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ABSTRACT

The key questions posed in this thesis are: what factors determine when and how a translator becomes famous; and to what extent do translation strategies relate to the recognition of translators and their works.

These questions are answered through an analysis of celebrity translators in Japan. The analysis includes translators’ own agency, publishers’ marketing strategies, and readers’ and critics’ receptions of translations, in order to identify what factors create translator fame and how status influences translation practices. The study also investigates the implications of historical background in the occurrence of the translator celebrity phenomenon by examining some of Japan’s first celebrity translators. This research considers the commercial publishing context of translated fiction, rather than focusing on its literary and cultural values, as existing studies on translator visibility usually do. Furthermore, the study considers intermediaries (e.g. publishers and readers) who play a part in the production of celebrity translators. The research relies on a variety of original and secondary resources, unconventional in translation studies, including existing research on celebrity, archival materials such as printed media and biographical accounts of historical translators, and survey data on translators, publishers and readers.

The thesis concludes that translator visibility is complex, and consists of a combination of multiple factors including cultural conventions, translator agency, and the perceptions of publishers and readers of translators and their works. Therefore, prevailing mainstream notions in translation studies are insufficient to understand and discuss translator visibility fully. The novel approach employed in this research enables future studies to bring a wide range of pertinent factors to bear in the examination of translator visibility.
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INTRODUCTION

Glory, for the translator, is borrowed glory. There is no way around this. Translators are celebrated when they translate celebrated books.

—Tim Parks (2016)—

The status of translators has attracted considerable attention within and beyond the discipline of translation studies in recent years, although mostly in relation to its negative aspects. The subject has been frequently discussed and debated at academic conferences, seminars, literary events, in newspaper articles and book reviews. The rise in awareness of translators’ low status owes much to Lawrence Venuti, who uses the term “invisibility” to refer to the situation of literary translators in anglophone cultural contexts, specifically the under-recognition of their works, names and status. His volume *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation* (1995, 2008), which has now been updated and republished under the “Routledge Translation Classics” series (2017), has contributed significantly to highlighting the importance of increased visibility in the area of literary translation.

As with those of Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, Venuti’s works have had an important influence in the development of methodologies in translation studies that began shifting towards cultural approaches during the 1990s (Marinetti, 2011: 26). Venuti’s approach to translation analysis goes beyond the relationship between source and target text and takes into account the cultural, political and historical situations in which the translation is produced (ibid.: 28-29). These include the target-language norms, translators’ motives for translation, and the political and cultural standing of the target language. Venuti’s focus on the relationship between translators’ intentions and the texts they produce has contributed to highlighting the ethics of translation (ibid.: 28). He has focussed attention on the importance of the translation, replacing the image of the role of the translator as secondary to that of creative artists whose actions can potentially be responsible for cultural change (Bassnett, 2005: 9).
The negative aspects of the status of translators in Europe and North America have been a popular research topic in the sociology of translation (Koskinen, 2000: 12, 60; Pym, 1996: 172; Ruokonen, 2013: 3, 334; Venuti, 2008: 8). For example, translators in Europe and North America usually have little or no influence over their publishers (Venuti, 2008: 7-9). However, this thesis will argue that the translator’s invisibility is not a universal phenomenon. Translators, like other professionals, such as novelists, chefs and artists, can attain a high degree of visibility, notably in certain countries, such as China, Israel, Japan and Taiwan, where they might even be termed celebrities. To reverse Parks’ (2016) quote in my epigraph, foreign literature can become celebrated when translated by these celebrity translators.

My master’s dissertation (Akashi, 2013) explored the translation work of Murakami Haruki, inarguably the most prominent translator in present-day Japan, exploring how his case might fit into Venuti’s conceptualisation. The sharp contrast between the Japanese context and the more frequently researched contexts of Europe and North America demonstrated to me that further research into the topic would have great potential to contribute to the ongoing visibility discussion. This research takes this potential as its point of departure. It will examine celebrity translators, considering the values ascribed to translation and translators’ roles, and how their status is perceived, in contexts that are not included in what I am terming Venuti’s visibility paradigm. In doing so, this research will contribute to broadening as well as challenging this widely applied conceptualisation developed by Venuti.

0.1. Venuti’s visibility paradigm

Venuti links translators’ invisible status to the dominant norms in English-language translation, which prioritise fluency, and to translators’ own approaches to translation, which create the illusion that a translation is the original text (Venuti, 2008: 1). Fluent

---

1 All the Japanese names are listed with surnames first, followed by first names, following Japanese custom.
translations eliminate any cultural, political, racial and linguistic diversity that might be considered undesirable in the target culture (ibid.: 32-33). Venuti’s analysis shows how the dominance of fluent translation originated in seventeenth-century England, where readers of classical literature were members of the upper class or elite groups and foreign ideologies were seen as threats to their culture and society (ibid.: 35). He asserts that translators in present-day “Anglo-American” contexts are invisible and are not rewarded with the payments, social status, and literary influence that they deserve because they adopt domesticating strategies that lead readers to view their texts as not being translations (ibid.: 1, 13). Venuti (ibid: 16) instead advocates foreignising or “minoritizing” strategies, as a form of resistance to translator invisibility. This resistant strategy involves highlighting the foreignness of the source text, through which the translated status of the text becomes clear to the reader, therefore rendering a translator’s presence more visible (ibid.: 15-16). In his more recent works, however, Venuti departs from the idea that translation should be solely “resistant” (Pym, 2015: 795). In the latest edition of *The Translator’s Invisibility* (2017: xv), he clarifies that foreignising translation does not refer to literalism or strategies that closely focus on the source text, as it is often misinterpreted. Instead, he states that foreignising effects must be made recognisable to the target reader through using interpretants in the target language thus, “any sense of foreignness in translation is always already domesticated” (ibid.: xiii).

Nevertheless, the applicability of Venuti’s conceptualisation, which is centred on cases of cultural and linguistic hegemony, has been challenged by scholars such as Anthony Pym (1996, 2015) and Maria Tymoczko (2000, 2006), as well as those outside dominant European-language contexts, for example Japan (e.g. Tamaki, 2005; Mizuno, 2010). Tymoczko argues that Venuti’s conceptualisation is based on evidence that mainly relates to his personal experiences as a translator of literary works in European languages produced during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (2000: 35). She further notes the ambiguity of the terms he uses; for instance, Venuti does not indicate the degree to which a foreignised translation should contain foreign elements in order to function as an act of resistance (ibid.: 37). Delabastita (2010: 133), in his review of *The Translator’s Invisibility*, argues that Venuti’s analysis is centred on “high-brow literature” of experimental origin that is not representative of literature read by a more general readership. While Venuti’s views on resistant approaches have shifted in recent
years, his perception of translator status seems to remain unchanged (Pym, 2015: 795). In the latest edition of *The Translator’s Invisibility*, Venuti continues to demonstrate the ways in which literary translation in the USA is considered secondary.

Hadley & Akashi (2015: 5-6) argue that in cultural contexts such as Japan, the tendency to undervalue translators’ input does not apply, and a fluent translation does not invariably make the translator invisible. This phenomenon suggests that publishing practice relating to translation in Japan is distinct from the practice in areas that have been more widely researched (ibid.: 5). While Japanese translation norms today, like those in English-language contexts, give preference to reader-focused, easy-reading translations (Furuno, 2005: 105; Sato, 2009: 16), fluent translation does not conceal the presence of the translator since Japanese publishing conventions require the translator’s name to be clearly shown on the book cover, as will be examined in Chapter Four. This Japanese example contradicts Venuti’s hypothesis that visibility and translation strategies are somehow linked. Examining translator status in the Japanese context will not only enable the applicability of Venuti’s conceptualisation to be reconsidered but will also lead to the identification of factors beyond translation strategies that contribute to translator visibility. Thus, the results of this study will generate a model which can be applied to the analysis of translator status in contexts not included in Venuti’s model.

This thesis aims to answer four main questions: 1. What are celebrity translators?; 2. What factors contribute to their fame?; 3. To what extent are translators’ status and work under-valued, as the established “visibility paradigm” suggests?; 4. How far is the “visibility paradigm” applicable in non-European/North American contexts? The first three questions above call for specific answers in specific contexts, rather than general answers.

### 0.2. The perception of translators in Japan

In general, literary translators in Japan are regarded as 黒子 (kuroko), or 黒衣 (kurogo) which literally means ‘black-robed’ in English (Tanabe & Mitsufuji, 2008:
10). *Kuroko* refers to “traditional Japanese theatre stagehands dressed in black, implying invisibility” (Gillespie, 2016: 302). In translation practice, it refers to translators who consciously attempt to make themselves invisible in their texts. Japanese translators seem to prefer directing the attention of the readers to the books rather than themselves and are happy to conform to Japanese publishing norms that focus on fluency. A celebrity translator, Shibata Motoyuki, who is arguably one of the most prominent Japanese translators (Kotani, 2009: 152-153), confirms in an interview ("A Translator is *Kurogo*", 1989) that he prefers to remain invisible in translation:

(...) The best compliment to me is when [readers] tell me [they] don’t feel like they are reading a translation.

However, despite their attempts to remain invisible, Japanese translators’ status and contribution are recognised and valued by publishers and readers alike (Akashi & Hadley, 2015: 1). Furthermore, there are highly prominent translators who can be regarded as celebrities. David Bellos (2011: 303) argues that these translators are treated how authors in the UK and USA are treated. Not only are their works regularly mentioned in the reviews of literary critics, but they are also invited to promotional events and book signings. Moreover, books are published in Japan which mainly feature interviews with translators and celebrity gossip about them; for example, *翻訳家列伝 101* (Hon’yaku-ka retsuden 101, 2009) [The Lives of 101 Translators], or *翻訳文学ブックカフェ* (Hon’yaku bungaku bukku café, 2004/2007) [Translated Literature Book Cafe]. This phenomenon contradicts Venuti’s conceptualisation, which lays responsibility for translators’ fluency-focused approaches in the European and North American contexts on translators’ invisibility. Might invisibility be held responsible here? The Japanese example suggests that the factors that result in translators’ visibility may be more complex than Venuti imagines, and a number of other critics have already

---

2 Translated texts in square brackets are my own back translations, unless otherwise stated, throughout this thesis.
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begun to analyse such additional factors. For instance, Carmen M. Toledano-Buendía (2013) argues that paratexts, which will be the main focus of Chapter Four, can be a powerful factor in creating translator prominence. Rakefet Sela-Sheffy (2008: 610), on the other hand, suggests that translators’ “personae” are the keys to their visibility.

0.3. Analysing translator status

This thesis aims to identify those factors other than translation strategies involved in the process of creating translator prominence, through analysis of celebrity translators, their publishers and readers. Ruokonen (2013: 327) argues that translator status is underexplored, and, with the exception of the work of Sela-Sheffy, most such studies dealing with status are centred on practitioners working in business or other areas of non-literary translation (e.g. Koskinen 2009, 2008; Ruokonen 2013, 2016; Dam & Zethsen 2008, 2016). These studies depend on translators’ self-evaluations, focusing on the relationship between their status and prestige. Similarly, Sela-Sheffy, who examines Israeli literary translators, relies heavily on translators’ accounts of their own actions and cultural standing. However, her studies do not include evidence about readers’ reception of translations or the involvement of publishers. Hence, the methodologies of those that study translators’ status in translation studies do not seem to take into account the relationship between translators, publishers and readers or the commercial aspects of books as commodities (Frow, 1997: 139).³

Translator status studies such as those listed above typically draw on Pierre Bourdieu’s field theory which has been widely applied in the sociology of translation. One of the key notions in Bourdieusian theory, which is frequently used in relation to translator visibility, is symbolic capital which is “the recognition, institutionalised or not, that they receive from a group” (Bourdieu, 1991: 72). Symbolic capital in translation is usually formed when translators earn recognition for their qualities, including their talents, skills and cultural knowledge, from other agents in the same field. Translators may attain visibility through the accumulation of such capital.

³ For an analysis of books as commodities, see Frow (1997: 139)
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However, this conceptualisation is problematic to apply to my analysis of these celebrity translators for a number of reasons. First, symbolic capital is usually field-specific capital and it is not necessarily valid outside the field in which the capital is earned (Driessens, 2013: 551). This phenomenon is manifested in Dam & Zethsen’s study of Danish business translators (2016). They demonstrate that the visibility translators gain through the accumulation of symbolic capital in translation practice is usually valid only within their translator communities (ibid.: 183). Conversely, “celebrity capital can work across social fields” (Driessens, 2013: 511). This is evident in the way Murakami’s literary celebrity has crossed over to have significant influence on his celebrity status as a translator (Akashi, 2018: 1, 6). A second reason is that celebrity capital is linked to “accumulated media visibility through recurrent media representation” (Driessens, 2013: 553). This phenomenon is reflected in Sela-Sheffy’s study (2008, 2010) on celebrity translators in the Hebrew context, which will be discussed in Chapter One. She observes that translators who promote their artistic personae are more likely to attract media attention, and thus, have greater chances of attaining celebrity status than those whose recognition is centred on their impersonal professional skills. In other words, translators are unlikely to attain public visibility unless their distinctive qualities are talked about and circulated in the media. Similarly, habitus, another key notion in Bourdieusian theory is not directly relevant for my analysis. Bourdieu (1990: 10), drawing on an old Aristotelian and Thomistic concept, describes habitus as “a way of escaping from the choice between a structuralism without subject and the philosophy of the subject”. Habitus is produced by “the conditionings associated with a particular class of conditions” (Gouanvic, 2014: 32). Gouanvic (ibid.; 2005, 517-518) explains that a translator’s habitus is a disposition “formed exclusively in exercising in his or her trade”, and it influences the translator’s behaviour, including the choice of source texts and translation strategies. However, this research does not solely focus on the relationship between translators’ status and their translation practice, as translator status studies often do, but it also considers the translators’ other professions, as well as other factors, including the commercial aspects of the translators and their works in relation to their prominence, such as how they are promoted by publishers. Hence, although these concepts are clearly relevant to some extent in any celebrity translator discourse, as demonstrated by the translation studies scholars mentioned above, they are less relevant in the case of the Japanese translator celebrity
Introduction

phenomenon, where multiple broader factors and contexts much also be considered in any attempt to account for their celebrity.

Wenche Ommundsen (2007: 246) argues that celebrity authors are a marketing tool, and are “engaged in careful manipulation of their public self-image to accommodate competing regimes of literary value”, the process in which context applies to celebrity in general. Ommundsen’s description of celebrity authors suggests that when a translator is a celebrity, he or she can similarly function as a marketing tool to promote the translation, particularly in contexts such as Japan, where celebrity translators are treated in the same manner as authors (Bellos, 2011: 303). Furthermore, prior methodological approaches in translation studies have not investigated the other professions a translator may practice in terms of their influence on translator visibility. This thesis attempts to explore this notion of translator visibility by examining celebrity translators in Japan, comparing them with their counterparts in other cultural contexts from the perspective of celebrity. The analysis incorporates approaches from the young discipline of celebrity studies into existing methodologies in translation studies. Considering the Japanese tendency to perceive well-known literary translators as authors mentioned above, the processes involved in the production of celebrity in the area of translation may be comparable to those of literary celebrity. The thesis posits the hypothesis that translator prominence is actively produced, based on the same principles that govern how celebrity is produced more generally.

This thesis begins with a brief introduction to widely applied notions of celebrity, aiming to illustrate how celebrity can be defined in a range of domains. The introduction will also discuss how celebrities are perceived in the cultural contexts which will be analysed in Chapter One. These contexts are: Hebrew, Chinese and Japanese. The discussion of celebrity here will include literary celebrity, the production processes of which will be compared with translator celebrity in Chapter One.
0.4. Defining celebrity (Chapter One)

0.4.1. Categories of celebrity

A variety of terms, including ‘star’, ‘hero’, ‘idol’, and ‘icon’, are used to describe famous individuals, depending on the cultural sphere to which each belongs. Many existing analyses in celebrity studies centre on a “taxonomy of fame”, which distinguishes celebrity from other types of fame (Franssen & Honings, 2016: 4). Star and idol, for instance, are often associated with talent and achievements in areas such as film, sports, and pop music (Driessens, 2013b: 544), while celebrity is frequently viewed as a “general and encompassing term” to describe individuals who are famous for being famous (Marshall, 1997: 7), irrespective of the factors that first led to their visibility (Holmes & Redmond 2016: 10-12). Su Holmes & Sean Redmond (2007: 8) argue that the use of the term celebrity is fluid and that defining the various instances in which it occurs is problematic as there are no clear boundaries between different types of fame. This is evident in the lack of a standardised use of terminology, except perhaps for ‘stardom’ in film studies (ibid.). James Monaco (1978) employs the term hero to refer to a person who attracts attention by an act of heroism, while he uses the term star for those who achieve fame by developing public personae that become larger than their professional career. ‘Quasar’, in Monaco’s terminology, describes a person who becomes famous by accident, which is also described as ‘accidental celebrity’ by Turner et al. (2000). Chris Rojek (2001, 2012) categorises celebrities as ‘ascribed’, ‘achieved’ and ‘attributed’. Ascribed refers to a person whose blood lineage attracts attention, such as the British royal family, while achieved typically applies to those who attain fame by their skills and talent. Attributed celebrity is purely constructed by the media. However, Graeme Turner (2014: 25) points out that although attribution follows as a consequence of achievement, it can also occur without any achievements. Rojek (2001: 20) creates further categories, including ‘celetoid’ for “any form of compressed, concentrated attributed celebrity”, including lottery winners and the lovers of public figures, who attract intense media attention one day and are forgotten the next. Celetoids then overlap with quasars or accidental celebrities (Turner, 2014: 25). Hence, there are no clear boundaries between those who have achieved fame and those who are famous for their ‘well-knownness’: accomplishments can be the primary reason for...
attaining celebrity status, but once such status is attained, the personal lives of celebrities may attract more media attention than their professional career (Holmes & Redmond, 2004: 3).

The examples above seem to suggest that celebrities tend to be categorised by the degree of randomness involved in the achievement of their status; that is, whether it was purely a matter of luck, or if they actively worked to bring it about. This approach of categorisation is useful in describing what celebrities are, and I will employ it in my analysis of celebrity translators, based on the degree of prominence. However, the factors that create celebrity are complex, and its production process requires such intermediaries as agents, publicist and managers.

0.4.2. The production process of celebrity

Joshua Gamson (1994) focuses on how celebrities are produced and what they mean for audiences. He views celebrity as an industry which involves the intermediaries mentioned above. He demonstrates that celebrities are publicised and marketed in a way similar to that of commodities and are consumed by the fans and audiences who engage with them. Celebrities provide pleasure for the audiences who admire them. Turner, by contrast, focuses on the functions of the public interest in personalities. He argues that “privileging of the personal self (the personality) as the object of publicity [...] is characteristic of contemporary celebrity” (Turner, 2014: 14). Furthermore, he adds that public figures are transformed into celebrities when media interest shifts from their professional careers to their private lives (ibid.: 8). Wenche Ommundsen (2007) has a similar view of literary celebrities which will be discussed later. He observes that a celebrity author’s “personal interviews, photographs in private settings, autobiographical and confessional writings” are what attract publicity rather than literary skills (ibid.:244, 246-247). Alternatively, David P. Marshall (1997: 56) interprets celebrity as a ‘sign’ which generates meanings that privilege people in different social groups. “Celebrity signs represent personality – more specifically, personalities that are given heightened cultural significance within the social world” (ibid.: 57). He explains that “the types of messages that celebrity provides are modalised
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around forms of individual identification, social difference and distinction, and the universality of personality types” (ibid.: 65). Through an examination of celebrities in film, television and the music industry, Marshall demonstrates how these particular meanings and distinctions are valued within a specific domain and among its audience or consumers. He explains that film celebrity is constructed to represent individuality in contemporary culture (ibid.: 79-118), while television celebrity is structured around ‘conceptions of familiarity’ (ibid.: 119-149). Music celebrity, on the other hand, is built through discourses of authenticity (ibid.: 150-184). My analysis will also draw on the above approaches in investigating the factors that create translator celebrity.

0.4.3. Historical approaches

Another approach to examining celebrity is through historical analysis, which focuses on the relationship between the development of technology and society and the celebrity phenomenon in contemporary cultures. This perspective is relevant to my research, which will trace the emergence of celebrity translators back to the late nineteenth century. Driessens (2013a: 643-644) argues that there is a paucity of analysis of celebrity in historical research due to common assumptions in media studies that the celebrity phenomenon emerged only around the beginning of the twentieth century. Similarly, celebrity studies in Asian contexts rarely seem to trace the roots of celebrity back to before the post-Second World War period after which popular culture played a significant social role during the emergence of modernity in those contexts (Fitzsimmons, 2013: 1, 3).

Technological development, especially the rise of mass media, is important in the emergence of celebrity culture. Studies that focus on the aspects of technological development are frequently seen in studies on literary and film celebrity. In his investigation into the origin of film celebrities, Marshall (1997, 2014) goes back to the early twentieth century, and examines how the roles of film stars shifted around that period, prior to which they were referred to as “picture performers” (2014: 80). Marshall (ibid.) distinguishes between the terms ‘performing’ and ‘acting’: the former is associated with “a display of natural action”, while the latter denotes “the artifice of becoming a person one was playing”. This shift relates to technical developments such
as close-ups, which emphasised individual performers’ staged personalities, generating the curiosity of audiences. Actors’ screen personae were maintained by publicising supposed areas of their private lives that related to the images of their stage roles. Bette Davis (1908-1989), who was regarded as “Queen of Warner’s”, is a good example of this (Klaprat, 1985: 355). The film company Warner Brothers constructed her star persona around the popular roles she played in order to maintain the audience’s attraction to the actress (ibid.: 355-360). Marshall (ibid.: 82-83), alternatively, claims that it was the publicity which made these actors into celebrities in the first place, generating demand on the part of audiences by “enlarging the meanings of actors” and feeding the audience’s desire to know about them (ibid.: 82-83). Chapter Two will adopt Marshall’s approach and will consider the relationship between the emergence of celebrity translators and the development of print culture in the late nineteenth century.

0.4.4. Fans and audiences

So far in this introduction, broad definitions of celebrity and the process of its production have been discussed. However, there are other important factors in the discussion of celebrity, including fans and audience. Celebrity commodities do not exist without their consumers, and celebrities need audiences who admire them and appreciate their presence. Gabler & Fellow (2001: 8) conceptualise the role of celebrities as “human-entertainment”. They entertain the audience, not merely by displaying their exceptional talent or physical beauty, but also by exhibiting the process of living itself. The audience can follow the celebrities’ life stories and related everyday gossip closely through the media of television, tabloid newspapers, magazines, and the Internet, and develop a sense of familiarity with the celebrities in question. What excites the audience are the vulnerable sides of their personalities behind the celebrities’ manufactured fame (ibid.: 12-13; Holmes & Redmond, 2006: 4). These personalities, of course, are inauthentic constructions. Nevertheless, they reflect the fears, joys and troubles in the lives of common people (Gabler & Fellow, ibid.; Holmes & Redmond, ibid.): fans evaluate their own relationships, identities, and social and cultural norms.

---

4 This phenomenon is also observable in the case of celebrity translator Kishimoto Sachiko whose failure in her previous career as an “office lady” seems to create intimacy between her and readers (see Chapter One, p. 62).
through narratives of celebrities as real human beings (Turner, 2004: 24). These factors, therefore, enable the audience to relate to celebrities on an emotional level. Holmes & Redmond (2006: 3) argue that individuals who are emotionally and socially confused seek a “self-directed healing process” in idealised celebrities; they see the distorted side of celebrities’ personal lives and feel assured that they are not alone in suffering emotionally.

However, fans are not merely the receivers of celebrity entertainment. Fandom contributes to the production of celebrities, by, for instance, providing dedicated websites. The networks of communication in these websites form interactions between fan communities, which enable them to share their personal views on the lives celebrities represent (Holmes & Redmond, 2006: 3). This interaction brings them a sense of belonging, which compensates for the loss of community caused by the decline of the nuclear family phenomenon (Schickel, 1985). Thus, celebrity is not just an object of aspiration, but also functions as a form of network, connecting people through various media platforms and building a new dimension to community (Holmes & Redmond, 2006: 3; Turner, 2004: 6). The perspective of the relationship between the fan and the celebrity given above is relevant to the reader-translator relationship, constructed by direct and indirect communication through social media sites, blogs and promotional events. The significance of the relationship in the production process of the celebrity translator will also be demonstrated in Chapters Five.

0.4.5. Perceptions of celebrities in the Hebrew, Chinese and Japanese contexts

In Israel, celebrities with talent and those without are clearly distinguished. The Israel Prize is given to talented intellectuals whose achievements have been publicly recognised, while the Israel Celeb Awards are given to celebrities without talent who have achieved nothing beyond contributing to the “Israel gossip scene” (Moshe, 2013: 3). However, Andrzej Klimk (2013: 1) argues that the personae of celebrities with artistic talent, such as architects in contemporary Israel, attract more media attention than their works. He describes the architect Zaha Hadids as an example of someone whose charismatic personality captured media attention, including from influential
lifestyle magazines, such as *Vanity Fair* and *Vogue* (ibid.: 5-6). Similarly, Sandra Mayer (2004: 2) infers that skilled individuals such as authors gather more media attention by appearing in televised interviews, being featured in magazines, and giving speeches than through their works. Hence, while the works they produce are still important, their personae and public appearances play key roles in the creation of celebrity in Israel.

Unlike the Israeli context above, the categorisation of celebrities in Chinese contexts not only includes those with talent and those without but also those who demonstrate patriotism toward their society, as illustrated by the various contributions included in the collection *Celebrity in China* (Edwards & Jeffreys, 2010). Examples include military figures, patrons of charities, as well as accidental heroes. Louise Edwards & Elaine Jeffreys (ibid.: 15) argue that celebrity culture in Chinese contexts is influenced by both socialist values and aspects of its European and North American counterparts. Good deeds, bravery and patriotism earn individuals admiration, while affluent lifestyles also create public interest. However, unlike European and North American contexts, notoriety and gossip seem to have less impact on the formation of Chinese celebrity. Thus, the factors that create celebrity in Chinese contexts seem to rely heavily on inner qualities.

In the case of Japan, publicly known individuals are commonly referred to as 有名 人 (yūmei-jin) or 著名 人 (chomei-jin). However, the former is a broad categorisation and covers any type of well-known individual, including those who are notorious, while the latter is more specific and refers to an eminent or renowned person (Weblio Dictionary). Therefore, the term *chomei* is frequently used for famous individuals who are talented, such as artists, writers, sports people, as well as translators, while those who are not necessarily talented, such as pop idols, are likely to be referred to only as yūmei. On the other hand, the Japanese term セレブ (serebu), which is short for celebrity, usually refers to individuals who are economically affluent, elegant or rated as first-class in their roles. Thus, celebrities in general belong to the category of yūmei-jin.

Unlike the other two contexts above, the discussion of celebrities in Japan frequently centres on pop idols (Lukács, 2010; Galbraith and Karlin, 2012; Minowa, 2013). One of the factors that is seen in celebrity production in the Japanese context,
especially that of pop idols, is that agencies known as 事務所 (jimusho) [offices] determine the success of celebrities in great part (Marx, 2012: 49). Jimusho are performer management companies and “are most responsible for the content of the entertainment world” in current Japan (ibid.: 36). Jimusho create performers, including idols, from scratch and “control every aspect of the performers’ public images and careers” (ibid.). Fandom is another powerful factor crucial to the success of celebrities which is manifested in how the production of a pop idol centres on the individual’s interaction with his or her fans and audiences through blogs and public events (Minowa, 2013: 53). However, as in European and North American contexts, the production strategies of celebrities in Japan vary depending on the industry in which celebrities are produced.

The examples of widely applied existing studies given above demonstrate that examining the agents who act as intermediaries in producing celebrities, the commodity value of individuals and the reactions of fans are important in analysing celebrities in general. Incorporating the same approach into the existing methodologies of translation studies will enable the analysis to identify the commercial value of literary translators and their works, plus how this value might relate to their prominence, in addition to how readers’ reactions contribute to that prominence.

0.4.6. Literary celebrity

Like other celebrities, literary celebrities create their prominence through publicity, media appearances, such as interviews and talk shows, biographies, advertising and book signings (Turner, 2014: 21). They also have a fan-base that behaves much like fans of other types of celebrities (ibid.). Gaston Franssen and Rick Honings (2016: 7) suggest that there are three processes, combinations of which are crucial to the emergence of literary celebrity culture. These are: “mediatisation”, “personalisation” and “commodification” (Driessens, 2013a: 650-651). Mediatisation generally signifies the influence of the media (ibid.: 650), which is not limited to technology but includes the media as “organisations and as a social institution” (ibid.; Krotz, 2009: 23) in which a media personality who has the potential to become a celebrity may be generated (Driessens, 2013a: 650). Personalisation, in Driessens’s (ibid.: 651) view, runs parallel
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to individualisation, and means emphasising the individual over the members of a community by highlighting the personality. Subsequently, personalisation can be turned into commodification by the addition of economic value (ibid.: 652). Hence, literary celebrity may be created through a succession of the three processes, provided that the writer earns recognition for the works he or she has produced in the first place. Driessens’s (2013a) approach enables my analysis to examine publishers’ marketing strategies in relation to translator celebrity in Chapter One.

In the following, I will first present a brief introduction to celebrity authorship, beginning with the emergence of literary celebrity culture.

0.4.6.1 The Romantic celebrity author

Celebrity authorship first emerged during the Romantic period, when key developments in economics, technology, ideology and copyright occurred. These developments enabled authors to acquire independent authorship, as opposed to being dependent on patronage, and also enabled the mass-production of books. Tom Mole (2007) describes Byron as one of the earliest examples of this phenomenon. In his *Byron's Romantic Celebrity: Industrial Culture and the Hermeneutic of Intimacy*, Mole argues that celebrity authorship emerged in the Romantic era when print culture became industrialised. He investigates Byron’s celebrity authorship which emerged at a distinctive historical moment, based on the premise that celebrity is a cultural system structured by “the relations between an individual, an industry and an audience” (ibid.: xi). Mole (ibid.: xii) demonstrates that literary celebrity in the Romantic period consisted of the distinctive qualities, including artistic talent, which made a person superior to others, high social status and public persona.

Byron was “the most celebrated English poet of his – or any – age” who became a phenomenon, following the success of *Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage* (1812-1818) (Wilson, 1999: 4). Not only were his poems read by many but also his manner of dress and even facial expressions were copied by his passionate admirers (Macaulay, 1831: 316). Annabella Milbank terms this “contemporary rage” for the poet “Byromania” (Wilson, 1999: 3). Furthermore, the impact of Byron on the public has been compared to that of James Dean and Mick Jagger (ibid.: 10). Byron portrayed himself in his works, notably *Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage*, and readers conflated his private self with the hero in his works, which is not dissimilar to the ways in which twentieth-century film actors
achieved stardom by creating the illusion that their on-screen and off-screen personalities were identical (ibid.: 5, Gledhill, 1991: xvi). Similarly, Franssen & Honings (2016: 12) argue that literary celebrity consists of not only the author’s works but their personalities and that readers often attempt to link the author’s personality to the characters in their works. Walter Scott (1771-1832) commented that Byron’s resemblance to Childe Harold became too close, to the extent that his literary creation seemed to emulate the real-life Byron (Lockhart, 1902: 127). Similarly, Wilson (1999: 10) refers to this phenomenon as “his works having written him”; that is to say, the protagonist of his own work became the author himself (1999: 10). As a result of the Byromania phenomenon, Byron’s fame eventually outgrew his reputation as a poet (ibid.: 4-5). In this respect, during his lifetime London Magazine (1821) suggested: “The personal interest, we believe, has always been above the poetical in Lord Byron’s compositions […]” (cited in ibid.: 10). Thus, the readers’ interests in Byron’s private self rather than his works was what distinguished him from other famous poets of his time. One comparable example in our time could be David Beckham, whose celebrity status outgrew his status as a skilled footballer.

0.4.6.2. The celebrity author in contemporary cultures: Murakami genshō

In Byron’s case, personalisation seems to be manifested particularly prominently, as was typical in the case of other Romantic celebrity authors (Bennett, 2004: 44-54). By contrast, Ommundsen (2007: 245) suggests that the key to creating contemporary literary celebrity is one’s “ability to be branded”, thus initiating commodification. He explains that the combination of the notion of author as “cultural hero” and the general idea of celebrity makes an author into a distinctive cultural brand, even if the brand tends to be less commercialised than those of the average celebrity (ibid.). This aspect is very noticeable in the contemporary case of Murakami Haruki. Hirabayashi Mitoko (2009: 8) describes how Murakami’s name as a “brand” functions in a similar way to that of a popular fashion designer whose name is marketed on a wide range of goods, from perfumes to towels. Murakami is inarguably one of the world’s most celebrated novelists today, to the extent that his level of celebrity is immeasurable (Hensher, 2011). There are, of course, contemporary writers who have acquired international celebrity status, including Bret Easton Ellis, Margaret Atwood, Salman Rushdie and Zadie Smith (Franssen & Honings, 2016: 1). However, what distinguishes Murakami from his celebrity contemporaries is, as will be illustrated below, the scale of the branding
strategy. Murakami, whose celebrity as a translator will be examined in Chapters One, Three and Four, is presented here as an ideal example of the commodification process, due to the scale of his celebrity status. As will become clear as my analysis develops, Murakami’s fame as a translator is closely related to his literary fame. Therefore, it is relevant to consider Murakami as a novelist prior to examining his status as a translator.

Murakami’s enormous popularity as a novelist has developed into a phenomenon on a scale no other Japanese writers achieved (Rubin, 2012: 160). His novels in English translation are usually bestsellers (Miura, 2013), and they have been made into films (e.g. *Norwegian Wood*, Kamayama, Ogawa & Tran, 2010) and adapted for the stage (e.g. *Kafka on the Shore*, Niwanaga, 2012). Furthermore, Murakami has a dedicated fan base who queue up overnight to buy his latest novel at book launches (McCurry & Flood, 2013). He was even voted one of the world’s most influential people by *Time* magazine in 2015 (Ono, 2015). The Murakami craze emerged after the publication of his first bestseller ノルウェーの森 (Noruwē no mori) [*Norwegian Wood*] in 1987 (Miura, 2003), which has sold over 10 million copies in Japan (Numano, 2013: 129). The craze surrounding Murakami’s fame is frequently referred to as 村上現象 (Murakami genshō), or the ‘Murakami Phenomenon’ (Wakatsuki 2016: 1). His name is marketed as a brand on a variety of things, including guides to his works and books of dishes that the main protagonists in his novels cook, as well as books on music featured in his novels. Examples include: *Happy Jack 鼠の心－村上春樹の研究読本* (Happy Jack nezumi no kokoro: Murakami Haruki no kenkyū dokuhon, Takahashi, 2000) [The Heart of Rat, the Happy Jack: A Study Book about Murakami Haruki]; 厳選村上レシピ (Gensen Murakami reshipi, Okamoto, 2012) [Hand-picked Murakami Recipes]; and 村上春樹を音楽で読み解く (Murakami Haruki o ongaku de yomitoku, Kuribayashi & Ōtani et al., 2010) [Reading Murakami Haruki Through Music]. Thus, it is not only his writings that attract readers, but also the particular music, food, or literature associated with the protagonists in his novels (Numano & Uchida, 2010: 166). Furthermore, *Murakami genshō* is not limited to the publication of the books described above, but is also manifested in organised events, such as 村上春樹を「聴く’ (Murakami Haruki o ’kiku’) [*Listen’ to Murakami Haruki*], a music event which took place on February 29th and March 1st 2016 at the Galaxy Theatre in Tokyo, where the music featured in *Colourless Tsukuru Tazaki and His Years of Pilgrimage* (2013c),
Norwegian Wood and 1Q84 was played live. The same concert had previously been performed in Seoul and Singapore in 2015. Similarly, a festival on a larger scale was organised in Rotterdam in January 2018 to celebrate the publication of De Moord Op Commendatore [Killing Commandatore]. This two-day event, which took place on a cruise ship, not only included poetry readings, a workshop, film viewings, dramatic adaptations and music related to Murakami, but Murakami-inspired food was served and merchandise bearing the author’s name was sold.

Besides the music, literature and food, Murakami’s novels themselves seem to function as a “recognisable trademark” (Franssen, 2017: 228). Franssen (ibid.: 226-227) explains that the author repeats particular themes, plots and characters in his writing, which are represented in Murakami Bingo, a game created by Grant Snider (2012). As can be seen in the Bingo, features such as mysterious women, secret passageways, cats, faceless villains, parallel worlds and old jazz records have repeatedly appeared in Murakami’s novels, and his fans relate these to the author (Franssen, 2017: 227). Indeed, they expect to find such typically Murakamian characteristics when reading his works (ibid.).

Thus, it could be argued that by sharing the music the protagonists listen to and the food they cook, Murakami’s readers are able to relate to the author indirectly, linking the author’s personality with the characters in his novels (Franssen & Honings 2016: 12). Furthermore, Franssen (2017: 228) supports the view that the Murakami brand is a product generated not only by intermediaries who invest in his fame, but also by the author’s willingness to cater to his readers’ expectations. Thus, reading his novels can provide readers with a form of dialogical (two-way) communication with Murakami through which they are able to build intimacy with the author without being exposed to narratives surrounding his private life, as in Byron’s case. Hence, while Murakami’s talent as a writer was a core factor in creating his celebrity status in the first place, branding strategies are what have taken the author’s celebrity to a point beyond the scale that his contemporaries have achieved.
0.4.7. Translator celebrity

The existing research in celebrity studies considered above has demonstrated variability in the nature of celebrity status and its production processes. It therefore seems plausible that celebrity may be produced in the translation industry, although appearances of this phenomenon are arguably rare in European and North American contexts, where translators are conceptualised as invisible by default (Venuti, 2008: 8).

Research has been done into a number of prominent translators across the globe: examples include Mohandas K. Gandhi (1869-1948), who, among his many other accomplishments, played an important role in the Gujarati translation of English literature (Prajapati, 2004), the acclaimed Argentinian writer and poet Jorge Luis Borges (Leone, 2011), and Iranian writer Jalal Āl-e Ahmad (جلال آل احمد) (Hanson, 1983). Moreover, prominent translators also exist in European and North American contexts: for instance, the former Irish Poet Laureate and Nobel Prize winner Seamus Heaney in Ireland (Brazeau, 2001; Hordis, 2010), Aldo Busi in Italy (Giusti, 1997), Dmitry Puchkov in Russia (Rulyova, 2005) and Ann Goldstein in the United States (Burgess, 2016). Translations by Heaney, such as his *Beowulf* (1999), have received particularly close attention. However, with the exception of Burgess, who briefly examines Goldstein’s prominence in her study, research focusing on the prominent translators of India, Iran, Argentina, and Europe frequently centres on text analysis. The prominent status of translators, its historical, cultural background and its implications are marginal to these discussions and rarely seen in research available in the English language. The notable exceptions are the Chinese and Hebrew contexts, where such socio-cultural factors are more frequently addressed. The celebrity translators in these contexts appear to have been examined with a focus on their prominent status per se to a greater extent than their counterparts elsewhere. In this dissertation, then, I intend to take these Chinese and Hebrew examples as a starting point and expand the discussion of translator celebrity to include Japan.

Chapter One will examine celebrity translators, employing the celebrity studies approaches summarised above. First, the analysis will attempt to categorise translator celebrity, focusing on identifying the difference in the level of each translator’s prominence. It will explore how that level is reflected in their translation practices. The
influence of their translation practices on the level of their prominence will also be examined as one of the potential factors that create translator celebrity. This method will enable the analysis to compare the relationship between translation practices and the level of visibility of translators in Venuti’s paradigm. The chapter then will proceed to focus on the production process of celebrity translators by drawing on Turner (2014), Gamson (1994) and Marshall (1997). The analysis will examine individual translators from the perspective of the three processes: “mediatisation”, “personalisation” and “commodification” (Driessens, 2013a: 650-651). The study will investigate the position of Japanese celebrity translators in comparison with their counterparts in other geographical areas and literary cultures.

As in celebrity studies, there are a number of terms to describe visible translators, including prominent, famous, established, well-known, acclaimed and recognised. However, these terms do not have equal values, and what Venuti refers to as a “visible” translator is not necessarily famous or a celebrity (Stock, 2018: 31). He does not provide clear definitions of ‘visible’ as opposed to ‘invisible’ translators. In this thesis, I employ the term ‘prominence’ when describing the state of an individual who already has recognition in various degrees, including celebrities, as opposed to ‘visibility’, which is broader and denotes the state of being able to be seen (Oxford English Dictionary). Thus, the latter can also mean a visible state of an individual who was previously invisible. In addition, I use the term ‘fame’ when describing the state of those who have celebrity status. As in Venuti’s paradigm, terms that describe translator status in Japan are ambiguous. As explained earlier, famous translators in Japan are likely to be referred to as chomei [renowned], or chomei hon’yaku-ka [renowned translator]. However, the term chomei does not describe the degree of prominence, since it can just mean an established translator who has certain recognition, as well as an exceptionally famous individual such as Murakami. In the analysis of Japanese translators, I will employ the term ‘celebrity’ to describe translators with exceptional levels of fame, even though the term does not have equivalence in Japanese. The reason for this is that the commercial aspect of their fame resembles those of celebrities in general. This commercial aspect of celebrity translators is what clearly distinguishes them from other so-called chomei translators, as will be demonstrated in the main analysis. There are currently three translators included in this study to whom the term celebrity applies; the remainder, who have a certain degree of recognition for their works, will be referred to
as ‘recognised’ translators. Although the degree of recognition varies within the latter group, I will not classify them into smaller categories, except in Chapter Five, since the main focus of the analysis is celebrity translators. In addition, the number of translators who will be examined in Chapter One is small. As Chapter Five, on the other hand, investigates a larger group of translators, some extra category is required in order to consider how the level of translators’ prominence might influence their translation practice and publishers’ approaches to marketing strategies. First, I divide the chomei translators into the four broad categories below (Figure 1). These are: 1. recognised translator; 2. media active; 3. celebrity; and 4. super-celebrity.

**Figure 1: The category of ‘chomei’ translators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fame category</th>
<th>The basic factors that create their fame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recognised</td>
<td>The translations they produce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Media active</td>
<td>The translations they produce + media coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Celebrity</td>
<td>The translations they produce + media coverage + personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Super-celebrity</td>
<td>The translations they produce + media coverage + personality + global fame</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first group consists of translators whose works are mainly what attracts the attention of readers and critics. The second group are the translators who make regular appearances in newspaper columns, book reviews, and translation-related events. Thus, their faces are familiar to a wider group of readers than those in the recognised category. In the third group are those whose personalities also seem to attract the attention of the media. Finally, the fourth category belongs to Murakami Haruki, who has global fame for his writing career, the scale of which is incomparable to all other translators here. Thus, Murakami is a category in himself. Chapter One will analyse the above groups, with the exception of the second group, who will be included in Chapter Five. It will then proceed to consider how translator celebrity is constructed by exploring the factors that create prominence, including translators’ other professional activities. The degree to which translator celebrity is comparable to celebrity in other branches of contemporary culture will also be addressed, as will whether the celebrity translator phenomenon appears in certain types of cultural contexts to a greater extent than others.
Japanese celebrity translators in each category will be examined. In the recognised category are Ogawa Takayoshi and Echizen Toshiya. Ogawa has been selected because besides being a typical representative of practising translators in this category, he has translated the same source text as Murakami, allowing direct comparisons which will be made in the text analysis in Chapter Three.\(^5\) Echizen, on the other hand, is arguably a rare case, who quickly earned his first recognition solely by producing a best-seller. Matsuoka Yuko, the translator of *Harry Potter*, also fits into this category. However, the analysis in this chapter focuses on translators whose major works are adult literature. *Celebrity* includes Shibata Motoyuki and Kishimoto Sachiko, while Murakami Haruki is the super-celebrity. These translators, the nature of whose prominence seems to differ, have been selected in order to identify the variety of factors that create translator celebrity. I have also limited my selection to those who are currently active in translation practice in order to maintain the consistency.\(^6\) Their cases will be compared with celebrity translators in other language contexts: those in the Chinese contexts, including Cao Ying and Lin Shaohua in mainland China, Lai Mingzhu in Taiwan,\(^7\) and in the Israeli context such as Nili Mirsky.

**0.5. A historical analysis of celebrity translators (Chapter Two)**

The existing research in celebrity studies mentioned earlier demonstrates that historical analysis is important in understanding contemporary celebrity culture (e.g. Marshall, 1997, 2014; Mole, 2007). Similarly, Venuti (2008: 43) also investigates the emergence of fluent translation in English language by tracing its roots back to seventeenth century Britain, where foreign ideologies were seen as threats to its culture and society by their aristocratic literary culture. For this reason, cultural diversity, political and racial elements in translation were usually eliminated (ibid.). Drawing on these perspectives,

---

\(^5\) Nozaki Takashi, whose translation will also be included in the text analysis, is not included here as he was most active between the 1960s and 1980s before his death in 1995.

\(^6\) Cao Ying and Nili Mirsky were active when this research began but passed away in 2015 and 2018 respectively.

\(^7\) All the Chinese names are listed with surnames first, followed by first names, following Chinese custom.
Chapter Two turns to a diachronic approach and seeks to analyse the idiosyncratic historical conditions underlying the emergence of a celebrity translation culture in Japan. The study aims to investigate not only the reception of translators’ works but also the ideological or philosophical approaches that may have influenced their translation activities. It will ask whether these factors relate to their acquisition of prominence. Furthermore, the analysis aims to identify whether gender also played a part in the process of creating translator fame during the period.

0.5.1. The history of Japanese translation

Translation has played a number of important roles in the history of Japan since the time when *kanji* (Chinese characters) were imported from China via Korea around the third and fourth centuries (Kondo & Wakabayashi, 2009, 468; Kornicki, 1998: 278-279). Buddhist texts translated into Chinese are said to have been first introduced to Japan around the eighth century by a Japanese monk Genbō (玄昉), who returned from China in 734 (Kornicki, 1998: 284). Between this period and the turn of the seventeenth century, Japan actively imported texts—including medical, philosophical and literary texts, mostly vernacular literature—from China in order to acquire more advanced knowledge (ibid.: 289). Thus, China had a significant impact on the development of intellectual, religious, and cultural life in Japan over a number of centuries (Kondo & Wakabayashi, 2009: 468). Japan’s first contact with the West came in 1543 when shipwrecked Portuguese arrived in Tanegashima, the southern island of Japan (Schurhammer, 1982: 271). The Jesuit Francis Xavier (1506-1552) sent missionaries to Japan in the following year, bringing with them volumes of Christian texts that were the first Western books imported into Japan (Kornicki, 1998: 300). The Portuguese texts translated into Japanese in this period were mostly related to Christianity, with a few exceptions, including Aesop’s *Fables*, which was translated partially in Romanised script and was published by the Jesuits in 1593 (Kondo & Wakabayashi, 2009: 469; Kornicki, 1998: 301). However, the government banned Christianity in 1614 and deported missionaries (Hirasawa, 1993: 80), fearing that the foreign religion would become too influential. Subsequently, in 1639, Japan officially closed its door to foreign traders; this is known as 鎖国 (sakoku) or the ‘closed country’ policy, and it lasted
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until 1854 (Keith, 2011: 179). However, an exception was made for the Korean and Chinese whose first settlers arrived in the pre-modern period, and Dutch citizens who arrived after the Portuguese in the early seventeenth century were allowed to remain and continue trading in restricted areas of Japan (Kondo & Wakabayashi, 2009: 469). During the sakoku a limited number of foreign texts, including those covering surgery, navigation and military matters, were permitted to be imported (Kornicki, 1998: 301), while all Christian books were banned due to the suppression of Christianity (ibid.: 325).

Non-literary texts in Dutch, including those originally written in French, German and English, were actively translated by Dutch interpreters (Kondo & Wakabayashi, 2009: 470) in order to acquire advanced knowledge from Europe (Kornicki, 1998: 300-304; Kondo & Wakabayashi, 2009: 470). However, Japan was forced to end its closed country policy in 1854 with the return of a U.S. naval squadron led by Commodore Matthew Perry which first arrived in the previous year. Subsequently, the Tokugawa shōgunate was pressured into signing a series of unequal treaties, as a result of which special economic and legal privileges were given to a number of dominant western nations (Kimura, 1981: 1). Foreign texts covering a wider variety of subjects, especially literary texts, became available with the end of the sakoku in 1854 (Kondo & Wakabayashi, 2009: 471).

As stated above, translation has been indispensable in modern Japan’s cultural, and political development, which began in the late Tokugawa period (1603-1868) (Kornicki 1998: 304; Sugimoto, 1983; Shinkuma, 2008). However, this phenomenon became even more significant during the following period, after the Meiji government was established in 1868 (Meldrum, 2009: 75). The perceived threat of Western domination led to 明治維新 (Meiji ishin) or the Meiji Restoration, in which Japan believed the construction of a modern westernized nation to be the only way to establish an equal relationship with the great powers of the West (Keith, 2011: 193). The new government actively imported a wide range of literatures, especially of non-literary works, from Europe and the United States (Yamada, 2012: 16; Kondo & Wakabayashi, 2009: 471) in order to acquire information concerning education, governance, economics, medicine and technology, all necessary for a country in the process of

---

8 Dutch interpreters of that period are usually referred to as 阿蘭陀通詞 (Oranda tsūji) in Japanese.
9 Translation has been indispensable in the country’s modernisation as a whole, including technological development which is not discussed here due to limited space.
modernisation (Shinkuma, 2008: 51). Although the majority of translations made during the first decade of the Meiji were educational, including those of *Self-help* (Samuel Smile, 1859), *On Liberty* (J.S. Mill, 1859), and *Du contrat social ou Principes du droit politique* [The Social Contract] (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, 1762), there was also a significant increase in the number of translations of foreign novels by the second decade (Kondo & Wakabayashi, 2009: 471-472). This period is regarded as the beginning of “a golden age of literature translation” (ibid.: 472), which modernised the national literary style. Yamada (2012: 16) states that the modernisation which began in this period was the most significant reform in the history of Japanese literature. The second decade of the Meiji period was also the time when highly-prominent translators emerged (ibid.: 18-19). Hence, the Meiji period can be considered as the most important in any discussion of Japanese translation, and the significance of translation in this period played a large part in generating the basis for the emergence of translator celebrity.

**0.5.2. Translation in the modernisation of Japanese literature**

Kisaka (1988: 364) suggests that the contemporary literary style in Japan developed in four stages: 1. the preparatory stage (1868-1887); 2. the adapting stage (1887–1909); 3. the maturing stage (1909-1935) and 4. the developing stage (1935-). The first two stages occurred during the Meiji period, when a wide variety of translation strategies were apparent: literal approaches that centred on conveying the meanings in the source text; 翻案 (hon’an) [free translation or adaptation], which heavily focuses on readability, and could be read as originals (Sato, 2006: 55-57) and those that combine literal translation with readability (Yamada, 2012: 15). Literal translation and free adaptation co-existed within the translation norms in the contemporary Japanese literary system until the early part of the second stage (Miller, 2001: 13; Mizuno, 2007: 4). These two radically different translation strategies served different purposes: in the former expediency underlay the translation of medical, scientific and philosophical texts (Miller, 2001: 14); the latter was employed for popular genres such as detective fiction, and dramas (Sato, 2006: 56-57). However, during the second stage, the literary trend gradually shifted towards literal translations that were more readable than the earlier
versions. Leading translators such as Morita Shiken (1861-1897) developed translation strategies that focused on the source text but also maintained readability.

The impact of translation on the modernisation of Japanese literary style became increasingly prominent in the later part of the first stage (Yamada, 2012: 18-19). Two very important writing systems were developed through translation as part of literary modernisation: 欧文脈 (ōbunmyaku) [Indo-European style writing] and 言文一致 (genbun itchi) [unification of writing and spoken language]. Broadly speaking, お文脈 consisted of European-style construction and expressions taken from literal translation, combined with the traditional Japanese writing (Kisaka, 1988: 363). Typical features of お文脈 include the use of inverted syntax, personal, expletive and relative pronouns, as well as inanimate and formal subjects (Kisaka, 1987: 106-107). This writing style, which formed wordings that seemed unnatural within Japanese language norms, came to be naturalised in Japanese contemporary writings, as a result (Kisaka, 1988: 378). Conversely, genbun itchi was a colloquial writing style, which was based on the narrative style used in 落語 (rakugo) (Inoue, 2002: 398). Rakugo is a traditional comic storytelling performance, centred on conversations between the characters (Brau, 2008: 1-2), who were typically from a class of labourers, shopkeepers, craftsmen and entertainers who grew up in old town Edo (Novograd, 1974: 188). Futabatei Shimei (1864-1909) became known for incorporating the narrative style of rakugo in his novel 浮雲 (Ukigumo) [Drifting Clouds] which was published between 1887 and 1889 (Inoue, 2006: 84). After publishing the first volume of the novel, Futabatei published a translation of A Sportsman’s Sketches (Turgenev, 1852) as あひゞき (Aibiki) [A Rendezvous], and this has frequently been referred to as the work which marked the foundation of genbun itchi (Mizuno, 2007: 14; 2009: 35; Yanagida, 1935: 152-153, 190-191; Yoshitake, 1959: 112; Ito, 2002: 135-136).

0.5.3. Analysing the roots of celebrity translators

My analysis in Chapter Two explores the emergence of modern Japan’s first prominent translators in the Meiji period (1868-1912) and relates this to the current Japanese phenomenon of the celebrity translator. It specifically focuses on the second half of the
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period when the number of literary translations grew significantly. The chapter argues that this history is key to the development of translator celebrity in Japan, as opposed to the European and North American contexts where more diverse historical contexts did not lead to the same phenomenon. The chapter draws on published accounts of the lives and works of some of the famous Japanese translators of the period who played significant roles in cultural modernisation (e.g. Kobori, 1998; Ito, 1988; Saito, 2008, 2011). The analysis will begin by identifying the roles of prominent Meiji translators through studying anthologies of Japanese translation (e.g. Inoue, 2011, 2012). It especially focuses on the formation of contemporary Japanese literature in that period in which translation was indispensable. A scholar of Japanese translation, Inoue Ken (2011, 2012), has studied translation practices by famous Japanese writers from the late nineteenth century to the present, from Tanizaki Jun’ichirō to Murakami Haruki, and evaluated the significance of their works in the formation of contemporary Japanese literature. He argues that writers who undertake literary translation in parallel to their authorial roles are not at all unique to the Japanese cultural context (Inoue, 2011: 1). However, Inoue observes that Meiji literature underwent a long period in which there were no clear boundaries between original writing, translation and adaptation (ibid.). Put another way, the history of contemporary Japanese literature began in the late nineteenth century with the complete abandonment of the old Japanese literary tradition (Origuchi, cited in Inoue, 2011: 1-2). However, Inoue (ibid.: 3) argues that despite the important roles translations by writers played in the history of Japanese literature, this subject is underexplored in academic studies. Inoue’s claim is evident in how studies of writers’ translations are heavily focused on certain individuals such as Mori Ōgai (e.g. Nagashima, 2005, 2012) and Futabatei Shimei (e.g. Cockerill, 2006, 2011), who are among the most studied Japanese writers and translators of the period. Moreover, these studies typically focus on male writers and translators, rarely including their women contemporaries. For example, 日本の翻訳論: アンソロジーと解題 [Japanese Discourse on Translation: Anthology with Commentary] (Yanabu et al., 2010) includes twenty-nine male translators but no women.

Besides the two mentioned above, there are other Meiji translators who have been widely studied, and were famous. Examples include Morita Shiken, who was regarded as “the king of translation” (Saito, 2011: 215, Sato, 2006: 58), Fukuzawa Yukichi (1835-1901), who produced a number of bestsellers in both original writing
and translation (Yanabu, 2010: 108), and Tsubouchi Shōyō (1859-1935), whose translations, which included works by Shakespeare, were widely read (Sato, 2010: 67-70). The factors that earned these translators fame centre on their contributions in cultural modernisation, such as the introduction of foreign literature, the standardisation of the writing system and the modernisation of literary style. However, the analysis here will also attempt to identify non-translation-practice factors that might have added to the celebrity of Meiji translators. The aim is to consider the conditions in which these translators worked and became famous and how they might relate to the existence of the translator celebrity culture in Japan today.

I have selected three translators who earned fame for a variety of reasons within and beyond their cultural contributions and who represent different categories in terms of the factors that earned them fame. Mori Ōgai (1862-1922), a prolific writer and translator, is a typical example of those who became famous in a traditional way, based on their contributions in cultural modernisation. He has been selected over others in the same category for producing what is arguably the widest variety of literary works in both original and translation among his contemporaries in that period. Ōgai has been compared to Murakami Haruki in terms of the exceptionally high standard of his writing and translation practices and for maintaining both practices in parallel, something which is unusual in both periods (Inoue, 2012: 94). Kuroiwa Ruikō (1862-1920) represents a further category of those who earned fame in a modern way. Besides his cultural contributions, Kuroiwa also owes his fame to media attention, mass readership, and his publishing company. Wakamatsu Shizuko (1864-1896), on the other hand, is the only woman translator who is examined in this analysis. She was one of the first female translators in the period to have her work recognised within the male-dominated literary milieu (Hayashida, 1999: 275; Tanaka, 2000: 6; Cockerill, 2011: 538). What distinguished the process of the creation of Wakamatsu’s fame from those of her contemporaries was that her publicity involved photography, one of the necessary tools in the production of celebrity today. Examining the translators in the above categories enables my analysis to identify the extent to which a translator’s talents and skills are important in gaining prominence, whether gender had any influence in translator prominence, and how significant a translator’s other professions are in the creation of their fame.

Existing studies of the above translators are typically centred on their particular translation strategies, their biographies, their roles in cultural modernisation and their
social standing. Kobori Keiichirō (1998) explores Ōgai’s original writings, translations, philosophies and their influences on socio-cultural development, and the establishment of contemporary Japanese literature. Nagashima Yōichi (2008, 2012), on the other hand, focuses on Ōgai’s particular translation strategies, employing text analysis. He examines the relationship between Ōgai’s translation and writing practices, highlighting the ways in which the two practices are intertwined. By contrast, studies of Kuroiwa, who has received less attention from academics compared to those of his contemporaries due to the genre of his works, which are generally considered to be unscholarly, are centred on his biography. The most extensive studies available on the translator are those by Itō Hideo (1978, 1988, 1995), which examine Kuroiwa’s private life, the reception of his works, his adopted persona, and his careers as a writer, translator, journalist, political activist, and newspaper proprietor (Oku, 2014: 91). Itō further investigates the relationship between Kuroiwa’s writing and translation practices and demonstrates how the two practices were linked. However, his study of Kuroiwa’s translations is centred on the reception of his works by the general public and critics, and it overlooks text analysis. Similarly, in the case of Wakamatsu, despite her significant contribution to the establishment of children’s literature and the development of colloquial language, her translation practice is under-explored (Hayashida, 1999: 276). The majority of existing studies on Wakamatsu seem to focus on the influence of her gender on her writing practice. Rebecca Copeland (1997, 2000) explores the writing practices of Japanese women writers of the Meiji and Taishō (1912-1926) periods and examines how they were perceived in Meiji society and the male-dominated literary milieu. She observes that women writers were not taken seriously and were considered “not only secondary but peripheral” by male writers and critics alike (Copeland, 2000: 2). Similarly, Tanaka Yukiko (2000) examines the writing practices and reception of mainstream women writers and their works, exploring how they were related to socio-cultural developments during the Meiji and Taishō periods.

My analysis of these Meiji translators will also consider the relationship between their prominence and the reception and means of circulation of their works. Graham Law and Norimasa Morita (2003) argue that the popularity of writers’ and translators’ works featured in the newspapers of that time had a substantial effect on their sales. They examine the roles of the mass media in that period and demonstrate how the development of printing culture contributed to the establishment of popular
Introduction

genres. Drawing on Law and Morita, Chapter Two also investigates how the print media influenced the translators’ fame by examining the ways in which their works were presented (e.g. the presentation of the authors’ and translators’ names etc.) and received, how they were advertised, and the circulation figures of the daily publications that carried their works. The data used for this analysis has been collected through archival research, which includes surveying such print media as the daily newspapers and literary magazines of that period. However, reviews, expressions of readers’ voices and the advertisements appear to be in short supply, and attempting to locate them manually by reading each publication is beyond the scope of this research. These materials are more likely to be found in memoirs or academic publications that were published after the Meiji period. Therefore, the amount of original data used for this analysis is restricted.

The data collected for each translator will be compared in order to establish the degree of popularity of each particular translator and the involvement of publishers in promoting their works. In addition to the case studies mentioned above, the chapter will briefly compare the Japanese case with the contemporary literary cultures in the UK and USA (Griswold, 1981; Marsh, 1998; Hart, 1950), focusing on translators’ roles in the same period and their perceived status. The findings of this historical analysis will allow this study to estimate whether the celebrity translator phenomenon is historically rooted in certain traditions more than others.

0.6. Text analysis (Chapter Three)

The linguistic approach in Chapter Three aims to answer part of my third and fourth research questions, i.e. “To what extent are translators’ status and work under-valued, as the established ‘visibility paradigm’ in translation studies suggests?” and “How far is the ‘visibility paradigm’ applicable in non-European/North American contexts?”.

The chapter employs text analysis to examine the translation strategies of contemporary Japan’s celebrity translators, asking whether the translators’ status is manifested in their approaches to translation, as the visibility paradigm suggests it would be.
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The analysis in this chapter is divided into two stages. The first will consist of a textual comparison between translated texts and their original source texts. This comparative model has been applied in the history of translation studies by many leading theorists (e.g. Baker, 2000; Blum-Kulka, 1986/2004; House, 1997; Nord, 2005) in order to evaluate translations in terms of their quality, focusing on features such as adequacy, semantic equivalence and register (Chesterman, 2000: 16-17). It can also identify translators’ approaches in the translation processes, including their choices of translation strategies (Baker, 2000: 242-243). Venuti employs text analysis of this kind in his study of the emergence of fluent translation in the English language (2004: 43-98). He compares the degree of fluency in translations of the same original texts by different translators in different periods. The findings of such case studies illustrate the perspectives behind each translator’s approach to translation. The second stage will examine the translators’ use of idiosyncratic expressions, or expressions that are typically found in the translator’s original writing, that may add to their visibility in translations.

0.6.1. An analysis of hon’yakuchō

Stage one of the textual analysis compares translations of the same original text by different translators. It focuses on particular grammatical features in the target text that are the linguistic markers of 翻訳調 (hon’yakuchō) [translational language], which is recognisably adapted from or influenced by translation from European languages. It creates foreign elements in the target text (Wakabayashi, 2009: 5), making its status as a translation apparent to Japanese readers (Yanabu, Isoya, & Uchimura, 1978: 142). Examining the presence of such translational language in the text is one way to identify the degree to which the translator employs domesticating or foreignising approaches. Foreignisation has been interpreted in different ways since the term was introduced by Venuti (1995); the foreignising approach here also does not equate with that of Venuti, for whom foreignising is a means of resisting the translator’s (un)conscious desire to eliminate cultural otherness in the process of producing the target text by deviating from the translation norms in the target culture (Venuti, 2008: 15-16). However, the applicability of foreignisation in the Japanese context has been questioned by scholars
including Tamaki (2005: 239), Wakabayashi (2009: 8) and Mizuno (2010: 38-39), who argue that translation into the Japanese language lacks a sense of ideological superiority over the source language. Similarly, Yukari Meldrum (2009: 53) argues that the history of Japanese literature is not affected by the same questions of status as in Europe and North America, where ethnocentrism and monolingualism-centred ideologies are dominant. Judy Wakabayashi (2009: 8) further points out that, unlike foreignisation, hon’yakuchō does not seek to deliberately “disrupt readers’ complacency through a variety of linguistic means already available in the target language”. Instead, it relies on the source language creating defamiliarising effects which are similar to those of foreignisation (ibid.). The textual analysis in this thesis focuses on these ‘defamiliarising effects’, in an attempt to identify whether prominent translators rely on translation strategies that emphasise their input to gain visibility.

Notable existing studies of hon’yakuchō include those by Yanabu Akira (1972, 1978, 1982, 1998), Wakabayashi (2009), Furuno Yuri (2005) and Meldrum (2009). Wakabayashi (2009: 2) views translational language as an “integral part of Japanese language and an innovative force” in the modernisation of language and literature. She explains that Japanese readers have been receptive towards language with “a distinctively ‘foreign’ origin and texture” (ibid.: 1). For this very reason, Wakabayashi (ibid.: 2) distinguishes hon’yakuchō from translationese, which is, in general, regarded pejoratively in English-language contexts. The latter is likely to be caused by the translator’s incompetence in translation, while the usage of the former is intentional and represents “the extension of [the] linguistic repertoire” (ibid.). Meldrum (2009: 26), however, uses the term ‘translationese’ in her study as an English translation of hon’yakuchō, but without the negative connotation. Wakabayashi (2009: 4) notes how common features of hon’yakuchō, such as the use of second person pronouns and the inanimate subject ‘it’, are found in translation with greater frequency than in Japanese source texts. However, what might be considered high frequency is not clearly defined. Furthermore, Japanese readers’ high tolerance of translational language problematises attempts to define hon’yakuchō as a linguistic marker. For example, Furuno’s study of translationese in Japanese literature takes as its starting point a readers’ survey and finds that the majority of the readers could not distinguish a translation from original writing in terms of the naturalness of the target language (2005: 154). Similarly, Nohara Kayoko (2018) views hon’yakuchō as a sub set of Japanese domestic norms. Meldrum,
instead, compares the occurrence of typical features of hon’yakuchō between translation and Japanese fiction, using a corpus study in an attempt to articulate the negative features of hon’yakuchō. Her study, which focuses on popular fiction, examines whether these features are in fact more frequently found in translation or if they are widely accepted in original writing. She compares the use of third person pronouns, loanwords, female-specific expressions, abstract nouns as subjects of transitive verbs, and paragraph length between translations and non-translations (ibid.: 110-131). Her findings demonstrate that a higher frequency of third person pronouns, and longer paragraphs compared to original writings are indeed observable in translation. Thus, they can be called characteristic features of hon’yakuchō, while the same does not seem to apply to loanwords that have been widely adopted in Japanese writing or the other features mentioned. My text analysis here draws partially on Meldrum’s corpus study in examining the differences in the occurrence of hon’yakuchō between my chosen translators.

Murakami Haruki has been chosen for this text analysis for his phenomenal visibility, which was addressed earlier. The analysis of this work in Chapter Three consists of two parts. The first will compare his translation strategy with those of his recognised contemporaries, Nozaki Takashi and Ogawa Takayoshi. As all three translators have translated the same work by the same author, the analysis will investigate whether, or how, their approaches differ. The findings of this comparison will suggest whether the particular translation strategies they adopt are linked to the translators’ prominence for the reader and whether this prominence in the translated text is related to their greater prominence within the literary culture. The chosen text for this comparative analysis is F. Scott Fitzgerald’s The Great Gatsby (1925), which has been translated by all three of the above translators and thus allows us to establish direct comparisons between the work of each. The text analysis will employ corpus-based methods, focusing on the specific grammatical features and expressions described above and the level of fluency, by comparing the translated texts with established Japanese language norms (e.g. Wakabayashi, 2009; Yanabu, 1982; Yui, 2007). This text analysis will compare parallel passages from each translator’s version
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10 Japanese language has gender-specific expressions, such as specific first-person pronouns and sentence-endings that can determine the gender of the speaker (Shibatani, 1990). Translations tend to contain the female expressions more frequently than original writings, and they are often subject to criticism in terms of readability (Ohmori, 2006; Kono, 1999). See also Meldrum (2009: 109-110).
of the same text. The selected passages, which are between two and four lines apiece and were selected because they contain each of the features mentioned above, will enable the analysis to establish the degree to which the three different translations are domesticated or foreignised. In addition, the analysis will briefly compare the findings on Murakami’s work with his other translations in order to identify whether the same tendency can be observed throughout. His case will be compared, this time, with Shibata Motoyuki, who has translated the same source texts.

0.6.2. Murakami’s idiosyncrasy in translation

The second part of this analysis will examine the idiosyncrasy manifested in Murakami’s translations, exploring the links between his particular translation style and the popularity of his translations. Murakami’s writing style has been shaped through his translation practices, which he describes as the “[deconstruction of translation]” (Murakami and Shibata, 2000: 219-220) It is the combination of structures borrowed from translation into his composition which makes his writing style idiosyncratic among the other Japanese authors (Walkowitz, 2015: 15). Jonathan Evans (2016: 15), who has investigated the relationship between the writing and translation practices of Lydia Davis, explains that when an author undertakes translation because “it appeals to the author” or “as an extension of their artistic project, there will be interactions with other writing by the author both before and after the translation”. He further adds that when readers recognise thematic or stylistic similarities between the translations and original works of the same writer, the translations can be viewed as a writer’s oeuvre, a form of extension of the writer’s literary works (ibid.: 9). Thus, it could be argued that a writer’s translations can be considered distinct from those by non-writers, and the originality of the former contributes to the translator’s prominence. The analysis here aims to explore Murakami’s two practices and identify how they relate to his exceptional visibility as a translator.

The findings of the comparisons at the first stage will identify whether the two types of translation strategies determine the translator’s prominence, as Venuti’s conceptualisation suggests, or if there are other approaches to translation that generate translator visibility. They will, thus, demonstrate whether Venuti’s assertion is in fact
challenged or disproven in terms of translation into Japanese, at least in the case of Murakami.

0.7. Paratextual analysis of celebrity translators (Chapter Four)

Chapter Four focuses on the relationship between translator visibility and paratexts. Venuti (2008: 273-274; 2004: 311) suggests the potential of using paratexts as a means of increasing the translator’s recognition, and he encourages translators to present sophisticated rationales for their translation strategies in such paratexts to draw the reader’s attention to the translator’s input. He does not, however, explore the extent to which paratexts influence translators’ visibility. This chapter draws on existing studies that examine translator visibility through paratextual analysis, including those of Gérard Genette (1997), Kathryn Batchelor (2018), Ellen McRae (2010) and Isabelle Bilodeau (2015). It will examine how a translator’s authorial presence manifests in paratexts and the extent to which it contributes to translator prominence.

Genette, whose conceptualisation is widely applied in paratextual studies, defines paratexts and identifies the textual and external features, functions and meanings of paratexts as well as the authors’ intentions. He describes paratexts as verbal or nonverbal productions that accompany a literary work, such as “an author’s name, a title, a preface and illustrations” (Genette, 1997: 1). Their functions are to present a literary work and to ensure “its presence in the world, its ‘reception’ and consumption in the form of a book” (ibid.). Thus, the paratext enables a text to become complete as a book and to be offered to its readers (ibid.). However, Batchelor (2018: 142) argues that Genette’s conceptualisation of paratext lacks an explicit definition of the term. For instance, she points out that although Genette describes paratext as a physical thing, he also suggests that paratext is a “message”, which can be something that does not have a physical form (ibid.: 9). Furthermore, Batchelor points out that Genette (ibid.: 150-

11 Genette (1997: 196) includes postfaces as a subcategory of prefaces. The Oxford Dictionary defines the former as a brief explanation or note, which is located at the end of a book, while the latter is generally an introduction to a book. https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/postface; https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/preface.
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174) views a translated text as synonymous with the source text, and paratexts to the translation are the same as paratexts to a new edition of the source text. Thus, Genette’s model does not consider the autonomy of paratexts to translation in their own right (Batchelor, 2018: 21-22). Batchelor takes a flexible approach and does not insist on source author-focused or material-based criteria as Genette does, but focuses on the functional aspects of paratexts, which she describes as “a consciously crafted threshold for a text which has the potential to influence the way(s) in which the text is received” (ibid.: 142). McRae, for her part, studies the functions and roles of translators’ prefaces. She argues that the importance of the functions of prefaces is overlooked in English translations by both publishers and readers (2010: 6). While her study of publishers’ approaches to paratexts in anglophone contexts is useful for my analysis, her perspectives on the functions of prefaces focus on providing information and lack consideration of the communicative aspects of paratexts.12 Bilodeau, by contrast, exclusively studies the paratexts of translated works of fiction in contemporary Japanese culture. She focuses on the conventions of atogaki, or the translator’s afterword, arguing that unlike in North America and Europe, where the functions of such paratexts are mostly informative in nature, in Japan they are a space for translators to make themselves visible as individuals and to interact with readers. My analysis will follow Bilodeau’s perspective and focus on the interaction between the translator and readers. In this way it will categorise afterwords according to the nature of their contents, ranging from those that are informative to those that are highly personal, such as anecdotes. The latter naturally earn the translator greater visibility as an individual than the former. Bilodeau (2015: 253) concludes that the Japanese convention of afterwords enables Japanese translators to build their self-image, including their public personality, agency, and “cultural roles as knowledgeable authorities and critics”. Thus, publishing practice in the Japanese context works in translators’ favour in terms of translator visibility. However, Bilodeau does not explore the relationship between the translators’ visibility in paratexts and in their translation practice as a whole.

Genette categorises paratexts into two types depending on their location: peritext and epitext. The former is located within the book, as opposed to the latter,

12 McRae (2010: 20) addresses the function of prefaces from five perspectives: 1) foregrounding differences of cultures and languages; 2) promoting understanding of the source culture; 3) promoting understanding of the translator’s role and intervention; 4) helping critics assess the quality of the translation; 5) being useful as process documentation.
which is located outside the book, including author interviews, book reviews, criticism and advertisements (Genette, 1997: xviii). My analysis, however, takes on Batchelor's function-based approach and employs the term ‘paratext’, instead of using the two different terms, which allows me to include afterwords that are not physically attached to the book. The analysis focuses on the translator’s afterword and dust jacket designs. Paratexts mediate between the book and readers and are important elements that influence how the book is read and received (Toledano-Buendía, 2013: 149; Tahir-Gürçağlar, 2002: 45). McRae (2012: 16) claims that the most cited function of paratexts in translation, especially that of the preface, is to enable translators to make themselves and their works visible. Similarly, Toledano-Buendía (2013: 150, 159-161) demonstrates that a translator gains visibility by providing information in peritexts, such as translator’s notes, which consist of “explicit and direct statements”. She further observes that translators’ notes, usually written in a discursive manner, can reflect their personal views on the source text or culture, enabling their individual personalities to become apparent to readers (ibid.). In these commentaries, the translator’s voice becomes clearly distinguished from that of the author, allowing the translator to gain authorial presence within the text (Toledano-Buendía, 2013: 150, 161). Dust jackets, on the other hand, are generally the first thing that comes to readers’ view before even turning to the first page. They are “arguably the most visible paratext” within the book (Bilodeau, 2015: 63), and printing the translators’ names on the jacket can be particularly effective in terms of visibility (Becker & De Haan, 2012: 23). Thus, dust-jacket design is an important element that can influence a translator’s recognition, while it is also an element that is usually beyond the translator’s control.

As in the case of Chapter Three, the analysis of paratext in Chapter Four centres on Murakami Haruki. It will examine his afterwords and essays that are included in his translations and the ways his name is promoted on the dust jackets, exploring how these factors relate to his exceptional prominence. The study will attempt to identify the features of paratext which might reflect or bolster his celebrity status. The number of translations he has published so far in book form is over sixty, out of which twenty-eight that include afterwords have been selected for this analysis due to their availability

---

13 Japanese books in general, both hardcovers and paperbacks, have what Genette (1997: 27-28) refers to as “a dust jacket”, which covers the entire surface of the book cover.
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at the time the research was conducted. The analysis is divided into two stages. First, it examines the contents of the afterwords, drawing on Bilodeau’s methodology (2015). The study particularly focuses on Murakami’s personal statements that mention his writing practices in which his authorial presence seems to manifest itself strongly. The second stage studies the dust jackets of the books used in stage one, focusing on their features, specifically the name of the translator. Murakami’s case will also be compared with those of his contemporaries who have translated the same source text or have published translations in the same imprint as Murakami. The aims are to establish how Murakami’s name is presented on the dust jackets and whether the nature of his afterwords reflect his celebrity status in comparison with his contemporaries. The chapter also incorporates data on publishers’ approaches to the inclusion of afterwords and jacket designs. This data was originally collected through surveys of and interviews with Japanese publishers for Chapter Five. In addition, this chapter will briefly compare the Japanese publishers’ approaches with those of their anglophone counterparts in terms of the inclusion of translator’s afterwords or forewords and the presentation of translators’ names on the dust jacket, in an attempt to identify the differences in publishing practices that might influence translator visibility.  

0.8. Publishers, translators and readers in the Japanese context (Chapter Five)

The final chapter aims to address the last of my four questions: “How far is the ‘visibility paradigm’ applicable in non-European/North American contexts?” The analysis focuses on translators, publishers and readers, the three key agents in the production of translator celebrity. It will explore the interactions between these three agents, considering how they influence translator status. The chapter will investigate the translation practices of Japanese translators with various degrees of prominence,

\[\text{14 Unlike in the UK and USA, the inclusion of translator’s afterwords is far more common than the inclusion of prefaces or forewords in present-day Japan (Bilodeau, 2015: 59-60).}\]
including their attitudes towards their own visibility and the reception of their status and works by publishers and readers. The chapter aims to identify how far Venuti’s conceptualisation is applicable. The results will also be compared with the cases in other cultural contexts, including the UK and Israel. It will be argued that the Japanese case is distinct from other cultural contexts where celebrity translators also exist.

0.8.1. The Japanese tradition of publishing practice

Japanese publishing conventions are different from those in the UK and USA, especially in terms of recognition of literary translators’ status and works, as will become clear as the analysis proceeds. Bilodeau (2015: 10, 74) notes that Japanese publishers tend to recognise translators as “literary authorities”, which is shown in, for instance, the way translators’ names are regularly displayed on the book covers, and the fact that they are allowed to include translator’s afterwords, practices that are rare in the UK and USA (ibid.: 4, 8, 63, 105). Bilodeau (ibid.: 44-52) traces this Japanese publishing convention back to the late eighteenth century, during which publishing practices were established, and the book trade began to boom (Nakano, 2011: 44-46; Kornicki, 2001: 232-233). The proclamation of the 出版条例 (Shuppan jōrei) [Publishing Ordinance] in 1772 enforced the inclusion of authors’ and publishers’ names in any books published for commercial use (Nakano, 2011: 43-45; Kornicki, ibid.). The same applied to translators of foreign literature, although the practice did not become standardised until the late nineteenth century (Bilodeau, 2015: 48, 50).

The Japanese publishing practice above contrasts with those in anglophone contexts that avoid drawing the reader’s attention to the translator or the fact that the book is indeed a translation (Venuti, 2008: 7; Paul, 2009: 22; McRae, 2010: 41). Anglophone publishers’ approaches are evident in the way translators’ names are regularly omitted from book covers and translators’ afterwords are seldom included (Venuti, 2008: 7; Bilodeau, 2015: 9, 62).
0.8.2. Analyzing translators’ status

The subject of translators’ status is an under-explored area (Ruokonen, 2013: 327). Ruokonen (ibid.) argues that existing studies tend to focus on translators’ assumed invisibility without analysing the extent to which translators are under-recognised. The few studies that examine translators’ status generally focus on technical translation, including Ruokonen (2013, 2016), Dam & Zethsen (2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012) and Koskinen (2009). One exception, however, is Sela-Sheffy (2006, 2008, 2010, 2016) who examines contemporary literary translators in regard to their prominence, although publishers and readers’ perspectives are not fully explored. These studies take a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches, employing interviews and surveys. Dam & Zethsen focus on Danish in-house translators with Masters degrees in translation who are employed by major companies. Based on their self-evaluation, they attempt to measure translator status through studying four parameters that relate to their status, namely salary, fame, education and influence. The results illustrate that Danish business translators enjoy relatively high visibility, although this is limited to fellow translators within the company where they are employed, and these translators do not appear to have the prominence which is comparable to that of literary celebrities (Dam & Zethsen, 2008: 88, 93). Koskinen instead examines the relationship between Finnish EU translators’ status and their behaviour. She concludes that the translators’ own behaviour, including interactions with their employers and clients, has a significant influence on their status. Similarly, Ruokonen’s survey of existing studies of translators, including those above, concludes that while their status in general is in fact rather low, translators’ behaviour can improve this situation. Sela-Sheffy’s analysis of celebrity translators in Israel also suggests that translators’ conscious efforts, such as creating artistic personae, contribute to their prominence. Hence, translators’ activities beyond translating itself are also an important factor to be considered in analysing translator status. This approach will be incorporated in my analysis of translators explained below.

This final chapter will investigate the relationship between the three key agents in the translator celebrity phenomenon: publishers, translators and readers. The study centres on the results of an original survey of the agents, asking how the relationship
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between the three influences translator visibility. The analysis will first examine the various degrees of prominence of the selected translators. The translators who were surveyed are divided into four groups, based on the categorisation I formulated earlier (p.18). This is the same categorisation as will be used in Chapter One, except for ‘media active’, which is included only in this chapter. The categories are: recognised, media active, celebrity and super-celebrity. The aim is to identify how differences in the degree of prominence influence translation practices; whether the translators make conscious efforts to make themselves visible and how their cases compare to the findings in Chapter One. Ruokonen (2013: 329) employs this model, referred to as “comparative” in her study, to examine the perceptions of translator status in different situations. My analysis then will proceed to investigate Japanese publishing practice and publishers’ attitudes towards the translators. It will explore how publishers’ perceptions of translators and the publishing tradition might contribute to the generation of translator celebrity. The main focus of this section includes publishers’ approaches to the production of translations, such as how they negotiate with the translators during the process and their marketing strategies. The analysis will address whether their attitudes differ depending on the degree of translators’ prominence. Finally, the chapter will consider readers’ perceptions of translators and translated literature, asking how these might relate to the translator celebrity phenomenon. The analysis will contrast the results with the UK context, in which this phenomenon is much less in evidence than in Japan. The results of the translator survey will also be compared with those of Sela-Sheffy’s study of Israeli celebrity translators. These comparisons will enable the analysis to isolate cultural and attitudinal trends that make the occurrence of celebrity translators more likely in certain contexts than others.

In my conclusion, I return to my four guiding research questions and attempt explicit answers in the light of the foregoing study: 1. What are celebrity translators?; 2. What factors contribute to their fame?; 3. To what extent are translators’ status and work under-valued, as the established “visibility paradigm” suggests?; and 4. How far is the “visibility paradigm” applicable in non-European/North American contexts?
CHAPTER ONE

The Definition and Status of the Celebrity Translator

1.1. Introduction

This chapter asks how the concept of the celebrity translator can be defined. It aims to answer the first two research questions (i.e. what celebrity translators are and what factors create their fame). The chapter will test the applicability of mainstream conceptualisations of celebrity to celebrity translators (e.g. Turner, 2014; Marshall, 1997; Gamson, 1994). It will study the processes involved in the production of celebrity translators, asking whether there are similarities with how literary celebrity is produced. The analysis will focus on three processes: “mediatisation”, “personalisation” and “commodification” (Driessens, 2013a: 650-651). Traditionally, in the Romantic period, literary celebrities were perceived as individuals who possessed distinctive qualities such as artistic talent, high social status and a public persona (Mole, 2007: xii). What distinguishes traditional literary celebrities from their contemporary counterparts is commodification, or “one’s ability to be branded” (Ommundsen, 2007: 245). Ommundsen (ibid.) explains that an author as a distinctive cultural brand is created through the combination of the notion of the author as “cultural hero” and a general idea of celebrity. Celebrities in contemporary cultures are frequently referred to as commodities due to the nature of the celebrity creation process, which resembles commercial goods production (Gamson, 1994; Turner, 2013; Rojek, 2001). Celebrities can be “manufactured, marketed, and traded” by the publicity and media industries in much the same way as any commercial product (Turner, 2010: 14). In addition, whether it is through fame or infamy, the role of celebrities generates emotional reactions among audiences. However, celebrities take many forms, and the factors that determine their status are complex. Through its analysis, this chapter argues that the fame of some
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highly prominent translators is marketed and publicized by their publishers in order to stimulate the sales of the translations they produce in a similar way to that in which a celebrity author might be marketed and publicized.

The examination in this chapter will focus primarily on the Japanese context, which will be compared with a few examples of celebrity translators in other national contexts. These other national contexts are the Chinese and Hebrew settings in which the status of translators, in socio-cultural terms, has been studied and for which details are available in English, especially from the perspective of translator visibility (e.g. Hillenbrand, 2009; Sela-Sheffy, 2008, 2010). The comparisons will not only identify the varieties of celebrity translators in cultural contexts beyond Europe and North America, on which Venuti’s paradigm centres, but will also support the definitions of translator celebrity which the study of the Japanese examples yields.

The chapter will focus on the outstanding cases of celebrity translators in each context who reflect different varieties of translator visibility. These varieties range from translators who become famous for other activities in the first instance, to those whose fame is based directly on their public personae, and those whose fame is based on the figures of their source authors or works. The analysis will examine the following factors that have been assembled from the list of features modelled on the key factors that create celebrities in general, as discussed in the Introduction, as well as previous works by Sela-Sheffy (2008, 2010): the main reasons for their fame; their activities beyond translation; their approaches to translation; their personalities; how they are marketed by publishers; readers’ reactions. The translators who will be included in the analysis are Murakami Haruki (村上春樹), whose phenomenal visibility will be used as the high end of the scale to be compared with the others whose degree of visibility and the factors that create their fame vary. These others are: Shibata Motoyuki (柴田元幸); Kishimoto Sachiko (岸本佐知子); Ogawa Takayoshi (小川高義); and Echizen Toshiya (越前敏弥) in Japan; Lai Mingzhu (賴明珠) in Taiwan; Lin Shaohua (林少华) and Cao Ying (草婴) in mainland China; and Nili Mirsky (נילי מירסקי) in Israel.

1 A celebrity translator’s ‘persona’ is a public personality formed through their image as presented by the media including translators’ own social media, publishers’ promotional activities and interviews. The translator’s persona is often associated with the works he or she produces.
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The chapter will draw comparisons and identify patterns between existing accounts of modern celebrity, especially those of literary celebrity, in order to highlight similarities and lacunae in existing paradigms. The aim is to demonstrate the relationship between the degree of prominence of an individual, their translation strategies and the reception of their works.

1.2. The Analysis of Celebrity Translators

1.2.1. The Hebrew Context

Rakefet Sela-Sheffy (2010: 134) regards literary translators in the Hebrew context as a group of “elitists” who enjoy the visibility of public celebrity. She finds that those who have attained the top level of prominence are disproportionately better paid than their less prominent counterparts, and their personal reputations allow them to negotiate individual contracts with publishers (ibid.: 136). Like celebrities in other elite professions, their fame is constructed from various factors, such as media coverage, prizes, and access to exclusive networks in literary and intellectual fields, rather than simply professionalism in translation (ibid.: 135). Sela-Sheffy (ibid.: 136) argues that some highly visible literary translators are keen to promote their artistic qualities rather than professional skills, which allows them to attain a privileged status similar to that of artists or authors of serious literature. Those who have no official translation qualifications usually have professions directly linked to the field of literature, and they are often intellectuals, such as poets, authors, literary editors and critics or academics, whose opinions, transmitted by the media, have a significant influence over high-end cultural issues (ibid.: 135-6). Moreover, literary translators in the contemporary Hebrew context frequently claim superiority over source authors (ibid., 2008: 617). The scholar and translator Nitsa Ben-Ari is a good example. She asserts that an author is powerless when faced with the translator, like a naked patient at the doctor’s consulting rooms (cited in Katzenelson, 2000: 27). These translators can be ambitious to attain professional prestige, and some of them invest considerable effort in establishing prominent social status and employ what Sela-Sheffy (ibid.: 610, 2010: 135) refers to
as “personal glorification” rather than formal professional qualification, and various types of personae. This phenomenon is illustrated by the way in which their life narratives as translators or their personal relationships with the authors are frequently featured in the media. It can be argued that the lack of professional criteria is compensated for by media emphasis on their eccentric personalities and unusual lifestyles, which differentiate their status from ordinary people. Sela-Sheffy (ibid.: 611-15) categorises such translators’ personae into three types: guardians of the national language and culture; importers of foreign cultures and innovators, and artists in their own right.

The image of Hebrew translators in the first category as custodians of culture originates from the pre-state period in the nineteenth century when Hebrew was being promoted as a part of the building of a national culture (Toury, 2002: xxv). During the nineteenth century, the popularity of translated literature and translating as an occupation saw a significant rise due to this promotion (Shavit & Shavit, 1997, cited in Sela-Sheffy, 2008: 612). The example of Aharon Amir, an acclaimed translator who was awarded the 2004 Israel Prize, is representative of contemporary translators. These translators see archaic Hebrew as a “language of high culture” and are concerned about today’s literature becoming increasingly entertainment-focused, with the resultant dilution of the canonical Hebrew language (Sela-Sheffy, 2008: 612-3). Amir (2004, cited in Sela-Sheffy, 2008: 612) emphasises the point that translators’ ultimate mission is to preserve their culture for future generations. Sela-Sheffy (ibid.) claims that this attitude is frequently seen among highly skilled, educated Hebrew translators who translate nineteenth and twentieth century “classics”. They construct their prestige by exhibiting their superior knowledge and exclusive skills in translation and by constantly emphasising the importance of their role as “cultural custodians” (ibid.: 611).

On the other hand, translators in the second category (importers of foreign cultures and innovators) commit themselves to enriching their culture by importing texts from foreign countries whose culture is considered superior to their own (ibid.: 613). The prominent translator Rina Litvin (cited in Snir, 1988: 19) claims that she translates texts with cultural importance, which can be used as models to create masterpieces in Hebrew. Similarly, Yoram Bronowski, who was an acclaimed translator throughout the 1980s and 1990s, saw European cultures as “the cultures of the world” and translation
as a means of education (Levtov, 1994: 22). His mission was to make these cultures available to the majority of the population, who would otherwise have had no access to them (Bronowski, 2002: 13). The prestige these translators acquire is created by public admiration, not only for their knowledge of the foreign language, but for their privileged backgrounds, which allow them to become ambassadors of the cultures of the world (Sela-Sheffy, 2008: 620). In addition to prestige, there is another factor that adds to the prominence of the innovator-translators. When a translator introduces readers to a particular genre or foreign author’s works for the first time in the target culture, readers may associate the translator with the author or genre, which can then become part of the translator’s persona. Moshe Ron, for example, suggests that the source author whose works he translated significantly influenced his persona:

I started to translate from American literature things that no one had ever done anything with before. […] I was much more [of a] fanatic for avant-gardism and innovativeness. […] and today I am particularly identified with Carver. […] many people who write in this style think of me and send me manuscripts (Beker 2001: 88, cited in Sela-Sheffy, 2008: 614).

Translators whose status most clearly demonstrates the qualities of contemporary celebrity belong to the third category (artists in their own right). Since the mid-1980s, Hebrew translators have been actively promoting translations as works of art in their own right (Sela-Sheffy, 2008: 614). This phenomenon contributes to the current trend for an increasing number of literary translators to construct their images as “creative translators”, to the point of gaining celebrity status in some cases (ibid.). Nili Mirsky, who was arguably the most celebrated translator in the contemporary Hebrew context, represents this phenomenon. She actively promoted her artistic image, which earned her titles such as “Mrs Culture” and “the Guru of Translation”, and she enjoyed her impressive public admiration purely based on her “translatorship” (ibid.). Media coverage, of course, played an important role in constructing Mirsky’s fame. Her interviews were frequently featured in magazines in which her refined taste in literature
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and music and her dramatic personality were showcased (ibid.: 614-5). Furthermore, Mirsky’s name on the book cover guaranteed its quality and sales (Melamed, 1989: 32). The media also is keen to capitalise on translators’ fame, and it constantly hunts for those who might be candidates for celebrity (Sela-Sheffy, 2008: 615). This trend has formed a star system in the field of translation. The celebrity translators, in turn, actively display the eccentricity which separates them from the majority of the public. This phenomenon is manifested in Mirsky’s comment: “Translation is after all [...] a story consisting of alchemy, wonder, almost magic” (Melamed, 1989: 33). Sela-Sheffy (1999: 84) defines this attitude as “mystification of the profession’s rules and requirements, and the construction of a shared mythological profile of its practitioners”. Thus, these translators maintain their status by constructing images that make them unusual, creating a hierarchy between the translators and readers that stresses the extraordinary vs. the ordinary (Couldry, 2000: 45). This social distinction may cause readers to feel a fascination for translators who have access to the space where they can create their own images and promote them, just like an actor on stage. Mirsky, for example, demonstrated her eccentricity by describing her emotional connection with particular source texts she translated. She talked about how the characters in Anna Karenina, which she translated, haunted her:

[They] actually walked around at my place at nights, all of them. I actually heard their voices. [...] It is something special, very hard to describe. As if you had another home-land, or another world, or another soul that takes place in Russian (Landsman, 2000: 92).

The mystification also seemed to have manifested in Mirsky’s preference to maintain ambiguity in relation to her approach to translation:

I do not believe in theory of translation or whatsoever [...] I have certain guidelines, but the trouble is that many of them contradict each other, and since I try hard to be faithful to all
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these principles at once, it turns out that I look at the work of translation as mission impossible by definition (Moznayim, 1983: 25, cited in Sela-Sheffy, 2008: 615).

The translators in all three of Sela-Sheffy’s categories above demonstrate that the main factors that earn them prestige are the perceived quality of the translations they produce, their superior cultural knowledge and glorified personae. Furthermore, the attention paid by the media to the translators’ personalities is the key to creating translator celebrity in the Hebrew context, which can be described as personalisation and mediatisation (Driessens, 2013a: 650-651). However, their images and narratives are not produced by cultural intermediaries, like those of celebrities in general. Rather, they are the product of translators’ self-promotion and the extent to which publishers utilise them to promote their translations. Although this phenomenon is not explored in Sela-Sheffy’s study, the value of translators’ names also suggests that a commodification process is likely to be taking place. Hence, it can be said that these celebrity translators possess a certain power that can influence publishers as well as readers, which contrasts with the more general understanding of modern celebrities, who are often controlled by the publicists and consumed as a product by the audience.

Another factor that distinguishes celebrities in general from Israeli celebrity translators in particular is that the status of the former is attainable by ordinary members of the public, and it is the ordinary or vulnerable side of their lives that appeals to the audience (Gabler & Fellow, 2001: 12-13; Holmes & Redmond, 2006: 4), while the latter appeal to audiences via the unusual features of their lives. Thus, the factors that form the readers’ interest in the translators in the Hebrew context, such as creativity, talent, and superior knowledge in the arts and culture, demonstrate that their celebrity status parallels traditional notions of literary fame (Mole, 2007: xii), which is based on particular types of superiority.

The relationship between translators’ translation strategies and their prominence, and the commodification process of translators in the Hebrew context, however, is not explored here, as Sela-Sheffy’s study of the celebrity translators does not discuss their translated texts, critical reviews of their works, or publishers’ marketing strategies.
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1.2.3. Chinese contexts

China has a long history of culturally orientated translation activities that brought new developments and cultural shifts (Hung, 2005: 43). As in the Hebrew context, there are a number of prominent Chinese translators who are highly skilled in foreign languages and dedicate themselves to making foreign literature available to their culture. Most of these were active from the early 1900s up until the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976), during which anything associated with intellectuality was destroyed (Langley, 2008: 43-44). Great examples are Fu Lei (傅雷), Guo Moruo (郭沫若) and Zhu Shenghao (朱生豪), whose translations render a huge range of authors, including Balzac, Dickens, Goethe, and Shakespeare respectively (Chan, 2004: 6-8).

Cao Ying (1923-2015) is one of the translators in the above category. However, unlike his counterparts mentioned above, whose career spans were limited to between the 1940s and 1970s, Cao continued his translation practice well into the late 1990s. A dedicated translator of Russian literature, Cao translated, most notably, the works of Leo Tolstoy, whom he admired. Cao earned his first fame when his translation of Story about the Director of the Machine Tractor Station and the Chief Agronomist (Galina Nikolaeva, 1954) was serialized in 中国青年 [China Youth] in 1956, a magazine which publishes three million copies per issue (Ni, 2012). In 1997, at the age of 75, he finished The Complete Works of Tolstoy, a twelve-volume edition that had taken him some twenty years to translate (Xie and Shi, 2011: 416). The edition had sold over one million copies by 2003 ("Twenty Years with Tolstoy", 2003). Among the prestigious positions and prizes Cao has been awarded as a result of his outstanding achievements in translation are: Chairman of the Shanghai Translators’ Association (1986) and Deputy Chairman of the China Translators’ Association (1988); the Maxim Gorky Literature Prize in 1987, the Lu Xun Literary Translation Rainbow Award by China Writers’ Association in 1997 (Ni, 2012), and the Lifetime Achievement Award in Translation in 2010 ("A Life of Words and Wisdom", 2010). However, Cao did not appear to promote the sales of his translations by emphasising his persona through the media, as his Israeli counterparts do. Rather, his media coverage was limited to newspapers, literary magazines and publishers’ websites, including China Daily and The Global Times,
which appear to focus mainly on Cao’s achievements in translation. His limited media coverage was perhaps related to the state policy on the freedom of press, which controls the media, including social media sites (“Media Censorship in China”, 2017). The examples above illustrate that Cao’s fame was built on the particular translations he produced, and public admiration and respect for his dedication to translating, which made canonical works of foreign literature accessible to readers for the first time. Thus, his celebrity status was strongly associated with his contribution to the Chinese culture.

However, the prominence of translators in contemporary China, especially in younger generations, is not limited to relying on their position as cultural leaders, the number of prizes they have received, and the particular works of translation they produce. There are translators who are regarded as celebrities because of the source authors’ phenomenal popularity, which contrasts with Cao’s case, as illustrated above. Chinese literature specialist Fujii Shōzō (2007: 191) claims that the Chinese translators of Murakami Haruki are exceptionally prominent. Fujii (ibid.) lists seven translators in mainland China, one in Hong Kong and eleven in Taiwan who translate the works of Murakami in book form, not including pirated versions. Of these, the two most prominent are Lai Mingzhu, who is the most authoritative translator of Murakami’s work in Taiwan, and Lin Shaohua, an academic and novelist, as well as an established translator of Murakami’s work in mainland China (ibid.: 192). Margret Hillenbrand (2009: 720) claims that both Lai and Lin enjoy the prestige of being privileged interpreters of Murakami, as well as mediators who link the author to readers. These translators regularly receive correspondence from Murakami fans who do not have direct access to the author himself (Lin, 2015 cited in Hillenbrand, 2009: 720; Lai, personal communication, 2017). Thus, these translators have arguably attained an exceptional level of celebrity status among their contemporaries.

Lai first translated Pinball 1973, Murakami’s second novel, in 1986, three years before Murakami acquired celebrity status in Taiwan with the publication of Norwegian Wood (Chan, 2009: 7). Lai’s popularity does not seem to be restricted to Taiwan alone. Her first official translation of the latter work was published in 1997, and in 2002 it also became available in Hong Kong, where 47,000 copies were sold within two years (Hillenbrand, 2009: 719). Although Lin had translated the same novel earlier than Lai, in 1989, it was the popularity of Lai’s translation in Taiwan and Hong Kong which was
responsible for the popularity of the novel in mainland China (ibid.). Chan (2009: 7) suggests that Murakami’s phenomenal popularity in Taiwan can be ascribed to Lai: she frequently gives public lectures and appears in the media, and writes essays as the translator of the famous author (Hillenbrand, 2009: 720). Furthermore, Lai regularly interacts with her readers through publishers’ blogs (Lai, personal communication, 2017). The readers not only share their personal feelings towards Murakami and their experiences of reading his novels with the translator, but also frequently ask Lai about facets of the author’s life and her personal relationship with him, as if she were, in some sense, a proxy of the author. Thus, readers seem to develop an illusion that they are connecting directly to Murakami by contacting Lai (Hillenbrand, 2009: 720). It could be argued that the promotional activities and communication with readers above have also made a significant contribution to cultivating Murakami’s popularity in Taiwan and Hong Kong, since the author himself does not seem to be involved in promoting his novels in Chinese-speaking territories.

Lin, on the other hand, has translated thirty-three volumes of Murakami’s works so far. His translation of Norwegian Wood, which has become one of the all-time Chinese best-sellers, has been reprinted twenty-two times in Shanghai alone since 2001, following the arrival of the Murakami craze via Taiwan and Hong Kong (ibid: 719). The novel had sold a total of 1,400,000 copies in mainland China by 2006 (Chan, 2009: 9). One comparable example is the international best seller The Kite Runner (Khaled Hosseini, 2003), which, by 2015, had sold 3 million copies since its first publication in 2006 (Olesen, 2015).² A third of the total sales were said to have been made in 2014 alone, after the famous Chinese actress Gao Yuanyuan recommended the book (ibid.). As with his Taiwanese counterpart, Lin writes a much-visited blog and regularly receives a large volume of correspondence from readers seeking answers to the structure of Murakami’s stories (Lin, 2005, cited in Hillenbrand, 2009: 720). Hillenbrand (ibid.) states that Lin’s status as “a Murakami surrogate” is the major attraction of his blog.

The two translators’ status as proxies of Murakami is not the only factor that draws substantial attention from readers and the media. The visible difference in their

² In 2012, The Kite Runner was listed as the third most popular foreign title in The New York Times, while Norwegian Wood came fifth (“Best-Selling Foreign Books in China”, 2013).
translation strategies is also of interest to readers. For example, Lai, who is knowledgeable about English and pop culture (Lin, 2006, cited in Fujii, 2009: 195), seems to retain Murakami’s world, in which American and European brand names and terms are frequently mentioned, in the target text (Lu, 1999, cited in Fujii, 2009: 193-4). Conversely, Lin’s target-language-focused translation has a more traditional appeal, fitting Murakami’s world into the target culture (Sun, 2003, cited in Ibid.: 190, 199, Chan, 2009: 13). The difference in the two translators’ approaches is manifested in the titles of their translations of the same novel. Lai translated the title of 風の歌を聴け (1979) [Hear the Wind Sing], which was published in Taiwan and Hong Kong as 聽風的歌 [Listen to the wind’s song], using colloquial language to produce a more contemporary feel. By contrast Lin’s translation, which was published in mainland China, bears the title 且聽風吟 [Let’s listen to the wind chant], which has a rather old-fashioned feel (Leung, 2009: 76). These comparisons are also frequently made by readers in blogs and cited by literary critics (Ibid.: 195; Lai, personal communication, 2017). Chan (2009: 13) claims that the readers are keen to use the Internet to express their opinions on the qualities of the translation, and this phenomenon has greatly helped to promote the Chinese translation of Murakami’s works. For example, a competition entitled “[Who’s the Better Translator - Lin Shaohua or Lai Mingzhu?]” was held on one reader’s website in 2006. In this competition, the two translators’ respective versions were critiqued and evaluated by readers (Ibid.: 13). Such reader activities generate publicity, adding to the translators’ fame. Furthermore, these websites enable readers to interact with each other, sharing their views on the translators, and thus creating a sense of community, which is typically seen in the case of celebrity fans in general (Holmes & Redmond, 2006: 3).

The examples above demonstrate that the translators themselves become exposed to readers’ high level of interest in the quality of Murakami’s work and its Chinese translations. Chan (2008: 11) claims that both Lin and Lai are part of the Murakami brand, and their prominence promotes the sales of Murakami’s works. Thus, it can be argued that, in this case, the author’s celebrity and the translators’ prominence interact. Furthermore, the celebrity status of Lin and Lai is not produced by intermediaries or by promotion of eccentric personae, as in the case of the translators in the Hebrew context. Rather, they attain their celebrity status by virtue of being
important links for readers to access foreign authors. The translators’ prominence is closely linked to the readers’ aspirations to read Murakami’s work and their strong desire to feel close to him. Thus, the fan base contributes in large part to the production of translator celebrity in these cases. On the other hand, the prominence of translators such as Cao is based on the cultural contributions they make by translating. In contrast to the examples of Lin and Lai above, these translators attain their celebrity status by providing readers with access to canonical works of foreign literature. Hence, for the particular case of translator celebrity in Chinese contexts presented in this chapter, it does not necessarily centre on translators’ personae, or their activities beyond translation. Rather, their prominence largely relies either on the fame of the source authors or on the cultural value of the texts they translate for the target readership, given that the quality of their translations is high. In the case of Lin and Lai, it could be said they contribute to the production of the Murakami brand rather than becoming established as brands themselves. Furthermore, the observable difference in the two translators’ approaches to translation demonstrates that unlike the “visibility paradigm” in translation studies, a particular translation strategy does not necessarily make one translator either more or less visible than the other.

1.2.4. The Japanese context

As in the Chinese contexts, translation in Japan played an important role during the cultural modernisation of the late nineteenth century, which earned translators and their works notable recognition as a result, as will be explored in my next chapter. In contemporary Japan, however, unlike in the contexts above, the core factors that earn translator prominence does not seem to be centred on self-promoting their artistic personae, emphasising the superiority of their position as cultural educators, or the result of the fame of the source authors. Echizen, for instance, is acclaimed for his translation of The Da Vinci Code (Dan Brown, 2003), Ogawa is known for his reader-focused translation strategies (Yoshioka, 2012: 4), and Kishimoto is famous for her best-selling essays, including ねにもつタイプ (Nenimotsu taipu, 2007) [Personality Type that Holds a Grudge], while her wit attracts readers to her works. Shibata, who is highly respected
for his expertise in contemporary American literature as well as his writing skills, is also famous for his close association with Murakami. On the other hand, Murakami’s extreme fame as a novelist greatly contributes to his translator celebrity (Akashi, 2018: 6), but he is also highly famous for particular translations he has produced, especially those of works by Salinger, Fitzgerald and Carver. Furthermore, Murakami’s individual writing style in translations, which reminds the reader of his original writings, attracts considerable media attention, including criticisms that he is deviating from the source authors’ styles (ibid.: 5-6). He also exerts himself in interacting with readers on his websites, and most recently through his own radio programme. The phenomenal popularity of the radio program has been reported in the media since its first launch in August 2018 (e.g. [“83.8% Share for Murakami Haruki’s First Radio Show”], 2018; [“On the Back of His Hugely Successful DJ-ing Debut”], 2018). These translators, especially Kishimoto, Shibata and Murakami, are heavily promoted by publishers on a regular basis.

The examples above suggest that Japanese celebrity translators can be conceptualised by observing the following factors that construct their fame: 1. the popularity of particular original works or translations; 2. the translators’ approaches to translation; 3. the translators’ non-translation activities; 4. expertise in particular genres; 5. the translator’s persona; 6. publishers’ marketing strategies; 7. the level of interaction between the readership and translators and, 8. reader reception. Drawing on the distinctions between recognised, celebrity and super-celebrity which I established in the Introduction, the analysis here will examine the above factors to determine the distinctions between the translators in these categories. The translators chosen for this analysis are: Ogawa and Echizen, whose status is referred to as recognised in this study; Kishimoto and Shibata, who have celebrity status and Murakami as super-celebrity, whose level of fame is at the very top end of the scale, in a category of its own. The aim here is to observe the difference in the reception of their works. This comparison will also enable the analysis to determine any effect on translator visibility caused by the degree of fluency in the translations and their ultimate popularity.
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1.2.4.1. Ogawa Takayoshi

Ogawa, now retired Professor of English literature at Tokyo Institute of Technology, has translated a wide variety of modern classics and contemporary literature, ranging from Edgar Allan Poe, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Paul Theroux and Rohinton Mistry to more contemporary writers, such as Bret Easton Ellis and Jhumpa Lahiri. The source texts are regularly selected and brought by publishers although he agrees to translate only what he likes (Ogawa, personal communication, 2016). Ogawa is renowned for his smooth translation style, which retains the natural flow of the target language, and his reinterpretations of modern classics, regarded as innovative interpretations. Ogawa’s approach to translation is manifested in the title of his ‘how-to’ book on translation, 翻訳の秘密 翻訳小説を「書く」ために (Hon’yaku no himitsu: hon’yaku shōsetsu o ‘kaku’ tameni, 2009) [The Secret of Translation: For ‘Writing’ Translated Fiction]. The choice of his phrase “writing translated fiction” with an emphasis on ‘writing’, instead of the conventional ‘translating’, suggests that Ogawa’s focus is on producing a book which can be read as if the author had written in the target language, rather than as a translation.

Unlike his contemporaries, Ogawa does not have his own website or social media site, a not uncommon situation among the older generation of translators. Ogawa’s approach, as mentioned above, suggests that he does not consider communication with readers to be a priority, although his publishers promote him through their social media and websites, usually when a new translation is published. Ogawa’s media exposure and public appearances also seem to be limited to promotional interviews, plus talks and seminars organised by publishers and bookstores, during which he usually speaks of his translated works. For example, interviews and book reviews on his reinterpretation of 老人と海 (Rōjin to umi, 2014), which is regarded as an innovative version of the existing translation of The Old Man and the Sea, were featured in major national online newspapers such as Sankei News (Ebisawa, 2014) and the publisher’s website Kobunsha Classics (Ogawa, 2014c). Moreover, the editorial team at 光文社 (Kobunsha) published Ogawa’s postscript for the same novel as a free download prior to its publication, encouraging readers to discover the novelty in Ogawa’s translation by comparing it with existing translations (Ogawa, 2014b). Similarly, other notable works by Ogawa, such as グレート・ギャッツビー (Gurēto...
gatsubi, 2009) [The Great Gatsby] and さゆり (Sayuri, 1999) [Memoirs of a Geisha], are praised for the smoothness that allows them to be read as originals (Someya, 2010: 86, Yoshioka, 2012: 4). Thus, Ogawa’s prominence lies mainly in the works he produces, and the major factor that constructs his fame is his translation skills, which have a strong emphasis on reader enjoyment.

1.2.4.2. Echizen Toshiya

Echizen earned recognition with his translation of the international bestseller The Da Vinci Code (Dan Brown, 2003), which was first published in Japan in 2004. His translation of the Robert Langdon series, which consists of five volumes by the same author, has so far sold 17,200,000 copies (”Two Billion Copies Worldwide!”), 2018. Echizen had begun his career as a translator only five years prior to the publication of The Da Vinci Code. He specialises in the mystery genre and has so far translated all the works by Brown that have been published in Japan, as well as retranslations of popular works by Ellery Queen such as The Tragedy of X (1932). Echizen produced his first translation of Brown’s work, Angels and Demons (2000), in 2003. Prior to the publication of this book in Japanese, the author was still largely unknown to Japanese readers, and his titles were not particularly popular (Echizen, 2016b). Nevertheless, the publisher, Kadokawa, acquired foreign rights for both Angels and Demons and The Da Vinci Code as a “two-book deal” from a literary agent, despite the fact that the latter did not even have a completed manuscript at the time (ibid.). Echizen (ibid.) explains that he was offered the translation of Angels and Demons, which required profound knowledge in science and European history, because he used to teach these subjects in schools. For the same reason, he was automatically selected to translate The Da Vinci Code, which had achieved phenomenal sales in the USA while he was still translating the former (ibid.).

Echizen makes media appearances from time to time, especially in terms of interviews in online-magazines. The interviews are usually focused on The Da Vinci Code, including the translator’s anecdotes and secrets behind the plot. However, promotional features of the Japanese translation of the novel do not seem to lay any significant emphasis on the translator. The publisher’s website, for instance, focuses on the plot and the popularity of the novel in the USA, but it does not mention the
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translation. Similarly, the main promotional features of the book cover are the national and international sales rankings and the film version of the story. This phenomenon contrasts with Ogawa, whose fluent translation seems to be one of the main promotional factors. The reason for this may perhaps be related to the genre with which Echizen’s works are usually associated. He translates エンタメ (entame), a shortened term for entertainment genres, equivalent to popular genres in anglophone contexts, including fiction and romance. Naturally, books in entame are expected to be read fluently, and publishers and readers’ main focus is on the entertainment value of the story rather than the translator’s approach to translation strategy. Hence, the sales of translations in entame largely depend on the plot or the popularity of the source text in the source context, rather than the translators.

Unlike Ogawa, Echizen actively communicates with readers through blogs and social media. However, his communication with readers began in 2009, after he had earned significant recognition for his works (Echizen, 2016a: 3-4). Echizen, who previously preferred to remain invisible as a translator, has, since then, started to utilise the media attention he received to take a role in promoting foreign literature (ibid.). His blog 翻訳百景 (Hon’yaku hyakkei) [A Hundred Views of Translation] features topics that are mainly related to his translation practice, including new releases, upcoming translation workshops and the seminars he organises, while his Twitter account 越前敏弥 Toshiya Echizen@t_echizen may occasionally contain details of his private life. Echizen also regularly gives seminars on translation in major cities, including Tokyo and Osaka, as well as organising reading events with other prominent translators. He has published essays on his translation practice, as well as ‘how-to’ books on translation. The essays collected in a volume titled after his blog Hon’yaku hyakkei (2016a) consist of his anecdotes of translating The Da Vinci Code and come with a promotional dust jacket which reads: “名訳はこうして紡がれる。ベストセラーテレビ翻訳者が明かす舞台裏” [How a masterpiece is created. The secrets of behind the stage, told by a bestselling literary translator]. Similarly, his ‘how-to’ book on translation, titled 越前敏弥の日本人なら必ず悪訳する英文 [The English Writings that Japanese People Always Translate Badly by Echizen Toshiya], bears a clear message on the book cover which reads: “あの『ダ・ヴィンチ・コード』の名翻訳者による” [By the translator of the master
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translation *The Da Vinci Code*]. It could be argued that the title of the novel functions as a brand and endorses Echizen’s other literary works and activities, such as his seminars and translation workshops. Thus, Echizen’s recognition is largely based on the fame of the source text, and mention of that novel allows the translator to maintain his visibility, mostly through translation-related activities.

1.2.4.3. Kishimoto Sachiko

Kishimoto, who is renowned for her translation skills (Niimoto, 2000: 39), is one of the two translators to belong to the *celebrity* category here. She regularly translates works by contemporary American writers, including Nicholson Baker, Lydia Davis and Steven Millhauser, and is described as “難解な文章もわかりやすく訳してくれる翻訳家” [The translator who translates texts that are confusing to read into readable ones] ("Five Recommended Works", 2017). As in the case of her contemporaries above, many of her source texts were brought to her by publishers who usually select the works of authors she would favour. However, she occasionally selects her own source texts, especially for anthologies. Kishimoto is known for her particular choice of foreign authors, including Baker, Jeanette Winterson, and Thom Jones, which she describes as (Kishimoto, 2004: 48):

> 本を訳すかどうか決めるとき、「作者が自分より変か」という基準があって。やっぱり自分より変じゃないと面白くない。

[When deciding on a book to translate, ‘whether the author is more peculiar than myself’ becomes the standard. It would not be interesting if the author were less peculiar than myself.]

She has so far published five anthologies consisting of works by foreign authors, some of whom are relatively unknown in Japan, selected and translated by herself. One of the five entitled 難愛小説集 (*Henai Shōsetsu shū*, 2008) [A Collection of Strange Love Stories] includes unusual short stories relating to love by Ray Vulcevich, Julia Slavin and Amy M. Homes. Similarly, another anthology 居心地の悪い部屋 (*Igokochi no warui heya*, 2012) [The Uncomfortable Room], which is described as “[focuses on dark
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stories that would guarantee to make the reader feel uncomfortable” (Takii, 2015), includes works by Brian Evenson, Rikki Ducornet and Daniel Orozco. The list of authors in Kishimoto’s collections, whose names have little commercial value within the Japanese book market, suggests that the publishers rely on the translator’s name-value to promote the books. This phenomenon is manifested in the promotional features of the book covers, as well as book reviews that emphasise the translator’s name. The book cover for her most recent anthology, 楽しい夜 (Tanoshii Yoru, 2016) [Such Fun], reads “岸本佐知子の「網」にかかった愛すべき 11 の短編” [Caught by Kishimoto Sachiko’s ‘net’, eleven short stories that you ought to love], while its book review emphasises her role as editor rather than translator: “本好きからの信頼は抜群！岸本佐知子氏が選んだ ‘感情を揺さぶられる’ 短編集” [Highly trusted by book lovers! A collection of ‘heart-stirring’ short stories selected by Kishimoto Sachiko.] (Toyozaki, 2016). Although Kishimoto does not have a personal imprint, the above examples indicate that her name functions as a brand which guarantees that the book is entertaining.

Kishimoto is also known as an essayist, or rather her essays have had a significant influence on her fame as a translator (Kishimoto, personal communication, 2016). She has so far published three collections of essays, one of which (e.g. Nenimotsu taipu) won the 23rd Kodansha Essay Award in 2007. The collection, which comes in a book form, consists of very short essays. The book bears a message on its jacket “読んでも一ミクロンの役にもたたず、教養もいっさい増えないこと請け合いです。” [We assure you that reading [this book] is no use for anything and it will not enrich your education, at all]. The collection has been praised by prominent figures in the literary world, including famous writers, such as Ogawa Yoko, and Kawakami Hiromi, who mentions the essay in her volume 大好きな本: 川上弘美書評集 (Daisuki na hon: Kawakami Hiromi Shohyōshū, 2010) [My Favourite Books: Collected Book Reviews by Kawakami Hiromi]. However, unlike Echizen and Ogawa, Kishimoto’s focus in her personal writings does not directly relate to her translation experiences. Instead, her essays consist of rather ordinary episodes surrounding her daily life, which are written

3 “Such Fun” is not a back translation of the book’s title Tanoshii Yoru. However, Kishimoto named the book after her translation of Such Fun by James Salter (2005), which is included in the book.
in her idiosyncratic humorous language ([“The Editor Knows”], 2007), known as “Kishimoto-style humour”, which has dedicated followers (Niimoto, 2004: 52). Her essays provide readers with access to her own voice, as opposed to her voice as a spokesperson of her source authors. Furthermore, her personal accounts allow readers a glimpse of her private life. On the other hand, her translator personality usually manifests itself in interviews, talks and round-table discussions, where she generally talks about her experiences as a translator and literature-related topics, such as the writers whose works she translates. Nor is she hesitant in talking about her failure with her first job as an “office lady” and her tendency to be a recluse (EnJoe, 2013). Kishimoto’s media coverage, however, is not limited to the literary-orientated media. She was featured in a female fashion magazine in which she modelled and talked about her anthology for the “Books and Coats” page ([“Choose a Translated Literature by the Translator!”], 2014). The above examples suggest that Kishimoto’s essayist voice represents an unpretentious and more personal side of her, as opposed to her personality as a talented translator. Her case, in which mediatisation and personalisation are much in evidence, contrasts with her contemporaries above, whose readers have access mainly to their professional personalities as translators. Thus, it could be argued that her readers can relate to what they believe Kishimoto to be as a person, which makes her more approachable than many other translators who are professors at prestigious universities. This is highlighted in one critic’s review on her essay (Toyozaki, 2017):

スティーヴン・ミルハウザーやニコルソン・ベイカーといったくせ者作家の訳者として、海外小説ファンの絶大な支持を集め岸本佐知子の中には天才と馬鹿が共生しています。

[Kishimoto Sachiko, who has tremendous support from foreign literature fans for being a translator of peculiar writers such as Steven Millhauser and Nicholson Baker, is both a genius and ridiculous at the same time.]

In addition, unlike her contemporaries discussed above, the readership of her translations is not limited to regular readers of foreign literature but also includes those who became interested in Kishimoto’s translations after reading her essays (Kishimoto,
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Kishimoto explains that she writes essays hoping that readers will be interested in her translations, thinking “the book translated by her [who writes in humorous language] may be not so difficult to read” (ibid.). Her approach suggests that readability is one of the reasons for the popularity of her translation work.

Kishimoto is also an active user of Twitter; her account @Karyobinga currently has 18.9K followers. However, she seems to focus on tweeting mainly on topics relating to foreign literature and her works, rather than creating dialogical communication with the readers.

The findings above illustrate that Kishimoto’s fame consists of: the popularity of her essays, which contributes to widening her readership compared to her recognised contemporaries; her unconventional tastes for literature, which her readers seem to associate with her personality and her talent and skills in translating as well as writing, which earn her readers’ admiration. Furthermore, the approachability that lies behind her status as a successful translator generates tangibility and provokes emotional reactions from readers, which is an important factor in the production of celebrity (Gabler & Fellow, 2001: 8-9; Holmes & Redmond, 2006: 4).

1.2.4.4. Shibata Motoyuki

Shibata is a prolific translator who can also be located in the celebrity category. He is regularly referred to as “the most famous Japanese translator” among those who translate as a primary profession in present-day Japan (Koyano, 2009: 152; Bellos, 2011: 303; Sim, 2011). A retired professor of American literature, Shibata is well known for his translations of the works of contemporary American authors, such as Paul Auster, Rebecca Brown and Steven Millhauser (Abe, 2014). The fact that the source texts are chosen by the translator practically guarantees their popularity among young-generation readers (Koyano, 2009: 152). Like Kishimoto, Shibata is regularly featured in interviews and roundtable discussions in literary magazines and newspapers, as well as in such books on translators as Hon’yaku-ka retsuden 101, (Koyano, 2009) [101 Lives of the Translators]. Moreover, literary magazines 鳥よ！ (Hato yo!), Coyote and 文藝 (Bungei) featured a ‘Shibata Special’, dedicated to his interviews and works, in 2001.

4 “Tangibility” refers to the idea that the person really exists and that they have daily life as we do (Gabler & Fellow, 2001: 8-9).
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2008 and 2009. He has also launched a number of literary magazines, most recently Monkey in 2013, for which he is the editor-in-chief. This magazine regularly introduces the works of contemporary American authors, and Shibata usually includes short extracts from his own translations. In addition, he is a co-founder of the English language journal Monkey Business, which focuses on introducing contemporary Japanese writings to English-speaking readers, including works by Furukawa Hideo, Ito Hiromi and Ogawa Yoko. Shibata regularly participates in Japanese literature-related events, especially in North America, and has been interviewed as an ambassador for new Japanese writers in newspapers and on literary websites, including Granta (2014), Asymptote (2011) and Words Without Borders (2017). Thus, unlike his contemporaries above, Shibata’s activities outside translation bring him media coverage beyond the Japanese context. He has also written several essays and ‘how-to’ books on translation. So far, Shibata has also won five major awards for his translations, including the BABEL International Translation Award (1995) and the Kodansha Essay Award (1992) for his essay 生半可な学者 (Namahanka na gakusha, 1992) [A Dilettante Scholar]. The latter consists of his thoughts and amusing episodes relating to his career as a scholar of American literature and English language. One bookstore’s promotional message reads: “アメリカ小説の名翻訳家によるすこぶる愉快でためになるエッセイが満載” [Fully loaded with amusing and useful tales by the master translator of American novels] (Hakusui U Books). Thus, the essay portrays Shibata as a humorous person while maintaining his academic traits. Shibata’s personality outside translation practice contrasts with that of Kishimoto, which centres on her ordinariness. More recently, Shibata was named winner of the 2017 Tsubouchi Shōyō Award, a prestigious literary prize whose previous winners include Murakami (2007).

From all this it can be seen that Shibata earned fame largely for his talent in translation and his role as an ambassador for the works of both foreign and Japanese authors. However, Koyano (2009: 153) argues that it was Shibata’s association with Murakami which shifted the translator’s status from famous to a celebrity. Shibata first became involved with Murakami in 1986, when the author was translating Setting the Bear Free (1986). Shibata was one of the five translators who edited Murakami’s translation, and has been Murakami’s personal proof-reader and editor for his translations since that time. The two have been regularly featured together in roundtable
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discussions and interviews for literary magazines and essays. On these occasions, Murakami generally endorses Shibata’s translation skills. One strong example is a chapter entitled “柴田先生が僕の大学だった” [Master Shibata was My University] (Murakami, 2017b) which is included in 村上春樹翻訳ほとんど全仕事 (Murakami Haruki hon’yaku hotondo zenshigoto: Translation Works of Haruki Murakami, 2017a). Murakami describes how he learnt his translation skills through his experience of translating Setting the Bear Free together with Shibata. Murakami’s comment as such puts Shibata under the spotlight, adding to his fame. Thus, a super-celebrity’s endorsement can be one of the factors that create celebrity-translator status. This phenomenon, however, contrasts with Shibata’s own practice of giving endorsements to his younger contemporaries. While these endorsements may guarantee the quality of the translation and contribute to young translators attaining recognition, they do not necessarily provide access to the celebrity category as occurred with Shibata himself.

Murakami and Shibata have co-authored essays on translation, including 翻訳夜話 (Hon’yaku yawa, 2000) [A Casual Talk on Translation], which has become a best-seller, and they also co-launched an imprint 村上 柴田 翻訳 堂 (Murakami Shibata Hon’yakudō) [Murakami Shibata Translation House] in 2016. The imprint consists of the translators’ favourite works, some of which are translated by themselves. Furthermore, Shibata is regularly invited to major Murakami-related events, where he usually speaks of the author’s writing or translation practices, including an international conference of Murakami’s translators “A Wild Haruki Chase: How the World is Reading and Translating Murakami” (Tokyo, Kobe, Sapporo, March 2006), and more recently, an international academic conference “40 Years with Murakami Haruki” (Newcastle University, March 2018).

As with Kishimoto, Shibata has also published a variety of anthologies. These are not limited to collections of the works by American authors often associated with him by readers, such as Auster and Millhauser, but also include ブリティッシュ・アイリッシュ・マスターピース [British and Irish Masterpieces] (2015), which consists of retranslations of British and Irish canonical writings, including works by Dickens, Wilde, Joyce and Conrad, while 昨日のように遠い日ー少年少女小説 (Kinō no youni tōi hi: shōnen shōjo shōsetsu, 2009) [A Distant Day Like Yesterday: Boys’ and Girls’
Novels] contains an unusual selection of such works as the twentieth-century American comic strip *Little Nemo in Slumberland* by Winsor McCay, poems by the Soviet-era surrealist Daniil Kharms (Даниил Хармс), and a short story by Bosnian writer Aleksandar Hemon. The above list illustrates that, like Kishimoto, Shibata has freedom in his choice of source texts irrespective of the marketability of the authors. He confirms that the benefit of being famous is that he can translate what he wants, including the works by unknown authors (Shibata, personal communication, 2016).

Shibata’s translations are known for their high quality and readability. However, unlike Ogawa, whose translations are also notable for their fluency in Japanese, the readability of Shibata’s translations seems to be the result of his focus on producing concise translations in order to avoid the ambiguity caused by redundancy (Abe, 2014). His writing style in translations has been praised by readers and critics. Examples include (“[Shibata Motoyuki and Takahashi Gen’ichiro]”, 2009):

実をいうと、私は谷崎潤一郎や三島由紀夫の文章を名文と思ったことはなく、その代わり、柴田元幸や鈴木道彦の翻訳を名文だと思っていて […] [Frankly, I’ve never thought of the writings of Tanizaki Jun’ichiro and Mishima Yukio as masterpieces, but instead, I think of translations by Shibata Motoyuki and Suzuki Michihiko as masterpiece writings […]]

Shibata also attempts to retain the feel of the source text, although this does not include the employment of expressions and terms that are obviously derived from the source language (Shibata, 2000: 221). Rather, he uses an alternative term in Japanese, while avoiding colloquial Japanese expressions (Abe, 2014). Thus, while Shibata’s translation aims to be comprehensible to the reader, it is not necessarily as fluent as original Japanese writings. A typical example can be found in a passage from his translation of *Fugue State* (Brian Evenson, 2009), which consists of dark, psychological stories. This passage contains a reference to the grotesque state of the protagonist Hroar’s body and “his boiled and dying hand”. Shibata renders the sentence as “手が煮られて腐りかけて

---

5 The same comparison is made by Abe (2004).
The phrase “te ga nirarete” [hand was being boiled] is not a standard expression in the Japanese language (Abe, 2004); however, its “[psychological spookiness]” in the target language somewhat reflects the peculiar nature of the source text (ibid.). Thus, Shibata attempts to reproduce the spookiness of the source text, not by employing terms derived from the source language but by the use of an unusual Japanese expression.

Aside from the literary magazine *Monkey*, Shibata does not use social media sites, but relies on literary events as a means of communicating with readers (Shibata, personal communication, 2016). Shibata suggests that no other literary translators in Japan actively involve themselves in organising and participating in literary events as frequently as he does (ibid.). He has been a regular participant at the Tokyo International Literary Festival, the largest of its kind. Shibata also appears at events, particularly book launches, where he reads his translations and talks to the readers. These activities further add to Shibata’s recognition.

In short, the components of Shibata’s celebrity status are his translation skills, talent in writing, expertise in foreign literature, persona and, more crucially, his association with Murakami. It could be argued that he is perceived as an official critic of the author’s works, which contrasts with Lin and Lai, whose voices are perceived as the author’s. Furthermore, Shibata’s association with Murakami forms a Murakami & Shibata brand, manifested in their imprint of co-authored work which makes a clear example of commodification. Although Shibata reveals the humorous side of his personality in essays, his persona seems to be associated with his high academic profile, in contrast to Kishimoto, whose persona contains two opposite elements – talented translator versus ordinary person.

1.2.4.5. Murakami Haruki

Murakami’s celebrity status as a translator in the Japanese context has been explored in Hadley & Akashi (2014; 2015) and Akashi (2018). Not only has he published a larger number of translations than of novels, but also his translations draw significant media attention (Sato, 2009: 13). Furthermore, Murakami’s reputation as a translator attracts
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readers in the same vein as his authorial career does for his original works (Hadley & Akashi, 2015: 2). Murakami (2017: 11) claims that some readers even prefer his translations to his novels. He has produced a number of bestsellers, such as *The Catcher in the Rye* and *The Great Gatsby*, which have contributed to a recent reinterpretation boom (Fujimoto, 2006: 312, Sato, 2009: 1). These translations have been heavily promoted by publishers, which has engendered high sales figures (Fujimoto, 2006: 312): *The Catcher in the Rye* in particular had sold 350,000 copies within 5 years of its publication (Sato, 2009: 1). Furthermore, Murakami is frequently regarded as being “the central figure” in the contemporary American literature boom which first began in Japan in the 1980s (Miura, 2003). Miura (ibid.) argues that the author’s strong preference for American literature distinguishes him from traditional Japanese novelists, whose works are usually influenced by great European literatures. Thus, Murakami’s choice of source text, including the works by F. Scott Fitzgerald, J. D. Salinger, Raymond Carver, Raymond Chandler, John Irving and Tim O’Brien, forms part of his persona, as was seen in the cases of Shibata, Kishimoto, as well as Moshe Ron in the Hebrew context.

On the other hand, Miura (ibid.) suggests that it was the image associated with Murakami at that time, such as being “postmodern”, “cool” and “fashionable”, which made reading American literature popular. Thus, Murakami’s novelist personality has also influenced the reception of the works he has translated.

Unlike other celebrity translators who are examined in this chapter, Murakami (2009: 66) often expresses reluctance to give interviews within his own country, and he is known for being so media-shy that he never makes TV appearances:

日本にいればぼくはまず人前にでません。テレビに出たりラジオに出たりしないし、講演もしないし、サイン会もしない。というのは、まず苦手だからだし、それにそんなことしてもしょうがないかなと思うからです。書いたものは多くの人に読んでもほしいと、ものすごくそれは強く思うんだけど、それ以外のことっていうのは関係ないんですよね、本当に。 [I don’t make public appearances when I’m in Japan. I don’t appear on TV and radio shows, or give talks at seminars, or show up at autograph
events. The reason is I’m not good at these things, and I believe there is no point to them. Of course, I strongly hope many people will read what I have written; but to me, nothing else is really important."

In this respect, he went so far as to flee Japan in 1986 to escape media attention, and he remained out of the country for ten years (ibid.). It can be said that his shyness has become an important part of Murakami’s public persona and makes him seem reclusive. This phenomenon resembles that of J. D. Salinger, who was known for his refusal to appear in the media (Lyons, 2014: 342; Franssen, 2016: 15). However, Murakami’s tendency to shy away from the media is perhaps beginning to change. For example, he made a rare public appearance to a limited audience during his book launch event “本当の翻訳の話をしよう” [Let’s have a real talk about translation] (27th of April 2017). Furthermore, in August 2018, Murakami launched his first radio show ‘Murakami Radio’, through which his fans can listen to him talking, a rare occurrence for many.

Murakami published his first translation マイ・ロスト・シティ (Mai rosuto shitī, 1981) [My Lost City] two years after winning the Gunzo Award for best first novel (1979). Despite his having no experience as a translator, the editor, whom Murakami had known personally prior to beginning his literary career, readily agreed to Murakami’s proposal to translate the work of Fitzgerald, whose name had little recognition in the Japanese literary milieu (Murakami, 2017: 88). Murakami translates mostly for personal reasons, such as admiration for particular authors, or to learn their writing styles (Murakami, 2012: 238), although he also lists maintaining the existence of literature as a reason (1996: 600). He translates, employing both reader-focused and source text-focused strategies where necessary, to produce texts that can be read fluently (Hadley & Akashi, 2015: 7-8, 2014: 188-9). Moreover, Hadley & Akashi (ibid.) demonstrate that Murakami, possibly unintentionally, uses his own writing styles as a novelist in the texts he translates, which differentiates his translations from those of his counterparts who are professional translators or scholars. One notable example is his use of the first-person pronoun 私 (boku) for male protagonists, which will be discussed in Chapter Three. The term appears consistently in his original writings (Hadley & Akashi, 2015: 10). Rubin (2002: 37) describes boku in Murakami’s novels
as portraying a passive character, which resembles Murakami’s own personality. Similarly, male protagonists in his translations call themselves ‘boku’ irrespective of their personal characteristics, creating some intertextual links between the protagonists in his novels and his translations (Hadley & Akashi, 2015: 10). Fujimoto (ibid.: 316) even claims that Murakami’s translation of The Catcher in the Rye can be read as his original work, which is one of the obvious reasons Murakami fans are attracted to his translations. Furthermore, the commercial value of Murakami’s name is manifested beyond his original writings. The covers of his translations bear the translator’s name in a larger font size than the authors’, especially in the case of those published in the 1980s (Kazamaru, 2006: 52, Rubin, 2002: 187). Murakami (1989c: 28) confirms that his publisher insisted on highlighting his name on the cover of his first translation of Carver’s work as the author was still unknown to Japanese readers in 1983.

Murakami promotes the books, not through promotional activities in public, but through providing readers with anecdotes relating to his particular translations. Murakami has co-published 翻訳夜話 2: サリンジャ戦記 (Hon’yaku yawa 2: Sarinjā senki, 2003) [A Casual Talk on Translation 2: The Record of the Salinger War] with Shibata, in which he talks exclusively about his experience translating The Catcher in the Rye, while advocating フラニーとズーイ (Furanī to zūī, 2014) [Franny and Zooey] as a great read and talking about his own experience of reading the novel in a complementary introduction こんなに面白い話だったんだ (Konnani omoshiroi hanashi dattanda, 2014) [Such a Good Story]. More recently, he has published Murakami Haruki hon’yaku hotondo zenshigoto: Translation Works of Haruki Murakami (2017b), in which he talks about all the translations he has produced in the past thirty-six years. However, his motives for such promotions seem to be based on his passion for translation or personal admiration for the authors rather than increasing the sales of his works.

As with his celebrity contemporaries, Murakami has published anthologies, including And Other Stories とっておきのアメリカ小説 12 編 (Totteoki no America shosetsu 12 hen, 1988) [And Other Stories: Selected 12 American Stories], レイモンド・カーヴァー傑作選 (Carver’s Dozen, 1994) and 恋しくて (Koishikute: Ten Selected Love stories). See Chapter Four for more details.
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*Stories, 2013*). *Carver’s Dozen* consists of Murakami’s personal favourites from among the author’s works. But what differentiates Murakami from his celebrity contemporaries is the level of freedom he has, which allows him to combine his own works with anthologies (e.g. *Koishikute*), which is no doubt a selling point of the books, as they are usually promoted in the covers. Furthermore, besides *Murakami Shibata Hon’yakudō*, Murakami has his own imprint 村上春樹翻訳ライブラリー (*Murakami Haruki hon’yaku raiburarī*) [Murakami Haruki Translation Library], which is entirely dedicated to works that are selected and translated by Murakami, including those by Salinger, Fitzgerald, as well as the complete works of Carver. This phenomenon illustrates how publishers are keen to capitalise on Murakami’s fame as a novelist (Hadley & Akashi, 2015: 2; Akashi, 2018: 4). In addition, in bookstores his translations are frequently found in the ‘Murakami section’ together with his novels, rather than the ‘translated literature section’, which makes it easier for readers to find his translations (Strecher, 2018: 259-260).

In terms of communication with readers, Murakami focuses on doing this directly through websites. His publishers have set up a number of websites for a limited period in which readers can post their comments and questions relating to or unconnected with his works. Murakami, in turn, answers the correspondence resulting from these websites personally. The websites include: 村上朝日堂 (*Murakami Asahido*), which ran from June 1996 to November 1997, February 1998 to November 1999, and again from March to June 2006; 海辺のカフカ (*Umibe no Kafuka*), September to December 2002; 村上モトクラシ (*Murakami motokurashi*), which ran for an unspecified period starting in March 2005, and the latest, 村上さんのところ (*Murakami-san no tokoro*), which began in January 2015 and is still in existence. This latest site, managed by Shinchosha, is said to have received fifteen thousand emails from readers across Japan within its first week (McCurry, 2015). Doubtless, Murakami’s reluctance to make media appearances adds to the high popularity of his websites, through which his readers glimpse the author’s personality and develop a semblance of intimacy (Hillenbrand, 2009: 720). In turn, Murakami (2003a: 1) explains that exchanging emails with his readers allows him direct access to their feedback on his works, which, he believes, is an advantage for any writer. His attitude towards the relationship with readers contrasts with his contemporaries above, whose
communications with their readers tend to be mono-logical (one-way) and are usually centred on promoting their works. Murakami’s “dialogic (interpersonal) communication” (Tella, 1994: 72) with his readers, which does not solely focus on his works, seem to create “tangibility”, one of the elements that modern celebrities depend on (Gabler & Fellow, 2001: 8). Hence, this approach, focusing on the reader-translator relationship, greatly contributes to the formation of translator celebrity in much the same way as does the fan-celebrity relationship.

The findings above have demonstrated that, first and foremost, Murakami’s world-wide literary fame has had a significant influence on his visibility as a translator (Akashi, 2018: 6), which distinguishes him from all of his contemporaries. Other factors that contribute to Murakami’s translator celebrity are: his reputation as a creative translator (ibid.: 4) whose translations attract readers due to their novelty, which will be further discussed in Chapter Three; his talent as a translator; his expertise in the works of particular authors, such as Carver and Fitzgerald; a huge fan base consisting of the readership of his novels; his public persona, plus tangibility, and publishers’ branding strategies. Some of these factors, including talent, persona and publishers’ marketing strategies, are shared by his celebrity contemporaries discussed above. What distinguishes Murakami’s case from those is that his translations are part of the Murakami brand, which ranges from his novels and essays to American literature, music and food recipes. His case contrasts with those of Shibata and Kishimoto, whose names function as brands only within their translations and writings. Thus, the Murakami brand has a far wider range of consumers than his contemporaries, and these consumers are potentially readers of his translations. Murakami’s case then demonstrates the three processes, ‘mediatisation’, ‘personalisation’ and commodification’ most prominently in the Japanese context. Hence, he has stronger elements that qualify for him as a celebrity status than his counterparts in the two other categories.

The level of a translator’s prominence seems to be reflected in publishers’ marketing strategies. Ogawa and Echizen in the recognised category have no imprint or anthologies, while the latter seems to benefit from being part of the ‘Da Vinci Code’ brand. By contrast, Kishimoto and Shibata in the celebrity category have anthologies
under their names, while the latter also has an imprint, but it is shared by Murakami. Hence, it could be said that publishers’ evaluation of Japanese literary translators is very much manifested in whether they allow the translator to publish anthologies and have individual imprints, although the latter seems to be an extremely rare case. Thus, it is plausible to say the scale of commodification is proportional to the degree of the translator’s prominence.

1.3. Conclusion

Celebrity translators in the three contexts examined in this chapter appear to be produced in a manner substantially similar to celebrities in other domains, especially literary celebrities, combining traditional notions of literary fame with the modern phenomenon of celebrity to varying degrees, depending on the context. Furthermore, the celebrity translators are seemingly treated as having similar authority to that of authors, as seen in the case of Shibata who is not only regularly invited to take major roles in large literary festivals but also organises his own literary events, as well as endorsing young generation Japanese writers.

Traditional notions of literary fame, such as one’s distinctive quality, including talent and superiority, are observable in all the translators examined above, irrespective of their degrees of prominence, most notably in the cases of Cao and his contemporaries, since the works they produced are core factors in their acquisition of status. It goes without saying that the translations produced by these translators are of high quality. As with authors in general, their works compete in a free market, and the translators earn respect based on how these works are evaluated by readers and critics. Therefore, the celebrity status of these translators is more stable than celebrities in general, who tend to be regarded as famous for being famous (Marshall, 1997: 7), having no particular talents nor works to solidify their status in the long term, as discussed in my Introduction.

However, analysis of examples such as Ogawa’s case demonstrates that one’s distinctive quality alone does not necessarily push one’s status from the recognised to the celebrity category, such as Mirsky, Shibata, Kishimoto and Murakami, who can
more clearly be compared with elements of modern celebrity. On the other hand, Echizen’s case demonstrates that when a translator’s recognition is based on the source text’s extraordinary level of popularity, the translator’s talents and skills may be eclipsed.

Another characteristic of celebrity translators is their possession of public personae associated with their works, which is promoted through the media. The Israeli translators promote their artistic talents or eccentricity by “self-glorification”, while translators such as Lin and Lai are regarded by their readers as proxies of their celebrity source authors. In the Japanese context, the translators’ personae are marketed by publishers: Ogawa’s reputation for fluent translation, Echizen’s association with the international best-seller, Kishimoto’s ordinariness and taste for idiosyncratic source authors, Shibata’s scholarly persona and association with the world-renowned novelist, and Murakami’s novelist personality are all emphasised by publishers in their promotions. The influence of the source authors’ visibility in the formation of translators’ personae is observable to various degrees, most notably in the cases of Lai and Lin. However, when a translator’s visibility exceeds that of the source author, the translator may become influential in relation to the reception of the author’s work, as seen in Murakami’s case.

Prizes also add to translator prominence, as demonstrated in Shibata and Cao’s cases. Endorsements, on the other hand, seem to have significant influence only when they are given by an individual whose prominence lies in the super-celebrity category.

A further factor is that translation strategies can have a major influence on translator visibility, as was seen with Ogawa. However, this requires the participation of publishers and critics who highlight the translator’s translation strategies. Moreover, translators’ approaches to translation alone do not tend to make them more visible than those who have a combination of various factors.

Regardless of the nature of the translators’ personae, the images of celebrity translators undeniably have public appeal and are utilised heavily by their publishers when marketing their works. Translators like Murakami, Lin and Lai exert themselves to make direct contact with readers and, as a result, create a sense of intimacy which can be described as one of the typical characteristics of modern celebrity. Their readers, in turn, respond by reading their works and talking about them in blogs and social media.
sites, which promote the translators and their works, contributing to their popularity. Traditional aspects of fame can be seen in translators such as Cao and his contemporaries, whose prominence is based on the works they produce. Hence, although further research is required into wider national contexts to solidify the claim, I would suggest that a celebrity translator, in global terms, not only has the talent to produce works that earn readers’ respect, but also a public persona that draws readers, attracts media attention, and generates commercial value. Thus, as in the case of contemporary literary celebrity, translator celebrity consists of the combination of notions of both traditional literary fame and modern celebrity and goes through the same three processes: personalisation, mediatisation, and commodification, to various degrees, depending on the cultural context.

The evidence produced in this chapter demonstrates that there are numerous factors involved in the formation of translator celebrity. However, the historical background, which allowed these translators to achieve high levels of visibility in the first place, is another important factor in understanding the phenomenon of translator celebrity. Earlier research by the Japanese translation studies scholars Yanabu Akira (1982, 2004) and Inoue Ken (2011, 2012) shows that translators in Japanese contexts historically played important roles in cultural, technological and political developments. The next chapter will focus on this Japanese context and explore factors in its historical background that allowed Japanese celebrity translators to emerge.
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The Roots of Japanese Celebrity Translators

2.1. Introduction

This chapter explores the emergence of modern Japan’s first prominent translators in the Meiji period (1868-1912), asking how it relates to the current celebrity translator phenomenon in Japan. The chapter identifies who the prominent translators were and the factors that earned them fame, in an attempt to demonstrate how the phenomenon came to emerge and form the grounding for translators in contemporary Japan to become celebrities.

Celebrity translators first emerged in Japan during the Meiji period when translation became hugely important due to social, cultural and technological shifts as the country ended its two-hundred-year-old policy of isolationism. A wide range of foreign literatures and non-literary works were imported during this period as part of the country’s modernisation process (Shinkuma, 2008: 51), which generated opportunities for translators to gain recognition for their status and works. However, there are other important factors that also contributed to the emergence of prominent translators. New printing technology was introduced to the country around this period, which allowed the mass production of printed media through which translated literature was circulated (Law & Morita, 2003: 113-114). Furthermore, the implementation of a new education system, which added English to the curriculum for the first time (Yamada, 2012: 20), allowed a small number of individuals who came from privileged backgrounds to acquire the language skills that enabled them to translate foreign literature. Several translators

---

1 The modern Japanese era system is associated with the emperors. A new era begins on the ascension of a new emperor and continues until his death. This ‘one reign, one era name’ system came to be adopted in the Meiji period.
began highly prominent for translating European and American literature in order to introduce foreign ideas and to explore literary styles that were new to their literary tradition. Thus, the environment in which these translators earned fame is significantly different from that of contemporary celebrity translators in terms of the significance of translators’ roles in the country’s modernisation. This chapter will attempt to establish how the tradition of conferring celebrity status on translators came about in the Meiji period and how it relates to the phenomenon of translator celebrity in contemporary Japan.

Like their contemporaries today, most of these translators had other professions as writers, poets, playwrights, scholars, journalists, editors or literary critics, but the translations they produced played a significant part in earning them fame. Inoue (2011: 1) argues that translations during the Meiji period were not often distinguished from original writings. Similarly, Yamada (2012: 31) suggests that the translators’ names influenced many readers when choosing literature, since they were unfamiliar with the source authors. Thus, it could be argued that these translators were perceived as almost equal to the source author, especially since many of the translators were also writers in their own right. Publishers, too, strove to publish European literature translated by established authors, whose names guaranteed the sales, as will be discussed later.

The Japanese situation above contrasts with Britain, where translation also played a large part in the establishment of the literary tradition, in this case as early as in the Middle Ages (e.g. Geoffrey Chaucer, c.1340-c.1400). Similarly, in the United States, translation greatly contributed to the formation of national culture over the course of the nineteenth century (Venuti, 2009: 323). As in the Japanese case, the majority of famous translators in both countries up to the late nineteenth century were leading writers and scholars (e.g. Thomas Carlyle, 1795-1881; Ralph Waldo Emerson, 1803-1882; George Eliot 1819-1880) who imported philosophical ideas and new literary styles through translation of literature from other European-language contexts, such as French and German. However, the environment in which literary translators produced works began to shift in Britain between the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries subsequent to the establishment of the Society of Authors in London (1883) and introduction of laws that protect authors’ legal and commercial rights, including the Net Book Agreement (1899) and Copyright Act (1911) (Pym, 2000: 74). The new laws enabled considerable
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numbers of authors to live by their writing profession alone, while translator status remained secondary. Furthermore, in contrast to Japan, the number of translations in late nineteenth-century Britain saw a significant decrease, perhaps partly due to the fact that authors had already explored new literary styles (Pym, 2000: 68) and also due to the self-sufficiency of the British fiction market (Law & Morita, 2003: 112). Indeed, by the 1880s, both Britain and the United States had become leading exporters of feuilleton fiction (ibid.).

This chapter argues that the development of translation and publishing practices in Japan has been key to the development of translator celebrity in that country, which contrasts with the European and North American contexts, where their diverse historical backgrounds did not lead to the occurrence of the same phenomenon.

2.2. An analysis of celebrity translators in the Meiji Period

This section focuses on three literary translators who were active during the Meiji period and show distinct differences from their prominent contemporaries. They are: Mori Ōgai (森鴎外, 1862-1922), Kuroiwa Ruikō (黒岩涙香, 1862-1920) and Wakamatsu Shizuko (若松賤子, 1864-1896), whose translations include works by Hans Christian Andersen (1805-1875), Victor Hugo (1802-1885) and Frances Hodgson Burnett (1849-1924), respectively. The above translators, all of whom were the first generation to learn English in their teens under the newly introduced education system (Yamada, 2012: 20), became famous for diverse reasons. Ōgai represents those who earned fame in a traditional way, while Kuroiwa could be hailed as the father of celebrity translators whose tactical publicising strategies seem to resemble those of the current publishing industry. Similarly, Wakamatsu’s fame was partly created through photography, another modern technology of that time, in the way contemporary celebrities are created, the process of which requires visual images.

Hadley (2018: 562) states that there were 503 named translators who were active at some point during the Meiji period, which lasted for thirty-nine years. However, he also points out that only a small number of them had a substantial career length or published a notable number of translations (ibid.: 565). For example, only twenty-seven translators had worked professionally for more than ten years and 464 translators
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published fewer than five translations during the period (ibid.: 565, 566). By contrast, Ōgai had the longest career length (twenty-seven years) and published the greatest number of translations (sixty-two) (ibid.). Moreover, he was voted the best literary translator in 1911. The competition was run between June and September 1911 in Bunshōsekai for distinctive persons in each area of the literary milieu, including writers, poets, playwrights, critics, and translators. Ōgai, who came top in the translator category, collected 15,190 votes, leaving his contemporary Nobori Shōmu (昇曙夢), who came second, far behind scoring only 693 ("The Final Result", 1911). The third place was gained by Tsubouchi Shōyō (坪内逍遙), followed by Soma Gyofū (相馬御風), Baba Kochō (馬場孤蝶) and Uchida Roan (内田魯庵), who collected 346, 287, 203, and 201 votes, respectively. Furthermore, the number of votes Ōgai collected was higher than all other categories, including novelists, playwrights and poets, who collected 7,567, 14,140 and 11,046, respectively. Ōgai was also included in a shortlist of the best five playwrights in their interim result up to 20th August ("The Result for Ten Distinctive Persons", 1911).

Conversely, Kuroiwa became a celebrity in a much more contemporary way. He earned his fame by establishing Japan’s first body of detective fiction for mass readership, while also being known for launching a gossip-orientated daily for which he was compared with James Gordon Bennett Sr. of the New York Herald, an American gossip newspaper (Ito, 1988: 169). Kuroiwa tactically promoted and featured his own works in his publication, which became the best-selling national newspaper at one point. Furthermore, he earned infamy by routinely reporting the gossip surrounding the high-ranking public figures of that time. Moreover, details of Kuroiwa’s private life were reported by rival newspapers, thus adding to his fame.

Wakamatsu was famous for her distinctive sentence ending and her contribution to the establishment of children’s literature in Japan (Copeland, 2000: 100; Takita, 1985: 6; Wakabayashi, 2008: 236); furthermore, the fact that she was the first female translator to have earned recognition in the literary milieu attracted significant attention from critics and readers. However, what really distinguished Wakamatsu from her male

---

2 Baba’s name was listed as 馬塲孤風 in the vote which is thought to be a misspelling.
3 Kuroiwa was ranked 7th in the result up to 1 July, collecting a mere 24 votes against Ōgai’s 678. Wakamatsu was not included in the top ten ranking. The reason for this is perhaps that the readership of Bunshōsekai did not overlap with those of Kuroiwa and Wakamatsu, whose readers were the general public, women and children, respectively.
contemporaries was the use of her photographic images in the way contemporary celebrities are promoted at a time when featuring visual images of writers was not yet a common practice.

This chapter argues, then, that the primary factor which contributed to the emergence of the translator celebrity phenomenon was not solely the importance of their roles in cultural modernisation, which seems to be the most frequently studied subject in relation to the Meiji translators, but also the development of modern technologies such as printing and photography, in the same way as celebrity authorship emerged in the Romantic period, parallel to the industrialisation of printing culture (Mole, 2007), as described in my Introduction. Newspapers and magazines, in particular, were indispensable for the publication and circulation of foreign literature in Meiji Japan, as they were for Victorian Britain and the United States at this time, where literature of all kinds first became serialised in weeklies and periodicals rather than in book form (Law & Morita, 2003: 112; Brake, 1994: 1). Law & Morita (2003: 114, 117) observe that the same pattern was seen in Japan in this period, when both serious and popular literature became serialised in dailies and literary magazines. Many of these serials were translations or adaptations of foreign novels and were aimed to attract greater readership. The dailies in this period were referred to as 大新聞 (ō-shinbun) [great newspapers], or 小新聞 (ko-shinbun) [small newspapers]. The former were elite journals of opinion, equivalent to broadsheets such as The Times in early twentieth-century Britain, while the latter were tabloids aimed at the general public, featuring gossip and scandal (ibid: 113-114, Otsubo, 2010: 18; Hori, 2011: 35). The magazines and dailies in the Meiji period usually appointed prominent translators and writers as their editors, and in some cases, the translators themselves launched their own publications. Examples include Kuroiwa, who founded the tabloid newspaper Yorozuchōhō (1892), and Ōgai, who launched a literary magazine しがらみ草紙 (Shigaramisōshi) (1889). Furthermore, the Meiji translators used these publications not only for circulating their works but also for voicing their opinions on the latest literary movements and ideologies from Europe and the United States in order to modernise their society. Thus, newspapers and magazines provided a grounding on which the translators could display their skills and talents as well as their advanced cultural knowledge and become recognised by the mass readership.

---

4 The term ‘tabloid’ in this chapter refers to a newspaper format which is half the size of a broadsheet.
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The following analysis of the Meiji translators draws on the same methodologies employed in Chapter One, focusing on: their translations; their activities beyond translation; personae; media coverage and the relationships of the translators with the publishers who promoted their names and works. I will first begin the analysis by examining Mori Ōgai, arguably the most well-known translator, who earned fame in traditional ways, including his involvement in cultural modernisation, which covers a wide range of areas from literature, drama and poetry to philosophy. Ōgai’s case study will be followed by Kuroiwa Ruikō, whose celebrity status was strongly related to the development of print culture and mass readership. His translations were regularly referred to as 翻案小説 (hon’an shōsetsu) [adapted novel] (Hori, 2011: 101), as opposed to the 翻訳小説 (hon’yaku shōsetsu) [translated novel] which Ōgai and Wakamatsu mainly produced. Furthermore, Kuroiwa regarded himself not as a translator or writer, but as a provider of entertainment (Ito, 1988: 73), which contrasts with his counterparts who seem to have possessed an air of authority as writers and translators. The analysis will then move on to Wakamatsu, whose case will be compared to those of her two male counterparts, asking whether or how her gender influenced the process of creating her fame.

2.2.1. Mori Ōgai

Ōgai (1862-1922) was one of the most prolific writers and translators of the Meiji period (Fujinami, 2010a: 169; Nagashima, 2012: 85). His literary career was not limited to writing novels, poems and translating European literatures; he was also a fine scholar, thoroughly grounded in Western literature and philosophy (Marcus, 1985: 218), actively produced essays and commentaries on the works of famous European writers and philosophers, including those of Goethe and Zola, and introduced theories of literature and drama into Japan through translation (Fujinami, 2010b: 197). Furthermore, his innovative literary style greatly inspired mainstream writers between the late nineteenth and late twentieth centuries, most notably Nagai Kafū (永井荷風, 1879-1959) and Mishima Yukio (三島由紀夫, 1925-1979), both of whom imitated Ōgai’s narrative technique (Marcus, 1985: 224; Ueda, 1976: 48-49, 252-255).
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Born into a prestigious medical family, he was given an elite education from the age of five, including studies in classical Chinese, Japanese as well as European languages (Ikeuchi, 2001: 18, 22). The young Ōgai developed exceptional talent, especially in terms of language skills, and he studied German in order to pursue a career in medical science (ibid.: 19, 22). Unlike many of his prominent contemporaries in that period, Ōgai did not have a background in the field of literature prior to becoming a writer and translator. He began his translation practice while he was attached to the Medical Corps of the Japanese Imperial Army, which he joined in 1881. Ōgai’s very first translation was a work on the Prussian army’s hygiene system, which he translated, then edited and published as 医政全書稿本 (Isei zensho kōhon, 1883) [Manuscript of Medical Science] (Ikeuchi, 2001: 33). Ōgai developed an interest in European literature during his time in Berlin, where he was sent to study the methods of European military hygiene between 1884 and 1888 (Rimer, 1994: 3). While his primary profession remained an army surgeon, Ōgai actively involved himself in writing practice on both medical science and literature on his return from Germany. He continued to write in his spare time over the thirty-five years of his high-ranking career as a surgeon and army medical hygiene executive officer (Ikeuchi, 2001: 32, 35). Ōgai was known to be a moralist and authoritarian and it was perhaps this, together with his military rank, that earned him a reputation for austerity (ibid.: 3).

2.2.1.2. Ōgai as a writer

Ōgai produced a substantial volume of works during the forty years of his writing career. All of these are included in 鴎外全集 (Ōgai zenshū) [The Complete Works of Ōgai] (1971-1975, Iwanami shoten), which consists of thirty-eight volumes in total: twenty volumes of novels, poetry and literary translation; seven volumes of literary criticism; seven volumes of works relating to military and medical science; four volumes of diaries and notes etc. Inoue (2012: 94) argues that the level at which Ōgai undertook both writing and translation practice, in terms of the volume of the works he produced, was exceptional in the modern history of Japanese literature. Inoue (ibid.) further adds that Murakami Haruki is the only writer and translator who is comparable to Ōgai in that respect. Many of Ōgai’s works were first published either in his own literary magazines, the prestigious daily Yomiuri-shinbun or the influential literary magazine Kokumin no
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Tomo (Ikeuchi, 2001: 43). He made his literary debut with 小説論 (Shōsetsuron) [The Theory of Novels], published in Yomiuri-shinbun in 1889 (Kabe, 1976: 67; Kobori, 1998: 5, Ikeuchi, 2001: 43), which was a critical essay on the literary school of naturalism and the works of Zola (Kabe, 1967: 68). Kabe (ibid.) argues that Ōgai included the name of the German poet on the book cover of this essay as “Cfr. Rudolf von Gottschall, Studien” in order to impress 文壇 (bundan) or the literary circle in which he was virtually unknown at that time. He built his reputation within the literary circle by actively publishing his works in the major newspapers and literary magazines that increasingly welcomed his submissions (Kato, 2007: 45-46). Thus, Ōgai consciously made efforts to earn prominence in the literary circle. He acquired his earliest fame as a writer with the publication of the novels 舞姫 (Maihime) [The Dancing Girl], 文づかひ (Fumizukai) [The Courier] and うたかたの記 (Utakatano-ki) [Foam on the Waves] between 1890-91 (Kobori, 1998: 5). These works are known as ドイツ三部作 (Doitsu sanbu-saku) [The German Trilogy] (Nagashima, 2005: 16-18), and are heavily influenced by German Romanticism. The concept of European Romanticism in literature, especially that of the Germans, was first introduced by Ōgai in his own literary magazine Shigaramizōshi (Karatani, 1993: 211-212). Ikeuchi (2001: 60) argues that Ōgai must have written the German trilogy in order to establish the Romantic literary theory, using his novels as model examples. Initially, however, Ōgai did not have a personal literary style that could be developed to express his work fully (Kato, 2007: 50). Dissatisfied with the literary tradition which prevailed in Japan at that time, he began translating in order to adopt new literary styles from European novels. Like writers in Victorian Britain such as John Payne (1842-1916) who explored new literary style through translation (Pym, 2000: 73), Ōgai sought to modernise his own style by adopting the European literary tradition as a model (Kato, 2017: 50), as did such contemporaries as Futabatei. This approach is still repeated today by a number of translators who are also writers; a notable example is Murakami, who uses translation as a means of developing his literary style (Hadley & Akashi, 2015: 3), as will be discussed in Chapter Three.

5 The term ‘shinbun’ refers to ‘newspaper’.
2.2.1.3. Ōgai’s translation practice

Ōgai’s accomplishments in translation practice are frequently regarded as outstanding in the history of modern Japanese literature by critics and scholars (e.g. Kobori, 1998: 7-8; Ishikawa, 1978: 99). The reception of his works is evident in an anonymous critic’s comment in Bunshōsekai (Mori-no-hito, 1911: 37), which describes Ōgai as “a leading authority in the world of modern translation.” One of his translations that made significant contributions to the modernisation of Japanese literature is 於母影 (Omokage, 1889) [Vestiges], an anthology of German poetry, which had a major influence on the Japanese Romantic movement (Kondo & Wakabayashi, 2008: 473). Furthermore, Ōgai’s experimental approach in Omokage, which created structures that go beyond the traditional seven and five mora, introduced new models for future generations of Japanese poets (Sugawara, 2008: 61). However, Kobori (1998: 76) claims that despite the large number of translations Ōgai produced during his career, his translations, except in relation to adaptation, did not attract great attention within the community of literary critics, many of whom did not have enough foreign language competency to appreciate their qualities. Kobori (ibid.) argues that when compared to adaptations, fiction that was produced based on translation which could be read as novels, translations were rather undervalued in the Meiji period. He further explains that this is because translation norms had not yet been established, and few critics possessed the language skills necessary to analyse translations (ibid.). Thus, critics of that time tended to focus on literary style rather than translation skills. Naturally, Ōgai’s adaptations, which could be evaluated as Japanese literature, drew more attention from critics than his translations. For this reason, 即興詩人 (Sokkyō shijin) (1901), his adaptation of Improvisatoren (Andersen, 1835), was the most discussed and praised work Ōgai produced (Kobori, 1998: 76). A review in Bungakukai (Sokkyō shijin, 1893) describes it as: “[The most outstanding work among the recent translations]”. This particular work, which took him some nine years to complete (Nagashima, 2012: 87), greatly inspired prominent writers and translators of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, including Shimazaki Tōson (島崎藤村, 1872-1943), Satō Haruo (佐藤春夫, 1892-1964) and Ueda Bin (上田敏, 1874-1916) (Kobori, 2008: 44).

6 See Sugawara (2008: 58-61) for more detailed on Ōgai’s experimental approach in Omokage.
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Ōgai’s contribution was not limited within the literary circle, however. He translated four plays by Ibsen, including *Brand* (1866), *John Gabriel Borkman* (1896), *Ghosts* (1881), and *A Doll’s House* (1879). His works, especially *John Gabriel Borkman*, which he translated for 自由劇場 (Jiyū gekijō) [Free Theatre], one of the first Japanese theatres to perform Western plays, were a phenomenal success (Nagashima, 2012: 88-89). Furthermore, Ōgai did not only translate the plays but rewrote them with his own interpretations of Ibsen’s ideas, based on which he also wrote novels, such as 青年 (Seinen, 1910-11) [Young Men] (ibid.: 90). As with his contemporaries described in this chapter, Ōgai’s role in cultural modernisation was not limited to introducing European literature and dramas to Japanese readers and audiences. He actively promoted the latest ideas from Europe by interpreting them through his own perspectives, and he incorporated this interpretation into his novels. A good example can be observed in *Seinen*, which Nagashima (ibid.: 90-91) describes as an elaborated version of his translation of *John Gabriel Borkman*. Unlike his adaptation of *Brand*, which was heavily ‘Japanised’, his translation of *Borkman* was very much source-text focused (ibid.: 87-90). Nagashima (ibid.: 93-94) suggests that in this translation, Ōgai focused on reproducing Ibsen’s original ideas, from which he later developed the notion of “altruistic individualism against egoism” which was incorporated into *Seinen*. Thus, *Seinen* could be thought of as an adaptation of the original in which Ōgai addressed and discussed the issues of Ibsenian ideas, including the autonomy of the individual, both of which were then new to the readers.

Another great literary figure who was a strong inspiration for Ōgai in terms of philosophy was Goethe, whose works had also influenced British and American philosophers earlier in the century, most notably, Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803-1882) and Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881) (Venuti, 2009: 323-324; Gentzler, 2008: 23; Morrow, 2006: 47). Ōgai took a particular interest in Goethe’s aesthetics, and he translated *Plastische Anatomie* (1832), which he used as teaching material in Japan’s first art school, where he taught artistic anatomy. In addition, Ōgai translated research on prominent European authors, most notably *Goethe. Sein Leben und seine Werke* [Goethe: His Life and His Work] (A. Bielschowsky, 1895-1903), and *Goethe’s Faust. Ueber die Entstehung und Composition des Gedichts* [Goethe's Faust: On the Origin and Composition of the Poem] (E. K. B. Fischer, 1877) (Fujinami, 2010b: 195). Ōgai also wrote two commentaries on his own translations of the author’s works, entitled 少年エ
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ルテルの憂 (Shōnen Eruteru no yūutsu, 1889) [The Sorrows of Young Werther] and ギョオテ詩を論ず (Gyōte shi o ronzu, 1891) [The Discussion of Goethe’s Poems] (Kobori, 1998: 28-29). The works by Ōgai described above greatly inspired his elite contemporaries, as had Emerson and Carlyle in mid-nineteenth-century America and Britain, and contributed to the establishment of a new literary tradition in contemporary Japan (Fujinami, 2010b: 170, 197).

Ōgai employed two distinctive translation strategies, focussing either on the target culture or on the source texts. The former has been regarded as adaptation or “cultural translation” (Nagashima, 2012; 2008). Nagashima (2008: 44) describes how, in Sokkyō shijin, Ōgai transformed the source culture into the target culture by eliminating the elements that were unfamiliar to the target readers, including foreign names and reference to Christianity. However, Ishikawa (1978: 105) claims that, except for the cases of adaptation given above, the majority of Ōgai’s works were centred on reproducing the source texts accurately in his target texts. Furthermore, he used the archaic writing style 雅文体 (gabun-tai), which is based on the kana-writing style used in the Heian period (794-1185) (e.g. The Tale of Genji) for most of his novels and translations produced after 1890 (Nagashima, 2012; Liao, 2008: 365, 366). A literary critic in Yorozuchōhō criticised Ōgai’s language for being too refined, and the footnotes in the texts for being too distracting to read (Liao, 2008: 366). Thus, his main approach to translation, which, except in the case of drama, did not particularly focus on readability, must have limited his readership. Furthermore, Ōgai’s motivation for translating seemed to lie in importing European ideas rather than introducing their literature, which contrasts with the motivations of his contemporaries both in that period and the present. This approach is manifested in his choice of source texts, the majority of which inspired him in terms of philosophy rather than literature. Hence, as with Emerson and Carlyle, Ōgai’s objective was to influence the thinking of intellectuals by introducing them to European ideas, but also to maintain national tradition (Kato cited in Schneider, 2005: 57).

The findings above illustrate that Ōgai’s fame was based on: the popularity of his works as a writer and translator; his role in the modernisation of Japanese theatre; his knowledge of the latest European philosophical ideas, which he disseminated through translation, inspiring the literary circle, students and scholars of that time. Furthermore,

7 See Liao (2008) for more details on Ōgai’s gabun-tai.
his role as an educator, his creative talents, and language skills attracted critics and readers’ admiration and thus were also important factors that added to his fame. In addition, Ōgai’s elite background, his talents, his high military rank and austere nature informed his public persona, which must have added to his air of authority. However, his phenomenal popularity as a translator was perhaps largely based on his adaptations, such as his most popular work *Sokkyō Shijin*, since the focus of literary critics was usually centred on literary style rather than translation skills, as described earlier (Kobori, 1998: 76). Thus, Ōgai’s adaptations were, perhaps, perceived as his original writings by readers and critics.

Hence, as in the case of celebrity authors in the Romantic period (Mole, 2007), Ōgai’s fame consisted of such distinctive qualities as artistic talent, which make a person superior to others, high social status and his public persona.

2.2.2. Kuroiwa Ruikō

Kuroiwa, who was renowned for his translated fiction, was a prolific writer and journalist, as well as philosopher and social activist of the Meiji period (Law & Morita, 2003: 120; Oku, 2014: 710). He was acclaimed for his excellent English skills and was regarded as one of the most competent English scholars of that time (Law & Morita, ibid.; Sato, 1979: 133). Kuroiwa even wrote English-language political columns for his own tabloid newspaper for the foreign community and Japanese students of English. He was also famous for his role in the introduction of popular genres (Ōtsubo, 2010: 24, Oku, 2014: 84), and he has been hailed as the founder of the detective novel genre in Japan⁸ (Ito, 1988: 1; Oku, ibid.; Tsutsumibayashi, 2015: 89). Although detective fiction was initially dismissed as vulgar by critics, Kuroiwa’s work had a significant influence on prominent contemporary mystery writers, notably Edogawa Rampo (江戸川乱歩, 1894-1965) (Ito, 1988: 1, 127). Furthermore, the popularity of Kuroiwa’s works made the writers of 純文学 (junbungaku), or “serious literature,”⁹ such as Ozaki Kōyō (尾崎紅葉, 1868-1903),

---

⁸ The detective novel refers to 探偵小說 (tantei-shōsetsu) in Japanese, which is a synonym for mystery/crime fiction.

⁹ “Junbungaku” [pure literature] means “serious literature” as opposed to 大衆文学 (taishūbungaku) or “mass literature” (Strecher, 1996: 359).
begin to publish mystery fiction themselves, although anonymously, perhaps due to their reluctance to be publicly associated with a popular genre (Hori, 2011: 107-109). The success of their mystery fiction, however, was nowhere near that of Kuroiwa (ibid.: 109). Law & Morita (2003: 120) state that he was one of the most popular fiction writers of that period, producing over seventy novels. The great majority of these novels are adaptations which were popular until the late nineteenth century (Millar, 2001: 13; Mizuno, 2007: 4). Kuroiwa’s adaptations were from a wide range of popular works from France, England, and the United States, including English translations of romans-feuilletons (Law & Morita, 2003: 120). The popularity of these works earned him many followers as a result (Hori, 2011: 33).

Kuroiwa was born into a family of elite samurai, and both his father and grandfather were scholars (Oku, 2014: 72-73; Ito, 1988: 20). From an early age he demonstrated his talents in many areas, including English and 漢文 (kanbun), or classical Chinese-style writing (Ito, 1988: 28-34). Kuroiwa also showed great interest in politics, and he frequently gave speeches at political meetings (ibid.: 39-40, 42) as well as publishing articles in politically influential newspapers, which earned him recognition among his peers (ibid.: 42). Unsatisfied with the contents of the newspapers available at that time, Kuroiwa subsequently launched his first newspaper 同盟改進新聞 (Dōmeikaishin-shinbun) in collaboration with colleagues in 1882 (Oku, 2014: 90; Ito, 1988: 43). However, since he openly criticised social injustice and corruption in his articles, he faced imprisonment or suspension of publication on several occasions (Ito, 1988: 42, 44, 46; 1995: 6; Oku, 2014: 90). Hence, his public activities and outspoken manner earned Kuroiwa his first prominence. He actively wrote educational articles in order to inspire the general public, the majority of whom were, in his opinion, ill-informed (ibid.: 54). Dōmeikaishin-shinbun lasted only two months, after which Kuroiwa continued his career as editor-in-chief for a number of newspapers until he launched the tabloid newspaper 万朝報 (Yorozuchōhō) in 1892.

10 Neo-Confucianism in the Tokugawa period categorised class, or kaikyū into four tiers: the samurai comes at the top, followed by peasant, artisans, and merchant. The Meiji restoration, however, abolished this social classification in 1871, and the samurai class came to be reclassified, and was divided into Shizoku [samurai] and Sotsuzoku [low-ranking equivalent samurai], both of which belonged to elite groups. See Howland (2010).
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2.2.2.1. Kuroiwa as a journalist

Kuroiwa had a reputation for being a morally righteous journalist, and he widely reported gossip and scandal, especially in relation to adultery among prominent figures of that time, using their real names, ages and addresses (Ito, 1988: 164-174; Meldrum, 2009: 89; Sato, 1979: 130; Oku, 2009: 70). He attacked social evils harshly in his columns and earned the nickname マムシの周六 (mamushi no Shūroku) [Shūroku, the viper] (Ito, 1988: 75; Oku, ibid.). For these reasons, Yorozuchōhō became infamous as a malicious or blackmailer’s newspaper, and Kuroiwa was much feared among the elites, including politicians and cultural figures (Ito, ibid.: 173, 178; Oku, ibid.). Naturally, such actions also generated opposition. Aspects of his private life, such as his having twice being arrested, having mistresses, and marriage problems, led to frequent attacks by a rival newspaper (Kuroiwa, cited in Ito, 1988: 175). However, Kuroiwa’s strong personality also aroused curiosity. For example, Yuasa Chikusanjin (湯朝竹山人), who was once a journalist for Yorozuchōhō, wrote about Kuroiwa’s private life in the literary magazine 新潮 (Shinchō) in September 1904 (Ito, 1988: 272). Yuasa’s report (1904, cited in Ito, 1988: 272-275) entitled 黒岩先生家庭の一日 (Kuroiwa Ruikō-sensei katei no ichinichi) [A Day in Kuroiwa Ruikō’s Household] reveals such strict daily routines as a cold bath even in the middle of winter, his stern personality, his dislike of visitors, and peculiar family relationships. Thus, his obsession with social justice, his outspoken manner and peculiar personality not only formed his public persona, but also attracted media attention, which added to his prominence.

2.2.2.2. Kuroiwa’s adaptations

Kuroiwa (cited in Ito, 1988: 64) was a passionate reader of foreign novels. He favoured the works of French authors, such as Dumas, Hugo, E. Gaboriau (1832-1873), and Boisgobey, in particular, but also read a wide range of American and English fiction, including works by W. D. Humphries (1850-1938), W. E. Norris (1847-1925), and E. P. Oppenheim (1866-1946) (Law & Morita, 2003: 120; Ito, 1995: 13). Law & Morita (ibid.) suggest that many of these works, based on which Kuroiwa produced adaptations, may have been American reprints that were originally published as dime novels and were cheaply imported from the United States during that period. Inspired by the entertaining elements of these foreign novels, Kuroiwa began translating them to be serialised in daily
Chapter Two

news papers, most of which carried short stories that he personally found dull (Ito, 1988: 64-65). He would read between ten to thirty works of foreign fiction a month in order to select a text which he hoped readers would find highly entertaining (ibid.: 75). His entertainment-focused approach in selecting source texts contrasts with that of Ōgai, who sought the latest European ideas in the areas of literature and philosophy in the works he translated (e.g. those by Goethe and Ibsen). Kuroiwa’s fiction, all of which was first serialised in tabloids, gained a phenomenal popularity among the general readers of that time (Meldrum, 2009: 82; Ōtsubo, 2010: 23; Tsutsumibayashi, 2015: 89, Sato, 1979: 130). His most notable works include an adaptation of Les Misérables (Hugo, 1862) and Dark Days (Conway, 1884). The latter, serialised in 今日新聞 (Kon’nichi-shinbun) as 定の美人 (Hōtei no bijin) [The Beautiful Lady at Court] in 1887, has been regarded as largely responsible for his gaining a reputation as a popular writer of adaptations (Oku, 2009: 67, 2014: 90). The popularity of his works is evident in the way they were published as books immediately after their serialisations (Ito, 1995: 12-13). Kuroiwa’s popularity can also be observed in the case of Miyako-shinbun, formerly known as Kon’nichi-shinbun, which head-hunted him in 1889 (Ito, 1995: 15). He was given an initial salary of 40 yen on condition that he would not contribute to any other dailies (Oku, 2009: 67). This was a large sum, considering that a police constable earned the average of 8 yen in 1891 (ibid.). Kuroiwa wrote serials for the newspaper between 1889 and 1892, and his upcoming works were regularly advertised as one of the largest selling points (Ito, 1988: 96). Oku (ibid.) states that the daily sales of Miyako-shinbun tripled from an average of 6,500 copies after Kuroiwa joined the company in 1889. Moreover, his sudden departure from the newspaper in 1892 caused the company a significant loss in sales, which fell from 27,000 in 1890 to 7,000 copies due to the termination of his serialisations (Ito, 1988: 135; Tsutsumibayashi, 2015: 89).

The popularity of serial fiction in the newspapers of that time greatly affected their sales figures. This phenomenon is observable in the examples of prestigious media organs that favoured serious literature rather than popular fiction but struggled with declining sales due to limited readerships (Ito, 1988: 127). When the news of Kuroiwa’s departure spread, national newspapers fought to appoint him as their contributor of serial stories by offering exceptionally high salaries (Ito, 1988: 107). However, he launched his own tabloid Yorozuchōhō (referred to as Yorozu hereafter) in 1892 and began publishing his serial fiction there. Yorozu was at that time the cheapest tabloid newspaper available,
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consisting of a single sheet, which initially had seven columns but later increased to ten on each side. Kuroiwa translated thirty-five works of fiction which were then serialised in 2,408 issues between 1892 and 1906, and he simultaneously produced twenty-three works of original fiction which were serialised in thirty-two issues during the same period. (Gankutsuou) [The Count of Monte Cristo], the longest serialisation, ran for fifteen months in a total of 268 issues. The popularity of Kuroiwa’s works made a significant contribution to the sales of his own tabloid, so that two years after its launch, the total number of copies sold annually reached nine million, third highest in the national newspaper sales ranking, with Tokyo Nichinichi’s twelve million copies on top (Oku, 2009: 69). The popularity of Kuroiwa’s serials became so great that certain rival dailies, jealous of his success, took countermeasures and revealed the ending of the source text of an adaptation he was in the process of serialising in his tabloid (Komori, 2009: 126). Despite that, the sales figures of Yorozu continued to rise, and in 1896, it rose to the top-selling national newspaper with an annual sales figure of twenty-five million (ibid.: 146, Sato, 1979: 130; Oku, ibid.). Kuroiwa’s case contrasts with that of the UK in a similar period, when fiction was usually serialised in literature-orientated periodicals such as Reynolds Miscellany and Bentley’s Miscellany, and Sunday newspapers were far more popular than daily newspapers (Hori, 2011: 17, 19). Furthermore, the annual sales figures of top UK daily newspapers were significantly lower than those of Yorozu: 300,000 for the Daily Telegraph (1890), and one million for the Daily Mirror (1911) (ibid.: 19). However, after the First Sino-Japanese War, which ended in 1895, Japan went into economic depression, and the standard price of daily newspapers rose. Ito (1988, 154-157) describes how, unlike all other publishers, Kuroiwa refused to agree to the newsagents’ demand for a price rise, and, in return, they refused to sell his daily. He survived this crisis by personally opening 120 newsagents across the country (ibid.: 156). Thus, Kuroiwa’s reader-focused approach was not limited to offering popular genres to a mass readership but also included maintaining the lowest price (ibid.: 111; Hori, 2011: 55), which perhaps added further to his popularity. Kuroiwa’s tactically astute marketing strategy was also seen in his hiring a highly prominent translator, Morita Shiken (森田思軒), although without assigning him any duties, using Morita’s prestigious reputation as a profile-raising exercise for Yorozu (Ito, 1988: 156-157). Thus, Kuroiwa was versatile in both writing and business, which enabled him to maintain the mass circulation of tabloid newspapers.
Having his own tabloid provided Kuroiwa with freedom in the choice of source texts and translation strategies. His approach to translation was unrestrained (ibid.: 74; Law & Morita, 2003: 120), which contrasts with his contemporaries who tended to follow a literal approach (Meldrum, 2009: 80). Instead of following the original texts closely, Kuroiwa would read a section of the novel he had selected, and memorise the plot before transferring the story into Japanese, without even looking at the original texts again. He routinely carried out this procedure each day for the next day’s serial (Ito, 1988: 74; Law & Morita: 120). These actions might suggest that, for him, source texts were mere ingredients in the production of target texts rather than materials based on which literary style can be developed, as was the case for such contemporaries as Ōgai. Kuroiwa’s idiosyncratic approach is not dissimilar to that of, for instance, Payne in late nineteenth-century Britain, who also took a somewhat unrestrained approach, using source texts as material based on which he experimented and explored new writing styles, as can be seen in One Thousand Nights (1882-4) (Pym, 2000: 73). In this work, Payne retained all the obscene passages, while transforming crude Arabic into rather mannered English, aiming to produce texts to be read as a novel rather than as a reference book of Middle Eastern culture (Irwin, 2000: 150). One of the distinctive features found in Kuroiwa’s work was that he used language which was simple and clear, which reflects his tabloid’s three mottoes: 1. “簡単” (kantan) [simple], 2. “明瞭” (meiryō) [readable], and 3. “痛快” (tsūkai) [intensely pleasurable] (Ruikō, 1892 cited in Ruikō-kai, 1992: 13). His translations contrast with those of the translators of serious literature such as Ōgai which were frequently written in a language incomprehensible to the less literate (Ito, 1988: 75). Kuroiwa’s approach was not only popular with a mass readership but also with leading writers and critics. A prominent literary critic, Takayama Chogyū (高山樗牛), praised Kuroiwa’s works in Taiyō: “[Kuroiwa’s] works are far greater than those that are carried by other dailies that trick readers with useless writings of today’s so-called novelists” (1902, cited in Ito, 1988: 272). Similarly, a well-known writer, Yamada Bimyō (山田美妙, 1868-1910), praised Kuroiwa’s use of colloquial language in the literary magazine Bunshōsekai (1907): “[Kuroiwa’s ‘genbun itchi’ is sophisticated and mature […].]11 His translation of Le Comte de Monte-Cristo is especially well done]” (cited in Ito, 1988: 212).

11 Genbun itchi (言文一致) [unification of writing and spoken language]. See p. 26-27.
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Kuroiwa frequently chose source texts that portray such social injustices as unfair trials, and he manipulated the plot to fit the patterns of Japanese popular stories of that time, in which social justice always wins (Ito, 1988: 74-75). Ito (ibid.: 75) explains that this type of story line, which was constructed on a system of simple logic, based on the concept of morality, was popular with the general public as it was easy enough to understand for those who were uneducated. He further suggests that 忠臣蔵 (Chūshingura), a national legend which has been enormously popular since the mid-eighteenth century, was largely responsible for popularising such plotlines. Thus, Kuroiwa not only used simple language for the less literate but also produced reader-focused stories. However, the aim of his translation practice was not only to offer entertainment to readers. Kuroiwa took particular interest in the social injustices in the works of fiction he translated, and he was keen to educate the general public about fairness through translation (ibid.: 64-65). For these reasons, his source texts tended to contain both educational and entertainment value. Hence, Kuroiwa’s translation practice focussed not on literary value or the development of literary style, like those of his contemporaries, but on disseminating his personal beliefs on public morality among the general public through entertainment. This intention is reflected in his policy that his translations were not intended to be literature for cultured people, but were forms of entertainment for the literate readers of daily newspapers (Ito, 1988: 73, 130).

His translation strategy can be described as prioritising “situational or cultural adequacy” (Bastin, 2009), which emphasises the cultural appropriation by the target culture. A good example can be found in his adaptation of Les Deux Merles de M. de Saint-Mars (Boisgobey, 1878), as 鉄仮面 (Tekkamen) [The Iron Mask]. The adaptation was serialised in Yorozu between December 1892 and June 1893 in a total of 137 issues (Yanagida, 2005: 242). The title would appear to be borrowed from The Iron Mask (circa 1884), the unauthorised American translation of the same French work by another translator (Law & Morita, 2003: 124), as Kuroiwa only translated from English (Ito, 1988: 120). He rendered the mask as being made of ‘iron’, instead of the ‘velvet’ in the source text. Ito (1988: 123) demonstrates how Kuroiwa freely changed the story lines, plus some of the identities and names of the protagonists in this text. Examples include

---

12 忠臣蔵 (Chūshingura) is a story based on the historical 赤穂事件 (Akō jiken) or ‘Akō vendetta’ of 1701-1730. It first appeared as a puppet play under the title 仮名手本忠臣蔵 (Kanadehon chushingura) in 1748. The story has been retold in novels, kabuki, oral storytelling and films, and its phenomenal popularity remains constant to this day (Smith, 2003).
the witch who was executed in the original text, but appeared alive as a future queen of some imaginary kingdom in the translation. Another strategy, frequently employed in his adaptations, was altering a tragic to a happy ending to suit his readers’ preference (ibid.: 124). However, Kuroiwa did not completely domesticate the texts as Ōgai did in Sokkyō shijin, but also imaginatively imitated the foreign feel of the source text; he typically replaced the English names of protagonists or places with unusual Japanese names that partly represent the sound of the original names, or invented new expressions that did not exist in the target language (ibid.: 74). Examples include: the name of the protagonist in Tekkamen “Maurice des Armoises” is translated as “有藻守雄” (Arumo Morio); “d’Orvilliers” as “鳥居立夫” (Tori Tatsuo); “Vanda”, as “妗陀” (Banda).

Kuroiwa’s creativity was not limited to his translation skills but can also be observed in the way he utilised entertaining aspects of foreign crime fiction in both his originals and translation: he would ask his readers to guess the perpetrator of the crime at the end of each episode, and they would post in their answers (Ito, 1988: 79-80). This was a completely new concept at that time and became highly popular among readers, so much so that Kuroiwa received over two hundred answers on each occasion (ibid.: 82). Thus, Kuroiwa engaged readers in a way that writers of serious literature did not. A similar interactive method was used by the UK weekly magazine Answers during the late 1880s. Answers featured a variety of questions sent in by readers to which the editor responded each week (Hori, 2011: 21). Furthermore, the editor encouraged readers to participate in quiz games and offered prizes for winners (ibid). The popularity of the magazine is manifested in its weekly sales figure, which reached 800,000 copies by 1906 (ibid.). The publicity Kuroiwa created was not, however, limited to publications. He actively promoted the production of his adaptations in the theatres of Tokyo and Osaka without charging them commission, which resulted in greater public knowledge of his works (ibid.: 68). Hence, the novelty of Kuroiwa’s scheme, self-promotion, and reader-focused approaches are important elements of his popularity among the general public. His approach contrasts with that of Ōgai, whose readership must have been limited to educated people which can be observed in the criticism on his writing style, as described earlier (p. 83).

The findings above illustrate that Kuroiwa was, in many ways, distinct from his prominent contemporaries. First, as a translator, his role was to entertain and educate a mass readership rather than to be an access point for foreign authors and their works, or
contributor to language modernisation. Second, he was not only talented in both writing and translation, but also had innovative ideas in terms of the business aspects of publishing. What really distinguishes Kuroiwa from his contemporaries, though, is his modern approach to marketing and promoting his daily newspaper as well as his own works. In addition, unlike many of his contemporaries, he had total control over how his works were promoted and distributed. He had the privilege of utilising his own media organ, which rose to the bestselling tabloid at one point, as a vehicle for his works. Thus, unlike Ōgai, who also had his own literary magazine but with a limited readership, Kuroiwa’s works reached the masses. Another point which distinguishes Kuroiwa from his contemporaries in terms of the promotion of their works is that Kuroiwa’s main focus seemed to centre on boosting the sales of his newspaper rather than raising his own reputation as a writer of adaptations. This again contrasts with Ōgai, who sought recognition for his works and status within the literary circle. Kuroiwa’s marketing-focused approach is also evident in his interactions with readers by utilising the print media, which further added to the entertainment value he offered readers. A similar idea has been employed by Murakami Haruki, who has engaged a large number of readers by interacting with them through websites, as was explained in Chapter One. In addition, his trademark ‘morally righteous persona’ was manifested in the works he produced, which must have made them recognisable to the reader.

Hence, it could be said that the four most important aspects that contributed to the creation of Kuroiwa’s fame are: 1. his freedom in publishing; 2. tactical promotions that engaged readers; 3. his public persona, which attracted media attention and; 4. his talent, which allowed him to produce popular works continual. Thus, Kuroiwa’s fame as a translator was closer to that of celebrity translators today than many of his contemporaries, including Ōgai, who earned their fame in a more traditional way.

2.2.3. Wakamatsu Shizuko

Wakamatsu was one of the first female translators and writers in the Meiji period to become recognised for her works (Hayashida, 1999: 275; Tanaka, 2000: 6, Cockerill, 2011: 538). She played an important role in the establishment of a modern children’s literature during her short career, which ended with her death at the age of thirty-two.
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Wakamatsu’s original approach to colloquial writing greatly contributed to the revival of the genbun itchi style [unification of spoken and written language], which went into decline after it was pioneered by Futabatei around 1889-90 (Yamaguchi, 1980: 164-165; Yamamoto, 1973: 48). Her writing style was highly praised as being “extraordinary” by leading writers and translators of that time, such as Morita Shiken and Tsubouchi Shoyō (Inoue, 2012: 28; Minamitani, 2008: 236; Yamamoto, 1981: 206-207; Yanagida, 2005: 281; Yoshitake, 1959: 140), and influenced many of her contemporaries (Tanaka, 2000: 78; Takita, 1985: 7). However, despite the degree of her contribution to the modernisation of literary style, her name is rarely mentioned in the modern history of Japanese literature (Hayashida, 1999: 276; Yamamoto, 1973: 23-25; Copeland, 2000: 100; Tanaka, 2000: 172). This phenomenon is manifested in the way credit for the development of the genbun itchi style is more often attributed to Futabatei, rather than Wakamatsu (Tanaka, 2000: 38; Yamamoto, 1981: 89-90). Tanaka (ibid.) argues that this is perhaps because she translated mostly short stories by minor authors, and also because her gender excluded her from the mainstream literary circle of that time.

Born into the family of a samurai, Wakamatsu was adopted at the age of seven by an affluent merchant. She was sent to study at the exclusive single-sex Ferris Seminary, established by the American missionary Mary Kidder (Takita, 1985: 2; Tanaka, 2000: 36; Kataoka, 1973: 141; Kitamura, 1956: 102). Wakamatsu learnt English and was introduced to European and American literature during her eleven years at the school (Tanaka, 2000: 35). Subsequently, she took on a teaching job at the seminary after completion of her studies, and she developed an interest in women’s issues, much inspired by Iwamoto Yoshiharu (巌本善治, 1863-1942), a prominent advocate of women’s education and the founder of the periodical 女学雑誌 (Jogaku-zasshi), whom Wakamatsu later married. Iwamoto initially aimed to enlighten male intellectuals about women’s need for education, developing not so much their domestic skills as their minds and modernising their thinking (Takita, 1985: 2; Tanaka, 2000: 33). Tanaka (ibid.) claims that Jogaku-zasshi was one of the most important publications in the Meiji period due to its contribution in the area of women’s emancipation in Japan. It typically featured articles and essays covering social and political issues related to women, education and religion, as well as book reviews and translated literature. Furthermore, the magazine introduced the life and customs of European and American societies through translated
literature in which free heterosexual love and romantic worship of women were frequently portrayed. Inspired by Iwamoto’s feminist ideas that were new and progressive at that time, Wakamatsu, among other emerging female writers, began writing essays on women’s education and emancipation (Takita, 1985: 2; Tanaka, 2000: 33). These essays were aimed at the young women of the middle class and were regularly published in the magazine (Tanaka, ibid.).

2.2.3.1. Wakamatsu’s translations

Wakamatsu began translating English stories into Japanese as appropriate reading materials for her students (Tanaka, 2000: 36). She chose texts that displayed moral values, reflecting her belief that literature should not be mere entertainment, but should inspire and educate readers about public morals (Shimada, 1994: 239; Tanaka, 2000: 39; Kataoka, 1973: 153). Her most renowned work, a translation of *Little Lord Fauntleroy* (F. H. Burnett, 1886) as 小公子 (Shōkōshi) (Copeland, 2000: 99; Yamamoto, 1981: 89), which was serialised between August 1890 and January 1892 in *Jogaku-zasshi*, introduced American ideas and morals that were based on Puritan culture (Takita, 1985: 4; Kataoka, 1973: 141-143). Women-focused fiction by female authors was the most popular literary genre of that time in the United States (Baym, 1978: 11), and *Little Lord Fauntleroy* was no exception. This children’s novel was published in London and New York in 1886, only four years prior to its Japanese publication, and was a phenomenal success (Wilson, 1996: 235). The book, which became one of the year’s best-sellers, was later adapted for the stage and performed in both cities in 1888 (ibid.). Wakamatsu’s translation of this popular work earned her prestige within the literary circle (Kitamura, 1956: 103). She also produced a large number of short fictions that closely focused on Christian belief; these include わが宿の花 (Waga yado no hana, 1892) [The Flower at My Inn] and 勇士最後の手紙 (Yūshi saigo no tegami, 1894) [The Last Letter of the Hero] (Kataoka, 1973: 148-149, 151). However, Tanaka (2000: 40) notes that her original fiction did not earn Wakamatsu as much prestige as her translations in the literary milieu. This contrasts with the situation of such contemporaries as Ōgai and Kuroiwa, whose fiction was equally popular as their translations. The reason could be that Wakamatsu did not follow the literary trends of that time, such as the Romantic and Naturalist movements, and remained as a writer within Christian thought (Kataoka, 1973: 154). Thus, unlike her
contemporaries, her creativity as an author does not seem to have played a role in the development of Japanese literature. Rather, her writing practice was focused on enlightening the public with her focus on moral values (i.e. conservative) (Tanaka, 2000: 39).

Wakamatsu was by no means the first person to attempt to produce literature for young readers and children: Takia (1985: 4) states that Iwaya Sazanami (巖谷小波, 1870-1933) preceded her in this aspiration. However, what differentiated children’s literature translated by Wakamatsu from existing works such as Iwaya’s こがね丸 (Koganemaru, 1891) [Golden Dog] was her modern writing style (Takita, 1985: 1). Inspired especially by Goethe’s Reineke Fuchs (1794) [Reynard the Fox], Koganemaru was written for boys with a strong emphasis on feudalistic morality, and as Iwaya considered colloquial language too distracting for the readers, he deliberately avoided it (ibid; Yamamoto, 1981: 111). Instead, he employed 五七調 (goshichi-chō) or “five-seven mode” (Thomas, 2008), which can be found in such classical Japanese poetry as 万葉集 (Manyōshū, circa AD759) (Yamamoto, ibid.), creating a rather old-fashioned feel (Kamei, 1994: 252). His approach contrasts with that of Wakamatsu, whose colloquial style, referred to as genbun itchi, was born of her strong focus on young female and child target-culture readers (Shimada, 1994: 251-251; Yamada, 2012: 29). Shimada (1994: 249) describes the distinctive effect of Wakamatsu’s language as being as if she was “talking to children, including her own”. Women’s voices or speech, which were usually distinguished by the final particle in a sentence, began appearing in novels for the first time with the emergence of genbun itchi (Inoue, 2006: 93), originally developed by Futabatei. However, the speech of the female characters in the early model of genbun itchi did not reflect the naturalness of the spoken language used by women in daily conversations (Inoue, 2002: 405) as it was created by male writers of that period, based on the language of middle class women (Saito, 2010: 149-151, 166). Furthermore, in this male-created female voice, which came to be standardised, individual characteristics were lost (Inoue, 2006: 95). Saito (2010: 149) observes that female characters in Meiji literature by male authors portrayed a femininity largely

---

13 *Genbun itchi* was developed from the narrative style used in 落語 (rakugo) (Inoue, 2002: 398), which is a traditional comic storytelling performance, centred on conversations between the characters (Brau, 2008: 1-2). These characters were typically from the class of labourers, shopkeepers, craftsmen and entertainers who grew up in the downtown area of Edo (Novograd, 1974: 188).
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centred on the male ideal of women. She further notes that this phenomenon also prevailed in 歌舞伎 (Kabuki) prior to the Meiji period. In kabuki, 女形 (onnagata) or ‘female roles’ were traditionally performed by male actors and usually portrayed female characters with an exaggeratedly feminine manner of speech and body language, thus representing an idealised notion of femininity in that period (ibid.: 150). Likewise, the female writers of the day regularly complied with the standard created by men, which was studded with honorifics (Tsubouchi, 1930: 7). This standard model was, however, unable to portray female characters’ voices in modern narratives (ibid.). Wakamatsu’s female language, by contrast, can be characterised as “simple”, “elegant” but “truly natural” (Morita, 1896), consisting of the native dialects and slang, as well as honorific and polite expressions appropriate to each character in the texts (Takita, 1985: 6). Thus, it could be argued that she was the first female writer to reflect the variety of real women’s voices in Meiji literature. The example below demonstrates Wakamatsu’s language use in its reflection of the emotions of a mother talking to her child, while hinting at the classical feel of female writing of Heian period (794-1185) (Kamei, 1994: 252-253). The passage is taken from Little Lord Fauntleroy, where the mother, being unable to disclose the death of her husband to her son Cedric, attempts to explain the situation they are now going to face:

“Yes, He is well,” she sobbed; “he is quite, quite well, but we – we have no one left but each other. No one at all.” (Burnett, p.1)

ソウだよ、モウよくお成りなすつたよ、モウ、スッ…スッかり、よくおなりなのだよ、ダガネ、おまへとわたしたは、モウふたり切りになってしまったのだよ、ふたり切りで、モウ外に何人もいないのだよ。と曇り聲に云はれて […] (Wakamatsu) [Yes, [he] has already become well, [he] has become qu, quite well, but you and me, are now two alone, two alone, and there is no one else. [He] was told by the clouded voice [...]]

Kamei (ibid.) argues that “[the way she uses wago [as opposed to kango, or kanji-based writing], which creates softness, is ideal for conversation between children and mothers]”.
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Furthermore, Wakamatsu reproduced the emotional dialogue of the source text, which is written in simple language (ibid.), while employing the metaphor 墮り聲 (kumorigoe) [clouded voice], which is poetic, instead of more commonly used 涙声 (namidagoe) [sobbed voice]. She also takes a source-oriented approach, rendering the sobbing voice by using a stammer (underlined) for “quite, quite”. Her idiosyncratic writing style influenced the leading Meiji authors of both children’s and adult literature, and contributed to the development of new literary expressions (Copeland, 2000: 100, Yamamoto, 1973: 48).

The language she used was not the only reason why her works generated a new readership (Wakabayashi, 2008: 236). Wakabayashi (ibid.) explains that Wakamatsu also glossed every Chinese character in her texts with phonetic kana, in order to facilitate reading by showing how they are pronounced. Thus, women and children who were less literate than men could also access the texts.

Despite her innovative attitude towards writing style, Wakamatsu’s approach to translation practice was rather biased (Tanaka, 2000: 39). As in her writing practice, her main objective in translating was to introduce the Victorian concepts of motherhood and family values (ibid.: 39-40), and in this she was perhaps influenced by her husband Iwamoto, who advocated a concept of the family based on the love of man and woman, which was new to a Japanese culture in which a feudalistic family system still prevailed (Takita, 1985: 5). However, Kitamura (1956: 107) argues that, unlike Iwamoto, Wakamatsu’s concept of the ideal woman was strongly focused on Christianity. She selected Little Lord Fauntleroy to translate as it demonstrates the belief that a child’s innocence could have an impact on the moral reform of society (Takita, 1985: 5). Thus, while her translation strategy was reader-focused in terms of fluency, the choices of text and translation strategy were influenced by her moralist ideas.

2.2.3.2. Wakamatsu in printed media

As with Ōgai, Wakamatsu’s presence in the media was centred on her works, including critical reviews and promotional material. Critics’ reviews of her most popular translation Shōkōshi were frequently featured in the major dailies, which promoted the serial (Yamamoto, 1981: 105). Her husband, who was editor-in-chief, actively sent out copies of Shōkōshi to acquaintances in the literary world and sought reviews from them (ibid.:102). Positive reviews of Wakamatsu’s work, mainly focusing on the story’s
inspirational aspects, were featured in newspapers and literary magazines, including *Yomiuri-shinbun* (15, November 1891) and *Keizai-zasshi* (1891, issue 595). These reviews were repeated in *Jogaku-zasshi* (1891, issue 291) for further promotion. However, what distinguished Wakamatsu from her male counterparts in this chapter is how her works were promoted. For example, *Jogaku-zasshi* ran an advertisement for the novel that was about to be published in book form; although Wakamatsu’s name was not mentioned, it was noted that she was ‘the wife of Iwamoto Yoshiharu’ ([“A New Publication of Juvenile Literature”], 1891). The advertisement suggests that the magazine was attempting to guarantee the quality of the work by highlighting her husband’s respected status. This phenomenon reflects the standard practice for women writers of that period, which required an established male writer’s endorsement in order to have their works published (Copeland, 2000: 44). Similarly, positive reviews of her work also seemed to emphasise women’s secondary status in the literary circle, which is manifested in Morita’s praise for Wakamatsu’s talent. In *Keishū novels special issue* [Rare Writing ‘Reading Shōkōshi’] in *Hōchi-shinbun*, Morita (1891) stated that her translation is faithful to the source text and is an extraordinary work for a woman translator. Furthermore, a newly launched literary magazine *文芸倶楽部* (*Bungeikurabu*) published an inaugural issue titled *閨秀小説号* (*Keishū shōsetsu gō*, 1895) [*Keishū novels special issue*] featuring a photograph of Wakamatsu with a heavily made-up face and wearing a formal kimono along with other female writers (Copeland, 2000 :215, 224; Yoshino, 2012: 36). Female writers of that time were categorised as a single group and were referred to as *閨秀作家* (*keishū sakka*) [talented lady writers of the inner chamber] in the male-dominated literary circle (Cockerill, 2011: 530; Saito, 2010: 172; Copeland: 215, 242). 14 Women writers in general were discouraged from becoming involved in publicity-related activities, as circulating their visual images was considered to dishonour their families (Copeland, 2000: 219). For this reason, the *keishū* writers were criticised harshly by readers for allowing their photographs to be printed (ibid.: 220). Despite the criticisms, the publicity generated significant sales, and this special issue went to a second print run after 30,000 copies had been sold (Yoshino, 2012: 36). Moreover, prominent literary figures such as Ōgai indicated that the heavily made-up faces of

---

14 Copeland (2000: 242) explains that the word *kei* indicates *neya* or bedroom in Japanese. However, when it is combined with *shū*, it forms a new meaning as “inner chambers” which is “the single-sex sanctum of women’s separate sphere”. See Copeland (2000) for more details on *keishū sakka*. 
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certain *keishū* writers aroused his interest in their works (Shioda, 1983: 182). Thus, it could be said, the visual images of the women writers attracted readers, who were predominantly male, more than their works. Hence, the printed media portrayed Wakamatsu’s image as a talented woman, while at the same time overlooking her status in the male-dominated literary circle.

The findings above demonstrate that Wakamatsu earned prestige for her language skills, modern writing style and her role in women’s emancipation. Wakamatsu’s writing style influenced prominent writers of the period, while gaining a readership consisting of young women, mothers and children who had not previously had access to a wide choice of suitable literature. In addition, her role in modernising the concept of women inspired young students and intellectuals. Thus, like Ōgai and Kuroiwa, her fame was partly “achieved” (Rojeck, 2001, 2012) by her talent, cultural and educational contributions.

However, as in the case of Ōgai, her readership was limited to the educated middle class. Furthermore, despite the literary influence she had on her contemporaries, Wakamatsu’s prominence as a writer and translator was rather short-lived in the history of modern Japanese literature (Hayashida, 1999: 276). This is perhaps, besides her literary career being cut short by her early death, largely due to the fact that her approach to writing practice was education-driven rather than focusing on literary values. Unlike many prominent writers of that period, Wakamatsu did not seek to develop her literary style according to the latest literary trends from Europe (Kataoka, 1973: 154). Kamei (1994: 244) suggests that she was perhaps aware that she lacked the talent required for creative writing. Moreover, her choice of source texts, which was purely focused on their educational value, clearly contrasts with that of Kuroiwa, whose aim was not only to educate the public in moral terms but also to entertain them. Thus, Wakamatsu failed to continue producing works that held the interest of her readers. For these reasons, despite her significant literary contribution and her status as one of the emerging female writers and translators in the modern Meiji, Wakamatsu’s fame was rather limited, and did not survive as long as that of her prominent counterparts considered in this chapter, who still maintain their fame to this day.

What clearly distinguishes Wakamatsu from her male counterparts of that period, however, was the mode of generating publicity, which resembles the ways in which celebrities today are promoted by the use of their visual images. Her image as a ‘*keishū*’ writer was circulated in magazines, drawing the reader’s attention directly to her person.
This contrasts with written advertisements in which she was likely to be promoted by use of her husband’s name. Thus, for Wakamatsu, having skills and talents was not sufficient in promoting her works. This phenomenon is the reverse of the situation of male writers and translators of that time, whose photographs were rarely used for publicity. In the case of Kuroiwa, for example, the considerable media attention was centred on gossip rather than any photographic image of him.

Hence, Wakamatsu’s fame not only consisted of distinctive qualities, but also her persona as a women writer, which was created through publicity using her visual image, one of the characteristics of contemporary celebrity (Turner, 2014: 14).

2.3. Conclusion

The studies of the three translators given above has demonstrated that, unsurprisingly, there are clear distinctions between the prominent translators of the Meiji period and their counterparts today in terms of their roles as translators, their motivations for translating and their publication practices. The cultural shift in the Meiji period generated opportunities for these translators to earn recognition for their contributions in the areas of literature, philosophy, sociology, language and entertainment, which led to the emergence of highly prominent translators.

All three translators studied in this chapter were pioneers of new literary genres, literary movements, writings, or literary systems that earned them a prestigious status. Thus, their roles were importers of foreign cultures, contributors in the development of contemporary culture, educators who modernised the readers’ thinking, and teachers of public morals. Furthermore, it was not uncommon for prominent translators and writers of the Meiji period to be personally active in publishing by launching their own magazines and newspapers, as did Ōgai and Kuroiwa. In the case of Wakamatsu, her husband was the owner and editor-in-chief of the magazine in which her works were featured and promoted. These translators had the freedom to publish their own works in these publications, although Wakamatsu perhaps required her husband’s approval. Thus, they were able to take charge of the publication, promotion and circulation of their own works, which contrasts with the situation today in which publishers usually take the decision on how translators and their works are promoted. Another characteristic of the
prominent Meiji translators is that they utilised translation practice to disseminate their personal beliefs in the area of public morals or philosophies, which inspired their peers, intellectuals and the general public. In addition, besides producing high quality translations, their translation strategies also played their part in creating the three translators’ fame, each of whom had a distinctive approach to translation. Unlike contemporary celebrity translators, whose translation strategies tend to focus on readability in one way or another, the approaches of Meiji translators varied, ranging from readability-focused to source-text focused, and those focus on the stylistic features of the writing, or the combination of two or more strategies. However, the types of works which became highly popular (e.g. Ōgai and Kuroiwa’s adaptation, and Wakamatsu’s highly readable children’s literature) suggest that those who produced reader-focused translations had a greater chance of earning a higher degree of prominence than those who did not. Furthermore, the translation practices of the translators who were also novelists interacted with their writing practice, or rather translation was part of their writing practice. Thus, it could be said, the Meiji translators with high prominence possessed as much authority as authors of Japanese novels.

In regard to the translators’ social status, similar situations were observable in Japan, Europe and North America. All of the Meiji translators studied in this chapter had a high social status which itself earned them respect. Likewise, in Europe and North America up to the early twentieth century, literary cultures were largely controlled by an aristocrat and/or intellectual elite. In Japan, most translators came from privileged backgrounds, which allowed them to study foreign languages at a time when higher education was yet to become widely accessible, especially for women (Inoue, 2004: 46). Therefore, their social status alone established superiority over the general public. Similarly, a great number of translators in current Japan are scholars or specialists in particular foreign languages or literatures (see Chapter Five), although this phenomenon seems to be less observable than in earlier decades. These professions situate them in a particular social location that ensures respect for their expertise. Furthermore, it goes without saying that talents and skills in relation to translation are essential factors for celebrity translators in both periods.

However, the striking difference between the situations of translators in the two periods is that the chances of female translators of the Meiji period gaining prominence were significantly slimmer than for their male counterparts, which does not seem to be the case in current-day Japan. The achievements of women needed to be first
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acknowledged by their established male counterparts in order for them to become accepted into the literary circle and attain prestige. Thus, these male writers, translators and critics held the key to female translators’ fame. Moreover, their achievements did not seem to earn them the same prominence as their male counterparts in the predominantly male literary milieu in which the works of women were not evaluated fairly, as is demonstrated in the way Wakamatsu and her works were promoted as compared with her male counterparts. Hence, gender significantly influenced translators’ visibility in that period.

The analysis in this chapter draws a clear contrast between the cultural contexts in which translators existed in Meiji Japan, the United States at this time, and late Victorian Britain: Japan relied heavily on imported ideas from the countries whose cultures were considered superior to theirs, while the United States, with its multiplicity of cultural backgrounds, was rich in internal resources, although it too did rely on imported ideas to a certain degree. Britain, on the other hand, was an exporter of its advanced culture. For both America and Britain, the hegemony of the English language and the perceived superiority of their cultures over the source cultures meant that translated literature was not necessarily important or influential beyond the field of literature. Conversely, for Japan, foreign literature was greatly influential in the development of the country as a whole. Another apparent contrast between those cultural contexts is the linguistic impact of translation: in Meiji Japan, translation took a major role in national language reform, while in Britain and United States, translation had no such a role in modern history. It could be said that Japan’s history of relying on foreign ideas for the modernisation and development of the country highlighted the specificity of translators’ talents and expertise. These factors, in addition to their high social status, gave the Meiji translators authority in their translation practice. Hence, the historical situation of Meiji Japan made the profession of translation indispensable in every aspect of the development of the country. This phenomenon generated respect and receptiveness towards translators and their works. Despite the significant shift in the environment in which contemporary translators work, the traditional perception of translators and translations has continued up to the present day, maintaining a situation in which translators may attain celebrity status.¹⁵

¹⁵ See Appendix A (pp. 298-299) for summarised factors that made Ōgai, Kuroiwa and Wakamatsu celebrities.
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So far, the two chapters above have analysed the phenomenon of celebrity translators in contemporary culture, and their historical and cultural backgrounds. The historical analysis has exclusively focused on the Meiji period. The methodologies used in this chapter lay the groundwork for future research into highly prominent translators who were also famous writers in other periods, such as Tanizaki Jun’ichirō (1886-1965), Akutagawa Ryūnosuke (1892-1927), and Hori Tatso (1904-1953). A comparison of the relationship between these translators’ fame and translation practices with those of their Meiji contemporaries, as well as celebrity translators today, would be an interesting subject for future study. The next chapter takes a linguistic approach, addressing the extent to which the status of translators is related to translation strategy, as Venuti’s (1995/2008) conceptualisation suggests. It will explore whether practitioners’ approaches to translation influence their prominence, or vice versa.
CHAPTER THREE

Linguistic Analyses of Celebrity Translators

3.1. Introduction

This chapter explores what distinguishes the translation strategies of celebrity translators, asking whether these strategies relate to the degree of the translators’ prominence, as the established ‘visibility paradigm’ suggests. Chapter One has demonstrated that translation strategies alone do not determine the status of translators but can be one of the factors that add to their prominence. Paradoxically, all the Japanese celebrity translators analysed in Chapter One are known for their fluent translations in one way or another, which contradicts Venuti’s claim that the same strategy makes a translator invisible. On the other hand, Murakami, who also produces fluent texts, is known for a foreignising translation strategy which deviates from target language norms (Hadley & Akashi, 2015: 11-13), while he also attracts media and critical attention for incorporating his original writing style into his translation, which reminds the reader of his novels (Akashi, 2018: 4, 6). Hadley & Akashi (2015: 14-15) argue that it is his celebrity status which allows Murakami freedom in the choice of translation strategies. Their claim suggests that while translation strategies can influence translators’ prominence, the degree of their prominence may also have impact on the translators’ approaches to translation.

Venuti claims that a translator’s own decision to conform to the target language norms, which favour fluent texts, is responsible for the translator’s invisibility; while the opposite approach, which highlights cultural otherness, brings the reader’s attention to the text as a translation and thus resists the translator’s invisibility. However, Venuti’s conceptualisation is inadequate for describing the Japanese case as the tendency toward under-recognition of translators’ works is weak, and Japanese readers
are less likely to equate a translation with a source text, a tendency which is observable in other language contexts (Hadley & Akashi, 2015: 14, 16). Thus, the strategy of resistance to invisibility does not apply to the Japanese context. For this reason, translations into Japanese do not usually seek to eliminate the foreignness of the source text (Tamaki, 2005: 239; Wakabayashi: 2009: 8; Mizuno, 2010: 38-39). Moreover, in Japan, fluent translation attracts the reader’s attention to the translator as demonstrated in Chapter One. The above examples imply that contrary to Venuti’s paradigm, in Japan fluency seems more likely to add to the translator’s prominence than a foreignising strategy. In addition, although Murakami’s idiosyncrasies in translation can be described as foreignising since they draw the reader’s attention to the translator’s writing itself, they do not necessarily highlight the fact that the text is translation. On the contrary, his recognisable writing style brings the reader to the Murakami world, creating an illusion that the text was originally written by him, which Nihei (2016: 392) refers to as “Murakamisation”. Venuti, however, is aware that a translation cannot be defined by a binary concept, and explains in the third edition of The Translator’s Invisibility (2017: xiii) that “‘foreignising’ does not escape the inevitable domestication”, while also stating that “fluency is not itself domesticating” (ibid.: xv).

This chapter will attempt to identify the features of celebrity translators’ texts that highlight their presence as individuals within the text. It argues that translator idiosyncrasies can be a powerful factor in creating translator prominence. Furthermore, the analysis will attempt to identify whether a translator’s celebrity status has any influence on the translator’s approach to translation. The term ‘celebrity’ in this study does not equate with ‘visibility’ in Venuti’s use of the term, as explained in my introductory chapter (pp. 19-20). However, the difference in the degree of each celebrity translator’s prominence will enable the analysis to identify the extent to which their status might influence their translation strategies or vice versa.

The analysis in this chapter employs a case study to examine the works of contemporary Japanese celebrity translators. The study focuses on translation strategy, especially that of Murakami Haruki, whose degree of fame is at the top of the scale. His case will be compared with those of other translators with different degrees of
prominence. Murakami’s celebrity status is not based on his particular translation strategy. However, as I have shown elsewhere (2018: 6), the readers of Murakami’s translations are attracted by his idiosyncrasies, the feature which distinguishes his translations from those of his contemporaries. Similarly, critical reviews seem keen to focus on the originality of his writing style rather than his translation skills (Sato, 2009: 12-13). The above phenomenon suggests that the feature in his translations which highlights Murakami’s status as an author of original works is one of the important factors for his popularity as a translator.

The chapter is divided into two parts. The first investigates the presence of foreignisation in translations. It compares Murakami’s translation strategy with those of Ogawa Takayoshi and Nozaki Takashi, another prominent translator whose translation strategy has previously been compared with Murakami’s by Hadley & Akashi (2014; 2015). Each of these three translators produced a translation of The Great Gatsby (F. Scott Fitzgerald, 1925) in 2006, 2009 and 1957/1989 (revised edition), respectively. The analysis first examines their respective translations, focusing on grammatical features of their texts that are linguistic markers of hon’yakuchō [translational language], which resembles foreignisation in the Japanese context (Wakabayashi, 2009: 2-3, 8). The study further examines passages from Murakami’s other translations, asking whether the same tendency is in evidence. They are: Collectors by Raymond Carver (1975) and Auggie Wren’s Christmas Story by Paul Auster (1990). These texts have been chosen in order to demonstrate Murakami’s approach in a variety of texts: the former is written in a particular writing style, which will be discussed later, while the latter employs colloquial language. The study will also refer to his first work of translation, My Lost City by Fitzgerald (1920-40), in order to decide whether his career length has had any influence in Murakami’s choice of translation strategy. Examining the presence of hon’yakuchō in the texts listed above

---

1 The translations of the same source texts by the two translators are compared in a chapter 海彦山彦:村上がオースターを訳し、柴田がカーヴァーを訳す [Umihiko Yamahiko: Murakami Translates Auster, and Shibata Translates Carver] in 翻訳夜話 (Hon’yaku yawa, 2000), pp. 115-178.
enables the analysis to identify the degree to which the translator employs a foreignising approach and whether there are particular patterns relating to their degree of visibility.

The second part of the chapter focuses on particular stylistic features in Murakami’s translations. It examines the presence of his idiosyncratic writing style, which is recognisable in his novels, considering whether or not it relates to his celebrity status as a translator. The analysis explores Murakami’s translation of *The Catcher in the Rye* (1951, J. D. Salinger), one of the most controversial translations Murakami has produced and which has been received both favourably and negatively by readers and critics for its idiosyncrasy (Sato, 2009: 13). His approach will be compared with that of Nozaki, who also translated the same source text.

### 3.2. Analysis 1

#### 3.2.1. Hon’yakuchō

*Hon’yakuchō* is a language which is recognisably adopted from or influenced by translations from European languages. It creates foreign-sounding elements in the target text (Wakabayashi, 2009: 5) and the source text is thus made apparent as a translation to Japanese readers (Yanabu, Isoya & Uchimura, 1978: 142). However, *hon’yakuchō* does not precisely equate to Venuti’s concept of a foreignising strategy, which includes deliberately resisting fluency by highlighting a foreignness which is not necessarily present in the source text (Venuti, 2008: 252); rather *hon’yakuchō* incorporates foreign elements of the source text, which, as a result, may affect readability. The typical features of *hon’yakuchō* include: higher than usual frequency of loanwords (Yanabu, 1982, 1998; Yoshioka, 1973); overt use of personal and demonstrative pronouns (Yanase, 2000; Miyawaki, 2000; Nakamura, 2001) and longer than usual paragraphs (Miyawaki, 2000). Ikeyama suggests that these features may
create an impression of stiffness and verbosity for the reader (1963: 217-218). Therefore, the text appears unnatural (Wakabayashi, 2009: 5), and becomes apparent as a translation (Yanabu, Isoya & Uchimura, 1978: 142). The first analysis in this chapter, however, focuses solely on the use of third person pronouns, as they are easier to distinguish than loanwords, which seem to have become widely adopted in recent Japanese writings (Meldrum, 2009: 162; Furuno 2005: 151). Similarly, examining paragraph length is problematic, as identifying the length at which a paragraph becomes perceptible as overly long is beyond the scope of this study for a number of reasons. First, it would require a large corpus study of Japanese novels to find out the average length of a paragraph in general. Second, paragraph length varies depending on the nature of the novel, and third, it would also require reception studies to determine the length up to which a paragraph is considered acceptable for Japanese readers.

The third person pronouns in Japanese are 彼 (kare) [he], 彼女 (kanojo) [she] and 彼ら (karera) [they]. Kare was originally used as a demonstrative pronoun, rather than a third person pronoun in traditional Japanese writing, addressing something that is physically distant from the speaker and the listener, in a way comparable to ‘that’ or ‘that one’ in English (Yanabu, 1982: 197-199). The Latin word ille (that), which became il (he) in French, could be seen as a comparable example. Kare acquired its new meaning as the third person pronoun ‘he’ after it was used in translations (ibid.: 199-200). Subsequently, the term kanojo was created as a neologism (ibid.: 196), and both terms were adopted in native Japanese writing. Unlike English, Japanese is a topic-prominent language and allows pronouns to be omitted from sentences when they can be inferred from the context (Inoue, 2005: 184-185). Furthermore, the function of personal pronouns in Japanese is different from their use in English: in the former, they serve as nouns while in the latter they function as determiners (Noguchi, 1997: 779-780). Third person pronouns in particular are not generally required in Japanese writing (Miyawaki, 2000: 20), as they can interfere with the fluency of sentences (Tobita, 1997: 118; Murata, 2005: 129).
3.2.2. Text analysis (I)

3.2.2.1. Third person pronouns

I will begin the analysis by comparing Ogawa, Nozaki and Murakami’s third person pronoun use in their translations of The Great Gatsby, based on Meldrum’s (2009) corpus study of hon’yakuchō, which is described in my introductory chapter (pp. 30-32). The instances of kare and kanojo in each translator’s text are counted using Microsoft word-count, and then the total number of characters in the text is divided by the number of pronouns in order to extract the frequency of each pronoun’s occurrence. The figures in brackets indicate the percentage of each text made up by the respective terms. However, there may be inaccuracy in the frequency of kanojo in particular, as the word consists of two characters, whereas kare consists of one. In Figure 2 below, Kanojo is counted as one character:

Figure 2: Number of third person pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Murakami</th>
<th>Nozaki</th>
<th>Ogawa</th>
<th>ST 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kare</strong> [he/him/his]</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kanojo</strong> [she/her]</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total no. of characters/words*</th>
<th>140455</th>
<th>124790</th>
<th>97137</th>
<th>48852*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kare</strong></td>
<td>212 (0.47%)</td>
<td>184 (0.54%)</td>
<td>8831 (0.01%)</td>
<td>30* (3.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kanojo</strong></td>
<td>379 (0.26%)</td>
<td>364 (0.27%)</td>
<td>6938 (0.01%)</td>
<td>60* (1.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>136 (0.7%)</td>
<td>122 (0.81%)</td>
<td>3886 (0.03%)</td>
<td>20* (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 Japanese language is usually counted by character rather than by word. All the figures presented in this chapter may include counting errors and are approximate.
3 All the figures for the ST section are counted by word.
The results above demonstrate that the source text uses the terms ‘he’/‘his’/‘him’ twice as frequently as ‘she’/‘her’; the total number of third person pronouns occupies 5% of the source text, and they occur about once every twenty words. Similarly, the frequency of the pronoun ‘kare’ in Murakami’s and Nozaki’s texts is double that of ‘kanojo’, while Ogawa employs ‘kanojo’ slightly more than ‘kare’. The differences in the numbers of third person pronouns between the source text and translations represent a characteristic of Japanese grammar (Miyawaki, 2000: 20). However, there are significant differences between the various translators’ use of the pronouns. The figures demonstrate that Murakami and Nozaki’s approach has a strong focus on the source text compared to Ogawa’s, whose strict adherence to fluency is manifest. Thus, the results imply that Murakami and Nozaki’s texts are similarly foreignised in terms of the use of third person pronouns, while Ogawa’s is significantly domesticated. In order to support the accuracy of the above results, the number of third person pronouns in the same chapter of each translator has been counted manually. I have selected the second chapter in which six male and three female characters appear. The results in Figure 3 below show the same patterns as the previous results above:

**Figure 3: Number of third person pronouns in the second chapter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Murakami</th>
<th>Nozaki</th>
<th>Ogawa</th>
<th>ST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kare</strong> [he/him/his]</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kanojo</strong> [she/her]</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following examples illustrate how each translator’s tendency is manifested in their actual texts. Below are extracts of the corresponding passages from each translation in the chapter in which the number of the pronouns are manually counted above. They reflect each translator’s normal third-person pronoun use, focusing on the frequency of the occurrence of ‘kanojo’ in this case, which seems to be more marked than ‘kare’ in popular fiction (Meldrum 2009: 113). The passage in the source text
consists of three sentences in which the term ‘she’ or ‘her’ (underlined) occurs seven times. Here, the protagonist Nick Caraway is at a party in the apartment shared by Tom Buchanan and his mistress, Mrs Wilson. Nick observes Mrs Wilson moving round the room as her guests arrive; she is wearing an elaborate afternoon dress which rustles as she walks:

With the influence of the dress her personality had also undergone a change. [...] Her laughter, her gestures, her assertions became more violently affected moment by moment and as she expanded the room grew smaller around her until she seemed to be revolving on a noisy, creaking pivot through the smoky air. (Fitzgerald, 2012, pp. 25-26)

Ogawa omits the term ‘kanojo’ altogether. However, he employs determiners (1) “kono onna” [this woman] and (2) “kiikii oto o tateru onna” [the noisy woman] where the subject is necessary. This approach allows third person pronouns to be omitted.

 [...] こういうドレスを着ていると、中身の人間までも変わるようだ。 [...] 笑い方も、仕草も、言わんとすることも、とめどなく気取った装いを見せていた。 (1) この女が大きくなって部屋が小さく感じられる。しまいには、タバコの煙だらけの室内で、(2) きいきい音をたてる女が一人、ぐるぐる回っているようにさえ思われた。(Ogawa, pp. 53-54) [...] when [she is] wearing a dress like this, the person inside [her] also seems to change. [...] [Her] laughter, [her] gestures, and what [she] wants to say endlessly displayed

---

cockiness. It feels as though (1) this woman had expanded and the room had shrunk. In the end, it felt as if (2) the noisy woman was circling in the room full of cigarette smoke.

Nozaki, by contrast, employs a literal approach, rendering all the third person pronouns except one, where the subject is obvious from the previous sentence. The term ‘kanojo’ occurs five times in the third sentence, which may sound repetitive to the reader (Tamura, 2005: 129):

…”衣裳のおかげで、彼女の人柄まで変っている。…彼女の笑い方も彼女の身ぶりも自説をとおす彼女の言い方も、刻々激越な 誇張をましてゆき、彼女が膨脹するにつれて、部屋の空間が狭くなり、ついには彼女が、やかましくきしむ軸の上で、煙った部屋の空気の中を回転しているような感じになった。(Nozaki, p. 51)  
[...] Because of the costume, her personality has also changed. [...] Her laughter, her gestures, her manner of speech which is persistent, is fiercely becoming more exaggerated, and as she expanded, the air space in the room shrunk, and finally, it felt as though she were circling through the air of the smoky room on the noisily squeaking pivot.

Murakami employs partial omission, rendering the feminine third person pronoun as ‘kanojo’ in two places where necessary in an attempt to maintain the coherence of the sentences:
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[...] 衣裳が替わったことによって、人格にも変化が見受けられた。[...

[...] 笑い声や、身振りや、権柄ずくなものの言い方は、刻一刻とわざとらしさを帯び、彼女がそんな風に膨張していけばいくほど、まわりで部屋はますます小さく縮んでいった。そして最後には、煙草の煙に包まれたその部屋の中で、彼女一人がきついと軋む耳障りな片脚旋回をやっているみたいな様相を呈してきた。

(Murakami, p. 62) [Because of changing costumes, a change in [her] personality could also be seen. [...] [Her] laughter, [her] gestures, [her] overbearing manner of speech were increasingly becoming deliberate, and so as she expanded further the room was shrinking around [her]. In the end, inside the room which was filled with cigarette smoke, she presented the appearance of [herself] circling alone on one leg with squeaky noise.]

The above comparison illustrates that Nozaki has a strong tendency to reproduce all the pronouns in the source texts in an almost literal manner. Thus, his text has a stronger element of foreignisation in terms of the pronoun use than the others, who employ total or partial omission. Ogawa opts for the conventional approach, using determiners that are not personal pronouns where necessary. This approach perhaps explains why Ogawa’s whole text contains such a small number of third person pronouns. Murakami, on the other hand, has a tendency to focus on readability while maintaining the feel of the source text where he can. However, his translation of My Lost City by the same author, which was published in 1981, shows a different result. In this short essay, the third person male pronoun occurs in thirty-two places in the source text; Murakami, however, omits the majority of them, retaining only seven.5 The ratio of the use of ‘kare’ in the target and source text is 1: 2.5 for The Great Gatsby, but 1: 4.6 in My Lost City. Thus, his earlier translation has a stronger focus on readability than the later one. The

5 Female third person pronoun is not discussed here as it occurs in only five places in the source text.
same approach can be also found in his other translations, such as *Auggie Wren’s Christmas Story* (2000). In the passage of the source text below, the term ‘her’ occurs seven times. Here, the protagonist, Auggie, recalls what happened on a Christmas Day when he ended up stealing an antique camera from an elderly blind woman who seems to have believed Auggie was her grandson and shared her Christmas dinner with him:

*I didn’t exactly say that I was her grandson. Not in so many words, at least, but it was the implication. I wasn’t trying to trick her though. […] I mean, that woman knew I wasn’t her grandson Robert. She was old and dotty, but she wasn’t so far gone that she couldn’t tell the difference between a stranger and her own flesh and blood. (Auster, 2009: p. 31).*

As in the sample passage from *The Great Gatsby*, Murakami omits all feminine third person pronouns where the subject is obvious from the context. However, he employs the same approach as Ogawa in the previous example and uses the determiner ばあさん (bā-san) [old woman] (underlined) instead of kanojo where a pronoun is necessary in order to maintain the coherence of the sentence:

*厳密に言えば、俺は自分が孫だとはっきり口にしたわけではない。少なくともそういう言い方はしなかった。とはいえものの、含みを持たせたことはたしかだ。でもな、(1) ばあさんをだまそうというつもりじゃなかった。[…] つまりさ、ばあさんも俺がほんとは孫のロバートじゃないってことはちゃんとわかっていたはずだ。たしかに年取って、耄穢してはいたけど、血肉を分けた身内と、あかの他人を見分けることができないほどぼけちゃいないかった。（Murakami, p. 157) [Strictly speaking, I didn’t clearly say I was*
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[her] grandson. [I] didn’t say that way, at least. But it’s true that [it] was suggesting. But hey, [I] didn’t intend to trick (1) the old woman. […] That is to say, the old woman must have known I was not her grandson Robert. It’s true that [she] was old and senile, but [she] wasn’t gone to the extent of not being able to tell between [her] own flesh and blood and a complete stranger.]

However, in the further example given below, Murakami takes the opposite approach. The following passage is an extract from Collectors by Carver. Here, the pronouns ‘he’ and ‘his’ occur eleven times in a repetitive manner, and this is one of the distinctive characteristics of Carver’s writings, which are heavily edited by his editor Gordon Lish, who has become known for cutting, rearranging and rewriting Carver’s works freely (Hemmingson, 2011: 482, 485). In this passage, Aubrey Bell, a vacuum cleaner salesman, knocks at the protagonist Slater’s door. Slater reluctantly lets the salesman into his house:

Aubrey Bell stared at the carpet. He pulled his lips. Then he laughed. He laughed and shook his head. What’s so funny? I said. Nothing. Lord, he said. He laughed again. I think I’m losing my mind. I think I have a fever. He reached a hand to his forehead. His hair was matted and there was a ring around his scalp where the hat had been. (Carver, p. ii)\(^6\)

Murakami employs partial omission of the third person pronouns. However, here, he preserves the repetition, especially in the first half of the passage, by rendering ‘he’ as ‘kare’ (underlined) four times:

---
\(^6\) Extracted from Murakami & Shibata (2000).
オーブリー・ベルはじっとカーペットを見ていた。
(1) 彼は唇をすぼめた。それから (2) 彼は笑い出した。
(3) 彼は笑って頭を振った。何かそんなにおかしいんですかね、と僕は言った。いや、なんでもありませんよ。しかしねえ、と (4) 彼は言って、また笑い出した。いやいや、頭がなんかぼうっとしてるな。どうも熱があるようですね。(5) 彼はおでこに手を当てた。髪はもつれ、頭には帽子のあとが輪のようなかたちにしていた。

(Murakami, p. 212)

[Aubrey Bell was staring hard at the carpet. (1) He pulled [his] lips. Then (2) he began laughing. (3) He laughed and shook [his] head. What’s so funny? I said. Oh, nothing. But yes, (4) he said, then began laughing again. Why, [my] head feels hazy. [I] feel like [I] have a fever. (5) He put [his] hand to [his] forehead. [His] hair was tangled and on [his] head, there was a mark from the hat which looked like a ring.]

Murakami’s comment on his approach to translating Carver below suggests that the repetition was intentional (Murakami & Shibata, 2000: 182):

[… ] 細かいところをあげていくと、‘彼’というのが多いですね。これはたぶん、それに意識してそうやったのかなという気はするんです。[[…] looking at it in detail, there are many instances of ‘he’, aren't there? [I] feel [I] probably did that quite deliberately.]

7 Murakami’s translation of Collector was first published in a collection of short stories 請むから静かにしてくれ [Will you please be Quiet, Please?] in 1991.
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He also employs a similar strategy in his translations of Carver’s other works such as *Sacks* (1974), as discussed in Hadley & Akashi (2014: 187-188). In *Sacks*, Murakami reproduces the author’s script-like dialogues that repeat “I says [sic]” and “she says”, which may sound unnatural to many Japanese readers (ibid.: 188). Furthermore, he takes the same approach in his fiction; for example, *納屋を焼く* (*Naya o yaku*, 1983a) [Barn Burning] and *ファミリーアフェア* (*Famirī afeā*, 1985) [A Family Affair]. Thus, the repetition also corresponds to Murakami’s original writing style. The foreignness of Murakami’s text becomes clear when the text is compared with Shibata Motoyuki’s translation of the same source text below. Shibata opts for the conventional approach, omitting all the masculine pronouns ‘kare’. He employs the determiner ‘otoko’ [the man] in two places (1), (2) where it is necessary in order to maintain coherence:

オーブリー・ベルはカーペットを見入っていた。そして唇をすぼめた。それから声を上げて笑った。笑って、首を横に振った。何かそんなにおかしいんです？と私は言った。いえべつに。こりゃいかん、と (1) 男は言った。もう一度笑った。頭がどうかしかけてるらしい。熱があるみたいで。(2) 男は片手をおでこに持っていった。髪はもつれ、頭皮の、帽子が触れていたところに丸い輪ができていた。(Shibata, pp. 136-137) [Aubrey Bell was gazing intently at the carpet. And [he] pulled [his] lips. Then [he] laughed loudly. [He] laughed, and shook [his] head. What’s so funny? I said. Nothing. This is no good, (1) the man said. [He] laughed again. [My] head must be going funny. [I] feel like [I] have a fever. (2) The man brought [his] hand to [his] forehead. [His] hair was tangled, and a round ring was formed around [his] scalp where the hat was touching.]

---

8 Murakami’s translation of *Sacks* as *菓子袋* (*Kashibukuro*) was first published in *海* (*Umi*) in 1983.
The examples above suggest that Murakami’s translation strategy varies, depending on the nature of the source text, but perhaps also on his experience as a translator at the time of writing. For example, Murakami (1989a: 23) says that in his translation of *My Lost City* (1981), he allowed himself to come a little too close to the text:

フィッツジェラルドを訳したとき、僕は翻訳するのは初めてだったし、僕のオリジナリティというか個性を出そうという気があったんです。だけど、訳した後で、そういうものは必要ないんでてことがわかったんです。[When I translated Fitzgerald, I had never done a translation before, and I wanted to bring out something of my originality [in the text]. But then, after I finished translating, I saw that wasn't really necessary.]

Similarly, in relation to the use of repetition in his translation of Carver’s works Murakami (Murakami & Shibata, 2000: 182) states, “今だったらこうは訳さないな” [I would not have translated that way now]. Thus, Murakami’s approach has also shifted in the course of his thirty-seven-year career as a translator.

Overall, Murakami, who is the most visible translator examined here in terms of media coverage and readership, does not demonstrate a tendency to produce texts that feature *hon’yakuchō* more extensively than Nozaki. On the contrary, he consistently attempts to maintain readability wherever possible unless the source text is intentionally written in unconventional language. Thus, Murakami’s use of a foreignising strategy corresponds to the originality of the writing style in the source texts and Murakami’s personal idiosyncrasies rather than the translator’s desire to gain visibility (Hadley & Akashi, 2015: 14). Conversely, the occurrence of *hon’yakuchō* in Nozaki’s translation, which is higher than in the work of any of the other translators
examined here, does not appear to have made him more visible than Murakami. Similarly, Ogawa, who has the strongest tendency to produce fluent texts, is a prominent translator, whose name and works are promoted by publishers, as demonstrated in Chapter One. Ogawa’s tendency to focus on the target text is perhaps strongly influenced by his publishing house, Kobunsha, which has a reputation for its strict policy of producing fluent texts, particularly in its imprint *Kobunsha Koten Shinyaku Bunko* [New Translations of the Classics], under which the work is published (Sato, 2009: 6-7). Their policy is represented by the catch-phrase “いま、息をしている言葉で” (*ima iki o shiteiru kotoba de*) [currently breathing words], which is printed on the last page of every title of this imprint (ibid.). Thus, Ogawa’s case also demonstrates that in Japan, fluent translations do not uniformly relate to the translators’ invisibility, as Venuti’s (2008) conceptualisation would imply.

### 3.3. Analysis 2

#### 3.3.1. Idiosyncrasy in Murakami’s translations

The second stage of this chapter will begin by identifying key features of the idiosyncratic writing style found in Murakami’s novels. As demonstrated in Akashi (2018: 3-6) and Nihei (2016: 391-395), there is an undeniable link between his writing and translation practices. For example, part of his debut novel *Kazeno uta o kike* (1979) [*Hear the Wind Sing*] was first written in English and then translated back into Japanese (Murakami, 1989: 25). Indeed, Murakami (Murakami & Shibata, 2000: 220) claims that translation has had a significant role in the process of shaping his literary style. To put it another way, he has “deployed translation as a method of composition” (Walkowitz, 2015: 14). This approach is manifested in Murakami’s description of his novels as the “[deconstruction of translation-style writing]”, which means retaining the structure of translation while replacing the contents (Murakami & Shibata, 2000: 219). Numano
(2003: 294) states that Murakami employs honyaku’chō in his fiction as part of his signature style, or what his readers and critics refer to as “村上文体” (Murakami-buntau) [Murakami-style writing]. On the other hand, Murakami’s translations attract critics’ and readers’ attention for his buntau (Uchiyama, 2015: 48), which resembles that of his novels. Thus, Murakami buntau in his translations can be understood as part of his idiosyncrasy. Notable examples in which his buntau manifests itself include his translations of The Catcher in the Rye and The Long Goodbye (R. Chandler, 1953), as discussed in Akashi (2018: 6). The critic Chūjō (2003) suggests that Murakami buntau in the former creates a new way of reading the novel. The latter, on the other hand, has been criticised for transforming the classic hardboiled fiction into ‘city type’ contemporary literature ([“Murakami Haruki version”], 2017). This phenomenon implies that there is an interrelationship between Murakami’s writings and translations (Akashi, 2018: 1).

3.3.2. Murakami buntau [Murakami-style writing]

Buntau in the broad sense usually refers to the characteristics of one’s writing (Ōno and Shibata, 1977: v). However, it is a problematic term to define, as it consists of various elements, such as a writer’s choices of vocabulary, a preference for particular regional accents, script types, or the manners of speech (ibid.; Yasumoto, 1977: 399). Makino Seiichi (2013: 1), an established linguist who has examined Murakami’s writing style, defines buntau as an author’s personal style of writing, which consists of particular words and expressions that are repeatedly selected by the author. One of the prominent features in Murakami’s writings is his use of first-person pronouns 我 (boku). Japanese language has a variety of first-person pronouns, depending on the speaker’s gender, position in the societal hierarchy and the nature of the relationship between the speaker and listener (Hadley & Akashi, 2015: 10). The English term ‘I’ is most commonly

———

9 See Nihei (2013: 69-71) for detailed characteristics of Murakami’s “boku”.
translated as the gender-neutral 仆 (watashi) (ibid.). Boku is an informal term reserved for males which evokes a passive character (Nihei, 2013: 69). Most of Murakami’s protagonists consistently refer to themselves as boku (Koshikawa, 2003: 292). Kazamaru (2006: 30) describes the characteristics of boku in Murakami’s novels as: a pacifist who likes to play it safe; never letting his lust and emotion out. His English translator Jay Rubin (2000: 37) suggests that boku in Murakami’s fiction resembles his own character:

Murakami was by no means the first Japanese novelist to adopt boku as the ‘I’ of a nameless male narrator, but the personality with which Murakami invested his Boku was unique. First of all, it resembled his own, with a generous fund of curiosity and a cool, detached, bemused acceptance of the inherent strangeness of life.

Rubin (ibid.) further states that Murakami’s use of boku is part of what separates his works from those of his contemporaries, who prefer to use the term watashi for first person pronoun which is “the long-established fixture of serious Japanese fiction”. Nihei (2013: 69) argues that Murakami’s description of his main protagonists as boku is “one of the essential elements” in the popularity of his fiction. The boku not only has certain characteristics but also employs habitual sayings that occur repeatedly. Yare-yare is one of these used by boku characters in Murakami’s novels (Kato, 2006: 141). This expression usually occurs ‘when the protagonists are confronted by confounding situations’ (Rubin, 2002: 37). The term has been rendered into English as ‘great, just great’ or ‘terrific’ or merely as a sigh by his translators (ibid.). This particular expression seems to attract the attention of the readers of his novels, which is manifested in the special feature 村上春樹「やれやれ」調査団 [Murakami Haruki ‘Yare-yare’ Investigation Committee] in 村上春樹新聞 [Murakami Haruki Times], a digital newspaper run by a dedicated fanbase. The site investigates his original writings,
including essays, in which *yare-yare* occurs. This on-going research currently lists 109 passages from thirty-three works that include the expression, out of which twenty-nine passages come from *Dansu·Dansu·Dansu* (*Dansu dansu dansu*, 1988) [Dance, Dance, Dance] alone. A good example can be found in a passage where *boku*, already in bed, is woken up by the sound of a doorbell ring (underlined):

僕はTシャツとパンツだけになってベッドにもぐりこみ、電気を消して五分も経たないうちにドア・ベルがかんこんと鳴った。やれやれまったく、と僕は思った。（Murakami, Book 2 p. 116）*

Besides the occurrence of *boku* and *yare-yare*, there is another feature which is frequently regarded as characteristic of *Murakami buntai*. Murakami has a strong tendency to employ *katakana* words; that is to say, loanwords or transliterations of high-frequency English words (Numano, 2003: 294). Typical examples include the names of foreign brands and western foods, such as roast beef sandwich as *ロースト・ビフ・サンドイッチ* (*rōsuto bīfu sandoicchi*) and *Levi’s* as *リーバイス* (*rībaisu*). The author had previously been criticised for his deliberate use of *katakana* words, as heavy usage of foreign vocabulary was not considered appropriate in serious literature at that time (Suter, 2008: 67). However, overt use of *katakana* words has now become more acceptable among mainstream authors, and Murakami is regarded as the pioneer who popularised their use in serious fiction (Suter, 2008: 68). What makes his use of foreign terms conspicuous is that he tends to transliterate them closely from the original language compared to conventional foreign terms in *katakana*, which are often

---

10 Katakana is one of the three Japanese syllabaries and is usually used for transcription of foreign words. See Perea and Pérez (2009) for more details.
abbreviated (ibid.). Suter (ibid.) claims that Murakami’s approach draws the reader’s attention to the foreignness of the word. Examples include リモートコントローラー (rimōtōkontorōrā) [remote controller], which is usually referred to as リモコン (rimokon), and スーパーマーケット (sūpāmāketto) [supermarket], instead of スーパー (sūpā). Furthermore, Murakami’s katakana words are not limited to the names of place and objects; he also uses abstract terms that are derived from foreign words which also include uncommon expressions in Japanese, such as ブラッシュアップ (burasshu appu) [brush up], アイデンティティ (aidentīti) [identity] and レゾン・デートゥル (rēzon dēturu) [raison d’être] (Suter, 2008: 71, 72). The same tendency is also observable in the titles of his original writings, such as “Family Affair” as “Famirī afea”, as was mentioned in the previous section. These terms are devoid of meaning in Japanese.

The examples presented above are some of the key features of Murakami’s novels, which I have referred to as ‘idiosyncrasies’ in this analysis. His use of the katakana words creates a foreign air, while boku and yare-yare seem to form familiar characteristics of Murakami’s main protagonists. The author would appear to employ the same approach in translation. Kawahara (2016: 42) observes that Murakami employs a larger number of katakana words than Shibata in their translations of Collector, which is examined earlier in this chapter. He further adds that Murakami tends to choose katakana words that are not frequently used in Japanese writings (ibid.: 42-43). In addition, Hadley & Akashi (2015: 10) suggest that the protagonists of Murakami’s fiction and those of his translations share a similar air, irrespective of the characteristics of the protagonists in the source texts, due to the employment of the same first-person pronoun. This phenomenon implies that readers of his novels may find the boku characters in his translations familiar. Similarly, Nihei (2016: 392) suggests that the familiarity of Murakami’s language in his translations contributes to the acquisition of a wide readership, although it also attracts criticisms. Murakami (Murakami & Shibata, 2000: 35) seems to be aware of this phenomenon and confirms that he cannot completely abandon his style when translating, however much he might
try. These resemblances between Murakami’s novels and translations are often mentioned:

似てるんでしょうね。それはよく言われる。僕の小説の文体は僕の訳す小説の文体と似てるというふうに言う人もいるし、僕の翻訳の文体は僕の小説の文体に似すぎているという人もいる。

(Murakami, 1989: 24) [I] guess, it’s similar. [I] often get told. Some say the writing style in my novels is similar to the writing style of novels I translate, while others would say the writing style in my translation is too similar to the writing style in my novels.]

3.3.3. Text analysis (II)

The following analysis investigates the presence of Murakami’s idiosyncrasies in キャッチャー・イン・ザライ (Kyacchā in za rai) [The Catcher in the Rye] (referred to as Kyacchā hereafter). The novel had previously been translated by Nozaki as ライ麦畑でつかまえて (Raimugibatake de tsukamaete, 1964) and had acquired canonical status (Sato, 2009: 12-13). Sato (2009: 13) explains that Kyacchā has drawn critical attention in two areas: one is the buntai Murakami employs in the translation; another is his approach to the interpretation of the story, which is explored in two articles by Hadley & Akashi (2014; 2015). What superficially distinguishes Murakami’s translation from that of Nozaki is that the former is written in “the contemporary, smooth Japanese” which makes the reader forget that the original even exists, while the latter employs the opposite strategy, prioritising the source text (Fujimoto, 2006: 315, 316). Fujimoto (ibid.: 315) argues that Murakami’s Kyacchā is produced through his buntai, which he has established in his novels. My analysis compares the extracts and terminology from Murakami’s translation with those of Nozaki in order to identify how Murakami buntai is manifested in his texts and how it relates to his celebrity status. There are several
features in Kyacchā that remind the reader of his novels. The study draws on Venuti’s (1995) model of the examination of stylistic features in target texts, focusing on the three key features in Murakami buntai: the term yare-yare, boku and the use of katakana words.

3.3.3.1. Boku and Yare-yare

Some of the marked features in Kyacchā that represent Murakami buntai are the presence of boku and the language boku speaks. The main protagonist, Holden, refers to himself as boku throughout the story. Furthermore, the boku uses Murakami’s hallmark expression ‘yare-yare’ to render the term ‘boy’ in the source text (Hayashi, 2012: 6). Hayashi (ibid.) argues that the frequent occurrence of this term in the text reminds the reader of Murakami. Similarly, Numano (2003: 292, 293) describes the idiosyncrasy of the expression, which does not seem to represent Holden’s characteristics, in the following way:

[Well it is certainly a phrase that Murakami’s readers are familiar with, but for a high school student to be saying ‘yare-yare’ certainly sounds anachronistic [to me]. [...] I really sensed I was in a ‘Murakami-ish world’ when I came across that phrase, put into the mouth of Holden].

An example can be found in the extract below from the second chapter in which yare-yare occurs in five places. Here, Holden is going to be expelled from the school for his apparent lack of interest in his studies. He tells his teacher, Spencer, that his parents are yet to be informed of his expulsion:

"And how do you think they'll take the news?"
"Well... they'll be pretty irritated about it," I said. "They really will. This is about the fourth school I've gone to." I shook my head.
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I shake my head quite a lot. "Boy!" I said. I also say "Boy!" quite a lot. (Salinger, p. 9)

In the translation below (A), the combination of Murakami’s choice of the term yare-yare for the protagonist’s repeated expression ‘Boy!’ and his use of the term boku for the first person pronoun creates a resonance between Holden as boku and the protagonists’ boku in Murakami’s novels (‘I’ without bracket is rendered as boku in the target text):

A) 「ご両親はそれを聞いてどう思われるかな?」「あの・・・・かなりなりかりするだろうと思います」と僕は言った。「まじめな話。なにしろこの学校は四つめくらいですから」、僕は首を振った。
僕はまたよく首を振るんだ。(1)「やれやれ!」と僕は言った。ついてに言うと、この「やれやれ!」ってのも口癖なんだ。
(Murakami, p.18) [“How will your parents think when [they] hear about it?” “Well, [I] think [they] will be quite annoyed” I said. “Seriously. Since this school is about the fourth one”, I shook my head. I shake my head quite a lot. (1) “yare-yare!” I said. This ‘yare--yare!’ is also my habitual saying, by the way.]

Furthermore, there is a passage in his novel 羊をめぐる冒険 (Hitsuji o meguru bōken, 1982) [A Wild Sheep Chase] (B) which is almost identical to the one above (1). The recurrence of the sentence establishes a clear intertextual link between boku in Kyacchā and his novel, as presented below. Here, the nameless protagonist boku comes back to his hotel after having had an unproductive day:

B) 「やれやれ」と僕は言った。やれやれという言葉はだんだん僕の口ぐせのようになりつつある。 (Murakami, Book 2, p. 36) [“Yare-yare” I said. The word yare-yare is gradually becoming my habitual saying.]
Chapter Three

The resemblance of the two passages potentially reminds the reader of Murakami when reading Kyacchā. Furthermore, his choice of the expression above seems to have a certain amount of influence on the protagonist’s personality, which is portrayed differently in Nozaki’s translation, which also employs the pronoun boku for Holden. Nozaki renders the term ‘Boy!’ as ‘Che’ which represents a ‘tut’ sound, and expresses one’s emotion when something does not go well (Che’, n.d.):

Although both terms express disappointment their implications differ. The translations of yare-yare in the Japanese-English online dictionary Weblio (Yare-yare, n.d.) include ‘thank God’, ‘dear me’, and ‘good grief’, while che’ seems to express irritation and annoyance, such as ‘shoot’, ‘shit’ and ‘dammit’. Numano (2003: 292) suggests that Nozaki attempts to portray Holden as a youth in the 1960s pretending to be a bad boy by speaking in a rough tone, whereas Murakami portrays him as a more modern and gentle character, the characteristics that are often found in the protagonists in his own novels. Murakami (Murakami & Shibata, 2003: 69) is aware that boku may seem to be too good a boy, deviating from Holden’s image in Nozaki’s existing translation. The characteristic resemblance between Holden and boku characters in Murakami’s novels is further emphasised by the manner of speech he employs for the boku throughout the
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story. Examples include a passage where Holden is being asked by a pimp if he would be interested in having the company of a girl for the night. Holden, who is dumbstruck by the question, manages to answer “Me?” (Salinger, p. 99). Murakami renders this as “僕がかい?” (boku ga kai) [Me, you mean?] (p.155), whereas Nozaki replaces boku with another male personal pronoun, おれ (ore), as in “おれが?” (ore ga?) [Me?]. Ore is an informal term for ‘I’ in English, which represents vulgarity, and is perceived as displaying masculinity (Lee & Yonezawa, 2008: 754). Holden’s attitude in Nozaki’s passage contrasts with boku in his counterpart’s, who maintains the gentle character. In the following passage the characteristic difference between the two becomes more explicit. Here, feeling disillusioned by his elder brother D. B., boku imagines himself doing things which would annoy D. B., who despises war:

If there’s ever another war, I’m going to sit right the hell on top of it. I’ll volunteer for it, I swear to God I will. (Salinger, p. 152)

The emotion in Holden’s voice, which is present in the source text, seems be toned down by the term と思う (to omou) [I think] in Murakami’s passage. The boku speaks in a rather neutral tone, sounding as if he were merely referring to his future plan:

もし次の戦争が始まったら、爆弾の上に進んでまたがってやろうと思う。僕はそういう役に志願しよう。ほんとに、真面目なはなし。 (Murakami, p.238) [If another war begins, [I] think [I] would willingly ride on the top of a bomb. Let me volunteer for that kind of role. Really, honestly speaking.]

Conversely, in Nozaki’s text, Holden’s voice appears to have a tone of assertiveness and emotion that correspond to the voice in the source text:

---

Cited in Okamoto (1985), and Ide (1990).
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今度戦争があったら、僕は原子爆弾のてっぺんに乗っかってやるよ。自分から志願してやってやる。誓ってもいいや。(Nozaki, p. 219) [If there is another war, I’ll sure sit right on the top of an atomic bomb. I’d definitely do it by volunteering myself. I can swear.]

The above examples demonstrate that it is not only the frequent occurrence of the terms *boku* and *yare-yare* which make Murakami visible in the translation but also the personality attached to the character, which is reminiscent of *boku* in his novels. Murakami portrays Holden in his own style, irrespective of his characteristics in the source text. In other words, *Murakami buntai* forms Holden’s personality as it does to the *boku* character in his novels, creating a similar feel between the two.

3.3.3.2. **Katakana words**

The final part of this analysis attempts to identify how Murakami’s idiosyncratic employment of *katakana* words manifests in his translation. His overt use of *katakana* words in *Kyacchā* has drawn the attention of critics (Murakami & Shibata, 2003: 61-62; Numano, 2003: 294-295; Niimoto, 2003: 294). However, their attention seems to focus on the words’ modernising rather than foreignising effect, as foreign-derived words are often expected to do. Numano (2003) comments that *Kyacchā* is “[filled with modern phrases and expressions]”, while Fujimoto (2006: 314) points out that *katakana* words occur with high frequency (ibid.: 314). Similarly, Hokujo (2004: 153) argues that the occurrence of the words in Murakami’s text is considerably higher than in Nozaki’s, whose version was considered to have contained unusually high numbers of *katakana* when published. Murakami (Murakami & Shibata, 2003: 65) explains that readers are now exposed to many more English words than in the mid-1960s when Nozaki published his first edition. Murakami indicates that he deliberately attempted to move the source text away from the 1950s, when the novel was set, and transferred it to the twenty-first century (ibid.: 63). Nihei (2016: 392) argues that Murakami’s frequent use of *katakana* in the target text reminds the reader of the “hallmark” of his *buntai*, thus
“Murakamisation”. In Figure 3 below, selected *katakana* words from Murakami’s text are compared with Nozaki’s translation of the same terms.\(^\text{12}\)

### Figure 4: Katakana words comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Murakami</th>
<th>Nozaki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Catcher in the Rye</td>
<td>キャッチャー・イン・ザ・ライ (<em>Kyacchā in za rai</em>)</td>
<td>ライ麦畑でつかまえて (<em>Raimugi batake de tsukamaete</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good luck!</td>
<td>グッド・ラック (<em>guddo rakku</em>)</td>
<td>幸運 (<em>kōun</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td>ナーヴァス (<em>nāvas</em>)</td>
<td>不安 (<em>fuan</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Necking</td>
<td>ネッキング (<em>nekkingu</em>)</td>
<td>抱擁 (<em>houyō</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sex life</td>
<td>セックス・ライフ (<em>sekkusu raifu</em>)</td>
<td>性生活 (<em>seiseikatsu</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fuck you</td>
<td>ファック・ユー (<em>fakku ū</em>)</td>
<td>オマンコシヨウ (<em>omanko shiyō</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>コンプレックス (<em>conpurekkusu</em>)</td>
<td>劣等意識 (<em>rettōishiki</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>フレンドリー (<em>furendorī</em>)</td>
<td>愛想[がいい] (<em>aiso ga ii</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Gorgeous</td>
<td>ゴージャス (<em>gōjasu</em>)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Roommate</td>
<td>ルームメイト (<em>rūumeito</em>)</td>
<td>同じ部屋にいる友達 (<em>onaji heya ni iru tomodachi</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Crazy</td>
<td>クレイジー (<em>kureizī</em>)</td>
<td>いかれた (<em>ikareta</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jesus Christ</td>
<td>ジーザス・クリスト (<em>jīzasu kuraisuto</em>)</td>
<td>これはねえ (<em>korewa nē</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the terms from Murakami’s text above are transliterations of the source language that are not necessarily comprehensible in the target language. This contrasts with Nozaki, who consistently renders them into Japanese equivalents. For example, the title (1) does not represent the meaning of the source title (Murakami & Shibata, 2003: 60-61), which is in any case opaque for English-speaking readers. Murakami

---

\(^{12}\) The page number cited in the table is not necessarily the only page on which the word occurs.
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(ibid.: 60) argues that the novel has now become a household name, therefore the title does not have to be semantically comprehensible to readers. He is adamant that “[the title cannot be anything other than Kyacchā in za rai]” (ibid.). However, the familiarity of the novel is not the only reason for this approach. He explains that the transliterated title allows readers space for their own interpretation, whereas semantic equivalence would limit this (ibid.: 60). Furthermore, Murakami (ibid.) suggests that the peculiarity of the title would become recognisable to readers. Similarly, Murakami transliterates terms such as ‘nervous’, ‘sex-life’ and ‘friendly’ which have commonly used Japanese equivalents, as shown in Nozaki’s column above. Murakami (Murakami & Shibata, 2003: 64-65) argues that Japanese readers have now become familiar with the American lifestyle, therefore, terms such as ‘fuck you’ do not need to be rendered by a Japanese equivalent. The foreignness which is created by his use of the katakana represents his buntai which is constructed, based on English language from which he translates (Murakami & Shibata, 2000: 218-219). Thus, Murakami’s preference for foreign-derived terms makes his identity explicit to the reader, while the frequent occurrence of such terms creates a textual surface which is reminiscent of Murakami’s novels.

The above findings illustrate that in a broad sense, the idiosyncrasy in Murakami’s translation consists of two elements: Murakami buntai, and the thinking behind his translation strategy. The Murakami buntai creates an intertextual link between his translations and novels, which manifests itself in the characterisation of the protagonist, whose personality resembles those in his novels. On the other hand, the motives behind Murakami’s choice of translation strategy manipulate the feel of the target text. He intentionally employs katakana words, deviating from the target language norms in an attempt to distinguish his translation from Nozaki’s existing version. Furthermore, the presence of katakana, which usually gives a foreign air to Murakami’s novels (Suter, 2008: 68), has a Murakamisation effect when used in his translations, reminding the reader of his original works. Hence, as Fujimoto (2006: 316) stated, his idiosyncrasies produce translations that can potentially be perceived as his original writing. Judging by the attention Kyacchā has received from critics and scholars
of translation studies, this would appear to be one of the works in which Murakami’s novelist personality manifests itself most prominently. Furthermore, this translation has achieved notable sales figures in comparison to his others (Sato, 2009: 1). Thus, it is plausible to conclude that the more Murakami’s idiosyncrasy manifests in the text, the more appealing it becomes to the reader.

3.4. Conclusion

The analysis in this chapter has demonstrated that Murakami’s translation strategy can be clearly distinguished from those of his counterparts in terms of fluidity. Although Murakami tends to prioritise readability, he also deviates from target language norms when he chooses to maintain the idiosyncrasies of the source text (e.g. those by Carver), which can also be linked with Murakami’s own original writing style. In addition, he intentionally Murakamises the text by employing Murakami buntai (e.g. Kyacchā). Thus, in either sense, Murakami’s presence as a writer tends to be manifest in his translations. His approach contrasts with those of Ogawa and Nozaki, whose translation strategies seem more consistent: the former focuses on readability, whereas the latter prioritises the source text. Murakami’s strategic decisions are likely to be influenced by his authorial perspective, especially when he translates the works of authors whom he admires, which will be discussed in Chapter Four. But such decisions are not likely to be the product of Murakami’s desire to increase his visibility since he is already famous. Nor is there clear evidence that his celebrity status is responsible for his choice of translation strategies.

Idiosyncrasies can directly remind readers of the presence of the translator in cases where the translator’s writing style is known to them. The stylistic features in Murakami’s translation which remind readers of his novels have a direct influence on his visibility in the translated text. Or rather, readers expect to find Murakami’s
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hallmarks in his translations in ways reminiscent of their presence in his novels. Moreover, Murakami’s hallmarks not only highlight his presence in the text but also add novelty to his translations, thus drawing in readers (Akashi, 2018: 6). Hence, it is plausible to conclude that Murakami’s translations are perceived by critics and readers as a sub-genre of his original works due to their idiosyncrasies, and this separates his translations from his contemporaries’ works, adding to his prominence.

This chapter has illustrated that translation strategies do influence the translator’s visibility. In Murakami’s case, his idiosyncrasies make his writer’s identity manifests in his translation. However, although translators’ idiosyncrasies in translations can be powerful factors that add to their visibility, they do not make the translators visible outside the text unless they are talked about by critics, readers, publishers or the translators themselves. Likewise, Murakami’s celebrity as a translator is not based on idiosyncrasy alone. There are other factors that are responsible for his fame, such as publishers’ marketing strategies as well as the translator’s willingness to make his voice heard in paratextual space. Venuti (2008: 273-274) suggests that paratexts can be used as a means of increasing the translator’s recognition, though he does not explore this aspect beyond the content of translators’ prefaces. The next chapter will examine paratexts, identifying whether and how Murakami boosts his visibility through writing translator afterwords and how his works are promoted by publishers in comparison with his contemporaries.
4.1. Introduction

This chapter examines the relationship between paratexts and translator visibility, considering how translators might attain prominence through paratexts. It argues that paratextual elements can be powerful factors that create significant translatorial visibility. Venuti (2008: 311) suggests that presenting sophisticated rationales for translators’ approaches to translation in paratextual space draws the reader’s attention to the text being translated and can, therefore, be an effective countermeasure to their invisibility. In his examination of translators’ prefaces produced between the seventeenth and the late twentieth century, Venuti centres his analysis on the translators’ explanation of their translation strategies; he does not, however, discuss how the contents of the prefaces relate to their visibility. Nor does he explore other types of paratexts, such as book cover designs, in relation to translator visibility.

Chapter Three has demonstrated that idiosyncrasies in Murakami Haruki’s translations are immediately recognisable to the reader, highlighting the translator’s identity. His name as a translator and his particular translation strategy add to his visibility further when discussions between critics over the peculiarity of his translation are incorporated into paratexts, as demonstrated in the case of The Catcher in the Rye. Furthermore, book cover design usually functions as advertising to attract potential readers (Genette, 1997: 28). Thus, whether or how translators’ names are listed on the book covers are another important subject of study in the discussion of translator visibility, especially in contexts where the inclusion of translators’ names is a regular practice. The analysis in this chapter examines paratexts in two stages, specifically, the
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translator’s afterword and dust jacket design, focusing on Murakami’s translations. It employs the perspectives proposed by Batchelor (2018), whose functional definitions of paratext are broader than Genette’s. Batchelor (2018: 19-22) points out the ambiguity and limitations of Genette’s model, including his views on paratext as a text which is focused on the original text, and which does not recognise translations as independent of their originals, with their own paratext. Genette also treats the cover designs of translations in the same way as paratext for non-translated texts. Furthermore, while some of Genette’s descriptions of the functions of paratext are useful for my analysis, his categorisation of paratexts according to their location is problematic: Genette (1997: xviii) describes an afterword as ‘peritext’ which is located within the book, but my analysis also discusses translators’ afterwords which have been published separately. For this reason, this chapter employs the term ‘paratext’, instead of ‘peritext’.

The first stage of my analysis examines the contents of afterwords authored by Murakami himself; the second studies how his name is presented on the dust jackets. The chapter aims to investigate how Murakami’s own voice in afterwords and his name being featured on dust jackets relate to his prominence, and how this compares with the cases of his contemporaries. Bilodeau (2015: 253, 63, 73-77) describes the translator’s afterword as a space which allows translators to promote themselves, while dust jackets represent the book in “advertisements, critical articles, websites, and other loci for discussing and promoting books”. Thus, the jacket design is indicative of how appealing the translator’s name is to the readers. Genette (1997: 39) observes that the more prominent the author, the more space is given to the author’s name on book covers. The chapter investigates whether this phenomenon also applies to translators. I will begin with a brief introduction to the status of Japanese paratexts, aiming to illustrate the context in which the main analysis is constructed. This introduction will enable the main analysis to situate Murakami’s paratexts. The Japanese case will also be compared with its anglophone counterparts in order to demonstrate differences in their respective publishers’ approaches to paratexts.

---

1 Books in Japan usually come with dust jackets which are removable covers for protection.
4.2. Paratext in Japanese translations

4.2.1. 訳者あとがき (Yakusha atogaki) [Translator's afterword]

The inclusion of a translator’s afterword, or yakusha atogaki, had become a regular practice in Japanese translations by the mid-twentieth century, although translators’ prefaces seem to have been more common in the early part of the century (Bilodeau, 2015: 59-60). These afterwords typically consist of a commentary on the original text and the process of its translation, information about the author, and about the historical and cultural background of the source text (Bilodeau, 2015: 154). Bilodeau (ibid.: 159) explains that Japanese translators usually have freedom to emphasise any aspects of the work they wish in their afterwords, depending on availability of space. However, one editor explained that the content of an afterword may be subject to editing when it is considered to be irrelevant to the book, or to offer insufficient or too much information (Anonymous, personal communication, 2017). Another editor (Anonymous, personal communication, 2017) explained that the cost of producing books is usually determined by the number of units, each of which consists of sixteen pages. He further stated that the length of an afterword depends on the number of pages remaining, and usually consists of a minimum of two pages, with fourteen pages being the maximum; anything longer than that is unrealistic (ibid.). Bilodeau (2015: 159) explains that some translators are inclined towards incorporating self-presentational elements such as anecdotes. The inclusion of anecdotes naturally generates opportunities for translators to increase their visibility.

4.2.1.1 Comparisons with the UK and USA

The Japanese practice of including an afterword described above contrasts with the UK and USA, where the practice is often limited to the cases of academic publishers (Munday, 2001: 32). Examples include Oxford World’s Classics whose retranslations of canonical works, including Tolstoy’s War and Peace (2010) and Dante’s Divine Comedy (2008), frequently contain introductions, background information about the
source text, or biographical details about the author. McRae (2010: 40-41) demonstrates that only 20% of translated fiction by major authors into English has an introduction. However, these introductions are often written by an expert or a person other than the translator, which contrasts with the Japanese case where the translator is normally the author of the afterword, while the author of a 解説 (kaisetsu) [explanation] is not necessarily the translator (Bilodeau: 2015: 105).\(^2\) By way of illustration, let us consider translations of Le Rouge et le noir (Stendhal, 1830). The Japanese translation entitled 赤と黒 (Aka to kuro, 2007) [The Red and Black] by Nozaki Kan (野崎歓) contains 読者ガイド (dokusha gaido) [A Reader’s Guide] written by the translator himself, who is a professor of French literature at Tokyo University. The guide, which is sixteen pages long, is divided into eight sections, providing brief introductions to: the social status of the protagonist; the value of money in nineteenth-century France; the Bourbon Restoration; the process of the July Revolution; the conflict between the royalist and Jesuit-supported legitimists versus liberals; the monarchical system, and the characters whom the main protagonist Julien Sorel encounters, plus references. Nozaki does not include personal accounts relating to his feeling towards the author, or experience of translating this particular work, but he focuses on providing readers with instructions on how the novel should be read. By offering the guide, Nozaki demonstrates his expertise, which emphasises his role as a cultural mediator. Similarly, the translation of the same novel (1958) by established scholars of French literature, Kuwahara Takeo (桑原武夫) and Ikusima Ryoichi (生島遼一), includes a はしがき (hasigaki), or a foreword consisting of background information on the author and novel, the function of which is the same as that of the afterword. Bilodeau (2015: 3) explains that the elements in afterwords that demonstrate the translator’s expertise situate them in a flattering light (Bilodeau, 2015: 3). Thus, all translator-authored paratexts contribute to the construction of an image of translator identity, and even a relatively bland, factual afterword or foreword advertises the translator’s expertise.

\(^2\) Kaisetsu traditionally focuses on the explication of the book, and is often authored by a person other than the translator (Bilodeau, 2015: 59, 105).
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The Japanese cases above contrast with English translations of the same source texts, whose introductions are written by third persons. The Red and the Black, translated by Catherine Slater (1991) and Lowell Bair (1958), have lengthy introductions centred on background information about the source text and author and are written by the British literary scholar Roger Pearson and American author and TV personality Clifton Fadiman, respectively. Furthermore, the same source text translated by Burton Raffel, which has been issued by several publishing houses, includes an introduction by different individuals, depending on the publisher, despite the fact that Raffel was a very well-respected translator who was commissioned to provide introductions to a number of his other translations. For example, Modern Library (2004) has the prominent writer Diane Johnson as the author of the introduction, Penguin Classics (2002) has the literary expert and author Roger Gard, while Signet Classics (2006) has the British author Jonathan Keates. Gard was an expert on French literature at London University, while Johnson authored the novel Arabian Nights (1998), which was shortlisted for the Pulitzer Prize. Similarly, Keates is an award-winning writer. The profiles of the authors of the introductions suggest that publishers tend to commission such texts either from more familiar names or from scholars perceived as being authoritative. This phenomenon is evident in the publisher’s promotional copy, which reads: “Burton Raffel’s extraordinary new translation, coupled with an enlightening Introduction by Diane Johnson, helps it shine more brightly than ever before.” (Penguin Random House).

On the other hand, the first English edition of Crime and Punishment (1914), translated by the Russian literature specialist Constance Garnett, includes an introduction by the translator herself. Garnett, who was highly regarded in her own time, is hailed as the most famous English translator of Russian literature (Remnick, 2005). Similarly, Oliver Ready, the translator of the same novel published by Penguin Classics (2014), is also the author of the Introduction and Notes. The reason for this is perhaps that Ready is a scholar of Russian literature himself, in contrast to the other translators listed above who have no scholarly background in the source contexts. This phenomenon can also be found in the case of the Penguin Classics translation of
Chapter Four

Nietzsche’s *Beyond Good and Evil* by the translator and biographer R. J. Hollingdale, whose Introduction in the first edition (1973) was replaced in the 1990 edition by a text written by Michael Tanner, who is a philosopher. Furthermore, the renowned poet and translator Seamus Heaney has written an introduction to his own translation of *Beowulf* (1999). Hence, the prominence of the author of the introduction is an important factor in promoting translated canonical works in anglophone contexts, except in the case where the translator is also an expert in the source contexts, or both famous and an expert, as in Garnett and Heaney’s cases. This phenomenon contrasts with the Japanese situation, where literary translators of serious fiction frequently come from an academic background. Thus, they are specialists themselves in the literary contexts they translate, which allows the translators to become convincing promoters of the books. Furthermore, an afterword functions as a space where the translators can promote themselves to readers as literary experts. Thus, the Japanese practice described above creates opportunities for translators, whose names are already on the book cover, to gain further recognition.

4.2.3. Dust Jackets

Genette (1997: 28) describes the function of a dust jacket (referred to as ‘jacket’ hereafter) as being to attract attention by including eye-catching features, such as graphic images, advertising a film or TV adaptation. By contrast, underneath the jacket the book cover generally bears minimal information, including the title and the names of the author, translator, and publisher. For both hardcovers and paperbacks, the jackets of first editions in Japan are generally accompanied by an *obi* (Genette’s sense (ibid.)). The band is a kind of “mini jacket”, which covers about one third of the cover or main jacket, and usually bears features including: the author’s

---

3 The technical term is *bande de lancement* [launching band] or *bande de nouveau* [new-publication band] (Genette, 1997: 27).
name in large font; literary awards and titles the author or work has won and an authorial or allographic phrase (ibid.: 28-29). The inclusion of a band seems to be common practice in some cultural contexts, for example French, but less so in anglophone contexts. A Japanese obi for translated literature typically includes promotional elements such as quotes from the translator’s commentary, aiming to attract readers’ interest (Bilodeau, 2015: 6-7). Furthermore, an obi frequently includes the name of the author and translator, despite their already being listed on the jacket. Thus, the obi serves as an additional form of publicity for the book, author, and translator (ibid.: 63). The process of deciding on jacket design typically involves the sales and marketing department and the company’s design team, depending on the size of the house (Anonymous, personal communication, 2018). However, one editor explained that there are some cases in which the translator makes suggestions on the jacket design. Similarly, another editor commented that Murakami was involved in one of the jacket designs of some of Chandler’s works (Anonymous, personal communication, 2018). In general, although the translator is not usually included in the process, he or she may indirectly influence the jacket design since design ideas can be formed in the process of communication between the editor and the translator during the project (ibid.). The final decision is in the hands of the publisher. The following section will make comparisons between publishers’ approaches to listing translators’ names in Japan, the UK and USA.

### 4.2.3.1. Comparisons with the UK and USA

The features on the jackets in Japan contrast with those of the UK and USA, where publishers tend to avoid crowded book cover designs, and translators’ names are usually one of the first elements to go when publishers look for features to remove (Bilodeau, 2015: 8, 63; Munday, 2001: 32; McRae, 2012: 17-18). Although the practice of excluding translators’ names does not uniformly apply to all publishers in the UK and USA, the retention of the name seems to be limited to the case where the translator

---

4 An “allographic” phrase is written by a person other than the author of the main text (Genette, 1997: 10).
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is familiar to readers, or in academic publishing where policies focus on introducing culturally diverse literature in translation. Examples of the former case would be Margaret Jull Costa, whose name is likely to be more familiar to UK readers than those of the source authors (Hahn, 2016), and Paul Auster, who is also a famous writer, as demonstrated below (Figure 5, 6):

![Image of a book cover]

**Figure 5: New Directions (2008)**
In the first image (Figure 5), Jull Costa’s name is clearly listed at the bottom of the cover of *The City of the Mountains*. Jull Costa has so far translated ten books by José Maria de Eça de Queirós, and all of them list the translator’s name on the book covers. Conversely, none of her translations of works by José Saramago list her name on the cover. This phenomenon suggests that the familiarity of her name is used to attract potential readers for the former, while her name is omitted from the covers of the latter author, who is a Nobel Prize winner. Thus, in this case, the author’s name is assumed to be familiar to readers. On the other hand, the case of Auster (Figure 6), whose name is printed at the bottom in a similar font size to that of Mallarmé, informs readers that the translator is given the same prominence as the author. This contrasts with the case of Jull Costa, whose name is printed in visibly smaller font than that of Saramago. Alternatively, academic publishers such as Oxford University Press sometimes list the translators’ names on the covers of newly commissioned translations. The first image
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below (Figure 7) is the latest edition of Anna Karenina translated by Rosamund Bartlett. Her name is visible, but much smaller than the author:

Figure 7: Anna Karenina (2014, Oxford University Press)

Oxford University Press, however, does not list the translator’s name on their 1980 (Figure 8) and 1995 (Figure 9) editions of the same novel:
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Figure 8: Oxford University Press (1980)

Both books are translated by Louise and Aylmer Maude, acclaimed translators of Russian literature who are hailed as being as important as Garnett for their roles in introducing the works of Tolstoy to English-speaking readers (Ashton, 2016). The reason for the publisher listing Bartlett’s name is likely to be to attract a new readership for this world classic by emphasising that the translation is different from the existing editions, as is evident in critical reviews: “[It is] much the best English translation which has ever appeared [...]” (Wilson, n.d.); “In this crisp new translation, Bartlett brings a refreshing tone to some of the novel’s traditional, didactic black spots [...]” (Rappaport, n.d.).

5 These quotes from book reviews are cited from Amazon: https://www.amazon.co.uk/Anna-Karenina-Oxford-Worlds-Classics/dp/0198748841
The following examples compare publishers’ approaches in Japan, UK and USA to listing translators’ names on the jacket or book cover of translations of the same source text. Below are the front covers of translations of Cien años de soledad [One Hundred Years of Solitude] (G. García Márquez, 1967):
On the jacket above (Figure 10), the name of the translator Tsuzumi Tadashi (鼓直) is listed under the author’s name in a visibly smaller font size. Tsuzumi, an acclaimed translator of Latin American literature, has so far been the only translator of the novel into Japanese. The translator’s name as well as the author’s name in Japanese immediately inform readers of the book’s status as a translation. Moreover, the original title and the author’s name in Spanish, which occupy the centre of the jacket, further highlight the foreign nature of the book, although such features are not expected to be comprehensible to all the Japanese readers.
The book covers of the UK (Figure 11) and USA editions (Figure 12) do not list the name of the translator Gregory Rabassa, despite his high profile as a translator. Rabassa was best known for his translation of this novel (Piepenbring, 2016), and won three translation awards, including the Gregory Kolovakos Award (2001) for his role in the expansion of Hispanic literature into English-speaking contexts. Furthermore, he has been praised as “the best Latin American writer in the English language” by American writer and editor Paul Elie (cited in ibid.).
The examples above suggest that while the Japanese publishers’ regular practice of listing translators’ names may guarantee the translators minimal recognition, it does not necessarily promote the translator to any significant degree. By contrast, the UK and the USA publishers’ approaches to listing translators’ names seem to differ depending on the company’s policy and the level of the translator’s prominence compared with that of the source author in the target culture. A striking contrast between the three examples above is that the covers of the UK and USA editions give no indication of the book’s being a translation, while the Japanese jacket explicitly informs the reader of this status. Although a further study is required, this phenomenon suggests that Japanese readers are more receptive toward translations compared to their anglophone counterparts.
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4.3. Paratext analysis

The following analysis will examine afterwords written by Murakami for the books he has translated. It will then move onto studying the jacket designs, specifically in relation to how Murakami’s name is listed. The analysis will explore the ways in which his paratexts relate to his celebrity status in comparison with that of his contemporaries. Both stages will attempt to identify features that might bolster his celebrity status. Of the more than sixty translations Murakami has so far published I have selected twenty-eight to which I had access at the time of my analysis (Figure 13). The study will also investigate whether the shift in his status from emerging writer to a celebrity corresponds to the degree of his visibility in paratexts.

Figure 13: Books used in this analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese title (language)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Original title/author/year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>マイ・ロスト・シティー (Mai rosuto shitī)</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>My Lost City, F. S. Fitzgerald, 1920-1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>僕が電話をかけている場所 (Boku ga denwa o kaketeiru basho)</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Where I’m Calling From, R. Carver, 1988^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>夜になると鮭は・・・ (Yoru ni naru to sake wa)</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>At Night the Salmon Move, R. Carver, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>熊を放つ (Kuma o hanatsu)</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Setting Free the Bears, J. Irving, 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ワールズ・エンド (世界の果て) (Wāruzu endo: sekai no hate)</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>World’s End and Other Stories, P. Theroux, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>偉大なるデスリフ (Idainaru desurifu)</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>The Great Dethriffe, C. D. B. Bryan, 1970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ Selections from the stories by Carver that originally appeared in What We Talk About When We Talk About Love, Will You Please Be Quiet, Please? and Furious Seasons (1982).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title (in English)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author (in English)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Things They Carried</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>T. O’Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot in the Heart</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>M. Gilmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Baby and Other Stories</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>M. Strand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enormous Changes at the Last Minute</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>G. Paley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Catcher in the Rye</td>
<td>2003b</td>
<td>J. D. Salinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July, July</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>T. O’Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Little Disturbances of Man</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>G. Paley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Great Gatsby</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F. Scott Fitzgerald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Long Goodbye</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>R. Chandler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fires</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>R. Carver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast at Tiffany’s</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>T. Capote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farewell, My Lovely</td>
<td>2009a</td>
<td>R. Chandler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Little Sister</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>R. Chandler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>極北 (Gokuhoku)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Far North, M. Theroux, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>大いなる眠り (Ōinaru nemurī)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>The Big Sleep, R. Chandler, 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>恋しくて (Koishikute): Ten Selected Love Stories</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>*Anthology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>フラニーとズーイ (Furanī to zūi)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Franny and Zooey, J. D. Salinger, 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>結婚式のメンバー (Kekkonshiki no menbā)</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>The Member of the Wedding, C. McCullers, 1946</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1. Murakami's afterwords

According to Murakami (personal communication, 2017) his Japanese publishers do not impose restrictions on the volume and contents of afterwords, which contrasts with the cases of his contemporaries, whose publishers are likely to impose page limits, as described earlier, although they seem to allow the translator relative freedom in relation to content. All the books listed above include afterwords, written by Murakami, except the translation of *The Catcher in the Rye*, since Salinger’s agent, Harold Ober Associates, forbids the inclusion of introductions and afterwords for this particular novel (Murakami & Shibata, 2003: 5). Although Murakami initially included his afterword in the book without being aware of the contractual agreement with the agent (ibid.), he had no choice but to remove the afterword at the last minute before publication. The afterword was later featured in 「サリンジャー再び」 [Salinger, Revisited], a special issue of the literary magazine *Bungakukai* (2003c), and was then co-edited with Shibata Motoyuki to be published in book form based on Murakami’s belief that readers need explanations when reading a translated work written in a cultural context which is foreign to them (ibid.: 5-6). Similarly, his translation of Salinger’s other work *Franny and Zooey* includes the introductory essay as a free supplement inserted into the book. The above cases suggest that Murakami’s celebrity status allows him the freedom to publish the translator’s afterwords separately,
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assuming that they would attract readers. This is an unusual practice since publishers tend to use the left-over pages of the book for afterwords (Anonymous, personal communication, 2017).

The main focus of the analysis here, however, is his afterword to The Great Gatsby, in which he is significantly visible. This high degree of Murakami’s authorial presence is perhaps the reason why it has been translated into English by Ted Goossen (2013), who is one of Murakami’s English translators. To Murakami, translating this particular novel had been a mission for nearly thirty years (Murakami, 2006: 327) and he includes a lengthy essay on his personal attachment to the novel in the afterword. I will now examine the presence of Murakami’s voice as a writer in his afterword to The Great Gatsby in comparison with the cases of his other translations in the above list. In addition, I will also compare this example with the cases of Ogawa Takayoshi and Nozaki Takashi, who translated the same source text, as was examined in Chapter Three.

Let us begin with the title, the function of which is to identify the work, designate its subject matter, and tempt potential readers (Grivel, 1973: 17). The title 翻訳者として、小説家として ー 訳者あとがき [As Translator, as Novelist: The Translator’s Afterword] explicitly reveals Murakami’s personal attachment to the novel as a writer, which contrasts with his counterparts whose titles are more conventional; Nozaki employs the term Kaisetsu [explanation], while Ogawa uses two separate entries, Kaisetsu, and Yakusha atogaki [Translator’s Afterword], which is followed by the subtitle 誰がカケスを殺したか、わたし、とは誰も言わないが [who killed the jay, nobody says ‘I did’]. Murakami also employs the same conventional titles for all the other books in the above list, with the exception of The Great Dethriffe, which is entitled 大丈夫、ミスタ・ブライアン、僕もこの本が好きです（訳者・あとがき） [No Worries, Mr Bryan, I Like This Book Too (translator’s afterword)], highlighting his personal feeling towards the book. The title perhaps reflects Murakami’s attempt to defend the literary value of the novel, which did not attract significant attention from readers or critics in the source culture (Murakami, 1987: 345-346). The rest of the books
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listed above have conventional titles such as *atogaki* [afterword] or in the case of *The Long Good Bye,* 訳者あとがき: 準古典小説としての『ロング・グッドバイ』[Translator’s Afterword: The Long Goodbye as a Semi-Classic Novel]. The latter, however, is no ordinary afterword despite its bland title. It is unusually big for an afterword, consisting of fifty pages, equivalent to 34,000 English words.\(^7\) This far exceeds the publisher’s maximum limit, which is usually fourteen pages, as shown earlier. Hence, the titles of Murakami’s afterwords do not consistently reflect his personal attachment to the source text.

The way in which Murakami’s authorial voice manifests itself more clearly is with reference to the relationship between his translation and writing practices, highlighting his special attachment to the novel as a writer. This phenomenon is found more frequently than the others on the list (Figure 13) in *Mr. and Mrs. Baby and Other Stories* (pp. 237-238, p. 240), *Shot in the Heart* (pp. 598-599, p. 599, p. 600) and *July, July* (p. 467, p. 468, p. 469), which were published in or after 1987. However, the afterword in which Murakami’s authorial voice appears most prominently is that of *The Great Gatsby.* His afterword to the novel incorporates: 1. an essay, including the significance of the source text for him as a novelist and anecdotes about the translation process; 2. a commentary on the source text; 3. the author’s biography. By contrast, Nozaki includes a commentary and a brief explanation of the reason for revising the contents of his commentary from the previous edition, while Ogawa includes background information, a commentary and a chronological record of the author’s career. The following focuses on Murakami’s voice as a writer in his afterword. The first passage explicitly illustrates the impact of the novel on Murakami as a writer. His arguments not only promote the book, but also potentially draw the attention of the readers of Murakami’s novels. Thus, in this case, his presence as a writer becomes particularly prominent:

---

\(^7\) The format of the book is 40 × 19 characters per page, which is equivalent to 380 English words. The equivalence of the number of Japanese characters to English words is extracted by dividing the former by two.
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[...] もし『グレート・ギャッツピー』という作品に巡り会わなかったら、僕はたぶん今とは違う小説を書いていたのではあるまいかという気がするほどである。（あるいは何も書いていなかったかもしれない。[...]） (Murakami, pp.333-334) 

Had it not been for Fitzgerald’s novel, I would not be writing the kind of literature I am today (indeed, it is possible that I would not be writing at all, although that is neither here nor there.) (Goossen, p.172)

The next passage below further emphasises the significance of the novel for Murakami’s writing practices:

このどちらかというとこじんまりした長篇小説は、小説家としての僕にとってひとつの目標となり、定点となり、小説世界におけるひとつの軸となった。（Murakami, p.334) [Though slender in size for a full-length work, it served as a standard and a fixed point, an axis around which I was able to organise the many coordinates that make up the world of the novel.] (Goossen, p.172)

The inclusion of explicit statements of a particular source text’s significance for Murakami’s writing career such as the above seems to be limited to Fitzgerald’s works, including My Lost City (p. 13), in which a similar statement can be found. On the other hand, references to what he learnt from translating particular source-authors’ works appear to be more frequent and can be found in five books on the list (9).

8 Setting Free the Bears (p. 338), Sudden Fiction (p. 568), July, July (p. 468), The Big Sleep (p. 312), and The Long Goodbye (p. 545).
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What clearly differentiates Murakami’s afterword to *The Great Gatsby* from those of the other novels, however, is that references to his writing practice are not limited to the influence of the source authors and the source texts on his own writing, but also the influence of being a writer on the translation process. In the passage below, Murakami’s voice becomes highly authorial:

[...] 僕はこれまで翻訳するにあたって、自分が小説家であるということは極力意識しないように心がけてきた。[...] この『グレート・ギャツビー』に限って言えば、僕は小説家であることのメリットを可能な限り活用してみようと、最初から心に決めていた。[...] (Murakami, pp.336-337) Until *Gatsby*, I had always tried to keep the fact that I was a writer far from my mind when translating [...]. *Gatsby*, however, was a different story. From the outset, I set my sights on putting my novel-writing experience to as good a use as possible. [...] Rather, it meant that, at strategic moments, I brought my imaginative power as a novelist into play (Goossen, p. 173).

The above findings demonstrate that Murakami’s voice as a writer is present to various degrees in several of his afterwords, reflecting how his writing and translating
practices are intertwined, which was demonstrated in Chapter Three. The degree of his prominence in an afterword seems to be proportional to the degree of the source text’s significance for him as a writer, as seen in the case of *The Great Gatsby*: the stronger Murakami’s attachment to the source text, the more visible he makes himself in his afterword.

Furthermore, the paratexts not only let Murakami share with readers the background information about the source texts, his admiration towards the source authors, or translating experiences, but also provide access to Murakami’s writing practice. Thus, the paratexts allow the readers to speculate on how his two practices might be interrelated, which could be one of the entertaining elements of the book for Murakami’s readers. Murakami suggests that he intentionally allows readers to make a link between his two writing practices as he believes that it is his duty as a writer to respond to those who may be wondering about the relationship between his status as a writer and the choices he makes in the source text (Murakami, personal communication, 2017). Finally, the separate publications of Murakami’s afterwords indicate that his afterwords must be appealing to the readers, many of whom are likely to be also readers of his novels. Thus, Murakami’s afterwords have more chance of being read than those of translators who are less prominent. Hence, Murakami’s celebrity status not only allows him freedom in the choice of the source texts, but also allows him to utilise paratextual space to promote his translation and himself. Moreover, he seems to have had more freedom in the production of paratexts after he established himself as a writer, which is manifested in the volume of his afterwords (e.g. *The Long Goodbye*), and his afterwords to Salinger’s works, which have been published separately from the books. Furthermore, Murakami’s freedom allows him to retain control over the extent to which he wants his novelist persona to be manifested in his afterwords. Thus, Murakami’s own approach to paratexts is partly responsible for creating his visibility. The next stage focuses on the elements that are in the hands of publishers.
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4.3.2. The jackets for Murakami's original books

The analysis here compares the jackets of Murakami’s translations listed in Figure 13. Japanese jackets in general do not always come with obi [mini jacket], although they are often included, wrapped around the first editions of hardcovers, and paperbacks. Furthermore, the designs of jackets and their obi for the same book often differ between the hardcovers and paperbacks, as in the UK and USA, where the cover design varies, depending on the target readers and where the book is sold. For example, the covers of paperbacks sold at large bookstore chains or supermarkets tend to have designs which are simpler and have broader appeal than aesthetically focused cover designs for hardbacks that are targeted at more specifically literary-minded readers (Kean, 2017).

I will first examine the features of the jackets on Murakami’s novels in order to demonstrate publishers’ approaches to promoting his original works in comparison with his translations. The images below are the jackets of Noruwei no mori [Norwegian Wood], one with obi (Figure 14) and one without (Figure 15):
The above (Figure 14) hardcover edition comes with an *obi*, which is located at the bottom of the jacket and covers one third of its area. The title ① and the author’s name ② are the most prominent features in this simple but striking coloured jacket. In the *obi* there are promotional scripts that read: ③ “[The long awaited newly written novel, long novel 900 pages]” and ④ “[Eternal loss and rebirth. Currently the most intense 100% love story!!]”. The image below is the same jacket without an *obi* which simply lists the title and the author’s name:
The promotional features of the *obi*, however, changed when the film version of the novel was announced in 2010. The scripts in the *obi* below (Figure 16) read: “[To be made into a film!!]” in bold white letters:
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Figure 16: Hardcover with obi (the announcement of the film version)

The *obi* on the paperback version below (Figure 17) repeats part of the same text as on the hardcover (the first example), apart from ⒌ “[The eternal masterpiece in long awaited paperback!]” : 
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The samples above have illustrated that the jackets mainly feature two elements: the title and the name of the author. *Obi*, on the other hand, tend to feature messages that promote the book with an emphasis on its content rather than the author.

As in the case of *Noruwei no mori* above, the UK cover design of the international bestseller *The Da Vinci Code* (Dan Brown) in both hardback (Figure 18) and paperback (Figure 19) focuses on two elements: the title and the author, a strategy also employed in the cases of translated fiction. The promotional scripts, however, simply centre on the novel’s bestseller status, while the hardcover also promotes it as a special edition:
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Figure 18: Hardback (Transworld, 2004)
4.3.3. The jackets for translated books

The main analysis which follows examines the jackets of Murakami’s translations. Here, I have selected samples that include obi, the majority of which are the hardcover editions. Most of their complete images, especially those of the older books, are sourced through the Internet as books in libraries rarely include obi. The back of the jackets and the obi may also bear promotional features. However, they are excluded in this analysis as their images are less frequently available than the front. The study focuses on whether Murakami’s name is presented differently from those of his contemporaries, and how this might promote the translator and his translations. It will also examine whether there is a shift in the way these features are presented before and after
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Murakami attained celebrity status with the publication of *Norwegian Wood*, as described in the Introduction (p. 16). When ten Japanese publishers were interviewed for the analysis in Chapter Five, eight of them indicated that they would highlight the translator for promotional reasons if he or she were famous. This analysis aims to establish whether the features on jackets correspond to the degree of the translators’ fame, as Genette (1997: 39) suggests is the case for authors.

The shared features that are found on all the jackets presented here are: the Japanese titles, which are usually the most visible feature, as in the other Japanese examples presented earlier; the names of the authors; and the name of the translator. Some of these jackets also include the source title, and in a number of cases, the authors’ names in the source language. Promotional features, on the other hand, are found on the *obi*, as illustrated in Murakami’s novels above. The *obi* can be the most prominent features of the book in the eyes of readers, depending on the design.

### 4.3.3.1. The translator’s name on the jackets

All the jackets bear Murakami’s name either under or to the right of the author’s name.\(^9\) His name appears to be in a similar font size to those of the authors, with the exception of the five books that were published before 1987. The most striking is the case of *My Lost City* below (Figure 20), in which Murakami’s name is printed in more than double the font size of the author’s (Akashi, 2018: 4): Fitzgerald’s name is hardly visible between the title and the translator’s name:

---

\(^9\) The name of the author, the translator and the Japanese title on all the jackets presented as graphic images for the analysis are indicated as ‘A’, ‘T’, and ‘JT’, respectively.
A similar case is also found in *Where I'm Calling From* (Figure 21) and *At Night the Salmon Move* below (Figure 22):

---

10 The years mentioned for the jackets indicate when the translations were published.
In the case of *At Night the Salmon Move* (Figure 22) below, the phenomenon is due to Carver’s low levels of recognition in Japanese literary circles at that time, as described in Chapter One. Murakami (1989: 28) explains that prior to agreeing to take on the project, the publishers made the condition that his name be listed in a larger font than the author’s:

> おもに中央公論で出したときに、レイモンド・カーヴァーよりも村上春樹の字の方が大きくて、それでいろいろ言われたんですが、それではしょうがないんです。そうしなければ出してもらうのはむずかしかったから。

When [the book] was published by Chuokoron, [I] was being criticised because ‘Murakami Haruki’ appears in larger font than ‘Raymond
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Carver’, but I had no choice. Otherwise, it would have been difficult to have [the book] published.

Figure 22: At Night the Salmon Move (1985)

Murakami’s comment clearly indicates that he did not have the final say in terms of jacket design. The same could be said of the jackets of Fitzgerald’s works that were not considered mainstream by Japanese literary circles at that time (Akashi, 2018: 3), and many had previously been out of print in Japan (Murakami, 2017: 89). The examples above illustrate that, unlike anglophone contexts, Japanese publishers do not consistently prioritise the author’s name when promoting the book if the translator is highly famous. For the remaining jackets, the font size of the translator’s name appears to be similar to that of the authors, if not slightly larger, as shown in the majority of the other images reproduced below.
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Overall, the prominence of Murakami’s name is striking when compared with his UK and Japanese contemporaries, whose names are given but are usually in a smaller font size than those of the authors, except for Paul Auster, whose case is comparable to that of Murakami. The way Murakami’s name is presented on the jackets indicates that it is an attraction for readers.

The analysis of jacket designs has so far discussed the font sizes of the translator’s name. The following section examines how the translator’s name is promoted in *obi* and how Murakami’s compared with those of his counterparts.

4.3.3.2. The translator’s name on the *obi*

The *obi* samples used in the analysis contain such promotional materials as quotes from the books, taglines and the translator’s name. The size of the *obi* varies, ranging from one fifth to nearly half the book size. Murakami’s name is listed on the *obi* of twenty-one books out of a sample of twenty-eight. The first three translations he published, which were presented above, have visibly smaller *obi* compared to the majority of the samples below. Furthermore, Murakami’s name does not seem to be a regular feature on the *obi* until 1988, the year after *Norwegian Wood* was published; the only exceptions are *At Night the Salmon Move* (Figure 22) and *Setting Free the Bears* (Figure 22). The former lists ⑥ “村上春樹によるインタビュー・作家論を付す” [Interview, and literary criticism by Murakami Haruki are included] at the bottom of the *obi* in the smallest font within the jacket, while the latter (below) promotes his name more prominently at the right top of the *obi* as ⑦ “村上春樹 初の長篇翻訳” [Murakami Haruki’s first translation of a full-length novel] in a significantly larger font than on the jacket:
Other features on the pre-1987 obi are centred on promotional material and the source authors whose names and works had not yet gained recognition in Japan. By contrast, the size of the obi tends to be larger, and Murakami’s name prominent after 1988, except for three which do not include his name, and four which give his name but in small font. I have selected the jackets with obi which feature the translator’s name more prominently. The first example is *I Remember Grandpa* below (Figure 24):
The script in the *obi* above reads ⑧“村上春樹がおくるカポーティの最もピュアな物語” [the most innocent story of Capote, which Murakami Haruki offers]. Murakami’s name, which is far larger than on the jacket, is printed in white against a burgundy background, which stands out to the readers’ eyes. This feature contrasts with the name of the artist Yamamoto Yoko whose etchings accompany the book. Her name ⑨ is given underneath Murakami’s in a dark font which appears less visible compared to his.

Similarly, in Figure 25 below, Murakami’s name is listed in a large red font against a white background. Unlike all the examples above, this book is 新訳 (shin’yaku) [new interpretation], which is the standard way of referring to the ‘retranslation’ of modern classics in Japanese. The *obi* in Murakami’s retranslations typically emphasise the novelty of his reinterpretation, as is the case below (Figure 25), where it overtly highlights the newly added value to the novel which has been familiar to Japanese readers for decades:
Murakami’s name is the most prominent feature of the obi above ⑨, which reads “村上春樹の新訳で甦る” [Revived by Murakami Haruki’s new interpretation], followed by “新時代の『さらば愛しき女よ』” [The Saraba itoshiki onna yo of the new generation] in smaller font. In addition, the script mentions the title (in italics) of the earlier translation of the novel by Shimizu Shunji (清水俊二, 1956/1974), which has acquired a canonical status (Murakami, 2010: 630). Thus, mention of the earlier title not only distinguishes Murakami’s version from that of Shimizu, but it further highlights the novelty of Murakami’s interpretation. In Franny and Zooey (Figure 26) below, again a retranslation, the obi becomes larger, covering more than half the space of the jacket:
There is a striking contrast in the image of the jacket with an obi and the one without (Figure 27), presented below. Murakami’s presence is specifically highlighted on the obi, not only because his name is in a larger font size but also because he is mentioned again in white at the bottom in a text ⑩ which reads “投げ込み特別エッセイ付、村上春樹『こんなに面白い話だったんだ！』” [Including Murakami Haruki’s special ‘thrown-in’ essay What an Interesting Story!], emphasising the additional text offered as a free download.
The above examples have demonstrated how Murakami’s name is typically given on the jackets and *obi*. His name on the *obi* is often in a larger font than on the jackets. Furthermore, Murakami’s name is usually mentioned in the texts that emphasise the following features: the novelty of his translation; the fact that Murakami is the translator; or the inclusion of his afterwords. Another noticeable feature is that, as in the case of *One Hundred Years of Solitude* in Japanese, Murakami’s jackets, especially those for retranslations, tend to list prominently the original title and the author’s name in the source language. This is perhaps, due to the authors and their works have already been familiar to Japanese readers. The same tendency is found in the following section.

**4.3.3.3. Comparisons with other translators’ jackets**

The analysis here will study how Murakami’s name is promoted on jackets, including
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obi, in comparison with those of his contemporaries. The first three books below are published under the same imprint, Murakami Shibata Honyakudō [Murakami and Shibata Translation House]. This imprint consists of translated works by contemporary American authors that had been out of print. The works were selected by Murakami and Shibata themselves, whose aim is to bring their old favourites back into print (Murakami, 2017: 138). The imprint has, so far, published ten books, with the two translators retranslating two books each. The rest are reprints of previously existing translations by translators other than these two. All the jackets are designed using the same format, consisting of the Japanese title at the top, the name of the author at the middle, and translator at the bottom. However, the promotional features of the obi seem to differentiate between the books. The image of three jacket designs below are of Murakami’s retranslation of (Figure 28) *The Member of the Wedding*, (Figure 29) Shibata’s *My Name is Aram* (William Saroyan, 1940) and (Figure 30) the translation of *China Men* (Maxine. H. Kingston, 1980) by Fujimoto Kazuko (藤本和子):

![Jacket Designs](image)

*Figure 28: The Member of the Wedding (Murakami, 2016)*
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A striking difference between the three examples is the emphasis on Murakami’s name. The tagline ⑩, which simply reads “村上春樹が新訳！” [Murakami Haruki’s reinterpretation!], occupies the majority of the space on the obi. His case contrasts with Shibata’s below (Figure 29) in which, although translator-status is noted, the emphasis is on both the author and the translator. Thus, the sentence becomes longer than that of Murakami, making the font size smaller: ⑪ “サラーヤンの名作を柴田元幸が新訳!” [Saroyan’s masterpiece is reinterpreted by Shibata Motoyuki!]. Furthermore, it includes a feature which mentions in small font ⑫ “村上春樹と柴田元幸がセレクト‘もう一度読みたい’小説” [selected by Murakami Haruki and Shibata Motoyuki, the novel which ‘[they] want to read again’]. This script is not included in Murakami’s jacket above, which suggests that mention of Murakami’s name adds further value to Shibata’s book:

Figure 29: My Name Is Aram (Shibata, 2016)
By contrast, in China Men (Figure 30), the name of Fujimoto, whose translations inspired many established writers, including Murakami (Murakami & Shibata, 2000: 220), is absent from the obi. In addition, as in Shibata’s case, the publisher includes Murakami and Shibata’s names as promotional features: “村上春樹×柴田元幸 特別解説付き！” [Including special commentary by Murakami and Shibata]. Thus, mentioning the names of the celebrity translators is seen to add value to the book. Hence, the degree of translator visibility manifests itself in how their names are used for the promotion of the book. In this case, of the three translators, Murakami’s name functions as the most powerful promotional tool for the publisher.

Another example in which the degree of Murakami’s prominence manifests

---

11 Originally published as アメリカの中国人 (America no chūgokujin) [Chinamen in America] in 1983 (Shobunsha).
Chapter Four

itself is the case of The Catcher in the Rye. The novel was first translated by Hashimoto Fukuo (橋本福夫) in 1952. Subsequently, it was retranslated in 1964 by Nozaki Takashi, whose translation strategy was examined in Chapter Three. His translation, which has attained canonical status (Sato, 2009: 12-13), had sold two and a half million copies by 2004 (Fujimoto, 2006: 312). The analysis below compares the features of each translator’s obi.

Figure 31: The Catcher in the Rye (Murakami, 2003b)

As in the previous examples, a clear difference between the two translators’ obi is the emphasis on Murakami’s name, which is repeated in a larger font than the one on the

---

12 In Amazon Japan’s bestselling ranking, Nozaki’s version lies in 2,332nd place, while Murakami’s is placed 5,851 at the time of writing.
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jacket. The main feature of Murakami’s *obi* in green reads “村上春樹訳 新時代の『ライ麦畑でつかまえて』” [Translated by Murakami Haruki. The *Raimugibatake de tsukamaete* of the new generation]. The publisher’s approach resembles the case of *Farewell, My Lovely* (Figure 25) above, overtly distinguishing Murakami’s new interpretation from Nozaki’s by using the existing Japanese title (in italics). By contrast, the *obi* of Nozaki’s first edition below (Figure 32), which is also a retranslation, focuses on the title and the story. The Japanese title, which is repeated on the *obi*, is given in the largest font size, followed by a summary of the story on a cream background. Nozaki’s name is in a visibly smaller font size than the author’s:

![Figure 32: The Catcher in the Rye (Nozaki, 1969)](image)

Similarly, on the jacket of the second edition below (Figure 33) Nozaki’s name is in the smallest font size, printed in black, which is hardly visible against blue background. Furthermore, the *obi* does not include his name at all, but promotes the canonical status
Chapter Four

of the source text and the translation, as “発表から半世紀、いまなお世界中の若者たちの心をとらえつつける名作の名訳” [half a century since the [first] release, master translation of the masterpiece which still continues to capture the hearts of young people around the world]. Thus, for Nozaki’s version, the canonical status of his translation seems to be the major selling point, whereas for Murakami, his name appears to play an important part in promoting the books.

Figure 33: The Catcher in the Rye (Nozaki, 1984)

The most striking difference between the two translators’ jackets is, however, the English title and the author’s name, which occupy over one third of the space on Murakami’s jacket. This tendency, which is also found in Farewell, My Lovely and Franny and Zooey as seen earlier, seems to be found more frequently in the case of retranslation. One of the reasons for this could be that these titles are already familiar
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to Japanese readers, as in the case of *The Catcher in the Rye* which I have mentioned in Chapter Three (p. 129). However, the case of *One Hundred Years of Solitude* contradicts the perception above, as the Spanish title is unlikely to be comprehensible to the great majority of the readers. This phenomenon suggests that Japanese readers have a tendency to embrace foreign culture and language even if they don’t understand the meaning (Yanabu, 1976: 24-25),\(^\text{13}\) which contrasts with anglophone contexts, where listing of the original title on the book covers is extremely rare.

The final part of this analysis will compare the jacket designs of *The Great Gatsby*, translated by Ogawa, Nozaki and Murakami. These editions were sold during the period when the film version was released in Japan in 2013. Each *obi* bears a reference to the film, including the same eye-catching image as its promotional poster.

---

\(^{13}\) See Yanabu’s (1976) “Casette effect”.
Murakami’s jacket (Figure 34) above gives his name in two places, as many of his other jackets do: one on the upper right of the jacket; and one on the *obi*. The latter is the most prominent feature of Murakami’s *obi* as it mentions him as ①“翻訳家村上春樹の輝かしい到達点” [The translator Murakami Haruki’s glorious goal] in a bold black font. By contrast, below, the main focus of Nozaki’s *obi*, which is in striking red against the black jacket, lies in the release of the film, plus the accumulated sales figure of the novel, which is over 1.1 million copies. Moreover, the illustration on his jacket is a representation of the film’s poster, which contrasts with Murakami’s case, where the poster occupies only one third of the *obi*. Although Nozaki was the first Japanese translator of *Gatsby* in 1957, his identity seems less important in promoting the book, as his name is only given on the far left of the jacket in the smallest font, below the author’s name:
Figure 35: Nozaki (1989)
Similarly, the film poster occupies the major part of Ogawa’s obi (Figure 36) above. However, unlike Nozaki, Ogawa’s name appears visibly in the same font size as the source author on the right in white font; on the jacket it is, however, obscured by the obi.

The comparisons above have illustrated the difference in each publisher’s evaluation of the translators’ names. Nozaki’s is least visible on the jacket, while Ogawa’s publisher seems to view the translator’s name as part of the promotional features to some extent. This phenomenon is perhaps related to Ogawa’s reputation for producing fluent translations, which was discussed in Chapter One. Thus, mention of Ogawa’s name guarantees the book’s readability, which is the main focus of the publisher’s policy, as explained in Chapter Three (p. 119). By contrast, of the three, Murakami’s name is the most visible on the jacket. The feature in the obi clearly indicates that Murakami’s personal association with the novel is the main focus of the
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publisher’s marketing strategy. Thus, his name plays the major role in promoting the book.

The findings above demonstrate that the font size of the translators’ names on the jacket reflects their degree of prominence, as in the case of Murakami, whose name is regularly given in a similar font size to that of the source author. Furthermore, the way his name appears in parallel with that of the source authors gives the translator the same authorial presence as the author, which adds to his prominence. This phenomenon contrasts with some of his contemporaries, whose names are far smaller than the source authors’ (e.g. Tsuzumi in One Hundred Years of Solitude, and Nozaki in The Great Gatsby). It could be argued that Japanese publishers value Murakami’s name no less than the author’s, if not even more highly.

However, what differentiates Japanese publishing practice and those of the UK and USA is the former’s use of obi, which allows extra space for advertising. In the case of the translator having a high profile, as is the case of Murakami and Shibata, their names are emphasised by repetition on the obi, while their contemporaries’ names are usually given on the jacket but not the obi, unless the obi eclipses the translator’s name. Thus, when translators are highly prominent their names have more coverage on the jackets than their less well-known counterparts, just as happens with authors (Genette, 1997: 39). This phenomenon is also reflected in the different ways Murakami is promoted on the obi before and after attaining his current celebrity status. Another point is this: the publishers’ promotion of the originality of Murakami’s translation suggests that when a translator is also a famous writer, their translations tend to be perceived as something other than translations, especially in the case of retranslations. Thus, the more a translator incorporates his or her writer’s creativity into translation, the more appealing it becomes to the publisher and readers, as illustrated in Chapter Three.
4.4. Conclusion

The studies of paratext in this chapter have demonstrated that paratextual space allows translators direct opportunities to create visibility. The Japanese publishing practice of regularly giving translators’ names, including an obi and a translator’s afterword in translations, creates an environment in which translators are more likely to become visible than in UK and American contexts, where such practices are not standard. However, while the Japanese practice of giving translators’ names on the jackets guarantees minimum recognition to all translators, it does not necessarily lead them to greater visibility unless the translator is already famous. Furthermore, the opportunity to have their name promoted on the obi also seems to be limited to cases where the translator is a celebrity. Thus, while the font size of a translator’s name on the jacket indicates the degree of his or her prominence, that prominence is also reflected in whether or not the name is mentioned on the obi. These tendencies are clearly demonstrated in the case of Murakami, whose name is given more frequently, and in larger font than those of most of his counterparts in this chapter.

There is a noticeable difference in the degree of freedom Murakami is allowed in the production of translator afterwords and the publishers’ approaches to promoting his translations before and after he established himself as a writer. His afterwords tend to be lengthier, and he writes more expansively since he attained his celebrity status. Publishers also dedicate more space to advertising the translator. Hence, the process of creating translator visibility can be described as a kind of virtuous circle — the more famous the translator, the greater space they are allowed in the paratextual space, which means the translator has a chance to increase his or her visibility further. Put another way, translators are given control to create greater visibility for themselves, only after having achieved a certain threshold level of visibility and recognition.

The case study in this chapter study has shown that the relationship between publishers and translators in the production of paratextual material is an important
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factor in creating translator visibility. The translator’s own agency is also influential in gaining recognition. However, translator celebrity cannot be generated without a readership that reads and talks about the translator’s works. The final chapter will further explore Japanese publishing practice, translators’ approaches to their own visibility, and readers’ reception of translators and their works.
CHAPTER FIVE

The Relationship between Publishers, Translators and Readers: How Does It Affect Translator Celebrity?

5.1. Introduction

This final chapter focuses on three key agents in translator celebrity: publishers, translators and readers, asking how the relationship between the three affects translator celebrity.

The previous chapter has demonstrated that Japanese publishing practice creates an opportunity for translators to draw readers’ attention to their identity and input through paratextual space. Furthermore, the degree of a translator’s prominence has significant influence on how that translator is promoted. The Japanese examples conflict with Venuti’s paradigm, which links foreignising strategies with translator’s visibility. As demonstrated in Chapter Three, translation strategies alone do not determine translator visibility. The final chapter argues that the Japanese case is distinct from other cultural contexts where celebrity translators also exist. It will attempt to establish patterns in the relationship between Japanese publishing practice, translators and readership, exploring how they relate to translator prominence. The aim, however, is not limited to proving the inapplicability of Venuti’s conceptualisation but also to demonstrate how another model can be applied to analyse translator visibility in non-anglophone contexts such as Japan not only in terms of their translation practices, how their works and status are perceived by publishers and readers, but also translators’ attitudes towards their own visibility.

The analysis in this chapter refers to Sela-Sheffy’s studies of translator status in the Hebrew context (2006, 2008, 2010, 2016): her examples of celebrity translators were presented in Chapter One. She demonstrates that the “elite translators” who belong to the top circle of literary translators attain celebrity status through glorifying the aspects of their personae that are strongly associated with the roles that earn them
prestige, such as custodians of language and culture, importers of foreign cultures, and artists (2008: 612-615; 2010: 135). These translators actively promote themselves by highlighting their cultural or artistic expertise through the media, and so heighten their fame. Thus, translators’ own actions are largely responsible for creating translator celebrity. The Israeli example contrasts with that of Japan, where translators do not appear to have a tendency to strive for prominence. On the contrary, they prefer to avert readers’ attention away from themselves. Indeed, in Japan, translators in general are frequently regarded as kuroko [black-robed] (Tanabe & Mitsufuji, 2008: 10), which refers to translators who consciously attempt to make themselves invisible in the text. For example, one celebrity translator Shibata Motoyuki (1989) views his role as a translator to be kuroko, demonstrating talent and skill by eliminating his presence and not asserting his persona. He further claims that, for him, the greatest compliment is when the reader mentions that the book does not appear to be a translation (ibid.), although such claims cannot be proven to be true. However, despite the Japanese tradition of translators assuming the role of being kuroko, these translators are very much visible outside the text, as demonstrated in Chapter One. This phenomenon suggests that in Japan, translators’ visibility in translated texts is not directly related to their visibility outside the text.

5.1.1. Methodology

5.1.1.1. Translators

The analysis in this chapter is centred on the results of an original survey. It investigates the relationship between the three key agents. First, I will examine the selected translators using the three categories formulated in the Introduction (p. 20): recognised, media active and celebrity. This section aims to identify how differences in the degree of prominence influence their translation practices, including their agency (Ruokonen, 2013: 329); one such difference is whether they make conscious efforts to produce visibility. The data collection for the analysis here employs a “purposive” sampling method, in which participants are selected based on certain criteria which enable the analysis to answer the research questions (Saldanha & O’Brien, 2014: 34, 180). The selected translators all have gained recognition as translators in Japanese literary circles.
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by either: having translated at least five books; having been awarded translation prizes; or being famous for other professions, including writer and musician. Fifty-five selected translators based on these criteria were contacted through publishers, institutions they work, personal contact, or their blogs and social media.\(^1\) However, forty three agree to participate.

The survey was undertaken either through one-to-one interviews or questionnaires.\(^2\) Pilot questionnaires (Appendix B-1) were distributed first to eleven anonymous translators through a publisher and personal contacts. Subsequently, more detailed questions (Appendix B-2) were created based on the results of the pilot survey. The questions included in the survey relate to the translators’ background information, translation practices, self-evaluation of their status, relationship with publishers and readership. The contents of interviews and written questionnaires were based on the same questions, although the interview procedures varied, depending on how respondents reacted to each question. For example, some translators elaborated on their answers, incorporating elements that were not being asked, or incorporating elements that answered other questions. The answers that are relevant to this study have been extracted in order to observe patterns among the small group of translators. A translator survey was also undertaken in the English-language contexts through an online questionnaire (SurveyMonkey) and interviews. However, due to a lack of relevant participants and inconsistency of the relevant data, the results are not compared with the Japanese ones throughout. Instead, the results of individual interviews with prominent UK translators and primary sources such as published interviews of translators were used to compare the results with those of Japanese translators where relevant.

The results will be compared to the findings in Chapter One, as well as the case of Murakami, who represents the super-celebrity category. The study will yield additional factors that contribute to translator prominence that are not included in Chapter One. The results will be compared with the Israeli context in terms of translators’ attitudes towards their own visibility in order to illustrate how behaviours

\(^1\) Listing contact addresses publicly is not a common practice among literary translators in Japan.
\(^2\) Twenty-six translators, out of forty-three, were interviewed in person in March 2016, while the rest answered the questionnaires via email between April 2016 and July 2017.
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that differ from those of their anglophone counterparts influence the process of creating translator celebrity.

5.1.1.2. Publishers

The second section will investigate Japanese publishing practice, and publishers’ attitudes towards translators. It addresses the ways in which Japanese publishing tradition and perceptions of translators might contribute to the production of translator celebrity. This section covers: the publishers’ approaches to the production of translations, such as how they negotiate with the translators during the process, and their willingness to include the translators in their marketing strategies; and how their attitudes might differ depending on the degree of a translator’s prominence. The data collection here also employs a “purposive” sampling method. The top twenty Japanese publishers whose publications include literary translation were selected, based on the list of top one hundred publishers produced by a major Japanese bookstore chain, Kinokuniya ([Kinokuniya-shoten releases 2016 sales ranking], 2017). The list contains the names of the publishers whose sales figures at the bookstores are recorded in the top one hundred. These publishers were contacted by email, telephone, and in person at book fairs. However, only half of them agreed to participate in the survey. As in the case with the translators, the publisher survey was undertaken either through interviews or questionnaires.3 The questions in the survey included, the publishers’ criteria for selecting translators, source texts and deciding on translators’ fees, the publishers’ approaches to editing and the marketing strategies of translated literature.

Similarly, twenty UK publishers based in England, and publishing translated fiction were selected and contacted by emails. The selection was made based on the list of UK translation publishers, published by Literature Across Frontiers (2014). However, only five publishers, including two small independents and three established names in literary translation, agreed to participate. The collected data from the UK publishers was therefore not sufficient to make fair comparisons with their Japanese counterparts. For this reason, combinations of published data and the results of

---

3 Four publishers, out of ten, were interviewed in person in March 2016, while the rest answered the questionnaires via email between April 2016 and April 2017.
individual interviews have been used where relevant in order to identify general ideas on UK publishers’ perceptions of translators. The data also includes a recorded panel discussion, the Publisher’s Armchair, in which editors from the UK publishing houses MacLehose Press, Scribe UK, and Oneworld discussed their perspectives on publishing translation and explained publication processes during the International Translation Day at the British Library in 2016.

5.1.1.3. Readers

The third section will consider the readers’ perceptions of translators and translated literature, asking how these perceptions relate to the phenomenon of translator celebrity. The data collection here employs a slightly different approach to those of the translators and publishers in order to increase the response rate within a limited time. It relied on the “stratified” method, which aims to collect data that represents the tendencies of “specific groups within the population”, either randomly or systematically (Saldanha & O’Brien, 2014: 34). A poll designed to examine the readers’ perceptions of translated literature and translators was created, and circulated in three parts through Twitter for a period of one week. The poll was addressed to the readers of translated literature and mainly asked their perceptions of translators and translated literature. The numbers of the collected votes were between 700 and 2400. The distribution of the survey relied on third parties, including prominent translators, actively communicating with the readers via Twitter, and reading clubs. This method enabled the poll to reach groups of people who regularly read translations within a limited time period. The analysis will also contrast the results with the UK context, in which the phenomenon is much less in evidence than in Japan.

For the UK readers, the two parts of the questionnaire were combined into one survey to increase the efficiency of the response rate. A link to the survey (SurveyMonkey) was circulated through a book club and a local library, both of whose reading groups were likely to read translations into English; sixty-nine people responded to this link. The results of Japanese and UK polls produced notable discrepancies due to the limitation of networks for the latter. Nevertheless, inconsistent

---

4 Between April and May 2016.
data still allows the analysis to explore “how and why” (Saldanha & O’Brien, 2014: 36) and provide general ideas on UK readers’ perceptions of translators and their works.

The results of the three studies will be compared, in order to isolate cultural and attitudinal trends that make the emergence of celebrity translators more likely in certain contexts than others. The survey data are presented in three different kinds of graphic charts, depending on the nature of the responses.

5.2. An analysis of translators

5.2.1. Translator background

The analysis divides the selected translators into three groups, as mentioned above. The great majority (forty translators) of those surveyed belong to the recognised category, while Konosu Yukiko (鴻巣友季子), who appears to have significantly higher media coverage than her recognised contemporaries, belongs to media active. The celebrity category, on the other hand, consists of Shibata and Kishimoto. The second group has higher recognition than the first, due to their frequent appearance in the media. What separates media active from celebrity, however, is that the former has not achieved a branding strategy, which is the core criterion for qualifying as a celebrity translator, as was demonstrated in Chapter One.

5.2.1.1. Career length

The first graphic data given below shows that the majority of Japanese translators in the survey have a substantial career length (Figure 37). Konosu, Kishimoto and Shibata have all been practising for around thirty years, and in Murakami’s case, thirty-seven. While a long career does not guarantee a translator celebrity status, none of those with shorter careers belong to the celebrity category. This trend indicates that in Japan, the longer a translator’s experience, the more chance they have of gaining recognition. Therefore, I now add ‘career length’ to the factors producing celebrity translators. By contrast, a long career does not seem to be a factor in anglophone contexts. While the
prominent Margaret Jull Costa has been translating approximately thirty years, as has Edith Grossman, there are also famous translators with short careers such as Deborah Smith who has been a translator for less than a decade, although the nature of Smith’s fame is different from that of her established contemporaries above.

5 The prominent translators from the UK and USA mentioned in this chapter are broadly referred to as ‘famous’ or ‘prominent’, as their prominence has not been explored in this research to define their status.

6 Smith earned her initial fame with her first translation entitled The Vegetarian. Her fame grew rapidly after she received heavy criticisms by critics in the source culture for her mistranslations. Thus, the notoriety has contributed much to her prominence, while the fame of Jull Costa and Grossman is based on their accomplishments alone.

5.2.1.2. Source Language

Another factor which is likely to have some influence on the chances of earning prominence is the choice of source language. Tamaki (2009: 124, 128) observes that Japanese publishers prefer publishing books that are translated from English, especially American English. The reasons could be the ease of sourcing translators, and the familiarity of English-speaking cultures to Japanese readers as compared with those of
other languages (ibid.: 128). The majority of the translators in the survey translate from English, including Shibata and Kishimoto, who frequently translate from American English, as does Murakami, while Konosu has translated a number of works by British authors. The remainder are other European languages, except for two, which are Hebrew and Turkish (Figure 38).7 Thus, it could be said that those who translate from English may have a better chance of earning prominence than those who translate from minor languages. By contrast, in the UK, translating from minor languages could also play a part in attaining celebrity status. Smith, for instance, has received significant attention for translating from Korean, which may be due to the novelty of the language and culture. Therefore, I will include ‘choice of source language’ as another factor which earns translator fame. The data presented here, however, does not necessarily represent that of a whole community of Japanese literary translators, as the great majority of the selected translators are experts in European and American literature. Nevertheless, the dominance of English, with French being the second most popular language, reflects the statistic of the top ten source languages translated into Japanese, produced by UNESCO (Statistics on Index Translationum database for “Target Language” = jpn, 2008) (Figure 39). Sela-Sheffy, however, does not discuss the choice of source language in relation to factors that add to translator visibility, although she includes translators’ expertise in foreign languages as one of the factors that earn them prestige (2010: 140).

7 12% of the translators translate from two or more languages.
Figure 38: Source languages of the Japanese translators in this survey

Figure 39: UNESCO data of top ten source languages into Japanese

Data between 1976 and 2008
5.2.1.3. Translators’ other professions

Sela-Sheffy (2010: 135-136) explains that having “additional respectable careers directly related to the literary and intellectual fields” is an important factor in creating translator prominence in the Hebrew context. She further adds that the cultural knowledge of the translators with such careers is valued highly, and translators with such knowledge are more likely to be interviewed or asked their opinions on cultural matters in the media (ibid.). All twenty-three “acclaimed” translators whom she surveyed are also either poets, writers, literary critics, editors or academics (2010: 135). Similarly, the Japanese data shows that 86% of the translators have other professions that relate to literature and translation practices (Figure 40): academics, writers, literary critics and essayists:

![Figure 40: Is translation your sole profession?](image)

5.2.1.4. Translator expertise in literary genres

The next chart (Figure 41) shows that 84%, including those with celebrity status, have expertise in specific literary genres, such as contemporary American literature, mystery fiction, and European classics. As demonstrated in the cases of Kishimoto and Shibata in Chapter One, publishers often utilise a translator’s extensive knowledge in particular
literary genres when promoting the book, which is also the case with Murakami, who is an expert in American literature, as seen in earlier chapters. On the other hand, Konosu, whose translations range from works by Emily Brontë to Margaret Atwood and J. M. Coetzee, does not seem to focus on a specific genre. However, her high reputation as a literary critic qualifies her as having expertise. Similarly, famous UK translators such as Jull Costa, whose expertise includes Portuguese, Spanish and Latin American literature, have frequently been interviewed and spoken about the authors they translate. The same can be said of Smith on Korean literature. Having expertise not only earn these translators prestige but also generate opportunities for increasing their media coverage. Hence, in addition to the translator fame which may be acquired outside translation practice, it can be assumed that translator expertise is another factor that potentially influences translator visibility:

Figure 41: Are you an expert in any particular literary genres?
5.2.2. Translator freedom

5.2.2.1. Choice of source text

One of the advantages celebrity translators enjoy is the freedom they are allowed in translation practices, including the choice of source texts, as is observable in Murakami’s case (Hadley & Akashi, 2014: 195-196; 2015: 3-4, 14; Akashi, 2018: 3). Murakami’s fame allows him to select his own source texts, including works by authors who are not necessarily well known to Japanese readers (Akashi, ibid.). Murakami himself (2017) acknowledges that his fame enables him to translate what he wants. Likewise, his celebrity contemporary Shibata Motoyuki (2016) also suggested during our interview that his prominence allows him to translate the works of minor authors. Murakami and Shibata have an imprint that consists of translations of literature chosen by themselves, including works by lesser-known authors, as described in Chapter Four. The same tendency can be observed in the Hebrew context, where most of the celebrity translators seem to have freedom in the choices of source texts (Sela-Sheffy, 2008: 616). The data below illustrates whether the degree of translators’ prominence influences their choices of source texts. Approximately one third of the Japanese translators regularly choose source texts themselves, while the majority tend to be commissioned for works chosen by their publishers (Figure 42). However, the latter are frequently offered source texts by editors that are related to their areas of expertise or reflect their preferences. The translators, for their part, seem to accept offers that match their tastes:
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Figure 42: Do you usually approach publishers to propose a translation?

![Pie chart showing responses to the question: Do you usually approach publishers to propose a translation?]

My study further examined those who regularly approach publishers with their choices of source texts (Figure 43). The translators who belong to this group include Shibata and Kishimoto as well as those who translate from languages other than English. The data suggests that translators’ celebrity status and/or their expertise in particular literary genres or languages with which editors are unlikely to be familiar can be influential factors that allow translators freedom in what they translate. Furthermore, a celebrity translator’s choice of a particular source text is likely to attract the attention of the readers and critics alike. Moreover, the curiosity of readers and critics will allow the translator to talk about his/her personal attachment to the source text, the author, or both in paratexts, adding to the translator’s prominence, as discussed in Chapter Four. Translators’ career length, on the other hand, does not seem to influence their freedom in selecting source texts, as those who regularly choose their source texts include translators whose careers are under ten years. The Japanese examples contrast with the UK context, where prominent translators choosing their own source texts is perhaps a less frequent occurrence. For example, Jull Costa (2011) indicated in an interview that publishers would normally ask her if she would translate the text they are offering. She would then read the text and accept the offer only if she liked it. On the other hand, as in the Japanese case, UK translators like Smith, who are experts in literature in minor
languages that editors are not familiar with, may select their own texts, while others may pitch their choices to a publisher.

**Figure 43: Translators who regularly choose source texts for their translations**

![Diagram showing percentages of different groups in translation choices]

*86% of those in academics category translate from languages other than English.

### 5.2.2.2. Translation strategies

Chapter Three has demonstrated that Murakami’s being a writer is the major reason for his freedom which allows him to overtly incorporate writerly creativity and an idiosyncratic writing style into his translations. However, the data below suggests that the Japanese translators in broader categories also enjoy relative freedom in their choice of translation strategies (Figure 44). This phenomenon contrasts with the American context, where publishers and literary magazines, such as Knopf and *The New Yorker*, undertake heavy editing for translations (Karashima, 2013: 213). Approximately one third of the translators answered that their editors’ opinions do not have great influence on their translation, while the majority said that they “somewhat” influenced them, mostly in reference to the copy-editing process. Those who answered “it depends” indicated that the significance of the editor’s opinions largely relies on the editor’s
expertise, or the publisher’s policy. Examples include: the editor is more experienced than the translator; the editor is an expert in the literary genre or the source language; the publisher has a strong focus on fluency. Furthermore, a quarter of the translators commented that publishers do not frequently interfere with their choice of translation strategies.

Figure 44: How much does the editor’s opinion influence the way you translate?

The study further investigated whether the degree of translator prominence or expertise influences their freedom in terms of translation strategies. However, unlike the choice of source texts, the results did not demonstrate observable patterns relating to the above factors, apart from perhaps career length. For example, most of those who answered “not at all” have been translators for thirty years or longer, while the career length of those who answered “not much” drops to between eight and thirty years. The Japanese data contradicts the Israeli case, where translators’ prominence or artistic persona rather than career length seems to determine the freedom in their approaches to translation (Sela-Sheffy, 2016: 58). For example, Mirsky, who had been practising for seventeen years at the time, indicated that she was not constrained by translation

I also examined whether the translators’ relative freedom in the choice of translation strategies has any influence on their approaches to translation, such as the employment of idiosyncratic writing styles, as in Murakami’s case. The result, however, was that nobody answered “yes” to the question, and that they all consciously avoid using a writing style which is recognisable in their other writings, or reveals their presence (Figure 45).

Figure 45: Do you usually employ a particular writing style, which reflects idiosyncrasy?

Furthermore, the chart below (Figure 46) shows that although 14% of the translators are aware that their personality might unintentionally manifest itself in translation, 63% commented that they normally focus on employing a writing style which reflects the source text, while 23% claimed that they make a conscious effort not to show any idiosyncrasy.
Similarly, Shibata (2016) explained during my interview with him that, in general, literary translators themselves do not wish readers to relate the stylistic features of the translation with the translators’ individual characteristics. Therefore, they attempt to play down their “translatorly” idiosyncrasies so as not to draw attention to themselves. However, in general, it is problematic to prove such a claim as it is up to the reader to recognise whether the translator’s particular writing style is observable in a text (Foucault, 1994: 795), except in the case of Murakami, whose idiosyncrasies are recognisable to readers, as demonstrated in Chapter Three. For example, one of the translators, who is also a writer, claims that she consciously avoids employing her original writing style in translation. Despite that, she explained that a number of readers had commented that reading her translations makes them feel as if they were reading her original works, which very much resembles Murakami’s case. It might be said that idiosyncrasy is more likely to be manifested in a translated text when a translator is also a writer. Evans (2016: 15) also suggests that when a translator is also an author, the interactions between the translation and the author’s original writing may be manifested in the translation, depending on the author/translator’s motivation for translating.
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However, further study on writers’ translation is required to prove this case as an observable phenomenon.

The findings above demonstrate that the degree of prominence as well as expertise seem to have an influence on the translators’ freedom in selecting source texts, while the career length influences the translators’ freedom during the translation process. Hence, a translator’s celebrity status, career length and expertise can be partially influential on the publication process. Furthermore, the degree of translator prominence does not seem to affect translators’ attitudes towards translation strategies, or encourage them to make themselves visible in their translations. This phenomenon is perhaps related to the Japanese perception of translators as *kuroko*. Sixteen percent of the translators in the survey used the term *kuroko* in describing their roles, while others showed reluctance in drawing readers’ attention to themselves, as seen in the following comments: “translators get too much attention”, “it’s not necessary to make the reader aware of the translator”, “we’d prefer to remain invisible but publishers would rather put us under the spotlight and keep the source authors in the background ”. Needless to say, the translators’ self-effacing attitudes should not be taken at face value. However, the Japanese translators’ public attitudes towards their visibility make an interesting contrast with Israeli celebrity translators, whose willingness to highlight their presence is explicit. Similarly, UK translators with recognition such as Daniel Hahn are keen to emphasise their input in translations:

[…] what makes me crazy is when the reviewer praises something that I did and gives the impression that I’m not there.
 […] The plot and the ideas and the themes aren’t mine, but the words are, all of them, and the way they all fit together, too. And if that’s what you’re reviewing, I want credit (Hahn, 2011)

Hence, translators’ approaches to their visibility vary depending on the culture. However, translators’ reluctance towards gaining prominence does not necessarily make them invisible, as demonstrated in the Japanese examples.
5.2.3. Translator status

The findings so far have illustrated that a high degree of translator prominence is influential in translation processes. This section will now examine how the prominence factor relates to the ways in which translators’ professional status and works are evaluated by publishers, critics and readers.

One of the ways in which translators’ work can be evaluated is whether or not they are mentioned in book reviews. The survey suggests that while it is a common practice in Japan to list translators’ names in book reviews, critics do not routinely comment on translations. The translators’ answers below demonstrate that the majority regularly have their translations mentioned in book reviews (Figure 47). Likewise, in the UK, although reviews of translated literature tend to give translators and their input minimal recognition (Bernofsky, 2011), in the mainstream press the works of prominent translators, such as Grossman, Smith and Jull Costa are regularly reviewed with their names mentioned.

*Figure 47: Have your translations been mentioned in reviews of your translations?*
**Chapter Five**

Sela-Sheffy discusses how celebrity translators are featured in the media, but she has not examined the content of book reviews in relation to translator prominence. Another way in which translator recognition could manifest itself is the frequency of their appearance in the media, including newspapers, literary magazines and websites. More than half of the translators in this survey have been interviewed in newspapers and literary magazines (Figure 48).

**Figure 48: Have you been interviewed in the media as a translator?**

![Chart showing the percentage of translators interviewed in the media](chart.png)

Similarly, Israeli celebrity translators attract significant media attention. Sela-Sheffy (2008: 614) claims that Mirsky received “the greatest public exposure as a translator”, including interviews. Furthermore, she suggests that the media actively take part in recruiting new celebrity translators by creating narratives that highlight their special qualities, as seen in the following quote (ibid.: 615): “Not every day, a new translator is born. […] No doubt, Buzaglo is a discovery” (Nagid, 1998: 26, cited in Sela-Sheffy, 2008: 615). Thus, in the Hebrew context, the media not only play an important role in maintaining translators’ fame but also in producing celebrity translators.
In Japan, the translators in the media active and celebrity categories are regularly interviewed, participate in roundtable discussions and write essays that relate to translation and foreign literature. They are featured in Hon’yaku bungaku bukku café (2004/2007) [Translated Literature Book Cafe], which comes in two volumes, consisting of collected interviews with twenty-one literary translators including Murakami, Shibata and Kishimoto. Similarly, Konosu has so far published eight essays in which she discusses literary translation. Her most recent book 翻訳ってなんだろう? (Hon’yaku tte nandaro?, 2018) [What is Translation?] investigates the role of translation in the existence of world classics. The publication of such books usually brings her opportunities for book launch events (e.g. 翻訳とは、体を張った読書だ [Translation is a Reading with Desperation], 3rd of August 2018). Furthermore, Konosu frequently contributes to major literary magazines (e.g. Bungakukai) and newspaper book columns (e.g. Mainichi-shinbun) in which she normally discusses the role of translation or translated literature, sometimes with other recognised translators. The above activities earn her a higher level of prominence than her recognised contemporaries. Deborah Smith can be described as media active as she frequently appears in interviews and online literary magazines. Furthermore, she has her own publishing house that may create further opportunities for media coverage.

5.2.3.1. Translator income

The Japanese translators’ relative recognition and media coverage described above might suggest that these translators would also enjoy high financial rewards. Sela-Sheffy (2008: 136) shows that the elite Israeli translators receive significantly higher pay compared to their non-elite colleagues, whose fees are usually at “the bottom of the pay scale”. By contrast, in Japan, as in Europe and North America, literary translation is a profession which brings an income that is often not enough in itself to make a living unless a translator has a constant flow of work and produces a large number of translations, or best sellers (Shibata, 2007: 13-15). On the other hand, in Japan, unlike their European and North American counterparts, it is a common practice for literary translators to be paid by royalties alone, the rate of which varies between publishers, ranging from 6% to 8% (ibid.). Although these rates are significantly higher than in the UK, which is generally between 1% and 2%, the royalties alone are usually not
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sufficient to make a living for many Japanese translators (ibid.). This publishing tradition may explain why the great majority of the translators in this study have other professions. Thus, their prominence, career length, or expertise does not necessarily have a direct influence on income.

5.2.3.2. Communication with readers

Approximately two thirds of the Japanese translators in the survey claim to have direct or indirect communication with readers through social media, websites, blogs, literary events, talk events, and seminars. Making appearances at promotional events seems to be the most popular means of communication with readers (Figure 49).

Figure 49: What are the means of communication with readers?

Those in the celebrity category actively involve themselves in large literary events, including the Tokyo International Literary Festival, while those in the recognised category may participate in smaller events such as talks and book signings at book stores. The larger literary events are seemingly centred on ‘serious’ literature, as opposed to popular genres, thus, genre may also influence a translator’s prominence.
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Shibata claimed to be the translator with the highest frequency of appearances at translation and literature-related events among his contemporaries (2016). In addition, he explained that his celebrity status allows him to organise events to his own taste, and that these events are usually sponsored by publishers. In regard to social media, only one third of the translators are in favour of their use. Those who are regular users of social media include Echizen, who has a translation-themed blog *Hon’yaku hyakkei,* and Konosu, who is active both on Twitter 鴻巣友季子(執筆再開中) [Konosu Yukiko (Writing resumed)] @yukikonosu” and Facebook 翻訳家の毎日 [The daily life of a translator], and Kishimoto, as described in Chapter One, although she does not regularly tweet about translation. Similarly, Ōmori Nozomi, a specialist in the science fiction genre, actively tweets about his works and science-fiction related topics, at 大森望 [Ōmori Nozomi] @nzm. His Twitter account currently has about 40,000 followers. Sela-Sheffy does not discuss the celebrity translators’ involvement in communication with readers.

The findings of the translator survey have demonstrated that the category of translator prominence has significant influence on translation practices, and media exposure, while the opposite could also be possible. Thus, translators in the celebrity class are likely to have greater freedom in their translation practices, more opportunities for public appearances, and higher media coverage than their counterparts in the recognised category. The media active, on the other hand, are likely to have more public recognition than their recognised counterparts, but less than those in the celebrity category. The influence of translator prominence described above is evident in Shibata’s case: his fame and widely recognised expertise allow him to translate and publish works of unknown authors to the same degree as Murakami. In addition, publishers are willing to sponsor Shibata to organise literary events, as well as inviting him to talks and seminars relating to translation and American literature, all of which also generate opportunities to interact with readers, further adding to his recognition. In the case of Murakami, he displays all the factors mentioned above: a long career length, English as his source language, a profession outside translation which originally made him famous, expertise in American literature, freedom in the choices of source texts and translation strategies, media coverage; the only exception being that he chooses not
to make public appearances. Thus, the state of Japanese celebrity translation can be understood as a kind of charmed circle, difficult to break into, but self-sustaining once a translator manages to enter. This phenomenon resembles the circle of Israeli celebrity translators, which allows only selected small numbers of “elitists”. What differentiates these celebrity translators from their Japanese counterparts, though, is that the former’s fame heavily relies on self-promotion. Once celebrity status is attained, the translator takes advantage of the freedom offered in translation processes, which is observable in a disregard toward translation norms and the target readers. By contrast, despite the freedom they are allowed, the Japanese celebrity translators are likely to take an opposite approach, with the exception of Murakami who, on some occasions, intentionally uses his idiosyncrasies, as was described in Chapter Three. However, to make detailed comparisons between the two contexts, further study of Israeli celebrity translators is required.

Hence, unlike Venuti’s visibility paradigm, in which he advocates using translation strategy as a tool to gain visibility, the Japanese example suggests that a translator must be prominent in the first place to attain freedom in the choice of translation strategies.

In the UK context, the influence of translator prominence on their translation practices seems slightly different from either of the above contexts. For example, while a translator with high prominence has wider access to press coverage than those who are less prominent, the level of the freedom they are given may be limited, including in the choices of source texts, and translation strategies. However, this also requires further study.

5.3. Publishers

The second part of this chapter studies Japanese publishers’ relationships with translators, including fees, the publication process, and marketing strategies,
considering how the degree of translator prominence influences these factors. The survey for this analysis included four interviews and six questionnaires. Three words appeared repeatedly in the Japanese publishers’ answers to the survey in relation to translators: career, experience, and skills. The analysis also investigates where these three keywords become important to the publishers.

5.3.1. The publication processes

5.3.1.1. Defining the genre of a translation project

The Japanese publishers in this study can be divided into two groups: the ones that focus on whatever genres are likely to sell; and the ones that specialise in particular genres, including German literature, and the retranslation of foreign canons. The former group, which is the majority, tends to choose popular genres such as mystery fiction and romances, often depending on the editor’s preference (Figure 50).

---

8 See the Appendix B for further details of the data collection for the survey and sample questionnaires.
5.3.1.2. Selecting source texts

When selecting a source text, editors play an important role in decision-making (Figure 51). However, while many of the editors in this study would choose a source text based on their personal preference, most consider suggestions from translators, literary agents, or scholars of particular literary genres. For example, one editor explained that when a project involves serious literature, translators’ opinions are respected in the decision-making process, as editors are often not confident when such literature is involved. This phenomenon explains the result of the translator surveys, which show that the great majority of the translators who are scholars of literature have been approached by editors for their opinions in selecting source texts. Thus, translators with expertise in serious literature are likely to hold sway over editors in the choice of source texts. On the other hand, for larger publishers, the opinions of literary agents and the company’s sales department may be more influential.
The Japanese editors’ approaches contrast with those of the UK editors, who seem to rely on solid information beyond the translator’s personal opinions, such as the author’s biography, the book’s popularity in the source culture, or whether or not the book has been translated into other European languages (Publisher’s Armchair, 2016). It is also common practice to look first at a sample chapter when a book is pitched by an agent or translator.

5.3.1.3. Selecting translators

Sourcing translators is also in the hands of editors for the Japanese publishers (Figure 52), who tend to approach a translator with a source text. On the other hand, half of the editors said that when a source text is brought forward by a translator the editor is likely to choose that translator to translate the text. This is particularly the case with celebrity translators such as Murakami and Shibata.
For the UK publishers approached, it seems common to commission a number of sample translations when selecting translators, while it is also a regular practice for translators to pitch themselves with their chosen texts. In the latter case, the translator who proposed the text is likely to be selected unless the editor does not like the translation, in which case, the entire project is likely to be dropped (Publisher’s Armchair, 2016).

When commissioning a translator, the Japanese editors seem to select particular translators for: 1. particular authors; 2. series; or 3. source texts (Figure 53). In the case of the first two categories, an editor would select the same translator who has translated the same author or series in the past in order to maintain the consistency in terms of the writing style, or the tone of the characters’ voices. This tendency is observable in the case of Murakami for Carver, and Echizen for Brown, as discussed in Chapter One. Two editors indicated that readers tend to become attached to a particular translator’s writing style in particular authors’ works, or series. In the third case, an editor would choose a translator whose writing style suits the source text’s tone.
The UK publishers at the Publisher’s Armchair, however, indicated that whether or not a translator has an existing relationship with the publisher plays an important role in selection.

Other factors that influence editors in selecting translators seem to be translators’ prominence and experience. Over two thirds of the editors in the survey indicated that translators’ prominence has some influence when they are selecting a translator (Figure 54), while when asked, half of the editors stated that a translator’s experience weighs more when they are commissioning a work. On the other hand, three editors linked celebrity translators with positive factors, such as ‘talented’, ‘skilled’, ‘experienced’, and ‘high-quality works’, based on the logic that a translator becomes famous for reasons, such as their solid career, professionalism and talents. Thus, it could be argued that, in Japan, celebrity translators are not only seen as beneficial to publishers in terms of attracting readers, but could also be seen as a guarantee of good-quality work.
However, prominence and experience do not seem to be the top priorities in choosing a translator. The publishers’ general criteria (Figure 55) show that the top three criteria are translation skills, translator’s knowledge of the source text, and writing skills in Japanese. The numerical values in the chart indicate the number of editors who voted for the criteria.
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Figure 55: On the basis of what criteria do you choose a translator?

The UK publishers who were interviewed, on the other hand, seem to prioritise the translator’s reputation, and the degree of the translator’s understanding and connection to the source text or context, while translator prominence was not mentioned at all by either the publishers or the editors at the Publisher’s Armchair.

The findings above suggest that the process of generating a project, selecting a source text and translator are influenced by various factors. The Japanese editors are willing to prioritise suggestions for source texts from translators who are literary experts, while the type of source text seems to determine the criteria by which a translator is selected. On the other hand, translator prominence, although being a beneficial factor to the Japanese publishers, is not as important as translators’ talent and skills in the three aspects of the process. For the UK publishers, translator prominence does not seem to have any influence at all in the process. Furthermore, the publishers seem to strongly prioritise the marketability of the book rather than relying on translators’ suggestions for good reads.
5.3.1.4. The translation processes

The survey demonstrated that the great majority of the Japanese editors usually have a prior meeting before commencing a project, where the overview of the project may be discussed with the translator (Figure 56). However, the editors’ approaches to translation strategies seem to be flexible, as suggested by the result of the translator survey. Although they may provide the translator with suggestions or stylistic guidelines, such as using a particular writing style for a certain readership, the editors are willing to allow the translator to work without restrictions in terms of translation strategy (Figure 57). One editor commented that Japanese translation norms have shifted from fluency-focused to a more source-text focus due to the readers’ growing familiarity with the contexts of translated literature in recent years. This phenomenon is reflected in the translators’ approaches to translation strategies described in the previous section, where the majority of them seem to focus on reproducing the stylistic effect of the source text. Overall, the editors do not seem to be interested in interfering with the translator during the translation process.

**Figure 56: How do you normally work with a translator?**
Similarly, the data below (Figure 58) demonstrates that the editors do not tend to exert power over the translators in regard to their approaches to translation. Any decisions concerning the translation process are likely to be decided in consultation with the translator. Those who answered “it depends” indicated that the degree to which editors are involved is dependent on the translator, or the source text. Examples include, when the translator is a celebrity such as Murakami his/her opinions may be given priority, which is very much reflected in Murakami’s translations as examined in Chapter Three.
The UK publishers who were interviewed seem to have similar attitudes to the Japanese examples towards translation strategies. They usually commission a translator based on their sample translation, so the publisher would know the translator’s approach to the translation in advance. The editors tend not to interfere with translators until the translation is complete, unless the translator is inexperienced, in which case they may provide suggestions.

5.3.1.5. The editing processes

For most of the Japanese publishers, the editing process is normally undertaken by both editors and professional proof-readers (Figure 59). The usual process involves the editor checking the whole text either at the initial or final stage, while copy editing is carried out by proof-readers. The publishers who rely on proof-readers alone have both in-house and out-sourced proof-readers who will also check a translation by comparison with the source text.
Unlike in the case of translation strategies, where editors may prioritise the opinions of celebrity translators, the next chart (Figure 60) indicates that the degree of translator prominence does not have a significant influence on the editors’ approaches to editing. The great majority answered that editing procedures should be the same irrespective of the translator’s prominence. On the other hand, one editor suggested that an inexperienced editor may be hesitant in pointing out errors when they are editing a highly experienced translator’s work.
Similarly, the UK editors in the survey answered that the translator’s prominence does not influence the editing process, while the translator’s career length could have some impact.

The findings above illustrate that prominence, other than celebrity, does not earn Japanese translators observable influence over publishers/editors during the translation process. However, the editors’ approaches to translators, overall, tend to be flexible, and they are open to the translators’ suggestions. The results, however, raise the question of the credibility of the respondents’ self-reporting, and whether their responses can be an accurate representation of actual practice. Nevertheless, the Japanese editors’ tendency to be open to translators’ opinions is perhaps related to the editors’ lack of expertise in the literature. Karashima (2013: 203) observes that many editors in Japanese publishing have no university degree in literature and tend to move between different departments within a company. By contrast, Japanese writers who were educated before the late 1970s tend to have degrees in literature from prestigious
universities (Koyano, 2012: 188-189). Karashima (2013: 203) argues that the difference in their educational background has an influence when it comes to the editing process, and the author is likely to have more authority than the editor. Therefore, it could be assumed that the same principle may apply to literary translators, many of whom are academics or specialists in literature. Karashima (ibid.) adds that this phenomenon contrasts with anglophone contexts, where literary editors are often graduates from Oxbridge or Ivy League universities, and are generally experts in literature. Thus, they are likely to hold power over translators in editing processes, unless they are dealing with source languages other than French, German, Italian or Spanish.

5.3.2. Translators’ fees

In Japan, during the pre-war period, translators were paid a 10% royalty, which was the same rate paid for writers (Shibata, 2007: 13). This phenomenon suggests that the works of translators were valued as highly as original works. However, this practice shifted as the difference between translation and original in terms of the author’s creative input became increasingly recognised by publishers and readers during the post-war period (ibid.: 14). Subsequently, in conjunction with a rise in the author’s advance and foreign rights, the rate for translators dropped to the current average of between 6% and 8%, depending on the publisher and marketability of the book, while the rate for Japanese writers remained 10%, and 8% for inexperienced writers (ibid.). All the Japanese publishers in the survey usually pay their translators by royalty (Figure 61). However, two editors explained that they may offer a flat-rate for short stories, or inexperienced translators. The average royalty rate of the publishers in this survey is the same as the national average of between 6% and 8%, often depending on the cost of the foreign rights. Furthermore, another editor explained that in the Japanese publishing tradition, it is not uncommon for translator’s royalties to be paid at the same rate as the source author. Similarly, Fujimoto (2006: 306) states that the average rate of royalty the source authors or their publishers receive from Japanese publishers is between 5% and 8%, which means they are sometimes lower than that of their translators. Thus, in general, Japanese translators’ works are valued as highly as those of the source authors.
Similarly, in the UK context, literary translators usually receive a royalty (CETAL, 2008: 30). However, their rates seem to be significantly lower than those of their Japanese counterparts, ranging from an average of 0.2% to 2%. Gill reports that the royalty ratio between author and translator is approximately 80:20 in most cases (2009: 23). Four out of five UK publishers interviewed in this survey pay their translators by a flat rate (around 90 GBP per 1000 words at the time when the survey was conducted) plus royalties. Their average rate for the latter is between 1% and 1.5%, which means that the source authors would receive 4% to 6%. The average rate for authors of English literature is 8% or 9% (How Do Authors Get Paid?, 2017). Nevertheless, the above figures are not necessarily indicative of how much a translator actually receives in royalties. The literary translator Lisa Carter (2012) explains that royalties usually function as an advance on the initial fee a translator receives. Therefore, a translator must first earn in book sales the amount he or she has initially received, before the royalties materialise (ibid.). This means that if a translator is granted an initial fee of £5,000 and 1% royalties for the book which is sold at £10 a copy, the publisher will
have to sell 50,000 copies before the translator receives any further payment. Thus, there is a clear hierarchy between English-language authors, source authors of translated literature, and translators in the UK publishing industry.

The criteria by which translators’ fees are decided vary between publishers. Some have a fixed rate for all translators, while others may base their decisions on the translator’s career length. The Japanese publishers use one criterion, or a combination of two or more criteria in determining the rate of translators’ fees. The data below (Figure 62) shows that translator experience and career records are the most widely applied criteria, while translator prominence does not seem to have a great influence on their fees.

**Figure 62: On the basis of what criteria do you decide on the translators’ fees?**

Similarly, the following chart (Figure 63) demonstrates that only one publisher clearly indicated that translator prominence influences fees, using the logic that a celebrity translator is talented. From this it can be deduced that translator talent weighs more than fame in determining fees. Another publisher explained that there may be cases where a prominent and experienced translator is paid at a higher rate than those
who have shorter career length and are less prominent. Thus, again, high prominence alone would not guarantee high pay. Furthermore, four publishers indicated that an inexperienced translator is normally paid at a lower rate than those who are experienced. Thus, translator experience is the most important factor in determining the rate, as is evident in Figure 62.

*Figure 63: Does the prominence of the translator affect the rate of the fee?*

The Japanese findings above contrast with those from the UK: all five publishers who were interviewed answered that they adopt fixed rates irrespective of the translator’s career, or skills. One editor indicated that they may increase the rate when commissioning a translator who is in high demand due to his/her popularity. However, in this case, the primary reason for paying a higher rate is that their commissioned work would burden a translator who is already busy with other works, not for the translator’s prominence.
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5.3.3. Marketing strategies

Most of the Japanese publishers seem to promote translations in very similar ways to Japanese literature, apart from when they involve the translator. The most popular method of advertising is the use of social media and websites (Figure 64). One of the reasons for using the former is that it is free. Naturally, the cost factor seems to influence the publishers’ marketing strategies. Two editors explained that usually, publishers have very small budgets for promoting translations, as they do not normally involve significant sales. Although the traditional method of advertising in literary magazines and newspapers is still popular, poster advertising on trains, which used to be the mainstream method in the past decades, is rare due to its high cost. The genre and origin of the book do not seem to have a notable influence on advertising methods (Figure 65).

Figure 64: How do you promote translated literature?

![Bar chart showing promotion methods]

- Send copies to editors, and critics of literary magazines, newspapers etc.
- Advertise in newspapers, literary magazines
- Social media, blogs, company websites
- Special display in bookstores, etc.
- Poster advertising on trains etc.
- Promotional events
- Use the translator
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Figure 65: Do you have different marketing strategies?

The publishers’ main focus in promoting translation seems to be centred on the elements that might capture readers’ attention (Figure 66). These can be: the source text having won awards; the book’s phenomenal sales figures in the source culture; the author, or translator is a celebrity. These elements generate narratives that attract media attention.
Similarly, the next chart (Figure 67) shows that the publishers are keen to utilise translators’ celebrity status in promoting translations. Highlighting the translator’s name on the book cover seems to be the most common strategy, as described in Chapter Four. One editor explained that readers of translation are also interested in translators, and they would buy a book because of the translator’s name. Another editor indicated that famous translators’ names are likely to be printed in a larger font size than others. However, there are not many translators who are prominent to the degree that their names are worth printing in large font, as was pointed out. Naturally, Murakami was mentioned as such an example in the survey. Interestingly, one editor explained that Japanese authors’ names on their book covers are generally printed in large font, while those of foreign authors in translations are not. Furthermore, the examples studied in Chapter Four suggest that source authors’ names may regularly be printed in similar font size to those of the translators, although further studies are required to prove such claims. Another reason for including famous translators in marketing strategies is that, unlike the promotion of Japanese literature, when the author would normally be invited to promotional events, foreign authors are rarely asked to promote their works. One
obvious reason is costs such as the travel expenses and interpreter’s fee that are incurred in bringing the author to Japan. Publishers are not prepared to cover such expenses, for reasons including their small advertising budgets and the high cost of the advance payment for the author.

Figure 67: How does the translator’s celebrity status influence your marketing strategies?

The editors at the Publisher’s Armchair event indicated that some UK publishers are willing to use translators when promoting translation. They mentioned Michael Hofmann, who is also a poet, and Deborah Smith as successful examples. One editor explained that when a translator presents her/his artistic quality as a translator, as in the case of Hofmann and Smith, the translator’s public persona can become a strong element in promoting their works. Conversely, the UK publishers who were interviewed seemed less keen on using translators in promotions. Although two out of five publishers indicated that famous translators have the potential to become part of marketing strategies, such cases are very rare. One editor explained that they would prefer to have famous British writers to talk about the foreign authors and their works when promoting translation. The reason for this is that prominent writers’ words are
very likely to draw the attention of UK readers and those in the literary circle, while those of translators are not. The case of Smith is exceptional in this respect. On the other hand, two publishers indicated that they promote translators wherever they can. However, one also pointed out that the media is not interested in translators, while the other said that currently there are no translators who can be considered famous outside the translation world. On the whole, UK publishers’ strong focus on the source texts and their authors when promoting translated fiction is apparent in book cover design, as demonstrated in Chapter Four.

The findings of the publisher survey have demonstrated that for the Japanese publishers, the three key phrases ‘career length’, ‘experience’ and ‘skills’ are the most influential factors throughout the publication process. The publishers seem to associate these factors with celebrity translators. However, prominence is also influential, especially when promoting translations; the more prominent a translator, the more willing the publisher is to include her/him in their marketing strategies and so the translator is promoted in a similar way to authors of Japanese fiction. Furthermore, celebrity translators are not only likely to be the centre of attention in promotions, but they may also earn higher royalties than the source author. The UK publishers, by contrast, seemed to be interested in the translator’s artistic persona rather than prominence when it comes to marketing. It can be said that a translator’s persona attracts the media attention and the translator earns prominence as a result, which resembles the cases of Israeli celebrity translators, although such cases are seemingly rare. What distinguishes Japanese publishing practice from that of the UK is that the former tends to treat translators, especially those who are celebrities, almost as if they were the original authors when promoting translations. This trend is also manifested in the translators’ royalties, which are usually equal to or higher in some cases than those of the source authors. Thus, Japanese publishers tend to view translators as representatives of the source authors, whereas in the UK they are likely to see them as mediators between the source and the target language. This Japanese tendency may be rooted in the publishing practice of the Meiji period in which no clear boundary existed between translations and original writings, as discussed in Chapter Two.
5.4. Readers of translations

The final section of the study investigates readers’ reception of translators and translations. The survey, which was aimed at Japanese readers of translations, was divided into three parts, asking: 1) What factor is the highest priority when you are choosing a work of translated fiction to read; 2) Do you read translator’s afterwords; 3) How appealing do you find translated fiction? These questions were circulated via Twitter. The responses were 2409, 965, and 702 votes, respectively. The same questions were translated into English and circulated as an online survey among the UK readers. The second question was omitted, however, as the inclusion of translator afterwords is often limited to the cases of academic publishers (Munday, 2001: 32), and this practice is not regularly seen in translated fiction in the UK (McRae, 2010: 40-41), as explained in Chapter Four. A total of sixty-nine people responded to the survey.

The Japanese readers of translations seem to take entertainment value as an important factor when reading a translated fiction. Over half the readers would select a translation depending on “the story” itself (Figure 68). For 31% of the readers, “the original work or author” determines their choices, while 15% would choose a translated book for the translator. By contrast, for the majority of the UK readers, “the original work or author” seems to be the most important factor when choosing translated fiction, followed by “the story” (28%), while only 4% would choose a translation by the translator (Figure 69). The readers’ attitudes in both contexts reflect their respective publishers’ approaches to marketing strategies that centre on “the contents of the story” (Japan), and “the source text and author” (UK). Their approaches are shown in the design of jackets and book covers as was demonstrated in Chapter Four.
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Figure 68: (Japan) What factor is the highest priority when you are choosing a translated fiction to read?

Figure 69: (UK) What factor is the highest priority when you are choosing a translated fiction?
Japanese readers’ perceptions of translated literature are seemingly high (Figure 70). About 44% of readers view translation as more appealing than non-translation, while one third of readers seem to make no distinction between translation and non-translation, and 13% do not view one as better than the other in terms of appeal. The reasons for answering “translated literature is more appealing” include: “reading translated fiction allows you to have a similar experience to travelling to foreign countries”, and “it opens up an undiscovered world to you”. These comments suggest that Japanese readers who are interested in translated literature are attracted to the diversity of the cultural contexts in translation. In the UK context, by contrast, only 23% of readers considered translation to be more appealing than non-translation, while a similar number had the opposite view. The reasons for the positive views seem to be the same as those of Japanese readers, while the reasons for the negative views are “uncertainty in terms of accuracy”, “the feeling you are not reading the original”, and “stilted style which makes you feel like you are reading a translation”. The UK answers reflect publishers’ common assertion that readers tend to prefer fluent texts, as Venuti claims (2008: 12).

**Figure 70: (Japan) How appealing do you find translated fiction?**
The inclusion of a translator’s afterword is a convention in the Japanese context, as discussed in Chapter Four. Readers’ perceptions of translation and translators can be seen in their approaches to the translator’s afterword, which the great majority of the Japanese readers routinely read, as shown below:
The reasons for reading translators’ afterwords can be divided into three: 1) the reader is interested to know background information on the source text/author; 2) the translator’s afterword is perceived as an integral part of a translated book; 3) the reader is interested in the translator’s anecdotes, and/or personal perspectives on the source text/author/cultural contexts (Figure 73). The greatest number of readers showed interest in reading about the translator, while fewer readers were interested in the source text and author. Thus, the former view a translator’s afterword as an access point which allows them to glimpse translators’ perspectives and translating experiences, whereas the latter view the function of the translator’s afterword as an access point to the source text/author.
Examples of the readers' answers to above questions include:

- It reveals the context behind the work.
- It deepens the reader’s understanding of the work.
- The translator’s afterword is considered as a part of a book’s authorship - it is similar to an author’s afterword.
- It reveals the translator’s passion towards their work.
- A fascination with the translator’s anecdotes

The above results suggest that for 36% of the Japanese readers translators are as appealing as authors.
5.5. Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that Japanese publishing practice generates opportunities for translators to make themselves visible to the readers. The publishers’ practice of including a translator’s afterword, the use of translators instead of the source authors at promotional events, and highlighting the translator’s name in advertisements enables readers to become familiar with the translator, although the third case (advertisements) seems to be limited to those who are celebrities. Thus, contrary to Venuti’s conceptualisation, translators can gain recognition without making themselves visible in the texts. The receptiveness of readers towards translators and their works also increases the effectiveness of publishers’ marketing strategies built around translator. Thus, Japanese publishing practice not only distributes foreign literature to the readers, but also provides those readers with access to the translators. This phenomenon contrasts with UK publishing practice, which is centred on distributing foreign literature to readers and provides access to the source authors, rather than the translators, while Israeli celebrity translators make themselves accessible to the readers.

Publishing practice, however, is not the only reason for Japan’s celebrity translator phenomenon. The translators, irrespective of their categories, also tend to involve themselves in promoting translations by writing book reviews, discussing foreign literature, and talking about their translating experiences through essays, interviews, roundtable discussions, seminars, workshops and social media. These activities draw readers’ attention not only to translation, but to the translators themselves, highlighting their personalities, expertise, skills and talents. Exhibiting a public persona as a translator is another important factor in creating translator prominence, which is shared by the Japanese, Hebrew and UK contexts. On the other hand, opportunities to attain celebrity status seem to be available only to a limited group of translators. As demonstrated in the survey of publishers, translators with the three key factors ‘experience’, ‘skills’, and ‘established career’ are likely to attain recognised status, while those who are famous outside the world of translation and also have these factors are more likely to be promoted by publishers and attract media attention. Mirsky, perhaps, belongs to this category. Although her fame outside translation
practice remains unclear, her name clearly attracted readers, and therefore, was promoted by publishers. On the other hand, despite their high media exposure, the names of the *media active* translators such as Konosu and Smith do not necessarily guarantee the sales of the books. Once translators enter the high end of celebrity ‘translatorhood’, they have opportunities to maintain their visibility, as in the cases of Murakami and Shibata, who are allowed the freedom to have their own imprints and, in the case of the latter, organise their own literary events.

Hence, the degree of translator prominence has significant influence on the Japanese publishers in terms of how translations and translators are marketed, while the publishers’ marketing strategies may also have an impact on translator prominence. Likewise, the publishing practice influences readers’ perception of translators, while it could also work in reverse. For example, readers’ high interests in translators themselves may correspond to how translators are promoted in paratexts. Furthermore, translators’ interactions with readers increase their levels of recognition. Conversely, cultural contexts such as the UK, where publishing practice does not readily provide translators with opportunities to interact with readers, are less likely to produce celebrity translators than their Japanese counterpart. Thus, the celebrity translator phenomenon in Japan is a special case, consisting of publishing tradition, translators’ approaches to translation practices, and readers’ perceptions of translation and translators, all of which are different from those in the cultural contexts discussed in Venuti’s paradigm.

This chapter has demonstrated that the relationship between the three agents, combined with a particular cultural background, is the key to translator visibility. This result enables future research to analyse groups of translators in cultural contexts that are under-explored in current translation studies, or to establish comparisons between translators in specific groups that can be distinguished by categories such as their gender, the literary genres they translate, or source languages. Furthermore, the criteria for the analysis could be expanded by adding other, contextually relevant factors. Thus, translator visibility can be analysed from a variety of angles such as above that are not included in Venuti’s conceptualisation, which centres on the current prevailing translation norms and translators’ approaches to translation strategies in Europe and North America. What translators in anglophone contexts could perhaps learn from their
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Japanese counterparts is that their own actions can influence their individual visibility to some degree, as also seen in the case of Smith, who actively promotes her own works through social media and literary websites.
CONCLUSION

6.1 Translator celebrity

This thesis has sought to demonstrate that perceptions and claims about translator (in)visibility, dominant in translation studies, cannot straightforwardly be applied to the Japanese cultural context. Japan has a pronounced celebrity culture in general; therefore it is hardly surprising that there are varying degrees of celebrity in the world of literary translation. Although there are other contexts such as Israel where similar claims have been made, the Japanese translator celebrity phenomenon is an unusual case even among this group of cultural contexts in which celebrity translators also exist. The combination of Japan’s historical background, publishing practices, and readers’ perceptions of translators and translation, which are diverse and divergent from those in anglophone contexts, leads to a setting in which translators have better chances to attain celebrity status than their anglophone counterparts, although such cases do not happen regularly even in Japan. There are a variety of factors that contribute to the production of this translator celebrity, ranging from a translator’s talent and skills to the winning of prizes, individual persona, and fame related to other practices or features beyond translation such as authorship. There is no single factor which weighs more than the others, but it requires a critical mass of factors that lay the ground for a translator to be propelled into celebrity. The factors that have been observed in the case of the translators analysed in this study are shown in the chart below:

Figure 74: Celebrity factors chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Recognised</th>
<th>Media active</th>
<th>Celebrity</th>
<th>Super celebrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The translator’s name attracts readers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having produced translations of high quality</td>
<td>☀️</td>
<td>☀️</td>
<td>☀️</td>
<td>☀️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a best seller in translation</td>
<td>☀️</td>
<td>☀️</td>
<td></td>
<td>☀️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having translated a famous ST</td>
<td>☀️</td>
<td>☀️</td>
<td>☀️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having translated works by famous authors</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having won translation prizes</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being known for particular translation strategies</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being known for particular literary genres</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating serious literature</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating from the English language¹</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing/translation skills regularly mentioned in the media</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being known for cultural contributions (introducing foreign literature, entertainment provider)</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being famous outside translation</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being famous abroad</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving regular media coverage (interviews, critics’ reviews etc.)</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving media coverage abroad</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being regularly included in translators’ gossip books</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal gossip or scandal attracting media attention</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having been featured in literary magazines (as a special feature dedicated to the translator)</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having been promoted/advertised by publishers</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing essays/articles (translation-related)</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing essays (personal accounts)</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing essays/articles (literature-related)</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imprints</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthologies</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having adopted a persona</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom in the choice of source text</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Applicable to the Japanese context only.
Conclusion

| Being professionally associated with celebrity persons | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ |
| Having own websites/social media | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ |
| Having one-way communication with readers via social media | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ |
| Having direct communication with readers via the internet | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ |
| Having direct communication with readers at public events | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ |
| Participating in major literary festivals | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ |
| Participating in small literary events | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ |
| Participating in promotional events | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ |
| Giving translation seminars and workshops | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ |
| Writing how-to books on translation | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ |
| Having particular tastes in foreign authors | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ |
| Having a readership that includes those who are not regular readers of translation | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ | ♠️ |

- ♠️ Regularly/applies to all
- ⭐️ Occasionally/applies to some

All of the factors above have the potential to play a part in publishers’ marketing strategies. Naturally, celebrities have more factors than recognised counterparts, while super-celebrity does not necessarily have more factors than the celebrity category. A notable distinction between those who are celebrities and those who are not is the public interest in the translators themselves as individuals. As with celebrity in general, gossip surrounding celebrity translators attracts media attention, while non-celebrities do not. On the other hand, as in Murakami’s case, public appearance is not necessary for celebrity translators as long as they have significant media coverage, direct communication with readers, and the narratives which surround the translator’s professional life are circulated through the media, including essays. What elevates a translator from recognised status to that of true celebrity, though, is the commodification process, which turns a translator’s name into a brand under which their translations are promoted and sold, as is true in the cases of Murakami, Shibata
and Kishimoto. This broader celebrity means the translators make themselves available to be part of marketing tools to promote the translated works through appearing in public events and communication with readers. Thus, the agency of translators plays an important part in shaping the commodification process. However, while the factors described above are necessary, they are not sufficient to elevate recognised translators to celebrities. It requires publishers’ decisions to turn the translator into a brand. Furthermore, the chances of influencing the decisions of publishers such as these appear to be limited to those who are already famous in other spheres. Murakami’s global fame as a novelist, Kishimoto’s high level of popularity as an essayist, and Shibata’s close association with Murakami have had significant influence on publishers’ readiness to include them in their branding strategies. Thus, although a translator need not be famous in the first place as in Murakami’s case, fame attained beyond the practice of translation significantly increases the chance of achieving celebrity status as a translator. However, as is also true for celebrities in other professional domains such as authors, skill and talent are usually essential in gaining a translator’s first degree of recognition. Especially, the quality of translations a translator produces is crucial in maintaining the recognition. Once a translator has achieved celebrity status, the factors in the chart also bolster their status—for instance, by their continuing to produce works that become popular, interacting with readers, taking part in interviews or roundtable discussions in literary magazines, and making regular appearances at promotional events. Furthermore, their celebrity status affords them greater freedom in their control of paratextual space in which they can make themselves visible and in organising their own literary events, all of which attract media attention and add to their prominence. However, editors’ personal opinions on the translator greatly influence whether or not the translator becomes promoted in the first place. For example, Murakami was able to publish his first translation, which held little market value, because of his close relationship with the editor. Thus, meeting an editor who is supportive also influences the chance of the translator becoming a celebrity. The production of translator celebrity follows a similar process to that which typically underlies the building of literary celebrity described by Driessens (2013a: 650-651): mediatisation, personalisation, and commodification. However, what differentiates celebrity authors from celebrity translators is that the former usually attain fame through the works they produce in the first place, while the latter’s fame seems to occur beyond their translation. As the distinction between the translators in recognised and celebrity groups has demonstrated, for translators, being
excellent in translation practice is enough to achieve recognition, but celebrity takes place outside the domain of translation proper.

6.2. Visibility paradigm

Notions of celebrity, which are applicable to the discussion of visibility in a wide range of contexts, enabled my thesis to explore a wider spectrum of translator visibility than existing studies of translator status in translation studies. Although ‘celebrity’ does not equate with ‘visibility’ in Venuti’s terminology, my analysis of Japanese celebrity translators has demonstrated that the factors influencing translator visibility are not limited to prevailing translation norms and publishing practices in the target cultures, as Venuti’s study implies. Venuti’s perception of translator visibility, which he has been developing since the early 1990s, remains unchanged even in the latest edition of The Translator’s Invisibility (2017), which has changed in its later editions in response to some powerful earlier critiques of the 1995 first edition. Instead, my study has demonstrated that the influence of cultural conventions, publicity, and publishers’ marketing strategies, as well as translators’ activities beyond their translation practice, are also highly influential in creating translator visibility. Furthermore, this research demonstrated that domesticating and foreignising approaches are not the only, or main, strategies that influence translator visibility. Translators’ idiosyncrasies as manifested in their translations can also be influential over their prominence. Thus, the factors that earn a translator visibility are far more complex than Venuti’s depiction. His conceptualisation, which focuses on the cultural and ethical values of translated literature, overlooks the commercial aspects of translation. Furthermore, Venuti does not consider translators’ other professions in relation to their visibility, despite the fact that the great majority of literary translators have other roles that are related to writing practice, such as creative writing and literary criticism, which can influence their prominence as translators.

As this thesis has demonstrated, translators are promoted when they offer elements that might help sales of the translated book, such as strong name value,
Conclusion

persona, expertise and winning prizes. Use of a foreignising strategy alone is very unlikely to persuade publishers to promote the translation or translator. Moreover, considering the current mainstream publishing practice, which prioritises fluency, it is unrealistic to expect a foreignising translation style would promote a translator to celebrity. In other words, such a translation style can only be adopted by a translator (such as Venuti himself) who has already achieved celebrity status. Translator visibility, like celebrity in general, is created through a number of intermediaries surrounding the translator, but not by the translator’s effort alone, as Venuti’s resistance strategy would seem to suggest. As described above, it necessarily involves publishers, the mass media, publicity, and readers’ reception, elements that are not included in Venuti’s paradigm. His conceptualisation centres on how to resist invisibility and attain a degree of recognition, but does not explore how a translator can become famous. There are examples of visible translators in anglophone contexts whose prominence might also be studied in this way, such as Margaret Jull Costa, who has recently received a lifetime achievement award for her translations from Spanish; Ann Goldstein; and Deborah Smith, whose fame owes much to notoriety, thus her case is distinct from her contemporaries representing the norm among English-language literary translators who gradually accumulated acclaim. Translated fiction, after all, is a commodity; therefore its commercial aspects must be considered in regard to translator visibility.

Hence, the findings of my thesis have demonstrated that Venuti’s visibility paradigm, which is based on his assumption that the translator’s visibility and a foreignising translation strategy are linked, conflicts with what I have been discussing as ‘the visibility paradigm’ throughout this thesis. It therefore needs to be nuanced, particularly in relation to some non-anglophone contexts, notably Japan.

6.3 Cultural and societal impacts of celebrity translators and their works

My analysis of celebrity translators has demonstrated that a translator’s prominence not only has an impact on the sales of their works but also influences the way foreign
Conclusion

literature is circulated, read by readers, and reviewed by critics. Translators’ choices of source texts and translation strategies can influence the existence of a given literature as a whole, especially when the translator is a celebrity. Although Murakami’s idiosyncratic writing style in his translation of The Catcher in the Rye and The Long Goodbye has attracted criticism for altering the existing image of the novels, it has generated a new readership. Similarly, his celebrity status not only affords him greater power to have the works of unknown foreign authors published, and to bring works which have long been out of print back into print, but can also contribute to the source authors’ recognition in the target culture, as in the case of Carver and Fitzgerald. Furthermore, the translator’s persona can potentially influence the reader’s perception of the source text and the author, as well as the literary genre, something which is evident in the way Murakami’s “new and postmodern” image as a writer made contemporary American literature, which he translated, fashionable in the Japanese market in the 1980s (Miura, 2003). Thus, a translated book can become celebrated when the translator is a celebrity. This notion is contrary to Parks’ (2016) claim: “Glory, for the translator, is borrowed glory. There is no way around this. Translators are celebrated when they translate celebrated books.” Hence, it is plausible to conclude that the higher the degree of the translator’s prominence, the higher the impact it has on the very existence of a particular foreign literature.

Murakami’s phenomenal literary fame makes his translator celebrity an extreme example. However, the case study devoted to Murakami in Chapters Three and Four suggests that a translator who is also a writer has greater opportunities to make themselves visible than translators who are not also writers. First, they already have readers who have the potential to become readers of their translations. Second, their original writing styles have greater recognition than those of their contemporaries who are not authors, and readers are likely to notice when these writing styles are manifested in their translations. Furthermore, any writer’s idiosyncrasies in translation are likely to attract the attention of critics, which adds to the translator’s prominence. The relationship between other writers’ translations and their visibility in translation practice would be an interesting subject to explore further. Evans (2016) and Woodsworth (2017) have investigated the interaction between famous writers and their translations. However, the implications of the two practices in terms of translator visibility are yet to be explored.
Conclusion

My study of Japanese celebrity translators has highlighted the importance of the translator’s role and agency in the circulation of translation more explicitly than existing studies of translator invisibility. Furthermore, the interdisciplinary approach taken here, drawing on celebrity studies, literary studies, socio-cultural studies, and historical studies, has allowed my research to formulate an original analytical model which will enable future research to move away from the translation strategy-based discussion of translator status, predominant in translation studies thus far, to include a much broader range of factors that have been demonstrated to contribute to translator prominence. Celebrity studies in particular has influenced this research, notably in its argument that we must consider some important, and hitherto neglected, elements that create visibility, such as the impact of the media. These aspects are not included in existing translator studies that tend instead to rely on a more restricted Bourdieusian approach. In addition, the results of my research, which have demonstrated the impact of Murakami’s celebrity status over the source authors’ prominence in Japan (e.g. Fitzgerald, Carver) suggest that the translator’s status can be an important factor to be considered in the discussion of celebrity authorship. Finally, the quality of the translation can also be a factor influencing the popularity of the author and his or her book in the receiving country. Hence, it is my argument that translation matters in how international celebrities are presented in the media and received in different linguistic contexts.

Interdisciplinary approaches have attracted notable attention in recent translation studies, especially in the sociology of translation, which focuses on translators. Angelelli’s (2014) “sociological turn” has addressed the increase in attention to the agency of translators and interpreters, as well as the social factors that influence translators and interpreters’ actions. Similarly, Chesterman (2009) has suggested an analytical model for translator studies that incorporates studying translators’ public images and attitudes to their works through examining the translator’s press coverage and paratexts. However, existing studies tend to centre on translators themselves and overlook the involvement of publishers and readers concerning translators’ status. My methodologies that cover much wider spectra of

---

2 Another area for future research arising from the work reported in this thesis is an examination of historical relationships between translator ‘celebrity’ or prominence and particular translation strategies. The results and methods used in this study will next be developed in a closer investigation of the relationship between translator prominence and the existence of a particular type of translation, namely, indirect translation, produced during the Meiji period (1868-1912).
Conclusion

translator status contribute to the further development of the “sociological turn” in translation studies.


1 All translations are listed under the name of the translators, with details of the original in parenthesis after the title.
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## APPENDIX A

**Factors that contributed to the Meiji Translators’ celebrity status in Chapter Two**

*Figure 75: Meiji celebrity factors chart*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meiji Celebrity Translator</th>
<th>Kuroiwa Ruikō</th>
<th>Mori Ōgai</th>
<th>Wakamatsu Shizuko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other profession</strong></td>
<td>Journalist, fiction writer, critics, proprietor of a tabloid, philosopher, social activist</td>
<td>Writer, biographer, poet, critic, philosopher, army surgeon</td>
<td>Writer, Teacher, Women’s emancipation activist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AKA</strong></td>
<td>Shūroku, the viper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural contributions</strong></td>
<td>Establishing popular genre, providing entertainments to general public</td>
<td>Developing new literary style, innovating Japanese theatre, introducing European philosophies and literary movements</td>
<td>Establishing Children’s literature, developing new colloquial language, promoting women’s emancipation and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Famous works</strong></td>
<td>Dumas, Conway, Boisgobey</td>
<td>H. C. Andersen, Goethe, Ibsen</td>
<td>F. H. Burnett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speciality in translation</strong></td>
<td>Detective/romantic fiction with high entertainment and educational values</td>
<td>Romantic fiction, philosophy, biography, poetry and drama</td>
<td>Children’s literature and fiction which is high in moralistic values, or those that contains Christian belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of translation</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source language</strong></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source texts</strong></td>
<td>Chose by himself</td>
<td>Chose by himself</td>
<td>Chose by herself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educations</strong></td>
<td>High level</td>
<td>High level</td>
<td>High level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Means of publication</strong></td>
<td>Dailies and book form</td>
<td>Prestigious literary magazines, dailies and book form</td>
<td>Prestigious literary magazine and book form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other means of circulating translated works</td>
<td>Theatre plays</td>
<td>Theatre plays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities beyond translation</td>
<td>Writing newspaper columns, novels, being activist, giving political speeches and reporting for tabloids</td>
<td>Writing novels, poems, critical essays, biographies, teaching, being military surgeon</td>
<td>Writing short novels, and essays on women’s emancipation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation strategies</td>
<td>Adaptation, reader-focused, but include some foreign elements</td>
<td>Adaptation or literal translation, using classical writing style</td>
<td>Word-for-word in colloquial language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology behind translation practice</td>
<td>Educate the general public and provide entertainments</td>
<td>Disseminate the latest European philosophies and literary movements</td>
<td>Disseminate Victorian concepts of family values and promote women’s education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readership</td>
<td>General public, the literary circle</td>
<td>Middle class, elites, university students, the literary circle</td>
<td>Young women, children, the literary circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persona</td>
<td>Righteous, moralist, peculiar habits, scared by some people, highly talented writer, business man, and expert in English</td>
<td>Moralist, authoritarian, austere, talented writer, elite, authorial figure within the literary circle</td>
<td>Talented translator, educated modern woman, the wife of Iwamoto, and immoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage</td>
<td>Critics’ reviews (praises), gossip and scandals</td>
<td>Critics’ reviews (praises)</td>
<td>Critics’ reviews (praises), photographic image of herself in literary magazines (scandalous)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Questionnaire samples used for the translators in Chapter Five

B-1. Pilot questionnaire for Japanese translators

文芸翻訳家の方へのアンケート
[Questionnaire for literary translators]

1. 性別：
[Gender]
2. 翻訳歴： 年
[Career length]
3. 翻訳が主な職業である（下から選んでください）
[Is translator your sole profession? (Please select)]

はい ・ いいえ、副業である

[Yes / No]

「いいえ」の場合、本業は何ですか。

[If “No”, please describe your primary profession]

4. 翻訳・語学に関係する訓練、学歴、資格などあれば記入してください。
[Have you had any training in translation and/or language studies?]

5. 起点言語（例：英語、フランス語）
[What is your source language?]?

6. 今まで翻訳した作品の数（一冊の書籍に限らない。短編小説、詩も含む）
[How many translations have you published so far? (Include poems and short stories.)]

7. 専門のジャンル（ミステリー、純文学、児童文学など）
[Are you specialized in any particular literary genres?]
翻訳作業に関して（あてはまるものを選んでください。）
[Translation processes (please select a relevant answer)]

8. 編集者の意向はあなたの翻訳作業にどの程度影響しますか。
   [How much does the editor’s opinion influence the way you translate?]
   大きく影響する・まあまあ影響する・あまり影響しない・まったく影響しない・どちらとも言えない
   [Significantly / Somewhat / Not much / Not at all / It depends / Don’t know]

9. 影響するとしたら、主にどのような場合ですか。
   [Can you give any examples or illustrations when this has been important? (e.g. relating to cultural sensitivity, potential omission, etc.)]

10. 翻訳をする際に気をつけること
    [If forced to choose, which is more important to you when translating?]
    原文の風合いや意味に忠実であること重視する・日本語の読みやすさを重視する・どちらとも言えない
    [Conveying the meanings of the source text / Fluency / Don’t know]

11. 翻訳家としての自分の存在を主張するような翻訳手法を使いますか。
    [Do you consciously make yourself visible as the translator in the target text by using particular translation strategies? (e.g. retaining idioms from the source language etc.)]
    はい・いいえ・どちらとも言えない
    [Yes / No / Don’t know]

12. 上記で「はい」と答えた場合、どのような手法ですか。例えば、自分の色を出す、独特な文体や言い回しをつかうなど。
    [If answered yes, please describe how]
翻訳活動について
[Translation practice]

13. 文芸翻訳家としての自分の役割は何だと思いますか。（複数の選択可）
[What do you think your role as a literary translator is? (Multiple answers possible)]
原作者の代弁者である ・ 読者に新しい文学を紹介する ・ 特定の海外文学に関するエキスパートである ・ 語学のエキスパートである ・ ただの仕事として翻訳をしている ・ 文化的貢献 ・ エンターテイメントの提供 ・ 著名人 ・ その他（述べてください）

[Representative of the source author / Introducing readers to new literature / Foreign literature expert / Language expert / It’s just a job / Cultural contributor / Entertainment provider / Celebrity / Others]

14. 文芸翻訳家としての実績は相応に評価されていると思いますか。
[Do you feel that your status and works as a translator have been evaluated fairly?]
はい ・ いいえ ・ どちらとも言えない

[Yes / No / Don’t know]

15. 翻訳家としての知名度を上げるために必要だと思われるのは次のどれですか。（複数の選択可）
[What factors do you think help in raising the level of recognition of a translator? (Multiple answers possible)]
キャリアを積む ・ 翻訳技術を磨く ・ 有名作品を数多く翻訳する ・ メディアでの露出度を高めて名前を売る（雑誌でのインタビュー、ブログ、作品の宣伝など） ・ 翻訳業以外で知名度を築ける職業（例えば、作家、大学教授など） ・ その他（述べてください）

[Experience / Translation skills / Translating the works of famous authors / Media exposure (interviews, blogs, promotion etc.) / Having another}
profession that brings fame or renown (e.g. writers, academics) / Others (Please describe)

16. あなたにとって優れた文芸翻訳（ノンフィクションは除く）とはどういうものですか。（複数の選択可）

What is a good literary translation to you? (Multiple answers possible)]

原文の要素がちゃんと伝わっているもの・読みやすい文章・読んで面白い・日本語としての文章がきれいである・原文の一語一語がきちんと訳されている・創造性がある・よくわからない・その他（述べてください）

The one which transmits the essence of the source text / Readable / Entertaining to read / Beautifully written in the target language / The source text is accurately interpreted / Creative / Don’t know / Others (please describe)

17. 翻訳する作品は持ち込むことが多いですか？それとも編集者から依頼されることが多いですか。

Do you usually approach publishers to propose translation? Or do publishers approach you to commission a work?

持ち込みが多い・依頼が多い・半々である・どちらとも言えない

I normally approach publishers with my own work / I normally get approached by publishers who commission works / Both / Don’t know

18. 翻訳対象となる海外文学の選択を編集者から依頼されることはありますか。

Do publishers seek your advice or suggestions for choices of potential source texts for translation?

ある・ない・どちらとも言えない

Yes / No / Don’t know
19. 文芸翻訳家として仕事上の満足度は
[How do you rate your satisfaction with life as a literary translator?]
大変満足している・不満である・どちらとも言うえない
[Highly satisfied / Not satisfied / Don't know]

20. 「満足している」と答えた場合、どういう点で満足ですか。
[If you answered “Satisfied” in the previous question, with what particular aspect(s) are you satisfied?]

21. 「不満である」と答えた場合、どういう点で不満ですか。
[If you answered “Not satisfied” in the previous question, please describe the main reason(s)?]

22. 翻訳活動についてインタビューをされたことはありますか。
[Have you been interviewed about your translation practice?]

23. 書評にあなたの名前は出ていますか。
[Has your name been included in reviews?]
いつも出ている・大抵出ている・出るときもある・全く出ない・よくわからない
[Yes, regularly / Occasionally / Rarely / Not at all / Don’t know]

24. いつも特定の出版社と取引をしますか。
[Do you regularly work with particular publishers?]
毎回同じ出版社の翻訳をする・複数の出版社の翻訳をしている・特に決まっていない・わからない
[I regularly translate for the same range of publishers / I translate for several publishers / It depends / Don’t know]

25. 「同じ出版社」と答えた場合、理由は何ですか。
[If you answered “I regularly translate for the same range of publishers” in the previous question, please state the reason.]
26. 読者との直接的なコミュニケーションをとっていますか。

[Do you have direct communication with your readers?]

はい・いいえ

[Yes / No]

27. 「はい」の場合、それはどういう方法ですか？(例えば、ブログなど)

[If you answered “Yes”, please describe the means of communication]

B-2. Main questionnaire for Japanese translators

翻訳家の方へのアンケート

[Questionnaire for literary translators]

*The main questionnaire consists of the same questions listed above which incorporates additional eight questions below.

1. 創作力はどの程度重要ですか。
   [To what extent is creativity important to you?]
2. 訳者あとがきは通常付けますか。
   [Do you regularly include translator’s afterword?]
3. どういう目的・理由で。
   [What is your reason/purpose for including translator’s afterword?]
4. 主な内容は。
   [What is the usual content of your translator’s afterword?]
5. ご自身が著名であることに対してどう思われますか。
   [What do you think of your being prominent?]
6. 新聞・雑誌、テレビなどにインタビューをされたことはありますか。
   [Have you been interviewed by newspapers, magazines or television programs?]
7. 最後に、自分の作品を読んでくれる読者に期待するものは何ですか。
8. [Finally, what is your expectations from the readers of your translations?]
APPENDIX C

Questionnaire samples used for Japanese and UK publishers in Chapter Five

C-1. 出版社の方へのアンケート
[Questionnaire for publishers]

文芸翻訳出版の企画
[The process of publication for translated literature]\(^1\)
1. 通常、文芸翻訳本の出版を企画するにあたって、特定のジャンルにこだわりますか。 [On the basis of what criteria do you choose the genre of literature for translation?]
2. そのジャンルを選択するのは誰の仕事ですか。 (例えば、出版社、編集者、リテラリー・エージェントなど) [Who chooses?]
3. 通常、原作を選択するのは誰の仕事ですか。 (例えば、出版社、編集者、又はリテラリー・エージェント、翻訳者など。) [Who choose the source texts?]
4. 新訳の出版には特に力を入れていますか。その理由は何ですか。 [Do you promote the publication of reinterpretations? If so, why?]

翻訳者
[Translators]
5. 通常、翻訳を依頼する訳者の選択をするのは誰の仕事ですか。 [Who chooses the translators?]
6. ジャンルによって、特定の翻訳者を選びますか。 (例えば、現代アメリカ文学ならこの人、とか。) [Do you choose particular translators for particular genres?]

\(^1\) The back translations in bracket are the same questions used for the UK publishers.
7. 翻訳者の著名度は翻訳者の選択に影響しますか。例えば、名作は著名翻訳家に依頼する、など。[Does the prominence of translator affect your choice of translator?]

8. 通常、翻訳者を選ぶ際の基準とはどのようなものですでしょうか。[On the basis of what criteria do you choose a translator?]

9. 通常、翻訳者への報酬はどのような形で支払われますか。例えば、印税、買い取りなど。[What is the method of payment for the works of translation?]

10. 著名翻訳家の報酬は著名でない翻訳者に比べて高いですか。[Does the prominence of the translator affect the price of the fee?]

11. 翻訳者の報酬を決める際、何を基準にしますか。例えば、著名度や翻訳技術、そして経験など。[On the basis of what criteria do you decide on the translators’ fees?]

12. 報酬は何を基準に上りますか。例えば、キャリアなど。[On the basis of what criteria do translators’ fees go up?]

翻訳過程

[The process of translation]

13. 翻訳のスタイルの選択（例えば、読みやすい翻訳、原作の国の文化が反映されている翻訳など）については翻訳者と出版社どちらに権限がありますか。[Who has more authority on the choices of translation strategies, translator or publisher?]

14. 出版社は翻訳を依頼する際、特定なスタイルの指定、または奨励をしたりしますか。[Do you suggest or specify particular translation strategies when commissioning a translator?]

15. 校正は誰がどのように行いますか。[How and who does editing?]

16. 翻訳者の著名度によって校正に対する姿勢は変わりますか。（例えば、著名であるほど校正は少ない、など。）[Does the prominence of translator affect your attitude towards editing?]
編集者

[Editor]

17. 編集者は語学に堪能である必要がありますか。[Does an editor need to have foreign language skills?]

18. 編集者はどのように翻訳者と仕事を進めていますか。（例えば、相談しながら仕事を進めていく、若しくは編集者は出来た作品を受け取るのみなど）
[How does an editor work with translators?]

19. 編集者は翻訳者を育てることに積極的ですか。（例えば、新人には短編から初めてもらって、キャリアを積んでもらう、など。）[Does an editor actively get involved in training translators?]

宣伝方法

[Marketing strategies]

20. 一般的に、文庫本の宣伝はどのように行いますか。（例えば、ホームページでの宣伝広告掲載、取引先の書店への指導、など。）[How do you normally promote books?]

21. 文芸翻訳に限った宣伝方法はありますか。あれば、それはどういうものですか。[Do you have any particular marketing strategies for translated literature?]

22. 文芸翻訳の宣伝で特にアピールする点は何ですか。（例えば、原作、もしくは原作者の人気度、又は内容の面白さ、翻訳者、など。）[How do you promote translated literature?]

23. 原作の言語によって宣伝の本法は変わりますか。（例えば、アメリカ文学の時と北欧、ドイツ、フランス文学の時の違いなど。）[Do you have different marketing strategies depending on the source language?]

24. 特定の作品、又はそのジャンルによって宣伝方法は変わりますか。（例えば、新人作家の作品の時と有名作家の作品の時、あるいはクラシック文学と現代文学の時の違いなど。）[Do you have different marketing strategies depending on genres or particular works?]
25. 翻訳者の名前、著名度は翻訳文学の宣伝の方法に影響しますか。（例えば、翻訳者が著名であればあるほど、本の表紙に記載される翻訳者の名前が大きくなるとか。) [How translators’ celebrity or names affect marketing strategies?]

文芸翻訳
[Translated literature]

26. 貴社にとって文芸翻訳作品にはどのような価値がありますか。 [What is the significance of translated literature to you as a publisher?]

27. 翻訳専用のブランド（imprint）がありますか。 [Do you have different imprint for translated literature?]

28. 最近の文芸翻訳のトレンドはどういうものですか。 [What is the current trend in translated literature.]

その他
[Others]

29. 海外のブックフェアに参加しますか。もしそうだとしたら、その理由は何ですか？（例えば、著作権取得のため、など）[Do you go to book fairs abroad? Why? It is to secure foreign rights?]