

Narrative Structure in Two English Translations of Tanizaki Jun'ichirō's *Shunkinshō*⁽¹⁾

Rihito MITSUI

Introduction: Two English translations of the same work

Shunkinshō 春琴抄 (The Story of Shunkin or A Portrait of Shunkin), one of the most acclaimed works by Tanizaki Jun'ichirō 谷崎潤一郎 (1886-1965), has been translated into English twice. Although classical works of Japanese literature such as *Genji monogatari* 源氏物語 (The Tale of Genji) and *Makura no sōshi* 枕草子 (The Pillow Book) have been translated multiple times, it is rare for a work of modern Japanese fiction to be translated into English twice, though there are a few exceptions such as Natsume Sōseki's 夏目漱石 (1867-1916) *Botchan* 坊っちゃん (Botchan) and *Kokoro* こゝろ (Kokoro). The two translations of *Shunkinshō* are interesting, too, because the first translation was published during the war, in the 1930s, when the Japanese government was attempting to export Japanese literature, while the second translation was published in the post-war period, when the image of modern Japanese literature in the United States had to some extent already been fixed by the many translations published during the 1950s. Edward Fowler argues that English translations of modern Japanese fiction in the 1950s—in particular, translations of works by Tanizaki, Kawabata Yasunari 川端康成 (1899-1972), and Mishima Yukio 三島由紀夫 (1925-1970)—produced “the postwar image of Japan in America—an exoticized, aestheticized, and quintessentially foreign land quite antithetical to its prewar image of a bellicose and imminently threatening power,” and that the translations may have limited the readership for modern Japanese literature.⁽²⁾

The first English translation of *Shunkinshō* appeared alongside another work of Tanizaki's, *Ashikari* 蘆刈 (The Reed Cutter), and was published in 1936 as *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin: Modern Japanese Novels*, by the Japanese publisher Hokuseidō Press 北星堂書店, which specialized in English textbooks and introductory books on Japan. The second translation, “A Portrait of Shunkin,” appeared in *Seven Japanese Tales*, a collection of Tanizaki's short stories, published in 1963 by the influential American publisher Alfred A. Knopf. Although these two translations were produced in contrasting situations, no study has yet examined the

differences in detail.⁽³⁾ While the strategy of the 1963 version has been studied to some extent,⁽⁴⁾ the translation strategy used in the 1936 version has yet to be considered.⁽⁵⁾ A comparison between the two translations of *Shunkinshō* is an interesting case study that reveals how contexts in which translations appeared lead to significant differences in the translated texts.

This paper begins with a consideration of the respective backgrounds of the two translations, in terms of the translator, the publisher, and the multifaceted network of readers. I rely on three separate conceptualizations of the reader: the intended reader, the actual reader, and the implied reader.⁽⁶⁾ The intended reader is the reader to whom a publisher or a translator markets a translation. The actual reader is the readership that actually exists and reads the translation. The implied reader is the reader who is constructed by or within the text itself. According to Wolfgang Iser, the concept of the implied reader is “a textual structure anticipating the presence of a recipient without necessarily defining him: this concept prestructures the role to be assumed by each recipient, and this holds true even when texts deliberately appear to ignore their possible recipient or actively exclude him. Thus the concept of the implied reader designates a network of response-inviting structures, which impel the reader to grasp the text.”⁽⁷⁾ After an examination of the intended reader and the actual reader, I will analyze the translations themselves with a focus on the narrative structure created by the narrator and the implied reader. By focusing on the rhetorical structure of the prose, I reveal the different positioning of the narrator in each of the two translations. Considering how the unique rhetoric of *Shunkinshō* was translated into English could help us better understand how Japanese literature was received in Japan in the 1930s, as well as in the United States in the 1960s. This case study of the two translations of *Shunkinshō* is important, first, as a demonstration of usefulness of applying the notion of the three types of readers to the analysis of the translations produced in different contexts; and, second, because it provides a way to untangle the relationship between a translation and its readers in a situation in which we have limited access to information about actual readership.

Shunkinshō by Tanizaki Jun'ichirō

Shunkinshō first appeared in June 1933 in the magazine *Chūōkōron* 中央公論, and soon gained acclaim as a modern classic. A famous review by Masamune Hakuchō 正宗白鳥 (1879-1962) suggested that Tanizaki had perfected his art and taken his place alongside the great writers of all ages and countries since he produced *Tade kū mushi* 蓼喰ふ虫 (Some Prefer

Nettles).⁽⁸⁾ *Shunkinshō* was published as a book by Sōgensha 創元社 in December 1933, along with Tanizaki's "Ashikari" and "Kaoyo" 顔世 (Kaoyo).

Shunkinshō is the story of a blind koto and shamisen musician, Mozuya Koto, known by her professional name, Shunkin, and her servant and disciple, Nukui Sasuke. After Shunkin has boiling water poured on her face and suffers a severe burn, Sasuke, who realizes that Shunkin does not want him to see her face, pierces his eyes with a needle and loses his sight. The blind Sasuke continues to serve Shunkin.

Shunkinshō has a visual characteristic embedded in its writing style. For example, it has very long sentences and paragraphs. Some sections of dialogue are included directly within the narrative, and, therefore, some instances of direct speech do not appear in quotation marks. In addition, *Shunkinshō* employs a unique system of punctuation. Tanizaki, in *Bunshō tokuhon* 文章読本 (A Reader on Style), published in 1934, indicates the best method of writing for general readers of his time. For Tanizaki, punctuation should not be used rationally.⁽⁹⁾ Tanizaki reveals his own aims regarding punctuation use as represented in *Shunkinshō*: punctuation is used to cloud the gap between sentences; to lengthen the breath of sentences; and to produce a pale, hazy effect, as though the sentences had been scribbled along with gradually fading ink.⁽¹⁰⁾ Thus, *Shunkinshō* can also be read as an experiment with the concrete visuality of the written word.

A further characteristic of *Shunkinshō* is the narrative structure. In "Shunkinshō kōgo" 春琴抄後語 (Postscript to "A Portrait of Shunkin"),⁽¹¹⁾ Tanizaki writes about his approach in this manner: "[w]hen I wrote 'A Portrait of Shunkin,' the one concern uppermost in my mind was to find the form that would convey the greatest feeling of reality. In the end I settled on the laziest, easiest method for a writer."⁽¹²⁾ The translator of "Shunkinshō kōgo," Anthony H. Chambers, notes that "[i]t would be a mistake, of course, to take what he says at face value."⁽¹³⁾

The text of *Shunkinshō* has been elaborately devised so that an unreliable narrator is given an air of reliability. The narrator, we are told, happened to own an otherwise unknown (because actually non-existent) biography of Shunkin. He visits the graves of both Shunkin and Sasuke, and begins his account by recounting the lives of these two individuals based on the biography. Moreover, this narrator informs us that he has gleaned relevant information from Shigizawa Teru, a musician and former servant for Shunkin and Sasuke in their later years. Having revealed his sources, however, the narrator raises doubts as to their veracity by questioning the reliability of the biography: after all, the main source of this biography could very well have been Sasuke, a man whose profound admiration for Shunkin hardly makes for an

unbiased account. In this way, the narrator invites readers to place their faith not so much in the description of the biography as in the narrator. Moreover, by equating the narrator with Tanizaki himself—this by a smattering of proper nouns, such as the name of a novelist close to Tanizaki, the title of an actual newspaper article, and the title of an actual piece of writing by Tanizaki, which the reader would have been able to access outside the text—and by using the word *dokusha*, or readers, the narrator imbues his narrative with “the greatest feeling of reality.” Overall, this has the effect of establishing a relationship between the inside and the outside of the text, that is, of tentatively forming a connection between the fictional and the historical world. The narrative structure is, at first glance, that of a reliable narrator, effectively equated with Tanizaki, who narrates the life of Shunkin based on what may very well be an unreliable biography. Despite the uncertain veracity of his source material, however, the narrator’s reliability is bolstered in those instances when he seems to tell the story from Sasuke’s viewpoint, as though presenting facts through the mind of a primary eye-witness.

This complex narrative structure has led to some debate about who actually attacked Shunkin.⁽¹⁴⁾ Although the narrator informs us that Shunkin was assaulted by someone, he never mentions the possibility that Sasuke could have been the assailant. Chiba Shunji argues that Sasuke, who longed to remember Shunkin as a paragon of feminine beauty, and, as a means of achieving this, to be blind just as Shunkin was, is most likely the criminal.⁽¹⁵⁾ Nagae Hironobu maintains that there was a tacit agreement between Sasuke, who desired to maintain a vision of Shunkin as an eternal beauty, and Shunkin, who wished Sasuke to go blind for fear that he might otherwise live to see her grow old and lose her bloom.⁽¹⁶⁾ Hata Kōhei argues that Shunkin burned her own face as a means of inducing Sasuke to take his own sight.⁽¹⁷⁾ Maeda Hisanori points out that these three critics treat the story as though it were a straightforward retelling of the relationship between Sasuke and Shunkin, and that, consequently, they overlook the crucial fact that *Shunkinshō* is a story told by a narrator who stands outside that story. Maeda argues that Tanizaki had his narrator recount the events leading up to Sasuke’s conversion of Shunkin into a vision of eternal beauty as a means of vicariously realizing Tanizaki’s own desire for a vision of ideal feminine beauty.⁽¹⁸⁾ Tatsumi Toshi, organizing the text of *Shunkinshō* into six narratological categories—namely, explicit assertions by the narrator, implicit assumptions by the narrator, citations of the biography, Sasuke’s direct narrative, Shunkin’s direct narrative, and information from other witnesses—argues that the many gaps between these categories are aimed at obscuring the (pseudo-)reality of the story, and that there is, therefore, no real sense of objective truth inherent in the narrative structure.⁽¹⁹⁾

Although the controversy has since died down, the fact that such a debate arose shows at a minimum that the reliability of the narrator is open to question.

Considered in this light, it is revealing to examine exactly how this particular sense of reality that Tanizaki achieved in *Shunkinshō*, inspired by an unreliable narrator, can be conveyed through English translations. Before delving into an analysis of the texts of the two translations, the following three sections will deal with the background of the translations, their translators and publishers, and their readers. The succeeding section will then examine in detail the texts in both translations. This analysis aims to consider differences in the manner in which “the greatest feeling of reality” was transmitted in two translations that targeted different audiences, namely, a 1930s Japanese readership, on the one hand, and a 1960s American readership, on the other.

English translations in Japan throughout the 1930s

I will begin by examining the historical background of English translations in Japan during the 1930s. The primary focus concerning the translation of Japanese literature at this early period was the issue of whether or not Japanese literature could be translated at all, and how Japanese people could benefit, from a political perspective, by translating Japanese literature. Publications of modern English translations of classical Japanese literature, along with the establishment of national institutions for cultural diplomacy, promoted interest in translations of Japanese literature, which led to a debate on whether or not *Shunkinshō* should be translated.

The publication of *An Anthology of Haiku: Ancient and Modern*, translated by Miyamori Asatarō 宮森麻太郎 (1869-1952) and published in Japan in 1932 by Taiseidō Press, stimulated discussions on the translatability of Japanese literature. Regarding Miyamori's translation, Komiya Toyotaka argues that, since haiku is one of the most traditional arts, an art bound up most profoundly with Japanese ethnicity, it can be understood only from within the ethnos and traditions of the Japanese people. Translation of haiku, he concludes, is fundamentally impossible.⁽²⁰⁾ In refuting Komiya's argument, Miyamori notes that his anthology of haiku was appreciated in English-language reviews, such as *The London Times* and *The Quarterly Review*, and adds that the introduction of Japanese culture can dispel the world's misunderstandings about Japan: translations of this sort can reveal to foreign readers—more effectively than any governmental foreign policy could—that the Japanese people are lovers of nature and peace, that they, too, are champions of justice.⁽²¹⁾ An important thing to note here is that

Miyamori regards the translation project as another vehicle of foreign diplomacy, as did many intellectuals in Japan during the 1930s. Discussions regarding the translation of haiku continued unabated.⁽²²⁾

The establishment by the Japanese government of institutions for cultural diplomacy reinforced the political aspect of translation. After Japan's withdrawal from the League of Nations in 1933, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs established, in 1934, a national institution to spread Japanese culture called the Kokusai Bunka Shinkōkai (KBS). KBS justified its existence by arguing that international relationships depend not only on political and economic negotiations, but also on exchanges of research, art, film, sports, and national feeling; that there was no institution to introduce Japanese culture on an international scale; and that other civilized countries throughout the world have institutions to spread their culture both domestically and globally, whereby they strive to promote cultural activities.⁽²³⁾ In accordance with its mission, KBS published introductory books about Japanese literature such as *History and Trends of Modern Japanese Literature* (1936) by Kikuchi Kan 菊池寛 (1888-1948) and *Introduction to Contemporary Japanese Literature* (1939) edited by KBS. Moreover, in 1935, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs established a new section in the department of cultural affairs that specialized in international cultural projects. The creation of these institutions enabled the formation of a discourse that framed translation as an element of foreign policy.

It was in the midst of such developments that, in 1935, debates about whether or not *Shunkinshō* should be translated took place, with rumors that KBS had plans to translate it. Kikuchi speculated that the cast of somewhat eccentric characters and the world depicted in *Shunkinshō*, if transmitted via translation to foreign readers, might not be of benefit for Japan.⁽²⁴⁾ Izumi Hachirō agreed with Kikuchi in arguing that KBS would not likely obtain any benefit from the translation.⁽²⁵⁾ However, Yanagisawa Takeshi, first chief of the aforementioned new section that specialized in international cultural policy, denied the rumor about KBS's plan to translate *Shunkinshō*, and asked what sort of benefit could be gained through translation.⁽²⁶⁾ Yanagisawa argued that the introduction of literature outside Japan had two objectives: The first was to introduce Japanese society and culture, that is, to present a vision of Japanese identity. The second was to introduce the literary value of Japanese literature.⁽²⁷⁾ Yanagisawa concludes that *Shunkinshō* is an example of one of the works that can benefit Japan in the second sense.⁽²⁸⁾

Katsumoto Seiichirō held a similar opinion about the importance of translating Tanizaki's works. Katsumoto argued that Shiga Naoya 志賀直哉 (1883-1971) and Tanizaki were not the

sort of authors whose works could be used to reveal the nature of Japanese society to foreign readers; rather, these writers could play a significant role in promulgating the artistic qualities of Japanese literature.⁽²⁹⁾ Katsumoto argued that publishing translations of Japanese literature was a reflection of the belief that the practice of international cultural exchange could ameliorate international tensions that had arisen since the Mukden Incident.⁽³⁰⁾ It should be noted that, in the 1930s, Katsumoto emphasized the significance of foreign publishers and readers. Katsumoto argued that it was important to gain the cooperation of major publishers in foreign countries, and, in this manner, to attract the attention of the general reader. The readership should not be limited to a handful of specialists of Japanese studies living outside Japan.⁽³¹⁾ This approach gauges the success of translations of Japanese literature in terms of their potential distribution abroad. In fact, translations of Japanese literature were disseminated in the 1950s and the 1960s mostly by the American publisher Knopf.

Such arguments as these indicate that the translation of Japanese literature became an important subject among Japanese literary scholars and the Japanese government during the 1930s. Translating Japanese literature was discussed primarily from the perspective of translatability, and in connection with a policy-oriented desire to spread Japanese culture for the benefit of Japan. It was during this time that "The Story of Shunkin" appeared.

"The Story of Shunkin" and Hokuseidō Press

"The Story of Shunkin," like several translations of Japanese literature in the 1930s, was translated as a means for Japanese people to introduce their own culture outside of Japan. A consideration of the viewpoints of both the translator and the publisher helps us to understand the intended reader of this translation in the 1930s market.

"The Story of Shunkin" was co-translated by Okita Hajime 沖田一 (1905-1985) and an English-speaking gentleman named Roy Humpherson (dates unknown).⁽³²⁾ Interestingly, it was translated in Shanghai. Through an arrangement with the Faculty of Letters at Kyoto University, Okita was posted as a teacher of English in 1933 in Shanghai Kyoryū Mindanritsu Nihon Kōtō Jogakkō 上海居留民団立日本高等女学校 (Girls' High School for Japanese Residents in Shanghai). Okita specialized in American literature, in particular, Henry James, and later founded Shanghai studies as a field during his thirteen-year stay in Shanghai. In 1933, Okita rented a room in an apartment that Humpherson owned. Humpherson had stayed on in Shanghai after having worked for the British Embassy in Tokyo. Okita learned that Humpherson wrote book reviews and short novels, and that Humpherson, who owned a copy

of Arthur Waley's (1889-1966) translation of *The Tale of Genji* and Miyamori's translation of plays by Chikamatsu Monzaemon 近松門左衛門 (1653-1725), was interested in Japanese literature. This led Okita to suggest that they translate Japanese literature into English together. Regarding the question of what they should translate, Okita noted that *Ashikari* and *Shunkinshō* would be appropriate both as examples of well-crafted literary works and as vehicles for introducing Japanese culture outside Japan.⁽³³⁾ In Okita's view, *Ashikari* and *Shunkinshō* fulfilled both of the objectives of translation that Yanagisawa had identified. The "Biographical Note" in *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin* claims that: "Among readers of discrimination, [Tanizaki's] reputation now is unsurpassed by any other living Japanese author."⁽³⁴⁾ His style is described as possessing "a peculiar charm for foreign readers by virtue of its literary 'purity' and freedom from Western influence."⁽³⁵⁾ The note reports that *Ashikari* and *Shunkinshō* "created something like a sensation in Japanese literary circles."⁽³⁶⁾ In fact, the "Biographical Note" reads like an introduction for the intended reader outside Japan.

The publisher, Hokuseidō Press, founded in Tokyo in 1915 by Nakatsuchi Yoshitaka 中土義敬 (1889-1945), dealt mainly in English-language textbooks as well as introductory books on Japan, including works by Lafcadio Hearn (aka Koizumi Yakumo 小泉八雲, 1850-1904). Interestingly, the section entitled "高等程度教科用原書其他 English Text-Books for Higher Grade Schools" in Hokuseidō Press's catalogues include literary works, such as *Selections from Thomas Hardy* (1922) and *Seven Select Stories from Edgar Allan Poe* (1935). This indicates that original works in English were at this time being used as English language primers. The catalogues also have a section entitled "日本及極東關係書其他 Books on Nippon, Books on the Far East, etc." The section notes that Hokuseidō Press has published Japanese novels and dramas, and books on Japanese manners, customs, and political diplomacy, along with Hearn's works, and that these books were being sold in bookstores in thirty-six countries.⁽³⁷⁾ This section includes various books on Japan such as *The Autobiography of Fukuzawa Yukichi* (1934), *Japan's Foreign Relations, 1542-1936: A Short History* (1936), *The Spirit of Japanese Industry* (1936), and *History of Japanese Education and Present Educational System* (1937). The section also includes translations of Japanese literature, such as Kikuchi's *Tojuro's Love and Four Other Plays* (1925), Futabatei Shimei's *Mediocrity* (1927), Akutagawa Ryūnosuke's *Tales Grotesque and Curious* (1930), Yamamoto Yūzō's *Three Japanese Plays* (1935), all translated by Glenn W. Shaw (1886-1961); and *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin*. The inclusion of English translations of Japanese literature in this section indicates that Hokuseidō Press regarded Japanese literature as a sub-category of introductory books on Japanese culture. Thus,

Hokuseidō Press focused not only on English-language education within Japan, but also on the introduction of Japanese culture outside Japan.

It is worth noting that although *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin* was published in Japan, Okita and Humpherson finished this translation in Shanghai. At the time, there were a number of concession zones in Shanghai in which extraterritoriality was applied. With the introduction of foreign capital and technology, Shanghai became an international city and the economic center of China.⁽³⁸⁾ In 1936, the first Chinese translation of *Shunkinshō*, translated by Lu Shaoyi 陸少懿 (dates unknown), was published by Wenhua Shenghuo Chubanshe 文化生活出版社 in Shanghai. According to Yin Yongshun, a scholar of translation studies, *Shunkinshō* has been translated into Chinese eight times, making this the most frequently translated work of Japanese literature into Chinese.⁽³⁹⁾ Intriguingly, the year 1936 saw both the publication in Shanghai of the first Chinese translation of *Shunkinshō*, as well as the publication, in Japan, of the first English translation, the text of which was, like the Chinese translation, also produced in Shanghai.

Uchiyama Kanzō 内山完造 (1885-1959), the owner of a famous bookstore named Uchiyama Shoten 内山書店 that was located in Shanghai and dealt in Japanese books, facilitated the publication of the English translation.⁽⁴⁰⁾ Okita mentions that Uchiyama contacted Tanizaki to request permission to translate *Ashikari* and *Shunkinshō*.⁽⁴¹⁾ Except for Okita's later books about Henry James and Shanghai studies, *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin* was Okita's first and only publication. It seems that Okita lacked any connections in the publishing world, and that Uchiyama contacted Hokuseidō Press on his behalf to arrange the publication. Since Uchiyama Shoten was the biggest seller of Japanese books in Shanghai, and Hokuseidō Press was a company that published books on Japan for export, it is reasonable to assume that the two companies had a relationship. Thus, after Okita and Humpherson completed their translation in Shanghai, Uchiyama contacted Tanizaki for permission to publish the translation, then contacted Hokuseidō Press to arrange the actual publication in Japan.

An examination of the various aims of the translators and their publishers indicates that the intended reader was conceived of as someone who lived outside Japan. Because of Hokuseidō Press's position in the international market, one can speculate that *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin* was received by three different audiences: readers in the United Kingdom and the United States, readers in Shanghai, and readers in Japan. Hokuseidō Press's catalogues confirm that the publisher distributed its books in the United Kingdom and the United States. According to the 1933 catalogue, Hokuseidō Press had foreign agents in London, New York,

Kansas, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, and San Francisco.⁽⁴²⁾ The 1938 catalogue cites reviews of its books from magazines and newspapers such as *The London Times Literary Supplement* and *The New York Times*, which praise the quality of their paper, bindings, and printing.⁽⁴³⁾ It is true that Hokuseidō Press had connections with newspapers in these two countries. Regarding *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin*, Donald Keene (1922-2019) argues that the translation was not widely disseminated in the United Kingdom and the United States.⁽⁴⁴⁾ However, one review of the book was published in *The Times Literary Supplement* in 1936.⁽⁴⁵⁾

With regard to the readership in Shanghai, considering the publication process, Uchiyama Shoten likely placed *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin* on its shelves. According to Qin Gang, a scholar of modern Japanese literature, who examined figures for Japanese books sales in material from 1937 belonging to the Diplomatic Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, the customers at Uchiyama Shoten were 30% Japanese and 70% Chinese.⁽⁴⁶⁾ In an essay about a visit to Shanghai, Tanizaki mentions visiting Uchiyama Shoten and notes that Chinese customers read books in Japanese.⁽⁴⁷⁾ Uchiyama Shoten would seem, then, to have been patronized largely by Chinese readers who read in Japanese and were interested in Japanese culture. *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin* appears to have sold well in Shanghai. Okita notes that Humpherson became so famous in Shanghai on account of the translation that he was put in charge of the literary reviews in *The North-China Daily News*.⁽⁴⁸⁾ This clarifies that *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin* was fairly well received by readers in Shanghai.

There was also a Japanese readership for the translation. This raises the question of why people in Japan needed, or even wanted, to read the English translation. “The Story of Shunkin” appeared around three years after the publication of *Shunkinshō*. One presumes that Japanese readers could have read the original version in Japanese more easily than the English version. The answer to this question lies in the growing interest in translation of Japanese literature within Japan. As previously mentioned, the 1930s was a time when discussions about translating Japanese literature arose in Japan, and critics had been split as to whether *Shunkinshō* should be translated or not. Hokuseidō Press’s 1938 catalogue cites a review published in Japanese in *Tōkyō nichichi shimbun* that says *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin* was as well executed as if it had not been a translation at all, and that the translation successfully conveyed Tanizaki’s more recent fluent style into English.⁽⁴⁹⁾ It is telling that Hokuseidō Press emphasizes how effectively the original text has been translated into English. This emphasis on translation method reflects a wider interest, during the 1930s, in how Japanese literature could be translated. Therefore, it seems likely that *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin* was read by

people in Japan who were interested in the actual translation of *Shunkinshō*, although some readers from overseas may have read it without knowing the original. To the best of my knowledge, *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin* received no other reviews in Japan beyond the one quoted in Hokuseidō Press's catalogue. Despite the fact that *Shunkinshō* had formed a subject of debate, it seems strange that its publication, which occurred around one year after the debate, did not attract much public attention.

What the above discussion indicates is that there is not much evidence to confirm the actual reader of "The Story of Shunkin." However, a close analysis of the translated text itself enables us to consider the readership from a different angle. I will argue that although Okita's aim in translating the book with Humpherson was to introduce Japanese literature and culture outside of Japan, the implied reader constructed by the text was one who already possessed such knowledge. The translation strategy employed in "The Story of Shunkin" might, indeed, have served to restrict the spread of the translation outside Japan in the 1930s.

"A Portrait of Shunkin" and Alfred A. Knopf

The situation regarding translations of Japanese literature changed dramatically after World War II. In the 1950s, publishers in the United States started to produce translations of modern Japanese literature with the cooperation of translators working in their own domestic academic institutions.⁽⁵⁰⁾ "A Portrait of Shunkin" was translated by Howard Hibbett (1920-2019), a professor of Japanese literature at Harvard University at that time. Many of the influential translators in the post-war period, in particular in the 1950s and 1960s, had been engaged during the war in occupations that involved translating or interpreting the Japanese language, and had taken up positions at universities in the United States after the war. The translation of Japanese literature was relegated to experts within domestic academic institutions, intimately tied up with teaching Japanese language in institutions of higher education. Translators at this time played a central role in teaching Japanese language and literature. An event symbolic of this change was a panel titled "Problems of Translation from Japanese" held at the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Association for Asian Studies in March, 1964,⁽⁵¹⁾ whose participants included: Ivan Morris (1925-1976) and Keene of Columbia University, Hibbett of Harvard University, Edwin McClellan (1925-2009) of the University of Chicago, Edward Seidensticker (1921-2007) of Stanford University, and James Araki (1926-1991) of the University of California, Los Angeles. In this panel, Hibbett gave a talk titled "The Limits of Literalism." Here Hibbett points out that although literal translation might serve as a crib or study aid to the original and

as a means to transmit the poetic aspects of the original, literalism requires extensive commentary.⁽⁵²⁾ Hibbett avoids literalism in his translations with the clear intention of reducing the number of footnotes. In an article of *Asahi shimbun* on September 27, 1964, Hibbett mentioned that he never used footnotes in his translations of Japanese novels.⁽⁵³⁾ Hibbett also mentioned in 2000 that he attempted “to avoid footnotes in a non-scholarly work that is intended for pleasurable reading.”⁽⁵⁴⁾ Indeed, none of Hibbett’s translations of Tanizaki’s works have footnotes. Hibbett’s introduction of *Seven Japanese Tales*, which includes “A Portrait of Shunkin,” clarifies his attitude: Hibbett focuses entirely on the content of the book. He writes that Shunkin “has more affection for her birds than for any human companions, even her long-suffering guide and pupil, the devoted Sasuke.”⁽⁵⁵⁾ This shows his own interpretation of the protagonist in the novel. The introduction, which is presumably meant to be read before the text of “A Portrait of Shunkin,” might improve the reader’s understanding but can also control the reader’s interpretation. Hibbett’s introduction emphasizes the function of the 1960s translator as a mediator and an educator, assisting readers with their understanding of Japanese literature through English. He does not refer to his translation strategy at all in his introduction. This contrasts sharply with Humpherson and Okita’s foreword, which explains their translation strategy without reference to the content of the story. This difference indicates two things: first, what the translators themselves focus on in their own translations, and second, what the translators think the reader will likely focus on when reading their translations. While Humpherson and Okita assumed that the reader would be interested in how the original was rendered into English, Hibbett assumed that the reader would enjoy the content itself. Therefore, I would argue that Hibbett’s version could have been received as an individual text—as a work of literature *in itself*—by readers who had no acquaintance with the original. For such a reader, the translation could serve as a type of original text written in English. The contrasting prefaces appended to the two translations indicate how translations of Japanese literature were received in Japan in the 1930s and the United States in the 1960s.

American publishers also played a crucial role in disseminating Japanese literature in translation during the post-war period. In 1955, Knopf launched a translation project focused on modern Japanese literature with the publication of *Kikyō* 帰郷 (Homecoming) by Osaragi Jirō 大佛次郎 (1897-1973), translated by Brewster Horwitz (1924-1954), and *Some Prefer Nettles* by Tanizaki, translated by Seidensticker. Harold Strauss (1907-1975), editor of the project, reveals why he chose the two works: first, they were of high quality artistically and the writers were highly valued in their own country; second, the works represented the inner life and character-

istic sentiments of the Japanese people.⁽⁵⁶⁾ Strauss notes that Knopf had published the works of eight Nobel Prize recipients and wishes Tanizaki to be the ninth.⁽⁵⁷⁾ *Some Prefer Nettles* was followed by the translation of *Sasameyuki* 細雪 (The Makioka Sisters), translated by Seidensticker, in 1957. In 1961, Knopf published the translation of *Kagi* 鍵 (The Key), translated by Hibbett, which became a best seller. Larry Walker notes that the first printing of 6,000 copies sold out, that a second run of 5,000 was printed soon, and that a third run followed.⁽⁵⁸⁾ According to an article published in *Yomiuri shimbun* on April 9th, 1963, the hardcover of *The Key* sold 15,000 copies and the paperback edition 250,000 copies.⁽⁵⁹⁾ This means that the text selection was successful and that Tanizaki was recognized in the United States. The success of *The Key* stimulated Strauss to publish another translation of Tanizaki's work, and *Seven Japanese Tales* appeared in 1963. In an interview held in 1963, Strauss again refers to Knopf's history as a promoter of foreign literature in translation, in particular, the number of the Nobel Prize recipients it had published.⁽⁶⁰⁾ The number increased from eight winners in 1954 to fourteen winners in 1963. Strauss emphasizes the importance of using literary English in translation, saying that the "first thing we insist upon is that translation be in magnificent literary English, not just literal translation of the words."⁽⁶¹⁾ He wanted translations to succeed, in other words, as masterpieces of English literature. Knopf aimed at the Nobel Prize with English translations of Japanese literature. Indeed, Hibbett nominated Tanizaki for the Nobel Prize in 1962.⁽⁶²⁾

As for the intended reader for translations of modern Japanese literature in the United States in the 1960s, Seidensticker notes explicitly that he targeted the general reader at that time, who could not read the original in Japanese.⁽⁶³⁾ The main target of "A Portrait of Shunkin" was also an English language readership outside Japan who could not read the original in Japanese, and who enjoyed the translations as stand-alone works in English. Strauss's view of Japanese literature and Hibbett's strategy of not using footnotes at all in translations both confirm this point. The intended reader imagined by Hibbett and Knopf was clearer than that of Okita and Humpherson, and Hokuseidō Press.

Differing translation strategies: The voice of the narrator

In my examination of the two translations of *Shunkinshō*, I have considered the nature of the intended reader, as envisioned both by the translators and by the publishers. I have also discussed the possible reception of each translation by actual readers. Although we have limited information about actual readerships, close textual analysis allows us to examine the

relationship between the translations and the implied readers. For this analysis, I have cited both the source text in Japanese as well as the translated texts in English, not as a means of finding so-called mistranslations, but in order to clarify the difference between the translated text that is considered appropriate for a reader that already has knowledge of Japanese literature, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the translated text that is aimed at the reader that does not have such knowledge. I will analyze translation strategies from two perspectives: first, the use of Japanese words; second, the relationship between narrative structure, narrator, and implied reader created within each text.

To begin with, we might observe that Humpherson and Okita's text is characterized by its use of many Japanese terms. In their foreword, Humpherson and Okita note that a number of "Japanese words have been left untranslated; partly because many of them are the names of things which have no exact equivalent outside Japan, and partly because they were thought to be in keeping with the slightly exotic atmosphere of the stories."⁽⁶⁴⁾ All these words are Romanized and italicized, and they are listed (with their meaning) at the back of the book. As to Sasuke's title, *Kengyo* 検校, Humpherson and Okita explain in the foreword: "Sasuke's honorific title *Kengyo*, might, with some show of reason, have been rendered as *Maestro*; but the associations of the two words are so widely different that we preferred to use the native term."⁽⁶⁵⁾ In the glossary, *Kengyo* is defined as "Highest honorific rank of blind musicians etc."⁽⁶⁶⁾ In Humpherson and Okita's text, the narrator addresses Sasuke as *Kengyo* in some parts. By contrast, the narrator in Hibbett's text addresses Sasuke as simply Sasuke, or uses explanatory phrases like "the celebrated samisen master" or "the famous virtuoso."⁽⁶⁷⁾ Other examples include Humpherson and Okita's rendering of "鯛の造り"⁽⁶⁸⁾ as "*sashimi* of sea-bream,"⁽⁶⁹⁾ in contrast to Hibbett's "fillets of sea bream."⁽⁷⁰⁾ Although Humpherson and Okita translate "盆"⁽⁷¹⁾ as "the *Bon* festival,"⁽⁷²⁾ Hibbett translates it as "the midsummer Bon Festival."⁽⁷³⁾ While Humpherson and Okita transliterate Japanese terms, placing them in italics and offering comments such as "Thin slices of raw fish" on "*sashimi*" and "Feast of All Souls. July 15th. (Lun. Cal.)" to explain "*Bon*" in the glossary,⁽⁷⁴⁾ Hibbet transforms "造り" into the word for a piece of fish, namely, "fillets," for the intended reader unacquainted with the custom of consuming raw fish, and adds an explanatory adjective, "midsummer," to a non-italicized proper noun "*Bon*." As Humpherson and Okita note, the use of the Japanese terms produces an exotic effect in the text. The use of Japanese terms with the glossary in English indicates that Humpherson and Okita's intended reader is one who does not know Japanese culture. Hibbett's paraphrasing without footnotes confirm that Hibbett's intended reader, too, is unfamiliar with

Japanese culture. While Humpherson and Okita focus on the transmission of the information on the original text, Hibbett emphasizes readability in the translated text. Their approaches to Japanese terms show the difference between their translation strategies.

The most significant difference in the two translations lies, however, in the identity and relationship of the narrator and the implied reader constructed by each text. The 1936 version incorporates some elements to make the reader imagine that the narrator is Tanizaki himself, while the 1963 version omits all these devices. I argue that the narrator in “The Story of Shunkin” is someone who can be regarded as the author Tanizaki and who is situated temporally and spatially in Japan in the 1930s, while the narrator in “A Portrait of Shunkin” is someone who cannot be regarded as Tanizaki, who has a perspective close to the implied reader, and who regards Sasuke’s story as foreign. The following examples demonstrate this difference.

- Source text by Tanizaki:

嘗て佐藤春夫が云つたことに聾者は愚人のやうに見え盲人は賢者のやうに見えるといふ説があつた。なぜならつんぽは人の言ふことを聴かうとして眉をしかめ眼や口を開け首を傾けたり仰向けたりするので何となく間の抜けたところがある⁽⁷⁵⁾

- Translated text by Humpherson and Okita:

Haruo Sato once remarked that the deaf look foolish, and the blind, wise. This apparent stupidity of the deaf is due, he explained, to their habit of knitting their brows, opening their eyes and mouths, and putting their heads on one side or raising them up—all in the effort of trying to catch what others are saying.⁽⁷⁶⁾

- Translated text by Hibbett:

It has been said that the deaf look like fools and the blind like sages: the deaf, in their effort to catch what others are saying, knit their brows, gape their mouths, and goggle their eyes, or cock their heads this way and that, all of which gives them an air of stupidity;⁽⁷⁷⁾

As already mentioned, Humpherson and Okita’s intention was to introduce Japanese literature and culture. The intended reader is one who does not possess such knowledge. However, in their translation, the narrator’s reference to the poet and writer Satō Haruo 佐藤春夫 (1892-1964), without any explanation, conjures up an implied reader who presumably already knows about Satō. Tanizaki and Satō were close friends, and the marriage of Tanizaki’s former wife to

Satō in 1930 was scandalously reported in the media. Although the intended reader outside Japan probably did not know these facts, it seems the implied reader is expected to know of the relationship between Tanizaki and Satō.

In Hibbett's translation, the same observation is introduced not as a specific person's remark but as a general idea with the phrase "It has been said." The implied reader in Hibbett's translation receives the narrator's observation as a general statement. The name Satō Haruo was not likely known to most readers in the United States in the 1960s because his works had not yet been published there. Since Hibbett's translation was aimed at readers who were unfamiliar with Tanizaki and Japanese literature, and since it was Hibbett's policy not to use footnotes, Hibbett omitted the reference for the benefit of his reader.

- Source text by Tanizaki:

本年〔昭和八年〕二月十二日の大阪朝日新聞日曜のページに「人形浄瑠璃の血まみれ修業」と題して小倉敬二君が書いてゐる記事を見るに、摂津大掾亡き後の名人三代目越路太夫の眉間には大きな傷痕が三日月型に残つてゐた⁽⁷⁸⁾

- Translated text by Humpherson and Okita:

In an article entitled "The Blood-stained Path to Marionette *Joruri*" by Mr. Keiji Ogura, which was published in the Sunday supplement of the *Osaka Mainichi*, on the 12th of February this year (1933), several such instances are mentioned.

Tayu Koshiji the Third, the only surviving master after the death of Taien Settsu, had a great scar in the shape of a crescent moon between his eyebrows.⁽⁷⁹⁾

- Translated text by Hibbett:

For example, the famous chanter of puppet dramas Koshiji-dayu II had a large crescent-shaped scar between his eyebrows—[...].⁽⁸⁰⁾

In Humpherson and Okita's text, the date is clear from the phrase "on the 12th of February this year (1933)." The narrator refers to "1933" as "this year," marking the time of the narration. This requires the implied reader to be in the time in the story, which encourages the reader to think that the setting is close to the actual publication date of *Shunkinshō* in June 1933. The narrator includes the title of the article,⁽⁸¹⁾ the name of the author and the newspaper,⁽⁸²⁾ and the fact that it is the Sunday supplement. As with the above reference to Satō Haruo, the detailed description of the article, which formulates the concept of time, requires the implied reader to belong to the narrator's culture and time.

By contrast, in Hibbett's translation, the concept of time becomes vague and the specificity of the Osaka newspaper disappears: the narrator simply cites "Koshiji-dayu II" as an example. The implied reader is not subject to the same restrictions on the time and space we see in "The Story of Shunkin." The phrase "For example" leaves the reader with a general impression that the events of the story belong to a foreign culture in a distant country.

- Source text by Tanizaki:

嘗て作者は「私の見た大阪及び大阪人」と題する篇中に大阪人のつましい生活振りを論じ東京人の贅沢には裏も表もないけれども大阪人はいかに派手好きのやうに見えても必ず人の気の付かぬ所で冗費を節しメ括りを附けてゐることを説いたが⁽⁸³⁾

- Translated text by Humpherson and Okita:

Once, in an article called "*My Impressions of Osaka and Osaka People*," I discussed the people's moderate style of living, pointing out that while Tokyo people indulge in luxuries in the real sense of the word, in Osaka, however extravagant they may appear to be, they reduce all unnecessary expenses in their private lives to a minimum, thus keeping their cost of living within bounds.⁽⁸⁴⁾

- Translated text by Hibbett:

Osaka people have frugal habits. Their apparent love of luxury is unlike the out-and-out extravagance of people in Tokyo: they maintain a tight control over their affairs, and economize whenever they can do it unobtrusively.⁽⁸⁵⁾

In Humpherson and Okita's text, the narrator draws attention to an essay titled "My Impressions of Osaka and Osaka People," which encourages the implied reader to identify the narrator with Tanizaki. "Watashi no mita ōsaka oyobi ōsakajin" 私の見た大阪及び大阪人 (My Impressions of Osaka and Osaka People) is an actual essay by Tanizaki published in 1932 in *Chūōkōron*, the same magazine that ran *Shunkinshō* in 1933.⁽⁸⁶⁾ In Hibbett's text, the narrator simply sets out a general idea about Osaka people with a sentence "Osaka people have frugal habits." The reader is not even encouraged to imagine that the narrator is a writer.

As the three examples I have discussed show, the implied reader of Humpherson and Okita's translation has the following information: the narrator knows Satō Haruo; the narrator lives in the 1930s, the same age as the reader; and the narrator is the author of "My Impressions of Osaka and Osaka People." The narrator's use of terms related to Tanizaki encourages the reader, that is to say, to imagine that the narrator is Tanizaki himself, which

increases “the greatest feeling of reality.” The narrator assumes, furthermore, that the implied reader is knowledgeable about Japanese literature and culture. Humpherson and Okita’s text creates an implied reader who differs significantly from the book’s intended reader.

By contrast, the narrator in Hibbett’s translation presents the same sections of the text as general ideas or examples. For the implied reader of Hibbett’s text, lacking knowledge of Tanizaki or Japanese literature, “A portrait of Shunkin” becomes a distant and foreign story, in terms of both time and space. Avoiding terms that reference Tanizaki and his time creates an ambiguous narrator. Indeed, Hibbett offers information about the narrator’s character outside the text, writing in the introduction that “the narrator is a scholarly man with antiquarian tastes who has come into the possession of a curious biography of Shunkin, a few anecdotes and reminiscences about her, and a single faded photograph—apparently the only one ever taken—of her bland, lovely face.”⁽⁸⁷⁾ This description eliminates the possibility that the narrator could be Tanizaki himself, and instead strives to present a clear picture of the personality of the (disembodied) narrator. I argue that the reason for this elimination is to invite the implied reader of “A Portrait of Shunkin” to trust the unreliable narrator in a way that is different from “The Story of Shunkin”: Hibbett produces a fictional narrator whose perspective is close to that of the implied reader. In Humpherson and Okita’s translation, the narrator evokes a sense of reality, by connecting things inside the text with reality outside the text by means of concrete terms related to the author Tanizaki. By contrast, Hibbett’s translation, which avoids using concrete terms related to Tanizaki that could be incomprehensible to the reader outside Japan, presents the narrator as an unidentified “scholarly man.” The possibility of imagining the narrator as Tanizaki is not even held out to the implied reader.

Unlike the examples above, which are explicitly related to Tanizaki, the following section implicitly evokes Tanizaki’s personality. It further clarifies the translators’ approaches to the relationship between the narrator and the author.

- Source text by Tanizaki:

邪推をすれば真面目な玄人の門弟の中にも盲目の美女の筈に不思議な快感を味はひつゝ、芸の修業よりもその方に惹き付けられてゐる者が絶無ではなかつたであらう幾人かはジヤン・ジャック・ルーソーがゐたであらう⁽⁸⁸⁾

- Translated text by Humpherson and Okita:

I have my suspicions that, sons of respectable artistes though they were, some of them preferred her lashes to the practice of music; finding some strange voluptuous plea-

sure in being whipped by the beautiful blind woman. There were, I think some Jean Jacques Rousseaus among them.⁽⁸⁹⁾

- Translated text by Hibbett:

I suspect that even among her serious pupils there were those who found the most intriguing part of their studies to be the strangely pleasurable sensation of being punished by the beautiful blind woman.⁽⁹⁰⁾

Here we are presented with the narrator's thoughts regarding the musical training Shunkin provided. The narrators in both translations have the same opinion, insofar as some pupils are said to gain pleasure from being scolded by the beautiful blind woman. The term *shimoto* 笞 is translated into "being punished" in Hibbett's translation, which sounds less severe and visceral than the direct expression "her lashes" and "being whipped" found in Humpherson and Okita's translation. Hibbett's softened rendering recalls Tanizaki's masochistic character somewhat less directly than Humpherson and Okita's translation. Moreover, the narrator in Humpherson and Okita's translation follows the Japanese in citing Jean Jacques Rousseau as an example of the masochistic type of person. In an early work by Tanizaki entitled "Jōtarō" 饒太郎 (Jōtarō), published in 1914, the masochistic protagonist also refers to Rousseau as being representative of masochism.⁽⁹¹⁾ The use of Rousseau's name in the narration could therefore be a means of alluding to an aspect of Tanizaki's personality for the implied reader, as expressed in one of his own works. Hibbett omits the sentence about Tanizaki's interpretation of Rousseau, perhaps because he felt the sudden appearance of Rousseau would have been surprising for readers outside Japan. Hibbett's strategy makes the narrator more neutral and fictional, an anonymous figure who speaks from a third-person perspective rather than from Tanizaki's own. Thus, while in Humpherson and Okita's text, Tanizaki's character is foregrounded and the narrator becomes concrete, in Hibbett's text, the unidentified narrator, disassociated from the historical person of Tanizaki, becomes abstract. A fictional narrator is more appropriate for the implied reader in Hibbett's translation than a historical narrator.

Seidensticker has described the author's character in Tanizaki's works as follows: "By turns expository, lyrical, and narrative, they do not really fit into genres familiar in western literature. They seem to cross genre lines with the greatest abandon. With similar abandon, the author steps forward in his own person to describe and to discuss. Authors take similar liberties in western novels, to be sure, but narrative and drama are expected to be firmly dominant over lyric and exposition all the same. In a work like *The Mother of Captain Shigemoto* narra-

tive steps aside as exposition steps to the fore, and the reverse; and the unprepared reader, not having had a pure draught of the one or the other, may well think in the end that he has not had much of anything at all.”⁽⁹²⁾ In the original, and in Humpherson and Okita’s translation, the author steps forward to assume the role of narrator, which increases “the greatest feeling of reality” of the narration, at least for the implied reader who has knowledge of Tanizaki and Japanese literature. By contrast, in Hibbett’s translation, the narrator is someone who remains a fictional narrator, a disembodied voice; he is never made to assume the personality of the historical Tanizaki. In terms of the narrator’s position, “A Portrait of Shunkin” works as a novel structured along lines familiar to an English readership. This argument is further supported by the following consideration of the relationship between the narrator and the reader.

- Source text by Tanizaki:

佐助が自ら眼を突いた話を天龍寺の峩山和尚が聞いて、転瞬の間に内外を断じ醜を美に回した禅機を賞し達人の所為に庶幾しと云つたと云ふが読者諸賢は首肯せらるゝや否や⁽⁹³⁾

- Translated text by Humpherson and Okita:

It is said that Gazan, a priest in the temple of Tenryu, when told the story of how Sasuke had blinded himself by piercing his eyes, praised the philosophy which promoted the deed, saying that, by grasping at the spiritual world, Sasuke had turned something ugly into a thing of beauty, and that it was the act of a noble mind. Do you agree with the priest, Readers?⁽⁹⁴⁾

- Translated text by Hibbett:

It seems that when the priest Gazan of the Tenryu Temple heard the story of Sasuke’s self-immolation, he praised him for the Zen spirit with which he changed his whole life in an instant, turning the ugly into the beautiful, and said that it was very nearly the act of a saint. I wonder how many of us would agree with him.⁽⁹⁵⁾

These excerpts, taken from the final passage of the novel, clarify the difference in the relationship between the narrator and the implied reader in the two translations. By using the term “Readers,” the narrator in Humpherson and Okita’s translation creates a clear gap between the narrator and the implied reader. Although the intended reader of this translation seems to be someone unfamiliar with Japanese culture and literature, the implied reader possesses this knowledge. In Humpherson and Okita’s text, things inside the text is related to real things outside the text, such as an actual novelist, an actual newspaper article, an actual exam-

ple of Tanizaki's writing, and a reference that evokes Tanizaki's masochism. Therefore, when the narrator addresses the implied reader with the word "you" and "Readers," it sounds as though it is directed at the actual reader, as if Tanizaki himself asked the question. The gap created between the narrator and the readers makes it seem as though the author is stepping forward, which increases "the greatest feeling of reality."

Hibbett's text functions in the opposite way. First, the expression of "Sasuke's self-immolation" is more abstract than the concrete phrase of "how Sasuke had blinded himself by piercing his eyes." As previously discussed, some critics interpret Sasuke's act as the product of his own desire. However, the narrator's reference to Sasuke's act as "self-immolation" connotes the narrator's own interpretation of the act, something distinct from Sasuke's subjective viewpoint. That is to say, the narrator looks at Sasuke from an objective perspective. Second, the narrator does not create a gap between the narrator and the implied reader. Rather, the question here posed: "I wonder how many of us would agree with him," includes the narrator in the collective "us," which gives the narrator a perspective close to the implied reader. The story of Sasuke is as distant for the narrator as it is for the implied reader. The fictional narrator with his disembodied voice tells the foreign story to an implied reader who is unfamiliar with Japanese culture. The structure constructed by the relationship between the narrator and the implied reader is appropriate for readers living outside Japan. Thus, "A Portrait of Shunkin" could be received by the actual reader in the 1960s as a novel narrated by a narrator who is, as it were, on the same side of the reader.

This excerpt also reveals the position of the translator. Hibbett presents the narrator, not as someone who evokes Tanizaki, but instead as "a scholarly man with antiquarian tastes," who narrates the story in a manner familiar to an English-language readership and regards the story as foreign. Describing Sasuke's act as "self-immolation" from a perspective aligned with the implied reader, the narrator controls the reader's interpretation. This structure indicates that translator's character overlaps with the narrator. Hibbett's description of Shunkin, who "has more affection for her birds than for any human companions, even her long-suffering guide and pupil, the devoted Sasuke,"⁽⁹⁶⁾ in the introduction, is directly linked with the narrator's interpretation of Sasuke's act as "self-immolation." While the author Tanizaki steps forward to assume the place of the narrator in "The Story of Shunkin," in "A Portrait of Shunkin" the translator Hibbett steps forward to assume the place of the narrator. "A Portrait of Shunkin" produces "the greatest feeling of reality" in a completely different way from "The Story of Shunkin." The novel's concluding sentences emphasize the relationship among the narrator, the

implied reader, the author, and the translator. Thus, the analysis of the narrative structure in terms of the different types of readers reveals how the translation functions.

Conclusion

I have examined “The Story of Shunkin” and “A Portrait of Shunkin” in terms of the intended reader, the actual reader, and the implied reader. Although the translators’ intention in each case was to introduce Japanese literature and culture to readers outside Japan, Humpherson and Okita’s “The Story of Shunkin,” which evoked the author Tanizaki himself, created a narrator who required an implied reader familiar with Japanese culture during the 1930s. This translation strategy seems likely to have worked best for readers, mostly those living in Japan or Shanghai, who had knowledge of Japanese literature. In contrast, Hibbett’s “A Portrait of Shunkin,” which carefully elided any possibility that the narrator might be Tanizaki, created an implied reader who had no knowledge of Japanese literature. In this translation, the narrator, who is depicted as having a perspective close to the implied reader, finally seems to come into alignment with the translator Hibbett himself. This translation strategy did not restrict the reader’s position. Presumably, this helped “A Portrait of Shunkin” function smoothly as a work of English literature set in a foreign and distant culture aimed at readers outside Japan during the 1960s.

This article is a case study intended to demonstrate the usefulness of applying the notion of three types of readers to two English translations of the same work of modern Japanese literature. It shows that the translators attempted to accomplish similar effects—a heightened sense of reality—in different ways. The methodology I have used can be applied to the analysis of translations in a common situation where there are limited data about the actual reader for the translations. In the case of *Shunkinshō*, there is not much evidence pertaining to how its translations were received, particularly in the case of “The Story of Shunkin.” Considering the translated texts with a focus on differences between the intended reader and the implied reader offers, however, one possibility for dealing with this situation, clarifying the relationship among the narrator, the reader, the author, and the translator in the translations. In this sense, I hope this article will contribute to the development of a new approach to considering the relationship between translations and their readers in literary and translation studies.

Notes

- (1) This article is a revised version of my presentations given at the Waseda Daigaku Kokubungakkai

Narrative Structure in Two English Translations of Tanizaki Jun'ichirō's *Shunkinshō*

Shūkitaikai held at Waseda University on November 30th, 2019, and the International Symposium/Workshop in Japanese Literary and Visual Studies held at Columbia University on February 28th, 2020.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Michael Emmerich, Dr. Satoko Shimazaki, Dr. David Lurie, and Dr. Kristopher Reeves for their insightful comments and editorial suggestions.

- (2) Fowler 1992, p. 3.
- (3) Yamamoto studies the situation regarding translating *Shunkinshō* in the 1930s, and refers to “The Story of Shunkin” (Yamamoto 2016). Walker researches Knopf’s publication process of translations of Japanese literature from 1955 to 1977, including *Seven Japanese Tales* (Walker 2015).
- (4) See, for example, Fukuda 1972/1977, Miyagawa 1973, Inazawa 1981, and Mizumura 2003.
- (5) In this paper, I will use the term “translation strategy” when I refer to how the source language text is rendered into the target language text on a textual level.
- (6) Dr. David Lurie helped me clarify this group of the intended reader, the actual reader, and the implied reader. I am grateful to him for suggesting that I consider the notion of the readers.
- (7) Iser 1980, p. 34.
- (8) Masamune 1933, p. 181.
- (9) Tanizaki 1934, p. 229.
- (10) Ibid., p. 232.
- (11) “Shunkinshō kōgo,” written one year after the publication of *Shunkinshō* and published in *Kaizō* 改造 in June 1934, is an essay in which Tanizaki explains the peculiar narrative technique he used in *Shunkinshō*.
- (12) Tanizaki (Chambers, Trans.) 1980, p. 466. “Hontō rashii kanji” ほんたうらしい感じ is translated here as “the greatest feeling of reality.”
- (13) Tanizaki and Chambers 1980, p. 460.
- (14) For details about the history of this debate, see Nagae 1992.
- (15) Chiba 1982.
- (16) Nagae 1986.
- (17) Hata 1989.
- (18) Maeda 1989.
- (19) Tatsumi 1990.
- (20) Komiya 1933.
- (21) Miyamori, August 20, 1933, p. 4.
- (22) See, for example, Sugimura 1933, and Tsunetō, September 7, 1933, p. 4.
- (23) Kokusai Bunka Shinkōkai 1964.
- (24) Kikuchi 1935, p. 227.
- (25) Izumi, October 7, 1935, p. 5.
- (26) Yanagisawa, October 8, 1935, p. 9.
- (27) Ibid.
- (28) Yamamoto details the discussion on translating *Shunkinshō* among Kikuchi, Izumi, and Yanagisawa (Yamamoto 2016).
- (29) Katsumoto 1936/1979, p. 127.
- (30) Katsumoto, July 10, 1935, p. 10.
- (31) Ibid.
- (32) According to Okita, Humpherson passed away around three years after the completion of *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin* (Okita 1983, p. 12). Okita wrote a short novel about Humpherson entitled “Gyotaku” 魚

- 拓 (Gyotaku): Okita 1950.
- (33) Okita 1950, p. 43.
- (34) Humpherson and Okita 1936b, p. iii.
- (35) Ibid., p. iv.
- (36) Ibid.
- (37) Hokuseidō Press 1938.
- (38) Yin 2010.
- (39) Ibid.
- (40) While visiting Shanghai, Tanizaki is known to have frequented Uchiyama Shoten. In the bookstore, Chinese and Japanese novelists were introduced to one another by Uchiyama. Tanizaki writes about the visit to Uchiyama Shoten in “Shanghai kōyūki” 上海交遊記 (1926).
- (41) Okita 1983, p. 12.
- (42) Hokuseidō Press 1933.
- (43) Hokuseidō Press 1938.
- (44) Keene 1958.
- (45) Bland, December 19, 1936, p. 1051.
- (46) Qin 2013.
- (47) Tanizaki 1926/2017.
- (48) Okita 1950, p. 45.
- (49) Hokuseidō Press 1938.
- (50) There are a few examples of translations of modern Japanese literature published by U. S. publishers before the 1950s. For example, a translation of *Hototogisu* 不如帰, by Tokutomi Roka 徳富蘆花 (1868-1927), as *Namiko-ko, a Realistic Novel* was published by H. B. Turner in Boston in 1904, a translation of *Sono omokage* 其面影, by Futabatei Shimei 二葉亭四迷 (1864-1909), as *An Adopted Husband (Sono Omokage)* was published by Alfred A. Knopf in New York in 1919, and a translation of *Shisen o koete* 死線を越えて, by 賀川豊彦 Kagawa Toyohiko (1888-1960), as *Before the Dawn* was published by George H. Doran Company in New York in 1924.
- (51) The discussions were printed in *The Journal-Newsletter of the Association of Teachers of Japanese*, 2:1/2 (May 1964).
- (52) Hibbett 1964.
- (53) Asahi Shimbun Henshūkyoku, September 27, 1964, p. 4.
- (54) Hibbett 2000, p. 43.
- (55) Hibbett 1963, p. viii.
- (56) Strauss, December 1, 1954, p. 5.
- (57) Ibid.
- (58) Walker 2015, p. 127.
- (59) Yomiuri Shimbun Henshūkyoku, April 9, 1963, p. 7.
- (60) Fukuda 1963, pp. 5-6.
- (61) Ibid.
- (62) Nomination Archive, *NobelPrize.org*. Sat. 24 Oct 2020. Tanizaki was nominated by Pearl Buck in 1958, by Sigfrid Siwertz in 1960, by The Japanese Authors' Union in 1961, by Hibbett in 1962, by Keene in 1963, and by Harry Martinson in 1964 and 1965.
- (63) Seidensticker and Nasu 1962, p. 214.

Narrative Structure in Two English Translations of Tanizaki Jun'ichirō's *Shunkinshō*

- (64) Humpherson and Okita 1936a, p. i.
- (65) Ibid.
- (66) Humpherson and Okita 1936c, p. 171.
- (67) Tanizaki (Hibbett, Trans.) 1963, pp. 4-5.
- (68) Tanizaki 1933, p. 57.
- (69) Tanizaki (Humpherson and Okita, Trans.) 1936, p. 122.
- (70) Tanizaki (Hibbett, Trans.) 1963, p. 45.
- (71) Tanizaki 1933, p. 58.
- (72) Tanizaki (Humpherson and Okita, Trans.) 1936, p. 124.
- (73) Tanizaki (Hibbett, Trans.) 1963, p. 46.
- (74) Humpherson and Okita 1936c, pp. 171-172.
- (75) Tanizaki 1933, p. 8.
- (76) Tanizaki (Humpherson and Okita, Trans.) 1936, p. 77.
- (77) Tanizaki (Hibbett, Trans.) 1963, pp. 8-9.
- (78) Tanizaki 1933, p. 36.
- (79) Tanizaki (Humpherson and Okita, Trans.) 1936, pp. 102-103.
- (80) Tanizaki (Hibbett, Trans.) 1963, pp. 28-29.
- (81) Satō Jun'ichi clarifies that the article “人形浄瑠璃の血まみれ修業” actually existed (Satō 2006).
- (82) Humpherson and Okita translate “大阪朝日新聞” into “the *Osaka Mainichi*.”
- (83) Tanizaki 1933, pp. 68-69.
- (84) Tanizaki (Humpherson and Okita, Trans.) 1936, p. 133.
- (85) Tanizaki (Hibbett, Trans.) 1963, pp. 54-55.
- (86) “Watashi no mita ōsaka oyobi ōsakajin” was serialized in *Chūōkōron* in February, March, and April 1932, and printed in *Ishōan zuihitsu* 倚松庵隨筆 in April 1932 by Sōgensha. “My Impressions of Osaka and Osaka People” is a translated name by Humpherson and Okita in “The Story of Shunkin.”
- (87) Hibbett 1963, pp. vii-viii.
- (88) Tanizaki 1933, pp. 75-76.
- (89) Tanizaki (Humpherson and Okita, Trans.) 1936, p. 139.
- (90) Tanizaki (Hibbett, Trans.) 1963, p. 60.
- (91) Tanizaki 1914/2016, p. 356.
- (92) Seidensticker 1966, p. 265.
- (93) Tanizaki 1933, p. 108.
- (94) Tanizaki (Humpherson and Okita, Trans.) 1936, pp. 168-169.
- (95) Tanizaki (Hibbett, Trans.) 1963, p. 84.
- (96) Hibbett 1963, p. viii.

Works Cited

- Asahi Shimbun Henshūkyoku. “Tanizaki bungaku no hon'yakusha Howard Hibbett shi: Konnichiwa.” *Asahi shimbun* (evening paper). September 27, 1964, p. 4.
- Bland, John Otway Percy. “Japanese Character.” *The Times Literary Supplement*. no. 1820, December 19, 1936, p. 1051.
- Chiba, Shunji. “Honbun oyobi sakuin kanshō.” Chiba, Shunji. (ed.) *Kanshō Nihon gendai bungaku: Dai hachi kan Tanizaki Jun'ichirō*. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 1982, pp. 33-255.

- Fowler, Edward. "Rendering Words, Traversing Cultures: On the Art and Politics of Translating Modern Japanese Fiction." *The Journal of Japanese Studies*. vol. 18, no. 1 (Winter, 1992), pp. 1-44.
- Fukuda, Rikutarō. "An Interview with Mr. Harold Strauss: Contemporary Japanese Literature in U.S." *Eigo kenkyū*. vol. 52, no. 5, 1963. pp. 2-7.
- Fukuda, Rikutarō. "Seiyō ni okeru Tanizaki Jun'ichirō." *Bungei tokuhon: Tanizaki Jun'ichirō*. Tokyo: Kawade Shobō Shinsha. 1972/1977. pp. 76-89.
- Hata, Kōhei. "Shunkin jigai." *Shinchō*. vol. 86, no. 1, 1989, pp. 336-355.
- Hibbett, Howard. "Introduction." *Seven Japanese Tales*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963. pp. v-ix.
- Hibbett, Howard. "The Limits of Literalism." *The Journal-Newsletter of the Association of Teachers of Japanese*. vol. 2, no. 1/2, 1964. pp. 13-17.
- Hibbett, Howard. "Howard Hibbett on Tanizaki Jun'ichirō." Richie, Donald. (ed.) *Words, Ideas and Ambiguities: Four Perspectives on Translating from the Japanese*. Chicago: Imprint Publications, 2000. pp. 35-50.
- Hokuseidō Press. *Hokuseidō's Catalogue: 1933 Special Number*. Tokyo: Hokuseidō Press, 1933.
- Hokuseidō Press. *Hokuseidō shuppan tosho sō mokuroku*. Tokyo: Hokuseidō Press, 1938.
- Humpherson, Roy and Okita, Hajime. "Foreword." *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin: Modern Japanese Novels*. Tokyo: Hokuseidō Press, 1936a. pp. i-ii.
- Humpherson, Roy and Okita, Hajime. "Biographical Note." *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin: Modern Japanese Novels*. Tokyo: Hokuseidō Press, 1936b. pp. iii-iv.
- Humpherson, Roy and Okita, Hajime. "Glossary." *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin: Modern Japanese Novels*. Tokyo: Hokuseidō Press, 1936c. pp. 171-172.
- Inazawa, Hideo. "Eiyaku sareta Tanizaki bungaku." *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō no sekai: Seiyō to Nihon no kakawari*. Tokyo: Shichōsha, 1981. pp. 142-169.
- Iser, Wolfgang. *Der Akt des Lesens: Theorie ästhetischer Wirkung [The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response]*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978. Johns Hopkins Paperbacks edition, 1980.
- Izumi, Hachirō. "Sekigaisen: Kan ni kike." *Tōkyō asahi shimbun*. October, 7, 1935. p. 5.
- Katsumoto, Seiichirō. "Nihon bungaku hon'yaku mondai ichi: Jiyūshugiteki tachiba tonon kankei." *Yomiuri shimbun*. July 10, 1935. p. 10.
- Katsumoto, Seiichirō. "Tanizaki Jun'ichirō to Shiga Naoya." *Kindai bungaku nōto ichi*. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō, 1936/1979. pp. 109-127.
- Keene, Donald. "Kaigai Tade kū mushi." Tanizaki, Jun'ichirō. *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō zenshū dai jūroku kan: Furoku jūni*. Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha, 1958. pp. 1-3.
- Kikuchi, Kan. "Hanashi no kuzukago." *Bungei shunjū*. vol. 13, no. 10, 1935. pp. 226-227.
- Kokusai Bunka Shinkōkai. *KBS sanjūnen no ayumi*. Tokyo: Kokusai Bunka Shinkōkai, 1964.
- Komiya, Toyotaka. "Hokku hon'yaku no kanōsei." *Bungei shunjū*. vol. 11, no. 8, 1933. pp. 52-56.
- Maeda, Hisanori. "Monogatari no kōzō: Tanizaki Jun'ichirō 'Shunkinshō.'" *Kokubungaku: Kaishaku to kyōzai no kenkyū*. vol. 34, no. 8, 1989. pp. 95-101.
- Masamune, Hakuchō. "Bungei jihyō." *Chūōkōron*. vol. 48, no. 7, 1933. pp. 177-184.
- Miyagawa, Kiyoe. "Eiyaku ni okeru jinbutsu byōsha: Shunkinshō no shunkin." *Jiji eigogaku kenkyū*. no. 12, 1973. pp. 58-69.
- Miyamori, Asatarō. "Komori kun no hokku hon'yakuron o bakusu." *Yomiuri shimbun*. August 20, 1933. p. 4.
- Mizumura, Minae. "Tanizaki Jun'ichirō no 'tenkanki': Shunkinshō o megutte." *Nihon kindai bungaku*. vol. 68, 2003. pp. 118-125.

Narrative Structure in Two English Translations of Tanizaki Jun'ichirō's *Shunkinshō*

- Nagae, Hironobu. "Shunkinshō: Sasuke hanninsetsu shiken." *Geijutsu shijō shugi bungei*. no. 12, 1986. pp. 13-21.
- Nagae, Hironobu. "'Shunkinshō' sairon: Shunkinshō ronsō ni furete." *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō ron: Fukuryū suru monogatari*. Tokyo: Sōbunsha, 1992. pp. 79-129.
- Nomination Archive. *NobelPrize.org*. Nobel Media AB 2020. Sat. 24 Oct 2020.
<https://www.nobelprize.org/nomination/archive/show_people.php?id=12374>
- Okita, Hajime. "Gyotaku." *Bungaku seishin*. no. 1, 1950. pp. 35-50.
- Okita, Hajime. *Okita Hajime chosaku mokuroku*. (private edition), 1983.
- Qin, Gang. "Senzen Nihon shuppan medhia no Shanghai rūto: Uchiyama shoten to Kaizōsha no umi o koeta nettowāku." *Nihon kindai bungaku*. vol. 89, 2013. pp. 200-207.
- Satō, Jun'ichi. "'Shunkinshō' ni okeru bunraku: Tanizaki Jun'ichirō no 'geinin' kan." *Nihon kindai bungaku*. vol. 74, 2006. pp. 197-211.
- Seidensticker, Edward. "Tanizaki Jun-ichirō, 1886-1965." *Monumenta Nipponica*. vol. 21, no. 3/4, 1966. pp. 249-265.
- Seidensticker, Edward G. and Nasu, Kiyoshi. *Nihongo rashii hyōgen kara eigo rashii hyōgen e*. Tokyo: Baihukan, 1962.
- Strauss, Harold. "'Kikyō' to 'Tade kuu mushi' Amerika de shuppan." *Asahi shimbun*. December 1, 1954. p. 5.
- Sugimura, Sojinkan. "Hanyaku ka hangyaku ka." *Kaizō*. vol. 15, no. 9, 1933. pp. 10-17.
- Tanizaki, Jun'ichirō. "Jōtarō." *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō zenshū dai ni kan*, Tokyo: Chūōkōronshinsha, 1914/2016. pp. 311-405.
- Tanizaki, Jun'ichirō. "Shanghai kōyūki." *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō zenshū dai jūni kan*, Tokyo: Chūōkōronshinsha, 1926/2017. pp. 401-433.
- Tanizaki, Jun'ichirō. "Shunkinshō." *Shunkinshō*. Osaka: Sōgensha, 1933. pp. 1-108.
- Tanizaki, Jun'ichirō. *Bunshō tokuhon*. Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha, 1934.
- Tanizaki, Jun'ichirō. "The Story of Shunkin." *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin: Modern Japanese Novels* (Humpherson, Roy and Okita, Hajime. Trans.). Tokyo: Hokuseidō Press, 1936. pp. 71-169.
- Tanizaki, Jun'ichirō. "A Portrait of Shunkin." *Seven Japanese Tales* (Hibbett, Howard. Trans.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963. pp. 3-84.
- Tanizaki, Jun'ichirō. "Postscript to 'A Portrait of Shunkin': Shunkinshō Kōgo." (Chambers, Anthony H. Trans.). *Monumenta Nipponica*, vol. 35, no. 4, 1980. pp. 461-466.
- Tanizaki, Jun'ichirō. and Chambers, Anthony H. "Postscript to 'A Portrait of Shunkin': Shunkinshō Kōgo." *Monumenta Nipponica*, vol. 35, no. 4, 1980. pp. 457-460.
- Tatsumi, Toshi. "'Shunkinshō' shinsō fuzai: Jojutsu kubun ni yoru bunseki." *Nihon kindai bungaku*. vol. 42, 1990. pp. 117-130.
- Tsunetō, Kyō. "Rondan jihyō go: Hi hijōji teki ronbun." *Yomiuri shimbun*. September 7, 1933. p. 4.
- Walker, Larry. *Unbinding the Japanese Novel in English Translation: The Alfred A. Knopf Program, 1955 - 1977*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Helsinki, 2015.
- Yamamoto, Ryōsuke. "Kokusaiteki sakka no in'ei: Bungei fukkōki Tanizaki zō no ichimen." Gomibuchi, Noritsugu. and Hidaka, Yoshiki. (eds.) *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō tokuhon*. Tokyo: Kanrin Shobō, 2016. pp. 110-116.
- Yanagisawa, Takeshi. "Sekigaisen: 'Shunkinshō' no hon'yaku." *Tōkyō asahi shimbun*. October 8, 1935. p. 9.
- Yin, Yongshun. "Chūgoku ni okeru Tanizaki bungaku no hon'yaku to juyō no hensin: Sakuhin no sentaku to hyōka o fumaete." *Tsūyaku hon'yaku kenkyū*. no. 10, 2010. pp. 103-120.
- Yomiuri Shimbun Henshūkyoku. "Amerika de nijūrokumanbu ureta 'Kagi'." *Yomiuri shimbun* (evening paper). April 9, 1963. p. 7.

* Traditional character forms (*kyūjitai*) in *Shunkinshō* have been replaced with their simplified equivalents (*shinjitai*). Relevant excerpts from all three primary texts are underlined for emphasis.

** The author is a Research Fellow of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science. This work was supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows Grant Number JP20J12553.