Shin-ichi Ichikawa

FURTHER THOUGHTS ON TRANSLATION IN JAPAN AS COMPARED WITH THE FRENCH TRADITION[1]

Foreword

In his book *After Babel*, George Steiner states that "[n]inety percent, no doubt, of all translation since Babel is inadequate and will continue to be so(1)". In a country such as Japan, where much ink has flowed in discussing the problem of mistranslation, that statement by an eminent expert on the subject takes on weighty significance.

I can only add that historically speaking translation that was faithful to the original text never wielded any great influence in the past. I will return to this idea more than once in this article.

Since the period that preceded and followed the Meiji Restoration in Japan (1868), the translation into Japanese of texts on new technologies or of philosophical and scientific works published in Europe and the United States has played an important role in the modernisation of Japan.

At an era when our language still did not have words to translate Western terms and when the first Japanese translators had no time to coin appropriate neologisms, translation left various "distortions" in its wake, but I will not dwell on those problems here, since I have discussed them at greater length in a recent article that appeared in the latest issue of *Cahiers internationaux de symbolisme*(2).

Given the historical background, in which the fate of the new Meiji Government depended on the quality of Japanese translations, numerous critical works on translation in Japan have appeared.

However, as CHINO Eichi notes, "very few critical works have dealt with the problems of translation in Japan from a linguistic point of view(3)" and, as another

---

[1] English text of my paper, an earlier version of which originally appeared in Japanese in the *Bulletin of The Institute of Language Teaching*, Waseda University. No. 55 (2000). pp. 21-40. I wish to take this opportunity to thank Prof, Paul Snowden (Waseda University) and Ms. Kathy Durnin (University of Calgary) for their valuable assistance.

contemporary Japanese critic has also stated, "very few people have written on translation theory[4]". That is because in Japan, the books on translation published thus far have become a sort of "translation key" or ill-intended works that point out bits of nonsense or egregious sections of bad translations.

I feel personally that the French tradition as I have come to know it is quite different from the Japanese, and I would therefore like to elucidate the nature of that tradition in the pages that follow.

I. The tradition of the "Belles Infidèles" in France

In the work cited above, George Steiner insists that:

> French pre-eminence in the theory of translation during this period [i.e., the sixteenth century] was no accident: it reflected the political and linguistic centrality of French culture during and after the break-up of European Latinity (a phenomenon which, of course, inspired the search for an agreed discipline of translation)[5].

Although Latin had been in decline since the Renaissance, one might say that the classical language survived in Europe, generally speaking, until the late eighteenth century.

The good French translators of the Renaissance went on to exert enormous influence on those who came later. Among the most outstanding names was Étienne Dolet (1509-46), author of *La manière de bien traduire d'une langue en l'autre* (1540). This French theoretician was followed by Jacques Amyot (1513-93), a well-known French translator, who translated Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* (1559) and Longus's *Daphnis and Chloë* (1547) into French. Jacques Amyot's method was marked by his characteristic cuts to the original text or the addition of words that did not exist in the original. His intention was to transmit to the reader the genuine meaning of the text[6].

From the seventeenth century on, as was required by the doctrine of classical drama, French translators tried to "please" the reader (see on this subject *Histoire de la traduction en Occident* (1991) by Henri Van Hoop)[7].

To cite only a few representative names, we would first mention Nicolas Perrot d'Ablancourt (1606-64).

The French method of translation was called "Les Belles Infidèles" because it consisted of making a text more readable, although the translation that resulted was to some extent remote from the original. According to Henri Van Hoop, the expression "Les Belles Infidèles" comes from the criticism by Ménage (1613-1691) of a translation done by Nicolas Perroe[8].

In the meantime Gaspard Bachet de Mézière (1581-1638) published his book on translation, aimed at criticising the additions and excisions made by Jacques Amyot, but might one not venture to say that in France, even today, the French maintain to a great extent this tradition of "Les Belles Infidèles"?

II. Translation theory in Eighteenth-Century France

Daniel Mornet, for many years the head of eighteenth-century French literature at the Sorbonne, notes in his book *La Pensée française au XVIIIe siècle* that the French were fascinated by anything that was foreign at that time, but that their sense of propriety prevented them from being strongly influenced by that interest. He states the matter thus:

> … they [these impatient curious minds] never really created anything, did not even overthrow anything. All those whom one reads, whom one praises, whom one imitates, are discussed, corrected, and often deformed. The French mind borrows from them only that which it has already conceived of, and has a taste only for that which flatters old tastes(9).

He goes on to say:

> And each time someone does a translation of English – or Oriental or Scandinavian – writers, they leave in them what is specifically foreign, what makes Swift resemble Swift alone, Ossian resemble only Ossian, and whether it is Swift's *Gulliver* or a Shakespeare play, a novel by Fielding or Richardson, poems by Ossian or Gœthe's *Werther*, translations are always adaptations(10).

We know that in the eighteenth century Abbé Prévost, the author of *Manon Lescaut*, was well known for his French translations of many English novels, including those of British novelist Samuel Richardson. He translated *Clarissa* in 1751 and *Grandisson* in 1753-74 successively.

However, Robert Niklaus, one of the greatest English experts in eighteenth-century literature, has the following to say about them:

> In 1753-54 the *History of Sir Charles Grandisson* appeared in seven volumes. Prévost translated it under the title *Nouvelles lettres angloises ou Histoire du Chevalier Grandisson* (1755-56). As with *Clarissa*, he made many cuts and toned down scenes of emotional and physical violence so as to render Richardson more acceptable to the French and *Grandisson* ran into many editions. It exercised an influence on Rousseau, as Clarissa had done previously(11).

We also know that Abbé Prévost in his translations of Samuel Richardson boldly made additions to and excisions from the texts, but Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who was unable to read the originals, read these novels, badly translated by Prévost, and wrote his masterpiece *La Nouvelle Héloïse* (1761), under the strong influence of the English novelist.

At the beginning of my paper I noted that, historically speaking, faithful translation has not always had a great influence, and on this I can cite Rousseau as a typical example.

III. Some writers of the Enlightenment and their ideas on translation

In contrast to Jean-Jacques Rousseau, one can cite Voltaire (1694-1778) as a French writer of the Enlightenment who was able to read Shakespeare in the original.

However, he translated Hamlet's famous monologue "To be or not to be, that is the question" into French as:

> Demeure, il faut choisir, et passer à l'instant
> De la vie à la mort, ou de l'être au néant[12].

In Japan, where the reader is quite used to reading word-for-word translations, this type of Voltairean adaptation would not be easily accepted but we must also recognise that in France, Voltaire had to submit to the literary and aesthetic requirements of the Eighteenth century.

We need only recall the fact that not only did all playwrights have to obey the rule of the three unities, but they also had to compose tragedies in (Alexandrine) verse. It was only in this form that the French reader would consider them plays.

I might mention, incidentally, that François-Victor Hugo later translated the Shakespearean monologue as follows: "Être ou ne pas être, c'est là la question[13]".

Similarly Diderot, editor-in-chief of the *Encyclopédie* (1751-1772), is known for having translated Shaftesbury's *An Inquiry Concerning Virtue or Merit* (1699; 1745) into French in his youth. Having worked for some time on this encyclopedist, I have had occasion to compare his translation with the original, and I have spent a great deal of time in vain trying to find passages that correspond to one another.

I remember as though it were yesterday my surprise when I read Diderot's preface in which he says: "I read and re-read him: I filled myself with his thought and, so to speak, closed his book when I took up my pen[14]".

To return to Voltaire's conception of translation, I believe it is useful to quote his own comment here: "Do not believe that I have rendered the English word for word; an abomination on makers of literary translations who, by translating each word, irritate the meaning! That is certainly one place where the letter kills, and the spirit revives[15]".

Then, before beginning to render Alexander Pope's poem into French, he made this comment: "What follows is a passage from his poem called 'The Rape of the Lock,' which I have lately translated with my usual liberty; for I must again repeat that I know nothing so execrable as a literal translation of a piece of poetry[16]". Although he did not lay out his idea of translation in so many words, we have just seen that Diderot translated Shaftesbury very freely: as for Voltaire, he was squarely opposed to word-for-word translation.

These considerations lead me to think that the French remained firmly attached to the tradition of the "Belles Infidèles" right up until the Eighteenth century.

IV. Various specific problems of translation in Japan

Compared with the cultural conditions for translation in Japan, it is clear that conditions have been quite different in the West.

For one thing, a foreign country in Europe usually means a neighbouring country. Secondly, some Europeans live in border towns and have access to their neighbours' radio and television, assimilating their language without learning it as a foreign language.

Moreover, in France and Switzerland as well as in Belgium, where one finds a large number of refugees from abroad, the children of those refugees and subsequent generations often grow up bilingual or even trilingual.

What seems to us unique in the West, for translations, is the frequency of collaborative work between authors and translators, which makes for better translations, as in the case of Joseph Conrad and André Gide, Rilke and Maurice Betz, James Joyce and Valéry-Larbaud, etc.

What I mean by this is that in discussions of translation theory in Western countries, problems most often arise from the cultural context between these countries and their neighbours.

Georges Mounin, who looked at the problem seriously from a linguistic point of view, stresses the near-homogeneity of the West when he cites the following from E. A. Nida's work: "most of the translations we are familiar with were done within the Indo-European linguistic family and, for the most part, culture in this linguistic area is relatively homogeneous(17)". Similarly, Eugenio Coseriu in his excellent article feels that translation consists of transmitting "equivalencies from one language to another(18)", but he seems to think that translatability is possible only between European languages.

In addition, it is rare for most well-educated Europeans to have no knowledge of a language other than their own. Unlike in Japan, where the reader is often very fuzzy on the details of translation, it seems to me that the Western reader pays more attention to the style or readability of the translation than to its accuracy.

Finally, I should add that it is rare that the translator's name is placed side by side with the author's, as is the case in Japan. In other words, I have the impression that in the West you have a long tradition of underestimating the work of translation.

I have already discussed good Western translators such as Constance Garnett in detail in my previous article, and there is no need to repeat myself on that subject.

V. Historical and cultural problems of translation in Japan

Going back to the Meiji Restoration (1868) (i.e., the period that preceded and followed it), it is safe to say that the Japanese needed translations of military and scientific texts published in the West because they absolutely had to find out their contents quickly in order to modernise the country as rapidly as possible.

During the long period when the country was closed, when Dutch was the language that served as a bridge in bringing Western civilisation to Japan, the same reason explains

the near instantaneous replacement of Dutch by English, which had spread to the four corners of the earth.

As the critic KIMURA Ki has aptly noted, "translation of [Western] literature was the last to arrive(19)" since the movement towards modernisation took precedence over everything else in Japan.

FUTABATEI Shimei, both an excellent translator of Russian literature and the first translator to modernise the Japanese language, was well known for having abandoned literature, remarking that it was not a worthy vocation for a man. His greatest concern was how to stem imperial Russia's southward advancer(20).

At that time, the Japanese had to know as quickly as possible the contents of important documents published in the United States and other Western countries, since the fate of the New Japan might be highly dependent on that knowledge.

These specific circumstances forced Japanese translators of the Meiji era to concoct nonsensical neologisms without taking their meaning into account instead of using the traditional language, called *yamato*(21).

It is important to note that as a result of that practice a fundamental idea of translation took root in the Japanese mind according to which words used for translation did not belong to our traditional language.

In short, was it at that time that the Japanese began to feel that words for translation were completely different from everyday words?

Here I would like to draw your attention to another unique phenomenon that probably did not exist in the West, though it may have existed in China or Korea: the phenomenon of retranslation from the English translation, instead of from a text in its original language.

TANIZAKI Jun'ichirô remembers being an avid reader of retranslations:

> I read foreign literature with a passion, many decades ago. At that time, Japanese translations of works had almost all been done from the English translation, whether it was French or Russian literature, and were often botched, if memory serves. Also, not as many novels had been translated as today, and we all read *Crime and Punishment* and *Anna Karenina* as retranslations(22).

He was not unaware of the faults of works translated into Japanese in this way:

> The vast knowledge that today's young Japanese people have of the world is based on an atrocious style of translation. When I learned a bit of French, I read Maupassant in the original and I was astonished to find that the Maupassant I had been reading was completely different from the real Maupassant. Today's young people have gained their knowledge from retranslation. Of course, it is better to have that sort than none at all…. (23)

As TANIZAKI Jun'ichirô has noted, this peculiar phenomenon existed in Japan until the end of the Taishô era, that is, until the 1920s, especially for Russian literature, and

Japanese translators had no qualms about doing Japanese retranslations from English translations. Here one need only cite the novelist HIROTSU Kazuo, who translated both French and Russian literary works into Japanese.

It is HIROTSU who translated Guy de Maupassant's *Une vie* into Japanese in 1914, based on the English translation. His translation went through numerous editions, even in paperback (31 editions).

I might mention in passing that TANIZAKI Seiji, the brother of the great novelist TANIZAKI whom I quoted above, has evoked the literary atmosphere of the School of Literature at Waseda, which graduated most of the first Japanese translators of foreign literature: "At that time, many students came to the School of Literature of Waseda wanting to learn about European literature through the English language – there were few who wanted to study only English literature(24)".

Finally, with reference to the introduction of Russian literature into Japan, EGAWA Taku has explained in his article(25) that once excellent Japanese translators specialising in Russian literature had entered the field of literature in Japan – translators such as NOBORU Shomu, YONEKAWA Masao and NAKAMURA Hakuyô – Japanese retranslators of Russian literature continued to exist side by side with them, and the same critic attributes this peculiar phenomenon to two reasons: (1) the foretaste of the attraction of Russian literature in Japan and (2) the total lack of Russian-speaking Japanese.

As he notes, however, it is undeniably impossible to speak of its introduction into Japan without mentioning the problem of Japanese retranslation from the English translation(26).

With that example, one can see the unique role played by the practice of retranslation and reiterate that translation that is faithful to the original has not always exerted a great influence.

VI. Problems of translation and modernisation in Japan

In the foregoing pages, having alluded to the specific phenomenon of retranslation in Japan that arose because the linguistic system of Japanese was completely different from that of European languages, I referred, among others, to the case of its expedience in the introduction of French and Russian literature into Japan given the absence of French- and Russian-speaking Japanese. To avoid misunderstandings, however, I wish to point out that I have no intention of underestimating the work of retranslation in Japan.

Whatever the merits or drawbacks of retranslation and mistranslation in Japan, if one attaches too great an importance to subsequent influence, one would have to overestimate the positive role played early in the Meiji era by the Japanese translation (1871) of *Self-Help, with Illustrations of Character and Conduct* (John Murray, 1858) by Samuel Smiles (1812-1904)(27).

The latter was known in Europe for having devoted a number of studies to the Huguenot refugees, because they included several people who did important work in various fields.

In the case of Japan in particular, however, I believe that NAKAMURA Tadanao's (1832-1891) Japanese translation of *Self-Help*, as well as another important book, FUKUZAWA Yukichi's *An Encouragement of Learning*, served as a basic work for the enlightenment of the new generation of Japanese in the Meiji era.

With reference to the famous translation of Samuel Smiles done by NAKAMURA Tadanao in 1871, I am far from believing that it would serve no purpose to mention his additions and excisions, whether purposeful or accidental, given the cultural context of the Meiji era[28]. It seems to me that rather than to examine in detail the errors committed by the Japanese translator, it is more important to appreciate the positive role this translation played in giving the former samurai, suddenly deprived of their traditional ethos, a new vision of the world by teaching them the protestant ethic of "self-help."

Similarly, with reference to the translation of Arthur Symons' *The Symbolist Movement in Literature* (London, William Heinemann, 1899) done in 1913 by IWANO Hômei (1873-1920), the Japanese critic KAWAKAMI Tetsutarô would later say that "… strictly speaking, I was educated by that book [i.e., IWANO's translation] during that crucial period. I had only two close friends at the time, KOBAYASHI Hideo and NAKAHARA Chûya, and the three of us talked in the vocabulary of that book[29]". The Japanese avant-garde of the era was charmed by the new style, despite the quality of the translation, which left much to be desired from a linguistic point of view.

Might not the translator's own declaration that his ambition with that translation was "to cultivate a novel vocabulary[30]", and the fact that his unique initiative in creating the new vocabulary had an unceasing attraction for the avant-garde of the Shôwa era – people such as KAWAKAMI, etc. – be seen as one of the mysteries of translating, yet another instance where faithful translation has not always exerted great influence?

This type of problem is not exclusive to the Japanese cultural context. As I refer to a more typical example of translation in the following pages, I would like to examine this role of translation more closely.

To conclude the foregoing discussion, I believe it is useful to quote here an important remark by KAMEI Shunsuke, a contemporary Japanese critic:

> To return to translated Japanese literature, no matter what one may say of it, all kinds of works have been translated into Japanese in various forms (which has resulted in a series of gaps), and have been widely read. They have often transformed the contents and expression of Japanese literature and in doing so have enriched it[31].

I agree with him entirely in thinking that it will be more useful to emphasise the positive role played by works of translation than to stress their negative side, because in the history of translation throughout the world one can find other examples of translations that are "very free interpretations" but whose influence has been equally great.

VII. Some reasons for the success of the "Belles Infidèles"

As far as their success is concerned, I remember in my youth reading with great interest NAKANO Yoshio's *Remarks on Translation*. The author cited as a typical case that of the extraordinary English translation of Rabelais by Sir Thomas Urquhart.

According to NAKANO, the twenty-eight insults found in the original passage have been increased to forty (types of insults) in the English translation in question, and in another place, nine kinds of birdsong become sixty-seven[32].

I should mention that Urquhart's English translation of Rabelais was published from 1653 to 1694, but if anyone tried to bring out this sort of translation in Japan today, the translator would be vilified and would be unlikely to receive any further translation work.

In 1893 another British translator named Smith brought out a new translation in England, but it does not seem to have had the same success (in sales) as the prior translation!

NAKANO makes his own commentary on this phenomenon:

> In other words, might one not say that the genius of translation can be found in Urquhart's translation of Rabelais? It goes without saying, of course, that linguistic accuracy and a conscientious attitude are called for. Quite simply, the meaning of translation does not consist of doing a word-for-word translation[33].

Recalling his own experiences of doing many translations, he notes that "it had never occurred to him to translate faithfully into Japanese the structure of the original text[34]". It seems to me that his comment is akin to Voltaire's idea of translation, to which I alluded at the beginning of this paper.

As NAKANO stated, in the case of Urquhart, his translation would have had great success amongst the English readership because "he succeeds in rendering much better than the original what we call 'la plaisanterie gauloise' [in French in the original][35]". It seems to me, however, that a translation augmented in this way was well received for another reason.

We know that the Koran was one of the first Muslim texts to be translated by Christians into Western languages. According to Abbé de Cluny, "the purpose of the work is not to propagate foreign values, but to provide the necessary information to better combat Islam. What it aims to propagate are Christian values[36]".

The first Latin translation of the Koran by Robert de Rétines was done in 1142-1143. It was published in 1543 (in Basel), with a further edition in 1550.

In addition, an Italian adaptation appeared in 1547, based on the Basel edition, and German and Dutch versions appeared at the same time. This first Western translation went through many editions from the twelfth century on and was very influential in Europe.

In the meantime, a new Latin translation came out in the thirteenth century but, even though it was a faithful translation, it never had any success and remains in manuscript form to this day.

The success of the translation of the Koran seems to stem from the translator's treatment of passages concerning other religions. In other words, one might say that the

destiny of the translation depended largely on the translator's decision to attenuate the negative aspects of other religions.

The same could be said for subsequent translations into Western languages, since it has been pointed out that Pierre Bayle and the Encyclopedists later held that Muslims and Turks were more tolerant of heretics than were Christians, using as evidence the translation that fit with their ideology.

These considerations lead me to think that without a doubt highly rigorous translations of excellent quality have always been in demand, but one never knows whether that sort of translation will fulfil the ideal conditions for being well received by the public.

Conclusion

I will be brief in my conclusion. To return to recent critical works on translation published in Japan, I will mention here only the publication *Literature* / "Special Issue on Translation" of 1982, to which I have often referred in the past. The most important point is that several Japanese collaborators concurred that with respect to translating foreign novels into Japanese, it is difficult to transcribe passages of conversation into our language. One of them found it arduous to translate into Japanese a play written in dialect, as in the case of the Irish playwright John M. Synge; others spoke of the extreme difficulty of dealing with puns and the dialect of black Americans(37).

I would like to add here something that HIRAOKA Noboru, a Japanese translator, once told me about his personal experience of translating Diderot's *Neveu de Rameau*. The translator told me that his greatest concern in that work was to reproduce the novel's "good-for-nothing tone," but that he finally had to give up despite his relentless efforts!

Moreover, in Japan the translation of German philosophical works is considered the most difficult because they are the hardest to understand, as in the case of Hegel and Heidegger. In the same "Special Issue on Translation", IKUMATSU Keizô, a leading Japanese expert on German philosophy, recognised this and proposed avoiding a literal translation of the German "Wortbildung(38)".

As we know, ever since the beautiful French translation of Hegel's *The Phenomenology of Mind* by Jean Hyppolite, French readers have had much less difficulty reading the great German philosopher.

If one must admit, as George Steiner says, that no translation is one hundred percent perfect, how could Japanese translators render into Japanese the masterpieces of Classical literature and the future great works of the entire world?

In the same "Special Issue on Translation" of 1982, WATANABE Kazutami, one of the Japanese collaborators, cites the case of the Japanese translation of Paul Morand's *Ouvert la nuit*, explaining the enormous sensation produced in the literary world by HORIGUCHI Daigaku's translation, and states that "it was owing to the novelty of his style(39)" and that "the novel translated into Japanese had a new meaning, different from the meaning it had had in France(40)".

In conclusion, I hope that I have elucidated to some extent the status, past and present, of the work of translation in Japan.

Notes

(1) George Steiner, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. p. 417.

(2) See my article, ICHIKAWA Shin-ichi. "Les problèmes de la traduction et la modernité japonaise" in *Cahiers internationaux de symbolisme*. Nos. 92-93-94, pp. 91-100, as well as its English version in *The Bulletin of The Institute of Language Teaching*, No. 56 (2001) under the title "Positive and negative aspects and current consequences of translation since the modernization of Japan". pp. 1-14.

(3) CHINO Eiichi, "On the Translatable and the Untranslatable from the Linguistic Point of View" in *Literature* / "Special Issue on Translation" [in Japanese]. (Iwanami, 1982). p. 230.

(4) HIRAKO Yoshio, *The Principal of Translation* [in Jap.] (Ed. Taishûkan, 1999).

(5) G. Steiner, *op. cit.* p. 276.

(6) Myriam Salama-Carr, "French Tradition" in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Edited by Mona Baker, assisted by Kirsten Malmkjaer (Routledge, 1998). p. 410.

(7) Henri Van Hoop, *Histoire de la Traduction en Occident*. (Duculot, 1991). p. 48.

(8) *Ibid.*, pp. 48-49.

(9) Daniel Mornet, *La Pensée française au XVIIIe siècle*. (Armand Colin, 1969). p. 28.

(10) *Ibid.*, p. 29.

(11) Robert Niklaus, *A Literary History of France / The Eighteenth Century* 1715-1789. (Benn, 1970). p. 114.

(12) Voltaire, *Lettres philosophiques*. Ed. René Pomeau (Coll. GF Flammarion). p. 122.

(13) Shakespeare, *Théâtre complet*. t. 11. Trans. François-Victor Hugo (Garnier, 1961). p. 768.

(14) Diderot, *O. C.* Ed. Assézat-Tourneux. t. 1. p. 16.

(15) Voltaire. *op. cit.* p. 122.

(16) Voltaire, *The Works of Voltaire*. Trans. William F. Fleming. Vol. XXXIX. (Paris, E. R. Dumont, 1901). p. 93.

(17) Quoted by Georges Mounin, *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction*. (Gallimard, 1963). p. 217.

(18) Eugenia Coseriu, "Portée et Limite de la Traduction" in *Cahiers de l'École de Traduction et d'Interprétation* No. 19. (Hiver 1997-1998). pp. 19-34.

(19) KIMURA Ki, *Overview of the History of Translation in Japan*. (Ed. Chikuma, 1972). [in Jap.] p. 375.

(20) See OKETANI Hideaki, *FUTABATEI Shimei and Meiji Japan*. (Ed. Bungeishunjû, 1986). [in Jap.]

(21) YANABU Akira, *History of the Formation of Words for Translation*. (Iwanami, 1982). [in Jap.] pp. 36-37.
(22) Quoted by OSHIMA Masaki, "Comparative Literature and Culture" No. 3. in *The Culture of Translation in Modern Japan*, ed. KAMEI Shunsuke. (Ed. Chûôkôron, 1994). [in Jap.] p. 368.
(23) *Ibid.* p. 370.
(24) TANIZAKI Seiji, *KASAI Zenzô and HIROTSU Kazuo*. (Ed. Shunjûsha, 1972). [in Jap.] p. 175.
(25) EGUCHI Taku, "Retranslation: the Case of Russian Literature" in "*Special Issue on Translation*." p. 251.
(26) *Ibid*.
(27) Arthur Symons, *The Symbolist Movement in Literature*. (London, William Heinemann, 1899). 198 p.
(28) KAWANISHI Susumu, see the previously cited edition of KAMEI Shunsuke, pp. 90-92.
(29) KAWAMURA Jirô, *Japanese for Translation*. / "The World of Japanese". No. 15. (Ed. Chûôkôron, 1981). [in Jap.] p. 81.
(30) Quoted by KAWAMURA Jirô. p. 164.
(31) KAMEI Shunsuke, "Western Civilisation and Japanese Tradition", *op. cit.* p. 49.
(32) NAKANO Yoshio, *Remarks on Translation in Evening Chats on English Literature*. (Ed. Shinchôsha, 1971). [in Jap.] p. 110.
(33) *Ibid.* p. 114.
(34) *Ibid.* p. 118.
(35) *Ibid.* p. 111.
(36) Yves Gambier, "Les Traducteurs, Importateurs de valeurs culturelles" in *Les Traducteurs dans l'Histoire*, ed. Jean Delisle and Judith Woodworth. (U. of Ottawa P, 1995) p. 195 ff.
(37) See "*Special Issue on Translation.*" p. 71, p. 246 and p. 340.
(38) IKUMATSU Keizô, "The Translation of Philosophical Works: the Case of Heidegger". *Ibid*. p. 367-368.
(39) WATANABE Kazutami, "Translation as Literature: on the Novel, Paul Morand's *Ouvert la nuit*". *Ibid*. p. 386.
(40) *Ibid*. p. 387.

Reference: *Bulletin of the Institute of Language Teaching* (Waseda University, Japan), No. 57, 2002, p. 155-174.