene, and brighte as any glas. (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 51)

An example of the latter practice, in which a passage is cut short or omitted for aesthetic or practical reasons, can be found in the *Nun's Priest's Tale*. Here, it is used to avoid recounting the whole story of the siege of Troy:

> How that the lyf of Ector sholde be lorn,
> If thilke day he wente into bataille.
> She warned hym, but it myghte nat availle;
> He wente for to fighte natheles,
> But he was slayn anon of Achilles.

> But thilke tale is al to longe to telle,
>
> And eek it is ny day; I may nat dwelle. (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 257)

These practices of self-conscious abbreviation certainly share features with the theory of foreignization, since they deliberately draw the target audience's attention to the fact that the target text is a translation. They are, however, features that it is difficult to imagine finding in a mediation-based translation, not because mediation proscribes omission or censorship but because to alert the target audience to an omission in this way would negate the illusion of the target text being a re-creation of or proxy for the source text. In a similar way to foreignization's use in rakugo, however, if mediation is removed from the equation and replaced with *excogitatio*, the theory can be used to nuance our understanding of the functions of *excogitatio* in medieval translations. That is, it becomes possible to observe on the word level how the idea of speaking where the source text is silent and remaining silent where the source text speaks actually functions and was interpreted by translators. The theory also provides us with a tool for analysing and systematizing the patterns of word usage and idiosyncrasies of the tradition.

Domestication

With the analysis of patterns of word usage in mind, it is logical to consider those patterns that define a translation's genre or text type. The consideration of this kind of pattern is particularly pertinent when we recall that of all the *Canterbury Tales*, only the *Tale of Melibee* is classified as prose. In Chapter 2 (92), the role played by Chaucer's use of verse types was explored with respect to the theory of domestication. It was found that it is highly problematic to describe Chaucer's choice of verse forms in terms of a contemporary understanding of domestication. The difficulty here results from the fact that the verse forms chosen by Chaucer do not derive from the native English tradition of alliterative verse but from end-rhyming forms of prosody particular to the Romance languages. Although Chaucer was certainly not the first or only individual to employ these kinds of verse form in English, he was working at a time when such a practice was still at least relatively novel. As a result, it was argued that Chaucer deliberately chose to align himself with the English turn away from use of the native tradition and towards one inspired by continental and especially French traditions. In other words, Chaucer joined a turn

away from the contemporaneous norms of the English language, instead choosing to import and adapt norms from Romance languages such as French. As has already been explored, Chaucer's target audience can be assumed to have been at least conversant in French and so, familiar with the complex uses of end-rhyme he employs. For this reason, although culturally speaking the tradition of end-rhyme to which Chaucer ascribes his translations would not have been particularly novel in itself to the target audience, linguistically speaking its use through the medium of the English language would have been.

This confusing set of circumstances is yet another way in which our contemporary, mediation-orientated conception of translation can problematize our study of translations produced in other traditions. The difficulty arises here because the mediation paradigm encourages us to infer that deliberate actions on the part of the translator, such as the choice to employ rhyming verse forms, have been instigated in order to promote communication between source text and target audience. We may assume, therefore, that the norm of a particular target language will be what is most familiar to the target audience. Thus, any choice to ascribe to this norm is an act of domestication, while a choice to ignore or subvert it is an act of foreignization. Here though, we have every reason to believe that Chaucer's audience was intimately familiar with the non-domestic norm. Chaucer's choice of prosody is then, a form of domestication in the sense that it is culturally familiar to the target audience, but not a form of domestication in the sense that it contravenes the norms of the target language.

These are merely the reasons an unmodified, mediation-orientated theory of domestication is problematic to describe Chaucer's translations. What then, can a modified version of the theory contribute to the study of Chaucer's translation tradition? As with the other theories, the modification necessary involves the removal of mediation as the guiding principle of the translation, and its replacement with the notion of *excogitatio*. When done, the question of target audience comprehension or familiarity becomes much less important, and is replaced with an overwhelming concern for the exploration of novel interpretations of the source material.

With this new concern for innovation in mind, Chaucer's choice to employ what were, at the time, unusual, or relatively novel verse forms for his translations becomes increasingly logical. One point of particular interest in respect of this

choice arises through considering the text-types of the sources and analogues of Chaucer's translations. A prime example is the *Second Nun's Tale*, which, as stated in Chapter 2 (93), is conveyed in arguably Chaucer's most complex verse form, rhyme royal. The example stanza below demonstrates the great skill with which Chaucer translates into this strict rhyming pattern:

> Cecile cam, whan it was woxen nyght,
> With preestes that hem cristned alle yfeere;
> And afterward, whan day was woxen light,
> Cecile hem seyde with a ful stedefast cheere,
> "Now, Cristes owene knyghtes leeve and deere,
> Cast alle awey the werkes of derknesse,
> And armeth yow in armure of brightnesse. (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 267)

When considering the rationale behind Chaucer's choice of rhyme royal here, however, comparison with the sources and analogues to Chaucer's translation in conjunction with the modified version of the domestication theory yields some interesting results. Below is the passage corresponding to that above, taken from *In Festo Sancte Cecilie Vrginis et Martyris*, the source for this part of the translation:

> Tunc sancta Cecilia venit ad eos nocte cum sacerdotibus, et universi baptizati sunt. Igitur cum aurora nocti finem daret, facto magno silentio Cecilia dixit, "Eya milites Christi, abicite opera tenebrarum et induimini arma lucis. Bonum certamen certastis, cursum consumastis, fidem servastis. Ite ad coronam vite, quam dabit vobis justus judex. (Reames, 2002: 523)
>
> [Then, Saint Cecilia came to them in the night with priests and all were baptized. And so, when the dawn brought an end to the night, having made a great silence Cecilia said, "Oh, soldiers of Christ, throw off the works of darkness and put on the armour of light]

The most important point to note from this example is that Chaucer's source texts for the *Second Nun's Tale* are written in Latin prose. Another massively influential analogue is the French translation that was produced by Jean de Vignay at some point between 1333 and 1340 (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 942), around forty years before Chaucer is thought to have been focused on the *Canterbury Tales* (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: xxiv). This translation too, is in prose. Thus, both of the versions of this story that are likely to have been most influential to Chaucer prior to producing the *Second Nun's Tale* were delivered in prose rather than verse.

Chaucer's choice to explore the use of verse with this story is then, further evidence of his *excogitatio*-based conception of translation. He uses a rhyme scheme, not in order to mimic his source texts but in order to create a novel interpretation of the story. The relationship between this decision and the choice to use the complex rhyme royal, however, is something that can be explained with the modified version of domestication. With mediation removed from the equation, domestication becomes yet another pattern that can be used to form links between translations.

The pattern here is formed between the *Second Nun's Tale* and Chaucer's other translations in rhyme royal, as well as the more established uses of structurally similar verse forms such as *chant royal* in French and *ottava rima* in Italian. The commonality between these forms is that they appear to have been perceived by medieval audiences as accentuating the heroism of the text's subject (Kuiper and Merriam-Webster, 1995: 228, 844). The texts conveyed by Chaucer in rhyme royal are overwhelmingly heroic in nature, although they also tend to take on a particular air of stoicism or pathos (Chaucer and Benson, 2008: 12). Examples include the long poem *Troilus and Creseyde* with its backdrop of the Siege of Troy, and the *Man of Law's Tale*, in which the protagonist Constance is shipwrecked, banished, and enslaved as a result of the actions of two of her would-be mothers-in-law. The *Clerk's Tale*, with its long-suffering Griselda and her stolen children is also conveyed in rhyme royal, as is the *Prioress's Tale* of a martyred child. Thus, by using the rhyme royal verse form, Chaucer adds a fresh interpretation to the *Second Nun's Tale* by domesticating it to this genre that specializes in the heroic and the stoic. Here, the domestication in question has nothing to do with target culture norms or understanding. Instead, it focuses on the patterns that are formed in the translator's practices across a number of texts.

Similarly, Rakugo scripts may demonstrate patterns of word usage that could be described as domesticating. In this case, the focus falls not on poetic prosody, but on lexical choice. These domesticating elements pertain specifically to contemporary Japanese culture as opposed to that of pre-modern Japan or China, where the source texts originate. Examples include mention of contemporary products in Shijaku's version of *Manjū Kowai*. Here, Shijaku dramatically extends the conversation between the friends at the beginning of the story to a debate on the things that each member of the group likes and dislikes the most. Within this debate, various

members of the group mention "竜野の[...]お醤油" [Tatsuno soy sauce][62] (S. Katsura, 2006c: 189), シロップ [syrup](S. Katsura, 2006c: 186), and ぺコちゃんの ミルキー [A Peko-chan Milky](S. Katsura, 2006c: 188)[63]. These contemporary elements are thoroughly incongruous to a pre-modern setting in either Japan or China and so, can be described as having a domesticating effect over the target text as a whole. However, as has already been mentioned, these elements occur in a section of the tale that is not present within the source text but form part of Shijaku's translation *shukō*. As a result, in the same way that foreignization and explicitation are affected by rakugo's lack of a mediating strategy, the use of domestication as a theory is problematic if mediation is not taken out of the equation.

If we do remove mediation, however, and replace it with the *sekai-shukō* dichotomy, the notion of domestication becomes a tool to classify and categorize the ways that *shukō* elements have been employed and the effect their use has over the story as a whole. Thus, it allows us to compare renditions of the same story and assert that one employs a domesticating *shukō* and hence, reduces the distance between text and audience, while another may domesticate less, or instead, perhaps, emphasize the distance by deliberately including a large number of archaisms.

Conclusions

This chapter has explored the lacuna between the contemporary translation studies theories of domestication, explicitation, and foreignization and the two translation case studies examined in chapters 1, 2, and 3. It discovered that in each case this lacuna embodies an assumption on the part of the three theories that translation is a form of mediation though translation does not have a mediating function in either of the cases. Each theory describes patterns that may be observed in individual translations or across a number of translated texts. In the earlier chapters it was found that while these patterns may still obtain in translations that are not based on the idea of mediation, the ways the theories rationalize the occurrence of the respective patterns will tend to be incompatible with the context in which the

---

[62] In a footnote, Shijaku explains that Tatsuno is an area of Hyōgo prefecture in Kansai that is famous for its soy sauce (S. Katsura, 2006c: 191).

[63] A popular Japanese confection, famous for its trademark character Peko-chan. This product was first released in 1951, and so, is totally incongruous to a pre-modern setting (Hatsumi, 2008: 89).

translations were produced or the underlying goal of the translators. This chapter sought a way to bridge this lacuna by first exploring the nature of mediation in translation in greater detail.

The finding that translation, conceptualized as mediation between source text and target audience, is extremely widespread in the corpus and other translation literature suggests strongly that it has had some influence over the formulation of theories. For this reason, translations, theories, and approaches to the study of translation, produced under the assumption that translation is mediation were described as constituting a mediation paradigm. This paradigm shapes the whole discipline to some degree, since it affects the kinds of examples of translation that are examined widely, the questions that are asked about them, and even the conclusions that are made. However, the finding that the assumption of mediation can be replaced with conceptions more appropriate to the study of the other translation traditions implies that the theories are not irreconcilable with these non-mediating forms of translation. This chapter has shown that if mediation is removed from the equation in each case, and replaced with an assumed goal appropriate to the tradition in question, meaningful results can be obtained. This approach necessarily entails a reconceptualization of the theory in question, meaning the results achieved are not closely comparable with those generated by the theory proper.

It can be argued, therefore, that the action of reconceptualizing theory for use in new contexts is distinct from reconciling the two. Reconciliation implies that the differences between two parties be neutralized. However, the approach illustrated in this chapter could be interpreted, instead, as formulating a new theory so that such differences are negated. It may be that because mediation has been found to be central to the theories' reasoning, it is not possible to reconcile them definitively with non-mediating translations in any way that does not entail a degree of misrepresentation on either part.

From the perspective of making the adaptation of theories a practical option for the study of translations, under which parameters the adaptation is to occur is another important point for consideration. This point is especially pertinent for the study of historical translations as it raises questions relating to the degree to which a conceptualization of translation can be said to be stable across translators and over a period of time. The approach involving a reformulation of theory explored in this chapter implies that the way translation is conceptualized in a case context is known

prior to the adaptation, and subsequent application of theory. However, if the range of conceptualizations is found to be very broad, this assumption may become an obstacle. It may also be that these conceptualizations differ to some extent across individuals and time-periods.

Medieval translators such as Chaucer existed in an antecedent context to that constituted by the contemporary, mediation-based tradition. Therefore, it is logical to assume that at some point, the *excogitatio*-based understanding of translation fell out of currency and was replaced by mediation. Similarly, *kanbun-kundoku* has been shown to occupy the Japanese context at the same time as classical rakugo, and yet, the two traditions have very different approaches to the act of translating. Thus, before any theories can be adapted for use on a particular set of translated texts, the way their translators conceptualized their own actions would need to be established.

Chapter 5 will explore the relationships between various conceptualizations of translation. It will attempt to ascertain how the *excogitatio*-based understanding came to be replaced by the conviction that translation is a form of mediation. In the Japanese context, it will also explore the relationship translation in rakugo has to *kanbun-kundoku*. As well as serving to define further the possible range of conceptualizations of translation in existence, this exploration of their relationships will inform the practicality of adapting theories to particular instances of translation. The chapter will attempt to discern if it is possible to compartmentalize conceptions of translation definitively or if the boundaries between them are, to some degree, porous.

CHAPTER 5
The Organic Understanding:
Exploring Translation as an Abstract, Evolving Idea

Introduction

Chapter 4 observed the lacunae that exist between thinking in contemporary translation studies and the practices represented by the *Canterbury Tales* and rakugo storytelling. It discovered that in each case, what problematizes the use of a contemporary theory to analyse translations originating in one of the other cultural contexts is a difference in the assumed goal of translation. In the case of Chaucer, the goal is one related to the medieval idea of *excogitatio*, in which translators are encouraged to explore innovative interpretations of source material. In the case of rakugo, the goal is related to the dichotomy between *shukō,* or constant and *sekai,* or variable elements. In the case of the contemporary tradition, by contrast, the assumed goal is one of mediation between source text and target reader. Chapter 4 went on to consider the novel ways that the theories of foreignization, domestication, and explicitation can be interpreted and used to nuance an understanding of these non-contemporary traditions if the idea of mediation is removed from the theory in question and replaced with each tradition's identified goal.

This chapter will consider the nature of these traditions and the origins of their respective understandings of the act of translation. It will begin by examining the form of meta-text called *kanbun-kundoku* that had achieved great prominence in Japan by the time that rakugo storytellers began to look to Classical Chinese texts as sources for their stories. It will consider the impact that this kind of translation had on Japanese understandings of what it means to consume a foreign language text. The chapter will explore the notion of multiple traditions of translation existing contemporaneously within a given cultural context. With this notion in mind, the chapter will consider the influence that *kanbun-kundoku* may have had over rakugo's translation tradition and practice.

After considering the Japanese context, the chapter will address the subject of the relationship between Chaucer's translation tradition and that of contemporary

translation studies. The question of what might have led the tradition to which Chaucer belonged to have been supplanted by the contemporary tradition will be asked. The chapter will explore the relative cultural specificity of the contemporary tradition and so, observe the degree to which a culture's understanding of translation can be said to be in a state of flux. The aim of the chapter is to consider the possibility that a wide range of developments within a translating culture may have a direct influence over the ways that translation is understood and distinguished from other forms of text production.

Kanbun-kundoku and its cultural impact

In Chapter 3 (99), the Japanese tradition of heavily source-orientated mediation-based translation known as *kanbun-kundoku* was introduced. It was found that this form of translation was conceived as a way for the Japanese reader to approach texts written in Classical Chinese. Instead of creating a new target text through translation, the *kanbun-kundoku* [Chinese text-Japanese reading] method relied on the Japanese reader's ability to understand the meanings of Chinese characters. It consisted in adding diacritics to the source text to indicate the order in which each character was to be read to be intelligible in Japanese. However, topics that were not explored in Chapter 3 include how wide-spread this form of translation became within Japan, what effects it had on the Japanese understanding of text production, how it affected the Japanese understanding of what it means to consume foreign language texts, and what brought an end to the tradition's prestige as Japan's primary method of accessing Chinese-language texts.

The Origins of *Kanbun-kundoku*

Despite the fact that the two languages are considered genetically unrelated (I. Taylor and Taylor, 1995: 282), Japanese has had an extremely long relationship with the writing system of Chinese. The earliest datable contact of Japanese individuals and Chinese characters occurs in the 1st-century AD, when the Chinese Emperor 光武 (Guang Wu) gifted a solid gold block seal to the country of Na (奴國), located on Japan's Kyushu island (Imamura, 1996: 185). The discovery of this seal in 1784, which reads "漢委奴國王" (Hirose, 2007: 199) [King of the country of Na in Wa, under the Han Dynasty] corroborates the entry in the Chinese historical text known

as the 後漢書 (*Hòu Hànshū*) [*Book of the Latter Han Dynasty*], which records: "建武中元二年，倭奴國奉貢朝賀，使人自稱大夫，倭國之極南界也。光武賜以印綬" (Chen, 1988: 2). [In the second year of the Jianwu period (57AD), an envoy was sent with tribute from Wa's (Japan's) country of Na. The envoy introduced himself as an official. The country lies to the extreme south of Wa. Guang Wu bestowed upon them a gift of a tasselled seal.]

Prior to this direct contact with Han dynasty China, Japan had no native writing system and the adoption of the Chinese writing system in these very early years appears to have entailed an adoption of the Chinese language for literary purposes (Coulmas and Watanabe, 2002: 251). That is, writing for the Japanese would have meant writing in Chinese. Thus, the ability to write would have necessitated a working knowledge of Chinese. By the 5th-century, however, there is evidence of efforts being made to use variants of the Chinese writing system to represent the Japanese language directly (Frellesvig, 2010: 12). This new approach relied on the principle of 借音 (shakuon) [borrowed sounds] to represent Japanese phonographically (Frellesvig, 2010: 14). Thus, the Chinese glyphs were stripped of any logographic meanings they represented and instead, equated with their Japanized phonological values. For example, the characters 可 [to be able], 香 [perfume], and 歌 [song] are all equated with the Japanese syllable "ka" and thus, a writer would, theoretically, be at liberty to use any in the event of a word including the syllable "ka". Because there exist several thousand Chinese characters, and their pronunciation encountered a degree of simplification and systematization when applied to the Japanese syllabary, the number of characters that could potentially be equated with any single Japanese syllable became extremely large (Frellesvig, 2010: 160). As a result of the complexity and unwieldy nature of this system, by the early years of the Heian period (794 - 1185), at least two distinct efforts had already been made to further systematize and simplify the use of characters (Frellesvig, 2010: 157). These two systems eventually developed into the katakana and hiragana syllabaries that still form parts of the Japanese writing system today.

Around the same period, the Japanese also invented the *kanbun-kundoku* system that approached the Chinese characters from the opposite perspective (Sato-Rossberg and Wakabayashi, 2012: 3). Instead of adopting the phonetic values represented by the characters and ignoring their meanings, this system focused, instead, on 借訓

(shakkun) [borrowed meanings] and ignored the Chinese phonetic values. *Kanbun-kundoku* allowed a Japanese speaker to read and understand a text written in Classical Chinese without necessarily knowing how any of the words would be pronounced in Chinese. It is referred to here as a form of translation, although Wakabayashi (1998: 59) notes that this designation has historically been the source of some debate. This debate is founded on the fact that *kanbun-kundoku* functions not through the production of separate target texts, but on a form of mental translation that relies on the characters used in a text having the same lexical significance in both the Classical Chinese and Japanese languages (Mizuno, 2012: 94). This reliance on static linguistic relativity is, perhaps, one of the shortcomings of the *kanbun-kundoku* method, particularly when it is considered in light of the fact that the system was in widespread use for well-over a millennium (Wakabayashi, 2012: 33).

Kanbun-kundoku is an important element for the study of translation in rakugo as it could serve as the first step by which a given story came to be translated into the rakugo idiom. Thus, the number of rakugo storytellers who had a working knowledge of Classical Chinese may have been small compared to those given access to the texts by *kanbun-kundoku*.

In Chapter 4 (134), we came across the work of the Classical Chinese author known as 馮夢竜 (Féng Mènglóng), who is credited with the compilation of the text known as 笑府 [*Ministry of Laughter*]. As already illustrated, this collection of humorous stories provided the source text for the rakugo 骨釣り [*Bone Fishing*] (Yasuda, 1969: 63). However, it also acted as source text for a large number of other classical rakugo (Kawado, 2001: 81). The book was first published in Japan in 1768 as an abridged *kanbun-kundoku* text (Féng and Matsueda, 1983: 260) and soon began to be used as a source of material for rakugo storytellers. Indeed, Classical Chinese writing in general and the *kanbun-kundoku* method in particular had a greater effect over Japanese writing conventions than the mere consumption of foreign language texts. A Sinicized form of writing also rose to prominence in Japan. This style of writing is known as 漢文訓読体 [*kanbun-kundoku-tai*] (Mizuno, 2012: 94), where the "tai" suffix indicates style or form. As its name suggests, *kanbun-kundoku-tai* is a way for Japanese writers to produce texts in a style reminiscent of the Chinese Classics (Mizuno, 2012: 94). The *kanbun-kundoku-tai* became the

accepted style for the composition of texts of an academic or intellectual nature (Mizuno, 2012: 93) that continued until the mid-Meiji period (1868-1912) (Hayakawa, 2007: 229-230) [64] . By contrast, texts in the vernacular, or 俗文 (*zokubun*), tended to be afforded the much less prestigious roles of writing for children and women (Okayama, 2012: 63).

The Challenge to Existing Tradition

The hegemony of *kanbun-kundoku* for the consumption of foreign language texts would not continue for long after Japan's restoration of large-scale international relations. Japan reopened her international borders in 1853, and very shortly afterwards, acquired a thirst for modernization, prompted by the technologically more advanced Western nations, with which she began to come into contact. Almost inevitably, this increased contact with foreign peoples and languages had a profound effect over text-production in Japan. This effect was sparked not least because the texts in which the Japanese tended to have most interest were written in a variety of European languages (Mizuno, 2012: 96). Thus, Classical Chinese learning, which had historically enjoyed a high level of prestige, came into competition with learning derived from the West.

Initially, Japan's extensive history with the Chinese writing system, and the *kanbun-kundoku* style of translation were taken as inspiration for the consumption of these texts composed in European languages. This, so-called 欧文訓読 (*ōbun-kundoku*) [European text-Japanese reading] operated under precisely the same principles as the earlier Chinese text-oriented system, on which it was based (Sato-Rossberg and Wakabayashi, 2012: 4). The system attempted to assign word-for-word Japanese equivalents to the lexical items of a foreign text, and indicate with a system of numbers the order, in which these words should be read to be intelligible in Japanese (Mizuno, 2012: 94). Thus, this early attempt to render European texts intelligible to the Japanese using a method clearly inspired by the older and trusted system used for Chinese texts demonstrates the widespread understanding of what it

---

[64] Saito (2008) discusses the work of 森田思軒 (Morita Shiken), a prominent translator during the same period. She notes the influence of *kanbun-kundoku-tai* over the development of his early work.

means to consume a foreign language text that was present within Japan at this period.

The Japanese appear to have seen a foreign text as something that can be deciphered by target readers as long as enough raw data are provided. It is interesting to note that rakugo and a number of other art forms that made use of foreign language source texts existed in Japan at the same time, but appear to have had less of an impact on the understanding of translation in Japan during this early period. Predictably, perhaps, the *ōbun-kundoku* system could not be made to function as smoothly as the earlier *kanbun-kundoku* and was soon replaced with target text-producing forms of translation. One of these methods of particular note because of the undeniable effect it had over the Japanese language is 欧文直訳体 (*ōbun-chokuyaku-tai*) [European text direct translation style]. Levy (2011: 160) observes that through this form of translation the Japanese language acquired a number of formulaic expressions that were inspired by the grammars of European languages. *Ōbun-chokuyaku-tai* is a potent example of the effects that early translation traditions tended to have over the wider Japanese literary system.

The immediate focus during the early years of Japan's reopening is on texts of a technical nature and it is not until the later 1870s that works of fiction begin to be translated in large numbers from European languages (Mizuno, 2012: 97). Oddly enough, in the translation of these early texts, these intellectuals tended to ascribe to the accepted Japanese norm at the time of producing academic or intellectual texts in the pseudo-Chinese style. Writing in *kanbun-kundoku-tai* should not be confused with writing in Chinese, however. Mizuno (2012: 95) identifies seven characteristics that define the style as a form of Japanese writing that is influenced by Classical Chinese. These characteristics include a restricted use of auxiliary verbs, honorifics, and post-positional particles, an abundance of words built up of numerous character compounds and a focus on the present tense. Mizuno (2012: 97-101) goes on to demonstrate these characteristics in the highly influential early generations of translators of Western technical documents. Examples include the uses of words and phrases particular to *kanbun-kundoku* in Masano Nakamura's (中村 正直) 1870 translation of Samuel Smiles' *Self-Help* (1859), entitled 西国立志編 *[A Collection of Success Stories in Western Countries]*.

This new form of target text-producing translation was not restricted to the consumption of Western texts. Japan's newly re-established international contact had not been limited to Western nations. As well as technical texts from the West, the Japanese had also developed a taste for works in vernacular Chinese, which resulted in an influx of Chinese novels (Sato-Rossberg and Wakabayashi, 2012: 3). The consumption of these novels, beginning in the late 17th-century, had to be approached in a way that differed markedly from the *kanbun-kundoku* that had been used earlier. The later Chinese vernacular adopted by the novels differed dramatically in form and style from the formulaic Classical texts decoded with *kanbun-kundoku* (Okayama, 2012: 54). The result was an intricate method that was called 通俗 (*tsūzoku*) [popularization] in the Edo period, produced and reserved specifically for vernacular Chinese texts (Okayama, 2012: 63). This method consisted of close translation, followed by adaptation that created a target text in the Japanese vernacular.

The nature of this vernacular was also set to change, however, when the focus of translations from European languages broadened to include works from the various canons of Western literatures. In a similar way that *kanbun-kundoku-tai* had been created as a way to imitate the style of Classical Chinese literature, when the Japanese of the Meiji period developed a taste for imported Western literature, they also began producing original Japanese texts that mimicked the style of Western works (Sato-Rossberg and Wakabayashi, 2012: 4). This new kind of writing was called 欧文脈 (*ōbun-myaku*) [European text-vein] and it developed as a mimicry of European stylistics and expressions in Japanese texts (Osawa, 2010: 103). Over time, as the use of this form became more widespread, the boundaries between subjects produced in *ōbun-myaku* and those produced in *kanbun-kundoku-tai* and Classical Japanese-style eventually became normalized (Mizuno, 2012: 97). This normalization meant that much as *kanbun-kundoku-tai* had already been the standard for academic works for a considerable period, *ōbun-myaku* became the standard for literary works originally composed in Japanese (Mizuno, 2012: 111, Nagata, 2007: 75). Thus, the arrival in Japan of works of literature in a variety of foreign vernaculars can be shown to have prompted a rethinking of what it means to consume or translate a work in a foreign language. It also demonstrates the tangible effect foreign forms of text production have had over the Japanese literary system.

The Impact on Rakugo

This rethinking may have also had some effect on the production of rakugo stories. Rakugo are only classified as *koten* [classical] if they were first produced between the Edo (1603-1868) and Meiji periods (Morioka and Sasaki, 1990: 9). Those rakugo that were first produced after the early years of the Meiji period are instead, designated as *shinsaku* [newly made] (Brau, 2008: 69). Mimura (1996: 68) points out that this distinction is not unproblematic, given that, as illustrated in Chapter 3 (111), the texts are traditionally transmitted orally, and are subject to a great deal of variation between one storyteller and another. As a result, for Mimura, classification of the stories in this way oversimplifies the fluid nature of texts in the rakugo art form. Nonetheless, this academic distinction in classifications between *koten* and *shinsaku*, which was formulated in the early 1960s, during rakugo's post-war surge in popularity (Mimura, 1996: 67) does describe more than the date of a particular rakugo's first performance. It also describes a profound shift in the ways that new rakugo come to be produced.

As discovered in Chapter 3, many *koten* rakugo have a recognisable source, whether a text in Classical Chinese, a Japanese play or poem, or a popular ballad. *Shinsaku* rakugo, on the other hand, are generally not based on the same kinds of sources, but are often inspired by the personal experiences of their creators. Indeed, the 現代落語辞典 [*Dictionary of Modern Rakugo*] stipulates that a *shinsaku* rakugo must have a known author and the story must be the author's own creation, not based on an antecedent text (Morioka and Sasaki, 1990: 279).

One example that illustrates the distinction between the two styles is the *shinsaku* rakugo called 代書 (*Daisho*) [notary], in which the eponymous clerk despairs at his client's ignorance of simple details such as his own date of birth (S. Katsura, 2006d: 7-33). This rakugo was composed in around 1939 by the famous storyteller 四代目桂米團治 [Katsura Yonedanji IV] (S. Katsura, 2006d: 35). It appears highly probable that this story was inspired by the personal experiences of the storyteller, who had been employed at 中濱代書事務所 [Nakahama Notary Office] only a year earlier (Shōfukutei and Mita, 1936: 112). Of course, storytellers relaying classical rakugo may choose to intersperse the traditional tale with events or details gleaned from personal experiences (Morioka and Sasaki, 1990: 288). However, the practice

of producing a large number of rakugo with no textual antecedent can be thought of as a development that characterizes *shinsaku* rakugo. Thus, it is possible to infer that the general change in attitudes towards translation and original writing that occurred in Japan as a result of its renewed contact and interest in the outside world may have also caused a shift in the ways that rakugo came to be composed. This shift saw newly composed rakugo being less closely aligned to the Edo period's practice of translating texts into the rakugo medium by interweaving *shukō* elements with *sekai* ones than the contemporary tradition's understanding of originality.

   The changes that occurred in Japan as a result of the country reopening its international borders were, of course, not limited to issues of textual norms and methods of translation. However, the shift that occurred in rakugo's approach to text production, and coincided with wider shifts in the culture it occupied reinforces the idea that developments within a translating culture can have tangible effects over the ways that traditions function as a part of that culture. Any tradition is necessarily reliant on human actors for its perpetuation and propagation. It is possible to infer, therefore, that if these human actors' understandings of what it means to translate shift, the translations they produce may also be affected. Similarly, if the worldview of a whole culture radically changes such that focus of attention comes to fall on the new, as opposed to the hitherto revered past, a form of text production that traditionally relied heavily on source texts may turn, instead, to entirely different sources of inspiration.

   These inferences raise questions relating to the degree to which the Japanese experience is comparable with other translation traditions. Of particular interest for this study is the question of whether the contemporary, mediation-based understanding of translation is similarly prone to influence by external circumstances.

The Development of *Excogitatio*

   Chaucer and the translation tradition, to which he belonged, can be seen as the antecedent of the contemporary, mediation-based paradigm. The question of how the medieval, *excogitatio*-based understanding came to be superseded by the contemporary, therefore, naturally presents itself. As we have seen in chapters 1, 2, and 4, while Chaucer's tradition makes little if any distinction between translation and original writing, the contemporary understanding appears to view the two as

practices that are largely divorced from one another. Moreover, the contemporary tradition has been shown (32) to have an underlying goal of mediating between source and target that is not present within Chaucer's tradition. What then, could have brought about this change in the way that translation is understood, and hence, employed?

In many ways, this change can be likened to that present in the Japanese context already examined. Although arguably less rapid than the changes observed during the period that followed the reopening of Japan's international borders after more than two centuries, the gradual shift that created the contemporary tradition is no less seismic. We have already seen how the notion of *excogitatio* that informed the medieval understanding of translation was formulated in the Classical period (69). However, it is overly simplistic to imagine that this understanding and the parameters, on which it was based, remained static. Indeed, Chaucer, as one of the 14th-century's early pioneers of English as a language of high literature can be thought of as indicative of the large-scale shift in sensibilities that would soon sweep across Europe. The shift in question is traditionally referred to as the Renaissance and is generally reckoned to have begun in Italy in the 14th-century (Rowe, 1965: 9). The beginning of the Renaissance in England is generally equated with the rise of the Tudor dynasty in 1485 (R. Carter and MacRae, 1997: 51)[65].

Chaucer and the authors of his sources and analogues such as Petrarch and Boccaccio illustrate the oversimplification inherent in arbitrary periodization. Each exhibits characteristics that demonstrate their position of transit between medieval and Renaissance norms (Ganim, 1999: 143). Perhaps it is most conventional to view Chaucer's efforts in subscribing to the English vernacular literary canon as an early precursor to the shift that would reach mainstream prominence in the 16th-century. The Renaissance is characterized by this same increase in the use of vernacular languages for literary works along with a renewed interest in classicism (Hermans, 1992: 95). These two interests are encompassed within the notion of humanism, which can be thought of as a heuristic term to describe the zeitgeist of the

---

[65] It is acknowledged that the Renaissance as a temporal designation is a convenient and, some argue (for example Tucker, 2000: 2), overly simplistic retrospective description. It is accepted that the precise dating of such a shift is open to debate. However, the aim here is not to advocate or challenge the designation of historical periods but to use them to mark important shifts in thinking.

Renaissance (Gray, 1963: 497). P. Burke (1990: 2) summarizes humanism as "the movement to recover, interpret, and assimilate the language, literature, learning and values of ancient Greece and Rome". With this combination of a heightened focus on the texts of ancient Greece and Rome and an increased appreciation for high literature composed in vernacular languages, it seems reasonable to expect individuals during the Renaissance to view translation as a means of interpreting and assimilating. That is, translation would appear from our contemporary standpoint to be the ideal means to achieve humanism's aim of interpreting and assimilating the language and literature of these ancient cultures. Hence, while translation may still have been afforded something of the prestigious position in the Renaissance that it had been given during the middle ages, it appears reasonable to infer that translation might have been seen more simply as a means to consume foreign-language texts and so, been understood as something quite separate from original writing.

The Impact of the Vernacular

While a sudden abandonment of the medieval understanding of translation's relationship to original writing is not fully attested in Renaissance writings on the subject, there is evidence of a relatively gradual shift in attitudes. In 1590, George Puttenham wrote his hugely influential treatise entitled the *Arte of English Poesie*. Alongside a detailed description of prosody and poetic history up until the 16th-century, Puttenham touches on the issue of inspiration in the production of poetry. Here, Puttenham appraises the practices of the earlier, medieval text producers in decidedly negative terms, which can be taken as indicative of the fact that some form of change in sensibilities had occurred in the intervening years.

Puttenham does not state his own understanding of the role of translation directly. However, it is possible to infer his understanding from his assertions regarding the best way to produce texts. In a way reminiscent of his medieval predecessors, Puttenham does not appear to make the same sharp distinction between derived texts and original ones. Instead, the assumption appears to remain that a certain amount of derived material is expected in any primary text. This assumption, which it is logical to assume was inherited from the medieval tradition does, however, pivot on the proviso that material appropriated from source texts must be improved upon.

Puttenham sees the direct incorporation of source material as a far less favourable practice than the unconscious imitation of antecedent authors (White, 1965: 69). Indeed, he is quite explicit in demonstrating his dislike for translation that includes no improvement. Puttenham examines the work of translators whose target texts remain too close, in his view, to their sources and says of this kind of translator "[t]he man deserves to be indicted of petty larceny for pilfering other men's devices from them and converting them to his own use" (Puttenham et al., 2007: 339).

Puttenham also demonstrates his understanding of the ideal ratio of original to derived material in his largely negative description of medieval text-producers (Puttenham et al., 2007: 149-150). He criticizes his medieval predecessors directly for their overreliance, as he sees it, on translation. He describes them en masse as "grave morall men but very homely Poets, such also as made most of their workes by translation ... & few or none of their owne engine" (Puttenham et al., 2007: 171). Puttenham also writes less generally on specific text-producers. He examines the work of a number of figures from the 14th and 15th-centuries, including Gower, Lydgate, Harding, and Chaucer, whom he describes as the "most renowned of them all" (Puttenham et al., 2007: 149). Puttenham goes on to critique Chaucer's work, saying that "though many of his books be but bare translations out of the Latin and French, yet are they well handled" (Puttenham et al., 2007: 149), which can almost be seen as praise, compared to his subsequent critiques of his other predecessors such as Gower and Lydgate (Puttenham et al., 2007: 150). Regarding John Lydgate, whom Nolan (2005: 2) describes as "a complex and skilful practitioner of Chaucerian poetics" Puttenham matter-of-factly states "[a] translator only and no deviser of that which he wrote, but one that wrote in good verse" (Puttenham et al., 2007: 150).

What is clear from Puttenham's criticisms of his medieval predecessors is that for him, direct or "bare" translation is aesthetically less highly commendable than a kind of indirect translation, by which a source author's work is so thoroughly internalized by the text producer that it has a tangible effect over the production of new works. Even less commendable, however, is the practice of translating without "devising", or improving (Puttenham et al., 2007: 150).

It is interesting to note that the main thrust of chapters 1 and 2 of this thesis could be interpreted as reconciling Chaucer's text production methods with the contemporary understanding of the word "translation". The fact, therefore, that

Puttenham describes this mode of text production as "bare translating", and advocates an even greater departure from the source material than is apparent in Chaucer's texts indicates a growing notional separation between the practices of translation and original composition in the late 14th-century. The practice of "devising" that Puttenham appears to advocate may in fact be a Renaissance precursor to the contemporary understanding of originality. Indeed, Puttenham is abundantly plain in terms of his low degree of appreciation of translation that lacks "devising", or translation for translation's sake. What is clear is that he prefers a form of translating that interweaves an even greater amount of originality into a target text than did Chaucer and his contemporaries.

Of course, Puttenham does not necessarily speak for his whole age, and indeed, his work and the apparent inconsistency with which he treats individuals such as Wyatt and Surrey was duly noted by his contemporaneous critics (White, 1965: 75). However, inconsistent as Puttenham may be regarding his appraisals of earlier text producers, his views on the employment of source material remain easy to align with the views of other writers from the same period such as Philip Sidney, William Webb and John Harrington (White, 1965: 79). The key point to note from all is the stress that is placed on the need for reinterpretation and improvement when source material is translated (White, 1965: 79). Whereas the practices of Chaucer and his contemporaries can often be thought of as a combination of translation and originality in equal measure then, by the Renaissance period, the focus had shifted towards a reduced reliance on the source text.

Translation retained an important role in the process of text production, but an even greater emphasis was placed on reinterpretation than had been the case during the middle ages. This tendency towards favouring originality and hence, creating a notional separation between translation and original composition appears to have continued to develop until the end of the Renaissance and into the 17th-century. The 17th-century also saw the beginning of a protracted period of substantial cultural change across Europe. This period, which is generally taken as encompassing the 17th and 18th-centuries is known as the Age of Enlightenment.

The Age of Enlightenment is another point in history that is pivotal in terms of wide-spread and far-reaching shifts in philosophical and ideological norms (Israel, 2001: 3). Perhaps the most important of these shifts is society's new-found interest in

objectively describing the physical world, embodied in the scientific method and empiricism-based scepticism (Israel, 2001: 481).

Empiricism's Contribution

The writings of thinkers concerned with translation who were active during this period demonstrate that changes in the ways that translation was perceived also occurred. These writings show that the shift away from the medieval understanding of translation and originality as tandem functions that occurred during the Renaissance had remained and taken on new dimensions. One of the key thinkers on the subject of translation during the 18th-century is John Dryden, the influential poet and literary critic. Dryden describes his understanding of translation in the preface to his own translation of Ovid's *Epistles* (1776)*,* where he identifies three methodologies that the translator may choose to adopt. The first methodology is *metaphrase*, in which translation is performed line by line and word by word (Ovid et al., 1776: XVI). Dryden likens this kind of translation to "dancing on ropes with fettered legs: a man may shun a fall by using caution; but the gracefulness of motion is not to be expected: and when we have said the best of it, 'tis but a foolish task" (Ovid et al., 1776: XVII).

The second methodology is paraphrase, or "translation with latitude, where the author is kept in view by the translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly followed, as his sense, and that too is admitted to be amplified, but not altered" (Ovid et al., 1776: XVI). The third methodology is imitation, where the translator "assumes the liberty not only to vary from the words and sense, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion; and taking only some general hints from the original" (Ovid et al., 1776: XVI). Dryden holds this third methodology to be the most praiseworthy form of translation:

> I take the Imitation of the Author, in their sense, to be an endeavour of a later poet to write like one who has written before him on the same subject; that is, not to translate his words, or to be confined to his sense, but only to set him as a pattern, and to write, as he supposes that author would have done, had he lived in our age, and in our country. (Ovid et al., 1776: XVII-XVIII)

Dryden's descriptions of these three methodologies highlight the fact that in just the same way that Chapter 4 (126) uncovered more than one way that translation can function and be understood in the contemporary tradition, translation as a practice is

unlikely to have been employed and understood in only one way at any particular point in history. Reynolds (2011: 73-74) even points out the inherent overlap in the practical applications of the three methodologies. Dryden's advocacy of imitation over direct translation, however, chimes closely with the taste for indirect translation that Puttenham had expressed over a century earlier. The form of translation he terms paraphrase can even be thought of as the descendent of the idea of "devising" endorsed by Puttenham.

What is less clearly a direct development of earlier norms, however, is Dryden's description of what he calls *metaphrase*. Although *metaphrase* is appreciably Dryden's least favoured form of translation, the fact that he mentions it demonstrates that this translation strategy, which is intimately linked with the source text, must have existed in some form at the time of his writing. Moreover, it is also possible to discern from Dryden's description that the contemporary understanding of translation as a means of re-creating or re-producing source works in the target language had begun to take shape. In this understanding, the translator attempts to embody the source author in the target culture. Thus, the conceptual gulf between the practices of translation and original writing can be seen as growing through the Age of Enlightenment.

Indeed, it can be argued that Dryden's work is evidence that the two practices have become notionally separate by the 17th-century. However, the danger of interpreting these historical understandings through a contemporary lens must be acknowledged. It may have been that the boundaries between originality and translation may have remained less distinct than they appear retrospectively, and continued to diverge over time. A comparable set of circumstances may be the contemporary distinction between translation and adaptation. As explored in the introduction (29), the practices that these two terms describe may be notionally distinct, but identifying the point at which one ends and the other begins within the contemporary tradition is largely based on subjective assertion and so, remains problematic in the extreme.

The Genius of the Text

Around the middle of the 18th-century, there arose another movement that overlapped with the Enlightenment to some degree but also acted as a reaction towards its focus on empiricism (Agassi, 2005: 214). The Romantic period lasted

until the middle of the 19th-century and saw several important developments that would prove influential in adding definition to the distinction between translation and originality. One of these key developments, which is central to the Romantic Movement is the notion of textual "genius" (Ruthven, 2001: 40), which, for the first time, promotes the individuality of a text to such a degree that originality becomes a prime factor in the appreciation of literature. Edward Young, in his highly influential *Conjectures on Original Composition* (1759), describes at length his understanding of genius, its importance in the generation of originality, and the relative merits of derived works compared to original ones:

> An Imitator shares his crown, if he has one, with the chosen object of his imitation; an Original enjoys an undivided applause. An Original may be said to be of a vegetable nature; it rises spontaneously, from the vital root of genius; it grows, it is not made: Imitations are often a sort of manufacture wrought up by those mechanics, art, and labour, out of pre-existent materials not their own. (Young and Morley, 1918: 7)

The influence that the work of Young had on the understanding of translation's general worth as compared to the newly idolized originality was also substantial. Writing in a letter in 1759, poet, William Shenstone praises Young's work, saying "You must by all means read Dr. Young's *New Conjectures on Original Composition*, and let it deter you, when you have compleated Ovid, from engaging in any more translations." (Young and Morley, 1918: 52). Thus, works such as that of Young, which advocate originality so strongly can be seen as cementing the dichotomous relationship between originality and derivation.

Indeed, Young was far from alone in his views regarding originality. Many thinkers of the 18th-century, including Samuel Johnson and Joseph Warton express the view that a reliance on source material is a hindrance to the expression of genius (see Allen and Clark, 1962: 101-102). This new, widespread focus on originality can, therefore, be seen as a decisive and emphatic reaction against the residue of medieval, *excogitatio*-based text production, which, as we have seen, had adapted and survived until the 17th-century.

A part of this reaction was a palpable distaste for textual derivation in general and translation in particular. Genius was not perceived as a solely individual phenomenon, but was also appreciated as an emanation of a particular culture with

its own textual heritage. Writing in his 1820 paper *On the Analogue Between the Growth of Individual and National Genius*, literary critic John Wilson describes the relative merits of native genius versus translated works, as he sees them:

> There is a natural inclination in men's minds to wish that the impulses under which the genius of a people acts, should be derived essentially from their own mind; […] for undoubtedly there is a very general and deep-felt admiration of those works of genius in every kind which bear impressed on them the character of the people among whom they have arisen, and which seem native, as it were, to their soil. There is felt, in like manner, a certain repulsive chillness investing those works of art, which though elaborate and fair, are imitated merely from the art of another nation. They want natural interest, and they always give back the impression of a timid genius [...] (J. Wilson, 1820: 375).

For Wilson, therefore, genius is inseparable from the cultural context in which it came into being. He goes on to describe collective genius in almost religious terms as a quality imbued within texts that is only perceivable from within that same cultural context:

> On the production of a nation's genius, it may be presumed there will be read the same character – that this collective genius will express itself, will mark its own act, its own work, with the seal of its own individual character; and it may be apprehended, that this expression of an individual character in a people, will imply as in the individual, some extraordinary self-communion in the spirit of the people (J. Wilson, 1820: 376).

Thus, for Wilson and his contemporaries, to remove a text from its cultural context is to lose its genius. Similarly, because genius is based in individuality, it is not something that can be reproduced.

A closely related development of the 18th-century that can be seen as the expression of these notions of genius as individuality is literary plagiarism. Plagiarism in the 18th-century hinges on the notion of literary genius, since it is a charge against works that are perceived as appropriating the genius of others (Spearing, 1987: 93). The early charge of plagiarism is, however, far from stable and may be, to some degree, linked with earlier understandings of text production.

The conditions under which a charge of plagiarism could be brought in the 18th-century were specific. A text could not be described as plagiarized if its source were

acknowledged, if it included some improvement on the source, if the original was considered familiar to the general readership, or if the link with the source was unconscious on the part of the text producer (see Mazzeo, 2006: 3-4). Perhaps the most surprising element of these stipulations is their subjectivity. Only the first stipulation, that the source author be acknowledged, can be demonstrated objectively, while questions of target audience familiarity or the intentions of the target text producer are much more difficult to prove. Nonetheless, it is important for a consideration of the notional separation of originality from derivation that arguably the most subjective stipulation regarding improvement remained. This stipulation, that a text could not be described as plagiarizing if it had improved on its source may be linked to the Renaissance taste for source material being interwoven with all important novel elements, and even more remotely, to the medieval understanding of *excogitatio*-based translation.

As well as developing its understanding of the distinctions between translations and originals, the Romantic period also inherited and expanded on the Enlightenment's notion of *metaphrase* and of using translation to re-produce or re-create source texts.

This period is, of course, when the Prussian philosopher and theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher was active (Hermans, 2008: 131). Schleiermacher's lifetime of the late 18th and early 19th-centuries coincides with the shift towards viewing translation as a tool with definite purposes. Notably, these purposes do not include the production of new works per se.

Schleiermacher is remembered for expressing the dichotomy that would come to be adopted into contemporary translation studies as foreignization and domestication (Snell-Hornby, 2006: 9). Venuti (1991: 129) describes Schleiermacher's understanding of translation in the distinctly mediating terms of "wanting to bring those two completely separated persons, his author and his reader truly together". With Schleiermacher, as with all of the historical figures observed here, there is a danger in seeing their work only through the lens of later developments. However, Schleiermacher can certainly be seen as one of the most influential figures in connecting translation with hermeneutics (Schleiermacher and Bowie, 1998: XXXVII). He is one of the earliest thinkers to express the sentiment, which would become so familiar in contemporary translation literature, that translation is a process of interpreting the source text for a new audience (Schleiermacher, 1813: 1). In doing so, he pre-empts the second contemporary understanding of translation

identified in Chapter 4 (126) that sees the practice as a way of making source texts available to new audiences.

Schleiermacher's connection of translation with hermeneutics is anything but simplistic. He introduces the notion that the interpretation of a source text varies, depending on the reason the translation is being produced (Schleiermacher, 1813: 5). Schleiermacher identifies four possible categories, into which a translation's purpose might fall: "zum ästhetischen Genuß" [for aesthetic pleasure], "zum Schulgebrauch" [for scholarly use], "zum philologischen Gebrauch" [for philological use], and "für den kritischen Leser" [for the critical reader] (Rübberdt and Salevsky, 1995: 303). These categories can be seen as direct evidence for an understanding of translation as a proxy or conduit of the source text. The categories can also be linked closely with the contemporary notion of the target audience, which, as was observed in Chapter 2 (77), can be seen as problematic for medieval translations as a result of their lack of interest in receiver comprehension.

By the end of the 18th-century then, the enthusiastic promotion of originality had ceased to be a reaction to earlier translation-favouring norms, and had solidified as a dichotomy between originality, as a method for producing primary texts, and translation as a method for producing secondary texts. Where hitherto, there had at least been something of a grey area between the two practices, Schleiermacher's focus is on translation as a means of communication alone (Schleiermacher, 1813: 1). Gone is the medieval idea that translation and originality are two ingredients to any literary text, together with the Renaissance idea that a writer must incorporate and improve on antecedent texts. Schleiermacher's writings are characteristically direct in their treatment of translation as a form of interpretation and quite distinct from the expression of genius that created original texts.

Genius Turning to Spirit

Even after the prestige of literary genius had waned, the influence of the related notions of plagiarism and originality remained. Walter Benjamin, writing in the first half of the 20th-century demonstrates the influence that the thoughts of Schleiermacher and his contemporaries had gone on to have in shaping the ways that translation would come to be understood by later generations. Benjamin also talks about translation in restricted terms, as a method for the production of secondary

texts. Where Schleiermacher describes the act of translation in terms of a conduit, however, Benjamin, instead, contradicts this view directly in stating that to translate focusing on the words is the "Erkennungszeichen der schlechten Übersetzungen" (Baudelaire, 1923: VII) [hallmark of bad translations]. Benjamin appears to concede that it is possible to view translation as a method of transmission, though he suggests that working in such a way is to miss something (Baudelaire, 1923: IX). He asserts that works have some form of defining quality that is "Unfassbare, Geheimnisvolle, Dichterische" (Baudelaire, 1923: VII) [unfathomable, mysterious, poetic]. Thus, for Benjamin, to translate in the way described by Schleiermacher is to miss this ineffable quality. For Benjamin, a far superior approach is to "den Widerhall eines Werkes der fremden Sprache zu geben [...]" (Baudelaire, 1923: XIII) [give the echo of the foreign work], or in other words, to recreate in the target text the same quality that gave rise to the source text. It may be that what Benjamin is referring to when he talks about the spirit or poetics of a work may be a vestige of the 18th-century reverence for a text's genius.

In advocating translation by re-creation, Benjamin also expresses another notion that has gone on to become important for contemporary translation studies, that target texts uncover understandings that may not have been apparent in the source text (see for example Chesterman, 1997: 28, Tymoczko, 2009: 413). This notion reinforces Benjamin's understanding of translation as an act of recreating a text's genius and not merely an act of unsentimental or mechanical communication. This understanding that new or hidden meanings could be uncovered in a source text through translation would go on to influence later thinkers such as Lefevere in the form of the understanding of translations, along with commentaries, reviews and other derived text forms as so-called "refractions" of source texts.

Thus, the 18th-century notion of literary genius that would play such an important role in the demise of translation as a means of producing primary texts and the cementing of the dichotomy between translation and originality, though modified, can be shown to continue exerting a very powerful effect over the contemporary understanding of translation.

Over time, notions have been modified by the rise of others or, as in the case of *excogitatio*-based translation, have been supplanted by an entirely new understanding of the process of text production. Even the shape of the notion of literary genius that saw the final downfall of the modified *excogitatio*-based form of

text production has altered over time and been interpreted in new ways. With this evolution of the ideas that underpin our understanding of text production in mind, it is perhaps natural to see understandings of larger notions such as that of translation also evolving over time.

Implications for the contemporary tradition

This apparent evolution of the idea of what it means to translate supports the findings of chapters 1, 2, and 3. These chapters can be summarized as demonstrating that the contemporary translation theories of domestication, explicitation, and foreignization are fundamentally incompatible with forms of translation that lie outside the mediation paradigm.

The idea that our overall understanding of what it means to translate is incumbent on any number of related notions also goes some way towards identifying the cultural and temporal specificity of any given understanding of translation. Moreover, this specificity highlights the effects, not only on the producers of translations as they act out their understanding of the practice, but also on observers' appreciation of those translations and their relationships to their sources.

Chapter 4 illustrated the effort that must be made when adapting contemporary translation thinking to non-mediating forms of translation. Perhaps the finding that even the mediation-based understanding of translation has been open to a certain amount of evolution over its lifetime goes some way to explain why, as found in the introductory chapter (13), such a large proportion (68%) of contemporary translation literature focuses on case studies from the relatively recent past.

The finding that the Japanese traditions of translation have also altered as a reaction to certain developments in the wider culture supports the inference that any understanding of what it means to translate is liable to evolve over time. In turn, this inference raises questions relating to the effect that new technologies, changing cultural and ideological norms, or different understandings of a people's place in the world may go on to inform our understanding of translation in the future.

Conclusions

This chapter has discovered that it is most appropriate to envisage conceptions of translation being subject to evolution over time. It has observed the wide range of

factors that influence an understanding of what it means to translate, as well as the ways this understanding is realized in the production of texts. The chapter has noted that within a given cultural context, the uses people put translation to are likely to change over time. This change, it has been observed, can be prompted by a range of factors that is difficult to fathom.

The findings of this chapter also demonstrate that while understandings of what it means to translate have been open to substantial change over time these understandings have not always been entirely passive. Translation in the Japanese context has been shown to shift dramatically in form and function as a result of the country's newly reacquired contact with the outside world. However, perhaps more interestingly, a similarly great effect appears to have been experienced in the production methods of non-translations as a direct result of these developments. The influx of Western literature in Japanese has been shown to have influenced not only the styles used in the production of native literature but its very use of language. Thus, the complex interrelationship that conceptions of translation can have with forms of text-production that pivot on notional originality is illustrated.

Perhaps most importantly for the potential of reconceptualizing translation theories such that they can be made to yield meaningful results in the analysis of non-mediating translations, this chapter has found that conceptions of translation are subject to a great deal of variation across individuals and time periods. It appears overly simplistic to attempt to define a point at which *excogitatio*-based understandings of translation are replaced by mediation, for example. Rather, the results of this chapter show that conceptions are more liable to evolve in response to a potentially wide variety of stimuli than change abruptly.

Even in the context of 19th century Japan, which could be seen as embodying a decisive shift from the earlier closed country attitude to the later fascination with the West, we do not see evidence of a widespread, immediate shift in understandings of translation. Rather, there is a transition period, during which the earlier approach to consuming foreign texts endures in an altered form, in this case, *ōbun-kundoku*. It is slightly later that the use of a dramatically different approach to translating gains widespread currency and the older approach loses substantial ground.

Equally, in the Western context the two versions of mediation identified appear at quite different times, prompted by quite different factors. The use of translation as a proxy, conduit, or representation of a source text appears to be linked to the newly

formed connection between translation and hermeneutics in the 18th century. The empiricism and rationalism of the enlightenment can be seen as having an effect over the ways foreign texts are consumed through an evidence-based methodology. Thus, the focus in this understanding of translation is on transmitting the text as it apparently is. Conversely, the idea of the translation as a re-creation of a source text appears to be, to some degree, inspired by the Romantic notion of literary genius, in which a text is imbued with some ineffable quality or defining spirit. This conception can be seen as a reaction to the idea of translation as proxy, since it implies that to focus on the written text alone in translating is to ignore this literary genius.

While both of these conceptions belong to the overarching understanding of translation as mediation, they have both been shown to develop over time, and can still be described as embodying two distinct perspectives on translation activities. Thus, the finding of Chapter 4 that theories can be adapted for non-mediating translation traditions as long as the way they conceptualize their own actions be taken into account must be tempered by the fact that before any such adaptation can take place, the tradition to which a translation belongs must be determined. It is not enough to assume a given group of translators subscribe to any particular understanding of translation. In other words, it is not practicable to attempt a definitive compartmentalization of the stages that translation thought has gone through in any particular context and use this as a schema for the adaptation of theories. Certain trends are observable in retrospect as conceptions evolve from one point to another. However, this chapter has even shown that particular elements of a conception can remain after translation practices have changed. We have seen how the 18th century notion of plagiarism continued to include the caveat that derived work that is improved upon is not plagiarized. This notion of improvement can be seen as the direct successor of medieval, *excogitatio*-based translation, in which the aim was to innovate on the material derived from the source text, even though this understanding of translation shows evidence of change by the 16th century.

The implication, therefore, is that the number of factors involved in a reconceptualization and application of originally mediation-based theories of translation to non-mediating translated texts is by no means small. It appears that any study that would aim to achieve meaningful results in such a way would need to establish the appropriate conception of translation from the outset in a manner similar to that of chapters 1 and 3 in their use of abductive reasoning.

Questions can be asked, therefore, regarding what the reconceptualization of theories actually adds. Chapter 4 demonstrated that the main benefit of applying the newly adapted theories was the ability to draw comparisons across various texts. If, however, an understanding of translation is given to a large degree of flexibility, it could be questioned if such a comparison, based on inductive logic, is the best way to proceed, or if this approach simply continues to imply uniformity in a practice whose defining feature appears to be diversity.

CONCLUSION

Introduction

This thesis set out with the aim of asking if the approach employed by translation studies is apt to analyse translations in general, irrespective of the context in which those translations were originally produced. It began by analysing a corpus of 152 articles, taken to be representative of the contemporary discipline because of their recent publication in its most highly ranked journals. This analysis illustrated a variety of trends within the corpus, such as a focus on a small number of politically important and well-represented languages in terms of speaker population. Another trend observed is a preponderance of case studies that focus on translations produced in the relatively recent past. A third was a tendency to draw on a relatively select number of translation theories in the description and categorization of translated texts. This thesis used the results of the analysis as guidelines for the selection of two case studies, set in contexts that are unrepresented in the corpus of analysed articles.

The contexts in question also belong to cultural and temporal categories identified within the analysis as generally underrepresented. The first context was that of the medieval translation employed by Geoffrey Chaucer in the *Canterbury Tales*. Chapter 1 (72) observed that Chaucer made use of a kind of translation that could not easily be aligned with the form of mediation-based translation described in the corpus. Instead, Chaucer's texts demonstrated that he employed practices such as drawing on multiple source texts in the production of a single target text; transposing the setting of a tale from one remote setting to another, equally remote setting; and elaborating on texts in order to develop features such as characterization. These practices, it was argued, surprising as they may be to a tradition that views translation as a form of mediation, may be expected if Chaucer's understanding of translation was based on the medieval notion of *excogitatio*. This originally classical notion advocated that translators speak where their source authors are silent and remain silent where their source authors speak. Thus, a tradition of translation based on this notion might naturally be expected to develop a target text in directions other than those present in the source.

Next, the three translation theories identified as most influential within the corpus were used to analyse Chaucer's translations. These theories are explicitation,

foreignization, and domestication, and they were used as representatives of the contemporary approach to studying translation. Through this analysis of Chaucer's work, it was found that the theories share an underlying assumption that translation is a form of mediation. This assumption, Chapter 2 (95) concluded, constituted an obstacle to the theories' analysis of Chaucer's texts and their relationships to their sources. In each case, the ways the theories accounted for a particular feature of Chaucer's texts was found to be at odds with the cultural context of late 14th-century England. Therefore, it was inferred that Chaucer's texts may represent a tradition of translation that is fundamentally different from that observed in the contemporary corpus and so, defies simple analysis in terms of popular translation theories.

The thesis acknowledged two possible implications of these findings: either, Chaucer and his contemporaries are an anomaly in the way they apparently approached translation and so, mediation can be thought of as appropriate for the study of translation in all other cultural contexts, or the manners in which translation has been understood and made to function are potentially as diverse as the cultural contexts in which translated texts are to be found. With this possibility that conceptions of translation activity may include additional variations, the thesis went on to examine the second case study, which was translation in Kamigata rakugo.

Chapter 3 saw that texts had been translated from Classical Chinese documents, as well as Japanese ballads, poems and plays, into the largely comic monologues of rakugo. However, in this case, too, it is the idea of mediation that was found inadequate to describe the translators' treatment of the texts. Rather than rendering source material into a target text, the translation functioned in such a way that only particular elements of the source text were adopted, and interwoven with a large amount of original material. It was also found that in many cases, the whole mood of the source text was dramatically shifted in the target text so that, for example, the tragic could be rendered farcical; and formalized gravity could be rendered into stylized parody. These texts were also analysed with the same translation theories used in the case of Chaucer. Again, the explanation of textual features suggested by each theory appeared to be at odds with the Japanese context in which the translations were produced. There exists a Japanese tradition of translation, which entails a dichotomy between those elements retained from the source text (*sekai*) and those particular to the target text (*shukō*) (117). It was concluded that if this

dichotomy had formed a part of the rakugo translator's understanding of translating, this understanding could account for all of the phenomena observed (120).

Hence, because both Chaucer's translations and those of Kamigata rakugo exhibit understandings of translation quite distinct from one another and that seen in the contemporary corpus, it was inferred that there may exist any number of different interpretations of translation practice. It may be that these diverse understandings are largely the products of the contexts in which they were formulated. The implication for contemporary translation theory is that it may be restricted to describing translations produced within contexts that share its own, mediation based paradigm.

Attempting to reconcile this apparent rift between theory and practice, Chapter 4 went on to observe that in each case, the feature that appears to have problematized the analysis is the theories' underlying assumption that translation is a form of mediation. This chapter reasoned that if the theories can be reconfigured, and this assumption replaced with the understanding of translation appropriate to the respective contexts, the theories might be rendered more usable (131).

With respect to the analysis of rakugo and the *Canterbury Tales*, if the theories of explicitation, domestication, and foreignization were adapted to an understanding of translation that focuses on a *sekai-shukō* dichotomy or *excogitatio* respectively, meaningful results could be yielded that would allow texts and features to be compared. The same process of adapting contemporary theories, it was inferred, might be used to analyse other translations produced in contexts lying outside the mediation paradigm.

With this inference in mind, the thesis went on in Chapter 5 to attempt to ascertain the probable extent of diversity in understandings of what it means to translate. It observed other forms of translation that have existed concurrently with classical rakugo in the Japanese context. In particular, the history of the form of *metatext*-based translation known as *kanbun-kundoku* was traced from Japan's earliest experiences with writing and the development of a Japanese writing system, to the rise in prominence of Western literatures in Japan (147). K*anbun-kundoku* was shown to have had a great and tangible effect over the Japanese understanding of what it means to consume a foreign-language text. The *metatexts* produced with this method, it was observed, could constitute the first step in a longer process by giving a rakugo storyteller access to a Classical Chinese text (153). This text could then be made to function as the source for a new rakugo story. *Kanbun-kundoku* was also

found to have served as the model for a new method of consuming Western texts. *Ōbun-kundoku*, as this method of deciphering texts in European languages was known, was gradually supplanted by target text-producing traditions that were often equally elaborate (150). These changing roles and uses of translation in reaction to external forces illustrated that it is overly simplistic to refer to an understanding of translation as a static entity. Rather, an understanding of translation is given to evolve over time, shaped by the context in which it is made to function.

This notion of evolution was also in evidence in Western contexts when the period separating the contemporary corpus from Chaucer's was analysed. A number of turns in the ways text-production has been perceived were identified. These turns were shown to have led to a growing cognitive separation between the production of original texts and translations. The 17th and 18th-centuries, it was found, were of significant importance for these turns, since they saw the development of notions such as plagiarism and literary genius that enshrined originality as the basis of a primary text. Once this understanding of primary text production had become established, translation was consequently relegated to the production of secondary texts that attempted to re-produce or give access to the originality of its sources. The thesis found, therefore, that the mediation-based understanding of translation is a relatively recent development that has continued to evolve into the form seen in the contemporary corpus. The implication is that an understanding of translation is probably not a static entity that can be applied to texts produced within an easily definable period of time. Rather, understandings most likely evolve gradually over time in response to a highly diverse range of factors that qualify how individuals conceptualize their place in the world and the process of text production.

This concluding chapter will bring together the findings of the previous five to address the thesis' initial aim (8). It will examine the evidence regarding the aptitude of the approach to studying translation that currently enjoys most attention to analyse translations produced in underrepresented contexts. In doing so, this chapter will summarize some of the shortcomings of this approach, uncovered in the course of the thesis' discussion, and ask if an alternative might be worth further exploration.

Theory as Opinion

Conclusion

The introductory chapter found that at present, by far the most dominant approach to studying translation involves some use of translation theory. It found that theory is a very widely used approach to the study of translation and that some 48.03% of the studies in the corpus analysed referred to the notion of "translation theories" directly. However, it was observed that these theories are generally the tools of analysis within translation research, rather than the subjects of it. The frequency, with which theories are "applied" to case studies, was compared with scholars' attempts to challenge, refute, corroborate, nuance, or support them (15).

A feature of the theories that was not explored in the introduction is their origins. Many are strongly influenced by and in some cases, derived from the recommendations of translation practitioners. In this sense, they are not theories that have been produced as the result of the analysis of translation case studies, but are based on practices that have been variously advocated or opposed by particular translators. Subsequently the same practices have been identified in other translations, equated with the translators' statements, and have become a way to categorize or describe translation phenomena in general. A classic pair of examples is found in foreignization and domestication, which were terms proposed as part of Venuti's goal of challenging the perceived invisibility of contemporary translators (Venuti, 2004: 1-2). Venuti (2004: 300-301) asserts that by translating in a way that contravenes target language norms he has succeeded in making himself visible to the target audience as the translator which, he infers, will lead to a greater understanding and so, respect for translators' efforts in general. Venuti (2004: 20) calls this practice "foreignization" and effectively describes it as a method of enhancing the translator's visibility by contravening target norms. By contrast, he refers to the alternative practice, as he sees it, of adhering to target norms and so, reducing the translator's visibility as domestication (Venuti, 2004: 20). Venuti (2004: for example, 34, 86, 100) examines a number of case studies, in which translators have exhibited or advocated a contravention of target norms, or "target-language cultural codes" (Venuti, 2004: 42) and equates these cases with his own aims of raising the profile of translators. For Venuti then, foreignization is the solution to a perceived problem, translators may choose to accept or reject. Those who reject the solution or deny the problem necessarily subscribe to domestication (Venuti, 2004: 23). If domestication and foreignization are viewed more as strategies for the production of translations and less as theories or ways to categorize translations, the issue that the terms are not

categorically defined seems less serious. If considered as a theory, however, Venuti's argument inevitably raises questions relating to how foreignness is to be defined. In turn assuming that a definition can be formulated implies an objective distinction between the foreign and domestic that is frequently absent (Tymoczko, 2007: 212).

This situation can be compared closely with equivalence, one of the theories that enjoyed a near hegemony in translation studies for much of its early history (Snell-Hornby, 2006: 25). As explored in the introductory chapter (29), equivalence has so many different interpretations and is so heavily dependent on subjective perspective that its practical uses as a theory have become decidedly limited. However, the formulation of Nida's sub-categorization of the theory into dynamic and formal equivalences (Nida, 1964/2004: 129) can be compared with that of Venuti's theories of domestication and foreignization. Indeed, Nida's theories continue to be referred to in contemporary translation literature (see for example Lee, 2011b: 19, Sihui, 2009: 269, Wang, 2009: 209). In a manner highly reminiscent of Venuti's theories, Nida's descriptions of dynamic and formal equivalences were not intended as the establishment of a general system of categorization. Instead, they embody Nida's personal advocacy of a particular translation strategy. His work reads, not as a guide to the categorization or description of translations, but as a guide to producing what Nida esteems to be a good translation:

> It must be recognized […] that it is not easy to produce a completely natural translation, especially if the original writing is good literature […]. A translator must therefore not only contend with the special difficulties resulting from such an effective exploitation of the total resources of the source language, but also seek to produce something relatively equivalent in the receptor language. (Nida, 1964/2004: 133)

Nonetheless, Nida's descriptions, along with those of Venuti and other practitioners have come to be used as theories for the categorization of translated texts. Thus, contemporary translation studies demonstrates its historically complex relationship with practising translators (see also Gambier, 2012). Translation studies has, on several occasions, adapted abstract descriptions of practices into theories to describe or categorize extant translations. As the introductory chapter (38) illustrates, however, this adaptation is often incomplete because of the abstract nature of the descriptions in question. These descriptions often neglect to define the extent of a

phenomenon and in cases such as foreignization and domestication, do not identify the point at which one classification is replaced with the other. Thus, Venuti does not define the degree of foreignization necessary to qualify a translation as foreignizing. However, this omission does not appear to have problematized foreignization's adoption as a means to categorize and describe other texts.

Not all contemporary translation theories have been adapted from practitioners' personal tastes. Many of those generated during what Snell-Hornby (2006: 123) describes as the "empirical turn of the 1990s" are, instead, based on notions gleaned from related disciplines such as corpus linguistics. Explicitation is one such theory, which often uses case studies to produce statistical results to describe a translated text, or occasionally, to describe translation in general. Blum-Kulka (1986/2004: 19) introduces the "explicitation hypothesis" as an observable increase in explicitness between source and target texts irrespective of the differences between the two linguistic systems. In the very next sentence, she states "[i]t follows that explicitation is viewed here as inherent in the process of translation" (Blum-Kulka, 1986/2004: 19). Leaving aside Blum-Kulka's highly individual interpretation of the word "hypothesis" to mean an accepted truth rather than a question to be answered, it is important to note that she makes the logical fallacy known as a *secundum quid,* or hasty induction. She does not hedge her findings on the kinds of translation represented in her case studies, but telescopes the findings into a general feature of all translated texts[66]. In other words, it does not follow that explicitation is inherent to all translation, simply because it is observable in a given corpus of texts, unless that corpus is large enough to be representative of all translated texts. A similar fallacy would be to observe a sample of plants from one area and, noting that they all have yellow flowers, conclude that yellow flowers are a universal quality of plants in general.

Blum-Kulka (1986/2004: 32) also bases her theory on the unsubstantiated assumption that "translation is an act of communication". She reasons that being engaged in an act of communication, translators will naturally seek to relay the message of the source text to the target text as fully as possible, and thus, will tend to increase the explicitness of the text as part of this aim (Blum-Kulka, 1986/2004: 19).

---

[66] For more detail on the *secundum quid* fallacy and its relationship to hedging, see Walton (1996: 240-241)

What does and does not qualify as an "act of communication" is, of course, open to some interpretation. However, from the context it seems justifiable to infer that it indicates the same notion as has been referred to as mediation in this thesis (32). Chapters 1, 2, and 3 have demonstrated that not all translations have an underlying goal of mediation and so, do not function as acts of communication between source text and target audience. This being the case, the explicitation hypothesis' claim to universality is undermined by its hasty generalization and unsubstantiated assumption. Thus, the hypothesis could potentially be dismissed on the grounds that it is fallacious in more than one sense.

Theory as Shorthand

Given that many of contemporary translation studies' theories can be demonstrated to be either adaptations of abstract notions and so, open to a great degree of interpretation, or are generalizations based to some degree on unqualified assertion, one reaction may be that the theories are of little use as tools of enquiry. This reaction may suggest, as above, that the theories could be abandoned. However, to do so would be to ignore the use and interpretation of theory within the discipline. In disciplines using the scientific method, empirical data are used to test theories (B. Gower, 1997: 242). However, as has already been noted, in translation studies, theories are rarely the objects of analysis but are, instead, used to analyse examples of translation. Theory is often used as a kind of shorthand to describe a translation philosophy or style of practice.

For example, Haddadian Moghaddam (2011: 225) uses explicitation as shorthand to refer to an isolated instance of an expanded phrase; "the English phrase talks of going to bath, while the translator's explicitation غسل و وضوی عبره للناظرین can be back-translated as 'my ritual immersion of the body in the water and ablution are lessons for observers'". Thus, the theory is invoked without being engaged with directly. Very similar examples of this approach can be found across the corpus (see for example Jooken and Rooryck, 2011: 247, Taivalkoski-Shilov, 2008: 258, Winters, 2009: 92-93).

In a similar way, certain translation theories appear to have come into being as products of this shorthand approach, combined with the interaction of translation studies with practitioners of translation. For example, as we have seen, what is

termed foreignization is, in essence, an abstraction of the approach to translation advocated by Lawrence Venuti:

> A translator can not only choose a foreign text that is marginal in the target-language culture, but translate it with a canonical discourse (e.g. transparency). Or a translator can choose a foreign text that is canonical in the target-language culture, but translate it with a marginal discourse (e.g. archaism). (Venuti, 2004: 310)

Venuti actively describes the choices open to a translator approaching the task of translation. He does not lay down a schema of qualities to be used in appraising an existing text. For this reason, foreignization could equally be referred to as "Venutiesque translation" and dynamic equivalence, as "Nidaesque translation" in much the same way that one might talk about "Chaucerian poetry" to describe literature in the style of, but not necessarily by Chaucer; or "Cartesian philosophy" to describe thinking produced or inspired by René Descartes. In each case, the approach he advocates or exemplifies is equated with the individual in question. This approach obviates the tendency to group essentially unrelated translators together on the basis of an ostensibly similar approach.

Whatever the terminology used, however, what is clear is that the discipline employs theories as shorthand for categories of translation. If they are considered in this way, and not as testable theories in the scientific sense, there is a potential tendency to demand less rigour in their employment. Issues such as logical fallacy and casual assumption, the inability or unwillingness to test theories, and their lack of definition appear to be small obstacles to the theories' use in describing translations.

Theories and Time

However, this approach of treating translation theories as adjectives, especially eponymous adjectives also curtails their application. To link a style or practice of translation with the individual who described it creates a link between the theory in question and the lifetime of the respective thinker. In turn, this link makes it methodologically more difficult to use a theory to describe a translation produced before the theoretician's lifetime. For example, while there is little to prevent Golden (2009: 383) using the shorthand approach to describe Niccolò Longobardo's (1559-

1654) advocation of a foreignizing translation strategy in Ming dynasty China, it would clearly be more problematic to describe the same individual having a *Venutiesque* attitude to translation, given that Venuti was born three centuries after Longobardo's death. In linking the theories to the individual who formulated them, however, the pitfall of supposing that translation has always functioned in the same way across all cultures, and so, that theories are applicable to any context is avoided. A causal relationship between the theory and those translations it has the potential of inspiring is formed. This causal relationship makes it equally illogical to equate a given theory with a translator it cannot possibly have influenced to, for example, describing a classical Greek advocating Bayesian inferences, given that Thomas Bayes was not born until 1701 (Dale, 1999: 18). Of course, this method does not prevent the comparison of contemporary theories with translations produced prior to the theories' formulation. It merely avoids the trap of using a theory as shorthand, and in doing so, refrains from implying a direct parallel that cannot exist.

Although he equates Longobardo with foreignization, at no point does Golden (2009) mention the idea of resistance to a translator's perceived invisibility. Therefore, while Longobardo's translation style may be comparable with texts produced under the influence of Venuti's theory, it is problematic to equate the two if Venuti's explicit aim of counteracting translators' low visibility (Venuti, 2004: 20) is not also present. Very similar tendencies are seen in the remainder of those texts in the corpus that focus on non-contemporary contexts. Regarding domestication, for example, Shamma (2009: 76) asserts that Abdullah Ibn al-Muqaffa (720-757 AD) "shows a clear intent to domesticate the text into its new Islamic context" and Jooken and Rooryck (2011: 244) assert that the intervention of an anonymous 18th-century translator "illustrates a particular case of 'domesticating'" although neither study overtly subscribes to Venuti's assertions about the correlation between domestication and low translator visibility.

One might ask what is wrong with using theories as shorthand terms, and on the surface, the practice may appear to be a neat solution for the radically differing ways that translation may function. However, especially in cases where the theory in question was produced long after the translation, or where the translation was produced in a dramatically different context from that described by the theory, the use of theory as shorthand tends to lead to fallacious reasoning.

One logical fallacy that can be associated with using theories as shorthand in historical contexts is known as *affirming the consequent*[67]. This fallacy infers a converse statement from an original statement and thus, ignores the potential that other explanations exist. An example that illustrates the fallaciousness of this type of reasoning is to infer the following:

> Someone who finds a cure for cancer will be famous.
>
> Person x is famous.
>
> Therefore, person x must have cured cancer.

A corresponding example in the context of translation theory is below:

> A foreignizing translation will subvert target norms.
>
> Text x subverts target norms.
>
> Therefore, text x foreignizes.

Here, the possibility that text x subverts target norms for some reason other than foreignization, with its undertones of resistance, is overlooked. It could be inferred that the casual use of theories as shorthand encourages this kind of illogical argument. This inference complements the findings of chapters 1, 2, 3, and 4, which describe some of the other difficulties in using contemporary theory to analyse translations originating in contexts that are culturally or temporally distinct.

Another perspective to the issue of reconciling contemporary theory and historical practice is added by the findings of Chapter 5. This chapter saw how understandings of translation in the two case studies have a strong tendency to shift over time. It saw that in the Japanese context a number of highly distinct understandings of translation have come into being during the period rakugo has existed (150). A similar variation was also in evidence in the European context. Here, a variety of successive shifts were seen such as that in the 18th and 19th-centuries, occurring as a result of the rise of notions such as textual genius as an ineffable quality of any literary work, and an associated increase in the prestige afforded to originality (160).

These dramatic shifts in cultures' understandings of translation illustrate several important points. First, they show that an understanding of what it means to translate can shift dramatically over a relatively short period of time. Second, that the range of

---

[67] For a more detailed description of *Affirming the Consequent* and its relationship to other fallacies of deductive reasoning, see (Corbett and Connors, 1999: 65-68)

factors which inform an understanding of translation is bewilderingly varied. Third, that these factors do not necessarily manifest concurrently and so, it is more accurate to think of an understanding evolving over time than remaining static or changing abruptly.

This third point has, perhaps, the greatest potential impact on the application of contemporary translation theory to non-contemporary contexts. It illustrates the highly problematic nature of any statement that describes translation as a monolithic entity. The corpus analysed by this thesis illustrates an overwhelming focus on a relatively small number of contexts. Nonetheless, the translations examined were themselves highly varied. This variation is testament to the complex range of translation practices found in any given cultural context. However, the findings here demonstrate that this complexity takes on yet another dimension when time is added into the equation. Hence, analysing a translation with theories generated much later or in an entirely different cultural context is likely to create problems, even if the issue of using those theories in a shorthand style is avoided.

The kinds of problems that such an act might generate are illustrated by chapters 2 and 3. Both of these chapters attempted to use the contemporary theories of foreignization, domestication, and explicitation to analyse translations from dramatically different temporal and cultural contexts. Chapter 2 (95) concluded that while Chaucer's translations in the *Canterbury Tales* do exhibit practices that, prima facie, might be equated with each of the respective theories, the underlying goal that prompted each practice differs from that predicted by the theory. A similar difference between contemporary understanding and earlier practice was also found in Chapter 3, where it was arguably more dramatic. It was found that classical rakugo interweaves derived and novel elements at all stages of a story's creation and transmission. Again, while it is possible to interpret rakugo translation practices in terms of the contemporary theories on a superficial level, the differences between the goal that initiated translation in rakugo and that which is assumed by contemporary theory tend to make one unsympathetic to the other.

This lack of sympathy, coupled with the observation above that many contemporary translation studies theories are abstracted from contemporary translators' personal tastes, makes such theories seem increasingly difficult to reconcile with historical contexts.

Chapters 1, 3, and 5 illustrate the potential variety of distinct ways that translation has been understood and described in such historical contexts. Chapter 1 (69) introduces the medieval notion of *excogitatio*. Chapter 3 (117) illustrates the *sekai-shukō* dichotomy present in classical rakugo. Chapter 5 (147-174) describes the Japanese forms of *metatext*-based translation known as *kanbun-kundoku* and the closely related *ōbun-kundoku* it inspired. Each appears to have approached the act of translating in a distinct way. As a result, the products of each and the relationships formed between source and target texts by each are distinct.

The Diplomatic Solution and its Issues

The potentially radical disparity between familiar contemporary theories and less familiar translating contexts may tend to lead us back to the conclusion that contemporary theories are of little use for the study of other contexts. Chapter 4 (131) attempted to offer a diplomatic solution to this lack of immediate sympathy between the diverse ways of seeing translation. It avoided the issue that each theory rationalizes the practices it advocates within the mediation paradigm by reformulating them in terms of the understanding identified in each case study. In the case of rakugo, for example, the identified understanding was one that hinged on the *sekai-shukō* dichotomy, meaning that any identified practices were assumed to be derived from this understanding of text production. Thus, explicitation in this case was interpreted not as a practice of expanding a text in order to facilitate mediation, as in the contemporary sense, but as a means of categorizing parts of the *shukō,* or novel elements of a target text (131).

However, this approach, while being a potential means of discussing translations from contexts other than the contemporary is also not without its own issues. Perhaps most important is the fact that it pivots on a dramatic reconfiguration of theory. The unwieldy state of affairs that dictates a dramatic reinterpretation of theory for every newly encountered understanding of translation scarcely requires illustration. However, this state of affairs is even further complicated when it is considered in light of the findings of Chapter 5, in which it was shown that these understandings are more liable to evolve than to remain static or change abruptly and cleanly (166). With this potential for evolution in mind, it must be acknowledged that any given text can be perceived as belonging to a unique moment, as well as being produced

under unique circumstances by a subjective individual. Ascertaining at what precise point a given understanding of translation falls out of currency and another arises would be a complex and ultimately subjective endeavour that the production of a schema for reconfiguring theories would necessitate.

Hence, with this approach, the very issue of how a theory should be reformulated inevitably becomes yet another parameter that is open to interpretation. This degree of interpretability is linked to the abstract or otherwise relatively unstable logical foundations, on which many theories are built. As has already been illustrated, this logic already makes the theories open to considerable interpretation. The complexity of this situation, coupled with the degree to which a subjective reinterpretation of an already abstract notion can be said to be transferable and repeatable shows that this diplomatic approach only builds on an already confused system. It may be that a more flexible approach would be one that uses different means to analyse translation altogether.

The Alternative Approach

To make any use of translation studies theories, even in an adapted form, to analyse non-mediating translation traditions is to build on an intricate and often problematic framework, adding to its complexity. An approach that does so does not remedy the issues with the various theories identified above and throughout this thesis: it inherits them. An alternative would be to reconceptualize the study of translation such that the conclusions one makes about a translated text are not incumbent on prior assertions. One possible strategy might be to avoid the inductive and probabilistic forms of logic that characterize the use of the theories examined here, in favour of the abductive approach this thesis has used to contrast them. This thesis has compared the results produced through abduction with those produced by theory and has found abduction more flexible due to its lack of reliance on potentially inappropriate assumptions based on the mediation paradigm.

As explained in the introductory chapter (42), abduction attempts to reconcile observed phenomena with probable triggers. In the case of the *Canterbury Tales,* Chapter 1 observed features of Chaucer's translation practice such as his alteration of tales' settings to other, similarly non-domestic settings (49); his tendency to expand on the details of his tales (52); and his practice of including material from numerous

source texts in the production of a single target (65). When these practices were analysed with the theories, the results were concluded to be at odds with the cultural context of medieval England (95). By contrast, abductive reasoning found that the medieval notion of *excogitatio* could be thought of as a potential stimulus of all of these phenomena (72).

Similarly, in the case of rakugo, Chapter 3 noted features of the translation practice. These features include fleshing out a source text's skeletal frame with material not derived from a written source (103); incorporating a source text in such a way as radically to reinterpret or parody the story (105); and altering the number of scenes or characters present in a target text from those in the received source (111). Again, these practices could be described as incompatible with the mediation paradigm, and so, any theories incumbent upon it. These theories were, therefore, unable to add to an understanding of these phenomena. Conversely, abductive reasoning found that if the rakugo translators had understood their actions in relation to a dichotomy such as *sekai-shukō*, such practices could be expected (117).

Hence, abduction not only demonstrated the lacunae between the respective theories and each case study, it also offered alternative ways that the translation act could be viewed in each context. Furthermore, these results, unlike any produced by explicitation, foreignization, or domestication are testable and can be expanded upon. For example, the *sekai-shukō* dichotomy could be tested by collecting a sample of classical rakugo not examined here and comparing their relationships to their sources. If it were found that some of these rakugo had translated their source material and at no time had included unrelated material, the hypothesis above would need to be altered, nuanced, or replaced. In this way, abductive reasoning and the tentative inferences it produces invites further research based on different data or alternative perspectives, while the theories' inductive approach tends to limit itself to the categorization of particular texts or textual features.

Research produced by abductive reasoning is not static (Anderson et al., 2005: 58), it infers explanations based on the available evidence and prompts a greater exploration of that evidence. The hypotheses it generates are, therefore, almost necessarily as fluid as the sum total of knowledge on the phenomenon in question. Since this sum total is liable to change "very rarely can we positively expect a given hypothesis to prove entirely satisfactory" (Peirce, 1998: 109). For example, the notion of *excogitatio* could be compared with other medieval translations, in order to

find different ways in which it was interpreted. It could be compared with translations from the classical period and Renaissance in order to track the development of the idea over time in the manner of Chapter 5. Individual texts could also be analysed in greater detail to nuance our understanding of the functions of *excogitatio*.

In terms of the findings of Chapter 5 (166), which found that understandings and practices of translation can be thought of as evolving over time in reaction to any number of external influences, abduction offers a highly flexible approach that is much less constrained by the paradigm the observer occupies than Chapter 4 (126) found the theories to be. Abductive reasoning is capable of taking into account not only the diverse circumstances that lead to translators' conscious actions, but also those actions, which are unconscious, being informed by the translator's understanding of what it means to translate.

The use of abductive reasoning in this thesis has shown how powerful this approach can be in the study of translation traditions in which the underlying understanding of the practice is fundamentally distinct from that assumed by the researching culture. Chapters 2 and 3 (95, 120) have shown that, in these cases, several contemporary translation studies theories, and by extension, approaches to the study of translation are rendered problematic because of their ambitious aim of describing translation in general, coupled with their overriding focus on relatively recent case studies.

In such cases, where translation studies can no longer rely on the shorthand terminology provided by theories, abductive reasoning gives the researcher a framework, from which a study may develop. For translation contexts where the understanding of translation is in doubt, abductive reasoning gives the researcher the licence to explore the cultural background of the case in question and infer the features of that background that are likely to have had an effect over the ways translation is understood, and caused to function in that context. Chapters 1 and 3 have shown that this kind of enquiry can be fruitful for historical translation studies, as it has an impressive power to introduce new material into the discipline and open new roads of enquiry.

However, since the corpus of studies examined by this thesis found that the majority of contemporary literature is focused on relatively contemporary case studies, and in a relatively select set of linguistic contexts, it is reasonable to ask why

translation studies should take any interest in another form of enquiry. This thesis has only shown the effectiveness of examining translations in historical and otherwise culturally distinct contexts. It has not demonstrated that the same approach is fruitful for the study of mediation-based translation, the mainstay of translation studies literature.

In this thesis, the contexts under examination were specifically chosen to test the flexibility of the contemporary approach to studying translation in unfamiliar contexts. The hypotheses formed through this examination are specific to their respective contexts. However, unlike the inductive approach to theories observed above, since abduction does not seek to create generalizations (Flach, 2000: 17), the approach, though not its findings is applicable to any context in which a noteworthy feature can be identified in a text. Abductive reasoning might, therefore, have been used by those studies identified above as employing theory as a form of shorthand (Golden, 2009: 383, Haddadian Moghaddam, 2011: 255, Jooken and Rooryck, 2011: 244, Shamma, 2009: 76, Taivalkoski-Shilov, 2008: 258, Winters, 2009: 92-93) as an alternative, and less problematic way to rationalize the same noteworthy phenomena. In this way, the hypotheses generated by abductive reasoning are comparable with many of the conclusions made with the help of contemporary theories, though they lack their logically problematic undertones.

It must be acknowledged that the approach adopted by this thesis, and in particular, its description of contemporary translations studies has necessarily been generalizing. It is accepted that there are approaches within translation studies that do not make use of theory, and it may be that some of the theories that were not examined here in detail may be less problematic from the perspective of analysing translations produced in historical or otherwise culturally distinct contexts. However, it does appear fair to surmise that one plausible explanation for the discipline's overriding focus is a paradigm of mediation that is not necessarily present in all translation contexts. The mediation paradigm has been shown to influence the contexts it occupies very substantially and so, the translation practices and thinking produced within those contexts. The degree to which one can separate oneself from one's own context, and by extension, a pervasive trend of thinking therein is debatable. However, in terms of an approach that allows any translated text to be analysed, irrespective of whether it was produced in one's own context or not, abductive

reasoning appears to have fewer features that link it to perceiving translation as inherently mediating than do the theories examined here.

In short, this thesis has attempted to offer a reconceptualization of the study of translation. It moves away from the repetition of casual assertions, describing what translation is suspected to be, and towards questioning if the known experience of translation is the whole story. The thesis began by demonstrating that much of what we may hold to be true of translation is, in fact, only true of some kinds of translation. It showed that the practice can be conceptualized in a variety of ways that resist application to the mediation paradigm so often taken for granted. The thesis went on to demonstrate that the hegemony of universalist theories can be detrimental to the study of translation in the wider sense, since, if used in conjunction with the non-mediation-based traditions the thesis has shown to exist, it can generate results incongruous with the translation context. The thesis showed that although these theories can be adapted for use in a non-mediating tradition, traditions are liable to shift over time as the understandings that underpin them are affected by developments within the wider cultural context. It also remains to be seen what degree of freedom a conception or tradition of translation grants the translators operating under it. There is a potential that individual members of a given tradition may interpret translation activities in a dramatically different way from their contemporaries.

As a result, adapting theories to a variety of contexts, it was reasoned, may be an overly convoluted approach that invites further levels of abstraction and interpretation to the study of historically underrepresented forms of translation. The alternative suggested is the use of abductive reasoning to infer the array of stimuli that may have led a translator to produce work in a given manner. This approach obviates the use of theories as a form of shorthand to describe phenomena. In doing so, it also frees the study of translation from the assumptions or assertions that accompany many contemporary theories and ultimately, impede the growth of translation studies as a discipline.

Thus, the thesis' main aim of ascertaining if the approach to studying translation is equally applicable to texts produced in underrepresented contexts has found significant evidence that the discipline has only begun to scratch the surface of the full gamut of translation activities. On the other hand, it has found equally significant potential for new ways the study of translation can be conceptualized. The use of

abductive reasoning appears to have great potential for influencing the analysis of translations in contexts that are historically or culturally distinct from the mediation paradigm. The flexibility of this approach and the number of contexts that have not yet been studied in detail imply a bewildering array of new directions that translation studies as a discipline might follow. Concurrently the various issues with the theories examined here suggest that growth may be impeded if the discipline does not reduce its tendency to rely on thinking most relevant to its traditional focus.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Journal Mission Statements

Mission statement of The Translator, published on St Jerome webpage;

"The Translator is a refereed international journal that publishes articles on a variety of issues related to translation and interpreting as acts of intercultural communication. It puts equal emphasis on rigour and readability and is not restricted in scope to any particular school of thought or academic group.

By keeping an open mind on how translation can or should be studied and the kind of disciplines that can inform it, The Translator hopes to provide a meeting point for existing as well as future approaches and to stimulate interaction between various groups who share a common concern for translation as a profession and translation studies as a discipline. Translation is understood to cover all types of translation, whether written or oral, including activities such as literary and commercial translation, various forms of oral interpreting, dubbing, voice-overs, subtitling, translation for the stage, and such under-researched areas as sign language interpreting and community interpreting." (www.stjerome.co.uk)

Mission statement for Target, published on John Benjamins website;

"*Target* promotes the scholarly study of translational phenomena from any part of the world and welcomes submissions of an interdisciplinary nature. The journal's focus is on research on the theory, history, culture and sociology of translation and on the description and pedagogy that underpin and interact with these foci. We welcome contributions with a theoretical, empirical, or applied focus. We do not publish papers on purely practical matters, and prospective contributors are advised not to submit masters theses in their raw state. We especially welcome papers on topics at the cutting edge of the discipline, as well as shorter positioning statements, which may encourage discussion by contributors to the "Forum" section of the journal. The purpose of the review section

is to introduce and discuss the most important publications in the field and to reflect its evolution." (www.benjamins.com)

Appendices

Breakdown of the Kamigata rakugo stories of Beichō and Shijaku Katsura

The table below illustrates the stories published in the two storytellers' various books (B. Katsura, 2002a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, S. Katsura, 2006a, b, c, d, e) with those stories shared by both highlighted.

Hanashi	Transliterated Title	Classification	Shijaku	Beichō
ＳＲ	SR	*Shinsaku*	(S. Katsura, 2006b)	
あくびの稽古	Akubi no Keiko	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006a)	(B. Katsura, 2002g)
いたりきたり	Itari Kitari	*Shinsaku*	(S. Katsura, 2006d)	
いもりの黒焼き	Imori no Kuro Yaki	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002c)
うなぎや	Unagi-ya	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006a)	
かけとり	Kaketori	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002a)
かぜうどん	Kaze Udon	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006a)	
かわり目	Kawari Me	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006a)	(B. Katsura, 2002c)
くしゃみ講釈	Kushami Kōshaku	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006a)	(B. Katsura, 2002g)
くやみ	Kuyami	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006d)	
けんげしゃ茶屋	Kengesha Chaya	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002a)
こぶ弁慶	Kobu Benkei	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006b)	(B. Katsura, 2002b)
しまつの極意	Shimatsu no Gokui	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002d)
たけのこ	Take no Ko	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002h)
たちぎれ線香	Tachigire Senkō	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002c)
ためし酒	Tameshi Sake	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002h)
ちしゃ医者	Chisha Isha	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006a)	
つぼ算	Tsubosan	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006d)	(B. Katsura, 2002d)

Table 1: Rakugo Stories Reproduced in the Books of Beichō and Shijaku Katsura

つる	Tsuru	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006e)	
テレスコ	Teresuko	*Shinsaku*		(B. Katsura, 2002h)
どうらんの幸助	Dōran no Kōsuke	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006d)	(B. Katsura, 2002f)
ぬの字鼠	Nu no Ji Nezumi	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002e)
はてなの茶碗	Hatena no Chawan	*Shinsaku*	(S. Katsura, 2006b)	(B. Katsura, 2002d)
ひとり酒盛	Hitori-sakamori	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002h)
ふたなり	Futanari	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002f)
べかこ	Bekako	*Shinsaku*		(B. Katsura, 2002e)
まめだ	Mameda	*Shinsaku*		(B. Katsura, 2002a)
らくだ	Rakuda	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002f)
ロボットしずかちゃん	Robotto Shizuka-chan	*Shinsaku*	(S. Katsura, 2006d)	
一文笛	Ichi-mon-bue	*Shinsaku*		(B. Katsura, 2002g)
七度狐	Shichido Kitsune	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006b)	
七段目	Shichidan-me	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002g)
三十石　夢の通い路	Sanjukkoku Yume no Kayoiji	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006e)	
三枚起請	Sanmai Kishō	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002c)
不動坊	Fudōbō	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006a)	(B. Katsura, 2002g)
五光	Go-kō	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002e)
京の茶漬	Kyō no Chazuke	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002h)
仔猫	Koneko	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006e)	(B. Katsura, 2002e)
代書	Daisho	*Shinsaku*	(S. Katsura, 2006d)	
伊勢参宮神乃賑	Ise-sangū Kami no Nigiwai	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002b)
住吉駕籠	Sumiyoshi Kago	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006c)	(B. Katsura, 2002d)

Table 1: Rakugo Stories Reproduced in the Books of Beichō and Shijaku Katsura

佐々木裁き	Sasaki Sabaki	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002f)
八五郎坊主	Hachigorō Bōzu	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006c)	
動物園	Dōbutsuen	*Shinsaku*		(B. Katsura, 2002g)
千両みかん	Senryō Mikan	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002a)
厄払い	Yakubarai	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002d)
口入屋	Kuchi-ire-ya	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006a)	
口合小町	Kuchiai Komachi	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002c)
商売根問	Shōbai Nedoi	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002d)
土橋萬歳	Dobashi Manzai	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002f)
地獄八景亡者戯	Jigoku Bakkei Mōjan no Tawamure	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002b)
夏の医者	Natsu no Isha	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006b)	(B. Katsura, 2002e)
夢たまご	Yume Tamago	*Shinsaku*	(S. Katsura, 2006d)	
天狗さし	Tengu Sashi	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002e)
天狗裁き	Tengu Sabaki	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002b)
天神山	Tenjin Yama	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006b)	
子ほめ	Ko Home	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006c)	
宿屋仇	Yado Yaka Taki	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002f)
宿替え	Yado-Gae	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006c)	
寄合酒	Yoriai Zake	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002h)
寝床	Ne-dokoro	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006a)	
小倉船	Kokura- bune	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002b)
崇徳院	Sutokuin	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006c)	(B. Katsura, 2002c)
帯久	Obi-kyū	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002d)
延陽伯	Enyōhaku	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006d)	

Table 1: Rakugo Stories Reproduced in the Books of Beichō and Shijaku Katsura

怪談市川堤	Kaidanichi Kawazutsumi	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002e)
恨み酒	Urami Sake	*Shinsaku*	(S. Katsura, 2006e)	
愛宕山	Atago-yama	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006e)	(B. Katsura, 2002a)
抜け雀	Nuke Suzume	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002g)
持参金	Jisannkin	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002c)
故郷へ錦	Kokiyō he Nishiki	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002c)
日和ちがい	Hiyori Chigai	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006b)	
時うどん	Toki Udon	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006d)	
景清	Kagekyo	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002e)
植木屋娘	Ueki Yabu Musume	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006a)	(B. Katsura, 2002c)
権兵衛狸	Gonbei Danuki	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006b)	
次の御用日	Tsugi no Goyōbi	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002f)
正月丁稚	Shōgatsu Decchi	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002a)
池田の猪買い	Ikeda no Inoshishi Kai	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006c)	(B. Katsura, 2002a)
焼き塩	Yaki Shio	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002h)
煮売屋	Niuri-ya	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002b)
牛の丸薬	Ushi no Ganyaku	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002d)
犬の目	Inu no me	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002b)
狸の化寺	Tanuki no Bake-dera	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002e)
狸の賽	Tanuki no Sai	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002e)
猫	Neko	*Shinsaku*	(S. Katsura, 2006e)	
猫の忠信	Neko no Tadanobu	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006d)	(B. Katsura, 2002e)
田楽喰い	Dengaku Gui	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002h)
百人坊主	Hyaku-nin Bōzu	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002f)
百年目	Hyaku-nen-me	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002a)

Table 1: Rakugo Stories Reproduced in the Books of Beichō and Shijaku Katsura

皿屋敷	Sara Yashiki	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006b)	(B. Katsura, 2002b)
看板の一	Kannban no Ichi	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002g)
禍は下	Wazawai ha Shimo	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002h)
稲荷車	Inari-Guruma	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002e)
算段の平兵衛	Sandan no Heibē	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002f)
米揚げ笊	Kome Age Ikaki	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006a)	(B. Katsura, 2002d)
紀州飛脚	Kishū Bikyaku	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002e)
義眼	Gigan	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006c)	
肝つぶし	Kimo Tsubushi	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002c)
胴斬り	Dō Giri	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006b)	
舟弁慶	Funa Benkei	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006a)	
花筏	Hana Ikada	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006e)	(B. Katsura, 2002g)
茶漬えんま	Chazuke Enma	*Shinsaku*	(S. Katsura, 2006e)	
茶漬け間男	Chazuke Ma Otoko	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002c)
菊江仏壇	Kikue Butsudan	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002c)
蔵丁稚	Kuradcchi	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006c)	(B. Katsura, 2002g)
蛇含草	Jagan-sō	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006b)	(B. Katsura, 2002a)
蛸芝居	Tako Shibai	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002g)
蟇の油	Gama no Abura	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002g)
親子酒	Oyako-Zake	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006e)	
貧乏神	Binbō-gami	*Shinsaku*	(S. Katsura, 2006d)	
貧乏花見	Binbō Hanami	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002a)
質屋蔵	Shichiyagura	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006e)	(B. Katsura, 2002b)
軒づけ	Noki-suke	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006d)	(B. Katsura, 2002g)
軽業	Karuwaza	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002g)

Table 1: Rakugo Stories Reproduced in the Books of Beichō and Shijaku Katsura

近眼の煮売り屋	Kingan no Niuriya	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002h)
道具屋	Dōguya	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006d)	(B. Katsura, 2002d)
鉄砲勇助	Tebbō Yūsuke	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006b)	
鍋墨大根	Nabezumi Daikon	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002h)
阿弥陀池	Amida Ike	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002f)
雨乞い源兵衛	Amagoi Genbē	*Shinsaku*	(S. Katsura, 2006e)	
青菜	Aona	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006c)	
風の紙送り	Kaze no Kamiokuri	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002a)
饅頭こわい	Manjū Kowai	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006c)	(B. Katsura, 2002h)
首提灯	Kubi-chōchin	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006b)	
馬の尾	Ushi no O	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002h)
馬の田楽	Uma no Dengaku	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002h)
骨つり	Kotsu-tsuri	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002b)
高津の富	Kōzu no Tomi	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006c)	(B. Katsura, 2002d)
鯉舟	Koibune	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002h)
鴻池の犬	Kō no Ike no Inu	*Koten*	(S. Katsura, 2006e)	(B. Katsura, 2002h)
鹿政談	Shika Seidan	*Koten*		(B. Katsura, 2002h)

Table 1: Rakugo Stories Reproduced in the Books of Beichō and Shijaku Katsura

Survey Results

	Languages	Source				Target				Totals						Total	
		Pre-modern	Modern	Unspecific	Total	Pre-modern	Modern	Unspecific	Total	Pre-modern		Modern		Unspecific				
European Languages	English	4	28	0	32	8	27	0	35	12	3.95%	55	18.09%	0	0.00%	67	22.04%
	French	4	5	0	5	1	2	0	4	5	1.64%	7	2.30%	0	0.00%	9	2.96%
	Spanish	0	2	0	9	1	7	0	3	1	0.33%	9	2.96%	0	0.00%	12	3.95%
	German	2	3	0	2	0	4	0	8	2	0.66%	7	2.30%	0	0.00%	10	3.29%
	Finnish	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	1	0.66%	0	0.00%	1	0.66%
	Danish	1	1	0	2	0	1	1	2	1	0.33%	2	0.66%	1	0.33%	4	1.32%
	Italian	2	1	0	3	0	2	0	2	2	0.66%	3	0.99%	0	0.00%	5	1.64%
	Dutch	0	3	0	3	1	2	0	3	1	0.33%	5	1.64%	0	0.00%	6	1.97%
	Afrikaans	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	1	0.66%	0	0.00%	1	0.66%
	Portuguese	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	2	0.66%	1	0.33%	0	0.00%	3	0.99%
	Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	1	0.33%	0	0.00%	1	0.33%
	Catalan	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.00%	1	0.33%	0	0.00%	1	0.33%
	Greek	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0.00%	3	0.99%	0	0.00%	1	0.33%
	Hungarian	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0.00%	1	0.33%	0	0.00%	3	0.99%
	Latin	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	0.66%

Table 2: Results of Contemporary Translation Literature Survey

	Polish	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	0.33%	0	0.00%	1	0.33%	3	0.99%
	Russian	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0.00%	3	0.99%	0	0.00%	1	0.33%
	Slovak	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.33%	1	0.33%
	Total	16	50	0	66	12	50	3	65	28	9.21%	100	33.55%	3	0.99%	131	43.09%
Asian Languages	Chinese	1	5	0	6	2	8	3	13	3	0.99%	13	4.28%	3	0.99%	19	6.25%
	Arabic	2	4	0	6	5	2	0	7	7	2.30%	6	1.97%	0	0.00%	13	4.28%
	Hebrew	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	3	1	0.33%	3	0.99%	0	0.00%	4	1.32%
	Turkish	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0.00%	2	0.66%	0	0.00%	2	0.66%
	Kurdish	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0.00%	2	0.66%	0	0.00%	2	0.66%
	Bengali	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0%
	Hindi/Urdu	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0%
	Japanese	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.33%
	Javanese	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	Persian	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	4	1.32%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	1.32%
	Punjabi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0%
	Total	4	10	0	14	12	16	3	31	16	5.26%	26	8.55%	3	0.99%	45	14.80%
Unspecific	Various	8	31	4	43	4	26	1	31	12	3.95%	57	18.75%	5	1.64%	74	24.34%
	None	0	13	16	29	0	12	13	25	0	0.00%	25	8.22%	29	9.54%	54	17.76%
	Total	8	44	20	72	4	38	14	56	12	3.95%	82	26.97%	34	11.18%	128	42.11%
	Total	28	104	20	152	28	104	20	152	56	18.42%	208	69.08%	40	13.16%	304	

Table 2: Results of Contemporary Translation Literature Survey

Appendices

Corpus Analysis

Article	Case Study	Source Language	Target Language	Time Period	Defines Translation	Alludes to Different Interpretations of Translation	Reference to Translation Theories
(Mees et al., 2013)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	No	No	No
(Munday, 2013)	No	None	None	None	No	No	No
(Alves and Gonçalves, 2013)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	No	No	yes
(Schäffner and Shuttleworth, 2013)	No	None	None	None	No	No	No
(Ehrensberger-Dow and Perrin, 2013)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	No	No	No
(Göpferich, 2013)	Yes	None	None	Modern	No	No	Yes
(House, 2013)	No	None	None	None	No	No	Yes
(Risku and Windhager, 2013)	Yes	None	None	Modern	No	Implicitly	No
(Seeber, 2013)	No	None	None	None	No	No	No
(O'Brien, 2013)	No	None	None	None	No	No	No
(Brems, 2013)	Yes	French	Dutch	Modern	No	No	No
(Delabastita, 2013)	No	None	None	None	No	No	Yes
(Boyden, 2013)	Yes	Dutch	English	Modern	Yes	Yes	no
(Charlston, 2013)	Yes	German	English	Historical	No	No	Yes
(Gould, 2013)	Yes	Arabic	Persian	Historical	Yes	Yes	Yes
(Washbourne, 2012)	No	None	None	None	No	No	Yes
(Kruger, 2012)	Yes	Afrikaans	English	Modern	Implicitly	No	No
(Pięta, 2012)	Yes	Polish	Portuguese	Historical	No	No	No

Table 3: Survey of Contemporary Translation Literatur

(Bruno, 2012)	Yes	Chinese	English	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Harding, 2012a)	Yes	Various	Various	None	No	No	Yes
(Delaere et al., 2012)	Yes	Various	Dutch	Modern	No	No	No
(Disler, 2012)	Yes	Various	Various	Historical	Yes	Yes	Yes
(McDonough Dolmaya, 2011)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Olohan, 2012)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	No	No	No
(Dwyer, 2012)	Yes	Various	English	Modern	No	No	No
(Neather, 2012)	Yes	Chinese	Various	Modern	Implicitly	No	Yes
(Boéri, 2008)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Hokkanen, 2012)	Yes	Finnish	Various	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Schouten et al., 2012)	Yes	Dutch	Kurdish	Modern	No	No	No
(Harding, 2012b)	Yes	Russian	English	Modern	No	No	No
(Bassnett, 2012)	No	None	None	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Nord, 2012)	No	Various	Various	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Shlesinger and Ordan, 2012)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Gambier, 2012)	No	None	None	Modern	Implicitly	Implicitly	Yes
(Tymoczko, 2012)	No	None	None	None	No	No	Yes
(Schäffner and Shuttleworth, 2013)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	No	No	No
(Simon, 2012)	No	Various	Various	Historical	Implicitly	No	No
(Rafael, 2012)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	Yes	Yes	No
(Hess, 2012)	Yes	Arabic	English	Modern	Yes	Yes	No
(Asimakoulas, 2012)	Yes	Greek	English	Modern	No	No	No
(Van Wyke, 2012)	Yes	Spanish	English	Modern	Yes	No	Yes
(Gamal, 2012)	Yes	Arabic	English	Modern	Yes	No	Yes
(Jiménez-Crespo, 2011)	Yes	English	Spanish	Modern	No	No	No

Table 3: Survey of Contemporary Translation Literatur

Appendices

(Becher, 2011)	Yes	English	german	Modern	No	No	No
(Hale et al., 2011)	Yes	Various	English	Modern	No	No	No
(J.H. Johnson, 2011)	Yes	Italian	English	Modern	No	No	No
(Inggs, 2011)	Yes	English	Russian	Modern	No	Implicitly	Yes
(Lee, 2011a)	Yes	English	Chinese	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Corrius Gimbert and Zabalbeascoa, 2011)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Boase-Beier, 2011)	Yes	German	English	Modern	Yes	No	No
(Hirsch, 2011)	Yes	Various	Hebrew	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Haddadian Moghaddam, 2011)	Yes	English	Persian	Historical	No	No	Yes
(R. Wilson, 2011)	Yes	None	None	Modern	No	Implicitly	Yes
(Mirlohi et al., 2011)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	No	Implicitly	No
(León and Presas, 2011)	No	Various	German	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Chang, 2011)	Yes	Various	Chinese	None	No	Implicitly	Yes
(K. Bennett, 2011)	Yes	Portuguese	English	Historical	No	No	No
(Meade, 2011)	Yes	English	Japanese	Historical	No	Yes	No
(Jooken and Rooryck, 2011)	Yes	French	English	Historical	No	No	No
(Somerset, 2011)	Yes	French	English	Historical	No	No	No
(Vandepitte et al., 2011)	Yes	English	Dutch	Historical	No	No	No
(Shuttleworth, 2011)	Yes	English	Various	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Sánchez, 2011)	Yes	German	Spanish	Historical	No	No	No
(Liao, 2011)	Yes	English	Chinese	Modern	No	No	No
(Sharkas, 2011)	Yes	English	Arabic	Modern	No	No	No
(Krein-Kühle, 2011a)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	Yes	No	Yes
(Cámara and Espasa, 2011)	Yes	English	Spanish	Modern	No	No	No

Table 3: Survey of Contemporary Translation Literatur

(Lee, 2011b)	Yes	English	Chinese	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Saldanha, 2011)	Yes	Various	English	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Strowe, 2011)	Yes	Italian	English	Historical	No	No	Yes
(Kruger, 2011)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	No	Yes	Yes
(Ertel, 2011)	Yes	Italian	English	Historical	No	No	Yes
(Garcia, 2010)	Yes	English	Chinese	Modern	No	No	No
(Wright, 2010)	Yes	None	German	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Károly, 2010)	Yes	Hungarian	English	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Valdéon, 2010)	Yes	English	Spanish	Modern	No	No	No
(Risku, 2010)	Yes	None	None	None	No	No	No
(Inghilleri, 2010b)	Yes	Arabic	English	Modern	No	No	No
(Baker, 2010)	Yes	None	None	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Jones, 2010)	Yes	Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian	English	Modern	No	No	No
(Stahuljak, 2010)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Tobia, 2010)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	No	No	No
(Beebee, 2010)	Yes	None	None	None	Implicitly	No	Yes
(Spiessens, 2010)	Yes	French	Various	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Tercedor, 2010)	Yes	English	Spanish	Modern	No	No	No
(Dam and Zethsen, 2010)	Yes	Various	Danish	Modern	No	No	No
(Brems, 2010)	Yes	Dutch	French	Modern	No	No	No
(Asscher, 2010)	Yes	English	Hebrew	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Marco, 2010)	Yes	English	Catalan	Modern	No	No	No
(Azadibougar, 2010)	Yes	Various	Persian	Historical	No	No	Yes
(Jiang, 2010)	Yes	Chinese	English	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Holton, 2010)	Yes	Chinese	English	Modern	No	No	Yes

Table 3: Survey of Contemporary Translation Literatur

(Varney, 2010)	Yes	Greek	English	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Goodwin, 2010)	Yes	Arabic	English	Modern	Implicitly	No	Yes
(Mackintosh, 2010)	Yes	French	Spanish	Modern	No	No	No
(Guillot, 2010)	Yes	French	English	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Göpferich, 2010a)	Yes	None	None	Modern	No	No	No
(V.X. Wang, 2009)	Yes	Chinese	English	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Colina, 2009)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Wohlfart, 2009)	Yes	English	German	Modern	No	No	No
(Pinto, 2009)	Yes	English	Portuguese	Modern	No	No	No
(Taivalkoski-Shilov, 2009)	Yes	French	English	Historical	No	No	No
(Venturi, 2009)	Yes	English	Italian	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Lambert, 2009)	Yes	English	French	Historical	No	No	No
(Yangsheng, 2009)	No	Various	Chinese	Historical	No	No	Yes
(Sihui, 2009)	Yes	Various	Chinese	Modern	No	No	No
(Zaixi, 2009)	No	Various	Chinese	None	No	Yes	Yes
(Chang, 2009)	No	Various	Chinese	None	No	No	Yes
(Lu, 2009)	Yes	Chinese	English	Historical	Yes	No	Yes
(Meifang and Li, 2009)	Yes	English	Chinese	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Golden, 2009)	Yes	Latin	Chinese	Historical	Implicitly	No	Yes
(Tymoczko, 2009)	No	Various	Various	Historical	Implicitly	Yes	Yes
(Špirk, 2009)	No	None	Slovak	None	Yes	No	Yes
(Skibińska and Blumczyński, 2009)	No	None	Polish	None	Yes	No	Yes
(Weissbrod, 2009)	Yes	English	Hebrew	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Winters, 2009)	Yes	German	English	Modern	No	No	No
(Rossette, 2009)	Yes	French	English	Modern	No	No	No

Table 3: Survey of Contemporary Translation Literatur

(Jacquemond, 2009)	No	Various	Arabic	Historical	No	No	No
(Gürçağlar, 2009)	No	Various	Turkish	Modern	Yes	Yes	No
(Shamma, 2009)	Yes	Various	Arabic	Historical	Implicitly	No	Yes
(Sharma, 2009)	Yes	Various	Persian	Historical	No	Yes	No
(Sajdi, 2009)	Yes	Arabic	Arabic	Historical	Implicitly	Implicitly	No
(Selim, 2009a)	Yes	French	Arabic	Historical	No	No	No
(Sameh F Hanna, 2009)	Yes	English	Arabic	Modern	Implicitly	Yes	No
(Dam-Jensen and Zethsen, 2008)	Yes	Various	English	Modern	No	No	No
(Alvstad, 2008)	Yes	Danish	Various	Historical	No	No	No
(Taivalkoski-Shilov, 2008)	Yes	English	Various	Modern	No	No	No
(Ramón and Labrador, 2008)	Yes	English	Spanish	Modern	No	No	No
(Brownlie, 2008)	No	None	None	Modern	No	No	No
(Price, 2008)	Yes	None	None	None	No	No	Yes
(McMichael, 2008)	Yes	English	Russian	Modern	Implicitly	Yes	No
(Öner, 2008)	Yes	Kurdish	Turkish	Modern	No	No	No
(Davies and Bentahila, 2008)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	No	Yes	No
(Yeung, 2008)	Yes	German	Chinese	Modern	No	No	No
(Giovanni, 2008)	Yes	English	Italian	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Mateo, 2008)	Yes	English	Spanish	Modern	No	No	No
(Bosseaux, 2008)	Yes	English	French	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Franzon, 2008)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	Yes	No	No
(Martín de León, 2008)	No	None	None	None	Implicitly	No	Yes
(Morini, 2008)	No	None	None	None	No	No	Yes
(Kayyal, 2008)	Yes	Hebrew	Arabic	Historical	No	No	No
(Alcina, 2008)	No	Various	Various	Modern	No	No	Yes

Table 3: Survey of Contemporary Translation Literatur

Appendices

(Vlachopoulos, 2008)	Yes	English	Greek	Modern	No	No	No
(Martín García, 2008)	Yes	Spanish	English	Modern	No	No	No
(Fung Chang, 2008)	Yes	English	Chinese	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Boyden, 2008)	Yes	None	None	Modern	No	No	No
(Tipton, 2008)	Yes	None	None	Modern	No	No	No
(Boéri, 2008)	Yes	None	None	Modern	No	No	No
(Batchelor, 2008)	Yes	None	None	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Dam and Zethsen, 2008)	Yes	None	Danish	None	No	No	Yes
(Colina, 2008)	Yes	Various	Various	Modern	No	No	Yes
(Besien and Meuleman, 2008)	Yes	Danish	English	Modern	No	No	No

Table 3: Survey of Contemporary Translation Literatur

Appendix 2

The Translation of *Circuitous Cat*

まわり猫 *(Mawari Neko)[Circuitous Cat]* (Ui, 1952: 402). The source text for this rakugo is a section called 貓號 *(Māohào)[Cat Designation]* of a Ming dynasty (1368-1644) text entitled 應諧錄 *(Yīngxié Lù)[Book of Spontaneous Humour]* by 劉元卿 (Liú Yuánqīng) (1544-1609):

> 齊奄家畜一貓、自奇之、號丁人曰：“虎貓。”客說之曰：曰虎誠猛、不如龍之神也、請更名曰龍貓。”又客說之曰：“龍固神于虎也、龍升天、須浮雲,雲其尚于龍乎？不如名曰雲。”又客說之曰：曰雲靄蔽天、 風倐散之、雲故不敵風也、請更名曰風。”又客說之曰:“大風飆起、維屏以牆、斯足蔽矣,風其如牆何！名之曰牆貓可。”又客說之曰：曰維牆雖固、 維鼠穴之、牆斯圮矣、 牆又如鼠何！即名曰鼠貓可也。”東裡丈人嗤之曰：“噫嘻！捕鼠者故貓也、貓即貓耳、胡為自失本真哉？”(reproduced in Du and Chang, 1996: 174)
>
> [A man once bought a housecat. The cat had a strange appearance. Therefore, regarding its name, one person suggested: "Tiger-cat." To which, the man said: "The tiger is honest and fierce, but no more than the Dragon God, it is better to call it 'Dragon-cat'." Then the man said: "A Dragon is tougher than a tiger, but for the dragon to ascend to heaven, it has to get past the clouds. Do you still prefer to call the cat 'dragon'? Wouldn't you rather call it 'cloud'?" Then the man said: "Clouds calmly cover up the sky, and then the wind can suddenly disperse them. Clouds are no match for the wind. It is better to call the cat 'wind'." Then the man said: "When a great wind rises up, you will be safe behind a wall. That way, you can stay sheltered from the wind. How can a wind get through a wall? You could call it 'the wall-cat'." Then the man said: "A strong wall may be solid, but mice make holes. They can break through a wall. How can a wall stop mice? It would be better if you called it 'mouse-cat'." The man from the east laughed and said: "Ridiculous! The cat is there to catch mice. It is a cat, so call it a cat. You fell into this trap by focusing on your own purposes!"]

When this text was translated into the rakugo tradition, the general framework of the story was retained as well as the allusions to a cat's name, clouds, wind and mice.

In particular, the phrase "雲故不敵風也" [Clouds are no match for the wind] demonstrates the close relationship between the two texts. However, it would be difficult to argue that this translation is attempting to create a proxy to the source text in the manner of *kanbun-kundoku.* A summary of *Circuitous Cat* is below:

負ぬ気の男、猫を飼ひなんでも負ぬ名を付やふと工夫して天と付る。友達聞て「雨雲には天も敵はぬ」「そんなら雨雲と付やふ」「雨雲も風には敵はぬ」「そんなら風と付やふ」「風も屏風や唐紙には敵はぬ」「そんなら唐紙と付やふ」「唐紙も鼠には敵はぬ」「そんならやっぱり猫と付やふ」(Ui, 1952: 402)

[A man who disliked loosing bought a cat and wished to give it a name that would bring it good luck. He asked a friend, who said "A clear sky is no match for a raincloud." "In that case, I'll call the cat 'Raincloud'." "A raincloud is no match for the wind." "In that case, I'll call the cat 'Wind'." "The wind is no match for a folding screen or coated paper[68]." "In that case, I'll call the cat 'Coated paper'." "Coated paper is no match for a mouse." "In that case, I'll just call it 'The Cat'."]

---

[68] The word used here is 唐紙 (karakami), which is the treated paper used on traditional Japanese sliding doors and windows.

Appendix 3

Source passages for the *Tale of Melibee*,

Latin

Prudentia respondit: […] Nam, licet inimici tui talia facientes graviter peccaverunt, tu vindictam cum excessu faciendo non esses a peccato immunis; ait enim Cassiodorus: "Nihil discrepat a peccante, qui se per excessum nititur vindicare." Et licet hostes tui scelus commiserint, tu eodem modo scelus committeres, si non te defendendo, sed noviter aggrediendo, contra juris ordinem vindictam faceres: quod esse non debet; ait enim Seneca: "Nunquam scelus scelere vindicandum." Quod autem dixisti, leges concedere vim vi repellere et fraudem fraude excludere, verum est, si in continenti defensio fiat cum moderamine inculpatæ tutela, et non ad vindictam. (reproduced in Sundby, 1873: 96)

[Prudence answered: […] For, even though your enemies have committed sins, you would not be free from sin yourself if you have revenge in excess, for Cassiodorus says: "There is no difference between you and the sinner if you take vengeance by excess". And although your enemies shall have committed a crime, you shall be just as much a criminal if you do not defend yourself against it but confront them and take vengeance outside the law: And also Seneca says: "You shall never avenge a crime with a crime." But as you said, there are laws that punish violence with violence and fraud with fraud, is true, if the defence is made immediately with blameless self-preservation and not vengence.]

French

"He!" dist Dame Prudence, "Vous dictes vostre voulenté, mais certes en cas du monde l'on ne doit faire oultrage par excés pour soy venger ne autrement. Car Cassidoires dit que aussi mal fait celui qui se venge par oultrage comme celui qui fait l'outrage. Et pour ce vous vous devez venger selon l'ordre de droit, non pas par excés ne par oultrage. Car auxi comme vous savez que voz adversaires ont pechié encontre vous par leur oultrage, aussi pechiez vous se vous vous voulez venger d'eulz par oultrage et autrement que droit le commande. Et pour ce dit Senecques: L'on ne doit nul temps venger mauvaitié par mauvaistié. Et se vous dictes que droit ottroye que l'on deffende violence par violence et barat par barat, certes c'est verité quant la deffense se fait incontinent senz intervalle et pour soy deffendre, non pas pour soy venger, (reproduced in Askins, 2002: 385-386)

[He ! said Dame Prudence, "You say your will, but indeed in no case in the world is one required to make excessive outrage in order to venge oneself. For Cassiodorus says that evil makes he that takes vengence by outrage as much as he that does outrage. For also as you know that your enemies have sinned upon you with their outrage, you also sin if you wish to have vengence on them through outrage and otherwise than you are commanded. And for this reason, Seneca says: One must never wreak revenge on evil by evil. And though you say that a man is compelled to defend himself violently against violence and blow against blow, certainly, it is true when the defence goes on without pause to defend itself, but not to have vengeance,"]

REFERENCES

Agassi, Joseph 2005. 'Deconstructing Post-modernism: Gellner and Crocodile Dundee' in John A. Hall and I. C. Jarvie (eds) *Transition to Modernity : Essays on Power, Wealth and Belief* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alcina, Amparo (2008) 'Translation Technologies: Scope, Tools and Resources', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 20(1): 79-102.

Allen, Gay Wilson, and Clark, Harry Hayden 1962. *Literary Criticism. Pope to Croce*. New York: American Book Co.

Alves, Fabio, and Gonçalves, José Luiz (2013) 'Investigating the conceptual-procedural distinction in the translation process: A relevance-theoretic analysis of micro and macro translation units', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 25(1): 107-124.

Alvstad, Cecilia (2008) 'Ambiguity translated for children: Andersen's "Den standhaftige Tinsoldat" as a case in point', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 20(2): 222-248.

Anada, Otowa / 穴田音羽 1977. *現代落語事典* [Modern Rakugo Encyclopedia]. Tokyo: Kofusha Shoten.

Anderson, Terence, Schum, David A., and Twining, William 2005. *Analysis of evidence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2nd ed. / Terence Anderson, David Schum, William Twining. edition.

Archer, Jerome W (1950) 'On Chaucer's Source for "Arveragus" in the Franklin's Tale', *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 65(2): 318–322.

Ashley, Maurice 1974. *Dawn of a new era. Editor Maurice Ashley. (Revised and expanded edition.)*: New York: Newsweek Books.

Asimakoulas, Dimitris (2012) 'Dude (Looks Like a Lady). Hijacking Transsexual Identity in the Subtitled Version of Strella by Panos Koutras', *The Translator* 18(1): 47-75.

Askins, William 2002. 'The Tale of Melibee' in Robert M. Correale and Mary Hamel (eds) *Sources and analogues of the Canterbury tales* Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 321-408.

Asscher, Omri (2010) 'A model for Hebrew translation of British humor: Amplification and overstatement', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 22(2): 237-263.

Atwell, William S. (1986) 'Some Observations on the "Seventeenth-Century Crisis" in China and Japan', *The Journal of Asian Studies* 45(2): 223-244.

Azadibougar, Omid (2010) 'Translation historiography in the Modern World: Modernization and translation into Persian', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 22: 298-329.

Baker, Mona 1993. 'Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications' in Mona Baker, John Sinclair and Elena Tognini-Bonelli (eds) *Text and technology: in honour of John Sinclair* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 17-45.

Baker, Mona (1995) 'Corpora in translation studies: An overview and some suggestions for future research', *Target* 7(2): 223-243.

Baker, Mona 1996. 'Corpus-based Translation Studies: The Challenges that Lie Ahead' in Harold L. Somers (ed) *Terminology, LSP and translation : studies*

in language engineering in honour of Juan C. Sager Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 175-186.

Baker, Mona (2010) 'Interpreters and Translators in the War Zone: Narrated and Narrators', *The Translator* 16(2, Special Issue: Translation and Violent Conflict): 197-222.

Baker, Mona, and Saldanha, Gabriela 2008. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge. 2nd ed. edition.

Bakhtin, M. M., and Emerson, Caryl 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bassnett, Susan 2006. *The Translator as Writer*. London: Continuum.

Bassnett, Susan (2012) 'Translation studies at a Cross-roads', *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies* 24(1): 15-25.

Bassnett, Susan, and Lefevere, André 1990. *Translation, History, and Culture*. London: Pinter Publishers.

Bastin, Georges 2009. 'Adaptation' in Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha (eds) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* London: Routledge, 3-6. 2nd edition.

Batchelor, Kathryn (2008) 'Third Spaces, Mimicry and Attention to Ambivalence: Applying Bhabhian Discourse to Translation Theory', *The Translator* 14(1): 51-70.

Baudelaire, Charles 1923. *Tableaux Parisiens: Deutsche Übertragung mit einem Vorwort Über die Aufgabe des Übersetzers von Walter Benjamin* [Tableaux Parisiens: The German Rendering with a Forword on the Task of the Transltor by Walter Benjamin]. Heidelberg: R. Weissbach.

Baugh, Albert Croll, and Blake, Thomas 2002. *A History of the English language*. London: Routledge.

Becher, Viktor (2011) 'When and Why Do Translators Add Connectives?: A Corpus-Based Study', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 23(1): 26-47.

Beebee, Thomas O. (2010) 'Shoot The Transtraitor! The Translator as 'Homo Sacer' in Fiction and Reality', *The Translator* 16(2, Special Issue: Translation and Violent Conflict): 295-313.

Beidler, Peter G. (1973) 'Chaucer's *Merchant's Tale* and the *Decameron*', *Italica* 50(2): 266-284.

Beidler, Peter G. 1999. 'Just Say Yes, Chaucer Knew the *Decameron*' in Leonard Michael Koff and Brenda Deen Schildgen (eds) *The Decameron and the Canterbury tales: New Essays on an Old Question* Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press ; London : Associated University Presses, 25-47.

Beidler, Peter G. 2002. 'The Reeve's Tale' in Robert M. Correale and Mary Hamel (eds) *Sources and analogues of the Canterbury tales* Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 23-74.

Beidler, Peter G. 2005. 'The Merchant's Tale' in Robert M. Correale and Mary Hamel (eds) *Sources and analogues of the Canterbury tales* Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 249-276.

Bell, K. (2000) 'Merlin as Historian in "Historia Regum Britannie"', *Arthuriana* 10(1): 14-26.

Benn, Charles D. 2004. *China's Golden Age: Everyday Life in the Tang Dynasty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bennett, Andrew 2005. *The Author*. London: Routledge.

Bennett, Karen (2011) 'The Scientific Revolution and Its Repercussions on the Translation of Technical Discourse', *The Translator* 17(2, Special Issue: Science in Translation): 189-210.

Berman, Antoine 1985. *La Traduction Comme Preuve de l'Etranger in Traduction: Textualité*. Toronto, Canada: Trintexte.

Bernofsky, Susan (1997) 'Schleiermacher's Translation Theory and Varieties of Foreignization', *The Translator* 3(2): 175–192.

Besien, Fred Van, and Meuleman, Chis (2008) 'Style Differences among Simultaneous Interpreters: A Pilot Study', *The Translator* 14(1): 135-155.

Besio, Kimberly Ann, and Tung, Constantine 2007. *Three Kingdoms and Chinese Culture*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Beston, John B. 1974. 'How much Was Known of the Breton Lai in Fourteenth-Century England?' in Larry Dean Benson and Bartlett Jere Whiting (eds) *The Learned and the Lewed: Studies in Chaucer and Medieval Literature* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 319-336.

Blake, N.F. 1991. *William Caxton and English Literary Culture*. London: Hambledon Press.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana 1986/2004. 'Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation' in Venuti Lawrence (ed) *The Translation Studies Reader* London: Routledge, 291-305.

Boase-Beier, Jean (2011) 'Translating Celan's Poetics of Silence', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 23(2): 165-177.

Boccaccio, Giovanni 1820. *Il Decamerone di Giovanni Boccaccio.*vol. 1. Firenze: L.T. Barrois.

Boccaccio, Giovanni, and Foscolo, Ugo 1825. *Decamerone di Messer Giovanni Boccaccio*. London: G. Pickering.

Boéri, Julie (2008) 'A Narrative Account of the Babels vs. Naumann Controversy: Competing Perspectives on Activism in Conference Interpreting', *The Translator* 14(1): 21-50.

Bosseaux, Charlotte (2008) 'Buffy the Vampire Slayer: Characterization in the Musical Episode of the TV Series', *The Translator* 14(2, Special Issue. Translation and Music): 343-372.

Bowers, John M. 2001. *The Politics of Pearl: Court Poetry in the Age of Richard II*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.

Boyden, Michael (2006) 'Language Politics, Translation, and American Literary History', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 18(1): 121-137.

Boyden, Michael (2008) 'Is Translation Studies too much about translation? A reply to Jan Blommaert', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 20: 149-157.

Boyden, Michael (2013) 'A Silent Spout: Paul de Man's Moby-Dick', *The Translator* 19(1): 25-50.

Brau, Lorie 2006. 'New Plots and Playful Schemes: Shukō in *Rakugo*, Japanese Comic Storytelling' in Stratos E. Constantinidis (ed) *Text & Presentation* [Text and presentation, 2006], Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland, 23-35.

Brau, Lorie 2008. *Rakugo: Performing Comedy and Cultural Heritage in Contemporary Tokyo*. Plymouth: Lexington Books.

Breeze, Andrew (2002) 'The Name of Kayrrud in the Franklin's Tale', *The Chaucer Review* 37(1): 95-99.

Brems, Elke (2010) 'A case of "cultural castration"?: Paul de Man's translation of De Soldaat Johan by Filip de Pillecyn', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 22: 212-236.

Brems, Elke (2013) 'Road Block in the Streets of Brussels Herge in Translation', *The Translator* 19(1): 105-124.

Brownlie, Siobhan (2008) 'Resistance and non-resistance to boundary crossing in translation research', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 20: 333-347.

Bruno, Cosima (2012) 'The Public Life of Contemporary Chinese Poetry in English Translation', *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies* 24(2): 253-285.

Bruns, Gerald L. (1980) 'The Originality of Texts in a Manuscript Culture', *Comparative Literature* 32(2): 113-129.

Burke, Michael B. (1994) 'Denying the Antecedent: A Common Fallacy?', *Informal Logic* 16(1): 23-30.

Burke, Peter 1990. 'The Spread of Italian Humanism' in Anthony Goodman and Angus MacKay (eds) *The Impact of Humanism on Western Europe* London: Longman, 1-22.

Burns, Susan L. 2003. *Before the Nation: Kokugaku and the Imagining of Community in Early Modern Japan*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books.

Butler, Pierce 1899. *Legenda Aurea - Légende Dorée - Golden legend: A Study of Caxton's Golden Legend with Special Reference to its Relations to the Earlier English Prose Translation*. Baltimore: John Murphy Company.

Butterfield, Ardis 2006. *Chaucer and the City*. Cambridge: D.S.Brewer.

Carter, Robert Edgar 2001. *Encounter with Enlightenment: a Study of Japanese Ethics*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Carter, Ronald, and MacRae, John 1997. *The Routledge History of Literature in English: Britain and Ireland*. London: Routledge.

Casal, U. A. (1959) 'The Goblin Fox and Badger and Other Witch Animals of Japan', *Folklore Studies* 18: 1-93.

Cavaye, Ronald, Senda, Akihiko, and Griffith, Paul 2004. *A Guide to the Japanese Stage from Traditional to Cutting Edge*. Tokyo: Kodansha International ltd. 1st edition. edition.

Chang, Nam Fung (2009) 'Repertoire Transfer and Resistance: The Westernization of Translation Studies in China', *The Translator* 15(2, Special Issue. Chinese Discourses on Translation): 305-325.

Chang, Nam Fung (2011) 'In Defence of Polysystem Theory', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 23(2): 311-347.

Charlston, David (2013) 'Textual Embodiments of Bourdieusian Hexis J.B. Baillie's Translation of Hegel's Phenomenology', *The Translator* 19(1): 51-80.

Chaucer, Geoffrey, and Benson, Larry Dean 2008. *The Riverside Chaucer*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press. 3rd edition.

Chen, Yaoji / 陳瑤璣 1988. *古漢語聲韻對日本《音讀》之影響* [The Influence of Ancient Chinese Phonology on Japanese "Onyomi"]. Taipei: Zheng Yang Chubanshe.

Chesterman, Andrew 1997. *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.

References

Cheung, Martha PY (2005) "To Translate' Means 'To Exchange'? A New Interpretation of the Earliest Chinese Attempts to Define Translation ('Fanyi')', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 17(1): 27-48.

Cheung, Martha PY (2009) 'Chinese Discourse on Translation & International Translation Studies', *The Translator* 15(2): 223-238.

Cheung, Martha PY (2011) 'The (Un) Importance of Flagging Chineseness', *Translation Studies* 4(1): 41-57.

Colina, Sonia (2008) 'Translation Quality Evaluation: Empirical Evidence for a Functionalist Approach', *The Translator* 14(1): 97-134.

Colina, Sonia (2009) 'Further evidence for a functionalist approach to translation quality evaluation', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 21: 235-264.

Constantinidis, Stratos E. 2006. *Text & Presentation*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland.

Corbett, Edward P. J., and Connors, Robert J. 1999. *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Correale, Robert M., and Hamel, Mary 2002. *Sources and Analogues of the Canterbury Tales*.vol. I. Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer.

Correale, Robert M., and Hamel, Mary 2005. *Sources and Analogues of the Canterbury Tales*.vol. II. Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer.

Corrius Gimbert, Montse, and Zabalbeascoa, Patrick (2011) 'Language Variation in Source Texts and their Translations: The Case of L3 in Film Translation', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 23(1): 113-130.

Coulmas, Florian, and Watanabe, Makoto 2002. 'Japan's Nascent Multilingualism' in Li Wei, Jean-Marc Dewaele and Alex Housen (eds) *Opportunities and Challenges of Bilingualism* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 249-274.

Crespo, Begoña 2000. 'Historical Background of Multilingualism and its Impact on English' in D. A. Trotter (ed) *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain* Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 25-36.

Dale, Andrew I. 1999. *A History of Inverse Probability: From Thomas Bayes to Karl Pearson*. New York: Springer.

Dam-Jensen, Helle, and Zethsen, Karen Korning (2008) 'Translator awareness of semantic prosodies', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 20: 203-221.

Dam, Helle V., and Zethsen, Karen Korning (2008) 'Translator Status: A Study of Danish Company Translators', *The Translator* 14(1): 71-96.

Dam, Helle V., and Zethsen, Karen Korning (2010) 'Translator status: Helpers and opponents in the ongoing battle of an emerging profession', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 22: 194-211.

Davies, Eirlys E., and Bentahila, Abdelâli (2008) 'Translation and Code Switching in the Lyrics of Bilingual Popular Songs', *The Translator* 14(2, Special Issue. Translation and Music): 247-272.

Dean, James (1991) 'Gower, Chaucer, and Rhyme Royal', *Studies in Philology* 88, No. 3: 251-275.

DeFord, Sara, and Harriss, Clarinda 1971. *Forms of Verse: British and American*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Delabastita, Dirk (2013) 'B2B in Translation Studies. Business to Business, or Back to Basics?', *The Translator* 19(1): 1-23.

Delaere, Isabelle, De Sutter, Gert, and Plevoets, Koen (2012) 'Is Translated Language More Standardized than Non-Translated Language?: Using

Profile-Based Correspondence Analysis for Measuring Linguistic Distances Between Language Varieties', *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies* 24(2): 203-224.

Delisle, J., and Woodsworth, J. 1995. *Translators Through History*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dempster, Germaine (1936) 'On the Source of the Deception Story in the "Merchant's Tale"', *Modern Philology* 34(2): 133-154.

Denzin, Norman K. 1970. *The Research Act in Sociology: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*. London: Butterworths.

Deschamps, Eustache, Laurie, Ian S., Sinnreich-Levi, Deborah M., Curzon, David, and Fiskin, Jeffrey 2003. *Eustache Deschamps: Selected Poems*. New York; London: Routledge.

Deschamps, Eustache, Queux de Saint-Hilaire, Auguste-Henry-Edouard, and Raynaud, Gaston 2001. *Oeuvres Complètes de Eustache Deschamps: Le miroir de Mariage*.vol. IX. Paris: Éditions Classiques Garnier Numérique.

Disler, Caroline (2012) 'Oxyrhynchus 1381: In memoriam Daniel Simeoni', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 24(2): 225-252.

Doheny-Farina, Stephen, and Odell, Lee 1985. 'Ethnographic Research on Writing: Assumptions and Methodology' in Lee Odell and Dixie Goswami (eds) *Writing in Nonacademic Settings* New York: Guilford Press, 503-536.

Du, Wenyuan, and Chang, Shigong / 杜文远 and 常士功 1996. *中国随笔小品鉴赏辞典* [Reference dictionary of Chinese Essays and Pieces].vol. III. Taiyuan: Shanxi People's Publishing House.

Dwyer, Tessa (2012) 'Fansub dreaming on ViKi:" Don't just watch but help when you are free"', *The Translator* 18(2): 217-243.

Eco, Umberto 1994. *The Limits of Interpretation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Edwards, Robert R. 1999. 'Rewriting Menedon's Story: *Decameron* 10.5 and the *Franklin's Tale*' in Leonard Michael Koff and Brenda Deen Schildgen (eds) *The Decameron and the Canterbury Tales: New Essays on an Old Question* London: Associated University Presses, 226-246.

Edwards, Robert R. 2002. 'The Franklin's Tale' in Robert M. Correale and Mary Hamel (eds) *Sources and Analogues of the Canterbury Tales* Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 211-264.

Ehrensberger-Dow, Maureen, and Perrin, Daniel (2013) 'Applying a newswriting research approach to translation', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 25(1): 77-92.

Englund Dimitrova, Birgitta 1993. 'Semantic Change in Translation - A Cognitive Perspective' in Y. Ed Gambier and J. Ed Tommola (eds) *Translation and Knowledge: 4th Scandinavian Symposium on Translation Theory: Papers* Finland: University of Turku, 285-296.

Englund Dimitrova, Birgitta 2005. *Expertise and Explicitation in the Translation Process*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ertel, Emmanuelle (2011) 'A Testament to Translation Criticism: Antoine Berman's Final Work', *The Translator* 17(1): 137-141.

Fann, Kuang Tih, and Peirce, Charles S. 1970. *Peirce's Theory of Abduction*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Faral, Edmond 1924. *Les Arts Poétiques du XIIe et du XIIIe Siècle: Recherches et Documents sur la Technique Littèraire du Moyen Age*. Paris: É. Champion.

References

Farrell, Thomas J., and Goodwin, Amy W. 2002. 'The Clerk's Tale' in Robert M. Correale and Mary Hamel (eds) *Sources and Aanalogues of the Canterbury Tales* Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 101-168.

Féng, Mènglóng, and Matsueda, Shigeo / 馮夢竜 and 松枝茂夫 1983. *笑府 下— 中 国笑話集* [Xiàofǔ Volume II: A Collection of Humorous Stories from China]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Fisher, J.H. (1992) 'A language policy for Lancastrian England', *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 107(5): 1168-1180.

Fisher, John H 1981. 'Chaucer and the French Influence' in Donald M. Rose (ed) *New Perspectives in Chaucer Criticism* Norman, Okla.: Pilgrim Books, 177-191.

Fisher, Ruth M (1965) "Cosyn' and 'Cosynage': Complicated Punning in Chaucer's 'Shipman's Tale", *Notes and Queries* 210: 168-170.

Flach, Peter A. 2000. *Abduction and Induction: Essays on their Relation and Integration*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Forgeng, Jeffrey L., and McLean, Will 2009. *Daily Life in Chaucer's England*. London: Greenwood Press. 2nd ed. edition.

Francis, W. Nelson (1953) 'Chaucer Shortens a Tale', *Modern Language Association* 68, No. 5: 1126-1141.

Franzon, Johan (2008) 'Choices in Song Translation: Singability in Print, Subtitles and Sung Performance', *The Translator* 14(2, Special Issue. Translation and Music): 373-399.

Frédéric, Louis 2002. *Japan Encyclopedia*. Cambridge, Massachusetts; London: Belknap.

Frellesvig, Bjarke 2010. *A History of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fung Chang, Nam (2008) 'A Missing Link in Itamar Even-Zohar's Theoretical Thinking', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 20(1): 135-148.

Furukawa, Kaichirō / 古川嘉一郎 1984. *上方笑芸の世界* [The World of Comic Art-Forms in Kamigata]. Tokyo: Hakusuisha.

Gallo, Ernest 1971. *The Poetria Nova and its Sources in Early Rhetorical Doctrine*. The Hague; Paris Mouton.

Gamal, Ahmed (2012) 'Postcolonial Translation as Transformation. Ahdaf Soueif's I Think of You', *The Translator* 18(1): 101-118.

Gambier, Yves (2012) 'Une Traductologie pour quelles Pratiques Traductionnelles?', *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies* 24(1): 61-82.

Ganim, John M. 1999. 'Chacuer, Boccaccio, Confession, and Subjectivity' in Leonard Michael Koff and Brenda Deen Schildgen (eds) *The Decameron and the Canterbury tales: New Essays on an Old Question* London: Associated University Presses, 128-147.

Garcia, Ignacio (2010) 'Is machine translation ready yet?', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 22: 7-21.

Genette, Gerard 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gerhart, Karen M. 1999. *The Eyes of Power: Art and Early Tokugawa Authority*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Gerstle, C. Andrew 2000. 'Performance Literature: The Traditional Japanese Theatre as Model' in Elinor S. Shaffer (ed) *Comparative Criticism: East and West: Comparative Perspectives* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 39-63.

References

Gillespie, James L. 1997. *The Age of Richard II*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing.

Gillham, Bill 2000. *Case Study Research Methods*. London: Continuum.

Giovanni, Elena Di (2008) 'The American Film Musical in Italy: Translation and Non-translation', *The Translator* 14(2, Special Issue. Translation and Music): 295-318.

Golden, Seán (2009) ''God's Real Name is God': The Matteo Ricci-Niccolo Longobardi Debate on Theological Terminology as a Case Study in Intersemiotic Sophistication', *The Translator* 15(2, Special Issue. Chinese Discourses on Translation:): 375-400.

Goodwin, Phil (2010) 'Ethical Problems in Translation: Why We Might Need Steiner After All. ', *The Translator* 16(1): 19-42.

Göpferich, Susanne (2010) 'Data Documentation and Data Accessibility in Translation Process Research', *The Translator* 16(1): 93-124.

Göpferich, Susanne (2013) 'Translation Competence: Explaining Development and Stagnation from a Dynamic Systems Perspective', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 25(1): 61-76.

Gould, Rebecca (2013) 'Inimitability Versus Translatability The Structure of Literary Meaning in Arabo-Persian Poetics', *The Translator* 19(1): 81-104.

Gower, Barry 1997. *Scientific Method: An Historical and Philosophical Introduction*. London: Routledge.

Gower, John, and Pauli, Reinhold 1857. *Confessio Amantis of John Gower*. London: Bell and Daldy.

Gray, Hanna H. (1963) 'Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 24(4): 497-514.

Guillot, Marie-Noëlle (2010) 'Film Subtitles from a Cross-cultural Pragmatics Perspective: Issues of Linguistic and Cultural Representation. ', *The Translator* 16(1): 67-92.

Gürçağlar, Şehnaz Tahir (2009) 'Translation, Presumed Innocent: Translation and Ideology in Turkey', *The Translator* 15(1, Special Issue. Nation and Translation in the Middle East): 37-64.

Gutt, E.A. 2000. *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Haarmann, Harald 2005. 'Linguistic Barriers between Speech Communities' in Ulrich Ammon (ed) *Soziolinguistik: Ein Internationales Handbuch Zur Wissenschaft Von Sprache und Gesellschaft [Sociolinguistics: An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society]* Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Haddadian Moghaddam, Esmaeil (2011) 'Agency in the translation and production of The Adventures of Hajji Baba of Ispahan into Persian', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 23(2): 206-234.

Hale, Sandra Beatriz, Bond, Nigel, and Sutton, Jeanna (2011) 'Interpreting accent in the courtroom', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 23: 48-61.

Hall, Edward T. 1959. *The Silent Language*. Garden City, NewYork: Doubleday.

Hamer, R.F.S., and Russell, V. 2007. *Gilte Legende*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hanna, Sameh F (2009) 'Othello in the Egyptian Vernacular: Negotiating the 'Doxic' in Drama Translation and Identity Formation', *The Translator* 15(1, Special Issue. Nation and Translation in the Middle East): 157-178.

References

Harding, Sue-Ann (2012a) "How Do I Apply Narrative Theory?': Socio-Narrative Theory in Translation Studies', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 24(2): 286-309.

Harding, Sue-Ann (2012b) 'Making a Difference?: Independent Online Media Translations of the 2004 Beslan Hostage Disaster', *The Translator* 18(2): 339-361.

Hare, Thoman Blenham 1993. '"The Raven at First Light": A Shinnai Ballad' in Edward Seidensticker, Aileen Patricia Gatten and Anthony H. Chambers (eds) *New Leaves: Studies and Translations of Japanese Literature in Honor of Edward Seidensticker* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 115-125.

Hatim, Basil, and Mason, Ian 1997. *The Translator as Communicator*. London; New York: Routledge.

Hatsumi, Kenichi / 初見健一 2008. *まだある。大百科お菓子編: 今でも買える昭和のロングセラー図鑑* [Still around. The Guide to Great Sweets: An Encyclopedia of Those Long Sellers of Shōwa That Are Still Available]. Tokyo: Ōzorashuppan.

Hayakawa, Isamu / 早川勇 2007. *ウェブスター辞書と明治の知識人* [Webster's Dictionary and the Meiji Inteligencia]. Yokohama-shi: Shunpusha.

Hayashiya, Shōzō, and Katsura, Mikisuke / 林家正蔵 and 桂三木助 1990. *古典落語：正蔵・三木助集* [Classical Rakugo: The Shōzō and Mikisuke Collection]. Tokyo: Chikumashobō.

Heinz, Morioka, and Miyoko, Sasaki (1983) 'The Blue-Eyed Storyteller: Henry Black and His Rakugo Career', *Monumenta Nipponica* 38(2): 133-162.

Heltai, Pál 2005. 'Explicitation, Redundancy, Ellipsis and Translation' in Kinga Klaudy, Krisztina Károly and Ágota Fóris (eds) *New Trends in Translation Studies: In Honour of Kinga Klaudy* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Hermans, Theo 1992. 'Renaissance Tradition between Literalism and Imitation' [Histories, systems, literary translations] in Harald Kittel (ed) *Geschichte, System, literarische Ubersetzung* Berlin: Schmidt, 95-116.

Hermans, Theo 2008. 'Hermeneutics' in Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha (eds) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* London: Routledge, 130-133. 2nd ed. edition.

Hess, Maya (2012) 'Translating Terror. The (Mis)application of US Federal Prison Rules in the Yousry Case', *The Translator* 18(1): 23-46.

Hirose, Kazuo / 広瀬和雄 2007. *考古学の基礎知識* [Fundamental Archeological Information]. Tokyo: Kadokawa Gakugei Shuppan.

Hirsch, Galia (2011) 'Explicitations and Other Types of Shifts in the Translation of Irony and Humor', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies: International Journal on Translation Studies* 23(2): 178-205.

Hokkanen, Sari (2012) 'Simultaneous Church Interpreting as Service. The Translator: Non-Professionals Translating and Interpreting. Participatory and Engaged Perspectives', *The Translator* 18(2): 291-309.

Holton, Brian (2010) 'When the blind lead the blind: A response to Jiang Xiaohua', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 22: 347-350.

House, Juliane (2013) 'Towards a New Linguistic-Cognitive Orientation in Translation Studies', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 25(1): 46-60.

Imamura, Keiji 1996. *Prehistoric Japan: New Perspectives on Insular East Asia*. London: UCL Press.

References

Inggs, Judith a. (2011) 'Censorship and Translated Children's Literature in the Soviet Union: The Example of the Wizards Oz and Goodwin', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 23(1): 77-91.

Inghilleri, Moira (2010) '"You Don't Make War Without Knowing Why": The Decision to Interpret in Iraq', *The Translator* 16(2, Special Issue: Translation and Violent Conflict): 175-196.

Israel, Jonathan I. 2001. *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jacquemond, Richard (2009) 'Translation Policies in the Arab World: Representations, Discourses and Realities', *The Translator* 15(1, Special Issue. Nation and Translation in the Middle East): 15-35.

Jakobson, Roman 1959/2004. 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation' in Lawrence Venuti (ed) *The Translation Studies Reader* London: Routledge, 113-118.

Jayapalan, N. 2001. *History of English Literature*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors.

Jiang, Xiaohua (2010) 'Indeterminacy, multivalence and disjointed translation', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 22: 331-346.

Jiménez-Crespo, Miguel a. (2011) 'The Future of General Tendencies in Translation: Explicitation in Web Localization', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 23(1): 3-25.

Johnson, Jane Helen (2011) 'The use of deictic reference in identifying point of view in Grazia Deledda's Canne al Ventoand its translation into English', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies: International Journal on Translation Studies* 23(1): 62-76.

Johnson, T. W. (1974) 'Far Eastern Fox Lore', *Asian Folklore Studies* 33(1): 35-68.

Jones, Francis (2010) 'Poetry Translation, Nationalism and the Wars of the Yugoslav Transition', *The Translator* 16(2, Special Issue: Translation and Violent Conflict): 223-253.

Jooken, Lieve, and Rooryck, Guy (2011) ' The Freedom of Expressing One's Ideas: Translating La Mettrie', *The Translator* 17(2, Special Issue: Science in Translation): 233-254.

Kadooka, Kenichi / 角岡賢一 (2013) '上方落語演題の意味的分類' [A Semantic Categorization of the Kamigata Rakugo Stories], *龍谷大学国際センター研究年報* 22: 49 - 69.

Kang, David C. 2010. *East Asia before the West: Five Centuries of Trade and Tribute*. New York; Chichester: Columbia University Press.

Károly, Krisztina (2010) 'Shifts in Repetition vs. Shifts in Text Meaning: A Study of the Textual Role of Lexical Repetition in Non-Literary Translation', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 22(1): 40-70.

Katan, David 2003. *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters, and Mediators*. Manchester: St. Jerome. 2nd ed. edition.

Katan, David 2008. 'Translation as Intercultural Communication' in Jeremy Munday (ed) *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies* New York: Routledge, 74-92.

Katsura, Beichō / 桂米朝 1978. *上方落語ノート* [Notebook of Kamigata Rakugo]. Tokyo: Seiabō.

Katsura, Beichō / 桂米朝 2002a. *上方落語桂米朝コレクション1: 四季折々* [Kamigata Rakugo, The Beichō Katsura Collection 1 "Season After Season"]. Tokyo: Chikumashobō.

References

Katsura, Beichō / 米朝 桂 2002b. *上方落語桂米朝コレクション 2: 寄想天外* [Kamigata Rakugo, The Beichō Katsura Collection 2 "Beyond Imagining"]. Tokyo: Chikumashobō.

Katsura, Beichō / 桂米朝 2002c. *上方落語桂米朝コレクション 3: 愛憎模様* [Kamigata Rakugo, The Beichō Katsura Collection 3 "The Patterns of Love and Hate"]. Tokyo: Chikumashobō.

Katsura, Beichō / 米朝 桂 2002d. *上方落語桂米朝コレクション 4: 商売繁盛* [Kamigata Rakugo, The Beichō Katsura Collection 4 "Flourishing Business"]. Tokyo: Chikumashobō.

Katsura, Beichō / 桂米朝 2002e. *上方落語桂米朝コレクション 5: 経異霊験* [Kamigata Rakugo, The Beichō Katsura Collection 5 "Unusual Miracles"]. Tokyo: Chikumashobō.

Katsura, Beichō / 米朝 桂 2002f. *上方落語桂米朝コレクション 6: 事件発生* [Kamigata Rakugo, The Beichō Katsura Collection 6 "The Occurence of Incidents"]. Tokyo: Chikumashobō.

Katsura, Beichō / 米朝 桂 2002g. *上方落語桂米朝コレクション 7: 芸道百般* [Kamigata Rakugo, The Beichō Katsura Collection 7 "Performing Arts of All Sorts"]. Tokyo: Chikumashobō.

Katsura, Beichō / 米朝 桂 2002h. *上方落語桂米朝コレクション 8: 美味礼賛* [Kamigata Rakugo, The Beichō Katsura Collection 8 "Worship of The Delicious"]. Tokyo: Chikumashobō.

Katsura, Shijaku / 枝雀 桂 2006a. *上方落語桂枝雀爆笑コレクション 1: スビバセンね* [Kamigata Rakugo, Shijaku Katsura's Roaring Laughter Collection 1 "I'm terribly sorry"]. Tokyo: Chikumashobō.

Katsura, Shijaku / 桂枝雀 2006b. *上方落語桂枝雀爆笑コレクション 2: ふしぎなあ* [Kamigata Rakugo, Shijaku Katsura's Roaring Laughter Collection 2 "How strange"]. Tokyo: Chikumashobō.

Katsura, Shijaku / 枝雀 桂 2006c. *上方落語桂枝雀爆笑コレクション 3:けったいなやっちゃ* [Kamigata Rakugo, Shijaku Katsura's Roaring Laughter Collection 3 "Bizzarre"]. Tokyo: Chikumashobō.

Katsura, Shijaku / 桂枝雀 2006d. *上方落語桂枝雀爆笑コレクション 4: 萬事気嫌よく* [Kamigata Rakugo, Shijaku Katsura's Roaring Laughter Collection 4 "Patience in All Things"]. Tokyo: Chikumashobō.

Katsura, Shijaku / 桂枝雀 2006e. *上方落語桂枝雀爆笑コレクション 5: バことに面目ない* [Kamigata Rakugo, Shijaku Katsura's Roaring Laughter Collection 5 "Absolutely no dignity"]. Tokyo: Chikumashobō.

Kawado, Sadakichi / 川戸貞吉 2001. *落語大百科* [Rakugo Encyclopedia]. Tokyo: Toseisha.

Kayyal, Mahmoud (2008) 'Salim al Dawudi and the Beginnings of Translation into Arabic of Modern Hebrew Literature', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 20(1): 52-78.

Kazui, Tashiro, and Videen, Susan Downing (1982) 'Foreign Relations during the Edo Period: Sakoku Reexamined', *Journal of Japanese Studies* 8(2): 283-306.

Kittel, Harald, and Poltermann, Andreas 2008. 'German Tradition' in Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha (eds) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* London: Routledge, 411-418. 2nd ed. edition.

Klaudy, Kinga 2001. 'The Asymmetry Hypothesis: Testing the Asymmetric Relationship between Explicitations and Implicitations' *The Third*

International Congress of EST 'Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies', Copenhagen.

Kolve, V.A 1981. 'Chaucer's Second Nun's Tale and the Iconography of Saint Cecilia' in Donald M. Rose (ed) *New Perspectives in Chaucer Criticism* Norman, Oklahoma: Pilgrim Books.

Kontra, Miklo s 1999. *Language, a Right and a Resource: Approaching Linguistic Human Rights*. New York: Central European University Press.

Krebs, Katja 2012. 'Translation and Adaptation - Two Sides of an Ideological Coin' in L. Raw (ed) *Translation, Adaptation and Transformation*: Continuum International Publishing, 8-42.

Krein-Kühle, Monika (2011) 'Register Shifts in Scientific and Technical Translation: A Corpus-in-Context Study', *The Translator* 17(2, Special Issue: Science in Translation): 391-413.

Kruger, Haidee (2011) 'Postcolonial Polysystems: Perceptions of Norms in the Translation of Children's Literature in South Africa', *The Translator* 17(1): 105-136.

Kruger, Haidee (2012) 'A Corpus-Based Study of the Mediation Effect in Translated and Edited Language', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 24(2): 355-388.

Kuhn, Thomas S. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.

Kuiper, Kathleen, and Merriam-Webster, Inc 1995. *Merriam-Webster's Encyclopedia of Literature*. Springfield, Massachusetts: Merriam-Webster.

Lambert, José (2009) 'Measuring Canonization: A reply to Paola Venturi', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 21(2): 358-363.

Lancashire, T.A. 2011. *An Introduction to Japanese Folk Performing Arts*: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Langland, William, and Skeat, Walter W. 1879. *The Vision of William Concerning Piers the Plowman: According to the Version Revised and Enlarged by the Author About A.D. 1377*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Laver, Michael S. 2011. *The Sakoku Edicts and the Politics of Tokugawa Hegemony*. Amherst, New York: Cambria Press.

Lee, Tong King (2011a) 'The Death of the Translator in Machine Translation: A Bilingual Poetry Project', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 23(1): 92-112.

Lee, Tong King (2011b) 'Translational (De)construction in Contemporary Chinese Poetics: A Case Study of Hsia Yü's Pink Noise', *The Translator* 17(1): 1-24.

Lefevere, André (1981) 'Translated Literature: Towards an Integrated Theory', *The Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 14(1): 68-78.

Lefevere, André 1998. 'Translation Practice(s) and the Circulation of Cultural Capital. Some Aeneids in English' in Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere (eds) *Constructing Cultures Essays on Literary Translation* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 41-56.

León, Celia Martín de, and Presas, Marisa (2011) 'Metaphern als Ausdruck subjektiver Theorien zum Übersetzen: Eine empirische Untersuchung zur konzeptuell-strukturierenden Funktion von Metaphernmodellen bei Studienanfängern', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies: International Journal on Translation Studies* 23(2): 272-310.

Levy, Indra A. 2011. *Translation in Modern Japan*. London: Routledge.

Lewis, M. Paul (ed.), 'Ethnologue: Languages of the World: Online version', SIL International, (2009) <http://www.ethnologue.com/web.asp> [Accessed 20/02/2012].

Li, Bo / 李博 (2012) '源自≪笑府≫的日本古典落语' [Understanding Japanese Classical Rakugo Adapted from Xiaofu], *Journal of the South China University of Technology / 华南理工大学学报: 社会科学版* 14(2): 98-102.

Liao, Min-Hsiu (2011) 'Interaction in the Genre of Popular Science: Writer, Translator and Reader', *The Translator* 17(2, Special Issue: Science in Translation): 349-368.

Limon, David 2010. 'Translators as Cultural Mediators: Wish or Reality? A Question for Translation Studies' in Daniel Gile, Gyde Hansen and Nike K. Pokorn (eds) *Why Translation Studies Matters* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Co., 29-40.

Long, Lynne (2010) 'Medieval Literature through the Lens of Translation Theory: Bridging the Interpretive Gap', *Translation Studies* 3(1): 61-77.

Lovewell, Bertha Ellen 1898. *The Life of St. Cecilia from Ms. Ashmole 43 and Ms. Cotton Tiberius E. VII with Introduction, Variants, A. Glossary by Bertha Ellen Lovewell, Ph. D*. Boston Lamson, Wolffe & C.

Lowitz, Leza, Aoyama, Miyuki, and Tomioka, Akemi 1994. *A Long Rainy Season: Haiku & Tanka*. Berkeley, California: Stone Bridge Press.

Lu, Fang (2009) 'Translation, Manipulation and the Transfer of Negative Cultural Images: A.C. Safford's Typical Women of China', *The Translator* 15(2, Special Issue. Chinese Discourses on Translation): 327-349.

Mackintosh, Fiona J. (2010) 'Alejandra Pizarnik as Translator. ', *The Translator* 16(1): 43-66.

Magoun Jr, Francis P (1955) 'Chaucer's Mediaeval World Outside of Great Britain', *Mediaeval Studies* 1977: 117-142.

Marco, Josep (2010) 'The Translation of Wordplay in Literary Texts: Typology, Techniques and Factors in a Corpus of English-Catalan Source Text and Target Text Segments', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 22(2): 264-297.

Martín de León, Celia (2008) 'Skopos and Beyond: A Critical Study of Functionalism', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 20(1): 1-28.

Martín García, Adolfo (2008) 'The Circumscribed Infinites Scheme: A Deconstructive Approach to Translating Poetry', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 20(1): 115-134.

Mateo, Marta (2008) 'Anglo-American Musicals in Spanish Theatres', *The Translator* 14(2, Special Issue. Translation and Music): 319-342.

Matsumoto, Yukihiro / 松本行弘 (1996) 'ある落語家の自死：桂枝雀の自殺についての心理学的考察　1999.4.19' [The Demise of a Rakugo Storyteller: A Psychological Study of Katsura Shijaku's Suicide on 19/04/1999], *神戸親和女子大学教育専攻科* 4: 83-94.

Mazzeo, Tilar J. 2006. *Plagiarism and Literary Property in the Romantic Period*. Bristol: University Presses Marketing distributor.

McDonough Dolmaya, Julie (2011) 'A Window into the Profession: What Translation Blogs Have to Offer Translation Studies', *The Translator* 17(1): 77-104.

McKie, Michael (1997) 'The Origins and Early Development of Rhyme in English Verse', *The Modern Language Review* 92(4): 817-831.

McMahon, April M. S. 1996. *Understanding Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McMichael, Polly (2008) 'Translation, Authorship and Authenticity in Soviet Rock Songwriting', *The Translator* 14(2, Special Issue. Translation and Music): 201-228.

Meade, Ruselle (2011) 'Translation of a Discipline: The Fate of Rankine's Engineering Science in Early Meiji-era Japan', *The Translator* 17(2, Special Issue: Science in Translation): 211-231.

Mees, Inger M., Dragsted, Barbara, Gorm Hansen, Inge, and Jakobsen, Arnt Lykke (2013) 'Sound Effects in Translation', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 25(1): 140-154.

Meifang, Zhang, and Li, Pan (2009) 'Introducing a Chinese Perspective on Translation Shifts: A Comparative Study of Shift Models by Loh and Vinay & Darbelnet', *The Translator* 15(2, Special Issue. Chinese Discourses on Translation): 351-374.

Meldrum, Yukari Fukuchi (2008) 'Source-Based Translation and Foreignization: A Japanese Case', *翻訳研究への招待* 2: 39-54.

Meyer, Milton W. 1992. *Japan: A Concise History*. Lanham, Maryland: Littlefield Adams Qaulity Paperbacks. 3rd ed. edition.

Miller, J. Scott (1994) 'Japanese Shorthand and Sokkibon', *Monumenta Nipponica* 49(4): 471-487.

Mimura, Masayoshi / 三村昌義 (1996) '明治期の落語の新作について' [On the Shinsaku Rakugo of the Meiji Period], *神戸親和女子大学研究論叢* 30: 67-94.

Mirlohi, Mehdi, Egbert, Joy, and Ghonsooly, Behzad (2011) 'Flow in translation: Exploring optimal experience for translation trainees', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 23: 251-271.

Miwa, Kunimi / 三羽邦美 2000. *三羽の漢文基本ポイントこれだけ!* [Miwa's Kanbun Fundamentals and Nothing Else!]. Musashino: Nagase.

Mizuno, Akira 2012. 'Stylistic Norms in the Early Meiji Period: From Chinese Influences to European Influences' in Nana Sato-Rossberg and Judy Wakabayashi (eds) *Translation and Translation Studies in the Japanese Context* London; New York: Continuum, 92-114.

Monumetensis, Galfredus, Reeve, Michael D., and Wright, Neil 2007. *The History of the Kings of Britain: an Edition and Translation of De gestis Britonum (Historia regum Britanniae)*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press.

Morini, Massimiliano (2008) 'Outlining a New Linguistic Theory of Translation', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 20(1): 29-51.

Morioka, Heinz, and Sasaki, Miyoko 1990. *Rakugo, the Popular Narrative Art of Japan*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University.

Munday, Jeremy (2013) 'The Role of Archival and Manuscript Research in the Investigation of Translator Decision-Making', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 25(1): 125-139.

Muto, Sadao / 武藤禎夫 1970. *江戸小咄の比較研究* [Comparitive Studies in the Short Stories of the Edo Period]. Tokyo: Tokyodo Shuppan.

References

Muto, Sadao, and Oka, Masahiko / 武藤禎夫 and 岡雅彦編 1975. *噺本大系* [Compendium of Tales]. Tokyo: Tokyodo Shuppan.

Nagata, Sae / 永田小絵 (2007) '中国翻訳史における小説翻訳と近代翻訳者の誕生 —前編—' [The Translation of Novels and the Birth of Modern Translation in Chinese Translation History - Part One -], *翻訳研究への招待* 1: 69-78.

Neather, Robert (2012) '" Non-expert" Translators in a Professional Community: Identity, Anxiety and Perceptions of Translator Expertise in the Chinese Museum Community', *The Translator* 18(2): 245-268.

Nicholson, Peter (1978) 'The "Shipman's Tale" and the Fabliaux', *ELH* 45(4): 583-596.

Nida, Eugene Albert 1964/2004. 'Principles of Correspondence' in Lawrence Venuti (ed) *The Translation Studies Reader* London: Routledge, 126-140.

Nobuhiro, Shinji, Yamamoto, Susumu, and Kawazoe, Yū / 延広真治, 山本進 and 川添裕 2003. *落語の愉しみ* [The Joy of Rakugo]: 落語の世界 1 [The World of Rakugo 1]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Noguchi, Takeshi / 野口卓 2008. *あらすじで読む古典落語の名作* [Reading the Outlines of Famous Classical Rakugo]. Tokyo: Rakushokan.

Nolan, Maura 2005. *John Lydgate and the Making of Public Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nord, Christiane (2012) 'Quo Vadis, Functional Translatology?', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 24(1): 26-42.

Notehelfer, F. G., Saveliev, Igor R., and Walle, W. F. Vande (2004) 'An Extraordinary Odyssey: The Iwakura Embassy Translated', *Monumenta Nipponica: Studies on Japanese Culture, Past and Present* 59(1): 83-119.

O'Brien, Sharon (2013) 'The borrowers: Researching the cognitive aspects of translation', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 25(1): 5-17.

O'Neill, Michael 2010. *The Cambridge History of English Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Sullivan, Carol (2012) 'Introduction: Rethinking methods in translation history', *Translation Studies* 5(2): 131-138.

Ohnuki-Tierney, Emiko 2002. *Kamikaze, Cherry Blossoms, and Nationalisms: The Militarization of Aesthetics in Japanese History*. Chicago, Illinois; London: University of Chicago Press.

Okayama, Emiko 2012. 'A Nagasaki Translator of Chinese and the Making of a New Literary Genre' in Nana Sato-Rossberg and Judy Wakabayashi (eds) *Translation and Translation Studies in the Japanese Context* London; New York: Continuum, 53-72.

Olohan, Maeve (2003) 'How frequent are the Contractions?: A Study of Contracted Forms in the Translational English Corpus', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 15(1): 59-89.

Olohan, Maeve (2012) 'Volunteer Translation and Altruism in the Context of a Nineteenth-Century Scientific Journal', *The Translator* 18(2): 193-215.

Olohan, Maeve, and Baker, Mona (2008) 'Reporting 'that' in Translated English. Evidence for Subconscious Processes of Explicitation?', *Across Languages and Cultures* 1(2): 141-158.

Olohan, Maeve, and Salama-Carr, Myriam (2011) 'Translating Science', *The Translator* 17(2, Special Issue: Science in Translation): 179-188.

References

Öner, Senem (2008) 'Folk Songs, Translation and the Question of (Pseudo-)Originals', *The Translator* 14(2, Special Issue. Translation and Music): 229-246.

Osawa, Yoshihiro / 大澤吉博 2010. *言語のあいだを読む: 日・英・韓の比較文学* [Reading the Spaces between Languages: Comparitive Literature in Japanese, English, and Korean]. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan.

Ovid, Dryden, John, and Walpole, Horace 1776. *Ovid's Epistles: With his Amours. Translated into English verse, by the Most Eminent Hands [Dryden, Pope and others]. Adorn'd with Cutts. (The preface, by Mr Dryden. The three epistles of Aulus Sabinus in Answer to as many of Ovid. Made English by Mr Salusbury.) With the Autograph and Bookplate of Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford.]*. London: J. Tonson.

Pápai, Vilma (2004) 'Explicitation: A Universal of Translated Text?', *Benjamins Translation Library* 48: 143–164.

Paris, Gaston (1883) 'Études sur les Romans de la Table Ronde: Lancelot du Lac, II: Le Conte de la Charrette', *Romania* 1: 459-534.

Parker, Helen S. E. 2006. *Progressive Traditions: An Illustrated Study of Plot Repetition in Traditional Japanese Theatre*: Brill's Japanese Studies Library,. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Parr, Roger P, and of Vinsauf, Geoffrey 1968. *Documentum de Modo et Arte Dictandi et Versificandi (Instruction in the method and art of speaking and versifying) Translated from the Latin with an Introduction by Roger P. Parr*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.

Peirce, Charles S. 1998. *The Essential Peirce Selected Philosophical Writings.1893-1913*.vol. 2. London: Indiana University Press.

Perteghella, Manuela (2008) 'Adaptation: 'Bastard Child' or Critique? Putting Terminology Centre Stage', *Journal of Romance Studies* 8(3): 51-65.

Pięta, Hanna (2012) 'Patterns in (In)Directness: An Exploratory Case Study in the External History of Portuguese Translations of Polish literature (1855-2010)', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 24(2): 310-337.

Pinto, Sara Ramos (2009) 'How Important is the Way You Say it?: A Discussion on the Translation of Linguistic Varieties', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 21(2): 289-307.

Pounds, Norman John Greville 2005. *The Medieval City*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Price, Joshua M. (2008) 'Translating social science
Good versus bad utopianism', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 20: 348-364.

Puttenham, George d, Puttenham, Richard, Lumley, John Lumley Baron, Whigham, Frank, and Rebhorn, Wayne A. 2007. *The Art of English Poesy*. London: Cornell University Press. A critical ed. edition.

Pym, Anthony (1996) 'Venuti's Visibility', *Target* 8: 165–178.

Pym, Anthony 1998. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Quine, W. V. 1960. *Word and Object*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Technology Press of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Quinn, Shelley Fenno 2005. *Developing Zeami: The Noh Actor's Attunement in Practice*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Rafael, Vicente L. (2012) 'Translation and the US Empire: Counterinsurgency and the Resistance of Language', *The Translator* 18(1): 1-22.

Ramón, Noelia, and Labrador, Belén (2008) 'Translations of '-ly' Adverbs of Degree in an English-Spanish Parallel Corpus', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 20(2): 275-296.

Reames, Sherry L. (1978) 'The Sources of Chaucer's "Second Nun's Tale"', *Modern Philology* 76(2): 111-135.

Reames, Sherry L. (1980) 'The Cecilia Legend as Chaucer Inherited it and Retold it: The Disappearance of an Augustinian Ideal', *Speculum* 55(1): 38-57.

Reames, Sherry L. 1985. *The Legenda Aurea: A Reexamination of its Paradoxical History*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.

Reames, Sherry L. (1990) 'A Recent Discovery Concerning the Sources of Chaucer's "Second Nun's Tale"', *Modern Philology* 87(4): 337-361.

Reames, Sherry L. 2002. 'The Second Nun's Prologue and Tale' in Robert M. Correale and Mary Hamel (eds) *Sources and Snalogues of the Canterbury Tales* Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 491-528.

Reider, Noriko T. (2000) 'The Appeal of "Kaidan", Tales of the Strange', *Asian Folklore Studies* 59(2): 265-283.

Reynolds, Matthew 2011. *The poetry of translation : from Chaucer & Petrarch to Homer & Logue*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ricci, Ronit 2011. 'On the Untranslatability of "Translation", Considerations from Java, Indonesia.' in Ronit Ricci and Jan van der Putten (eds) *Translation in Asia: Theories, Practices Histories* Manchester: St Jerome Publishing, 57-72.

Riddy, Felicity 2000. 'Middle English Romance: Family, Marriage, Intimacy' in Roberta L. Krueger (ed) *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 235-152.

Risku, Hanna (2010) 'A cognitive scientific view on technical communication and translation: Do embodiment and situatedness really make a difference?', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 22: 94-111.

Risku, Hanna, and Windhager, Florian (2013) 'Extended Translation: A Sociocognitive Research Agenda', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 25(1): 33-45.

Rossette, Fiona (2009) 'Translating Asyndeton from French Literary Texts into English', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 21(1): 98-134.

Rossignol, Rosalyn 2007. *Critical Companion to Chaucer: A Literary Reference to his Life and Work*. New York: Facts On File. Rev. ed. edition.

Rossiter, William T. 2010. *Chaucer and Petrarch*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.

Rowe, John Howland (1965) 'The Renaissance Foundations of Anthropology', *American Anthropologist* 67(1): 1-20.

Rübberdt, Irene, and Salevsky, Heidemarie 1995. 'New Ideas from Historical Concepts: Schleiermacher and Modern Translation Theory' in Mary Snell-Hornby, Zuzana Jettmarová and Klaus Kaindl (eds) *Translation as Intercultural Communication: Selected Papers from the EST Congress - Prague 1995* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 301-312.

Ruthven, Kenneth K. 2001. *Faking Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saito, Mino / 齊藤美野 (2008) '森田思軒と文学翻訳 －起点テクストの「姿」を再現すること－' [Morita Shiken and Literary Translation - On Reviving the "Form" of the Source Text], *通訳研究* 8: 169-190.

Sajdi, Dana (2009) 'Print and Its Discontents: A Case for Pre-Print Journalism and Other Sundry Print Matters', *The Translator* 15(1, Special Issue. Nation and Translation in the Middle East): 105-138.

Saldanha, Gabriela (2011) 'Translator Style: Methodological Considerations', *The Translator* 17(1): 25-50.

Saltzman-Li, Katherine 2010. *Creating Kabuki Plays: Context for Kezairoku, "Valuable Notes on Playwriting"*. Leiden: Brill.

Sánchez, Dolores (2011) 'Translating Science: Contexts and Contests - On the Translation of a Misogynist Scientific Treatise in Early Twentieth-Century Spain', *The Translator* 17(2, Special Issue: Science in Translation): 325-348.

Sanders, Julie 2006. *Adaptation And Appropriation*. London; New York: Routledge.

Sargeant, Carol 2010. *Love, Honour and Royal Blood: Book Two: John of Gaunt*. Indianapolis: Dog Ear Publishing.

Sasaki, Miyoko, and Balkenhol, Heinz (1979) 'Rakugo: Fascination for and Popularity of One of the Classical Japanese Arts of Narration', *Journal of Popular Culture* 13(1): 152-170.

Sasaki, Miyoko, and Morioka, Heinz (1981) 'Rakugo: Popular Narrative Art of The Groteque', *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 41(2): 417-459.

Sato-Rossberg, Nana, and Wakabayashi, Judy 2012. *Translation and Translation Studies in the Japanese Context*. London; New York: Continuum.

Saunders, Corinne J. 2005. *Cultural Encounters in the Romance of Medieval England*. Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer.

Scattergood, John 2005. 'The Shipman's Tale' in Robert M. Correale and Mary Hamel (eds) *Sources and Analogues of the Canterbury Tales* Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 565-582.

Schäffner, Christina, and Shuttleworth, Mark (2013) 'Metaphor in translation: Possibilities for process research', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 25(1): 93-106.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich 1813. 'Ueber die Verschiedenen Methoden des Uebersezens' [On the Different Methods of Translating] in Hans Joachim Störig (ed) *Das Problem des Übersetzens* Stuttgart: H. Goverts, 38-69.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich, and Bowie, Andrew 1998. *Hermeneutics and Criticism and Other Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schouten, Barbara, Ross, Jonathan, Zendedel, Rena, and Meeuwesen, Ludwien (2012) 'Informal Interpreters in Medical Settings: A Comparative Socio-Cultural Study of the Netherlands and Turkey', *The Translator* 18(2): 311-338.

Seeber, Kilian G. (2013) 'Cognitive Load in Simultaneous Interpreting: Measures and Methods', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 25(1): 18-32.

Seeley, Christopher 1991. *A History of Writing in Japan*. Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill.

Seigle, Cecilia Segawa 1993. *Yoshiwara: The Glittering World of the Japanese Courtesan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Sekiyama, Kazuo / 関山和夫 1964. *説教と話芸* [Preaching and Narrative Arts]. Tokyo: Seiabō.

Selim, Samah (2009a) 'Languages of Civilization: Nation, Translation and the Politics of Race in Colonial Egypt', *The Translator* 15(1, Special Issue. Nation and Translation in the Middle East): 139-156.

Selim, Samah (2009b) 'Nation and Translation in the Middle East: Histories, Canons, Hegemonies', *The Translator* 15(1, Special Issue. Nation and Translation in the Middle East:): 1-13.

References

Shamma, Tarek (2009) 'Translating into the Empire: The Arabic Version of Kalila wa Dimna', *The Translator* 15(1, Special Issue. Nation and Translation in the Middle East): 65-86.

Sharkas, Hala (2011) 'The Use of Glossing in Modern Original Scientific Writing in Arabic: An Influence of Translation?', *The Translator* 17(2, Special Issue: Science in Translation): 369-389.

Sharma, Sunil (2009) 'Translating Gender: Āzād Bilgrāmī on the Poetics of the Love Lyric and Cultural Synthesis', *The Translator* 15(1, Special Issue. Nation and Translation in the Middle East): 87-103.

Shen, Jun / 申俊 1991. *中国笑话* [Humorous Stories of China]. Shanghai: Shànghǎi Wényì Chūbǎnshè.

Shibata, Shoichi / 柴田庄一 2009. '「超近代芸術」としての歌舞伎と近代化の功罪 —演劇改良運動への対応をめぐって—' [The Merits and Demerits of Modernization and Kabuki as "Ultra-modern Art" - The Turn Towards Theatre Reforms] *異文化としての日本* Nagoya: Nagoya University Graduate School of Languages and Cultures, 23-32.

Shlesinger, Miriam, and Ordan, Noam (2012) 'More Spoken or More Translated?: Exploring a Known Unknown of Simultaneous Interpreting', *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies* 24(1): 43-60.

Shōfukutei, Shokaku, and Mita, Jun'ichi / 笑福亭松鶴 and 三田純一 (1936) '上方はなし' [Kamigata Stories], *Kamigata Hanashi*.

Shores, Matthew W. (2008) 'Travel and Tabibanashi in the Early Modern Period: Forming Japanese Geographic Identity', *Asian Theatre Journal* 25(1): 101-121.

Shuttleworth, Mark (2011) 'Translational Behaviour at the Frontiers of Scientific Knowledge: A Multilingual Investigation into Popular Science Metaphor in Translation', *The Translator* 17(2, Special Issue: Science in Translation): 301-323.

Sihui, Mao (2009) 'Translating the Other: Discursive Contradictions and New Orientalism in Contemporary Advertising in China', *The Translator* 15(2, Special Issue. Chinese Discourses on Translation): 261-282.

Simon, Sherry (2012) 'The City in Translation: Urban Cultures of Central Europe', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 24(1): 126-140.

Skibińska, Elzbieta, and Blumczyński, Piotr (2009) 'Polish metaphorical perceptions of the translator and translation', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 21(1): 30-57.

Smits, Ivo 2007. 'The Way of the Literati' in Mikael S. Adolphson (ed) *Heian Japan, centers and peripheries* Honolulu, T.H.: University of Hawai'i Press ; London : Eurospan [distributor], 105-128.

Snell-Hornby, Mary 2006. *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?* Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.

Somerset, Richard (2011) 'Textual Evolution: The Translation of Louis Figuier's La Terre avant le déluge', *The Translator* 17(2, Special Issue: Science in Translation): 255-274.

Spearing, A. C. 1987. *Readings in Medieval Poetry*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Spiessens, Anneleen (2010) 'Voicing the Perpetrator's Perspective: Translation and Mediation in Jean Hatzfeld's 'Une Saison de machettes'', *The Translator* 16(2, Special Issue: Translation and Violent Conflict): 315-336.

References

Špirk, Jaroslav (2009) 'Anton Popovič's contribution to translation studies', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 21: 3-29.

Stahuljak, Zrinka (2010) 'Minor Empires: Translation, Conflict, and Postcolonial Critique', *The Translator* 16(2, Special Issue: Translation and Violent Conflict:): 255-274.

Steiner, George 1998. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 3rd ed. edition.

Stevens, Martin (1979) 'The Royal Stanza in Early English Literature', *PMLA* 94(1): 62-76.

Strohm, Paul 1989. *Social Chaucer*. Cambridge, Massachusetts; London: Harvard University Press.

Strowe, Anna (2011) 'Is Simpatico Possible in Translation?: The 1620 Translation of the *Decameron* and the Case for Similarity', *The Translator* 17(1): 51-75.

Sturluson, Snorri, Egilsson, Sveinbjörn, and Egilssyni, Sveinbirni 1848. *Edda Snorra Sturlusonar: Eda Gylfaginning, Skaldskaparmal og Hattatal*. Reykjavik: H. Helgasyni.

Sundby, Thor 1873. *Albertani Brixiensis Liber Consolationis et Consilii: Ex quo Hausta est Fabula Gallica de Melibeo et Prudentia, quam, Anglice Redditam et The tale of Melibe insriptam, Galfridus Chaucer inter Canterbury Tales Recepit*. London: The Chacuer Society

Susam-Sarajeva, Şebnem (2008) 'Translation and Music: Changing Perspectives, Frameworks and Significance', *The Translator* 14(2, Special Issue. Translation and Music): 187-200.

Susam-Sarajeva, Şebnem (2009) 'The Case Study Research Method in Translation Studies', *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 3(1): 37-56.

Suzuki, Seiichi 2004. *The Metre of Old Saxon Poetry: The Remaking of Alliterative Tradition*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Sweeney, Amin (1979) 'Rakugo Professional Japanese Storytelling', *Asian Folklore Studies* 38(1): 25-80.

Taivalkoski-Shilov, Kristiina (2008) 'Subtitling 8 Mile in Three Languages: Translation Problems and Translator Licence', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 20(2): 249-274.

Taivalkoski-Shilov, Kristiina (2009) 'Translating for a Good Cause: Joseph Lavallée's Antislavery Novel Le Nègre comme Il y a Peu de Blancs (1789) and its Two English Translations (1790)', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 21(2): 308-332.

Takada, Makoto 1989. 'The Development of Japanese Society and The Modernization of Japanese During the Meiji Restoration' in Florian Coulmas (ed) *Language adaptation* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 104-116.

Tarsot, Louis, Legrand, and Mansion, J. E. 1914. *Fabliaux et Contes du Moyen Age*: Heath's modern language series. Boston: D.C. Heath.

Tatekawa, Shiraku / 立川志らく 2000. *全身落語家読本*[Rakugo-ka Reader]. Tokyo: Shinchosha.

Taylor, Insup, and Taylor, M. Martin 1995. *Writing and literacy in Chinese, Korean and Japanese*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Taylor, Karla (2005) 'Social Aesthetics and the Emergence of Civic Discourse from the Shipman's Tale to Melibee', *The Chaucer Review* 39(3): 298-322.

Tercedor, Maribel (2010) 'Cognates as Lexical Choices in Translation: Interference in Space-Constrained Environments', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 22(2): 177-193.

Thompson, N. S. 2005. 'The Merchant's Tale' in Robert M. Correale and Mary Hamel (eds) *Sources and Analogues of the Canterbury Tales* Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 479-534.

Tipton, Rebecca (2008) 'Reflexivity and the Social Construction of Identity in Interpreter-Mediated Asylum Interviews', *The Translator* 14(1): 1-19.

Tobia, Simona (2010) 'Crime and Judgement: Interpreters/Translators in British War Crimes Trials, 1945-1949', *The Translator* 16(2, Special Issue: Translation and Violent Conflict): 275-293.

Toury, Gideon (1981) 'Translated literature: System, norm, performance: Toward a TT-oriented approach to literary translation', *Poetics Today* 2(4): 9-27.

Toury, Gideon 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Toury, Gideon 1995/2004. 'The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation' in Lawrence Venuti (ed) *The Translation Studies Reader* London: Routledge, 205-218.

Tucker, George Hugo 2000. *Forms of the "Medieval" in the "Renaissance": A Multidisciplinary Exploration of a Cultural Continuum*. Charlottesville, Virginia: Rookwood Press.

Turner, Stephen P., and Risjord, Mark W. 2007. *Philosophy of Anthropology and Sociology*. Amsterdam; Boston: Elsevier.

Tymoczko, Maria 2007. *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Tymoczko, Maria (2009) 'Why Translators should Want to Internationalize Translation Studies', *The Translator* 15:2: 401-421.

Tymoczko, Maria (2012) 'The Neuroscience of Translation', *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies* 24(1): 83-102.

Tytler, Alexander Fraser Lord Woodhouselee 1790. *Essay on the Principles of Translation*. London: J.M. Dent & Co. [1907] edition.

Ui, Mushū / 宇井無愁 1952. *落語の原話* [The Source Stories of Rakugo]. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten.

Valdéon, Roberto a. (2010) 'Schemata, Scripts and the Gay Issue in Contemporary Dubbed Sitcoms', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 22(1): 71-93.

Van Wyke, Ben (2012) 'Borges and Us. Exploring the Author-Translator Dynamic in Translation Workshops', *The Translator* 18(1): 77-100.

Vandepitte, Sonia, Vandenbussche, Liselotte, and Algoet, Brecht (2011) 'Travelling Certainties: Darwin's Doubts and Their Dutch Translations', *The Translator* 17(2, Special Issue: Science in Translation): 275-299.

Varney, Jennifer (2010) 'The 'Wobbling' Translation: H.D. and the Transmission of the Classics', *The Translator* 16(1): 1-18.

Venturi, Paola (2009) 'The Translator's Immobility: English Modern Classics in Italy', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 21(2): 333-357.

Venuti, Lawrence (1991) 'Genealogies of Translation Theory: Schleiermacher', *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction* 4(2): 125-150.

Venuti, Lawrence 2004. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge. 2nd ed. edition.

Vinay, Jean-Paul, and Darbelnet, Jean 1958/2004. 'A Methodology for Translation' in Venuti Lawrence (ed) *The Translation Studies Reader* London: Routledge, 84-93.

Vinay, Jean-Paul, and Darbelnet, Jean 1977. *Stylistique Comparée du Français et de l'Anglais: Méthode de Traduction* [Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation]. Paris: Didier.

Vlachopoulos, Stefanos (2008) 'Translating into a New LSP: The Translation of Laws in the Republic of Cyprus', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 20(1): 103-114.

Volker, T. Writer on Art 1950. *The Animal in Far Eastern Art and Especially in the Art of the Japanese Netsuke, with References to Chinese Origins, Traditions, Legends, and Art.* Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Wagner, Adolf, and Boccaccio, Giovanni 1826. *Il Parnasso Italiano, Ovvero: I Quattro Poeti Celeberrimi Italiani.* Lipsia: E. Fleischer.

Wakabayashi, Judy 1998. 'Marginal Forms of Translation in Japan: Variations from the Norm' in L. Bowker, M. Cronin, D. Kenny and J. Pearson (eds) *Unity in Diversity?: Current Trends in Translation Studies* Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 57-63.

Wakabayashi, Judy 2005. 'The Reconceptualization of Translation from Chinese in 18th-century Japan' in Eva Hung (ed) *Translation and Cultural Change: Studies in History, Norms, and Image Projection*: John Benjamins, 121-145.

Wakabayashi, Judy (2008) 'Foreign Bones, Japanese Flesh: Translations and the Emergence of Modern Children's Literature in Japan', *Japanese Language and Literature* 42(1): 227-255.

Wakabayashi, Judy 2012. 'Situating Translation Studies in Japan within a Broader Context' in Nana Sato-Rossberg and Judy Wakabayashi (eds) *Translation and Translation Studies in the Japanese Context* London; New York: Continuum, 33-52.

Wakabayashi, Judy, and Kothari, Rita 2009. *Decentering Translation Studies: India and Beyond*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Walsby, M. 2011. *The Printed Book in Brittany, 1484-1600*. Leiden: Brill.

Walton, Douglas N. 1996. *Arguments from Ignorance*. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Wang, Vincent X. (2009) 'Pragmatic shifts in two translations of Fusheng Liuji: A Descriptive Study of Request Behaviour', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 21(2): 209-234.

Washbourne, Kelly (2012) 'Load-managed problem formats: Scaffolding and modeling the translation task to improve transfer', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 24(2): 338-354.

Weissbrod, Rachel (2009) 'Philosophy of Translation Meets Translation Studies: Three Hebrew Translations of Kipling's "If" in light of Paul Ricœur's "Third Text" and Gideon Toury's "Adequate Translation"', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 21(1): 58-73.

White, Harold Ogden 1965. *Plagiarism and Imitation during the English Renaissance, etc*. New York: Octagon Books.

Wilson, John (1820) 'On the Analogy Between the Growth of Individual and National Genius', *Blackwood's Edinburgh magazine* 6: 375-381.

Wilson, Rita (2011) 'Cultural Mediation through Translingual Narrative', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 23(2): 235-250.

Wilss, Wolfram 1999. *Translation and Interpreting in the 20th Century: Focus on German*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

References

Windeatt, Barry 2005. 'Geoffrey Chaucer' in Roger Ellis, Stuart Gillespie and David Hopkins (eds) *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 137-148.

Winters, Marion (2009) 'Modal Particles Explained: How Modal Particles Creep into Translations and Reveal Translators' Styles', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 21(1): 74-97.

Withrington, John, and Field, P.J.C 2005. 'The Wife of Bath's Tale' in Robert M. Correale and Mary Hamel (eds) *Sources and analogues of the Canterbury tales* Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 405-448.

Wohlfart, Irmengard (2009) 'Investigating a Double Translation of Culture: The English-Maori Classic Postcolonial Text Potiki and its German Translation', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 21(2): 265-288.

Wright, Chantal (2010) 'Exophony and Literary Translation: What it Means for the Translator when a Writer Adopts a New Language', *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 22(1): 22-39.

www.benjamins.com, 'John Benjamins Publishing Company website: Target' <http://www.benjamins.com/#catalog/journals/target> [Accessed 16/2/2012].

www.esf.org, 'ERIH Foreword' <http://www.esf.org/research-areas/humanities/erih-european-reference-index-for-the-humanities/erih-foreword.html> [Accessed 16/02/2012].

www.stjerome.co.uk, 'St. Jerome Publishing: The Translator' <https://www.stjerome.co.uk/tsa/journal/1/> [Accessed 16/02/2012].

www.stjerome.co.uk, 'St. Jerome Publishing: The Translator: Contributor Guidelines' <https://www.stjerome.co.uk/tsa/publication-page/2/> [Accessed 16/02/2012].

www.un.org, 'UN official languages' <http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/languages.shtml> [Accessed 20/02/2012].

Xu, Gary, and Feiner, Susan (2007) 'Meinü Jingji/China's Beauty economy: Buying Looks, Shifting Value, and Changing Place', *Feminist Economics* 13(3-4): 307-323.

Yamashita, Munetoshi / 山下宗利 (1987) '大阪市都心部における空間利用の特性' [Characteristics of Spacial Use in Osaka's CBD], 人文地理 39(1): 54-69.

Yangsheng, Guo (2009) 'Theorizing the Politics of Translation in a Global Era: A Chinese Perspective', *The Translator* 15(2, Special Issue. Chinese Discourses on Translation): 239-259.

Yasuda, Takehiro / 保田武宏 1969. *落語事典* [Encyclopedia of Rakugo]. Tokyo: Seiabō.

Yasufumi, Nakoshi, and Yoshinori, Kōno / 名越康文 and 甲野善紀 2008. *薄氷の踏み方: 時代に塗りこめられないために* [The Way to Tread on Thin Ice: So As Not to be Painted over by Time]. Tokyo: PHP Research Institute.

Yeung, Jessica (2008) 'The Song of the Earth: An Analysis of Two Interlingual and Intersemiotic Translations', *The Translator* 14(2, Special Issue. Translation and Music): 273-294.

Yiu, Angela 1998. *Chaos and Order in the Works of Natsume Sōseki* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Young, Edward, and Morley, Edith J. 1918. *Edward Young's "Conjectures on Original Composition"*. London; New York; Bombay: Longmans; Green & Co.

References

Zaixi, Tan (2009) 'The 'Chineseness' vs. 'Non-Chineseness' of Chinese Translation Theory: An Ethnoconvergent Perspective', *The Translator* 15(2, Special Issue. Chinese Discourses on Translation): 283-304.

Zanettin, Federico 2012. *Translation-Driven Corpora: Corpus Resources for Descriptive and Applied Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome.