Universiteit Utrecht

# Haruki Murakami in the West

*Comparing the English, Dutch, German, and Swedish translations of Norwegian Wood*

Master's thesis
Lukas Skowroneck, 3689247
Supervisor: Prof.dr. A.B.M. Naaijkens
Second reader: Prof.dr. I.B. Smits
RMA Literary Translation - Utrecht University
August 2017

**Contents**

**Introduction**

Haruki Murakami is enjoying unprecedented popularity worldwide. Publishers and bookstores organize fan meetups, release parties, and even weekend-long festivals celebrating the work of the Japanese author, and readers attend in staggering numbers. In the West, Japan is hip like never before and Murakami's cosmopolitan novels bring the nation long considered an oriental mystery to bedside tables across the occident. Despite its 'Westernized' feel, the author's prose contains distinctly Japanese elements and the tensions between the West and East in his work have made readers acutely aware of the act of translation. Because most Western readers are unable to read the Japanese source texts, they rely on translations, which are often taken at face value to be faithful representations of the source texts. As more and more readers meet and discuss his work, one question is asked with increasing frequency: in what language do you read Murakami?

The question is all but an easy one. First, there is the issue of availability: not all of Murakami's writing may be available in a language, either because publishers deem some works less interesting or because translators have simply not yet had the time to translate all thirteen novels, numerous short stories, and various non-fiction works the author has produced over his career. As new works appear, publishers scramble to be the first to publish a translation, or to at least publish a work before the English translation appears on the market. After all, English is the 'lingua franca' of the reading

world, and fans of Murakami are expected to buy the first translation they can understand, regardless of language.

Secondly, readers seem to have preconceived ideas of which translations are 'best'. A commonly heard opinion is that the English translations must be better, because the large English-speaking market must have fierce competition between a great number of translators, leaving only the best of the best to translate Murakami's work. Languages with only a handful of translators into Japanese, it is argued, produce less reliable translations, either due to the lack of internal competition or because publishers are so keen to release any translation at all that they may lower their standards. Some readers also seem to believe that a cosmopolitan author is best translated into a cosmopolitan language like English rather than their own language, which is familiar and bound to their country and culture.

At the same time, however, the English translations have received criticism from readers and translators alike for being 'too Americanizing', omitting passages and smoothening out cultural differences. Readers sceptical of the supposedly sales-driven American publishing market may believe translations into other languages to be more 'authentic', more representative of both the contents of the source texts and Murakami's literary style. The fact that such opinions are usually based largely on hearsay or – at best – a comparison of a few translations without consulting the source texts only complicates matters further.

At the core of the issue lies the fact that the vast majority of Western readers are able to read the English translations, while many smaller languages have a readership limited to their own national borders. As such, if a work is not available in their native language, readers always have the option to read the English translation of a work; in contrast, a Dutch reader may not be expected to pick up the Swedish translation, or vice versa. The fact that the English translation is the only option available to all readers *by default* has resulted in a market where the English translations assume the position of being 'international versions' of Murakami, translations that everyone – readers and translators alike – must be aware of.

Little has been written about the quality of the various translations of Murakami's works. Some works, such as that of Anna Zielinska-Elliott and Ika Kaminka (2016), provide a valuable source for comparing several Western translations but are largely descriptive, collecting textual material but not evaluating its effects. Other research, such as that of Irmela Hijiya-Kirschnereit (2013), focuses on Murakami's cosmopolitan, accessible image as produced by both the English translators and by Murakami himself, but does not involve the various other Western translations available. Translation studies could benefit greatly from a combination of the two – a comparison of translations in various languages combined with a critical analysis of the strategies used in the culture-bridging process. Such a multilingual critical comparison would allow scholars to map the various translations, providing an overview of the

strengths, weaknesses, and unique characteristics of each language's rendition of Murakami's work.

The purpose of this thesis is to provide a stepping-stone in the process towards a full overview of Murakami's work in translation. The thesis focuses on one of Murakami's most popular novels, *Norwegian Wood* (1987), and studies its translations into English, Dutch, German, and Swedish – made by Jay Rubin (EN), Elbrich Fennema (NL), Ursula Gräfe (DE), and Yukiko and Eiko Duke (SE). These translations may be considered alternative 'versions' of the source text, each representing the style and contents of the novel in its own way. The central question of this thesis is as follows: *what are the defining characteristics of the English, Dutch, Swedish, and German translations of* Norwegian Wood *and which translation(s) most closely represent the tone and contents of the Japanese source text?* To arrive at a reliable and sound answer to this question, the argument will be split up into three parts, focusing on:

1. *Which translational choices were made in each translation*
2. *How these choices effect each translation as a whole*
3. *How the choices and effects of one translation relate to those of the other translations*

The third point is of particular importance to this thesis: by highlighting the differences between translations, each target text's unique characteristics will become more clearly apparent. Critical works focusing on only one target text may encounter

difficulties in determining the true effects of subtle translational choices; after all, the absence of comparative material forces critics to imagine for themselves the alternative translational choices and their effects, which may be easy to do within a single passage but is far more difficult within a work as a whole. When comparing multiple translations, a critic is presented with different versions of the same text, which form an ideal basis for comparing subtle translational choices as they appear throughout the work.

Due to spatial constraints, the focus of this thesis needs to be narrowed down further. Thus, the search for choice/effect-relationships will focus on two subjects: names and culture-specific items (CSIs). These subjects lead to the following sub-questions:

a. *How are the various instances of the name of the protagonist translated and how do these translations influence the interpretative potential of the text?*
b. *What patterns may be found in the strategies used to translate CSIs and where do these patterns place the target texts on a spectrum between exoticizing and naturalizing?*

This thesis consists of five chapters. Chapter 1 presents a theoretical framework that will serve as a solid foundation for analysis and criticism. The theories discussed will be those of Lance Hewson in *An Approach to Translation Criticism* (2011) and Javier Franco Aixelá in "Culture-specific items in translation" (1996). Chapter 2 provides information on the author, novel, translators, and translations. There will be an analysis of elements

of Murakami's style, both in general and for *Norwegian Wood* specifically. There will also be space to provide profiles for each of the translators, with a special focus on the English translators' complex role in shaping Murakami's international reception. Chapter 3 then provides a short description of the methodology used for selection and criticism of passages from *Norwegian Wood*. Chapter 4 concerns sub-question (a); it focuses on translations of the name of *Norwegian Wood*'s protagonist, exploring how various translations may influence readers' interpretations of characters' relationships in the novel. This chapter uses Hewson's theory and attempts to arrive at a critical judgment of each translation. Chapter 5 concerns sub-question (b); it consists of an analysis of strategies used to translate CSIs. This chapter uses Aixelá's theory and attempts to situate each translation on a scale between the two extremes of exoticizing versus naturalizing translation. Chapters 4 and 5 will both end in a sub-conclusion answering the respective sub-questions. Finally, in chapter 6, the sub-conclusions of chapters 4 and 5 will be combined to answer the research question of this thesis.

**Technical notes**

Because this thesis is written in English, all titles of Murakami's works are referred to by their English translations to improve readability. All texts referred to by their titles alone are the source texts, while the English translations will always be explicitly named. *Norwegian Wood* was published in two volumes, and page numbers referring to the source text include the indications 上 (volume 1) and 下 (volume 2) accordingly. The Dutch and German translations were studied in the e-book format, so only chapter numbers have been provided for quoted passages from these texts. Because the German translation treats the beginning of volume 2 as a separate chapter, the numbering between the two versions differs from chapter 7 onwards.

## Chapter 1 – Theoretical framework

This chapter discusses theories on translation criticism and categories of Culture-specific Items (CSIs) in translation. The model of translation criticism used will be that of Lance Hewson, who provides a step-for-step model for analyzing texts and their translations. Chapter 2.1 discusses the theoretical foundations of translation criticism that Hewson uses for his model, and 2.2 describes the model itself. Chapter 2.3 focuses more specifically on the definition and classification of CSIs, based mainly on a text by Javier Franco Aixelá, and includes a list of available strategies for their translation.

### 1.1 – Translation criticism

To contrast and evaluate translations, a critic must first establish a clear basis for evaluation, especially in relation to the claims made by descriptive translation studies. Each step in the critical process must logically flow into the next, and the argumentation must be transparent and consistent throughout. To ensure the work is studied in a structured manner, the critic must use a model; in this thesis, the method used is that provided by Lance Hewson in *An Approach to Translation Criticism.*

Hewson defines translation criticism as "an interpretative act whereby the basis of the value judgement is explicitly spelled out" (6). An explicit basis for judgement ensures that critics cannot simply reject a translation whenever it does not reflect the

critic's opinion of how a text 'ought to be' translated. It is all too easy to compare source and target texts and label a translational strategy 'wrong', but many critics neglect explaining exactly *why* something is wrong or offering alternative, 'better' solutions. In fact, labels such as 'right' or 'wrong' are usually unproductive, as are controversial terms such as equivalence: as Hewson writes, "'equivalence' *per se*, in whichever of its disguises, is not a sufficient criterion for analyzing translations" (4). After all, there are many forms of equivalence and a translation that is formally equivalent may differ radically in meaning from the source text, while a translation that seems entirely different at first glance may very closely approach the meaning of the source text. Moreover, equivalence seems to imply that there is always one perfect translation, while practice shows that numerous different translations can all faithfully replicate a source text in their own ways, producing different 'versions' of one text.

The notion of equivalence also implies that the source text is authoritative and must serve as the sole basis for judgment. Readers of translations, however, will rarely read the source text as well and are therefore reliant on the authority of translator. In other words, translations deserve to be considered as independent texts – in the words of Cees Koster, a translation is "a representation of another text and at the same time a text in its own right" (26). Neither source nor target text should be the authoritative starting point for criticism, but both need to be considered as equally important: the critic must "[reactivate] interpretations of the original while envisaging the

interpretative potential of the translation" (Hewson 17). An important task of the critic, then, is to find these potential interpretations and judge what their impact is on the text as a whole.

This thesis follows Hewson is his choice of terminology, describing translations in terms of "translational choices and their effect(s)" (17) rather than using loaded terms such as 'shift' or 'change'. As Hewson argues, translation always involves choice – though in many cases one choice may be highly preferred – and each choice has an identifiable effect (17). While choices and their effects may be studied, it is not the task of the critic to examine *why* translational choices were made. The intent of the translator, much like the authorial intent in reader-response criticism, is insignificant compared to the effects the text may have on the reader. While a translator may work with one interpretation of a text in mind, this will not necessarily be the interpretation that readers find in the translated text; after all, each text "will give rise to a *range* of interpretations" (Hewson 20) and readers may discover any of these plausible interpretations in the text.

In other words, the translator's intent is both difficult to trace and inconsequential to the critic, who must instead compare the *interpretative potential* of both texts: which interpretations are encouraged by the translational choices in the target text and whether these interpretations fit within the range of interpretations that can be found in the source text. In addition, the critic must consider other possible

translations and their potential interpretations, all the while judging whether these interpretations are desirable. Of course, terms such as 'desirability' are far too vague and subjective to reliably use in comparisons and Hewson instead uses the terminology of Jean-Jacques Lecercle, labelling interpretations as either 'just' or 'false':

> *An interpretation … is false if it is either delirious, disregarding the constraints of the encyclopaedia, or incorrect, disregarding the constraints that language and the text impose on the construction of interpretation.* (Lecercle 32)

> *A just interpretation is one that conforms to the constraints of the pragmatic structure that governs the interpretation of the text, and that does not seek to close the interminable process of reinterpretation.* (id., 33)

As it is ultimately the critic who decides which potential interpretations do and do not conform to the constraints of the text, the act of judging interpretations is clearly still subjective. Objectivity, however, implies that there should be one 'true' interpretation of a text, which is refuted by Lecercle, in the words of Hewson, "as it would mean (i) that authorial intention was simultaneously the extension and limit of interpretation, and (ii) that one could effectively (and fully) recover that intention" (Hewson 21). Translational choices that may be called undesirable, then, are those choices that mainly give rise to

false interpretations – even a choice with a multitude of potential just interpretations may be undesirable if the structure of the surrounding text is likely to lead the reader to a false interpretation.

This division between just and false interpretations allows a critic to determine the extent in which the translation is similar to or divergent from the source text. Hewson distinguishes between four categories of similarity: divergent similarity, relative divergence, radical divergence, and adaptation (27). Adaptations, with their radical additions and omissions, differ so strongly from the source text that there can be little doubt about their categorization, but the borders between the other categories can be less clear: when, for example, is a text no longer radically divergent but only relatively divergent? Hewson explains that "while radical divergence always leads to 'false' interpretation, relative divergence designates the translation that stands on the threshold between 'just' and 'false' interpretation" (221). In other words, the potential interpretations of radically divergent translations are clearly 'false', while relatively divergent translations find themselves in a gray area where the interpretative potential contains both just and false interpretations, meaning that the text can be interpreted both 'correctly' and 'incorrectly'. Depending on the reader, then, relative divergence could still lead to a just interpretation. Finally, divergent similarity is characterized by Hewson as those cases where there is "nothing in the translation to *prevent* the reader from constructing a 'just' interpretation or to *encourage* her to make a 'false' one" (235).

These translations, in other words, align perfectly with the interpretative potential of the source text.

It is important to note that these labels say nothing about *which* choices the translators made to arrive at the desired effect. Two texts that differ strongly in their strategies may still both be assigned the label "divergent similarity", but this is also a clear benefit of Hewson's model, as it accepts the existence of radically different versions of a text that still encourage similar interpretations. As such, the model accurately represents the essence of translation: it is not the individual building blocks, but the combined result that determines how a work is perceived by the reader. Of course, the combined result can only be determined through the studying of single 'building blocks' – translational choices in style, register, culture specific items, etc. – but the focus in Hewson's model always lies on the effect of the text as a whole. The task of the critic is to determine how these building blocks together form the overarching interpretative potential of the text.

To determine how individual translational choices can impact the translation as a whole, Hewson uses Kitty van Leuven-Zwart's terminology (in "Translation and Original. Similarities and Dissimilarities, I.") to describe the different levels of a text: single elements in the text – elements on the microtextual level or micro-level – can influence the overarching structure of the text – the macrotextual level or macro-level. Hewson also identifies a third, intermediary level: the meso-level. Where the micro-level

concerns only a single translational choice, the meso-level concerns "all the phenomena such as they accumulate on the level of the whole passage under observation" (53). This meso-level is a necessary addition, as the effect of a micro-level choice must always be considered within its surrounding context to determine its potential effects on the text. The proposed length of these meso-level passages is not made explicit, though Hewson's own cited passages generally cover one to two pages. However, there may very well be cases where the larger surrounding context of a micro-level element is not hugely important to determine its interpretative potential. In such cases, a single sentence may suffice, as long as the critic can convincingly show the influence of the element on the text as a whole.

How, then, can a critic determine the impact of individual choices on this overarching macro-level? Hewson explains that it is not a question of frequency or consistency of choices, as "one marked shift can influence the way a whole text is interpreted" (8). In contrast, consistently made 'unimportant' translational choices may have no discernible impact on the macro-level of the text at all. Instead of focusing on frequency or consistency, the critic must focus on the range of potential interpretations encouraged by the texts on the meso- and macro-levels and determine to which extent these interpretations are just or false.

### 1.2 – Hewson's procedure

Hewson's model for criticism contains six steps: collecting preliminary data [1]; constructing a critical framework [2] for analyzing passages on a micro- and meso-level [3]; moving from the micro- and meso-levels to the macro-level [4]; identifying macro-level effects and interpretative paths in the translation to form to a hypothesis about its nature [5]; and testing the newly formed hypothesis on other passages [6] (24).

The preliminary data consist of any relevant information about source and target texts and author and translator, as well as paratextual and peritextual elements of the studied texts (introductions, footnotes, translator's notes, etc.) and existing critical texts about the work – everything that may influence readers' potential interpretations of the text. The gathered information situates the source and target texts in their cultural context, giving the critic a solid basis for his argument.

The critical framework aims to "identify the key stylistic characteristics of the work" and to "explore the underpinnings of major potential interpretative paths" (26). The framework is clearly based on the source text, where the critic notes the elements (s)he deems important to the work. The goal is not, however, to produce an interpretation, as this would clash with Lecercle and Hewson's criticism of 'true' interpretations. Instead, the critic can "identify a limited number of elements that appear to have particular importance when interpretations are envisaged – and whose treatment by the translator is thus deemed to be important" (26). These elements in the

source text act as markers for examining the target text.

Once the critical framework has been established, the critic collects all corresponding passages in the target language(s), examines the translational choices and makes "provisional notes about their potential effects" (27) – step three in the model. Hewson stresses the temporary character of this analysis; it serves purely as an initial reading, allowing the critic to focus on those choices that seem important to the structure and interpretation of the text. The result of the analysis is "a series of meso-level observations regarding the effects of the different translational choices" (27).

The critic then moves from the micro- and meso-levels to the macro level, forming an initial hypothesis about the translation as a whole. Once this hypothesis has been tested on further passages, the translation is placed in one of the four categories "divergent similarity", "relative divergence", "radical divergence" or "adaptation" (27).

Hewson's exclusive focus on the source text when forming the critical framework has one clear flaw, as it ignores potentially problematic elements that only become visible in translation. These 'invisible' elements may seem insignificant to the interpretation of a work when considered in the source text alone, but their translations may dramatically influence the interpretative potential of the target text. For example, characters in *Norwegian Wood* always address the protagonist by his last name ワタナベ (Watanabe), as is common in Japanese and not likely to strike the critic as particularly important to the interpretation of the text; however, translators may choose to instead

have characters address the protagonist by his first name Toru. If a translator chooses to use Toru, the choice of *who* says it – all characters or only some – and *when* it is said – when characters first meet or only later on – may influence how readers interpret the relationship between characters. This element would have been overlooked in Hewson's model because it only gains its complex interpretative potential through the act of translation.

The blind spot in Hewson's model can be remedied by including a target text-oriented analysis in the construction of the critical framework. After analyzing the source text, the critic will be aware of its stylistic characteristics and major potential interpretative paths. Based on this knowledge, the critic can then analyze the target text and identify additional elements and passages that may be important to its interpretative potential. Note that this analysis differs from step 3, which is an in-depth micro-level analysis: the analysis proposed as extension of step 2 is a global one, based on a superficial reading of the target text(s). This thesis expands upon Hewson's model by including notable passages from the target texts in which the name of the protagonist appears. The selection of passages will be discussed in further detail under Methodology.

### 1.3 – Categorizing CSIs

As this thesis not only focuses on the comparison between the source text and target

texts but also concerns a comparison between target texts, some passages have been selected not for their interpretative importance in the source text but for their strikingly different translational choices in the target texts. In many cases, these different choices still arrive at the same or similar potential interpretative paths, making them highly interesting from a translator's point of view. In fact, some of the most notable translational choices in a text may be made in passages that have seemingly little impact on the interpretation: culture-bound, offhand remarks that serve to add a little color to a passage but carry no deeper meaning. Hewson's model cannot be directly applied here, as it is primarily based on the source text and relies on the macro-level to draw conclusions, while these cases concern micro-level choices that are mainly of interest for their role in the target texts. Of course, Hewson's model was intended for translation criticism, while these cases require analysis: the focus lies not on *how* a translational choice influences the interpretation of a text, but on *what* translation was chosen to achieve a specific effect – and which translations were not.

Despite the micro-level focus, there may be macro-level tendencies or patterns in these translational choices that point at a set of strategies adopted by the translator. If a translator consistently uses similar strategies, the seemingly insignificant micro-level choices may still influence the voices heard in a work, be it the voice of the narrator or of a character. In turn, these voices may still influence how readers perceive a text through its style or its interpretative potential. Because these choices are relatively insignificant

on their own – and are therefore not "elements that appear to have particular importance when interpretations are envisaged" (Hewson 26) – they are not included in Hewson's critical framework and will likely be overlooked in the critical process. In a comparison across target texts, however, uncovering macro-level patterns in these translational choices is critical, as the strategies adopted by translators will often set one text apart from the other.

As such, Hewson's model can be expanded upon by widening the scope of elements included in the critical framework: where Hewson focuses on stylistic characteristics and interpretative paths, it is fruitful for a cross-target text analysis to also include culture-specific items (CSIs). To analyze CSIs, this thesis uses Javier Franco Aixelá's classification in *Culture-specific Items in Translation*. Aixelá's text provides a terminological framework that can be used to categorize individual translational choices and in doing so uncover any patterns in their translation.

It can be difficult to arrive at a precise definition of the term culture-specific item, as essentially all linguistic elements in a text are culturally bound – after all, language itself is bound to culture. As Aixelá writes, CSIs have often been oversimplified to only contain "the most arbitrary area of each linguistic system – its local institutions, streets, historical figures, place names, personal names, periodicals, works of art, etc.–which will normally present a translation problem in other languages" (57). This definition, however, excludes exactly the group of culturally bound items which are often most

difficult to translate, and therefore most deserving of our attention: those items "which do not seem more arbitrary than the average" (57) but still form translation problems. A proper name, for example, will be easy to identify and categorize as such, but many sociocultural linguistic elements – politeness, forms of address, etc. – will only reveal themselves to be translation problems when the text is translated. Wordplay, too, while mainly bound to language, may contain strong cultural references that can feel nearly impossible to translate and even words which seem easy to translate at first may have a completely different connotation in the target language.

Aixelá writes that CSIs are not static, but differ depending on which cultures are contrasted (57). A text translated from Japanese to English, for example, will likely contain far more words that could be labeled as CSIs than one translated from Dutch to English, due to the larger cultural and linguistic distance that needs to be bridged. Aixelá further specifies the position of the CSI:

> [A] CSI does not exist of itself, but as the result of a conflict arising from any linguistically represented reference in a source text which, when transferred to a target language, poses a translation problem due to the nonexistence or to the different value (whether determined by ideology, usage, frequency, etc.) of the given item in the target language culture. (57)

A group of CSIs, then, is bound to one pair of languages. This poses a theoretical problem for this thesis, as the goal is to compare CSIs between *four* language pairs. However, because the distance between Japanese and each target language is similarly large and the target languages share much of the same cultural heritage, the groups of CSIs will be similar enough to compare them as 'equals'. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that they are not completely equal and there may be differences in how CSIs are – or are expected to be – translated.

Considering the textually and culturally bound position of CSIs, Aixelá arrives at the following definition of the term:

> [CSIs are] Those textually actualized items whose function and connotations in a source text involve a translation problem in their transference to a target text, whenever this problem is a product of the nonexistence of the referred item or of its different intertextual status in the cultural system of the readers of the target text. (58)

This definition is highly flexible and takes into account not only the differences between target cultures, but also the changing nature of these very cultures: an item considered a CSI at one point may eventually become common cultural property in both source and target cultures. This is especially relevant in the increasingly globalized world today,

where more and more 'foreign' words are becoming absorbed into languages' vocabularies. Of course, the flexibility of the definition can be taken too far, as it is impossible to account for all possible variations in readers' knowledge; Aixelá therefore focuses on cultural systems as represented by an "average reader" (58), representing the common cultural knowledge of a target audience.

Though CSIs are ever changing, they still generally appear in archetypal situations and can therefore also be divided into categories. Aixelá distinguishes between two types of CSI: proper nouns and common expressions, the latter term being used "for want of a better term to cover the world of objects, institutions, habits and opinions restricted to each culture and that cannot be included in the field of proper names" (59). Proper nouns, in turn, are subdivided into conventional and loaded nouns. Conventional proper nouns may be considered 'meaningless', i.e. carrying no deeper connotations of themselves, while loaded proper names are imbued with meaning, ranging from "faintly 'suggestive' to overtly 'expressive' names and nicknames" (ibid.). As Aixelá writes, conventional names are generally repeated or transcribed in the target text with only slight variation, while loaded names, with their greater cultural embeddedness, see a whole range of possible solutions (ibid.).

To gain an overview of these solutions, CSIs will first need to be divided into sub-categories; after all, the strategies used in a translation may differ vastly depending on the type of CSI. The categories of proper nouns and common expressions are too broad

to use for this purpose, as common expressions alone include food, references to historical events, wordplay, units of measure, and many others. A translator cannot be expected to translate all these CSIs with the same or similar strategies, so further categorization is required to uncover patterns in a translation. One drawback of categorizing CSIs is that categories are rigid while CSIs may fulfil multiple roles in a text; however, most CSIs will still fulfil one main role. Any CSIs that are too multi-faceted to fit into one main category are likely to be complex, isolated cases, which means they cannot fit into a pattern as there are no other comparable items. In other words, rigid categories provide exactly the level of abstraction required to uncover patterns in a translated text.

Although many scholars have provided limited categorizations of CSIs – see, for example, Grit (189) – only few provide a practically applicable, all-encompassing set of categories. One particularly useful and exhaustive categorization is the one proposed by Anne Lopes Michielsen, who distinguishes between the following categories (13-14):

- *proper names*: these include Aixelá's conventional and loaded proper nouns as discussed above.
- *ecological & geographical CSIs*: plants, animals, landmarks, cities, regions, etc.
- *historical CSIs:* references to historical figures, events, or periods.

- *institutional CSIs*: names of and references to schools, political organizations, administrative systems, laws, etc. Also includes the titles and terminology associated with these institutions.
- *material-cultural CSIs:* tangible, man-made items or products with commercial value; i.e. clothing, furniture, houses, food and other consumables, etc.
- *socio-cultural CSIs*: intangible products of society or social groups; i.e. traditions, leisure activities, sports, social hierarchies, art, etc.
- *units of measure*: currencies and units of weight, length, size, etc.
- *idiom:* words or phrases with a culturally determined meaning or connotation; i.e. proverbs, expressions, forms of address, politeness, slang, and other forms of social code.
- *humor:* wordplay, jokes.
- *intertextuality*: quotes from or allusions to other (literary) works.

While there is some overlap between categories, they are separate and precise enough to be used in large-scale comparisons of CSIs. The category of proper names may be considered to contain all names that do not fit easily into any of the other categories – historical names, for example, will generally be categorized as Historical CSIs.

The final two categories, humor and intertextuality, are problematic for

translation critics as they generally contain isolated cases that are difficult to regard as parts of one cohesive category. Even within the humor category, each humorous CSI may be vastly different, and, depending on the context and complexity of the joke, require a completely different strategy from other humorous items. As these CSIs are relatively rare, one can only discern patterns in their translations if the corpus studied is large enough to contain at least a group of comparable items within the category. In *Norwegian* Wood, for example, there is no shortage of ecological and geographical CSIs but there are only two instances of wordplay – far too few to form a clearly defined separate category. With a larger corpus, these additional categories may be the most interesting ones for the critic, as their complexity tends to show most clearly the voice of the translator.

To uncover patterns in the strategies used within each category, there must also be clear definitions for the various strategies available to translators. The main body of Aixelá's work consists of a categorization of such strategies. It is important to note that these categories are not rigid and that some fringe cases may fall into multiple categories. Additionally, the model in no way assumes that one CSI is (or should be) consistently translated in the same way. It can be used, however, to uncover tendencies in a translator's work – to see if a translator favors one solution, or a category of solutions, over other available options. As such, it provides an adequate framework for the comparison between target texts in this thesis.

Aixelá describes two main strategies in translating CSIs: conservation and substitution, where the original reference is either conserved in some form or substituted by another item closer to the target culture (61). These two main categories are then subdivided further. Conservative strategies include (61-62) (example phrases taken from *Norwegian Wood* and translations):

- *repetition*: the item remains unchanged in the translation; a strategy which emphasizes the exotic nature of the CSI. From the Japanese, this is hardly used except for when translating acronyms, as few other items are written in the roman alphabet.

  *Example: JP: NHK -> EN: NHK*

- *orthographic adaptation*: the item is transcribed or transliterated; often used when translating between languages with different alphabets.

  *Examples: JP: ワタナベ -> EN: Watanabe; JP: 歌舞伎町 -> NL: Kabukicho*

- *linguistic (non-cultural) translation*: a translation very close to the original denotatively; a word-for-word translation resulting in a target language version of an item which is still part of the cultural system of the source text.

  *Example: JP: 六畳間 -> DE: sechs Tatami groß*

- *extratextual gloss*: any of the strategies above supplemented with explanatory notes, commentary, etc. that are placed outside the text and therefore make

the act of translation highly visible. Often used for items deemed 'untranslatable'.

*Example: JP: 六畳間 -> SE: sex tatami-mattor* (linguistic translation + note)*

- *intratextual gloss*: the same as above, but included as an indistinct part of the text and therefore 'invisible'.

  *Example: JP: 豊島区 -> EN: a north-west suburb, Toshima (orthographic adaptation + note)*

Substitutive strategies include (63-64):

- *synonymy*: using a synonym or parallel reference to avoid repeating the CSI.

  *Example: JP: ワタナベ -> EN: Toru*

- *limited universalization*: replacing an obscure CSI with a better-known one from the source culture, helping the reader understand the CSI while maintaining an exotic connotation.

  *Example: JP: 歌舞伎町 -> EN: Shinjuku*

- *absolute universalization*: replacing an obscure CSI with a familiar item completely free of foreign connotations.

  *Example: JP: 六畳間 -> NL: zo'n tweeënhalf bij vier meter*

- *naturalization*: a source culture CSI is replaced by a target culture-specific CSI. Rarely used in literature.

*Example: JP: 六畳間 -> EN: nine-by-twelve*

- *deletion*: the CSI is omitted, possibly because it is deemed irrelevant or too obscure for the target reader.

  *Example:*

  *JP: 千代田区三番町、港区元麻布、大田区田園調布、<u>世田谷区成城</u>*

  *SE: 3-bancho i Chiyoda, Moto-Azabu i Minato-ku, Denenchofu i Ota-ku <u>[ø]</u>*

- *Autonomous creation*: a CSI is inserted in the target text to potentially make it more interesting for the reader. This strategy is rarely used.

  *Example:*

  *JP: 四ツ谷駅*

  *EN: Yotsuya, <u>where the green embankment makes for a nice place to walk by the old castle moat</u>.*

Aixelá also lists a few strategies that fall into neither conservative nor substitutive strategies (64):

- *compensation*: deletion + autonomous creation to replicate the deleted effect somewhere else in the text.

- *dislocation*: moving a reference to a different point in the text.

- *attenuation*: replacement, on ideological grounds, of an element by another element deemed more fitting for the target audience.

As the examples indicate, the given strategies are by no means prescriptive: a single CSI may be translated in any number of ways varying by target language or translator – as with "歌舞伎町" and "六畳間" – but also differently within the same text – as with the two strategies used for "ワタナベ" in the English translation.

The listed conservative and substitutive strategies display a gradual shift from one extreme (repetition) to the other (autonomous creation), the former being largely source text-oriented and the latter being target text-oriented. The other strategies can be placed on various points between these two extremes, resulting in a sliding scale between poles resembling James Holmes' distinction between exoticizing and naturalizing strategies. As Holmes writes, elements from the source text's linguistic and cultural context may, when conserved in translation, gain an exotic connotation in their target context that was absent in the source context, meaning the item was exoticized; altering the element to fit the target context – naturalizing it – can be an option to reduce its exotic connotations (185).

It is important to note that naturalization and exoticization are not identical to Aixelá's division between conservative and substitutive strategies. For example, an item translated using repetition – the most conservative strategy – may fit just as easily into the target context as it did into the source context and be fully free of exotic connotations. Still, there is much overlap between the categories of Aixelá and Holmes, as conservative strategies are the only ones where exoticization *could* take place.

Substitutive strategies, by their very nature, are naturalizing, because the translator always replaces a potentially exotic element with an element from the target culture. Although conservation is not equal to exotization, the great distance between Japanese culture and the four target cultures ensures that in most cases, conserved items will be perceived as exotic. In contrast, substitutive strategies are likely to produce items perceived as more culture-neutral or naturalized. To determine how the strategies used by translators may influence readers' perception of a text, critics may search for macro-level patterns in the strategies used. Heavy use of conservative strategies may lead to an exoticized text, while a large number of substitutive strategies will often result in a naturalized text.

### 1.4 – Conclusion

Hewson provides the critic with an adequate model for analyzing and evaluating a translation. The focus on potential interpretative paths moves the discussion away from 'correct' and 'incorrect' choices and instead forces the critic to focus on the impact of choices on the overarching macro-structure of the translation. The translation is then judged based on whether this macro-structure encourages just or false interpretations. Translations are assigned a label – divergent similarity, relative divergence, radical divergence, or adaptation – based on the availability of these just and false interpretations in the text.

Hewson's model has one blind spot as it bases its critical framework purely on the material of the source text, leaving some potentially impactful translational choices in the target text out of the equation. These 'invisible' elements only gain interpretative significance through the act of translation, but may be equally important in determining the interpretative potential of a text. This thesis modifies Hewson's model to include target text elements – in this case, translations of the name of the protagonist – in the critical framework. Translations of the name of the protagonist will be evaluated in Chapter 4, using Hewson's model.

Although translations of culture-specific items may not always influence the interpretative potential of a text, patterns in the strategies used to translate them may still influence how exotic the text appears to readers. Because the aim of this thesis is not only to evaluate the studied translations, but also to contrast them, the focus must also lie on *what* translational choices were made, regardless of their interpretative effect. Aixelá's descriptive list of translational strategies is particularly useful for contrasting individual items in translation; the types of CSI provided by Michielsen then facilitate the shift from individual items to larger categories, enabling the analysis and comparison of macro-level patterns in the strategies used to translate CSIs. These patterns may influence readers' perception of a text, making it appear exoticized, naturalized, or somewhere in between. Chapter 5 will focus on uncovering patterns in the strategies used in the translation of CSIs in *Norwegian Wood*.

## Chapter 2 – Background

This chapter concerns the collection of preliminary data as well as the forming of a provisional critical framework. The chapter contains four sections: Murakami and his style; Murakami in English; *Norwegian Wood;* and translations of *Norwegian Wood*. The first section concerns Murakami's literary style and focuses on rhythmicality, storytelling, the I-novel genre, the use of foreign elements, and Americanization in Murakami's writing. Although Murakami's style has evolved over the years, this section focuses mainly on his early writing, up to and including *Norwegian Wood*. The second section focuses on the dominant position of the English translations and how these have shaped his international reception, as well as on the criticism these translations have received. The third section focuses on the key characteristics of the *Norwegian Wood* – its plot, main themes, and stylistic characteristics. The characteristics of both Murakami's work as a whole and *Norwegian Wood* in particular will serve as a basis for the critical framework. Finally, the chapter on *Norwegian Wood* in translation collects noteworthy preliminary data about translations of the novel in each language, also providing short profiles for each translator.

### 2.1 – Murakami and his style

Haruki Murakami (1949) was born in Kyoto and he grew up in the area around Kyoto,

Osaka and Kobe. Murakami began writing in 1978 and debuted with *Hear the Wind Sing* (1979), which won the *Gunzo* magazine Newcomers Award. After enjoying years of moderate success, Murakami's major breakthrough came in 1987 with the publication of *Norwegian Wood*. The novel was a departure from Murakami's usual fantasy-filled novels and told a story free of the supernatural, instead presenting a realistic love story. The novel went on to become a bestseller and propelled Murakami into national fame. Gradually, Murakami also gained international attention and he has frequently been listed as a favorite among candidates for the Nobel Prize in Literature in recent years.

Murakami's writing has been described as un-Japanese. Although labeling a Japanese author as un-Japanese is somewhat of an oversimplification, it is undeniable that Murakami has been influenced by Western culture, and Western writing in particular. This may be caused in part by his frequent travels, as he has spent many of his writing years in Europe and the United States, including longer stays as artist-in-residence at Princeton (in 1990) and Harvard (in 2005). More importantly, Murakami has been a voracious reader of European and American literature since his teens. As early as in his high school years, he began to read the works of hard-boiled detective writers Raymond Chandler, Ed McBain, and Ross MacDonald, as well as the works of F. Scott Fitzgerald and Truman Capote. His admiration was put to practical use when he began translating these authors' works into Japanese, starting with a collection of short stories by F. Scott Fitzgerald in 1981. Over the years, translations followed of works by

Raymond Carver, John Irving, Truman Capote, Raymond Chandler, and many more. The fact that Murakami was already translating works from English only a few years into his writing career has undoubtedly influenced his style.

Murakami himself has stated that when he began writing *Hear the Wind Sing*, he learned to write in a "simple, swift-paced style" (qtd. in Rubin 30) from Kurt Vonnegut and Richard Brautigan. One of the greatest influences on his work was Raymond Carver, who Murakami calls "the most valuable teacher I ever had and also the greatest literary comrade" (qtd. in Rubin 76). Murakami himself has described his style as follows: "First of all, I never put more meaning into a sentence than is absolutely necessary. Second, the sentences have to have rhythm. […] To maintain that rhythm, there must be no extra weight" (qtd. in Rubin 3). His sentences are streamlined and rhythmical, almost effortlessly guiding the reader along in the story. Such effortless prose may be deceptively difficult to translate, especially into a language syntactically and culturally removed from Japanese. For example, some CSIs may require explanation, but too much explanation might make a sentence feel undesirably heavy.

Murakami's focus on weightlessness and a bare minimum of meaning partly seems to stem from his vision on the place of literature in modern times, where it competes with fast and easy media such as television and the internet. He believes "the novelist can no longer expect readers to put the time and energy into trying to understand difficult fiction […] The burden is on the writer to entertain, to tell stories in

simple, easy-to-understand language" (qtd. in Rubin 147). Clearly, Murakami does not write literature for its own sake, but uses the art form as a tool to convey a message to the reader. This does not mean, however, that Murakami's writing is in any way unliterary or lacking in depth. As German translator Ursula Gräfe states, although Murakami avoids writing 'difficult' sentences, the ideas he expresses – exploring philosophical themes and the outer edges of human nature – can be highly complex (Janz). In other words, Murakami focuses more on *what* he writes than on *how* he writes it, and more on overarching themes than on details. In extension, his work is perhaps best translated with the same mindset: whenever there is a choice between stylistic faithfulness and faithfulness to the contents, translators may wish to favor the latter.

Much of Murakami's oeuvre closely resembles the traditional Japanese I-novel. The genre's defining characteristic is that the protagonist's life is largely based on the life of the author. While traditional I-novels are highly confessional and personal, Murakami handles the genre more loosely, borrowing elements from his life but never venturing into the autobiographical. Even so, because of the popularity of the genre in Japan, many of his novels have been mistakenly interpreted as autobiographical, especially the realistic *Norwegian Wood* (Rubin 152-153).

Unlike the name 'I-novel' suggests, even third-person narrations may be I-novels, but most novels in the genre are written using formal first-person pronouns such as 私 (*watakushi* or *watashi*) (Fowler 4). Murakami, too, writes much of his work in the first

person but instead uses 僕 (*boku*), "an unpretentious [pronoun] used primarily by young men in informal circumstances" (Rubin 37). While there are other I-novels that use 僕, Murakami is noteworthy for almost exclusively using it. Because personal pronouns in Japanese always bear a connotation of social hierarchy – 私 is formal and distant, 僕 is informal and familiar – the choice of a personal pronoun automatically signals the relationship between narrator and narratee (Fowler 6). In other words, Murakami's choice for 僕 means his narrators adopt an informal and familiar stance toward the narratee and, in extension, toward the reader. The fact that Murakami's novels are I-novels with a twist roots them firmly in the Japanese literary tradition: the use of 僕 has its effect on the reader through its contrast with a tradition of narrations using 私. Because the choice of pronouns is so culturally bound, the informal relationship between narrator and reader is easily lost in translation. After all, none of the languages studied in this thesis have comparable different forms of the word "I", nor do they have a similar literary tradition of formal I-novels to contrast with the translated work. Translators may choose to compensate the loss in some other way. At the very least, the translator may wish to bear in mind the informal tone of works that use 僕 as a narrator and make translational choices accordingly where appropriate.

Murakami's style has been described as heavily Americanized or Westernized, both by his translators (see, for example, Rubin 401; Messmer) and by scholars (Hijiya-Kirschnereit 174). At times, Murakami's prose is so unidiomatic that it almost seems to

have been translated *into* Japanese. For example, *After Dark* (2004) contains an unusually large number of sentence subjects, which are generally implicit in the Japanese language (Hijiya-Kirschnereit 171). Unnecessarily explicating sentence subjects is highly unusual and will give Japanese readers the sensation they are reading a foreign work, even though it is written entirely in Japanese. Akio Nakamata notes that Murakami's use of metaphors, too, is nonstandard: "Haruki Murakami's novels are full of brilliant metaphors that hitherto had no expression in the Japanese. These metaphors give off the uncanny feeling one gets when reading English idioms translated literally into Japanese" (qtd. in Zielinska-Elliott and Kaminka 179).

According to Murakami, this peculiar style has its roots in his teenage years, when he dreamt of writing a novel in English:

> I had the feeling that I would be able to express my emotions so much more directly than if I wrote in Japanese. But with my limited proficiency in English, that was impossible. It took a very long time before I could somehow write a novel in Japanese. That is why I wasn't able to write a novel until I was 29. Because I had to create, all on my own, a new Japanese language for my novels. (qtd. in McInerney)

When he began formulating this 'new Japanese language', Murakami first tried writing realistically:

> [B]ut it was unreadable. So then I tried redoing the opening in English. I

> translated that into Japanese and worked on it a little more. Writing in English, my vocabulary was limited, and I couldn't write long sentences. So that way a kind of rhythm took hold, with relatively few words and short sentences (qtd. in Rubin 36)

That this new Japanese language should carry strong hints of English, then, is no surprise. Though Murakami's new language makes his prose feel distinctly foreign, his writing is in no way un-Japanese, and although his use of language is marked, it never feels forced or unnatural – in the words of Rubin, "Its American flavour is subtle and feels both foreign and natural at the same time" (403). No matter how Westernized his writing, Murakami still writes in Japanese.

Paradoxically, the fact that Murakami's prose appears to be translated makes it all the more difficult to translate. Translations into English risk transforming all of Murakami's 'translationese' into natural language: English idioms, exotic in the Japanese linguistic context, are translated into English idioms in an English context, rendering them entirely unremarkable. Translations into other Western languages run a similar risk, given their relative similarity to English: a typically English idiom translated into Dutch may seem somewhat foreign, but far less so than in the Japanese context. As English, Dutch, German and Swedish do not allow the use of implied sentence subjects to the same degree as Japanese, Murakami's marked use of the explicit sentence subject also loses its foreign touch.

Because this loss is largely inevitable, translators may seek to compensate for it by introducing elements in the translation that have a comparable effect. One could, for example, use sentence structures or words that are exotic within the target language, creating a text with a similar foreign flavor. This does present a dilemma, however, as readers are quick to blame foreign or unnatural prose on translators' incompetence. According to Rubin, other English translators may have wanted to compensate for the loss by "introducing a certain exaggerated hipness of expression into the English text" (404); Rubin's own strategy is to "try to reproduce the clean rhythmicality that gives Murakami's style its propulsive force" (ibid.). However, these strategies do not truly cover the loss of Murakami's exotic style, nor do they impart the text with new flavor to compensate – after all, hipness and rhythmicality are *already* characteristics of Murakami's writing. Although Rubin's solution may seem satisfying at first glance, it is by no means perfect.

Another strong characteristic of Murakami's writing is that he frequently uses brand names in his stories and writes about everyday objects in great detail (Smits) These items are not simply there as a colorful backdrop, but serve a distinct purpose: they characterize urban life, where their presence signifies "the absence of individuality, deeper relationships or a 'greater purpose' in life" (id., my translation). Indeed, seemingly mundane descriptions appear everywhere in Murakami's work. The preparation and consumption of food is often described in great detail, and most scenes

are set to a musical backdrop, from classical music to pop. The constant name-dropping of foreign brands and musicians lends Murakami's prose a distinctly exotic tone; even visually, Murakami's prose is foreign to the Japanese reader, as all non-Japanese words are written in *katakana*, a syllabary used for loan words and the transcription of foreign words and names. All these strikingly exotic proper nouns lend Murakami's prose a distinct hipness.

To complicate matters, however, many of the names perceived as exotic by Japanese readers may be common in the West: when a Japanese character drinks Heineken, it is an entirely different beer from when a Dutch character drinks Heineken, and reading *the Great Gatsby* in Japan is not the same as reading it in America. As such, Murakami cannot be called Westernized for his use of Western elements alone – after all, the exotic nature of these elements emphasizes the *differences* between Japan and the West, and the elements are only perceived as exotic because the surrounding context is Japanese. This is proven true when Murakami's work is translated into a Western language: when a character in a Dutch Murakami translation drinks a can of Heineken, the passage retains none of its original exotic hipness and the character is left drinking a wholly unremarkable beer. Attempting to retain this cosmopolitan atmosphere in some other form may be a consideration when translating Murakami.

This multicultural aspect of Murakami's writing dissolves many Orientalist stereotypes of what constitutes 'typical' Japanese literature. If Murakami's writing reads

as somehow un-Japanese, it is not only due to his Americanized style, but also due to his choice to fill his stories with Western references rather than typical Japanese ones. Because there few elements to label as distinctly Other, the stories are not perceived as exotic and labelled as un-Japanese. Of course, this label is highly problematic, as Murakami's writing is still very much Japanese – featuring Japanese characters in a Japanese setting in stories written in the Japanese language, with all its linguistic characteristics. Perhaps Murakami's fiction is only labelled un-Japanese because perceptions of what constitutes 'Japaneseness' are ill-defined or outdated – as Will Slocombe writes, "when we read Murakami, perhaps we do not see Japan, but an already Americanised Japan. The question of whether this is the 'real' contemporary Japan, or even if there is a 'real' Japan, becomes subsumed by market forces" (6). Slocombe also notes that "Murakami writes about a new Japan, in which the tenets of national identity are in stark contrast to a global identity, and seeks to create a new Japanese identity in relation to the global community as a whole" (ibid.). Murakami's Americanized writing places his stories in a wider international context – free of Orientalist clichés – while still being firmly rooted in Japan. Translators may want to bear this tension in mind when translating Murakami's work; choices that could make a target text appear drastically more 'Japanese' or more 'international', though sometimes unavoidable, may require careful consideration.

In short, Murakami's style is made up of several factors. Firstly, his writing is heavily influenced by American authors, which has led him to develop a rhythmical, weightless style. Because he writes in simple language about complex ideas, the focus

when translating Murakami should generally lie on preserving meaning over preserving form. His characteristic handling of the I-novel genre, using an informal pronoun over more formal options, gives his prose a strong sense of familiarity, but languages lacking comparable pronouns may require other forms of translation to compensate for the loss of tone. Murakami's Americanized style, with its unidiomatic sentences and strange metaphors, at times makes his work seem as though it was translated into Japanese. Because this characteristic is so strongly bound to the relationship between the English and Japanese language, it is inevitably lost in translation, though translators may seek to compensate for the loss using other methods. Murakami also frequently uses foreign (brand) names in his writing, which appear exotic to Japanese readers; however, these names carry fewer foreign connotations in the West, so that these exotic touches are often lost in translation into Western languages. Translators may choose to introduce similar exotic elements or hipness elsewhere. Finally, it is important to note that Murakami generally avoids Orientalist clichés of 'typical Japanese writing' in his literature; accordingly, translators seeking to faithfully reproduce his texts may wish to do the same.

**2.2 – Murakami in English**

While all translators act as cultural ambassadors, the English translators of Murakami deserve separate attention not only for their role in bringing the author to a large worldwide readership, but also for their translational choices that have been subject to

criticism from both scholars and translators into other languages. The English translations of Murakami's work are widely read, far surpassing other Western translations in readership, and for a long time they were the only translations to be published in the West. Figure 1 shows an overview of all of Murakami's novels and their translations into the languages discussed in this thesis.

| | JP publ. | EN | NL | DE | SE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Hear the Wind Sing** | 1979 | 2015* | 2015 | 2015 | -- |
| **Pinball, 1973** | 1980 | 2015* | 2015 | 2015 | -- |
| **A Wild Sheep Chase** | 1982 | 1989 | 1991 | 1991 | -- |
| **Hard-Boiled Wonderland** | 1985 | 1991 | 1994 | 1995 | -- |
| **Norwegian Wood** | 1987 | 2000** | 2007 | 2001 | 2003 |
| **Dance Dance Dance** | 1988 | 1994 | 2008 | 2002 | -- |
| **South of the Border, West of the Sun** | 1992 | 1999 | 2001 | 2013*** | -- |
| **The Wind-Up Bird Chronicle** | 1994 | 1997 | 2003 | 1998**** | 2007 |
| **Sputnik Sweetheart** | 1999 | 2001 | 2004 | 2002 | 2008 |
| **Kafka on the Shore** | 2002 | 2005 | 2006 | 2004 | 2006 |
| **After Dark** | 2004 | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2012 |
| **1Q84** | 2009 | 2011 | 2010 | 2010 | 2011 |
| **Colorless Tsukuru Tazaki** | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2014 | 2014 |

| | | EN | NL | DE | SE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Hear the Wind Sing** | | Goossen* | Westerhoven | Gräfe | -- |
| **Pinball, 1973** | | Goossen* | Westerhoven | Gräfe | -- |
| **A Wild Sheep Chase** | | Birnbaum | Westerhoven | Ortmanns/Stalph | -- |
| **Hard-Boiled Wonderland** | | Birnbaum | op den Camp | Ortmanns/Stalph | -- |
| **Norwegian Wood** | | Rubin** | Fennema | Gräfe | Duke |
| **Dance Dance Dance** | | Birnbaum | van Haute | Mangold | -- |
| **South of the Border, West of the Sun** | | Gabriel | Fennema | Gräfe*** | -- |
| **The Wind-Up Bird Chronicle** | | Rubin | Westerhoven | Bandini**** | Duke |
| **Sputnik Sweetheart** | | Gabriel | Fennema | Gräfe | Emond |
| **Kafka on the Shore** | | Gabriel | Westerhoven | Gräfe | Duke |
| **After Dark** | | Rubin | Westerhoven | Gräfe | Emond |
| **1Q84** | | Rubin/Gabriel | Westerhoven | Gräfe | Emond |
| **Colorless Tsukuru Tazaki** | | Gabriel | Westerhoven | Gräfe | Duke |

*Earlier translations by Birnbaum in 1987 (Wind) and 1985 (Pinball).

**Earlier translation by Birnbaum in 1989.

***Earlier translation by Giovanni and Ditte Bandini, 1998, from English

****Translated from English

*fig. 1: Murakami's novels in translation*

Recently, non-English translations have been appearing before the English to stay competitive, but because the English translations were historically the first – *Norwegian Wood* appeared in English a full 7 years before the Dutch translation was published –

and enjoy a wide readership all over the world, they have played a critical part in shaping Murakami's international reception.

Only few Western readers are proficient enough in Japanese to read the source texts, so for many years they were completely at the mercy of the English translations to form an image of both how Murakami writes and what he writes about. Until at least the early 2000s, then, the foremost 'Western Murakami' was the English Murakami. The dominant position of the English translations thereby shapes other translations in countries with a high percentage of English speakers – for each translation, non-English translators may want to consider choices made in the existing English translation and either (partly) conform to these choices or consciously ignore them. Because most critics will have no other frame of reference than the English translations, new translations with a style different from that of the English translations may cause them to be labelled as 'too free' or 'inaccurate'. After all, for many readers, the style of the English translations has implicitly become equal to Murakami's style, regardless of whether this is an accurate comparison or not.

Some European publishers also seem to subscribe to this notion, publishing translations of Murakami's works that were based not on the Japanese source texts, but on their English translations. Murakami's English novels have been re-translated into several languages, including German, Norwegian, and Greek. As such, it may be argued that there are two Murakamis – the Japanese author and the English-translated author –

and, to some extent, two sets of source texts that serve as a basis for new translations.

Among the novels re-translated from English is *The Wind-up Bird Chronicle*, with both the Greek and German translations based on Jay Rubin's version. The English translation of this book, however, is partly adapted rather than translated: when Rubin began translating the novel, was ordered by the U.S. publisher Knopf to cut several chapters' worth of text from the novel, and parts of Book Three have been rearranged in the process because Rubin found "several chronological inconsistencies which were not deliberately placed there by the author" (390). The reasoning behind the cuts was simply that Knopf deemed the novel too long for American readers, and Rubin was asked to remove passages where appropriate (id. 389-390). These cuts were made in cooperation with Murakami and the translation was authorized by Murakami himself, so perhaps the loss is not as great as it seems. Indeed, a later Japanese paperback publication included some of the minor cuts Rubin and Murakami made for the American translation (id. 391), which tells us that Murakami must have at least found it a partial improvement over his original publication.

Still, the translation is undeniably different from the source text and it is therefore striking that publishers should – perhaps unwittingly – select this book for re-translation from the English into another language. As a result, Rubin's cuts and alterations have become a part of Murakami's international oeuvre. Though the copyright page of the English translation of *The Wind-up Bird Chronicle* reads "Translated

and adapted from the Japanese by Jay Rubin with the participation of the author" (n.p.), the question remains how many readers will notice, and whether readers understand to what extent the novel has been adapted.

The German translation of the novel, *Mister Aufziehvogel,* became the subject of heated debate on the literary television program *Das Literarische Quartett*, where one critic praised the book but another called it pornographic literary fast food (Rubin 388). After the conversation escalated into a barrage of insults from both sides, Murakami, now a controversial writer, gained widespread attention among German readers. Following the incident, the German publisher decided to only accept translations directly from Japanese and Ursua Gräfe was selected as the main translator (Klappentexterin). The novel *South of the Border, West of the Sun*, which had also been translated from English, was translated anew from Japanese, but strikingly, *Mister Aufziehvogel* still only exists in its original translation based on the English adapted version.

While the fact that U.S. publishers go so far as to cut long passages from a translation to potentially increase sales is surprising – and questionable – in itself, the more surprising fact is that Murakami agreed to the cuts seemingly without protest. Though according to Rubin, Murakami was "admittedly uneasy that so much had been eliminated" (391), Murakami is above all a pragmatic author who wants to see his works translated into many languages as quickly as possible. He has remarked that he does not

mind re-translations and understands that a re-translation from English, as the lingua franca of the international publishing world, is the most efficient way to have his work published into smaller languages with only very few or no translators from Japanese (Rubin 394). For this reason, Murakami "takes special care with the English translations [because they serve as] the starting point for the journey of his works around the world" (id. 391-392).

In other words, while Murakami does care about differences in the English translations, he does not seem to care too much: as long as enough of his novels is left intact, he will allow cuts and alterations in his stories to please an American or international audience. He willingly authorizes even adapted novels, such as *The Wind-up Bird Chronicle*, to serve as the international representatives of his work. While it is entirely understandable that an author would like his books to be read, it is striking that the translations Murakami chooses to be his international representatives are so heavily edited, as in doing so he "proactively supports the hegemony of American literary tastes" (Hijiya-Kirschnereit 174). Moreover, as Isabelle Vanderschelden writes, collaboration with the author does not make a translation, by default, the best translation possible: after all, "authorial and translation collaboration are efficient ways to legitimize a translation, but they also constitute a safety exit by which some translators surrender part of their independence." (29) Between the influence of American publishers and collaborations with Murakami himself, the English translators

may be left with very little room to maneuver.

Several translators from Japanese into other languages have strongly criticized the English translations for their free translational choices and the publishers' influence. One Dutch translator of Japanese literature, Luk van Haute, goes so far as to call the translations "maimed and censored" versions of Murakami ("De qu van qutienvierentachtig", my translation). The Swedish translator Yukiko Duke has also criticized the English translations, saying Murakami is never as hip or cool in Japanese as he is in English, and the English translations lose many of his poetic touches (Sandoval). German translator Ursula Gräfe, too, writes that she finds some source texts have been treated arrogantly in the English translations (Messmer).

Gräfe further criticizes the American translations, more specifically "one of the translations of *Norwegian Wood"* (my translation) for the sentence "I like a slick finger job from behind" (Messmer). The sentence in question is a loose quote from Birnbaum's 1989 translation: "I really get off from behind. A good slick finger job" (140). Birnbaum's translation, however, was intended for Japanese learners of English and only for sale in Japan, so it is in no way of equal status to the later translation by Rubin. In other words, Gräfe's criticism of "one of the translations" is unproductive, as the two versions differ heavily in target audience and the first translation was never intended for an international readership. Gräfe names Birnbaum's sentence as an example of the American translators not only misinterpreting the register of a sentence, but that of the

overarching atmosphere of Murakami's novels, since Murakami would never use such vulgar language (Messmer). However, it is not the Birnbaum translation but the Rubin translation of the novel that is widely read, and Rubin rendered the sentence as "I have this tremendously sensitive back. The soft touch of fingers all over… mmmmm." (EN 294), a far more neutral translation. While Gräfe's criticism of Birnbaum's translation may be justified, judging the complete English translations of Murakami's works by one sentence from an old niche translation is not.

Nevertheless, the English translations certainly deserve attention for how widely criticized they are, while simultaneously being presented as the international standard and read by millions of readers from all over the world. Perhaps it is more fruitful to consider them not only as representations of the source texts but as *alternative versions* of the source texts; after all, they have served as the basis for several indirect translations. As Rubin writes, "there is no single authoritative version of *any* Murakami work" (391). There are so many editions of his works, each with their own revisions – by translators or by Murakami himself – and so many translations that there is no longer a single "true" work.

For the purposes of translation criticism, however, translations still need to be judged as translations and not as alternative original works, no matter their position or influence. The source text always remains the authoritative version upon which the critical framework is based. Any revisions and omissions in the translations, even large

ones such as those in *The Wind-up Bird Chronicle,* may be judged based on how they alter the interpretative potential present in the source text. In this way, a translation can still be subject to criticism even if it is considered an alternative authorized version. Because one of the aims of this thesis is to contrast the four different translations studied, it may be a valuable addition to the ongoing debate about the English translations' dominant position. On the one hand, this thesis will judge whether the English translation of *Norwegian Wood* is deserving of its dominant position in its own right; on the other hand, it will contrast the English translation with the other translations to explore whether the differences are indeed as large as some translators claim they are.

**2.3 – Norwegian Wood**

*Norwegian Wood* is Murakami's fifth novel, published in 1987. A departure from his previous work, the novel leaves touches of the supernatural behind for a realistic coming-of-age love story. Despite its straight-forward approach, or perhaps because of it, the novel went on to become a massive hit, selling over 3,500,000 volumes in Japan by the end of 1988. The popularity of the novel may have played a role in attracting attention overseas as well, as the first internationally available English translation of Murakami's work followed as quickly as two years later, in 1989. *Norwegian Wood* was also made into a feature film in 2010, making it one of the few works by Murakami to be adapted to the screen.

The novel has a framed narrative: it opens with the protagonist, Toru Watanabe, age 37, sitting in an airplane touching down in Hamburg. The protagonist recalls his past love, eighteen years prior, before the reader learns that Toru himself is writing the novel, "[to] think. To understand" (EN 4). After the introduction of the narrator, the majority of the first chapter is made up of a flashback to the time Toru spent as an adolescent with his love Naoko, and the chapter closes again with a short passage in the present tense to remind the reader of the position of the narrator. The majority of the novel is set in the past, in the years 1968-1970, and tells the story of Toru in his late teens and early twenties. The framed narrative seems to have little impact stylistically, because Toru adopts the informal 僕-pronoun and speaks to the reader in colloquial, natural Japanese throughout. As such, the present-time narrator soon becomes invisible, as if it were simply a regular novel set in the past. Even at the end of the novel, Murakami closes in the past narrative, leaving very little to remind the reader that there was ever a narrator writing the novel in the first place.

The novel tells the story of Toru and his two loves, Naoko and Midori. Naoko is the former girlfriend of Toru's childhood friend Kizuki, who committed suicide when he was 17. Kizuki's suicide and that of Naoko's sister have left Naoko depressed and suicidal. Naoko and Toru become close friends after Kizuki's death, and they sleep with each other on Naoko's 20th birthday. Toru hears nothing from Naoko in the following weeks, until she sends him a letter saying that she has gone to a sanatorium for her

mental health. Naoko's depression and mental instability continue throughout the novel. A large part of the communication between Toru and Naoko takes place through letters, always closed by Naoko with an ambiguous "さようなら", often translated as "goodbye" but also translatable as "farewell" as it carries connotations of finality. Although Toru and Naoko grow closer over time, there is always a sense of uncertainty about the stability of their relationship. Toru visits Naoko and her new friend Reiko, an older patient, in the sanatorium and the three spend a few happy days together. Toru grows close to the 38-year-old Reiko, who acts as his advisor and friend in these turbulent days. Although Naoko shows little promise of ever being cured, Toru remains optimistic, even if he is silently aware of the fact that Naoko can and will never truly love him.

At his university, Toru meets a girl named Midori Kobayashi. Midori is in many ways Naoko's opposite: while Naoko is quiet and chooses her words with great care, Midori is loud and self-confident, with an apparent lack of regard for social etiquette. As Rubin notes, the two love interests are also different in the symbolism associated with them: Naoko is associated with deep wells and forests, while Midori is frequently found on rooftops and in other high places (156-157). Throughout the novel, Toru struggles with his choice between "the lively, life-affirming Midori and the death-obsessed Naoko" (id. 157).

Midori's liveliness is expressed in large part by her dialogue, which uses

colloquial contractions such as “わかんない” for “わからない” and short, rhythmical sentences, often restating the same ideas for extra emphasis. The shortness and repetition make Midori’s dialogue come off as highly energetic, as if it were spoken at a high tempo and with much emotion. Naoko’s sentences, on the other hand, are often long and pondering, and she is described when speaking as often “slowing down to find the exact word she was looking for” (EN 5). Two pieces of dialogue of comparable length from both characters’ introductory passages make the difference abundantly clear:

> Naoko: そのまま首の骨でも折ってあっさり死んじゃえばいいけれど、何かの加減で足をくじくくらいですんじゃったらどうしようもないわね。声を限りに叫んでみても誰にも聞こえないし、誰かがみつけてくれる見込みもないし、まわりにはムカデやらクモやらがうようよいるし、そこで死んでいった人たちの白骨があたり一面にちらばっているし、暗くてじめじめしていて。(上14)

> Midori: そうなのよ。私もそう思うのよ。坊主にしてみてね、うん、これもわるくないじゃないかと思ったわけ。でも男の人って誰もそんなこと言ってくれやしない。小学生みたいだとか、強制収容所だとか、そんなことばかり言うのよ。ねえ、どうして男の人って髪の長い女の子がそんなに好きなの？ そんなのまるでファシストじゃない。下らないわよ。(上107)

In approximately the same number of characters, Naoko's dialogue consists of two sentences while Midori's consists of eight. The difference is not so much caused by the topic of conversation – both girls are speaking animatedly about a topic that interests them – as by the girls' personalities. Naoko uses many conjunctions, allowing her to continue her sentences at considerable length. In contrast, Midori's dialogue contains very few conjunctions, but does contain interjections such as "うん" and "ねえ", which make her dialogue appear far more lively and informal. Because the contrast between the two girls' speech plays a prominent role in their characterization, it may be important to retain a similar contrast in translation. Midori's colloquial speech requires special attention, as translators may want to choose an appropriate register and possibly compensate elsewhere whenever a language has no comparable colloquial word.

Toru also befriends a young man named Nagasawa, who lives at the same dormitory. Nagasawa, whose first name is never given, is Toru's senior and fulfils a mentor-like role in the story. This is not to say, however, that Nagasawa's behavior is exemplary: he shows an absolute lack of regard for ideals or morals, and is only interested in things he believes are worth his time. Although he attends the prestigious Tokyo University, he shows little interest in his studies or career and seems to treat his life as a game, seeing how far he can get. Toru seems aware of these characteristics, and though he respects Nagasawa for his support and honesty, he worries about the

conflicting sides of his personality. Toru compares his friendship with Nagasawa with the friendship he had with Kizuki and discovers they are fundamentally different because "The first time I saw Nagasawa drunk and tormenting a girl, I promised myself never, under any circumstances, to open myself up to him" (EN 40).

Nagasawa takes Toru out to go hunting for girls, and Toru enters a period of sleeping around with various girls in Tokyo while maintaining his long-distance love for Naoko and his budding interest in Midori. Nagasawa has a girlfriend but goes girl-hunting far more often than Toru does, displaying a callousness that Toru lacks and does not understand, but which still intrigues him. As such, Nagasawa becomes a teacher in being insensitive, a welcome role model for the highly sensitive Toru. Nagasawa also represents temptation: he has the carefree, detached lifestyle Toru sometimes longs for, although Toru simultaneously condemns it.

In a key passage toward the end of the book, Nagasawa, his girlfriend Hatsumi and Toru go out to dinner together. During the meal, Hatsumi and Toru share a friendly conversation, and Hatsumi appears caring, kind and well-spoken – all of which Nagasawa is not. Nagasawa grows increasingly drunk and has an argument with Hatsumi about his and Toru's sleeping around, and about the similarities between him and Toru. Hatsumi tries to appeal to the feelings of both Nagasawa and Toru, while Nagasawa is concerned with purely intellectual rhetoric, resulting in an opposition between two forces – the emotional versus the rational, as well as love versus sex – and

Toru is forced to pick a side. In the end, the argument comes to a boiling point and the dinner ends with Hatsumi and Toru driving off in a taxi. Toru's choice to support Hatsumi is a symbolic one, as he implicitly chooses emotion and affection over cold rationality and meaningless sex.

*Norwegian Wood* is clearly an I-novel, as there are strong parallels between Toru's life and that of Murakami himself: they both grew up in Kobe and moved to Tokyo to study, and the university Toru attends seems strikingly similar to Waseda University, which Murakami attended. The novel contains numerous precise descriptions of buildings and areas, which, unlike Murakami's frequent references to pop culture, do not serve to add hipness to the novel but rather fill the scenes with a sense of nostalgia. As Rubin writes, they are "based on first-hand experience, included not for symbolic value or plot significance" (150); instead, they serve to set the novel in the years 1968-1970, in the middle of a turbulent period of student uprisings in Japan. Although these clashes between the political right and left form a backdrop to a significant part of the story, Murakami avoids making political statements by choosing neither side:

> The ridiculous ways in which the factions are portrayed, from the rigidly structured flag-raising ceremony outside the narrator's dormitory, to the left-wing activists who bore students even more than their drama professor after taking over a class one day, make it abundantly clear that the surface text of *Norwegian Wood* is not about politics. (Strecher 367)

These political events, though turbulent, are described by the narrator with a trademark ironic detachment that can be found throughout the novel. It seems at times as if Toru has no real opinion about things that do not directly concern him, only showing a slight weariness at all that happens around him – he frequently uses the interjection "やれやれ", which recurs in many of Murakami's novels and may be translated as "oh, man", "just great" or similar exasperated phrases.

Stylistically, *Norwegian Wood* is filled with Murakami's typical weightless, rhythmical writing. The opening sentence of the novel provides a clear example:

> 僕は三十七歳で、そのときボーイング７４７のシートに座っていた。(上 7)
>
> I was thirty-seven, and I sat in a seat in a Boeing 747. (my translation)

One can hardly imagine a more dry, descriptive opening sentence; in it, Murakami sets the tone for the rest of the novel. Through the constant description of scenes, events and everyday items, Toru appears at times not to be an active force in his life but simply an onlooker, recording the scenes of his life as they pass by. Because this weightlessness is used to narrative effect, translators may wish to conserve as much of it as they can in translation.

### 2.4 – *Norwegian Wood* in translation

The first English translation of *Norwegian Wood*, by Alfred Birnbaum, was made as early as 1989 (see fig. 1). However, this was a translation published only in Japan by Kodansha, as part of a series intended for Japanese students of English. As a result, the translation was and is rarely seen outside Japan. The two-volume translation featured extensive notes in the back, with key English phrases and their Japanese equivalents given to help readers master the English language. The later translation by Jay Rubin was published in 2000 and is the authorized translation for international publication. Although Birnbaum's translation is an interesting subject for study – as a potential tool for comparing Birnbaum's and Rubin's translation styles, or simply because translating for a Japanese audience may have influenced Birnbaum's translational choices in interesting ways – it will not be discussed in further detail in this thesis as it never saw circulation outside Japan and is therefore largely unknown in the West.

Strikingly, the re-translation of *Norwegian Wood* was made quite late, not until after *the Wind-Up Bird Chronicle* was translated. As the Birnbaum version was not available internationally, this means the majority of the English-speaking audience did not have access to *Norwegian Wood* until eleven years after the first English Murakami translation. It may not be surprising that the novel was not re-translated sooner, however, as Birnbaum was the main Murakami translator for many years and he may not have wanted to redo his own work. Only later, when Jay Rubin and Peter Gabriel

began translating Murakami's works, was *Norwegian Wood* retranslated.

The Dutch translation of *Norwegian Wood* was also only translated later, in 2007 – a full sixteen years after the first translation of a Murakami novel in Dutch. Translations of other popular novels such as *Kafka on the Shore*, written fifteen years after *Norwegian Wood*, were published before Dutch fans could read about Toru Watanabe. *Norwegian Wood* was translated by Elbrich Fennema, who has an impressive translation record, having translated three of Murakami's novels as well as a few short story collections. Compared to the other two well-known translators from Japanese into Dutch, Jacques Westerhoven and Luk van Haute, Fennema has remained largely invisible, not involving herself in any debates or discussions. As such, little can be found of her views on translation. Westerhoven has commented on Fennema's style, stating "Elbrich is a completely different kind of translator than I am, very faithful to the text" ("De vertaler doet het altijd fout", my translation). It is interesting that the two main Dutch translators of Murakami's work should ostensibly have such differing styles, and perhaps Fennema's Murakami is indeed different from Westerhoven's Murakami. This difference in styles could be problematic given the popularity of *Norwegian Wood*, as readers introduced to Murakami through Fennema's translations might get a vastly different impression of the author's style than readers starting off with Westerhoven's translations. This, however, is a subject for a different study altogether.

The German translation of *Norwegian Wood* by Ursula Gräfe was published in

2001. Gräfe is by far the most prolific German Murakami translator, having made all translations since 2002. Following the controversy surrounding the two Murakami novels translated from English into German, Gräfe was selected by the publisher to be the main translator of Murakami's works from the Japanese original texts (Klappentexterin). She has also translated numerous works by other Japanese authors, including Kenzaburo Oe and Yoko Ogawa. *Norwegian Wood* is the first Murakami novel she translated. Gräfe has explicitly stated her vision on the balance between the exoticizing and naturalizing translation of CSIs: "I work hard to leave as few exotic elements as possible, as there will always still be plenty of 'strange' elements left" (Bogdan, my translation). She has voiced a preference for including unobtrusive explanations of elements she deems too exotic for the reader (id.) – the strategy Aixelá calls intratextual gloss – but elsewhere indicates a strong preference for (extratextual) glossaries, as long as not too many words are left unexplained (Messmer). In Gräfe's opinion, high concentrations of unexplained words may give the text an undesirable exotic effect, as "[Japanese] texts themselves are not necessarily exotic, but are only perceived as such" by German readers (id., my translation).

Strikingly, Swedish is the only target language studied in this thesis where *Norwegian Wood* was not translated out of order. Perhaps due to its popularity, it was the first of Murakami's novels to be translated into Swedish. It is also worth noting that of the seven novels Murakami wrote before 1994, *Norwegian Wood* is the only one to have

been translated into Swedish. Clearly, the Swedish publisher gave *Norwegian Wood* a high priority. The Swedish translation of the novel was made by the mother-daughter translator duo Eiko and Yukiko Duke, who have since translated the majority of Murakami's publications in Swedish. Yukiko Duke has also given her views on the translation of CSIs in an interview, naming both material-cultural CSIs, as categories she finds problematic. Duke prefers the intratextual gloss for most CSIs that are difficult to translate, as she and her mother have a preferred technique where they add an explanatory sentence or phrase (Översättarsektionen).

## Chapter 3 – Methodology

This chapter describes the steps that will be taken in the following two chapters to answer the research question of this thesis. To cover both the critical and the comparative aspects, the four target texts will be both evaluated as individual translations and compared as different versions of the same work. In both chapters 4 and 5, passages will be studied using the following structure: first, a selected passage will be examined based on its position in the source text, its interpretative potential and its potential translations; then, the passage will be studied in each of the four target texts in turn, focusing on the new interpretative potential and the relationship between source and target texts.

It is important to note that selected passages will not be given a self-made 'neutral' English translation made for the purposes of comparison. No translation is ever fully neutral because it always contains translational choices, and as such, any self-made translations would implicitly label a set of choices as somehow 'more correct' than others. As stated in the chapter 1, the focus of this thesis lies not on 'right' or 'wrong' translational choices on a micro-level but on the effects of each text on a macro-level – its connotations and interpretative potential. A self-made translation would risk drawing the eye towards micro-level differences between translations, where the four existing target texts are all compared to the supposedly authoritative self-made translation – even if the latter is only one of many valid representations of the source text. In contrast,

if no self-made translation is provided, readers will be able to deduce the connotations and interpretative potential of each source-text passage from the four existing target texts. These all approximate the meaning of the source text, so that the four translated passages, when read together, will give the reader an impression of a passage's connotations and interpretative potential on a meta-level.

**Methodology for chapter 4**

Chapter 4 will focus on translations of the name of the protagonist of *Norwegian Wood*, Toru Watanabe. As discussed in chapter 1, Hewson's procedure excludes passages that appear unimportant in the source text but whose potential translations may greatly influence how the target text is interpreted. Toru's name is one of these 'invisible' elements, and passages will be selected where the translation of a name may potentially influence the interpretative potential of the story.

The analysis of the novel provided in chapter 2 will serve as an initial critical framework, which will be supplemented by additional information given in the introduction to chapter 4. For clarity, the chapter will be split into four sections, one for each character interacting with Toru: section 1 will focus on Naoko, section 2 will focus on Midori, section 3 will focus on Reiko, and section 4 will focus on Nagasawa and Hatsumi. Each section will contain passages with dialogue spoken by the character studied, to create an overview of how each character addresses Toru.

Due to spatial constraints, not all instances of Toru's name will be studied. Instead, passages will be selected to give a complete overview of characters' forms of address, from the first uttering of Toru's name to the last. The selection will be based in part on the critical framework, to include passages deemed important in determining the interpretative potential of the source text. In addition, the selection will be based on the extension of Hewson's model proposed in the chapter 1, including passages with translational choices that may influence the interpretative potential of the target texts.

Each section will begin with an introduction to the character, serving as critical framework for the passages studied. Passages will then be studied one by one. Each passage will first be discussed as it is in the source text to determine its interpretative potential and on potential translations. Then, each of the four target passages will be studied in turn, focusing first on the micro and meso-level effects of the translational choices made. For each target text, an attempt will then be made to relate the findings in the passage to the text's macro-structure, analyzing how the passage may influence the interpretative potential of the text as a whole.

When all passages in one section have been studied, there will be a sub-conclusion for the character of that section, combining that section's findings for each target text in turn. First, there will be a summary of how the character addresses Toru. Then, important differences and similarities between the interpretative potentials of both source and target texts will be listed, leading to a conclusion of how readers may

interpret that character's relationship with Toru. As Hewson's model prescribes, this will lead to an initial hypothesis of the interpretative potential of the whole target text, which may then be tested in following sections and altered if necessary.

When all sections have been studied, there will be a conclusion combining all findings of the chapter. The four sections' sub-conclusions will be merged, transforming the initial hypothesis into concluding remarks about each text's representation of Toru's name. For each target text, the influence of the translational choices on the interpretative potential of the text will be determined. Then, in an extension of Hewson's model, the target texts will be compared among each other, focusing on the differences and similarities between the four target texts' interpretative potentials. Finally, each target text will receive one of the labels divergent similarity, relative divergence, radical divergence, or adaptation.

**Methodology for chapter 5**

To allow for further comparison between the target texts, Chapter 5 will focus on the translation of various CSIs in *Norwegian Wood*. The goal of this chapter is to uncover patterns in the strategies used to translate CSIs and, in a slight adaptation of Hewson's model, to form a hypothesis about each text's handling of CSIs on a macro-level – which strategies may be favored and how these may influence the perceived exoticness of the work. The chapter will open with a set of hypotheses of each translation's handling of

CSIs based on the translators' profiles provided in chapter 2. These hypotheses will serve as the starting point for the analysis, and may be altered as the analysis progresses.

The passages studied in this chapter will be selected not for their interpretative significance but for the presence of CSIs which allow for potentially interesting translations. The items will be largely selected at random, but the corpus will also include passages selected specifically for their complexity or because they show striking translational choices. 'Complex' passages are those with a high concentration of CSIs or those that include humorous CSIs, which, as discussed in chapter 1, require a high level of creativity in translation. Passages with striking translational choices are those that show any of the rarely used strategies: extratextual gloss, naturalization, and autonomous creation. These strategies are worth studying because they may either betray the presence of 'untranslatable' items – in the case of extratextual glosses – or because they are infrequently used in literature – in the case of naturalization and autonomous creation (cf. Aixelá 62-64).

For the analysis, CSIs will be categorized and sorted using Michielsen's list of categories. Based on these categories, passages will be discussed in separate sections, one for each category. Should there be too few items in one category to warrant a separate section, there will also be a section for miscellaneous CSIs. Each section will begin with an introduction, which includes a clear definition of the category, its

potential translational strategies and the strategies expected in each target text.

Passages will then be studied one by one. For each passage, the CSI will be analyzed as it appears in the source text and its potential translations will be discussed and evaluated. Then, the four existing translations of each CSI will be analyzed in turn, focusing on their potential effects, and categorized using Aixelá's classification of strategies. The strategy used in each target text will then be compared to the initial hypothesis of the text: should the strategy used render the hypothesis incorrect, it will need to be altered.

When all passages in a section have been studied, there will be a sub-conclusion for that section, to determine patterns in strategies used for that category of CSIs. For each target text, the most frequently used strategies and most striking translational choices will be named. The effects of all strategies used will then be combined to determine the macro-level exoticizing or naturalizing effect of the category. The findings for each text will then be compared to the initial hypothesis, which may be altered if necessary.

When all sections have been studied, there will be a conclusion for each of the four target texts. The conclusion will cover patterns in strategies used, examining whether these differ between the various categories. The similarities and differences between the patterns found in each section will be negotiated to arrive at a conclusion about patterns in the translation of CSIs in each target text as a whole. Each target text

may then be characterized by its use of conservative and substitutive strategies, and, in extension, its exoticizing or naturalizing nature. The target texts may then be contrasted, exploring differences and similarities between patterns and their effects.

## Chapter 4 – The translation of names in *Norwegian Wood*

Because *Norwegian Wood* is a coming-of-age novel, interpersonal relationships and character development play an important role. Indeed, much of Murakami's work revolves around the tension between friendship or love and the "inability of characters to ever truly converse with each other" (Slocombe 9). The plot of *Norwegian Wood* largely consists of characters interacting with each other and depictions of how these interactions change – or remain the same – over time. These changes are often subtle; the smallest details – how one character addresses the other, what words a character uses – may alter readers' perception of a character or relationship between characters. From a translator's perspective, this means that subtle nuances in dialogue may have a relatively large impact on a passage's interpretative potential.

One such subtle nuance can be found in the translation of the name of the novel's protagonist, Toru Watanabe. Toru's name is a CSI, but it is discussed here using Hewson's model due to its role in determining the interpretative potential of the target texts. The research question for this chapter is as follows: *how are the various instances of the name of the protagonist translated and how do these translations influence the interpretative potential of the text?* To answer the question, the chapter is subdivided four sections, each discussing the translation of Toru's name in the dialogue of a different character: the first section focuses on Naoko's speech; the second on Midori's speech; the third on Reiko's speech; and the fourth section covers Nagasawa's and Hatsumi's speech.

In the source text, all characters address Toru by his last name – ワタナベ – which is common in Japanese: men are generally addressed by their last name, while women are more often addressed by their first name among friends. Interestingly, the source text mentions Toru's first name only once, and only in combination with his last name. While this has no true narrative significance, it does show the differences between Japanese culture and the four target cultures, where men are regularly addressed by both their first and last names. This cultural difference presents translators with an option that was not readily available to Murakami when he wrote the novel: using Toru's first name in characters' speech. In Japanese, using Toru's first name throughout would result in marked language, while the opposite is true for the four target languages, where it is unusual to address friends by their last name – and even more unusual to address your lover as such. To make instances of Toru's name appear more natural within the target culture, translators may choose to translate some or all occurrences of "ワタナベ" not as "Watanabe" but as "Toru".

It is unlikely that all occurrences will be translated only as "Toru", because not all characters who address Toru are close to him; as such, the choice to use "Toru" will likely mean that only some occurrences of "ワタナベ" will be rendered as such. However, if Toru's name is translated as both "Toru" and "Watanabe" within the same text, this introduces a contrast that was not present in the source text. This contrast is likely to be noticed by readers, and they may attach narrative significance to the

contrasting translations of Toru's name accordingly, potentially altering the interpretative potential of the text. This does not mean, however, that such a contrast is somehow 'wrong' or indefensible: the option to naturally use Toru's first name in dialogue was unavailable to Murakami, so the source text could not possibly contain the two different uses. Introducing the second option in languages that do allow for the use of both first and last names in natural speech shows translators' full awareness of linguistic and cultural differences, counterbalancing what is lost in translation with what may be gained.

Should translators choose to use "Toru" as well as "Watanabe", the usage of the two forms of address may vary by character – where some characters use "Watanabe" and others use "Toru" – and by context – where, for example, one character uses "Watanabe" at first and later shifts to "Toru". These choices may significantly impact how readers perceive the relationship between Toru and the character in question: generally speaking, characters addressing Toru by his first name are likely to be perceived as being closer to him than characters using his last name. As a result, a single character may be perceived differently in different translations based purely on how (s)he addresses Toru. It is important to note that the choice between the two options will often influence potential interpretations that were *already* available in the source text; however, the translation of Toru's name may *emphasize* one of these potential interpretations, thereby altering the interpretative potential of the text.

As such, it will be important to note which characters use “Toru” and which use “Watanabe”, as the contrast between characters may influence how readers perceive the various relationships in the novel. Additionally, if a character shifts from the last name to the first name, it may be significant when and how this shift takes place because it may or may not coincide with a narrative turning point. Clearly, the interpretative potential of the text may be influenced in various ways should translators choose to use “Toru”.

On the other hand, a translator may choose to consistently use “Watanabe” for all instances of the name, creating no contrast between the various occurrences and leaving the name ‘as it was’ in the source text. While this appears to mean that the strategy has no significant influence on the interpretative potential of the text, this is not entirely true: the name “ワタナベ” never appear in isolation in the source text, but always appears in context with or without an honorific suffix. Such suffixes are used in Japanese to signal the relationship between speaker and receiver; the type of honorific used – or the absence of honorifics – allows readers to interpret how the speaker sees Toru. Most female characters, for example, use the -君 suffix, an informal honorific which may signal closeness, when addressing Toru. In contrast, Toru addresses Nagasawa with -さん, expressing respect for his senior, while Nagasawa uses no suffix at all, signaling seniority, familiarity, and masculinity.

Clearly, there is a difference in the source text between the "ワタナベ君" used by female characters and the "ワタナベ" used by Nagasawa. Using only "Watanabe" in the target text could decrease the difference between characters such as Naoko and a character like Nagasawa, and it may be undesirable to allow for the potential interpretation that Nagasawa and Naoko somehow have a similar relationship with Toru. Using "Watanabe" in both characters' speech may require compensation in other areas – such as register – to ensure the difference remains intact in the target text. It may be argued, in fact, that the use of "Toru" is exactly such a form of compensation, where the loss of honorifics is remedied through the newly possible use of Toru's first name.

It has become clear that both "Toru" and "Watanabe" are complex options that may influence the interpretative potential of the text. While neither option is inherently wrong, there may be cases where one of the options introduces a false interpretation – one that cannot be found in the source text. This is most likely to be the case whenever usage of "Toru" signals closeness that cannot be found in the source text, or whenever "Watanabe" signals distance that cannot be found in the source text. Translational choices that introduce a false interpretation may be labelled 'problematic'.

Regardless of the choice for "Toru" or "Watanabe", an important option to consider is that of partial deletion, where some occurrences of Toru's name are either deleted or translated as the second-person singular pronoun. Because second-person pronouns are infrequently used in Japanese, names are the primary form of address. This is not true, however, for the four target languages, where second-person pronouns are not as uncommon. As a result, the characters in the source text will use names to address each other more frequently than is common in the four target languages. If all occurrences of Toru's name were to be retained in the target text, this could result in unnatural-sounding passages where his name is used too frequently. This is not so much a matter of interpretative potential as it is a matter of negotiating the differences between cultures; it is important, however, to recognize that some instances of Toru's name *could* be of narrative importance and cannot simply be replaced by a second-person pronoun without altering the interpretative potential of the text. In such cases, translators may wish to retain the name in translation.

**4.1 – Naoko**

At the beginning of the narrative, Toru and Naoko are little more than acquaintances, having met in Kobe when they were young through Toru's friend and Naoko's ex-boyfriend Kizuki. They drift apart after Kizuki commits suicide at the age of seventeen, but they eventually meet up by chance in Tokyo. On Naoko's twentieth birthday, Toru

and Naoko have sex, but Naoko appears distraught and disappears from Toru's life for a long time afterwards. From letters, Toru then learns that Naoko has gone to a sanatorium for her mental health. Toru visits the sanatorium several times, and the two build a relationship of mutual trust and love. Although Naoko is willing to commit to her love for Toru, she is unable to do so due to her mental health; eventually, Naoko's mental health deteriorates further, and she returns to communicating with Toru through letters. Finally, Toru reads in a letter from their mutual friend Reiko that Naoko has committed suicide.

Naoko is one of the characters to use "君" as an honorific when addressing Toru. While she begins using the suffix when they are little more than friends, Naoko continues to use it as the two grow close and share intimate secrets with each other. Due to the narrative, the closeness between the couple is unlikely to be lost should translators not compensate for the 'loss' of "君" and as such, a translator could perhaps choose to consistently use "Watanabe" for all instances of the name without severely impacting the interpretative potential of the text. It may be argued, however, that this should only be done if the translator never uses "Toru" elsewhere: Naoko is the character closest to Toru for the majority of the novel, so if any character were to use "Toru", Naoko seems the most likely choice. Moreover, the close relationship between Toru and Naoko is overshadowed by uncertainty: the reader never truly knows if

Naoko will stay with Toru – and indeed, in the end, she does not. Critically, however, Naoko makes clear attempts to be close to Toru when the two are together, and as such, it may be undesirable to signal distance in the target texts that was not present in the source text. After all, the use of the last name as a form of address signals a greater distance in the four target languages than it does in Japanese, which may have a relatively large impact on the interpretative potential of passages. While the choice to use "Watanabe" in Naoko's dialogue is entirely viable, it may be problematic and require compensation to avoid altering the interpretative potential of the text.

On the other hand, if translators wish to use "Toru" in Naoko's dialogue, they are presented with two choices: they may use only "Toru", or they may use "Watanabe" in some instances. The former option is likely to be unproblematic, because as discussed above, Naoko may be the first candidate to use only "Toru". The latter option leads to a range of sub-options, which may all influence the way readers perceive the couple's relationship. For example, Naoko may use "Watanabe" before the two grow close and begin to use "Toru" as the two become lovers. This option and many others are viable and will be discussed should they appear. One option which is clearly problematic, however, is to first use "Toru" and later use "Watanabe", signaling a growing distance – the opposite of what the narrative shows.

**The first instance of "ワタナベ"**

The opening chapter of the novel, set in the 'present' when Toru is 37, contains a flashback to a time Toru and Naoko spent together when they were lovers. In this passage, the two have been seeing each other for quite some time, and Naoko asks Toru if he loves her. Should translators wish to use Toru's first name in Naoko's dialogue, this may be a good opportunity, as the couple is very close here. It is also important to note that this is the first time Toru's name is mentioned in the text; as such, the translation of his name in this passage serves as an introduction to his name throughout the novel, and readers may come to expect his name to be translated accordingly.

「ねえワタナベ君、私のこと好き？」(上 20)

"Tell me something, Toru," she said. "Do you love me?" (9)

'Watanabe, hou je van me?' (Chapter 1)

»Sag mal, Tōru, liebst du mich?« (Chapter 1)

»Toru, älskar du mig?« (13)

Strikingly, the Dutch translation is the only one to use "Watanabe" here. Because the two are already very close in this passage, this means it may be expected that the Dutch translation uses only "Watanabe" in Naoko's dialogue; in extension, because Naoko is the character most likely to use "Toru", it may be assumed that Fennema refrains from using "Toru" altogether, translating the name 'as-is'. The Dutch translation may contain

some form of compensation for nuance lost through the absence of analogous honorifics in Dutch.

The English, German, and Swedish translations' use of Toru's first name confirms that it is indeed possible – and perhaps preferable – to introduce this second form of address in the target text. Because the couple is close here, it may be assumed that passages set later in the narrative will also use "Toru" in these three languages. Passages set earlier, before the two are truly close, may still use "Watanabe".

**Reunited with Naoko**

The question if translators use "Watanabe" earlier may be tested by studying a passage taken from Toru's first visit to the sanatorium where Naoko lives. This marks the first time the two meet after Naoko's disappearance. The distance between the two is apparent and their relationship is clearly strained; as such, if translators wish to use "Watanabe" at all in Naoko's dialogue, this is the likely occasion to do so. Nevertheless, the use of "Watanabe" here could signal that Naoko feels a greater distance than there is between the two in the source text, effectively straining their relationship further and introducing an additional layer of doubt.

「ワタナベ君、ここに来てくれてありがとう。(上 214)

"Toru," she began, "I really want to thank you for coming to see me." (136)

'Watanabe,' zei ze, 'dankjewel dat je bent gekomen.' (Chapter 6)

»Tōru, ich danke dir, daß du hergekommen bist. (Chapter 6)

»Toru«, sa hon, »jag vill verkligen tacka dig för att du har kommit hit för att träffa mig.« (141)

As the results in this passage are the same as above, it can be assumed that the translations of "ワタナベ君" in Naoko's dialogue are set: the English, German, and Swedish translations use the first name throughout, while the Dutch translation uses "Watanabe". Although these assumptions are indeed accurate, as seen in other passages, the impact of the chosen strategies on the interpretative potential of the text cannot be fully determined until Naoko's dialogue is contrasted with the dialogue of other characters. It can be said to be likely that the English, German, and Swedish translations allow the reader to interpret Naoko and Toru's relationship as close. Whether or not the same is true for the Dutch translation depends on other characters' dialogues, as well as on whether any attempts were made to compensate for the loss of honorifics in Naoko's speech. The passages below are included to search for any such compensation, as well as to point out any problems that may arise through the use of either "Toru" or "Watanabe".

Passage 1, included in the appendix, is set shortly after the previous passage. Toru has arrived at Naoko house and the two talk to get to know each other better. Naoko says Toru's name twice (underlined). Translations of Toru's name follow the same pattern as seen before, where Fennema uses "Watanabe" and the other translators

use “Toru” or “Tōru”. This passage also shows translators’ willingness to use deletion: Rubin uses one deletion and Gräfe uses two. As discussed, deletion is entirely viable, perhaps even preferable, in cases where the name may be replaced with the second-person pronoun with negligible impact on the interpretative potential of the text. Because the two translators have already shown that Naoko addresses Toru by his first name, the instances of the name here may be deleted without altering the interpretative potential.

The passage clearly shows the juxtaposition between Toru’s last name and Naoko’s first name, common in Japanese but uncommon in the four target languages. Despite these cultural differences, the contrast is retained in the Dutch translation, resulting in a striking passage where the narrator and Toru address Naoko by her first name, but Naoko only uses Toru’s last name. The contrast may appear exotic, perhaps even strange, to readers unfamiliar with Japanese forms of address. As a result, using only “Watanabe” in Naoko’s dialogue may not be as unproblematic as it first seemed. Even if all characters address Toru by his last name, which was expected to avoid any contrast, contrast naturally appears when Toru interacts with other characters and addresses them by their first name. In fact, Toru *must* address Naoko by her first name because her last name is not given in the source text, and although Fennema could plausibly have invented a last name for Naoko, she has clearly chosen not to do so; as

such, the contrast stands in the Dutch translation. It is too early, however, to say if this contrast may lead to the interpretation that Naoko is more distant in the target text than she is in the source text. After all, if all characters address Toru as "Watanabe", the reader may grow used to it and the contrast between first and last names will be little more than an exotic oddity.

**Intimate discussions**

Passage 2, included in the appendix, shows similar patterns: the English translation uses deletion once, and the Swedish translators, too, show their willingness to use the strategy – both deletions having a negligible influence on the interpretative potential of the passage. The contrast caused by the use of "Watanabe" in the Dutch translation is particularly striking here because Naoko talks to Toru about their childhood friend Kizuki, addressing him by his first name. Critically, Naoko addresses him by his first name in the source text as well, which is understandable because the two were very close for a long time before Kizuki's suicide. As a result, the contrast in the Japanese text between "キズキ君" and "ワタナベ君" does not appear unnatural to the reader.

However, Dutch readers unaware of the cultural context may interpret the passage differently: if Naoko addresses her ex-boyfriend by his first name but her current lover by his last name, this may be perceived as a signal of distance. It is important to note

that Fennema again did not have the option to use Kizuki's last name because it is unknown – although once again, perhaps she could have invented one. She did, however, clearly have the option to use Toru's first name to avoid the contrast. Interpretative considerations aside, the exotic nature of Fennema's choice is made apparent once again: the contrast between names is striking, but readers may also find it odd that Naoko should ask Toru if he wants to sleep with her while using his last name. Through her choice to use "Watanabe", Fennema makes the Dutch text appear more exotic in these passages than the other three translations.

**Sub-conclusion**

It must be said beforehand that all choices made in this section were entirely viable. The effects of the translational choices on the interpretative potential of the text – how the relationship between Toru and Naoko is perceived – cannot be judged until the dialogue in this section has been contrasted with the dialogue between Toru and other characters. Nevertheless, some of the choices do have implications for the translation of other characters' speech.

The English, German, and Swedish translations all showed the same overall strategy, where Toru was addressed by his first name in Naoko's dialogue. There was no shift from "Watanabe" to "Toru", which was an available option. The choice to translate all occurrences of the name as "Toru" was a safe one, as Naoko was likely to be

the first character to be on a first-name basis with Toru. Some instances of the name were deleted, but none of these deletions had a discernible impact on the interpretative potential of the passages in question. Other characters in these three translations may be expected to use either "Toru" or "Watanabe".

The Dutch translation was the only translation to use "Watanabe" throughout Naoko's dialogue. This choice leads to the hypothesis that Fennema has only used "Watanabe" in her translation, due to the aforementioned closeness between Naoko and Toru. Should this not be the case, the impact of this choice on the interpretative potential will need to be determined; for now, the interpretative potential of these passages may be regarded as largely the same. Nevertheless, some passages in the Dutch translation did present potentially problematic contrasts between characters who were addressed by their first name and the use of Toru's last name, which could signal a greater distance between Naoko and Toru than is present in the source text. The contrast gives the text an exotic tone, as readers cannot be expected to know about Japanese customs surrounding forms of address.

### 4.2 – Midori

Midori is the 'other girl' in the narrative, Toru's life-affirming love interest. Toru and Midori rapidly grow close and share a kiss when Toru first visits her house, not far into the novel and before Toru has seen Naoko again. Nevertheless, Toru still feels bound to

Naoko, and Midori has a boyfriend herself, so the two do not take their relationship further. In the chapters following the kiss, there is an artificial distance between the two: they spend much time together and appear to long for a closer relationship, but are unable or unwilling to commit to each other. In the second half of the novel, however, Midori and her boyfriend break up, and with Naoko's passing, there are no remaining obstacles for their love.

The complex relationship between Toru and Midori gives translators use a wide range of strategies when translating the "ワタナベ君" in Midori's dialogue. It is important to note, however, that there is no contrast between the forms of address used by Naoko and Midori in the source text. As such, translators are by no means required to incorporate a contrast in their translations; any contrast that is introduced may influence how readers perceive the various relationships in the novel. The Dutch translation may be expected to use only "Watanabe" in Midori's speech, as was the case in Naoko's dialogue. If Fennema were to use "Toru" here, this would signal that Toru and Midori are closer, leading to an altered interpretative potential.

Due to the artificial distance maintained between Midori and Toru, the other translators – who used "Toru" in Naoko's dialogue – may also choose to use "Watanabe" throughout. In such a case, the use of "Watanabe" would signal a greater distance between Toru and Midori than was present between Toru and Naoko. There is then the option of shifting to "Toru" when the two finally commit to their love near the

end of the novel, which would strengthen the perceived bond between the two, not necessarily altering the interpretative potential but likely reinforcing it. Any earlier shifts from "Watanabe" to "Toru" in Midori's speech may alter how their relationship is perceived: because there is little narrative incentive for the shift to take place earlier, readers may interpret the shift as a significant sign of change.

Finally, if translators choose to use "Toru" throughout Midori's dialogue, no contrast is created between Naoko's speech and Midori's speech. Because no such contrast was present in the source text, this is an entirely viable option. This choice may signal that translators translated most or all occurrences of "ワタナベ君" in dialogue as "Toru", perhaps using "Watanabe" for other occurrences of "ワタナベ".

**The first meeting**

The passage below is taken from the first meeting between Midori and Toru; in fact, it is the very first sentence spoken by Midori. Because this is their first encounter, the two are not yet as close as Toru and Naoko are throughout the novel. As such, translators using both "Toru" and "Watanabe" may choose the latter here to indicate a greater personal distance.

「ワタナベ君、でしょ？」(上 105)

"You're Watanabe, aren't you?" (64)

‘Jij bent toch Watanabe?’ (Chapter 4)

»Sie sind doch Tōru Watanabe, oder?« (Chapter 4)

»Det är du som är Watanabe… eller hur?« (70)

In contrast to Naoko’s dialogue, all translators mention Toru’s last name here, and the English, Dutch, and Swedish translations all start out from the same point. The Dutch translation continues to use only “Watanabe”, but the other two translations introduce a contrast between Naoko’s dialogue and Midori’s dialogue. It may be inferred from the translations of this passage that Midori and Toru are – logically – less close than Naoko and Toru are. If any of these three translations shift to using “Toru” later, the shift may have narrative significance. In contrast, the German translation also includes Toru’s first name, meaning both “Toru” and “Watanabe” can be used in the future without constituting a shift compared to this passage.

Passage 3, included in the appendix, is taken from the same scene and contains the only time Toru’s first name is mentioned in the source text; without this passage, readers would not know Toru’s first name at all. This does not present an obstacle to translators, however, because most target readers will not be aware of this fact, nor do they need to be: as stated above, the translation “Toru” can be used more often without necessarily altering the interpretative potential of the text. Because the English, German, and Swedish translators already used Toru’s first name the first time his name was mentioned in the novel, they do not need to introduce his first name here; Fennema,

however, may choose to include Toru's first name for the sake of completeness, as in the source text. Strikingly, however, the translations show the exact opposite: Rubin, Gräfe and the Dukes translate the underlined phrases word for word, while Fennema deletes the second phrase. The result is that Toru's first name is not mentioned in the Dutch translation here, in a passage where it could have been included without difficulty. So far, the Dutch translation has only used "Watanabe" and should this pattern continue, the question arises whether Fennema's translation contains Toru's first name at all. If it does not, the interpretative potential of the text is not necessarily altered, but it would be a significant – and easily avoidable – loss.

Although the Swedish translation began by using "Watanabe" in Midori's dialogue, the translators quickly shift to using "Toru" when Midori asks the following question only three pages later in the source text, still during their first encounter:

「ねえ、ワタナベ君、あなた講義のノートとってる？ (上 112)

"Tell me," she said. "Do you take lecture notes? (68)

'Watanabe, maak jij aantekeningen? (Chapter 4)

»Du, Tōru, du schreibst doch bestimmt mit? (Chapter 4)

»Säg mig, Toru«, sa hon. »Antecknar du? (74)

Because the context is largely the same as in the previous passages, there is no discernible reason for this shift. It does, however, influence the tone of this sentence: the

shift from "Watanabe" to "Toru" within the same conversation may make readers perceive Midori as being – or attempting to be – closer to Toru. Perhaps it simply indicates that, now that the introductions are over, Midori is on a first-name basis with Toru. It may be assumed that the translation uses only "Toru" from now on, to keep this newly formed closeness intact. The English translation again shows Rubin's willingness to use deletion, which may be done here without influencing the interpretative potential. Gräfe seems to have chosen to use Toru's first name, which does not constitute a shift from previous passages. It may be assumed, accordingly, that she continues to use "Tōru" throughout the novel, which would mean the German and Swedish translations so far use largely the same strategies.

Near the end of their conversation, Midori asks Toru if he has time to meet later. Because this is still part of the same conversation, translations of "ワタナベ君" may now be assumed to be the same, although the English text, too, could show a shift from "Watanabe" to "Toru" now that the friendship between the two characters is beginning to develop. Strikingly, however, the Swedish translation reverts to using "Watanabe":

> 「ところでワタナベ君、今度の日曜日は暇？あいてる？」(上 134)
>
> "Anyway, Watanabe, would you have some time this Sunday? Are you free?" (83)
>
> 'Heb je trouwens komende zondag tijd? Ben je vrij?' (Chapter 4)

»Übrigens, hast du nächsten Sonntag Zeit?« (Chapter 4)

»Förresten, Watanabe, har du tid på söndag? Är du ledig?« (89)

It appears strange that Midori should use the more 'distant' form of address in a question that is clearly meant to bring the two closer. The choice of the Swedish translators to shift from Watanabe to Toru and back within one conversation may show that they use both translations alternatingly, not choosing one over the other, and thereby creating no narrative distinction between the two options. What this does mean, however, is that a contrast potentially arises between Midori's dialogue and Naoko's dialogue, because Midori sometimes uses the more distant "Watanabe". Further passages will show the patterns in the Swedish translation more clearly. Interpretative potential aside, the question arises whether it is likely that Midori should address Toru by both his first and last names in alternation within the same conversation. While the translators safely avoid choosing an option, it does create unnatural, inconsistent dialogue which may strike readers as odd.

The English translation continues to use "Watanabe", now beginning to show a clear distinction between Midori's and Naoko's speech. Because it has already been established in the novel that Naoko uses "Toru", readers are likely to interpret Midori as more distant. Should Rubin continue to use "Watanabe" throughout Midori's dialogue,

this may further influence how the various relationships are perceived. The Dutch and German sentences show that these translators, too, are willing to use deletion within Midori's dialogue. It is important to note that this is the first time Fennema uses deletion in the passages studied, perhaps showing a greater reluctance to use the strategy.

**The friends grow closer**

As Toru and Midori's relationship progresses, Midori begins to show Toru more affection, involving him in her strange and often sexual daydreams. As the two grow closer and see each other frequently, the chosen translation for Toru's name grows in importance – if only because Midori says Toru's name more often. Passages 4 and 5, found in the appendix, occur shortly after each other and clearly show the patterns translators have chosen. At this point in the narrative, Toru has just returned from his first reunion with Naoko in the sanatorium, and readers of the English, German, and Swedish translations have just been reminded that Naoko addresses Toru by his first name. As a result, any contrast in Midori's speech, which could plausibly appear in the English and Swedish translations as they used "Watanabe" earlier, is more likely than before to be noticed by readers. These passages, then, could form the beginning to determining the interpretative potential of chosen translations.

The English translation contains numerous deletions, but also still contains two instances of "Watanabe" in close succession. More importantly, these translations occur

within Midori's fantasy, where Toru is supposedly attempting to sleep with her, forming a direct parallel with Toru and Naoko's relationship. The contrast between the "Toru" in Naoko's speech and the "Watanabe" in Midori's speech, then, introduces a difference in forms of address not present in the source text, where Midori's dialogue signals a greater emotional distance.

In contrast, the Swedish translation again uses "Toru" in both passages, which could mean that the previous instance of "Watanabe" was only an irregularity. Nevertheless, readers may have noticed the contrast between the previous passages – where Midori said "Toru" once and "Watanabe twice" – and these passages, and interpret this as a sign that the two are growing closer. It is also worth noting that as a result, the Swedish translation no longer displays a contrast between Naoko's and Midori's speech here, which may further strengthen this interpretation.

Passage 6, found in the appendix, has Midori introduce Toru to her sick father. The passage shows the exact same translations as in the very first passage studied in this section, but the differing context here has a few implications. The English translation continues its use of only "Watanabe" even when Midori introduces Toru to her father, which is likely to catch the reader's eye. Rubin could have used "Toru Watanabe", as Gräfe did, which may have been more natural for a character introducing a friend. Nevertheless, this passage shows Rubin's strong preference for only "Watanabe". It is also important to note that the German text contains "Watanabe" for the second time

now, and that both occurrences were in combination with Toru's first name. As such, the German translation of Toru's name seems almost completely opposite to its representation in the source text, where Toru's first name was only mentioned once, and only in combination with his last name. If Gräfe continues to use "Toru" throughout the text, such a 'mirror image' translation may not cause a significant shift in the interpretative potential of the text.

**Commitment to love**

Passages 7, 8, and 9, found in the appendix, occur near the end of the novel, after Naoko's suicide. At this point, Toru meets Midori again and she confesses her love for him. Toru, in turn, commits to his love for Midori, leaving Naoko's memory in the past. Passage 9 is spoken by Midori while the two are in bed together; if translators wish to shift from "Watanabe" to "Toru", this is a highly suitable place to do so, as it would likely reinforce the fact that Midori now wants to be close to Toru. Continued usage of "Watanabe", in contrast, could make readers believe that Midori is still somewhat distant – especially if "Toru" was used in Naoko's dialogue, as was the case in the English translation.

Rubin deletes the name in passage 7, and uses increasingly many deletions as the novel progresses, which may give the impression that Rubin uses these deletions to narrative effect. If Midori were to use "Watanabe" less often as the novel progressed,

this could also signal a growing closeness. However, Rubin then *adds* "Watanabe" in passage 8. If Rubin wished to avoid using "Watanabe" for narrative reasons, it is highly unlikely that he would add it in this passage. Instead, the name may simply have been frequently deleted due to of the aforementioned rarity of second-person pronouns in Japanese. The presence of "Watanabe" in passage 9 confirms that Rubin has not attempted to fully avoid using Toru's last name near the end of the novel. As such, the deletions may not so much be a narrative strategy as a culture-bridging strategy.

These passages confirm that Rubin has introduced a clear contrast between Naoko's and Midori's dialogue, where Naoko uses "Toru" and Midori uses "Watanabe". Rubin does not introduce a shift from the last name to the first name in Midori's speech, which could have 'closed the distance' between Midori and Toru; instead, the continued usage of "Watanabe" could influence the interpretative potential of these passages and readers' impressions of their relationship as a whole. For example, Midori could be regarded as more distant than Naoko, even after confessing to Toru. This becomes especially apparent in passage 9, as it is highly uncommon in English to address one's bed partner by their last name. Because English readers will be well aware of Toru's first name due to Naoko's dialogue, the contrast is likely to be noticed and the use of "Watanabe" in the passage may be perceived as odd or narratively significant.

Although the Dutch translation also uses "Watanabe" here, it does not have the same effect as the English translation because Fennema also used "Watanabe" for

Naoko's speech. As a result, no contrast is introduced and the distance between characters remains the same as in the source text. It is worth noting that the Dutch translation still has not used Toru's first name once, not in the passages studied or in other passages where Midori and Naoko speak. As such, it may very well be that the Dutch translation is a 'Toruless' translation, which may be only a minor loss as far as the interpretative potential is concerned, but a loss nonetheless.

The German and Swedish translations continue their use of Toru's first name. Although the Swedish translation contained two passages which used "Watanabe", it quickly shifted to "Toru", which was used in the remaining majority of the novel. The impact of the two passages using "Watanabe" is negligible, perhaps signaling a slightly larger distance between Midori and Toru when they first met, which is understandable from a narrative perspective. Otherwise, the German and Swedish translations are the same throughout, with no contrast between Naoko's and Midori's speech, as in the source text.

**Sub-conclusion**

This section saw translators use clearly differing strategies. The English translation introduced a contrast between Naoko's and Midori's speech, where the former used "Toru" and the latter used "Watanabe" throughout. This contrast was not present in the source text; although the full effect of this will only become clear as other characters'

speech is also studied, it can already be said that readers may interpret Midori as more distant than Naoko throughout the novel. While this fits the majority of the narrative, where there is an artificial distance between Midori and Toru, it does present a potential problem in the final chapters, where Midori becomes Toru's main love interest. The greater distance introduced by the use of "Watanabe" may cause readers to interpret Midori's love as somehow less strong than Naoko's, an interpretation that is not as readily available in the source text. As such, Rubin's introduced contrast may cause target readers to interpret Midori's relationship to Toru differently than readers of the Japanese text would. An important factor that may influence the perception of both Naoko's and Midori's relationship with Toru is whether Rubin uses primarily "Watanabe" or "Toru" in other characters' speech. Further passages will show whose dialogue, if any, is the 'odd one out', with all the narrative implications this may have.

The Dutch translation again used "Watanabe" throughout the dialogue. Strikingly, the one instance where Toru's first name is mentioned in the source text was deleted, which may mean that the Dutch text contains no mention of Toru's first name at all. This would be an unfortunate and easily avoidable loss, but it does mean that Dutch readers may be unaware that "Watanabe" is a last name at all. Otherwise, readers may find it odd that Naoko and Midori address Toru by his last name, but this is a cultural difference with little narrative significance – at least thus far. However, should Fennema

use only “Watanabe” in dialogue without honorifics as well, this may remove a contrast that existed in Japanese, possibly altering the interpretative potential of the text.

The German and Swedish translations, finally, may be discussed as one because they largely used the same translations, “Tōru” and “Toru” respectively, in both Naoko’s and Midori’s dialogue. Because there was no contrast in the source text between the two characters’ speech, these translations do not yet alter the interpretative potential of the text. However, the translators’ choice has two implications for the remaining passages: firstly, it may be assumed that both Gräfe and the Dukes also translate all other occurrences of “ワタナベ君” as “Toru”. If this is not the case, the translators introduce a contrast not present in the source text, which may alter the interpretative potential of the text. Secondly, it may be of narrative importance that instances of “ワタナベ” without honorific are not translated as “Toru” in German and Swedish, as this would remove a contrast present in the source text, which may also lead to an altered interpretative potential.

**4.3 – Reiko**

The relationship between Toru and Reiko is fairly complex. The two meet because Reiko lives together with Naoko in the sanatorium, and while they develop a friendship, it is second to Toru’s love for Naoko; after all, Toru visits the sanatorium for Naoko, not for

Reiko. The great age difference between the two – Toru is 20 when they meet, Reiko is 38 – seems to dismiss any possibility for a romance, and although Toru and Reiko share intimate secrets and worries, their relationship is little more than a growing friendship.

Near the end of the novel, however, the two have sex after mourning Naoko's death. It is not entirely clear whether this is an act of love or simply another one of Toru's casual sexual encounters, but the scene portrays great intimacy. The couple have sex four times and discuss the risk of pregnancy, a subject left largely untouched throughout the novel. Rubin describes this scene as "the only truly adult sex in the book" and contrasts it with Toru's sex with Naoko, who was mentally unstable at the time she sleeps with Toru (159). In fact, Rubin believes "Murakami hoped to bring Tōru's relationship with Naoko to some kind of completion by having Reiko stand in for her" (ibid.). Although this is only one of multiple potential interpretations of the scene, it is clear that Toru and Reiko, who start out as strangers, are very close by the end of the novel. This makes the progression of their relationship resemble that of Toru and Midori, except that it is unclear by the end whether Toru and Reiko are in love.

It is important to note that Reiko, too, uses "ワタナベ君", meaning that there is no contrast in the source text between her way of addressing Toru and that of Midori and Naoko. There is, however, an imbalance in their relationship, as Toru addresses Reiko as "レイコさん", using the formal -さん honorific to signal his respect for her

seniority. Socially speaking, then, the relationship between Toru and Reiko is not the same as the relationship between Toru and Midori or Naoko. In other words, even if Reiko also uses "ワタナベ君", Japanese readers will perceive Toru and Reiko's relationship as different. This difference, however, is only slight, and mainly rests on social norms surrounding their age difference. The slight difference gives translators a multitude of options for the translation of Toru's name in Reiko's dialogue.

The English translation is difficult to predict, because Rubin earlier either used only "Toru" or only "Watanabe". Should Reiko only use "Toru", she implicitly becomes closer to Toru than Midori is, which is not necessarily the case in the source text. It would, however, make Reiko's speech resemble that of Naoko, which could fit Rubin's interpretation of Toru and Reiko's lovemaking. In contrast, if Reiko only uses "Watanabe", Naoko's use of "Toru" will stand out even more, perhaps leading readers to believe she is special or different from the other women in Toru's life. It would, however, make Reiko address Toru the same way as Midori, which is perhaps fitting considering their slight resemblance. Rubin may also introduce a shift where Reiko first uses "Watanabe" and only uses "Toru" as the two sleep with each other. However, this shift was also available in Midori's dialogue, where Rubin chose not to introduce it; as such, it may be assumed that he will not do so here either.

The Dutch translation, secondly, may be the easiest to predict: because Fennema only used "Watanabe" until now, it is highly likely she will continue to do so in Reiko's

dialogue. While the choice to use “Watanabe” throughout mainly has implications for the translation of honorific-free instances of “ワタナベ”, it also means readers will not perceive the social difference present in the source text unless it is shown through compensation. To compensate, Toru might, for example, use the formal second person pronoun “u” instead of “jij” when addressing Reiko, which would signal a similar social distance. If no compensation is used, the slight contrast between Reiko and Toru’s relationship and that between Toru and the other girls may come to disappear, possibly leading readers to interpret the three relationships as equally close.

The German translation has a wider range of plausible options. Because Gräfe used “Tōru” for both Naoko’s and Midori’s speech, it could be assumed that Reiko, too, will address Toru by his first name. As in the Dutch translation, this may require compensation to increase the perceived distance between the two, although compensation by using “Sie” will likely look unnatural if Reiko says addresses Toru by his first name. Instead, it is perhaps more likely that Gräfe will use “Watanabe”. This would introduce a contrast which may cause readers to perceive their relationship as less close than those of Toru and the other girls, which is true for the majority of the novel. Near the end, however, this could present a problem, as readers may find it strange that Reiko would sleep with Toru while still calling him “Watanabe”. To avoid this, Gräfe may choose to shift to “Toru” at some point, perhaps in the passage where the two agree to sleep with each other.

Because the Swedish translation largely used the same translations as the German translation, the predicted strategies and effects are similar – however, there are a few slight differences. Because the Swedish translators quickly shifted from "Watanabe" to "Toru" in Midori's dialogue, it may be possible that they will do the same in Reiko's dialogue. The point at which this shift occurs, in turn, may influence readers' perception of their relationship. Any potential compensation for the distance lost by using "Toru" is equally difficult to incorporate in Swedish as it is in German; as such, it is also possible that the translators will use "Watanabe" throughout, although this will likely require the same shift to "Toru" near the end.

**The first meeting**

> 「えーとねえ、ワタナベ君だったわね、あなたが直子に会う前に私の方からここの説明をしておいたほうがいいと思ったのよ。(上 195)
>
> "It crossed my mind that I should tell you about this place, Mr – Watanabe, wasn't it? – before you see Naoko. (124)
>
> 'Kijk, eh... Watanabe was het toch? Het leek me beter om je wat uitleg te geven over deze plek voordat je Naoko ontmoet.' (Chapter 6)
>
> »Also, Herr Watanabe – so war doch Ihr Name? Ehe Sie Naoko sehen, sollte ich Ihnen vielleicht einiges über diesen Ort erzählen. (Chapter 6)
>
> »Det slog mig plötsligt att jag borde berätta för er om det här stället, herr… Watanabe var det väl, innan ni träffar Naoko. (130)

The passage above is taken from Toru and Reiko's first meeting, which takes place at the sanatorium before Toru sees Naoko again. Because this is their first meeting, the distance between the two characters is great and translators may be expected to use Toru's last name accordingly. Indeed, every translator has chosen to use "Watanabe"; the English, German, and Swedish translators add an honorific as well, which makes the introduction more natural. The Dutch translation's use of only "Watanabe" is a little unnatural in a first meeting between characters, but this has little effect on the interpretative potential of the passage.

As discussed, the use of "Watanabe" here need not alter the interpretative potential of the text yet, although it may do so if it is used in all of Reiko's dialogue. Strikingly, the German and Swedish translators have included a formal second-person pronoun in Reiko's dialogue as well – "Sie" and "ni", respectively – which further increases the distance between the two. This is especially striking in Swedish, where the formal second-person pronoun is very rare, especially compared to German, where it is fairly common. Understandably, the Swedish translation quickly shifts to using "du" as soon as Reiko has introduced herself, continuing in unmarked Swedish. The use of "ni", though short-lived, may have given readers a formal first impression resulting in a similar sense of distance to that found in the source text. The German translation continues to use "Sie", keeping the distance intact.

After getting to know each other, Toru and Reiko go to see Naoko. The following passage is set a little after that:

> 「ねえワタナベ君」とレイコさんが僕に言った。「悪いけれど二十分くらいそのへんをぶらぶら散歩してきてくれない。そうすればなんとかなると思うから」(上 232)
>
> "You know," Reiko said to me, "it might be a good idea for you to go out for a little walk. Maybe 20 minutes. Sorry, but I think that would help." (148)
>
> 'Watanabe,' zei Reiko, 'misschien is het geen goed idee als je een halfuurtje een ommetje in de buurt maakt. Dat zal wel helpen, denk ik.' (129-130)
>
> »Herr Watanabe, wie wär's, wenn Sie ein bißchen spazierengingen?« sagte Reiko zu mir. »Zwanzig Minuten vielleicht? Dann geht's bestimmt wieder.« (121)
>
> »Toru, förlåt, men skulle du kunna ta en liten promenad? En liten runda på tjugo minuter eller så? Då tror jag att hon är OK när du kommer tillbaka.« (153)

The German translation of Reiko's dialogue is striking for its formality. Not only does Gräfe use the more distant "Watanabe", she uses "Herr Watanabe" and the formal "Sie", which increase the distance between the two characters dramatically. Although German is a relatively formal language, at least compared to the other three languages, it is by no means more formal than Japanese, and although rules of formality differ

between the two cultures, it is worth noting that Reiko's speech in Japanese is entirely casual, untouched by formalities. Japanese readers do see a level of formality in Toru's speech, which creates some distance between the two, but this formality arises naturally due to the age difference; as seen below, Toru uses the same -さん suffix and formal verb forms when addressing his close friend and senior Nagasawa. As such, the highly formal tone of the German translation differs strongly from the tone of the target text. While the level of formality may have limited impact on the interpretative potential here because Toru and Reiko only just met, it may substantially influence the perception of their relationship should it continue to appear further into the narrative.

Although the Swedish translation began with "Watanabe", it has shifted to "Toru" here. It may be assumed, then, that "Watanabe", like the formal "ni", was only chosen to be used in the introduction between the two, just as it was in Midori's speech. The shift to "Toru" closes the distance between the two, which may fit their growing friendship but does remove any contrast between Reiko's and the other girls' relationships with Toru. However, the initial distance created by the use of "ni" may still be in readers' minds, keeping some formal distance intact here. The fact that the shift from "Watanabe" to "Toru" takes place now means that the later lovemaking scene in the Swedish translation will likely also use the unproblematic "Toru".

The Dutch translation, finally, continues its consistent use of "Watanabe" throughout all dialogue. It is important to note that Toru does not use "u" instead of

"jij" when addressing Reiko, which means there is no clear difference in formality between Toru and Reiko on the one hand, and Toru and the other girls on the other.

**The sex scene**

The sex scene between Toru and Reiko near the end of the novel – passage 10 in the appendix – contains the final occurrences of "ワタナベ君" in the text. Because the selected passage shows the pairing at their most intimate, any potential remaining shifts from "Watanabe" to "Toru" would likely take place here. If no such shifts occur, continued use of "Watanabe" in the English and German translations may lead to odd-sounding dialogue, especially if the German text retains its formal tone. The Dutch and Swedish translators' predicted use of "Watanabe" and "Toru" respectively would continue earlier patterns, but otherwise mean little for this passage that has not been mentioned above.

The English translation continues to use "Watanabe" throughout Reiko's dialogue. As was the case in Midori's dialogue, it may strike readers as strange that a woman would address her bed partner by his last name. The choice to use "Watanabe" here is especially striking considering Rubin's own interpretation of the scene: if Reiko truly acts as a stand-in for Naoko, it could be more fitting to close the distance between the two by letting Reiko use Toru's first name, as Naoko did. Of course, however, this would have created a potentially problematic contrast between Reiko's and Midori's

speech. Regardless, the choice to continue using "Watanabe" throughout means that Reiko remains more distant than Naoko, but does maintain the same distance as Midori throughout.

The German translation continues the problematic use of "Herr Watanabe" and "Sie", maintained throughout Reiko's dialogue until this point and contrasting heavily with the dialogue of the source text. Such a high level of formality may cause German readers to interpret the two as still being distant, while they have become close friends in the source text. As such, Gräfe's choice here alters the interpretative potential of the text. Reiko's suggestion to sleep with Toru flows naturally from the dialogue in Japanese, but may come as a surprise to German readers; moreover, it may sound unnatural because Reiko suggests it while still addressing Toru as "Herr Watanabe". While it is understandable why Gräfe opted to use the formal language when the two first met, this passage raises the question why she did not shift to less formal language further into the narrative, as the Swedish translators did.

The formalities are finally dropped after the two have agreed to sleep with each other: in the second half of the passage, both Toru and Reiko shift to addressing each other with "du". Reiko does, however, keep saying "Watanabe", retaining a sense of distance. The shift from "Herr Watanabe" to "Watanabe" may be compared with the suggested shift from "Watanabe" to "Toru" which could have taken place in this same passage. The shift in the German translation does move towards less formal language,

but the initial formality of Reiko's speech was so high that the shift does not close the distance between Toru and Reiko sufficiently. As a result, the relationship between Toru and Reiko may appear far more distant in German than it is in Japanese.

**Sub-conclusion**

This section saw similar patterns to those found before, with a few striking exceptions. The English translation used "Watanabe" throughout Reiko's dialogue, which gave Reiko the same form of address as Midori, signaling the same level of distance. Both Midori's and Reiko's dialogues contained a passage where the women go to bed with Toru but still call him "Watanabe", and readers may find the distant use of Toru's last name to sound somewhat strange or awkward. Reiko's form of address contrasts with Naoko's, which may signal that Naoko is closer to Toru than Reiko is, an interpretation that was available in the narrative regardless. However, it also means that for the three major female characters, Rubin has used "Toru" only within Naoko's dialogue, setting her apart. Readers may interpret this to mean that Naoko is a special character who is closer to Toru – perhaps even that she is Toru's only 'true' love. Although this interpretation is also available in the source text, it is not emphasized there as there is no contrast between the three characters' forms of address, so Rubin's chosen translations so far have caused the interpretative potential of the text to be altered.

The Dutch translation continued patterns found earlier, using "Watanabe" in all characters' dialogue so far. No compensation was found to slightly increase the distance

between Toru and Reiko, resulting in an equal distance between the three major female characters. However, the lack of difference does not necessarily lead to a significantly altered interpretative potential, because readers may still consider Reiko to be more distant due to her age. The translations of Toru's name so far do, however, have strong implications for remaining passages. Because Fennema has only used "Watanabe" in the dialogue of the three characters closest to Toru, she cannot increase the distance for characters less close to Toru through translations of his name alone. Unless Fennema introduces a form of compensation, readers may not perceive a difference between the different characters' dialogue, which may lead to an altered interpretative potential.

The German translation of Reiko's speech was strikingly formal compared to both the other translations and the source text. Reiko addressed Toru as "Herr Watanabe" throughout the novel, using the formal second-person pronoun "Sie". Only at the very end, when the two agreed to sleep with each other, did Gräfe reduce the formality by using "du" and removing the "Herr" from Reiko's speech. Nevertheless, some distance was retained through the use of "Watanabe". While the distance between the two characters became clear enough through studying Reiko's speech alone, the formalities become especially striking when contrasted with the speech of Naoko and Midori in the German text: Gräfe used "Tōru" and "du" for both, strikingly different from the "Herr Watanabe" and "Sie" in Reiko's dialogue. As a result, readers of the German text are highly unlikely to perceive Reiko's relationship with Toru as similar to

Naoko's or Midori's relationships with Toru. Furthermore, the distance between Reiko and Toru is likely to be perceived as far greater than it is in the source text, which may mean that German readers are unlikely to see Toru and Reiko as close friends by the end of the novel, substantially altering the interpretative potential by introducing a false interpretation.

In the Swedish translation, Reiko started out using "Watanabe" but quickly shifted to "Toru" after the introductions between the two characters. The use of "Toru" for the remainder of the dialogue meant that there was no difference in the forms of address between Reiko, Midori, and Naoko, so that the slight social difference found in the source text disappeared. However, there was compensation for this loss in the form of the formal second-person pronoun "ni", used by both Reiko and Toru when they first met. Because this pronoun is fairly rare in Swedish and signals a high level of formality, this initial distance may lead Swedish readers to interpret Reiko as slightly more distant overall, an effect similar to that found in the source text. Finally, it is important to note that the Swedish translation is the only one to have used "Toru" in all three major characters' dialogues, making it somewhat comparable to the Dutch translation, which only used "Watanabe". Unlike in the Dutch translation, however, readers will be aware of the alternative form of address because of the few passages studied where "Watanabe" was used.

**4.4 – Nagasawa and Hatsumi**

The final section of this chapter concerns Toru's friend Nagasawa and his girlfriend Hatsumi. Toru meets Nagasawa at his dormitory and the two become close friends, Nagasawa being a role model for the inexperienced Toru. In the source text, Nagasawa addresses Toru as "ワタナベ" without honorific, signaling his seniority and emphasizing his masculinity. In addition, he uses the rough masculine second-person pronoun "お前" throughout his dialogue. Toru, in turn, uses the さん-suffix to address Nagasawa, signaling respect for his senior. These forms of address clearly differ from those in Midori's or Naoko's dialogue, where both speakers were equals. Even in Reiko's dialogue, where Toru used the same honorific suffix, the distance was not as pronounced because Reiko used the honorific "君", which softened her dialogue. Nagasawa's speech is far more detached, perhaps even arrogant, and the lack of honorific emphasizes this fact. This distance is what initially fascinates Toru, but eventually pushes him away. Conveying this distance to the target reader, then, is of importance to the interpretative potential of the text.

Although Nagasawa's personality alone may convey a fair level of arrogance, translators may emphasize it by choosing a distant form of address for Toru. Because none of the target languages have informal second-person pronouns equivalent to "お前", translators may choose to compensate in various ways, one of which may be

choosing between “Toru and “Watanabe”. Because there is a clear difference in the source text between Nagasawa’s speech and the speech of the three women above, it may be important to retain such a difference. Any similarities in form of address could make target readers perceive the gap between characters as smaller: for example, if Nagasawa were to use “Toru”, a part of his arrogance could be lost. The English, German, and Swedish translators, who used “Toru” for some other characters, may therefore opt to use “Watanabe”; the Dutch text, however, will likely contain “Watanabe” throughout, as few other options are available.

The chosen form of address in Nagasawa’s speech becomes especially important in a key passage towards the end of the book, where his girlfriend Hatsumi joins the two friends for dinner. As mentioned in chapter 2, Nagasawa and Hatsumi fulfil symbolic roles in the scene, where Nagasawa represents rationality and emotionless sex, while Hatsumi represents emotionality and love. In their ensuing conflict, Toru is forced to choose a side and chooses to leave with Hatsumi. It is important to note that Hatsumi also addresses Toru as “ワタナベ君”, with the same honorific as the three other women, as is common in Japanese. Hatsumi is not, however, a serious love interest: Toru respects the relationship between Hatsumi and Nagasawa, and at one point in chapter 8 (in 下 140) remarks that while he cares for Hatsumi, he mainly wishes he could have had

an elder sister like her. Moreover, Toru addresses Hatsumi as ハツミさん, the -さん suffix signaling the same level of distance as existed between him and Reiko.

The existing contrast between the unemotional Nagasawa and the sensitive Hatsumi is emphasized by the contrast between their respective forms of address, and translators may choose to retain such a contrast in translation. One option is to let Nagasawa say "Watanabe" and Hatsumi use "Toru". While this option is technically available to all translators, it is highly unlikely to appear in the Dutch translation – if it did, Hatsumi would be the only character to use "Toru", which would place a disproportionate amount of emphasis on her dialogue. Although the other translations did use "Toru" elsewhere, the choice has implications for these translations as well. The English translation only used "Toru" in Naoko's dialogue, so using "Toru" in Hatsumi's dialogue could create parallels between the two characters. In the Swedish translation, all characters so far used "Toru", so having Nagasawa suddenly use "Watanabe" would single him out as the odd one out. The effects of these choices will be discussed should they occur.

**Introductions**

> 「だから読むのさ。他人と同じものを読んでいれば他人と同じ考え方しかできなくなる。そんなものは田舎者、俗物の世界だ。まともな人間はそんな恥ずかしい

ことはしない。なあ知ってるか、ワタナベ？この寮で少しでもまともなのは俺とお前だけだぞ。あとはみんな紙屑みたいなもんだ」(上 67)

"That's why I read them. If you only read the books that everyone else is reading, you can only think what everyone else is thinking. That's the world of hicks and slobs. Real people would be ashamed of themselves doing that. Haven't you noticed, Watanabe? You and I are the only real ones in this dorm. The other guys are crap." (39)

'Daarom lees ik ze juist. Als je hetzelfde leest als iedereen, dan denk je ook hetzelfde als iedereen. Dat is de wereld van de boeren en het plebs. Een weldenkend mens zou zich schamen. Weet je, Watanabe, de enige normale mensen op deze campus zijn jij en ik. De rest is vuilnis.' (Chapter 3)

»Genau deswegen lese ich sie ja. Liest man, was allen anderen auch lesen, kann man auch nur das denken, was alle anderen auch denken. Das ist etwas für Hinterwäldler und Banausen. Ein ernsthafter Mensch würde sich schämen. Hast du das noch nicht mitgekriegt, Watanabe? Hier im Wohnheim gibt es kaum wahre Menschen, außer dir und mir. Die andern sind Abfall.« (Chapter 3)

»Det är därför jag läser dem. Om man bara läser böcker som andra läser, då kan man till slut bara tänka sådana tankar som de tänker. Det är sådant lantisar och snobbar ägnar sig åt. Riktiga människor skulle skämmas om de höll på så där. Vet du vad, Watanabe? Du och jag är de enda rejäla människorna på studenthemmet. De andra killarna är bara skräp.« (45)

The first true exchange between Toru and Nagasawa is set when the two have already become friends, so there is no opportunity to study their initial forms of address; this passage shows the first time Nagasawa addresses Toru. Interestingly, all four

translations use “Watanabe” in his speech. This is perhaps least surprising for the Dutch translation, which used “Watanabe” in all dialogue, but it does mean that the Dutch translation displays no contrast between the various occurrences of “ワタナベ” versus “ワタナベ君”. While this contrast is lost in the target text, Nagasawa’s personality alone may be enough to convey the distance. However, Nagasawa’s dialogue does seem somewhat less rough overall in Fennema’s translation than it is in the target text due to the chosen register and tone, which could become problematic in combination with the lack of contrast. The influence of register and tone, however, would need to be studied elsewhere.

The use of “Watanabe” in the English translation is the same for all characters studied so far, except Naoko. This means that Nagasawa’s speech is not necessarily perceived as different from that of Midori and Reiko, but again, his personality alone may be enough to convey the difference. Nevertheless, the fact that Nagasawa uses the same form of address as Midori and Reiko may cause readers to perceive the three as similar, while the contrasting forms of address in the source text do not allow for this interpretation. Using “Watanabe” in the speech of the cynical Nagasawa may give the name negative connotations, which could in turn be carried over to Midori and Reiko. The fact that Nagasawa appears in the novel before the two women plays an important role here, as “Watanabe” may already be established in readers’ minds as a distant form

of address when Midori and Reiko begin to use it. As such, Rubin's choice to use "Watanabe" in all three characters' speech may alter the interpretative potential of the text, because Midori and Reiko may be perceived as more distant than they are in the source text. There is, however, a clear difference between Nagasawa's speech and that of Naoko, as also found in the source text. The fact that Midori, Reiko, and now Nagasawa all use "Watanabe" in opposition to Naoko's "Toru" may further strengthen the impression that Naoko is somehow special or different, an interpretation not as strongly present in the source text.

The fact that the German translation uses "Watanabe" creates a clear division between characters: Naoko and Midori use "Tōru", while Reiko and Nagasawa use "Watanabe". As such, there is a clear contrast between the distant Nagasawa and the two main love interests, as there is in the source text. However, Reiko's use of "(Herr) Watanabe" remains problematic, because it now also means that there is little contrast between Reiko's and Nagasawa's speech. Perhaps, however, the formality of Reiko's speech and the informality of Nagasawa's may create enough distance between the two that they are not perceived as similar. While Reiko's form of address may be problematic, the use of "Watanabe" in Nagasawa's speech creates enough contrast with Naoko's and Midori's speech to leave the potential interpretations of his character largely unaltered in translation.

The Swedish translation, finally, uses "Watanabe" as well, which may come as a surprise considering all characters so far used "Toru". By using "Watanabe" here, the Swedish translators create a clear distinction between the two groups of characters and, as a result, a larger distance between Toru and Nagasawa. In fact, the Swedish translation closely follows the Japanese distinction between "ワタナベ君" and "ワタナベ" by translating the two as respectively "Toru" and "Watanabe", mirroring the difference in tone and preserving the interpretative potential caused by this difference.

**Dinner with Nagasawa and Hatsumi**

Passage 11, included in the appendix, takes place when Toru, Nagasawa, and Hatsumi meet to have dinner and shows the two different forms of address in the same scene: Nagasawa's "ワタナベ" and Hatsumi's "ワタナベ君" appear in juxtaposition, creating a clear contrast between the two. Due to the unambiguous nature of the conversation, forms of address are unlikely to heavily influence readers' interpretation of the passage; nevertheless, the strong contrast between the two characters may still be preserved in translation, and the results are worth studying.

The English translation shows a clear distinction between Nagasawa's and Hatsumi's speech: where Nagasawa uses "Watanabe", Hatsumi uses "Toru". This creates a strong contrast between the two, emphasizing their already contrasting

characters. However, Rubin's choice to use "Toru" in Hatsumi's dialogue does have consequences for the target text as a whole, because Toru's first name otherwise only appears in Naoko's dialogue. Readers may already have noticed that Naoko uses "Toru" while the other women use "Watanabe"; the appearance near the end of the novel of a second character that uses "Toru", then, may also catch the reader's eye. Rubin's choice creates parallels between Naoko and Hatsumi, which may be problematic because the first is one of Toru's love interests while the latter is not. It has already been established that the use of "Toru" in Naoko's speech may lead readers of the English text to believe that Naoko is more special than Midori or Reiko, and in extension, readers may come to believe that Hatsumi is similarly special. Because the source text shows no contrast between the speech of the four women, no such interpretation is encouraged by the forms of address. Although readers of the source text may also see great significance in Hatsumi's character, readers of the English translation are more likely to arrive at this interpretation due to the parallels with Naoko that did not exist in the source text, leading to a substantial shift in the interpretative potential of the passage and text as a whole. Because the source text does not allow readers to draw parallels between Naoko and Hatsumi based on forms of address alone, Rubin introduces a false interpretation to the text's interpretative potential.

The Dutch translation, as expected, shows no distinction between the forms of address of the two characters. The 'flattening' effects of this choice have already been discussed extensively, but it is important to note that in a passage such as this one, with a clear contrast in the source text between the two forms of address, the absence of contrast in the target text may result in a slight shift in the interpretative potential. Japanese readers are highly likely to perceive Nagasawa and Hatsumi as near polar opposites, and their contrasting forms of address reinforce this interpretation. In the Dutch text, however, the absence of this contrast may cause readers to be less likely to arrive at this interpretation. Still, the contrasting personalities of the two may be enough to leave the interpretative potential largely unaltered.

The German translation does show a contrast between the two characters' form of address. Through the use of "Tōru" and "Watanabe", Gräfe has created a distinction between the uses of "ワタナベ君" and "ワタナベ" in the passage; if not for the problematically translated forms of address in Reiko's dialogue, the distinction would be present in the whole text. The preservation of the contrast between the two characters' speech in this passage means that forms of address here do not alter the interpretative potential.

Finally, the Swedish translation displays a surprising shift from "Watanabe" to "Toru" in Nagasawa's dialogue. Because few characters in the Swedish text use "Watanabe", readers will likely have noticed that Nagasawa does use it; as a result, the

shift here is also likely catch the reader's eye. The shift is even more striking because "Watanabe" was used only three pages earlier, within the same conversation: "Jag och Watanabe bytte flickor för länge sedan. Minns du, Watanabe?" (272). Due to Nagasawa's strong personality, it is unlikely that the shift will cause readers to perceive him differently. It does, however, cause the contrast in this passage to disappear, removing some of the opposition between Nagasawa and Hatsumi. It almost seems as if Nagasawa alters his speech to fit that of his girlfriend, making him appear considerate in the translation – this potential interpretation causes a major shift in the interpretative potential of the passage, as the source text does not allow for such an interpretation and in fact largely signals the opposite through the separate forms of address. The reasons for this shift from "Watanabe" to "Toru" are unclear, as there appears to be no narrative incentive for it to take place. Were it not for this scene, the Swedish translators would have captured the contrast between "ワタナベ君" and "ワタナベ" by using respectively "Toru" and "Watanabe" throughout the whole text.

**4.5 – Conclusion**

The passages studied in this chapter clearly showed that there was no single 'correct' solution for the translation of Toru Watanabe's name in characters' speech. Differences between translations ranged from slight to substantial, and while all translators seemed to have clearly defined strategies for translating Toru's name, some of these were more

fitting than others. Most choices resulted in only subtle shifts – if any – in the text's interpretative potential, but some may have significantly altered the way a character or group of characters can be perceived by readers. It is important to note, however, that the translations of Toru's name are only one of several factors forming the interpretative potential of the text. This chapter would benefit from additional research into register and tone in characters' dialogue, which could confirm or refute the findings. As such, only tentative conclusions may be drawn about the effect of some translations; however, there are also cases where forms of address alone were enough to encourage certain interpretations. These interpretations may have been available in the source text, but were by no means the *only* interpretations available, and the fact that a subset of interpretations is encouraged causes a clear shift in the interpretative potential of the text. These cases will be discussed below.

**The English translation**

The English translation displayed a mixed set of strategies, using "Toru" in Naoko's and Hatsumi's dialogue and "Watanabe" in that of other characters. Readers of the English translation will be well aware of the two available forms of address, because Rubin uses both in alternation. As a result, readers are likely to distinguish between two groups – characters who use "Toru" and characters who use "Watanabe" – perhaps assigning narrative significance to this contrast. Rubin's strategy has two substantial

consequences: it introduces a division between characters not present in the source text, and it removes the source text's contrast between users of "ワタナベ" and "ワタナベ君". The introduced division singles out Naoko and Hatsumi from the other characters, while contrast that existed between Midori, Reiko, and Nagasawa is removed. Each of these will be discussed in detail below.

The use of "Toru" in Naoko's and Hatsumi's dialogue meant that these two were separated from the other characters. In isolation, both characters' use of "Toru" fit the passages and narrative entirely: Naoko, as one of Toru's main love interests, could be expected to address him by his first name, while Hatsumi's role as polar opposite to Nagasawa was strengthened through their contrasting forms of address. However, because the two women were the only characters to use "Toru", readers of the translation may come to regard them as special, different, or – in the case of Naoko – as Toru's only 'true' love interest. It is important to note that these interpretations may have been *available* in the source text, but that they were not *encouraged* by the forms of address, causing a shift in interpretative potential. More importantly, however, the very parallel created between Naoko and Hatsumi by Rubin's use of "Toru" was not available in the source text, because all four women used the same form of address; as such, Rubin's translation adds a false interpretation to the interpretative potential of the text.

The division between the two groups of characters also means that Midori and Reiko, also close to Toru, may be perceived as less affectionate than Naoko. In contrast to Naoko's use of Toru's first name, the two other women used Toru's last name as a form of address. Readers are likely to notice the contrast and may interpret it as meaning the two women are more emotionally distant – and perhaps that Midori is not Toru's 'true' love. Although these interpretations, too, were available in the source text, the division created in the translation encourages them, again causing a shift in the text's interpretative potential.

The impression of emotional distance that may be found in Midori's and Reiko's use of "Watanabe" is strengthened by the loss of contrast between Midori, Reiko, and Nagasawa. The fact that all three characters addressed Toru by his last name meant that these characters may be implicitly placed into one group. In the source text, however, there was a clear difference in the forms of address of Nagasawa and the other two characters, because Nagasawa used no honorific. The absence of honorifics in Nagasawa's speech was natural in Japanese, especially considering his generally cynical and informal nature, and Rubin's choice to use "Watanabe" in his speech may have reflected a similar distance between Nagasawa and Toru. The fact, however, that Nagasawa used the same form of address as Midori and Reiko may cause readers of the English text to see parallels between the cynical Nagasawa and the two women, which

again may cause readers to perceive the two women as less affectionate towards Toru than Naoko is.

Due to the effects described above, the characters most heavily impacted by Rubin's translational choices are Naoko, Midori, and Reiko – the three important women in the novel. Because *Norwegian Wood* largely revolves around Toru's interactions with these three women, Rubin's choices have touched the very core of the novel. The minor shifts in interpretative potential together have a substantial influence of the text's macro-structure, and the English text as a whole has an altered interpretative potential compared to the source text. The parallel created between Naoko and Hatsumi also introduced a false interpretation to the text's interpretative potential. Further study into tone and register could prove or disprove some of these claims, but the false interpretation stands, because it was encouraged by forms of address alone. As such, the English text may be assigned the label relative divergence.

**The Dutch translation**

The Dutch translation was notable for being the only text to only use "Watanabe" throughout. Perhaps Fennema did not recognize the opportunity to use "Toru" where Murakami could not, or perhaps she chose not to, adhering to the material of the source text. As predicted in the introduction, translating Toru's name 'as-is' was not without its problems, as it effectively removed all contrast between characters' forms of address.

The loss of honorifics was not compensated through the use of Dutch formal pronouns, nor did it appear to be substituted through the register of characters' speech – although the latter claim is only a hypothesis and requires further study. As such, it is possible that Dutch readers will not consider the various characters' forms of address to be different, while the source text contained clear contrasts. This is especially true for Nagasawa, who was the one character studied who used no honorific and informal, masculine language throughout his dialogue. It is possible that Dutch readers will not consider the distance between Nagasawa and the other characters to be as large as readers of the source text are likely to do; this interpretation would make Nagasawa less of a unique, isolated character in the Dutch translation, altering the text's interpretative potential. The true effects of this 'flattening' of the target text may only become clear when the register and tone in characters' speech is analyzed: should the contrast be less clear here as well, the forms of address may contribute to a significant shift in the interpretative potential of the text.

A striking translational choice was made in the one passage containing Toru's first name, where Fennema left out the first name in the Dutch text. As such, the Dutch text contained no mention of Toru's first name whatsoever, a finding confirmed by a search for "Toru" – including the various alternative spellings – in the e-book version of the Dutch translation. Because the name could easily have been included, the deletion may be the result of a conscious choice to leave the name out. Regardless of the

reasoning behind the choice, the deletion may be considered a loss for the novel, even if it does not alter the interpretative potential in any way.

The deletion does mean, however, that readers of the Dutch text may come to believe that "Watanabe" is Toru's first name, and in turn believe that all characters address him by his first name. In fact, readers unfamiliar with Japanese names are likely to consider "Watanabe" a first name, because it would be unusual for his friends and lovers not to be on a first-name basis. As such, readers may not consider the consistent use of "Watanabe" as striking as it appears when contrasted with the other translations. Readers could find it odd if unknown minor characters were on a first-name basis with Toru, but fortunately, none of the minor characters in the novel who address Toru are complete strangers to him. In effect, the Dutch translation may be considered to have 'flipped' all last names in the text into perceived first names. This is unlikely to cause confusion, unless readers read the source text or the other translations, or watch the 2010 film adaptation with subtitles, all of which include Toru's first name. Although Fennema's choice is somewhat questionable from a theoretical point of view, then, its effect on the interpretative potential of the text is not as large as it may have first seemed. Apart from the contrast lost between characters, Fennema's choice to use

"Watanabe" in all characters' speech leaves the interpretative potential largely unaltered; as such, the Dutch text may be assigned the label divergent similarity.

**The German translation**

The German translation used both "Tōru" and "Watanabe", showing a clear distinction between characters. Readers will likely be aware of the contrast, and may assign it narrative significance accordingly. Gräfe largely preserved the contrast between the different forms of address in the source text through her translational choices: Naoko, Midori and Hatsumi used "Tōru", while Nagasawa used "Watanabe". This strategy preserved contrasts available in the source text, leaving the interpretative potential largely unaltered for these characters' scenes.

However, there was one clear case where the interpretative potential of the text was altered substantially: that of Reiko. Gräfe used "Herr Watanabe" throughout her dialogue, which not only signaled a greater distance than other characters by using "Watanabe" over "Tōru", but also added a layer of formal distance by using "Herr" and the formal second-person pronoun "Sie". While Japanese readers may have interpreted Reiko as being somewhat distant due to the social difference between her and Toru and Toru's use of the さん-suffix, this is a natural product of Japanese social rules and readers may likely still consider Reiko and Toru to be friends. Gräfe's strategy, however, increases the formal distance compared to the source text, making it unlikely that

readers *could* interpret Toru and Reiko's relationship as one of close friendship. This may mean that the sex scene near the end of the novel comes as a complete surprise to German readers, who may not have noticed the two characters' closeness.

The narrative offered the opportunity to shift to a less formal form of address in Reiko's dialogue during the sex scene, and Gräfe was the only translator to utilize this opportunity. However, the shift only involved the removal of formalities, as the "Herr" was dropped and the "Sie" replaced by the informal "du" – the use of "Watanabe" remained throughout Reiko's dialogue. As such, rather than being a shift from distance to closeness, Gräfe's choice caused a shift from formality to distance. Although the shift took place in the expected direction, it will likely not have been enough to counterbalance the potential impression of distance caused by Reiko's formal language earlier in the novel. Because this level of distance could not be identified in the source text, Gräfe's translational choices introduced a false interpretation to the text's interpretative potential. Even if Reiko is not one of the two main love interests of Toru, she fulfils an important role as Toru's advisor and friend – as a result, Gräfe's problematic choices influence the macro-structure of the text. However, Reiko is only one of several characters, and the interpretative potential for other relationships in the novel were left intact. As such, the interpretative potential of the text as a whole is not fully altered, and the German text may be assigned the label relative divergence.

**The Swedish translation**

Finally, the Swedish translation also showed a clear distinction between the uses of "Toru" and "Watanabe". Interestingly, the contrast between the two forms of address largely corresponded with the contrast between "ワタナベ" and "ワタナベ君" in the source text: Naoko, Midori, Reiko, and Hatsumi used "Toru", while Nagasawa largely used "Watanabe". The translators did use "Watanabe" in both Midori's and Reiko's speech initially, but only while characters introduced themselves, which is unlikely to strike readers as significant.

The Swedish translation, like the German, showed the use of formality in Reiko's dialogue, through the use of "herr" and the formal second-person pronoun "ni". Unlike in the German translation, however, these formalities were quickly dropped at the same time as Reiko started to use "Toru". Due to the initial formal distance, readers may perceive the relationship between Toru and Reiko to be more distant than that between Toru and Naoko or Midori, preserving the slight contrast available in the source text. Other translations either removed the distance – as in the Dutch translation's constant use of "Watanabe" – or increased it – as in the English and German translations' use of "Watanabe" over "Toru". As such, the Swedish translation may have most successfully preserved the slight distance between Toru and Reiko present in the source text. The narrative effect of this choice is only slight, of course, but readers of the Swedish

translation are likely to have largely the same set of interpretations for Reiko's relationship with Toru as readers of the source text do.

One problematic shift from "Watanabe" to "Toru" occurred in Nagasawa's dialogue, in the dinner scene with Hatsumi. While reasons for the shift are unclear, it may signal to the reader that Nagasawa attempts to be closer to either Hatsumi, who used the same form of address, or Toru himself. It may be argued, however, that Nagasawa's distant personality alone makes this interpretation unlikely. As such, while the translation is surprising, it should not be considered significant enough to alter the interpretative potential of the passage or text. Were it not for this passage, the Swedish translators would have preserved the contrast between the various forms of address in the source text entirely, and because the passage itself is not impactful enough to alter the macro-structure of the text, the Swedish text may be assigned the label divergent similarity.

## Chapter 5 – Culture Specific Items

This chapter concerns the translation of culture specific items (CSIs). Using the categories proposed by Michielsen and Aixelá's list of strategies, CSIs from *Norwegian Wood* have been classified and analyzed below. The focus of the analysis is to uncover patterns in the strategies used by each translator, per CSI category and within the text as a whole. The strategies used in a translation may significantly influence how the text is perceived; for example, if a work is translated using only conservative strategies, it will be seen as more exotic than if the work is translated using only substitutive strategies. As such, any patterns found in the four translations may influence the target texts' interpretative potential on a stylistic level, where Murakami's writing is represented somewhere on a scale between 'exoticized' and 'naturalized'. The research question for this chapter is as follows: *what patterns may be found in the strategies used to translate CSIs and where do these patterns place the target texts on a spectrum between exoticizing and naturalizing?* It is important to note that exotic elements are far more likely to be noticed by readers than naturalized elements, as the latter are largely invisible – as such, even a single exotic element may alter readers' perception of a passage, whereas one naturalized element is unlikely to do so. This will be kept in mind when determining the impact of chosen strategies on the text as a whole.

This chapter contains four sections: the first focuses on ecological and geographical CSIs; the second concerns material-cultural CSIs; the third focuses on three longer passages containing humor and idiom; and the fourth section contains passages from remaining categories. Because the final section contains items from multiple categories, there will not be a search for patterns within that section; however, these passages may still show striking translational choices and are therefore included because they may single-handedly influence how the target text is perceived by the reader. Although random selection should ensure a high level of consistency, it may be that some translations show radically different strategies in passages not studied here. With this in mind, conclusions will only be drawn if patterns shown within the selected passages are clear enough to accurately present an overarching translational strategy – or the lack thereof – within each translation.

Initial hypotheses about the four translations' handling of CSIs may be formed based on the translators' profiles established in chapter 2. Because various non-English translators have criticized the English translations for being too free in their translational choices, it may be assumed that Rubin has used a relatively large number of substitutive strategies, taking liberties to adapt the text to the tastes of the target readership where other translators did not. Rubin's relative willingness to use deletion as shown in chapter 4 may also be continued here. Considering other translators' criticisms of

Rubin's approach, it may also be assumed that the overall strategy found in Rubin's translation will differ from that of the other three translations.

Fennema is largely invisible in the translational debate, so no information was found about her views on translation. Fellow translator Jacques Westerhoven did comment that Fennema is "very faithful to the text" ("De vertaler doet het altijd fout", my translation). While it is unclear what exactly is meant by 'faithful', it may be taken to mean 'favoring conservation of the source text material'; an impression confirmed by the findings in chapter 4, where Fennema only used the orthographic adaptation "Watanabe" for Toru's name. This leads to the hypothesis that the Dutch translation will contain a relatively large amount of conservative strategies.

Gräfe, in contrast, has stated her preference for retaining as few exotic elements as possible, favoring intratextual and – in limited numbers – extratextual glosses to help readers understand exotic items. As such, it may be assumed that the German translation will avoid orthographical adaptations unless these are accompanied by glosses, and that the text will likely contain a number of extratextual glosses. Gräfe's stated preference for leaving few exotic elements in the target text may also predict a relatively large number of substitutive strategies, which would result in a mixed translation using both conservative and substitutive strategies.

Yukiko Duke, finally, has stated her preference for intratextual glosses when translating items which she and her mother find difficult to translate, listing example

items that are all part of the category of material-cultural CSIs. As such, it may be assumed that the Swedish translators will mainly use conservative strategies such as orthographic adaptation and intratextual gloss, especially in the category of material-cultural CSIs.

### 5.1 – Ecological & geographical CSIs

Ecological and geographical CSIs include "flora, fauna, animals, trees, fruit, mountains, waters, topography: these are all natural elements, not man-made, and also include geographical names of rivers, cities and countries" (Michielsen 13, my translation). Somewhat ironically, Michielsen emphasizes the natural side of these elements, while most CSIs in this category found in *Norwegian Wood* are parts of Tokyo and therefore everything but natural: names like Shinjuku may be geographical, but carry strong 'man-made' connotations. Nevertheless, they belong in this category and not under Material-cultural CSIs, a category that contains smaller, tangible items. Items in the ecological and geographical CSI category (henceforth: geographical CSIs) are the most frequently used CSIs in the novel, as Murakami describes Toru's movements through Tokyo and beyond in detail. As a result, the items discussed below are only a small selection of all items available; nevertheless, due to the process of random selection, they may be considered to be representative of the whole.

Geographical CSIs are often easy to recognize in Western languages because they are capitalized, setting them apart from the surrounding text. Thus, readers will generally assume that capitalized foreign words that are not other proper names are the names of areas or cities. This means that even if readers are unfamiliar with an item, they will generally recognize it as a geographical name. As a result, Western translators may use orthographic adaptation with relative ease, as there is less risk of creating an incomprehensible element in the target text. It may be expected, then, that relatively many CSIs will be orthographically adapted in the translated passages. German forms an exception, however, because the language capitalizes not only proper nouns but all nouns. This means that German readers will not be able to categorize CSIs by capitalization alone; "Tokyo" and "Teriyaki", if unrecognized, could belong to the same category of nouns. The German translation, then, may be expected to contain fewer orthographic adaptations than the other translations.

**Additions in English – Yotsuya**

> 降りましょうよと直子が言って、我々は電車を降りた。それがたまたま四ツ谷駅だったというだけのことなのだ。(上 41)

> She had suggested that we leave the train, which we happened to do in Yotsuya, where the green embankment makes for a nice place to walk by the old castle moat. (22-23)

> Naoko had voorgesteld uit te stappen en dat we op station Yotsuya uitstapten, was toeval. (Chapter 2)
>
> Komm, wir steigen aus, hatte Naoko an der Haltestelle Yotsuya vorgeschlagen. (Chapter 2)
>
> »Vi går av«, sa Naoko. Och så gjorde vi det. På vad som råkade vara stationen i Yotsuya. (28)

At the beginning of the novel, there is a passage where Toru meets Naoko on the train by chance and they decide to get out to take a walk. In an unremarkable sentence, Toru names their stop: Yotsuya station – technically a material-cultural CSI, although Yotsuya is also the name of the surrounding area and therefore a geographical CSI. In the Dutch, German, and Swedish translations, the translation is an equally unremarkable orthographic adaptation. Only in the English translation is there a striking addition; this addition could be categorized as a simple intratextual gloss, were it not for the fact that it adds CSIs from the source culture to the text: the embankment and the castle moat. These added foreign elements make it more correct to label Rubin's choice as an autonomous creation – a rare strategy.

While the reasons behind Rubin's addition may only be guessed at – perhaps he simply wished to add some information to help foreign readers form an image of the area – the intention behind the addition is not as interesting as its effects. Most translations aim to bridge the distance between the source and target cultures by

reducing 'foreignness' in the text, but this choice instead introduces foreign elements into the text, thereby *increasing* the distance. This is all the more remarkable in a work by an author as Westernized as Murakami who, as discussed in chapter 2, tends to avoid Orientalist clichés. The fact that Rubin introduces what could be considered typical traditional Japanese elements is problematic, as it effectively Orientalizes the passage.

The function of the addition only seems to be to add color to the passage; readers would have just as easily understood the passage without the addition, and there are many Japanese readers who do not know the exact surroundings of Yotsuya station. Perhaps it is telling that the translation presented by both publishers and Murakami himself as the 'international Murakami' is the one that contains such a foreigner-friendly addition. Should this addition be the product of an underlying strategy, other passages in the English translation will likely also contain such additions.

**Additions in English – Tokyo and Kobe**

> その女の子は僕に東京に行かないでくれと言ったが、僕はどうしても神戸の街を離れたかった。(上 52)
>
> The girl asked me not to go to Tokyo – "It's 500 miles from here!" she pleaded – but I had to get away from Kobe at any cost. (29)
>
> Het meisje vroeg me om niet naar Tokio te gaan, maar ik wilde hoe dan ook weg uit Kobe. (Chapter 2)

> Das Mädchen bat mich, nicht nach Tōkyō zu gehen, aber ich wollte Kōbe unter allen Umständen verlassen (Chapter 2)
>
> Min flicka bönföll mig att inte åka till Tokyo, men jag ville bara bort från Kobe. (36)

This passage shows a similar pattern to the one studied above. As the narrator, Toru tells us of a girlfriend he had in his hometown of Kobe, who asked him not to leave for Tokyo. Japanese readers will know of the great distance between the two cities, but foreign readers may not; as such, the reason for the girl's question may not always be clear in translation. It can, however, be inferred: even if readers may not know the exact distance between the cities, they will understand that moving to another city can put a strain on a relationship. In other words, while translators can choose to clarify the distance between Kobe and Tokyo for foreign readers, it may not be necessary.

The Dutch, German and Swedish translations translate the sentence more or less as-is, using orthographic adaptation twice; the English translation, however, again contains an addition. The strategy used here is intratextual gloss, added as a piece of dialogue spoken by the girl. The addition is similar to the one in the Yotsuya passage, except that it contains no target culture CSIs. The function of this addition, however, is different from the one used for Yotsuya: here, the addition provides knowledge that helps the foreign reader understand the CSI, and it therefore bridges the gap between

the source and target cultures rather than enlarging it. It is striking, however, that the English translation again is the only one not using only orthographic adaptation.

**Wards and cities – Toshima and Musashino**

> 住所は豊島区で、家は自宅だった。(上 114)
>
> She lived in a north-west suburb, Toshima, with her parents. (70)
>
> Ze woonde in Toshima bij haar ouders. (Chapter 4)
>
> Sie wohnte im Stadtteil Toshima bei ihren Eltern. (Chapter 4)
>
> Jag antecknade att hon bodde i Toshima med sin familj. (76)

Rubin's tendency to explain items continues in this passage, where both the English and the German translations add an intratextual gloss. The context is different here, however, as there is no way for the reader to deduce the denotation or connotations of the CSI from the source text alone, as was possible in the Tokyo-Kobe passage. For this reason, the CSI has very little meaning to the foreign reader when left unexplained: Toshima could be a part of Tokyo – a suburb or an upper-class district – or it could be a city outside Tokyo. The fact that Toshima is one of Tokyo's central wards adds characterization in the source text: the "she" in question is Midori, and the passage effectively describes her as a city girl. Although it is by no means required, translators may wish to convey this connotation to the target reader by choosing a strategy that bridges the cultural gap.

Rubin's choice for "north-west suburb" is somewhat surprising considering Toshima is located close to central Tokyo – more importantly, the connotations of the word "suburb" differ strongly by country. Readers of the English translation may imagine a quiet neighborhood with large houses and wide streets, while Toshima is – and was in 1968 – densely populated**.** Rubin's addition, then, may not necessarily help readers understand the text better. While the translational choice is not impactful enough to change the interpretative potential of the text on its own, it may be interesting to see if the English translation contains more of these 'misleading' additions.

Gräfe has made a neutral choice in her translation, simply adding the descriptive intratextual gloss "Stadtteil". While all only the English translations used strategies other than orthographic adaptation up to this point, the German translation now also widens its scope, differentiating itself from the Dutch and Swedish translations.

彼女は武蔵野のはずれにある女子大に通っていた。(上 57)

Naoko went to a girl's college on the rural western edge of Tokyo (32)

Naoko studeerde aan een meisjesuniversiteit aan de rand van de landelijke buitenwijk Musashino. (Chapter 3)

Sie besuchte eine kleine, aber feine Universität für Mädchen am Stadtrand, in Musashino (Chapter 3)

Naoko gick på ett universitet för kvinnor i Musashinos utkant (38)

The translations in this passage appear somewhat confusing when compared: the English and German translations mention the edge of Tokyo, while the Dutch and Swedish mention the edge of Musashino. The Japanese CSI may be translated as "the edge of Musashino", and it is unlikely that the difference in translations is the result of a misunderstanding as the phrase is unambiguous. Instead, the difference is likely the result of deliberate choices made by the translators: as was the case with Toshima, foreign readers may be unaware of Musashino's location and translators may therefore choose to help the reader by including additional information. "Musashino" alone is unlikely to mean anything to the reader, but this does not mean that the translator is required to add information or that strategies that decrease the distance between source and target cultures are somehow 'more correct'.

The least complex translation of the CSI is the Swedish one: it is a simple orthographic adaptation. As such, the CSI is left exotic, unlikely to mean much to the target reader but also unlikely to draw much attention. The chosen strategy fits earlier patterns found in the Swedish translation, which until now always only used orthographic adaptations for geographical names.

The Dutch translation breaks the pattern found earlier: where until now it favored orthographical adaptations alone, it now adds an intratextual gloss. It is striking that no gloss was added for Musashino where the geographical CSI contributed to

Midori's characterization, but this passage – where the exact location of the CSI is of limited importance – does include a gloss. It is too early, however, to speak of inconsistency on the translator's part. For now, it may be assumed that the Dutch translation favors the orthographical adaptation, sometimes adding an intratextual gloss.

The strategies used in the German translation are orthographical adaptation, intratextual gloss, and partial deletion. For clarity's sake, the CSI is best split up into two parts: "武蔵野" and "のはずれ". The former part has been orthographically adapted as "Musashino", with the added gloss "am Stadtrand". The latter part has been omitted, possibly to keep the sentence short and avoid repetition ("the edge of the edge of the city"). Because the deletion was likely specific to this sentence, it cannot yet be assumed to be part of a larger pattern; otherwise, the German translation continues using the same combination of orthographical adaptation + gloss found before.

The English translation is similar to the German translation in that the second element of the CSI has been omitted. However, "武蔵野" has been translated using limited universalization, where it has been replaced with the more well-known source culture CSI "Tokyo". This adds a new strategy to the patterns found in the English

translation; it is worth noting that so far, the English translation is the only one to have included substitutive strategies.

**Middle-class and rich areas**

Passage 12, found in the appendix, contains a staggering number of geographical CSIs, a few of them with strong connotations in the source culture. In the passage, Midori talks about her old school. To clarify just how rich the other girls in her class were, she lists the areas they lived in (elements 5-8). These areas are all expensive neighborhoods in Tokyo and carry strong upper-class connotations within the source culture. In contrast, Toshima (element 4) is a more middle-class area, and the city Kashiwa in Chiba prefecture (element 9) is less well-known but unlikely to strike the reader as particularly upper-class since it is located outside of central Tokyo. As such, readers of the source text will understand from reading the names of the areas alone why Midori befriends the girl from Kashiwa and not the other girls. The passage as a whole is highly exaggerated: the geographical CSIs and the other CSIs – discussed below – combine to make Midori's school come off as over-the-top and comical, befitting Midori's tendency to exaggerate.

The translation problem in this passage is caused by the presupposed knowledge of the reader: Japanese readers are likely to recognize at least one of the names in elements 5-8 and therefore understand the connotation of the areas being named;

furthermore, knowledge of where Chiba prefecture is located will help the reader assume that Kashiwa is less upper-class. Most foreign readers, however, are unlikely to recognize any of the names in the passage and will therefore be unaware of their connotations. The target audience will likely still be able to infer through the context what the names mean to the Japanese reader, but if translators were to only orthographically adapt the elements without using additional strategies, it would undoubtedly make target readers aware of the gap between source and target cultures. In other words, chosen strategies are unlikely to change the interpretative potential of the text, but they may strongly affect how exotic it is perceived to be. Moreover, if the connotations of too many CSIs become unclear to the reader, the comical effect of the passage may be lost in translation.

The English translation shows a version of the passage heavily tailored towards the target reader. Element 4 combines orthographic adaptation with an intratextual gloss explaining the connotations Toshima has in contrast with the upper-class neighborhoods. A far more striking strategy can be found in the translation of Elements 5 through 8: the four areas in Tokyo have been reduced to the short phrase "a rich area". Rubin here uses absolute universalization to transform a list of items with strong source culture connotations into a neutral, descriptive sentence. This is the first time absolute universalization is used – and perhaps it is no surprise that it is used in the English translation, given that it is a substitutive strategy. The passage contains a second

substitutive strategy – deletion – in the translation of element 9: the name Kashiwa is removed, leaving only "Chiba". Foreign readers are unlikely to know the city, but may have heard of the prefecture. Rubin then helps the reader further by including an intratextual gloss explaining the CSI "Chiba". Through these strategies, the comical contrast between the two types of geographical CSI is maintained. This passage clearly shows the pattern found in the English translation until now, with intratextual glosses and substitutive strategies.

The Dutch translation showcases the other extreme: it contains only orthographic adaptations – although somewhat unfortunately, element 8 has been mistranscribed as "Narishiro" instead of the correct "Seijo". The use of only orthographic adaptations is striking given the intratextual gloss added for Musashino earlier: the connotations of Musashino were unimportant, while the areas in this passage are mentioned for their contrasting connotations. These connotations will be lost to readers of the Dutch translation, who are left to figure out by themselves what exactly is "ongelofelijk" about the four areas listed, or why Midori befriended the girl from Kashiwa. Much of the exaggeration is obscured, making the passage fall flat for readers unfamiliar with the CSIs. Nevertheless, the Dutch translation shows strong consistency: so far, most geographical CSIs have been translated using orthographic adaptation.

The German translation once again finds a middle ground between the English and Dutch translations, containing orthographic adaptations, intratextual glosses, and –

for the first time – an absolute universalization. Element 4 is left exotic, but the comical contrast in the passage is made explicit through the translation of elements 5 through 8 which, as in the English translation, are summarized in a single phrase using absolute universalization. This strategy deviates from the pattern found so far in the German translation: while Gräfe first seemed to favor only orthographic adaptations and intratextual glosses, she now adds a substitutive strategy. A second substitutive strategy may be found in the translation of element 9, where "Kashiwa" is deleted and an intratextual gloss is added to explain the connotations of Chiba prefecture. In elements 5 through 9, then, Gräfe uses the same strategies as Rubin did, although the execution is different. Perhaps Gräfe's use of substitutive strategies here means that the deletion used for Musashino was part of a larger pattern, where the German translation contains mainly orthographic adaptations and glosses, but also a few substitutive strategies – situating it between the English and Dutch translations.

The Swedish translation also shows a mix between the extremes found in the Dutch and English translations. Element 4 is translated much like it was in the English translation, combining orthographic adaptation with intratextual gloss. Elements 5 through 8 show a wide array of strategies: the whole list has been given the intratextual gloss "exclusiva adresser", which clarifies the connotations of the areas, and elements 5 through 7 have been translated using orthographic adaptation. Curiously, element 8 has been deleted, marking the first time the Swedish translators use a substitutive strategy.

Finally, element 9 has been translated using orthographic adaptation with an intratextual gloss. Strategies used in the translation of this passage strongly deviate from the patterns found earlier in the Swedish translation, as before, the only strategy used was orthographic adaptation, making the Swedish translation the most conservative translation of the four. With the translation of this passage, however, the Swedish translation shows itself to be less conservative overall than the Dutch translation. Reasons for this sudden shift in strategies can only be guessed at, but one possible reason lies in the effect of the CSIs within the passage. The CSIs studied earlier were relatively 'unimportant' as they ultimately played no larger role within the passage itself, but the CSIs in this passage are used to create a comedic exaggeration, which may explain why the Swedish translators chose to help the reader understand their connotations.

**Translating Shinjuku – Sanchome and Kabukicho**

新宿三丁目の喧噪の中でバスを降り (上 168)

We walked around a lively area for a while (104)

We stapten in het rumoerige Shinjuku Sanbancho uit (Chapter 4)

In Shinjuku San-chōme stiegen wir aus (Chapter 4)

Vi gick omkring i Shinjuku Sanchome ett tag (110)

The two passages studied in this section both concern connotations of areas of Shinjuku in Tokyo visited by Toru and Nagasawa. Shinjuku Sanchome in the passage above is famous within the source culture for having an active nightlife. Western readers, however, may be unfamiliar with the name and therefore require some additional explanation to understand where the duo is headed.

As may have been expected from earlier patterns found in the English translation, Rubin uses an intratextual gloss to translate the CSI, informing the target reader of the connotations of the area but leaving its name unmentioned.

The Dutch translation, however, chooses an unexpected strategy by not only using orthographic adaptation, but also including an intratextual gloss. Perhaps Fennema deemed the connotations of this geographical CSI more important than those of earlier CSIs, but considering the absence of any glosses for the geographical CSIs in passage 26, where connotations played a major role, the choice may be called surprising. Again, the translation contains an unfortunate mistranscription of the CSI, with "Sanbancho" instead of "Sanchome".

The Swedish and German translations simply use orthographic adaptations, leaving the connotations of the area unclear to the target reader. This fits patterns found in the Swedish translation, but is slightly more conservative than expected from the German translation.

化粧も服装もごくまともで、朝の五時前に歌舞伎町をうろうろしているようなタイプには見えなかった。(上 170)

Both were reserved in the way they dressed and made up: they were definitely not the type to be wandering around Shinjuku at five in the morning. (106)

Met hun keurige make-up en kleding leken ze niet het type dat om vijf uur 's nachts door Kabukicho dwaalt. (Chapter 4)

Beide waren dezent geschminkt und gekleidet, überhaupt nicht der Typ, der sich bis morgens um fünf in Shinjuku herumtreibt. (Chapter 4)

De var sparsamt sminkade och diskret klädda – definitivt inte den sort som drev omkring i Shinjuku fem på morgonen. (112)

This passage shows an interesting set of strategies, where three of the four translations use a limited universalization. Kabukicho, the area mentioned in the source text, is a notorious part of Shinjuku ward in Tokyo, known among Japanese and tourists alike for its bars, red-light district, and gang activity. Strikingly, the English, German, and Swedish translations all use the limited universalization "Shinjuku". While this choice fits patterns found in the English and German translations, it is particularly interesting within the Swedish translation, because earlier CSIs that played no larger role within the passage were translated using orthographic adaptation. As the comparison between translations progresses, the strategies used by the Swedish translators are turning out to

be less conservative than initially expected, although they are still more conservative overall than those found in the English and German translations. The Dutch translation continues earlier patterns, favoring the orthographic adaptation.

**A striking universalization – Omotesando**

> 「彼女のお友だちが最近表参道の近くでアクセサリーのお店始めたんで (下 208)
>
> "A friend of hers opened this swanky accessory shop a little while ago (330)
>
> 'Een vriendin van haar heeft net een sieradenwinkel geopend in de buurt van Omotesando (Chapter 10)
>
> »Eine Freundin von ihr hat vor kurzem in der Nähe von der Omotesandō einen Laden für Accessoires eröffnet (Chapter 11)
>
> »En vän till henne öppnade en affär för accessoarer för ett tag sedan i Omotesando. (329)

This passage, in which Midori tells Toru about her sister and her sister's friend, further solidifies patterns found earlier. Omotesando is a street in the central Shibuya ward in Tokyo; at the time the novel is set, the popularity of the street as an upscale shopping area was on the rise, with expensive stores and apartments opening along the street and in its vicinity. The fact that the accessory shop is opened near Omotesando, then, will tell Japanese readers that it is likely to be an upscale shop. Note that according to

Michielsen's classification, streets are material-cultural CSIs and not geographical CSIs; however, this is the only street studied in this thesis, and because all other material-cultural items studied are fairly small items – the largest being a bus – a single street would be unlikely to be a meaningful addition to the category. As such, the CSI fits better as an outlier in this category of cities and areas.

Although the connotations of the CSI are strong, they are ultimately unimportant to the reader's interpretation of the passage and three of the translations use only orthographic adaptation for their target texts. Unsurprisingly, the odd one out is the English translation: Rubin uses absolute universalization to translate the item, transferring the connotations to the target audience but removing the foreign name, thereby naturalizing the passage.

**Sub-conclusion**

The translations in this category may be classified as follows, from least to most conservative: English – German – Swedish – Dutch. The English translation used far more substitutive strategies than the other translations, even in passages where the CSIs were of limited importance. The passages studied contained two absolute universalizations, one deletion and one autonomous creation. The autonomous creation inserted two 'typically Japanese' CSIs into the target text, which clashed with the non-Orientalist use of CSIs generally found in Murakami's novels. The English translation

also never used only orthographic adaptation in the passages studied. Overall, Rubin leaves far fewer items unexplained to target readers than the other translators, and naturalizes far more items.

The German translation also saw a few of the stronger substitutive strategies, with one absolute universalization and one deletion; other than that, however, it largely used intratextual glosses and orthographical adaptations. The stronger substitutive strategies were both used within the same passage, so perhaps this passage was deemed to require special treatment. Overall, readers were helped to understand some of the more important CSIs but not minor ones, showing a mixed overall strategy. Unlike expected, the German translation did not show a noticeably lower number of orthographic adaptations than other translations.

The Swedish translation was fairly conservative, only using one deletion in a list of four orthographical adaptations. While many of the 'non-essential' CSIs were left fully exotic, those important to the interpretation of the text were generally given glosses and nothing critical was missed or left out. Elements were left exotic slightly more often than they were given an explanation, leading to a fairly exoticized category.

Finally, the Dutch translation was highly conservative, using no strategies other than orthographic adaptation and intratextual gloss. Out of the eight passages studied, six contained no explanations to help the target reader understand the items – the most notable being the long passage 26 about Midori's rich classmates – and the result is a

highly exoticized category. The passages also included two unfortunate mistranscriptions, although these were unlikely to be noticed by most readers unless they chose to look up a CSI for information.

### 5.2 – Material-cultural CSIs

Material-cultural CSIs are "tangible, man-made elements or (natural) products with commercial value. Examples include clothing, products, housing, food and drink, transport, but also meals, streets, gardens" (Michielsen 14, my translation). The category includes those mundane objects which Murakami often lists is his novels: everyday items such as clothing, household appliances, and food – most notably the latter. Murakami often describes in detail how characters buy, prepare and eat food, making them a central part in his scenes of urban life. Though Murakami's characters eat a surprising amount of spaghetti and hamburgers, much of the food they eat is Japanese, with Japanese names and ingredients. The stores they visit, the magazines they read, the buses they take, all these mundane items together form an impression of Murakami's Japan – and how they are translated may influence the way foreign readers perceive it.

Translations in this category allow for a somewhat greater degree of freedom than the translations of geographical CSIs – after all, the names of cities will not generally be changed, but the names of items may be. Material-cultural CSIs may often be universalized or otherwise adapted without disturbing the flow of a sentence, so it is possible that this category will show more substitutive strategies. Although patterns found earlier in the Geographical CSI category may seem indicative of translators' overall strategy when translating CSIs, strategies may differ between categories. After all, food and books fulfil different functions within the narrative than cities or areas do;

as such, it can only be tentatively assumed that the relative levels of conservativeness between the target texts will be the same as before, where the English translation is the least conservative, the German is somewhat more conservative, the Swedish is fairly conservative and the Dutch is highly conservative.

**Girlie magazines – *Heibon Punch***

> しっくいの壁には「平凡パンチ」のピンナップか、どこかからはがしてきたポルノ映画のポスターが貼ってある。(上 30)
>
> The walls bore pin-ups from girlie magazines or stolen porno movie posters. (15)
>
> Aan de kale muur hing meestal een pin-up uit een mannenblad of een meegejatte poster van een pornofilm (Chapter 2)
>
> An den Wänden klebten Pin-ups aus *Heibon Punch* oder irgendwo geklaute Pornofilmposter. (Chapter 2)
>
> På väggarna satt pinuppor ur *Heibon Punch* eller porrfilmsaffischer som någon hade stulit någonstans. (20)

This passage contains the CSI *Heibon Punch*, which was a magazine aimed at young men created in 1964. The name will undoubtedly sound nostalgic to many older Japanese readers, as the magazine was one of the most popular magazines of the 1960s (Smith 337). For the Japanese reader, then, it serves to place the narrative in a specific time; for the foreign reader, however, these connotations will be absent and the name will

generally mean nothing. The time-bound aspect of the item is nearly impossible to retain without unwieldy explanations, presumably in footnotes, and because the item has little narrative importance, translators are likely to let this connotation of the item be lost.

The English translation chooses to remove the name altogether, using the absolute universalization "girlie magazines" to make the item culture-neutral. Strikingly, the Dutch translation also contains an absolute universalization, making this passage nothing like the translations studied above. Where before, Fennema used only orthographic adaptations and intratextual glosses, she now uses a substitutive strategy to translate a relatively unimportant item. This could mean that material-cultural CSIs are treated differently in the Dutch translation; further passages will show whether this is true.

Both the German and Swedish translations use orthographic adaptation, leaving the element unexplained and exotic. This is somewhat surprising, because the CSI is only mentioned in passing and plays a negligible role in the narrative. The conservation of the exotic element, then, may be the result of a conscious choice to leave the foreign connotations of material-cultural CSIs largely intact; perhaps the Swedish and German translations favor orthographic adaptation or similar strategies within this category.

**Food – *mochi* and *zoni***

> 二人で餅[1]を焼いて、簡単な雑煮[2]を作って食べた。(上 77)
>
> On New Year's Eve we had rice cakes [1] and soup [2] like everybody else. (46)
>
> Samen bakten we rijstkoeken [1] en maakten een eenvoudige versie van de traditionele nieuwjaarssoep [2]. (Chapter 3)
>
> Zu Neujahr gab es die traditionellen Klößchen [1] und Neujahrssuppe [2] wie bei allen anderen auch. (Chapter 3)
>
> Vi grillade mochi [1] och gjorde en enkel zoni-soppa [2]. (52)

This passage contains the first of many references to food in *Norwegian Wood*. Elements 1 and 2 are foods typically eaten on New Year's Day in Japan: *mochi* rice cakes (1) are grilled and added to a soup called *zoni* (2). Zoni is strongly associated with the new year, and Japanese readers will all recognize the CSI when they see it. Because such a tradition is unknown in the West, however, foreign readers may not know that it is a traditional New Year's dish – in fact, few readers will be familiar with zoni at all. Mochi may be recognized for its use in Japanese confectionery, but readers less familiar with Japan are still unlikely to be familiar with the item.

The English translation uses a mix of strategies: the first element has been translated using linguistic translation and the second has been translated using absolute universalization. The whole sentence has been given the intratextual gloss "like

everybody else" to help foreign readers understand the connotations of the CSIs. Because the first element still contains some foreign connotations, the sentence still retains a light exotic touch; still, the sentence has been heavily neutralized, as expected from the English translation.

The Dutch translation is quite similar to the English, but uses two linguistic translations: both elements 1 and 2 have been given a denotative translation that retains some exotic touches. Because the translation of element 2 includes an explanation, Fennema does not need to include a gloss. The result is a slightly more exotic translation than the English. The strategies in this passage continue the shift away from only orthographic adaptations and intratextual glosses, showing that Fennema indeed treats material-cultural CSIs differently.

The Swedish translation again contains only orthographic adaptations, fitting the strategy used for Heibon Punch; the reader is not helped to understand what meal the characters eat, or why they eat it on New Year's Day.

The German translation is somewhat complex. The problem lies in the translation of element 1, which combines the highly naturalized "Klößchen" with the exotic modifier "traditionellen". On its own, "Klößchen" could only be considered an absolute universalization and it would likely have given the German reader the wrong interpretation of the CSI, as the German cuisine has many traditional recipes of soup with "Klößchen" – be it dumplings or meatballs. The modifier "traditionellen",

however, will help the reader understand that these are no German "Klößchen" and should therefore be interpreted differently; nevertheless, the word has such strong connotations within the target culture that readers are unlikely to understand what *is* meant by "traditionellen Klößchen", and the CSI therefore only carries some vague foreign connotations. Nevertheless, because it does carry foreign connotations at all, the strategy used must be linguistic translation, as absolute universalizations are culture-neutral. Element 2 is translated much like it was in Dutch, using linguistic translation, and the sentence is given an intratextual gloss that nearly seems borrowed from the English translation. The strategies in this passage differ strongly from that found in the Heibon Punch passage, which may mean that the German translation again uses a mixture of strategies, sometimes favoring orthographic adaptations and sometimes using linguistic translations and glosses.

**Famous novels – *Seiteki Ningen***

> 『戦争と平和』もないし、『性的人間』もないし、『ライ麦畑』もないの。(上 129)
>
> No *War and Peace*, no Kenzaburo Oe, no *Catcher in the Rye*. (80)
>
> *Oorlog en vrede* hebben we niet, en ook geen boeken van Kenzaburo Oe, of *De vanger in het graan*. (Chapter 4)

> Kein *Krieg und Frieden* und keine *Persönliche Erfahrung* von Kenzaburō Ōe, kein *Fänger im Roggen.* (Chapter 4)
>
> Ingen *Krig och fred*, ingen Oe, ingen *Räddaren in nöden*. (86)

This passage contains an interesting list of items: Midori lists novels they do not have in their bookstore – the Japanese titles of three novels of Russian, Japanese, and American origin respectively: *War and Peace*, *Seiteki Ningen, and the Catcher in the Rye*. While Western readers will likely by familiar with the works by the two Western authors, Kenzaburo Oe's work is unlikely to be known except by readers of Japanese literature. As a result, the Japanese title is the odd one out in the list. The case is made more complex in Swedish, as there is currently no Swedish translation of the novel – nor was there one for English at the time of translation. In other words, two of the four translators could not choose to use an existing translation of the title; the only remaining methods to retain the title, either through orthographic adaptation or direct translation – which would both result in a name meaningless to the target reader – are unlikely to be satisfying answers to this translation problem. In the other two languages, using the name of the translation is an option, but the question remains whether the name alone will mean anything to the target reader: while many readers will instantly recognize "*Krieg und Frieden*" or "*Oorlog en vrede*", few will recognize "*Persönliche Erfahrung*" or "*Homo sexualis*". As such, translators will likely need to adopt a different strategy to make the CSI understandable to the target audience.

The English translation uses a limited universalization, where the name of the author substitutes the name of his work. Because there was no English translation of the novel at the time, this is an understandable choice. The use of limited universalization fits patterns found in the English translation, as it leans toward using substitutive strategies – even more so than in the translation of geographical CSIs. The Dutch translation, too, uses a limited universalization, continuing the trend of substitutive strategies for material-cultural CSIs in Dutch.

The German translation is the only translation to mention the title of the work – which is a linguistic translation – but Gräfe also adds the name of the author, which could be considered an intratextual gloss. As such, the German translation continues to display a mix of strategies, slightly favoring the linguistic translation and other conservative strategies.

The Swedish translation, finally, also uses a limited universalization, although it only uses the last name. This is a somewhat remarkable choice as it makes the CSI difficult to understand for the target reader, while universalization is generally used to *help* the reader understand a CSI. If the translation included both first and last names, readers could at the very least deduce that the item is the name of an author; with "Oe" alone, however, readers unfamiliar with Oe may not even recognize the item as a name. Moreover, a word as short as "Oe" is effectively impossible to use as an online search term, yielding millions of varied results. As a result, readers unfamiliar with Kenzaburo

Oe will not be able to understand the CSI in the Swedish translation, making this an ineffective universalization. This is all the more remarkable as it is the first universalization found for material-cultural CSIs in the Swedish translation, which up until now only used orthographic adaptations, meaning that the text may not be entirely conservative after all.

**Midori's cooking**

Passage 13, found in the appendix, contains a large number of food-related CSIs. Many readers of Murakami's work will note his attention to culinary detail, and this passage exemplifies his elaborate descriptions of dishes and ingredients. While Japanese readers will be familiar with most, if not all items, only few items will be known to the average foreign reader. Because the sentence contains such a high number of items, some strategies become extremely unwieldy – for example, it is nearly impossible to use intratextual glosses for all eight items without creating an illegible sentence. The use of orthographic adaptation alone is also unlikely to produce a satisfactory result, as it would result in a highly exotic sentence containing eight foreign words and phrases, most of which mean nothing to the target reader. This especially makes the Swedish translation interesting, as it favored only orthographic adaptations until now.

The English translation mainly uses substitutive strategies. Elements 1 through 7 are all translated using absolute universalization, where the foreign connotations of each

item are removed, transferring only the main ingredient of each dish to the target text. Elements 1 and 3 have both been captured in the word "mackerel", the fishes in the source text being Japanese horse mackerel (1) and Japanese Spanish mackerel (3) respectively. Interestingly, the elements are presented out of order, with element 2 being placed before elements 1/3 and elements 4 and 5 switching places, but these changes seem arbitrary and have no discernible impact on the interpretation of the sentence. Element 7 has been split up into two separate elements, slightly altering the meaning of the sentence but not in any significant manner. The use of absolute universalization has removed the specific flavoring and cooking techniques of each dish, leaving the elements naturalized. Perhaps Rubin wished to compensate for this loss by adding the phrase "an amazing assortment of fried, pickled, boiled and roasted dishes", which captures parts of all elements. It could be argued that this phrase, too, is the result of absolute universalization, as it is an abstraction of the seven elements that follow; the phrase supplements each element in the English translation, creating an image of a dish close to that found in the source text, but nevertheless free of foreign connotations. Despite the addition, a few elements are entirely different dishes in the target text: element 5 is no longer a soup but only "fresh greens" and element 6 no longer contains any rice. In other words, Rubin's universalizations may help the reader, but they alter the passage considerably. The final element adds an exotic touch to what would other be a fully naturalized sentence with the mention of "Kyoto style". The strategy used is

limited universalization, where "関西" (Kansai) is transformed into "Kyoto", which readers may be more familiar with. All eight elements in the passage were translated using universalizations, continuing patterns found in the highly substitutive English translation.

The Dutch translation, which seems highly similar to the English translation, contains a slightly different mix of strategies. Elements 1 through 7 are free of foreign connotations and have been translated using absolute universalization. In the process, element 5 has lost its reference to *junsai* greens, becoming a culture-neutral clear soup. Element 8, however, has been translated using linguistic translation, transferring the phrase word for word. As such, the passage continues patterns found in the Dutch translation, with mainly universalizations and a few linguistic translations.

The German translation contains a wider range of strategies. The fish in element 1 has been translated to an obscure alternative name of the bluefish; the reason for this choice is unclear, as "Roßmakrele" is not the fish mentioned in the source text – which would be "Bastardmakrele" – nor a commonly known name in Germany. Because the chosen translation has no clear effect, it is difficult to pinpoint the exact strategy used: it could be an erroneous linguistic translation, or it could be an ineffective limited universalization. In either case, the reader is highly unlikely to recognize the name of the fish. However, given the word "Vinaigrette", which is an absolute universalization of "酢のもの", it may be assumed that "Roßmakrele" was also intended to be an

universalization. In contrast, element 3 shows an effective combination of absolute universalization – with the name of the fish translated simply as "Makrele" – and linguistic translation, leaving unexplained what is meant by "nach Kyōto-Art". Elements 2, 4, 5, and 7 have been translated using absolute universalization, with element 7 having been split up into two phrases. Element 6, in turn, shows orthographic adaptation with the conservation of "Shimeji". Element 8, though slightly lengthened in comparison to the source text, could be called a linguistic translation, as the core of the item, "Kansai-Küche", has been translated word for word. In this passage, Gräfe uses considerably more conservative strategies than the English and Dutch translators did, making the German translation the most conservative so far. The passage shows little consistency in the strategies chosen, as absolute universalization and orthographic adaptation – which are highly differing strategies – are used in succession for elements with the same function within the text. This is not to say that the lack of consistency is necessarily problematic: the resulting passage is largely neutralized but contains a few exotic elements which will stand out to the reader, leaving it with a mildly exotic tone while still largely bridging the cultural gap.

The Swedish translation contains a striking repetition of the first seven elements of the passage. The first half of the translation is so much like the English that it must have been borrowed: it uses the same strategies and includes the same added phrase; the items are ordered in the same way with elements 1 and 3 moved together and

elements 5 and 4 presented out of order, and element 7 is again split up into two separate items. As such, the first half of the passage is, like the English translation, highly naturalizing, using only absolute universalizations and the same limited universalization for element 8. The second half of the passage, however, is the polar opposite: the only element free of foreign connotations is element 4; all six other elements have been translated using a combination of linguistic translation and orthographic adaptation, transcribing the Japanese names of many ingredients used. The result is a somewhat baffling, highly exoticizing repetition of the seven elements. Though the reasons for this repetition are unclear, the effect is very interesting: the two 'versions' of the passage supplement each other in such a way that the first gives readers a rough 'translation' of the second, helping readers understand some of the foreign elements. Nevertheless, some of the linguistic translations are left unexplained, as readers cannot infer from "ägg" what a "dashimaki-omelett" is, nor can they know that both "aji-fisk" and "sawara-fisk" are grouped under "makrill".

The translated result is somewhat alienating, as the extreme generalizations of the first half contrast strongly with the extreme specificity of the second half. Had the translators only used the second half, the passage would have fit patterns found in the Swedish translation perfectly, where linguistic translation and orthographic adaptation were the main strategies used until now. With only the second half, however, the items would have been nearly incomprehensible to the average Swedish reader. Because the

passage has been translated in such a unique manner, it is not suited for drawing conclusions about the Swedish translators' overall strategy when translating material-cultural CSIs. What this passage does show, however, is that the Swedish translators were aware of choices made in the English translation and sometimes borrowed strategies from Rubin. This is somewhat striking considering the fact that until now, the Swedish translation is so unlike the English: Rubin uses far more substitutive strategies than the Dukes, who until now mainly favored conservative strategies. Whether the translator duo opted for this radically different approach as a reaction to the English translation can only be guessed at.

**Lunch boxes**

Passage 14, found in the appendix, continues the culinary theme, containing four food-related CSIs. Element 1 is repeated in element 3, and strategies may differ between the two translations to avoid potentially strange repetition – for example, it would be unnecessary to repeat an intratextual gloss. Due to the repetition of the CSI, deletions of element 3 should also not be considered to be 'true' deletions according to Aixelá's model if element 1 is translated.

The English translation of the passage is quite a bit longer. Element 1, a short phrase in the source text, has been translated by Rubin with a lengthy phrase, describing all that can be found in such a "cold lunch assortment". The translation may be split into

two parts: "old-fashioned cold lunch assortment" is a denotative, linguistic translation of element 1 and the following descriptive phrase is an intratextual gloss. These strategies would be conservative, were it not for the fact that Rubin adds two CSIs from the source culture to his description: "tempura" and "teriyaki chicken" – both autonomous creations. Rubin's translation, then, is more than the simple 'translation plus gloss' seen numerous times above. Rather than decreasing the distance between the source and target cultures, this strategy emphasizes it, using what could be called 'safely exotic' CSIs – items that are fairly well-known in the target culture but are nevertheless considered foreign. This is not unlike the autonomous creation used for Yotsuya, and both additions seem to be included to give the reader a sense of 'authentic Japaneseness' within the translation. This does not mean that such choices are necessarily 'right' or 'wrong', and Rubin's choice in this passage is defendable: perhaps the autonomous creation was meant to compensate for what is common knowledge among Japanese readers but lost in translation. Even if such additions are defensible, however, it is striking that until now they have occurred only in the English translation.

The translation continues with an absolute universalization of item 3, before once again including a lengthy description for element 2, which was concise in the source text. Rubin adds "separate compartments" and the adjectives "fancy" and "lacquered" to the absolute universalization "half-moon lunch boxes"; the additions have a exoticizing effect similar to that of the autonomous creations used for element 1, but a

critical difference is that none of the additions here can be considered 'new' CSIs within the source culture. As such, the added phrase is best labeled as an intratextual gloss, which adds information about the lunch boxes.

Element 4 is translated using the absolute universalization "clear soup", but again contains an addition: "from lacquered bowls". What makes this addition striking is that there is no reference in the source text to bowls of any kind, meaning that Rubin again adds an element to the text to color the scene for foreign readers. This addition is difficult to label: it is clearly not an intratextual gloss explaining "吸い物", as the soup can be drank from anything – not only lacquered bowls. The phrase cannot be considered a Japan-specific CSI, so the addition cannot be labelled a true autonomous creation, even though it is an element inserted into the target text. If anything, Rubin's addition gives the impression that the *source text* contains a CSI, which he has translated as "lacquered bowls"; in other words, Rubin has inserted an *imaginary* CSI into the meta-text. Whatever the correct label may be for such an addition, it is clear that Rubin's translation adds exotic flavor to the passage that was not there in the source text.

The introduction of exotic items in this passage may come as a surprise within the English translation which until now heavily favored neutralizing strategies such as absolute universalization, but the addition of exotic elements to a 'foreigner-friendly' translation is not as paradoxical as it seems. All added elements are readily understood by the reader, as they are either well-known CSIs – such as "tempura" and "teriyaki" –

or not true CSIs but phrases with a light exotic connotation within the context – such as all the lacquered bowls. In other words, Rubin's additions give the *impression* of reading an exotic text, while his other strategies until now have carefully avoided any CSIs which would be too exotic for the reader to understand.

The Dutch translation, in comparison, is very simple. Element 1 has been translated with the sparse absolute universalization "een lunchmenu", and element 3, in extension, has been translated using the same strategy. Element 2 has been translated using a combination of orthographic adaptation ("bento") and linguistic translation; possibly Fennema considered the CSI "bento" to be widespread enough to be understood by the target reader. This combination of strategies is more conservative than most strategies seen so far in the Dutch translation of material-cultural CSIs. Element 4, however, again fits earlier patterns by using the absolute universalization "soep".

The German translation uses a linguistic translation for element 1 – it differs from the Dutch translation in the use of the word "traditionelles", which retains some Japanese connotations. The repetition of the CSI has been deleted, and the second part of the passage instead focuses on the contents of the box, which itself is translated using absolute universalization. Strikingly, the German translation, too, adds an adjective to the element: the box is "hübsch" in Gräfe's translation, which is similar to the "fancy" found in Rubin's passage. The addition may again be labeled an intratextual gloss.

Finally, the translation of element 4 shows an absolute universalization. This passage is more substitutive than previous passages studied, which were fairly conservative overall, showing that the German translation seems to be somewhat lacking in consistency when it comes to the translation of material-cultural CSIs.

The Swedish translation of the passage is straightforward. Element 1 has been translated using linguistic translation and the repetition in element 3 has been deleted. Elements 2 and 4 have been translated using absolute universalization, which is somewhat surprising considering the conservative tendencies found earlier in the Swedish translation. However, despite these and a few other substitutive strategies, the Swedish translation remains the most conservative overall in the material-cultural category. Perhaps it is most interesting that the Swedish translators do not use "bento" as Fennema does, which would be a valid choice considering the large number of orthographic adaptations used elsewhere in this category.

**Public transport**

Passage 15, found in the appendix, steers away from the culinary CSIs, instead revolving around several transport-related items. The passage distinguishes between 'city buses' (1) and 'privately owned buses' (2), elements from the Japanese transport system that have no true equivalent in many Western countries. The passage also focuses in detail on which bus Toru takes and where the bus departs, fitting Murakami's

attention to detail. It is important to note that despite these details, Murakami never names the exact bus Toru takes, which means that readers hoping to trace Toru's route will need to do some research into the various bus lines departing from Sanjo in the late sixties. In other words, the passage has multiple functions: readers may simply read the passage as one of Murakami's typical detailed descriptions, but it can also be used as a hint for a treasure hunt of sorts. Elements 3 and 4 are not 'true' CSIs in that they may refer to specific Japanese material-cultural items, but do not in themselves carry exotic connotations; nevertheless, they are marked because the strategies Rubin used to translate them are worth studying.

Of the four elements marked in the source text, only one returns in the English translation. Element 1, using linguistic translation, is represented as "city bus", but the other three elements have been deleted. The deletion of element 2 is not too surprising, as the translation is likely to be either wordy or unclear; Rubin could, however, have used an absolute universalization, which would be in line with strategies found in the English translation overall. The deletion of elements 3 and 4 is far more striking, as they are easy to translate in a compact and understandable manner: translations such as "bus 16" and "the farthest bus stop" are by no means unwieldy. The only plausible explanations for the deletions are that Rubin either forgot to include the elements, or that he deemed them irrelevant for the target readership – the latter perhaps being more likely, considering the naturalizing strategies found earlier in the English text. No

matter the reason, Rubin's choice strips the passage not only of the 'treasure hunt' aspect for fans of the novel, but also removes the detailed description typical of Murakami's writing, resulting in a 'smoothened' passage, a result seen numerous times before in the English translation's handling of material-cultural CSIs.

The Dutch translation provides the opposite result, as it is the only translation to retain all four elements. Element 1 has been translated using linguistic translation, and element 2, which has no compact or clear word-for-word translation in Dutch, has been translated using absolute universalization. These strategies continue patterns found in the Dutch translation, which is mainly split between linguistic translation and absolute universalization. Elements 3 and 4 have unremarkable translations, although element 3 has been misread or mistranslated as "36" instead of "16". Because the item itself can still be understood by the target reader – unlike the two mistranscriptions found under ecological and geographical CSIs – the impact of this translation on the interpretative potential of the text is negligible, but Dutch readers wishing to retrace Toru's journey will now be unable to do so.

The German translation uses the same strategies as the English for the first two elements, using linguistic translation for element 1 and deleting element 2 – showing fairly conservative and a highly substitutive strategy within the same passage, continuing the mixed pattern found in the target text overall. The translations for elements 3 and 4 are unremarkable word-for-word translations.

The Swedish translation, finally, uses two substitutive strategies to translate elements 1 and 2: element 1 has been translated using absolute universalization, while element 2 has been deleted altogether. This marks the first true deletion in the Swedish translation, which has now used most of the strategies available, also showing a mixed pattern.

**Upper-class life – passage 12 revisited**

Passage 12, found in the appendix and also studied above, contains three material-cultural CSIs: elements 1, 2, and 3. These elements fulfil a similar function to elements 4 through 9, being extreme examples of upper-class living. This passage is of particular interest because it contains both geographical and material-cultural CSIs: if translators indeed treat the two categories differently, this passage will show these differences clearly. If translators instead focus on context over CSI category, the strategies used for elements 1, 2, and 3 may differ from the overall tendencies found in other passages.

The English translation treats the elements much like other material-cultural CSIs. Elements 1 and 2 have been translated using linguistic translation, keeping exotic elements in the target text. Element 3, in turn, has been translated using a gloss and limited universalization, where the reference to Hotel Okura is replaced by the less exotic "Tokyo". Rubin is the only translator to not use orthographic adaptation for this element, showing his tendency to avoid this conservative strategy. These three strategies

fit Rubin's strategies for material-cultural CSIs overall and although they are slightly more conservative than the strategies used in the second half of the passage, the two categories as a whole are treated much the same.

The Dutch translation shows a clearer division between the two categories: Fennema used highly conservative strategies for elements 4 through 9, but elements 1 and 2 have been translated using absolute universalization. In doing so, the connotations of the items are transferred and the elements are left fully culture-neutral in the target text. In contrast, element 3 has been translated using orthographic adaptation, leaving the item exotic but not helping the reader understand that it is an expensive, upper-class hotel. The strategies found in this passage continue to show that the Dutch translation treats material-cultural CSIs far less conservatively than geographical CSIs.

The German translation uses the exact same strategies as the Dutch for the first three elements, with the same effects. The context, however, is different: Gräfe used a mixture of conservative and substitutive strategies for elements 4 through 9, which is much the same as the strategies used for elements 1 through 3. As such, the contrast in the German translation is not as apparent as in the Dutch target text; it seems Gräfe has treated the two categories more or less equally, alternating between absolute universalizations and conservative strategies throughout.

The Swedish translation, finally, uses linguistic translation for element 1, but absolute universalization for element 2. Element 3 has been translated using orthographic adaptation, making the Swedish translation have the most diverse set of strategies for the three elements. This fits the second half of the passage, which showed highly varied strategies, from orthographic adaptation to deletion. The use of absolute universalization for element 2 does showcase a slight distinction between the two categories of CSI, as the Swedish text tends to naturalize material-cultural items more often than geographical items.

**Sub-conclusion**

This category saw far more substitutive strategies than the previous, as was expected. For this category of CSIs, the translations may be classified as follows, from least to most conservative: English – Dutch – German – Swedish. The English translation being the least conservative should come as no surprise, as the strategies used in this category have cemented Rubin's approach as highly naturalizing and foreigner-friendly. The translation again included an autonomous creation, something not found in the other translations, and contained other additions with similar 'safely exotic' effects. Additionally, the strategies not used by a translator may be as telling as the strategies he did use: Rubin never used orthographic adaptation in the passages studied, while all other translations used the strategy at least once. Regardless of whether this was the

result of a deliberate strategy, the result is a text far less exotic than its German, Dutch, and Swedish siblings. The deletions found in passage 15 also showed a looser approach to the translation of CSIs, and the high amount of absolute universalizations rendered a few passages nearly culture-neutral. This category saw more linguistic translations than the previous, but these were counterbalanced by a large number of highly substitutive strategies which made the overall strategy used for this category equally naturalizing.

The Dutch translation was the second most naturalizing one, which may come as a surprise considering the highly conservative strategies Fennema used for the translation of ecological and geographical CSIs. The overall approach was far more neutralizing and foreigner-friendly, showing a clear division between the two categories. This category saw a high concentration of absolute universalizations, most notably the list of foods in passage 13, which were all translated using the strategy. The Dutch translation also showed a strong adherence to the information present in the source text, as it was the only translation to not use deletion in this category.

The German translation was mainly split between linguistic translations and absolute universalizations, showing a mixed overall strategy. While the translations of some elements were similar to those found in the substitutive English text – such as the addition in "hübschen halbmondförmigen Lackkästen" – other translations were fairly conservative in comparison to those found in the other texts. The overall approach was more substitutive than that of the previous category: geographical CSIs only saw one

absolute universalization in the German translation, while Gräfe used the strategy frequently in this category. Unlike in the previous category, there seemed to be no real logic to which strategies were used in which passages: some minor CSIs were translated using orthographic adaptation while others were translated using absolute universalization, and passages such as passage 13 showed a wide variety of strategies, lacking internal consistency. The effect of this mixed approach was that such passages were largely naturalized but retained a mild exotic tone, resulting in an 'unobtrusive' exoticness.

Finally, the Swedish translation was the most conservative overall, although it still displayed a wide variety of strategies. A relatively large amount of orthographic adaptations often left the cultural gap unbridged, and a few passages were left fully exoticized, relying on readers' ability to decipher or look up the meaning of items. A few of these orthographic adaptations made the text difficult to comprehend for non-experts, as was the case with the translation "Oe". The presence of orthographic adaptations in passage 13 was particularly striking as it was juxtaposed with a sequence of highly substitutive translations presumably borrowed from the English text, effectively showing the same passage twice in opposite strategies. Although the Swedish translation was the most conservative of the four, the translators handled this category far less conservatively than the previous, as apparent from the large number of absolute universalizations.

### 5.3 – Humor and Idiom

As defined by Michielsen, humorous CSIs include "wordplay, jokes, and gags" (13, my translation), while idiom includes "all lexical forms with a specific cultural meaning on a semantic level, such as proverbs, sayings, expressions, forms of address, exclamations, apologies, formalities, slang, expletives, etc." (14, my translation). The categories are combined here because the items studied below are all isolated cases requiring complex translational strategies that cannot be considered parts of a repeated pattern. The passages contain two instances of wordplay and one use of dialect; choices for such items are made largely depending on context and are therefore rarely the result of an overarching strategy. The creativity required when translating these items does showcase translators' vision on translation at the highest level: the choices they make within the constricted freedom of 'untranslatable' items reveals exactly how far they are willing to alter the text to bridge the cultural gap. Translators may insert notes or glosses, attempt to replicate an item with a comparable item from the target culture, or ignore or delete the item altogether. Due to the complexity of these items, choices may be difficult to categorize using Aixelá's list of strategies, and it may be largely uninteresting to do so as there are no true patterns to discover; as such, strategies will only be mentioned where relevant. Nevertheless, the translations of these items may strongly influence readers' perception of a text, because they take up large passages and are therefore relatively likely to catch the reader's eye.

Due to the complexity of the items studied, only general hypotheses may be provided. Considering Rubin's clear willingness to add or remove textual material, the English translation may be expected to handle these CSIs with the greatest ease, perhaps using substitutive strategies. In contrast, Fennema, with her apparent strong adherence to the source text material, may be expected to either deliver exotic translations using conservative strategies or to deviate from the pattern established so far. The German translation, considering Gräfe's mixed overall strategy, is difficult to predict. Gräfe did, however, express a preference for extratextual glosses while none have been seen thus far, and the complex cases studied below may be the perfect occasions to use this strategy effectively. The Swedish translators, finally, may be expected to favor conservative strategies here as before, perhaps using intratextual glosses where possible.

**Translating *sensei***

Passage 16, found in the appendix, contains three fragments from the same chapter which all develop the same humorous CSI. In these fragments, Murakami plays with two different meanings of the word *sensei*, an honorific title that may be used for both teachers and doctors. The item "石田先生" thus becomes ambiguous, creating a misunderstanding which Murakami uses to humorous effect. The misunderstanding occurs in the first fragment, where Toru assumes that a 'sensei' in a mental care facility would logically be a doctor and not a teacher. The gatekeeper in fragment 1 is so used to

Ishida-sensei's presence that he no longer thinks of explaining her title, and the reader – and Toru – naturally assume that the honorific means "doctor". Crucially, the misunderstanding is based on misinterpretation, not misinformation: the sentence spoken by the gatekeeper allows for the correct interpretation and nothing forces the reader to interpret sensei as "doctor". Murakami then relies on the Japanese language's ability to leave sentence subjects implicit when he leaves the name and honorific unmentioned in fragment 2, which reads "[ø] will be here soon". Finally, the misunderstanding is brought to light and explained in the third fragment: Ishida-sensei – Reiko – is not a doctor, but a music teacher. Only when readers and Toru learn that their initial interpretation of the honorific was wrong does Murakami's wordplay reveal itself. Readers will then likely recall the honorific in the first fragment and understand how they were misled. This successive experience of misinterpretation, discovery and retracing gives Murakami's wordplay its subtle humorous effect.

The Japanese honorific forms a large problem for translators working in languages that lack similar titles. While the Japanese language allows for both meanings of the word "sensei" to exist simultaneously – although context generally steers the reader towards one interpretation – the four target languages force the translator to choose one meaning over the other; in other words, the translator is forced to make a distinction where Murakami was not. Without the honorific, translators wishing to translate the honorific will need to be more specific or intentionally unspecific –

potential options include “Doctor Ishida”, “Professor Ishida” on the one hand, or more vague forms such as “Mrs. Ishida” on the other. Because the target languages lack the ability to leave the sentence subject implicit, this translation will then likely need to be repeated in fragment 2, further emphasizing the chosen solution.

Unfortunately, the effect of Murakami’s wordplay is impossible to replicate if the translator chooses one of the two specific interpretations: calling Reiko “Doctor Ishida” forces the reader to have the wrong interpretation, but other choices will remove the chance of a misunderstanding entirely, either because they ensure the correct interpretation – “Professor Ishida” or “Ishida, the music teacher” – or because they do not steer the reader toward any interpretation at all – “Mrs. Ishida” or “Reiko Ishida”. If translators wish to retain a sense of misunderstanding and wordplay, they will presumably need to either choose “Doctor” or retain “Sensei” as an orthographic adaptation. As mentioned, the former choice is problematic because the gatekeeper now misinforms Toru and the reader: after all, Reiko is not a doctor, but a music teacher. The gatekeeper would not call Reiko a doctor without reason, meaning that the translator may wish to invent a reason for her unusual title. This could, however, result in the misunderstanding appearing forced or far-fetched, which would damage the humorous effect of the passage.

The second option – using “Sensei” – will likely require additional explanation in the form of an intratextual or extratextual gloss. While Western readers may be familiar

with the word as an honorific for teachers, it is unlikely that readers will be aware of its second meaning. As such, the Western reader may not be able to arrive at the intended misunderstanding of the gatekeeper's words without additional information. Any additional information, however, is not without its potential problems: extratextual glosses in a text without footnotes of its own will inevitably reveal the presence of the translator, and intratextual glosses would be difficult to disguise, as the gatekeeper would never need to explain to Toru that the word "sensei" has multiple interpretations. Furthermore, any glosses will draw attention to both interpretations of the word, thereby prematurely revealing the wordplay.

Finally, any potential deletion of the wordplay would involve substantial alterations to the text, especially in the dialogue in the third fragment: Toru could no longer ask Reiko if she is Naoko's doctor, as all references to "doctor" would need to be removed from the text, and the ensuing exchange would therefore need to be altered or removed. While deletion is an option, it would effectively require a rewriting of the entire fragment. Clearly, each potential translation has its drawbacks, and the option chosen by each translator will reveal which drawbacks they deem acceptable.

The English translation leads the reader toward the wrong interpretation of the honorific: Rubin translates "sensei" as "doctor" in all fragments, removing any reference to the correct interpretation of the word. Because Toru now cannot possibly know that Reiko is a teacher, the wordplay as it is in the source text is lost. Rubin compensates for

the loss by adding a different explanation for the title: Reiko is a "music doctor" for her fellow patients. In fragment 3 alone, this explanation appears adequate, as Rubin creatively compensates for the loss by inserting wordplay of his own. However, the chosen translation is somewhat problematic within fragments 1 and 2, because while other patients may call Reiko the music doctor, it is perhaps less likely that the gatekeeper and the receptionist would do the same – especially to a visitor unfamiliar with the sanatorium and its staff, as this would cause unnecessary confusion. Critically, Rubin's translation relies on misinformation over misinterpretation; this may cause readers to experience the wordplay as forced, which would be a disservice to the subtlety found in the source text. Nevertheless, Rubin has managed to substitute the wordplay in his translation, which certainly is worthy of praise.

The Dutch translation also uses "dokter" throughout. Interestingly, however, no effort seems to have been made to explain the connection between the two meanings of the honorific: the explanatory sentence is simply a word-for-word translation of the Japanese. While Japanese readers, with their knowledge of the language, will understand the wordplay, it is highly unlikely that a Dutch reader would understand why a music teacher would be called "doctor" by patients or staff. Because the link between the three fragments is lost, Fennema has effectively removed the wordplay with this translation through her adherence to the source text. Readers may find the third fragment somewhat confusing, but because nothing striking is added to the text

like in Rubin's translation, the sentence is less likely to catch the reader's eye. Critical readers could, however, begin to question Murakami's writing because the leap from "muziekdocent" to "dokter" appears unintuitive and forced. As such, this translation, though 'faithful' in a word-for-word sense, is not effective in transmitting the material of the source text to the target reader. Although the result seems similar to that in the English translation, there is a clear difference between Rubin's and Fennema's approaches: while Fennema conserves the existing source text material by translating it word for word – effectively using linguistic translation – Rubin uses the two interpretations of "sensei" to insert new wordplay specific to his text – using substitution.

The German solution to the translation problem is strikingly different from that of the other translations. Where the other three translators attempt to deal with the wordplay 'invisibly', Gräfe has inserted a footnote after the first occurrence of the CSI in fragment 1. The result is a fairly straightforward translation of the following fragments, without attempts to bring the two interpretations of the honorific together in German. By orthographically adapting "sensei" and including both interpretations in the extratextual gloss, Gräfe helps the reader understand the wordplay. Whether the joke has any impact, however, is a different question: readers will be instantly aware of both interpretations of the word, perhaps sensing that something is afoot. Readers will not experience the same joy of 'figuring out' the wordplay as Japanese readers do, but

perhaps this is largely inevitable; considering the difficulty of conserving the wordplay without making strange mental leaps or twisting the text, adding a gloss may be a favorable option. Footnotes do remain controversial, as they may be perceived by readers as intrusive and attract attention to the act of translation itself. Apparently Gräfe gave producing a coherent text priority over her own invisibility.

The Swedish translation is highly similar to the English. In fact, the solution to the wordplay in the third fragment is nearly identical to the one in Rubin's translation: both mention a "music doctor" or "musikdoktor". It is of course possible that the Swedish translators arrived at this solution on their own, but considering passage 13, where they clearly borrowed a solution from the English translation, it is possible that they again looked to the English text for inspiration. Regardless, the effect of the translation is largely the same as in the English text, where the newly inserted wordplay seems slightly forced. The Swedish translation is a bit more compact as it does not have an equivalent to the phrase "It's a kind of therapy for some patients", which makes the wordplay in the Swedish text less obtrusive than the instance in Rubin's translation. However, this makes the link between the two words less clear and the reader may be left wondering why patients would call their music teacher the 'music doctor'. As such, the Swedish translation seems less committed to making the wordplay work; the solution in fragment 3 is less obtrusive here than in the English translation, but also less convincing.

***Kiuri* and *kiui***

Passage 17, found in the appendix, again contains wordplay, albeit less complex. Midori unpacks a bag of food her sister bought for their sick father and is surprised to find cucumbers instead of the kiwis she asked for. The misunderstanding is based on the closeness in pronunciation between キウリ (*kiuri*) and キウイ (*kiui*); through a telephone, the one could plausibly be mistaken for the other. The wordplay is introduced in element 1, and Toru points out the likely misunderstanding in element 2, where "キウイ" is marked with emphasis marks, highlighting the wordplay. Finally, Midori snaps her fingers in realization and confirms that she indeed asked for kiwis in element 3, ending the wordplay. The confusion adds a little lightness to the text but is of limited importance to its interpretation, which would normally mean that translators are relatively free in their choices; however, translation is complicated by the fact that that the cucumbers return in a later passage where Toru eats them together with Midori's father. As such, the first element cannot be changed without altering the narrative, and translators are left with one constant in the equation. Moreover, the second element of the wordplay will need to be something Midori would plausibly include in the bag for her sick father.

Such constraints push translators to explore the limits of their creativity, but also form a significant obstacle. Dutch and English have extremely unwieldy translations for

キウリ – “cucumber” and “komkommer” – which cannot plausibly be misunderstood as there are no other similar words; German and Swedish, unfortunately, do not have any useable words that sound like “Gurke” or “gurka” either. As such, the wordplay as-is is untranslatable in all four languages; the translators may wish to compensate by including different wordplay here or elsewhere, but the original wordplay is inevitably lost. Regardless of any compensation, the translators will need to find an explanation for the presence of the cucumbers – or leave out the dialogue between Midori and Toru altogether.

The English translation remains close to the material of the source text, maintaining the references to “cucumber” and “kiwi”. Elements 2 and 3 are translated freely while retaining their function in resolving the wordplay. Rubin moves the explanation in element 3 forward, but the sentence is no longer an explanation in the target text – rather, it creates confusion: because there is no logical link between elements 3 and 2 as “kiwi” cannot plausibly be misunderstood as “cucumber”, the reader is left wondering what the misunderstanding was.

The Swedish translation again seems to have borrowed its solution from the English, re-ordering elements 2 and 3 in the same way as Rubin did, and deleting the first sentence of element 3. As a result, the wordplay is equally confusing in the Swedish translation. One benefit of both translations is that they remove the ‘aha moment’ in element 3 where Midori snaps her fingers, thereby drawing less attention to the

wordplay than in the source text. This again shows the Swedish translators' – and now also Rubin's – willingness to conserve the elements of wordplay without committing to making the wordplay itself work in the target text. Since readers cannot be expected to make the connection between "cucumber" and "kiwi" themselves, perhaps the misunderstanding was best left out altogether.

A contrasting strategy may be seen in the Dutch translation, which is the only text that retains the first sentence of element 3, again using what may be called linguistic translation, translating the wordplay largely word for word. Fennema conserves the aha moment, making the link between "kiwi" and "komkommer" appear clear to Midori; however, the reader cannot plausibly understand why this link should exist at all. As such, the translation draws unwanted attention to the failed wordplay and readers will likely be left wondering what Murakami meant, or, in the worst case, begin to doubt the abilities of the translator.

The German translation, finally, is notable for being the most neutral of the four. Gräfe has removed the reference to kiwis altogether, effectively using deletion for her translation of the item. In German, there are no elements that will strike the reader as out of place and the passage proceeds naturally. Although the wordplay is lost, this is largely unavoidable – perhaps even preferable, should there be no good solution: the other three attempts to conserve the wordplay are clearly not without their flaws, and the German text is the only one unlikely to strike the reader as strange. With a style as

streamlined as Murakami's, it may be a disservice to include forced wordplay in translation. This translation shows Gräfe's willingness to remove 'untranslatable' items, which shows an underlying view of translation that can also be seen in her use of the footnote in passage 36: Gräfe seems to hold the position that it is better to 'lose' wordplay – through deletion or explanation – than to attempt to fit it into the target language if this results in an unwieldy translation.

**Kyoto dialect**

Passage 18, found in the appendix, contains the only instance of dialect in *Norwegian Wood*, spoken by a girl near Naoko's sanatorium. Japanese readers will be able to identify the distinctive characteristics of the Kyoto dialect which is part of the Kansai dialects, one of Japan's largest dialects. Typical identifiers of the Kyoto dialect in the girl's speech are marked with the numbers 1, 2, and 4. In the phrase marked with the number 3, Murakami includes an explanation for the Japanese reader: "the girl said in Kyoto dialect" (my translation). The inclusion of dialect mainly seems to be there to give the passage a touch of local color, as neither the girl nor the dialect return in the narrative. While the presence of the dialect plays no important role in forming the interpretative potential of the text, translators' choices may influence how the passage is perceived by target audiences. The translation of dialect is notoriously complex, and opinions differ on how it is best done – options include deletion, substitution with a

dialect from the target language, or substitution by including colloquialisms in characters' speech.

Interestingly, only the Swedish translation seems to have made attempts to retain the dialect in some form, or at least a reference to it: the translators have conserved element 3, informing the Swedish reader that the girl speaks in the Kyoto dialect. What this dialect is, however, is not made clear, as the girl speaks regular Swedish, free of dialect or colloquialisms; while readers will know they are supposedly reading dialect, they will not have the experience of reading dialect. As such, the conservation of element 3 is hardly more than a marker for the reader that there was something present in the source text which was lost in translation. The item conserved in the Swedish translation does not mean anything to the target readership, a characteristic of the text found earlier in passages which only used orthographic adaptation. In such cases, the Swedish translators seem to favor the conservation of exotic elements over the invisibility of the act of translation.

**Sub-conclusion**

While this category only contained three passages, it nevertheless saw many striking strategies. The English translation of passage 16 showed Rubin's willingness to make small adaptations to the text in order to make the translation of wordplay successful. The addition of the 'music doctor' sentence linked the two interpretations of the word

"sensei", conserving the wordplay present in the source text without breaking the narrative voice. In contrast, the 'untranslatable' wordplay in passage 17 was largely left untouched, with no attempts to link the words "cucumber" and "kiwi"; this resulted in failed wordplay, where the elements were conserved but the humorous connection was not. This is perhaps striking considering Rubin's approach to translating other CSIs with strong foreign connotations, which were generally neutralized using absolute universalization or other substitutive strategies. After all, the effects of conserved exotic CSIs and of failed wordplay are much the same: in both cases, the target reader will be unable to fully understand the item or passage. However, while readers may look up orthographically adapted CSIs to come to understand them, no such option is available for failed wordplay because the original successful wordplay is hidden from the reader. Because Rubin chose to neutralize researchable CSIs but not wordplay, it may be concluded that perhaps Rubin does not see wordplay as a truly foreign CSI that requires naturalization. The contrast is seen clearly in the English translation of passage 18, where the obviously foreign Kyoto dialect is deleted from the text, rendering the passage culture-neutral.

The Dutch translation showed the strong adherence to the material of the source text also found in categories above. In this category, however, this tendency was problematic, as the wordplay was translated largely word for word, without any attempts to bring the two meanings of each word together. Dutch readers cannot be

expected to understand the connection between "muziekdocent" and "dokter" in passage 16, nor the similarity between "komkommer" and "kiwi" in passage 17. The fact that no attempt seems to have been made to bridge the cultural gap is striking considering Fennema's willingness to use substitutive strategies for material-cultural CSIs; however, similar results were seen in her heavy use of orthographic adaptation for geographical CSIs. Because the translations of these instances of humor may be considered linguistic translations, Fennema continues her use of conservative strategies here.

Strategies used in the German translation differed substantially from those of the other translations. Gräfe was the only translator not to translate the word "sensei" in passage 16, instead inserting a footnote explaining both interpretations to the reader – the first occurrence of extratextual gloss in the passages studied. This strategy successfully conserved the wordplay, but did draw attention to the act of translation; perhaps Gräfe deems her own visibility to be less important than the success of the text, fitting her stated preference for extratextual glosses as seen in chapter 2. In contrast, the untranslatable wordplay in 17 was simply left out through the deletion of any reference to kiwis. In the two instances of wordplay, Gräfe clearly favors natural German over the forced conservation of items that could result in marked language. This view returns in the translation of passage 18, where any reference to the Kyoto dialect, which would seem out of place in a German text, is removed.

The translation of wordplay in the Swedish translation was nearly identical to that found in the English translation. Both passages 16 and 17 showed clear signs that the Swedish translators consulted Rubin's translation, resulting in similar passages within a text with otherwise vastly different strategies for the translation of CSIs. The link between the two interpretations of "sensei" in passage 16 was weakened compared to the English version, which resulted in a less convincing attempt to substitute the wordplay. In turn, the untranslatable wordplay in passage 17 was conserved but just as unclear as in the English and Dutch translations. Considering the Swedish translators' preference for orthographic adaptation, it is perhaps striking that they chose to transfer both instances of humor to the Swedish language rather than using an orthographic adaptation and a gloss, as Gräfe did in passage 16. Perhaps the Swedish translators deemed their invisibility more important than the success of these few instances of wordplay. Strikingly, however, the translators did draw attention to the act of translation in their rendering of the dialect in passage 18, where the conserved phrase "sa flickan på Kyoto-dialekt" was unlikely to mean anything to the Swedish reader. It may be said that the Swedish translation has showed two different overall tendencies thus far – conservation and substitution – depending on who *originally* made the translation: passages borrowed from Rubin showed his trademark substitutive approach, while passages that were original translations by the Dukes showed their

preference for conservative strategies. As such, the act of borrowing from Rubin's text has negatively impacted the internal consistency of the Swedish translation.

### 5.4 – Other CSIs

The categories in this section did not contain enough items to be given a separate section, but nevertheless contain a few translations of note. These passages, while not necessarily parts of a larger pattern, may in themselves be telling enough of translators' strategies. For each of these passages, the focus will lie on the texts containing the striking translations, and the translations in other languages will be mentioned briefly but not expanded upon.

#### A historical event

Passage 19, found in the appendix, is taken from a conversation between Toru and the strange gatekeeper of Naoko's sanatorium. Toru learns that the gatekeeper has not been to Tokyo for a long time, since the crown prince married; while not all Japanese readers will know this event took place in 1959, they will have some idea of when it was approximately. While the CSI (皇太子殿下の御成婚) is likely to give the Japanese reader a fair amount of information, the foreign reader cannot be assumed to know when the event took place. This knowledge is not vital to the interpretation of the novel because the gatekeeper is only a minor character, but the passage does add to the gatekeeper's

odd personality and will lose some of its impact if the CSI is not understood by the reader.

The Swedish translation, in its now typical approach, adds no gloss to help the reader understand the CSI. In both the English and Dutch translations, the year is added as an intratextual gloss placed inside the gatekeeper's dialogue, as an addition to the final underlined phrase. Because the gatekeeper is thinking aloud to himself, he could believably mention the exact year he visited Tokyo, so the gloss is unlikely to be recognized as an addition by readers.

The fact that the year is so easily included in the dialogue makes the German translation highly noteworthy, as it contains the second of only two extratextual glosses used by Gräfe. The first footnote in the German text was used for the highly complex wordplay in passage 16, which makes the inclusion of this footnote even more surprising – after all, there is no clear reason to include a footnote here and not in countless other places. The gatekeeper is not an important character, nor is this passage an important passage within the narrative; moreover, the footnote here does not fit Gräfe's earlier strategies, which generally favored relatively 'invisible' translations using intratextual glosses, linguistic translations and substitutive strategies. The translation unnecessarily breaks the narrative voice and is the odd one out in Gräfe's approach to CSIs as a whole, further showing that the German text is sometimes lacking in consistency.

**Tokyo University**

> その当時僕のまわりで「グレート・ギャツビイ」を読んだことのある人間はたった一人しかいなかったし、僕と彼が親しくなったのもそのせいだった。彼は永沢という名の東大の法学部の学生で、僕より学年がふたつ上だった。(上 65)

> When I did finally meet the one person in my world who had read *Gatsby*, he and I became friends because of it. His name was Nagasawa. He was two years older than me, and because he was doing legal studies at the prestigious Tokyo University, he was on the fast track to national leadership. (38)

> Er was in die tijd maar één iemand in mijn omgeving die *De grote Gatsby* had gelezen, en dat was meteen de aanleiding dat we bevriend raakten. Hij heette Nagasawa, studeerde rechten aan de universiteit van Tokio en was twee jaar ouder dan ik. (Chapter 1)

> Als ich schließlich dem einen Menschen in meiner Nähe begegnete, der den *großen Gatsby* gelesen hatte, freundeten wir uns deswegen an. Er hieß Nagasawa und studierte bereits seit zwei Jahren Jura an der staatlichen Universität von Tōkyō, der renommierten Tōdai. (Chapter 1)

> Vid den tiden fanns det bara en person i min omgivning som hade läst *Den store Gatsby*. Orsaken till att vi blev vänner var just detta faktum. Han hette Nagasawa, var juridikstuderande vid Tokyo-universitetet och hade två studieår mer än jag bakom sig. (44)

This passage concerns the institutional CSI "東大". The university is extremely famous in Japan and is widely considered the most prestigious university in the country. The

fact that the cynical and rebellious Nagasawa attends a university held in such high regard adds to his enigmatic and contradictory character, and Japanese readers will characterize him as a serious, well-educated student. Because the CSI appears in Nagasawa's introductory passage, it plays a large role in the image readers will form of him; transferring the connotations of the CSI, then, may be important to conserving the interpretative potential of the text. The German and English translations both do so adequately using intratextual glosses, but strikingly, the CSI is left unexplained to the target reader in both the Dutch and the Swedish translations. Although the loss may be criticized, the strategies used do fit patterns found in both texts, as neither translation saw many intratextual glosses, instead favoring orthographic adaptations, linguistic translations, and absolute universalizations. Although the Swedish translation did help the reader understand some elements where the Dutch did not, such as the list of areas in passage 16, both Fennema and the Dukes appear to apply their chosen global strategies fairly rigidly, regardless of context or impact on the interpretative potential.

**Measuring in *tatami***

> 二人部屋は六畳間をもう少し細長くしたくらいの広さで (上 29)

> Double rooms were a little longer and narrower than nine-by-twelve (15)

De tweepersoonskamers waren zo'n tweeënhalf bij vier meter (Chapter 1)

Die Doppelzimmer waren etwas über sechs Tatami groß (Chapter 1)

Första- och andraårsstudenternas rum var något mer avlånga än ett sex tatami-mattor stort rum (…) (sex tatami-mattor motsvarar ungefär elva kvadratmeter, *övers anm.*) (20)

This passage contains one of the few units of measure in *Norwegian Wood*. In the passage, Toru describes the rooms in his dormitory, using *tatami* mats to measure their size. While the Japanese are used to counting the size of rooms in tatami and will immediately have an image of the size of the double rooms in the passage, Western readers, unfamiliar with the counting system, will generally have no clear idea of what "six tatami mats" entails. While Fennema has neutralized the item using absolute universalization, Rubin here uses the rare, strongly substitutive strategy naturalization, measuring the size of the room in target culture-specific feet.

The truly striking translations, however, are the German and Swedish. Gräfe has used linguistic translation for the element, leaving "sechs Tatami". As discussed, readers will likely be unaware of the size of a tatami – or even that there *is* a standard tatami size used to measure rooms; as a result, the item in the German text cannot be expected to be understood. The translation is striking considering Gräfe's self-declared preference

for glosses – intratextual or extratextual – to explain such exotic items, and doubly so considering her previous use of several absolute universalizations on the one hand, and an arguably unnecessary footnote on the other. Why such strategies were not used here is unclear, showing further inconsistency in the translation of CSIs.

The Swedish passage, finally, contains the only extratextual gloss in the whole translation, inserted between brackets at the end of the sentence. The linguistic translation "sex tatami-mattor" is no surprise considering the Swedish translators' preference for conservative strategies, but it is striking that the translators chose to include an extratextual gloss here and not in countless other places where they used linguistic translation or orthographic adaptation. Perhaps they felt that leaving "tatami" unexplained would be too confusing to readers, or that the size of the room needed to be made clear for narrative purposes. The choice to use a conservative strategy even at the cost of breaking narrative voice when the alternative – using absolute universalization and rendering the room size in meters – is so readily available shows the Swedish translators' committal to conserving foreign elements in the target text.

## 5.5 – Conclusion

With the large number of passages studied in this chapter, summarizing and combining the results found in each section may help gain a clear overview of each translation.

### The English translation

As initially expected, the English translation set itself apart from the other three texts with its strikingly different approach, which included heavy use of substitutive strategies. Some of the rarest and most radical strategies were used only by Rubin: his translation included two autonomous creations and one naturalization, neither of which were used by other translators, as well as relatively many deletions. A large number of absolute universalizations rendered some passages almost entirely culture-neutral, as was the case with the list of foods in passage 13. Rubin also used far fewer orthographic adaptations than the other translators, never using the strategy in isolation but only in combination with glosses. The resulting translations were generally heavily naturalized, while the passages with autonomous creations contained Japanese CSIs which could be considered 'safely exotic' – such as "teriyaki chicken" in passage 14 – adding a sense of foreignness while still likely being recognized and understood by readers.

Differences between categories in the English translation were only slight: strategies used for ecological and geographical CSIs were marginally more conservative than those used for material-cultural CSIs, but the overall translation was highly

substitutive. The only cases where Rubin's approach failed to produce naturalized passages were the two instances of humor: Rubin largely conserved the source text material, making the wordplay with sensei appear somewhat forced and the cucumber wordplay fall flat entirely. Nevertheless, the fact that the English translation was one of only two that attempted to transfer the first instance of wordplay into the target language shows Rubin's dedication to making his translations palatable for his target audience.

Overall, Murakami's work appears far more culture-neutral in Rubin's translation than it does in other translations, which is perhaps fitting for the 'international version' of Murakami. Rubin has clearly chosen strategies for his translation of CSIs that help create a foreigner-friendly text, adapting it to Western tastes.

**The Dutch translation**

The Dutch translation separated itself from the others through its strong adherence to the material present in the source text. Fennema retained elements which all other translators deleted and rendered the two instances of wordplay largely word for word, making the humor fall flat in the target text. There was a clear distinction in the strategies used between ecological and geographical CSIs on the one hand and material-

cultural CSIs on the other: the former category was translated using mainly conservative strategies, while the latter saw mainly substitutive strategies.

For ecological and geographical CSIs, Fennema mainly used orthographic adaptations without additional strategies, leaving the majority of items unexplained to the target reader. Resulting passages were highly exoticized, sometimes to the point where the interpretative potential of the passage was negatively impacted because readers could not be expected to understand all exotic items present, as with the list of areas in passage 12. This issue returned in the translation of Nagasawa's introductory passage, where the connotations of a characterizing CSI were lost in translation due to the use of a conservative strategy.

In contrast, the substitutive strategies used for material-cultural CSIs resulted in heavily naturalized passages, some containing no foreign elements in translation. For example, the list of foods in passage 13 showed absolute universalization for seven out of eight items, creating a passage easily comprehensible by target readers. Overall, then, the Dutch text showed a striking division between exoticized and naturalized passages. While the overarching strategies used for the two categories were near polar opposites, they did share one characteristic: the low amount of glosses used. This further strengthens the impression that Fennema prefers adhering to the source text material as-is – not adding text to her translation but rather translating items compactly.

Despite the many naturalized material-cultural CSIs, the Dutch text does still appear far more exoticized than the English translation. As mentioned in this chapter's introduction, foreign elements are more likely to the attract attention of the target reader than naturalized elements, and Fennema's translations of geographical CSIs were so conservative that the resulting text will likely be experienced as exotic. The fact that this exoticness is concentrated largely in one category, however, creates an imbalance in the translation where readers will be able to effortlessly understand some CSI-heavy passages but will experience a large cultural gap in others, resulting in a heavily polarized text.

**The German translation**

The German translation is the most difficult to categorize, as it displayed the widest spread of strategies. Gräfe used relatively many substitutive strategies in her translation of ecological and geographical CSIs, resulting in more naturalized passages than were present in the Dutch and Swedish translations. Nevertheless, a large number of orthographic adaptations, some with intratextual glosses, made this category appear far more exoticized than Rubin's rendition of it.

There were slight differences between categories, with slightly more conservative strategies in the category of ecological and geographical CSIs, but the difference was not great enough to speak of two different approaches to the categories. Gräfe's approach to

material-cultural CSIs was more substitutive overall, but also showed a strong division between the conservative linguistic translation and the substitutive absolute universalization. The lack of internal consistency in some passages meant that some items were naturalized entirely while neighboring items were orthographically adapted – again, the list of foods in passage 13 provides a clear example, where most items were naturalized but there were also a few orthographic adaptations. This approach created passages that were largely foreigner-friendly but included a few exotic outliers; as a result, readers can easily understand these passages, while still feeling some of the exotic connotations.

Gräfe's translational approach made her text stand out in the category of humorous CSIs, where she was the only translator to use an extratextual gloss to explain the wordplay with sensei, while also being the only translator to use deletion for the cucumber-wordplay, which could be considered untranslatable. Her readiness to use such strategies showed that she was not willing to conserve wordplay that would result in unnatural or forced humor in the target text. She was willing, however, to increase her own visibility in the text by using footnotes, using two of the three extratextual glosses found in this study. However, the second gloss, used to include the year 1959 in the gatekeeper passage, seemed unnecessary because the year could easily have been included using an *intratextual* gloss. Any unnecessarily increased visibility of the

translator may be frowned upon by readers. Again, this strategy showed some inconsistency in Gräfe's approach to CSIs.

Perhaps Gräfe did not begin her translation process with a strong strategy in mind, preferring instead to choose a strategy for each CSI individually depending on context – or perhaps Gräfe's approach is one of calculated, measured exoticism. Whatever the case, the strategies used are ultimately unimportant compared to their effects, and the result of Gräfe's approach is a target text with some neutralized and some exotic items in all categories, bridging much of the cultural gap while still being mildly exoticized. Gräfe's text may be the most balanced of all four translations, showing equal parts of both extremes.

**The Swedish translation**

Finally, the Swedish translation was fairly conservative, albeit in a markedly different way than the Dutch translation. The Swedish translators showed clear awareness of context in their translations of ecological and geographical CSIs, where items with connotations important to the interpretation of the passage were given a gloss or substitutive translation, while non-essential items were generally translated using orthographic adaptation. This was seen clearly in the list of areas in passage 12, which were all explained to the reader in some way to preserve the humorous effect of the passage. Such strategies contrasted with the conservative strategies used by Fennema,

which were not as context-aware. The Dukes' approach may thus be called 'selectively exotic', where they may have attempted to include as many exotic elements as they could without significantly altering the interpretative potential of passages.

This was seen clearly in the category of material-cultural CSIs, which in the Swedish translation showed far more conservative strategies than in other translations. Some of these conservative strategies, however, did result in passages that were difficult for the target reader to comprehend without aid – as with the passage simply using "Oe" – showing that the Dukes may have gone too far in their conservative approach. The Swedish translation showed a slight difference between categories, where material-cultural CSIs were translated using more substitutive strategies; nevertheless, the high amount of orthographic adaptations in this category resulted in a markedly exotic tone. The translation contained one striking extratextual gloss in a passage where it could have easily been avoided, explaining the size of a six-tatami room. Apparently, the Dukes preferred to conserve the exotic CSI but still felt the need to explain it to the reader.

One fact which marked the Swedish translation was that a few passages were clearly borrowed from the English text. This mainly occurred in complex passages, perhaps because the translators felt the need to look elsewhere for inspiration: the passages were passage 13 – the list of dishes – and passage 17, which contained the cucumber-wordplay. This approach would not normally present a problem, were it not

for the fact that Rubin's overall strategy differed strongly from that of the Dukes. Passages taken from Rubin's translation had a contrasting tone to the surrounding material, which became most obviously apparent in passage 13, where the translators included both an adaptation of Rubin's passage and their own translation, the two of which were made using nearly opposite strategies. Rubin's translations of the wordplay in the text were only moderately successful, but the Dukes did choose to include them – possibly, given the Dukes' preference for conservative strategies, they would otherwise have chosen to use an extratextual gloss, which may have been equally or more successful. The Swedish translation thus showed a split character in places where Rubin's voice took over, but Rubin's translational choices were not always a positive addition to the text.

The translation could have been strongly consistent in its moderately conservative, exoticizing approach were it not for the passages borrowed from Rubin. These passages make the translation appear somewhat inconsistent, although they were few enough that they may be overlooked by readers; as stated, conservative strategies are most likely to catch the reader's eye, which means the Swedish translation will likely be perceived as fairly exotic overall. Although the Swedish and Dutch translators were approximately equally conservative in their approach, the Dukes' approach has been more consistent than Fennema's, and, critically, more context-aware. As such, the

Swedish translation may be called the more 'successful' of the two, balancing a strong exotic tone with substitutive strategies where necessary.

## Chapter 6 – Final conclusion

Much has been said about the four translations studied in this thesis, and much more remains to be said. Perhaps the most striking finding of this thesis is that the four translations, radically different in their approaches, all represent the same text – and are taken by readers and critics alike to be faithful representations. While all translations have indeed shown themselves to be valid versions of the same text, some have been more successful in their approach than others. The English translation positions itself at the naturalizing, text-altering extreme while the Dutch translation positions itself at the opposite side as exoticizing and conservative. The German and Swedish translations find themselves somewhere in the middle, and this mixed approach seems to have been the most successful overall in representing the tone and contents of *Norwegian Wood*.

### The English translation

The English translation most clearly distinguishes itself by its heavily naturalized tone. In the translation of CSIs, Rubin consistently used far more substitutive strategies than other translators, and he was the only translator to add safely foreign elements to the text, creating a perceived level of exoticization that nevertheless was accessible to Western readers. Overall, the resulting text has been heavily adapted to Western readers' cultural knowledge, leaving very little of the source text's Japaneseness intact.

Perhaps it is no wonder that many readers – and critics – believe Murakami to be a Westernized author, should they have based this impression on the English translations alone. Overall, Rubin's translation certainly deserves its reputation of being the 'international version' of *Norwegian Wood* – whether this is a positive label, however, is doubtful.

The English translation also showed a clear strategy for the translation of Toru Watanabe's name. Rubin introduced a contrast in his translation, making some characters use "Toru" and others use "Watanabe". Strikingly, however, only Naoko and Hatsumi used "Toru", creating parallels between the two that were not present in the source text. Readers of the English translation are more likely than Japanese readers to see Naoko and Hatsumi as similar, central love interests – in contrast, Midori's use of "Watanabe" increases the distance between her and Toru, causing a large shift in the text's interpretative potential. Because Rubin's translational choices added false interpretations to the interpretative potential of the text, his translation received the label relative divergence.

Because Rubin heavily naturalized the text and introduced false interpretations, it should be clear that the English text cannot be the 'winner' among the four translations, with neither the tone nor the contents of the Japanese source text represented entirely faithfully. However, it is by no means a poor translation: the interpretative potential was not altered dramatically, and Rubin's foreigner-friendly strategies certainly deserve

merit for delivering Murakami's work to a large audience. Still, the supposed international version of the novel is clearly not without its flaws.

**The Dutch translation**

The Dutch translation was by far the most conservative – and in many aspects the polar opposite of the English translation – translating much of the material studied word for word. For Toru's name, this meant Fennema used "Watanabe" throughout, eliminating all contrast between characters' speech that was found in the source text. While the effects of Fennema's translational choices were not as dramatic as in the English and German translations, the loss of contrast still negatively affects the interpretative potential of the text. Nevertheless, the translation received the label divergent similarity because no false interpretations were introduced. Strikingly, Fennema's strategy may cause readers to interpret "Watanabe" as Toru's first name, which is a strange effect but only becomes problematic should readers consult other translations of the text. Compared to the other translations, however, the consistent use of "Watanabe" appears almost stubbornly source-text oriented.

Fennema's adherence to the material of the source text also became highly apparent in her translations of CSIs, most of which were conservative. While there was a clear difference between CSI categories in the strategies used, with material-cultural CSIs showing more substitutive strategies, the heavy use of conservative strategies was

predominant throughout the translation. Critically, this rendered some passages unintelligible to readers because the connotations of CSIs were not transferred. Two instances of wordplay were also translated word for word, losing their humorous effect and creating odd-looking passages in the text. As discussed in chapter 2, Murakami's writing is generally focused not on stylistics but on conveying the underlying message; as such, Fennema's approach did not provide a faithful representation of the source text. Overall, the Dutch text appeared heavily exoticized.

While the Dutch translation was largely successful in maintaining the interpretative potential of Toru's name, its conservative tendencies negatively impacted the representation of both tone and style in the text. Unintelligible passages within a highly exoticized text render the translation a difficult and at times puzzling read, neither of which is true for the Japanese text. Readers familiar with Japanese culture may still discover parts of the tone and contents of the source text, but the majority will be lost to the average Dutch reader. As such, the translation, while 'faithful' in the literal sense of the word, does not faithfully reproduce the *effect* of the source text and is therefore less successful than its German and Swedish counterparts.

**The German translation**

The German translation was not as clearly defined as other translations, choosing a middle-of-the-road approach in both subjects studied. Gräfe used a wide variety of

strategies for the translation of CSIs, with some passages containing a mixture of vastly different strategies in juxtaposition. The German translation also contained two footnotes, one of which was unnecessary, which was somewhat unfortunate as it drew attention to the act of translation without good cause. Although the chosen strategies caused German passages to appear complex – sometimes even messy – when compared to other translations, readers unaware of the material of the source text were simply presented with naturalized passages containing a few exotic items. As such, the effect overall effect on the reader was one of subtle exoticization. This may be considered an ideal approach: readers are able to understand most of the passages, while still gaining a sense of Murakami's Japaneseness.

Gräfe's approach to Toru's name showed a clear division between users of Toru's first name – Naoko, Midori, and Hatsumi – and of Toru's last name – Reiko and Nagasawa. While the contrast largely corresponded with the contrasts between honorifics found in the source text, there was one striking exception in the case of Reiko. Gräfe used the formal "Herr Watanabe" and "Sie" throughout Reiko's dialogue, increasing the perceived distance between the two characters tremendously. Readers of the German text may be unable to interpret the two as friends at all, introducing a false interpretation and a strong shift in the interpretative potential of the text. As such, the text received the label relative divergence.

Were it not for the unfortunate translation of Reiko's forms of address, the

German translation could have been labelled an 'ideal' translation, showing a balanced mix between exoticized and naturalized elements, as well as translations of Toru's name that left the interpretative potential of the text largely unaltered. The tone and contents of the source text were largely preserved, but due to Reiko's presentation in the text, the translation cannot be considered the best among the four.

**The Swedish translation**

The Swedish translation, finally, showed a highly conservative approach overall. Perhaps the translation is best contrasted with the Dutch translation: both showed similar tendencies, but the effects are strikingly different. CSIs in the Swedish text were largely translated using conservative strategies, but critically, explanations were included for readers whenever connotations of items were crucial for interpreting the passage. In the Dutch translation, even items with important connotations were left unexplained, showing that the Dukes' context-aware exoticizing approach is highly preferable. The tendency to explain items did cause the Swedish text to contain one translators' note, which drew attention to the act of translation. Overall, the Dukes' approach would have been highly praiseworthy were it not for the fact that some passages were clearly borrowed from the English translation, which used opposing strategies. While this meant that some passages were simply naturalized to no greater effect, one passage contained a striking juxtaposition between the Dukes' conservative

and Rubin's substitutive renditions of the same passage, and may have struck readers as odd. Nevertheless, this was only one passage – overall, the Swedish translators delivered a strongly exoticized yet still comprehensible text.

The Swedish translation conserved effect over content in the translation of Toru's name. The translators introduced a distinction between "Toru" and "Watanabe" that coincided almost precisely with the difference between honorifics in the source text, leaving the interpretative potential of the text largely unaltered – resulting in the label divergent similarity. Although the Dutch translation also received this label, the Swedish translation better captured the subtle differences between characters through the introduction of contrasting forms of address. As such, the Swedish rendition of Toru's name may be considered the best among the four texts studied.

Perhaps it should come as no surprise that the Swedish translation may be considered to most accurately represent the tone and contents of the source text. The Dukes most closely preserved the interpretative potential of the text through their translation of Toru's name, while all other translations introduced slight to moderate shifts in the interpretative potential. In addition, their approach to CSIs was exoticizing but context-aware, rarely leaving readers in the dark while still maintaining a strong sense of Japaneseness in the text.

**Further research**

Finally, it is important to touch upon subjects not discussed in this thesis. Although the study of translations of Toru's name did reveal a number of shifts in the interpretative potential of texts, the results would benefit greatly from an analysis of the register and tone in characters' speech. A possible subject of study is the differences between sentence lengths in Naoko's and Midori's speech, as discussed in chapter 2. It may also be fruitful to focus on the colloquialisms in Midori's speech mentioned in the same chapter, and to see whether – and how – translators convey these in translation. This thesis was initially meant to include an analysis of register and tone, but spatial restraints only allowed for the study of two subjects. Of course, the two analytical chapters could have been shortened to include a third, but in that case, the quality of the analysis would have suffered; two convincing chapters were ruled to be more productive than three unconvincing ones.

The thesis also did not touch upon Murakami's literary style beyond the analysis provided in chapter 2. Possible focal points include representations in translation of the 僕 narrator, as well as Murakami's weightless and rhythmical prose. Further studies could benefit greatly from a stylistic analysis, as the four translations appeared to display vastly different approaches. Because style and tone are essential parts of any literary work, the analysis of *Norwegian Wood* provided in this thesis was not complete. It does, however, provide a stepping stone for further research.

Because the scope of the thesis was intended to be much larger, some passages were selected to study style and tone as well. Although the selection is far from complete, it does show some translators' tendencies; these passages are included at the end of the appendix under a separate header. A few initial observations are listed below, although these will require further study.

The English translation appears to handle the 'weightlessness' of Murakami's style – mentioned in chapter 2 – relatively loosely, often lengthening sentences by adding material to them. This tendency could also be seen in some CSI translations – most notably the addition for Yotsuya station. In contrast, Rubin appears to conserve the tone of characters' speech faithfully, although some characters – especially Midori and Nagasawa – seem somewhat more exaggerated in his translation. Toru's dialogue, too, may appear less formal in English, especially in conversations with Nagasawa.

The Dutch translation seems to do the opposite of the English in both areas. Sentences appear to be largely translated word for word, fitting tendencies found in this thesis and perhaps conserving Murakami's style. In contrast, characters' speech appears to have been toned down, with some expletives and informal language rendered as old-fashioned or unmarked Dutch phrases.

The German and Swedish translations appear to take a middle ground between the other two for both style and tone. The German may show a slight tendency to split up or combine sentences, which could alter readers' perception of Murakami's style. The

Swedish translation, in turn, seems to use relatively vulgar language in both Midori's and Nagasawa's speech, but not as strong as that found in the English translation.

Further research could of course also focus on the multitude of other works written by Murakami. Ideally, critics could construct profiles not only of target languages but of translators as well, exploring if different translators show different representations of Murakami. For Dutch translations, Jacques Westerhoven's approach may be radically different from Elbrich Fennema's, as he himself noted their stylistic differences as mentioned in chapter 2. Jay Rubin, too, has written on the differences between the three English translators (on page 404 of *Haruki Murakami and the Music of Words*), so there appear to be discernible differences between the English translators as well. As it is, this thesis is only a single case study within a wide scope of available translations, and many works remain to be studied before we may gain an accurate impression of Murakami's representation in the West.

**Works cited**

**Primary sources**

Murakami, Haruki. *Noruwei no Mori*. Tokyo: Kodansha, 2014. Print.

---. *Norwegian Wood*. Trans. Jay Rubin. London: Vintage, 2003. Print.

---. *Norwegian Wood*. Trans. Elbrich Fennema. Amsterdam: Atlas, 2011. E-book.

---. *Naokos Lächeln*. Trans. Ursula Gräfe. Cologne: Dumont, 2011. E-book.

---. *Norwegian Wood*. Trans. Eiko Duke and Yukiko Duke. Stockholm: Norstedts, 2004. Print.

**Secondary sources**

Aixelá, Javier Franco. "Culture-specific items in translation." *Translation, power, subversion* 8 (1996): 52-78. Print.

Bogdan, Isabel. "Interview: Ursula Gräfe." *Isabelbogdan.de.* 2010. Web.

Fowler, Edward. *The rhetoric of confession: shishosetsu in early twentieth-century Japanese fiction*. Univ of California Press, 1988. Print.

Grit, Diederik. "De vertaling van realia." *Denken over vertalen*. Nijmegen: Vantilt, 2010. 189-196. Print.

Haute, Luk van. "De qu van qutienvierentachtig." *Filter.* Vol. 18:1. 2011. Print.

Hewson, Lance. *An Approach to Translation Criticism: Emma and Madame Bovary in Translation*. Vol. 95. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2011. Print.

Hijiya-Kirschnereit, Irmela. "Pretranslation in Modern Japanese Literature and what it tells us about "World Literature". *Translation and Translation Studies in the Japanese Context*. Eds. Nana Sato-Rossberg and Judy Wakabayashi. London: Bloomsbury, 2013. 167-182. Print.

Holmes, James. "De brug bij Bommel herbouwen." *Denken over vertalen*. Nijmegen: Vantilt, 2010. 183-188. Print.

Janz, Hannah. "Die Meisterübersetzerin: Ursula Gräfe über Murakami Haruki."

*Japandigest*. 2016. Web.

Klappentexterin. "Talking about Haruki Murakami mit Ursula Gräfe." *Klappentexterin.* 2015. Web.

Koster, Cees. "The translator in between texts: on the textual presence of the translator as an issue in the methodology of comparative translation description." *Translation Studies: Perspective on an emerging Discipline, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge* (2002): 24-37. Print.

Lecercle, J. *Interpretation as pragmatics*. Palgrave Macmillan UK, 1999. Print.

McInerney, Jay. "Roll Over Basho: Who Japan Is Reading, and Why." *The New York Times*. September 27, 1992. Web.

Messmer, Susanne. "Keine Übersetzung ohne Verluste." *Taz.de*. 2002. Web.

Michielsen, Anne Lopes. *Salazar, de pannenlikker. Over het vertalen van cultuurspecifieke elementen en de houding van Nederland ten opzichte van drie Portugeestalige culturen.* Utrecht: Utrecht University, 2015. Print.

Murakami, Haruki. *The Wind-up Bird Chronicle.* Trans. Jay Rubin. London: Vintage, 2003. Print.

---. *Norwegian Wood*. Trans. Alfred Birnbaum. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1991. Print.

Översattarsektionen. "Månadens översättare: Yukiko Duke." 2016. Web.

Rubin, Jay. *Haruki Murakami and the Music of Words*. Vintage Books, 2012. Print.

Sandoval, Åsa. "Måndagsmöte: Yukiko Duke." 2013. Web.

Slocombe, Will. "Haruki Murakami and the ethics of translation." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 6.2 (2004): 6.

Smith, Martyn David. "'A MAD age': Heibon Punch, student protest, the media and consumer society in Cold War Japan." *Japan Forum*. Vol. 28. No. 3. Routledge, 2016. 337-359. Print.

Smits, Ivo. "Opwinding over opwindvogels." *Filter*. Vol. 12:1. 2005. Print.

Strecher, Matthew C. "Beyond "pure" literature: Mimesis, formula, and the postmodern in the fiction of Murakami Haruki." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 57.02 (1998): 354-378.

Van Leuven-Zwart, Kitty. "Translation and original: Similarities and dissimilarities, I."

*Target. International Journal of Translation Studies* 1.2 (1989): 151-181. Print.

Vanderschelden, Isabelle. "Authority in literary translation: collaborating with the author." *Translation Review* 56.1 (1998): 22-31.

Westerhoven, Jacques. “De vertaler doet het altijd fout: Dialect in vertaling.” *Filter*. 2016. Web.

Zielinska-Elliott, Anna and Ika Kaminka. “Online Multilingual Collaboration: Haruki Murakami’s European Translators.” In: *Collaborative Translation: From the Renaissance to the Digital Age*. Cordingley, Anthony, and Céline Frigau Manning, eds. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2016. 167-191. Print.