УДК 81’255.2
DOI: 10.32342/2523-4463-2018-2-16-8

K. NUMANO,
MD in Philology, Professor
Graduate School of Institute of Global Sciences
In Tokyo State University of Foreign Studies (Japan)

THE JAPANESE TRANSLATIONS OF RUSSIAN LITERATURE: DOSTOEVSKY, TURGENEV AND GOGOL

В статье исследуются особенности переводов произведений русской литературы на японский язык – Ф. Достоевского, И. Тургенева и Н. Гоголя. Анализируются характеристики и эстетические аспекты каждого произведения. Новый перевод романа Ф. Достоевского «Братья Карамазовы» Ико Камеямы ориентирован прежде всего на читабельность (легкость чтенія). Форенизация – как термин Лоуренса Венути – в Японии обычно понимается как стратегия перевода. Отличительной чертой перевода на японский язык повести И. Тургенева «Первая любовь» Кёко Нумано является использование форм «desu/masu» вместо «da/de-aru», характерных обычно для японских романов. Японский перевод рассказа Н. Гоголя «Шинель» Масахару Юра, несомненно, имитирует стиль ракуго. Ранее Таку Эгава по прочтении статьи Б. Эйхенбаума «Как сделана “Шинель” Гоголя» отметил, что в стиле Гоголя проявляются черты ракуго, и сделал попытку перевода произведения в уникальном стиле.

Ключевые слова: перевод, русская литература, японский язык, ракуго, Ф. Достоевский, И. Тургенев, Н. Гоголь.

У статті досліджуються особливості перекладів творів російської літератури японською мовою – Ф. Достоєвського, І. Тургєнєва, М. Гоголя. Аналізуються характеристики та естетичні аспекти кожного твору. Новий переклад роману Ф. Достоєвського «Брати Карамазови» Іко Камеями орієнтований передусім на читабельність (легкість читання). Форенизація – як термін Лоуренса Венуті – в Японії зазвичай розуміється як стратегія перекладу. Відмінною рисою перекладу японською повісті І. Тургєнєва «Перше кохання» Кьоко Нумано є використання форм «desu/masu» замість «da/de-aru», характерних, в основному, для японських романів. Японський переклад оповідання М. Гоголя «Шінель» Масахару Юра, безперечно, імітує стиль ракуго. Раніше Таку Егава, прочитавши статтю Б. Ейхенбаума «Як зроблена “Шинель” Гоголя», зазначив, що в стилі Гоголя виявляються риси ракуго, і зробив спробу перекладу твору в унікальному стилі.

Ключові слова: переклад, російська література, японська мова, ракуго, Ф. Достоєвський, І. Тургєнєв, М. Гоголь.

Introdution

In 2006 Japanese publisher Kobunsha launched the “Kobunsha New Translations of Classics Library” with the aim of republishing mainly European classic literary works from such countries as France, the US, Britain, Germany, Italy and Russia into modern easy-to-read translations. The objective of the series was to encourage young people who are perceived to be less and less interested in literature to read the classics and in so expand their readership.

The first six books republished from the Classics Library included the first volume of The “Brothers Karamazov” by Fyodor Dostoevsky and First Love by Ivan Turgenev. Sales rose steadily for the five-volume novel by Dostoevsky, which eventually went on to sell more than a million copies across its 5 volumes. Foreign literature in general has become less and less popular in

Japan, with fewer readers than in the past. On top of this, Russian literature was not particularly commonly read to begin with. However, the newly translated series ushered in a "Dostoevsky boom" and several literary journals went on to arrange special features on the author. Taking into account the current situation of translated literary works in Japan, this is a rather exceptional phenomenon.

Later on, other new translations of Russian literary works from the Classics Library were also republished. These included "Anna Karenina" and "The Death of Ivan Ilyich" by Leo Tolstoy, "Notes from Underground" and "Crime and Punishment" by Fyodor Dostoevsky, as well as "The Nose", "The Overcoat" and "The Government Inspector" by Nikolai Gogol. Unfortunately, none of these enjoyed the same sales success as did the "The Brothers Karamazov".

This report focuses on three new translations of Russian literary works from the Classics Library: "The Brothers Karamazov", "First Love" and "The Overcoat", and examines the characteristics as well as issues concerning each translated piece.

The Case of "The Brothers Karamazov"

The first piece I will discuss here is "The Brothers Karamazov" written by Fyodor Dostoevsky, translated by Ikuo Kameyama. The main characteristic of Kameyama's translation is unquestionably its readability. In correspondence with the publisher's strategy, the literary piece was translated into natural, smooth-flowing Japanese, as opposed to the more awkwardly composed texts easily recognised by readers as translations of foreign literature. Kameyama refrained from the use of old-fashioned words, and in most cases chose to adopt simple language commonly used in modern day conversation.

Conventionally, "The Brothers Karamazov" has been described as an especially difficult piece among Dostoevsky's works; however, with the new translation by Kameyama, it has sold over a million copies, reaching out to a large number of Japanese readers. It may be the case that Japanese readers of this new translation have had their attention drawn to the various issues raised in Dostoevsky's works – those of worship, terrorism, child abuse, and disparity between rich and poor – which also exist in modern society, and through this these readers may then have also been able to rediscover the attraction and greatness of his works. If so, then this can be regarded as a commendable achievement of this new translation.

However, what is most necessary to consider here is readability itself. In recent Japan, generally speaking, an easy-to-read translation tends to be recognised as a good translation. From the Meiji era, Japanese translators have traditionally put priority on the original text, translating as literally as possible. A great number of translators in Japan approached original texts with a determination not to ignore even a single word. They did not remove parts which ordinary readers might have found difficult to understand, and aimed for as little distortion to the original text as possible. Readers, likewise, have come to expect that translations of foreign literary works will contain different cultural elements, and will often read translated works with an enthusiasm to learn about different cultures, despite the difficulty in comprehension. In so, Japanese readers have come to accept these kinds of difficult-to-read texts which differ in style from natural Japanese writing.

Borrowing the words of translation theorist Lawrence Venuti, this conventional translation strategy can be said to employ the approach of foreignization, which deliberately brings in the different cultural values of the source language, even if they do not blend in well with the dominant cultural values of the target language [1]. Kameyama's translation strategy however can be said to adopt the domestication approach, as it ethnocentrically alters the source language text to fit in with the cultural values of the target language.

For example, let us quote a part of Kameyama's translation from "The Grand Inquisitor" of "The Brothers Karamazov".

"Уж по одним вопросам этим, лишь по чуду их появления, можно понимать, что имеешь дело не с человеческим текущим умом, а с вековечным и абсолютным. Ибо в этих трех вопросах как бы совокуплена в одно целое и предсказана вся дальнейшая история человеческая и явлены три образа, в которых сойдутся все неразрешимые исторические противоречия человеческой природы на

всей земле. Тогда это не могло быть еще так видно, ибо будущее было неведомо, но теперь, когда прошло пятнадцать веков, мы видим, что всё в этих трех вопросах до того угадано и предсказано и до того оправдалось, что прибавить к ним или убавить от них ничего нельзя более" [2, p. 230].

これら三つの問いだけで、この問いが現れたという奇跡だけで、理解できそうなものだ。おまえが相手にしているのは、人間の日々の知恵ではなく、永遠の、絶対的な知恵だと言うことがな。なぜかというと、この三つの問いのなかには、人類のその後の歴史がすべてひとつの全体にまとめられ、預言されているし、また地球全体におよぶ人間の本質の、解決しがたい歴史的な矛盾すべてを集約する、三つの姿が現れているからなのだ。

当時、それはまださほどくっきりとした姿をとりえなかった。なにせ、未来が知られていなかったからだ。だが、十五世紀が過ぎたいまにして、われわれにはわかるのだ。すべては、これら三つの問いにあまりにみごとに言い当てられ、預言され、おまけに的中までしているので、それら三つの問いに足したり、それらから引いたりする必要など何ひとつないということがな。[3, p. 266–267].

Kameyama's translation flows smoothly with little awkwardness present. Even those who do not understand Japanese will notice that each sentence of Kameyama's has been made shorter for the sake of readability. Where the original text consists of three sentences, Kameyama's counterpart is composed of as many as seven sentences.

In addition, the number of paragraphs in Kameyama's translation far surpasses that of the original. In the section shown above for example, the original text have only one paragraph. On the other hand, Kameyama splits this into two. Another instance is Part1, Book1, Chapter 1 of "The Brothers Karamazov" translated by Kameyama, which is composed of 18 paragraphs, while the original counterpart was divided into only three. There are arguments for and against dividing up the original units of meaning for the sake of readability.

Another feature of Kameyama's translation is the use of simplified hypocorism for Russian names to make it simpler for Japanese readers to understand. In Russian novels, authors often use several forms for one name; for instance, Aleksandr Sergeevich can be Sasha or Sashenka, both carrying slightly different meanings. For ordinary Japanese readers, however, this complicated hypocorism was the very greatest cause for them feeling that Russian literature was difficult to read. Kameyama thus used the approaches of consolidating this hypocorism into one single form, and also used the Japanese honorific way of addressing people by adding *san* to their name, as in *Aleksandr-san*.

Here, it is rather interesting to compare the shift of Japanese translation strategies used in Russian literary works to their English counterparts, because interestingly English translation strategies have shown shifts in the opposite direction.

Constance Garnett (1861–1946), who played a major role in the early stages of English translation of Russian literature, began translation in 1893 and introduced almost all the main pieces of 19th-century Russian literature to the English-speaking public. According to Heilbrun, "Constance Garnett estimated, in 1928, that in the 35 years (…) she had completed some seventy volumes. The main body of this work consisted of 17 volumes of Turgenev, 13 volumes of Chekhov's Tales and 2 volumes of his Plays, 13 volumes of Dostoevsky, 6 volumes of Gogol, 4 volumes of Tolstoy…" [4, p. 183]. Since translations by Garnett were easy to read and comprehend, they contributed in attracting a very large number of English readers to Russian literature. Especially after her translation of the "The Brothers Karamazov" in 1912, a Dostoevsky boom is said to have arisen and lasted for some time in the UK [4, p. 189]. Quite a few Japanese authors including Soseki Natsume, Katai Tayama, Toson Shimazaki, and Masuji Ibuse read Russian literary works through Garnett's English translation during the period when Japanese translations of these were still few in number.

However, there was also some criticism of her translation. Vladimir Nabokov, a writer in exile, described her translation of Gogol's work as "dry and flat, and always unbearably demure", while Russian writer and literary critic Korney Chukobsky stated that her translations are "turning the Russians" volcanos into a "smooth lawn". Carl Proffer, an American scholar of Russian literature, asserted that "Gogol's style becomes indistinguishable from that of Turgenev, Tolstoy,

Dostoevsky, or Chekhov" in her translation [5, p. 38–40]. They claimed that Garnett made no hesitation in removing the parts she thought would be difficult for readers to understand. She put priority on what was written, but not on how it was written; in other words, she underrated the importance of form against content.

Garnett translated Russian into Victorian-style English according to the comprehension ability and taste of readers of that time, which consequently brought about stylistic homogenizing. It is quite clear that her translations exhibit the domestication strategy.

In contrast to this, the recent English translations of Russian literary works by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky were carried out based on the foreignization approach. Their collaborative translations have been coming out one after another, and are gathering much attention in literary circles. In their translation process, Volokhonsky, whose mother tongue is Russian, first creates a literal translation of the original in English, which Pevear then proceeds to edit. After the editing, they together examine the outcome and complete the final version.

Their first collaborative translation was "The Brothers Karamazov", done in 1990. They say they tried to preserve Dostoevsky's distinctive style – that of polyphony – in the English translation. According to Mikhail Bakhtin, polyphony is a style of narrative in which independent voices and views interact with each other or the author, but at the same time retain independence from one another. Bakhtin referred to Dostoevsky's novels as polyphonic works differing from the conventional monologue-style novels which focus solely on the author's view. Pevear and Volokhonsky tuned in to the voices of not only the author but also the characters in the novel, and worked to retain them in the English translation. It is perhaps not an easy translation for the average reader to get through; nevertheless, it met with much public approval and was awarded the PEN/Book-of-the-Month Club Translation Prize.

Venuti, who stresses the importance of foreignization in translation, said the following in regards to the translation by Pavear and Volohonsky: "Their first effort, a version of Dostoevsky's "The Brothers Karamazov" (1990), was pitched against previous versions by translators like Constance Garnett who, as Pevear put it, "revised", 'corrected', or smoothed over his idiosyncratic prose". To restore the stylistic peculiarities that Garnett had removed in the interest of fluency, Pevear and Volokhonsky adhered more closely to Dostoevsky's Russian, a discursive strategy that has been confirmed by various readers, native speakers of Russian as well as academic specialists and translators of Russian literature" [6, p. 122].

As is clear from the examples shown above, Japanese translations of Dostoevsky's works have begun to exhibit a shift in the opposite direction to English translations: Japanese translations that conventionally employed the foreignization strategy are now showing an inclination towards the domestication strategy, while English translations that previously tended to adopt domestication are now increasingly leaning towards foreignization.

The reason that translations of Russian literary works are moving in completely opposite directions between English and Japanese is much related to the difference in their relative positions to the Russian cultural sphere: that is, the politics of translation. From the late-19th century to early-20th century, the English cultural sphere held the most dominant position both politically and culturally. The Russian cultural sphere followed in second from this, and the Japanese cultural sphere was the lowest among the three. English and Japanese were thus in a contrastive relationship in relation to their positions on opposite sides of Russian. However the hierarchy would later on collapse. Several factors contributed to this, such as a deepening in the level of comprehension of literary works due to progress in literary theories, changes in readers' status and desires, as well as changing global affairs. Faced with these circumstances, English translation and Japanese translation started a shift in the opposite direction than they had previously been following up till that point.

The Case of "First Love"

In the second part of this report, I would like to focus on the new translation of Turgenev's "First Love", which I myself translated, and to reassess to what extent Japanese translations of Ivan Turgenev's works have contributed to the establishment of Japanese modern literature in the latter half of the 19th century.

The distinctive feature of Numano's translation concerns Japanese writing styles, especially that of the forms used at the final position of sentences. Japanese has two forms to end sentences: the 'desu/masu' form used in honorific spoken language, and the 'da/de-aru' form used mainly in written language. In the Meiji Period, writers experimented with the available writing styles in Japanese novels, but finally the 'da/de-aru' form used in written language became the preferred style. From this point on, the 'da/de-aru' form has been employed in most Japanese fiction, including translations of foreign literary works. Put simply, it is merely the difference between which form is used in sentence-final position, but it is worth pointing out that these different forms bestow a significantly different impression on the reader across the overall piece.

When I began to translate "First Love", I first adopted the 'da/de-aru' form, the basic form for writing, without giving it a second thought. After translating three or four pages, however, I felt that something was not quite right. In the beginning of the novel, three male characters are introduced, one of which confesses his first experience of love. Since he is not particularly articulate in speech, he writes a memoir to read out loud for the other two, and the novel mostly consists of this memoir, which is supposed to be conveyed vocally. Moreover, the polite form of the second person pronoun in Russian, "вы", is used in the conversations among the three men at the beginning of the novel. Therefore, upon translating the parts in memoir style, I felt that using the 'desu/masu' form (for the past tense 'deshita/mashita'), the polite form of spoken Japanese language, sounded more natural and realistic rather than adopting 'da/de-aru' form, which is usually seen in written language and carries more of an offhand impression. In my opinion, this choice of sentence final form was a response to the inherent motivations of the piece itself.

当時、私は一六歳でした。一八三三年の夏のことです。
両親が、モスクワのカルーガ門近く、ネスクーシヌィ公園のむかいに別荘を借りていて、私もそこで過ごしていました。大学受験の準備をしていることになっていましたが、ろくに勉強もせず、のんびりしたものでした。
気ままな生活に口出ししてくる人もいないので、好きなことばかりしていました。[7, p. 10].

Here, one may recall the movement which pushed for unification of the spoken and written forms of language in Japan in the latter half of the 19th century. In this period directly after the opening of the country to the outside, Japanese language was in a so-called diglossia; in other words, the gap between the literary and colloquial style, namely that of classical written language and the day-to-day spoken language, was wider than that which we see in present day Japanese. Upon the establishment of modern literature, Shimei Futabatei, a prominent scholar of Russian Literature who taught at Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, promoted this unification movement. In 1888, Futabatei translated Turgenev's short story "Meeting" in "A Sportsman's Sketches", adopting a writing style closer to spoken Japanese, and in so doing went against the conventions of Japanese literature of that time. In the history of Japanese literature, it is commonly accepted that this translation and his novel "The Drifting Cloud" contributed greatly to this unification of the two language styles.

At that time, Japanese literature was full of stylised descriptions based on conventions of Chinese classical literature as well as Edo-period literature; in contrast, Futabatei's translation, especially in its description of nature, was completely different. Jiro Kawamura, a literary critic, stated that Japanese people of the day had grown used to norms and traditions, and "they were completely astonished by his expressions (in "Meeting") which faithfully described every subtle change and glow of each moment by tuning in both visually and aurally to the rich tone of colour and sound of nature, without being bound to any particular kind of convention whatsoever" [8, p. 158].

In 1896, eight years after its magazine publication, Futabatei revised his translation of "Meeting" considerably in order to republish it in an Anthology of translation. Comparing his two translations is rather exciting as it feels as if one is witnessing the establishment of Japanese translation literature right before one's eyes.

"Я сидел в березовой роще осенью, около половины сентября. С самого утра перепадал мелкий дождик, сменяемый по временам теплым солнечным сиянием; была непостоянная погода. Небо то все заволакивалось рыхлыми белыми облаками, то вдруг местами расчищалось на мгновенье, и тогда из-за раздвинутых туч показывалась лазурь, ясная и ласковая, как прекрасный глаз. Я сидел и глядел кругом, и слушал. Листья чуть шумели над моей головой; по одному их шуму можно было узнать, какое тогда стояло время года. То был не веселый, смеющийся трепет весны, не мягкое шушуканье, не долгий говор лета, не робкое и холодное лепетанье поздней осени, а едва слышная, дремотная болтовня" [9, p. 260].

秋九月中旬といふころ、一日自分がさる樺の林の中に座していたことが有ツた。今朝から小雨が降りそゝぎ、その晴れ間にはおりおり生ま暖かな日かげも射して、まことに気まぐれな空ら合ひ。あわあわしい白ら雲が空ら一面に棚引くかと思フと、フトまたあちこち瞬く間雲切れがして、無理に押し分けたやうな雲間から澄みて怜悧し気に見える人の眼の如くに朗らかに晴れた蒼空がのぞかれた。自分は座して、四顧して、そして耳を傾けてゐた。木の葉が頭上で幽かに戦いだが、その音を聞いたばかりでも季節は知られた。それは春先する、面白さうな、笑ふやうなさゞめきでもなく、夏のゆるやかなそよぎでもなく、永たらしい話し聲でもなく、また末の秋のおどおどした、うそさぶさうなお饒舌りでもなかツたが、只漸く聞取れるか聞取れぬ程のしめやかな私語の聲で有ツた。[10, p. 5].

秋は九月中旬の事で、一日自分がさる樺林の中に坐ってゐたことが有つた。朝から小雨が降つて、その晴間にはをりをり生暖な日景も射すといふ気紛れな空合である。たわいの無い白雲が一面に空を蔽ふかとすれば、ふとまた彼方此方雲切がして、その間から朗に晴れた蒼空が美しい利口さうな眼のやうに見える。自分は坐って、四方を顧廻して、耳を傾けてゐると、つい頭の上で木の葉が微に戦いでゐたが、それを聞いたばかりでも時節は知れた。春のは面白さうに笑ひさゞめくやうで、夏のは柔しくそよそよとして、生温い話し聲のやうで、秋の末となると、おどおどした薄寒さうな音であるが、今はそれとは違つて、漸く聞取れるか聞取れぬ程の、睡むさうな、私語ぐやうな音である。[11, p. 175].

The first thing one will immediately notice here is that both translations use the 'da/de-aru' form, and that old expressions and writing forms from the magazine edition have been changed into more modern ones which are more familiar to us in the present time. The text of the revised edition sounds closer to natural Japanese partly because Futabatei used the present tense alongside the past tense. In order to describe something that happened in the past, it is normal to use only the past tense in Russian; however, Japanese generally uses the present tense along with the past tense so that it does not sound monotonous.

According to the translation theory in "Yoga-Honyakuno-Hyojun" (My standard of translation) (1906) written by Futabatei himself, he tried to keep not only the content but also the form of the original text in his translation. This was in order to retain the rhythmic tone of the original in the Japanese translation along with the meaning. To achieve this he used the same number of commas, full stops, and even words of the original text in his first translation. One might call this literal translation in its most true sense.

However, he stuck too much with form, and actually admitted that this attempt ended up as a failure, stating "one cannot just cling to form. It is necessary to first understand the sentiment expressed in the original, as this is the basis supporting it all; after that one may begin translating but while taking care not to undermine the form of the original". He also states that as, for example, Turgenev and Tolstoy both have their own respective writing styles, it is necessary for the translator to capture the respective stylistic features of each and reflect that in the Japanese [11, p. 168].

In the translation quoted above, the original, the magazine translation, and the revised book translation are composed of six, six, and five sentences respectively. The book edition is one sentence shorter compared to the other two because it merges two sentences from the original Russian into one. The merging of these two sentences seems to make the text flow somewhat more smoothly. In addition, the last sentence, "*То был не веселый, смеющийся*

трепет весны, не мягкое шушуканье, не долгий говор лета, не робкое и холодное лепетанье поздней осени, а едва слышная, дремотная болтовня", retains its sentence structure in the magazine edition, but is altered in the revised edition to sound more natural in Japanese.

As described above, although Futabatei's translation style shifted somewhat from foreignization to domestication over the eight-year period, it is still possible to witness from the very inception of translation of Russian literature into Japanese the efforts of Japanese translators to grasp the rhythm and elements which breath life into the original and try and reflect those in the Japanese.

Struggling to develop his own writing style for translation and novels, Futabatei went to his greatly regarded teacher Shoyo Tsubouchi for advice. Tsubouchi told him, "you should write as the storyteller speaks in *rakugo*", (a Japanese traditional form of entertainment) and advised Futabatei not to use the honorific form at the end of sentences [11, p. 171]. *Rakugo* is one of the classical Japanese performing arts in which a storyteller sitting in the seiza position (sitting with legs tucked under oneself) on stage depicts comical stories in front of audience while using various gestures at the same time. This one-man-play art came out of the latter half of the 17th century in the Edo period, and developed its own unique style of narration, especially in its use of dialogue. Following his teacher's advice, Futabatei took various ideas from *rakugo* and created a whole new writing style adopting the 'da/de-aru' form.

At the same period of time, Bimyo Yamada employed in his novels the 'desu/masu' form, the polite form for ending sentences. Nevertheless, what became the new standard as a writing style for novels was not Yamada's 'desu/masu' honorific spoken language form, but Futabatei's 'da/de-aru' written language form. The reason why authors and critics thereafter chose Futabatei's form over Yamada's form is likely connected to the profound impact that Futabatei's translation of Turgenev had upon the literary world in Japan.

Even at the present time, Japanese still retain both forms: 'da/de-aru' and 'desu/masu'.

The fact that 'da/de-aru' form became dominant in Japanese literature does not however mean that there have been no Japanese novels with 'desu/masu' form. Generally speaking, it is considered more proper to unify one's form to either 'desu/masu' or 'da/de-aru', and students are instructed so in the education system. However writer Saiichi Maruya has produced works which deliberately mix the two forms to make the text look more vivid. Thus, the translation of "First Love" by Numano is not especially ground breaking; rather it just slightly deviates from the conventions of modern Japanese novels. This does not mean, of course, that all works of Turgenev should be translated using only the honorific spoken style; however, in the case of "First Love", I think the literary piece itself calls out for the 'desu/masu' form to act as its flesh after attaining its afterlife, to take the Walter Benjamin term, in Japanese.

The Case of The Overcoat

The last piece I wish to cover is the new translation of Gogol's "The Overcoat" by Masaharu Ura. This can be considered a rather experimental attempt because, while Futabatei took various ideas from *rakugo* to create a new writing style for novels, Ura translated the work using a style much closer to the narrative of *rakugo* itself. When reading Ura's translation, one can even imagine a *rakugo* storyteller in a kimono kneeling on a cushion telling a comical story to an audience.

The new translation of "The Overcoat" with its narrative style unique to the Japanese traditional art might seem to be in complete opposition to the new translation of "The Brothers Karamazov", which uses modern language, and could be considered a regression into the past. Although *rakugo* uses distinctive vocabulary, tone, and intonation used by the common people in the Edo-period, *rakugo* and Gogol's works are very compatible. The translation, rather than sounding out-dated, feels novel and has rhythmic flow, and can therefore be said to have succeeded as a new original translation.

Why was this possible? This can be explained by the presence of a common methodology in the distinctive narrative of Gogol's literary works and in that of *rakugo*.

In "How Gogol's "Overcoat" is Made" (1919), Russian formalist Boris Eikhenbaum analysed Gogol's narrative style, *skaz*, in detail and pointed out that Gogol's works had some auditory

features such as illogicality, plays on words, puns, obsession with names with strange sounds, and the impressions of words. Russian formalists, who played an active role in the early 20th century, considered that what makes literary works literature was not the authors' intentions or thoughts but their devices. They claimed that literary works are creations, or independent worlds, that are assemblages of various devices. According to Eikhenbaum, one of the most outstanding devices of Gogol's works is his *skaz* narrative style.

In the world of *rakugo*, on the other hand, it is also important to make the audience laugh through the art of story-telling. This implies the skilful use of plays on words, puns, and a command over the impressions given by the spoken word. There are even stories whose central theme is that of strange names. Thus, Gogol and *rakugo* are strikingly similar in their narrative style that places emphasis on phonetic characteristics. By being placed meaninglessly, words can become free of their meaning, going on to become mere sounds with their own particular phonetic features. This is quite similar to the use of zaum, a transrational language, used by Russian avant-garde, especially Russian Futurist poets.

Taku Egawa, a scholar of Russian literary works, was the first to notice this resemblance between Gogol's works and *rakugo* and translated Gogol by imitating *rakugo* in its style. Egawa published the *rakugo*-style translation of "The Overcoat" in 1984. In its postscript, Egawa wrote that he was impressed by Eikhenbaum's comment, pointing out that the scene in which a name is given to the main character in "The Overcoat" was made rather humorous thanks to the phonetic features of the words, even though the words themselves do not make any sense semantically. Egawa also mentioned the funny names such as Mokky or Sossy that come up in The Overcoat as candidates for the name of its main character; they were completely uncommon even in Gogol's time. In fact, this is also quite similar to the famous *rakugo* number *Hirabayashi*, in which funny-sounding names such as Mockmokk or Tockicky appear [12, p. 71]. This shows, therefore, that Egawa did not translate Gogol by imitating *rakugo* style on a whim, but rather with the conviction, based on interpretations of Gogol by formalists, that it was inevitable to do so. Conversely, *rakugo*-style translation does not go well unless the original work has a strongly individualistic narrative style such as those works in which there is ostentatious display of phonetic play, nonsensical punning, and repeated digressions from the subject.

However Egawa's *rakugo*-imitating translation failed to catch the eye of the general public, and consequently did not achieve much popularity.

Ura went on to develop Egawa's translation further and created his own style. Ura's translation style for "The Overcoat" is evidently different from that of Mizuho Yokota, who adopted a standard literary style for his translation.

"Фамилия чиновника была Башмачкин. Уже по самому имени видно, что она когда-то произошла от башмака; но когда, в какое время и каким образом произошла она от башмака, ничего этого не известно. И отец, и дед, и даже шурин, и все совершенно Башмачкины ходили в сапогах, переменяя только раза три в год подметки. Имя его было Акакий Акакиевич. Может быть, читателю оно покажется несколько странным и выисканным, но можно уверить, что его никак не искали, а что сами собою случились такие обстоятельства, что никак нельзя было дать другого имени, и это произошло именно вот как" [13, p. 116–117].

この役人の姓は、バシマチキンというのであった。すでにこの呼び名でもわかるとおり、この姓は、いつのころにかバシマーク（短靴）からでてきたものにちがいないが、しかしいつ、いかなる時代に、またどんなふうにしてそれがバシマークからでてきたかは――とんと見当がつかぬ。とにかく、父親も、祖父も、いや細君の兄弟さえも、バシマチキン一家の者は一人残らずみなサパギー（長靴）のほうを履いて歩きまわっていたが、それも一年にせいぜい三度ぐらいしか底革の張替えをしなかったものである。彼の名前は、アカーキイ・アカーキエヴィチといった。おそらく読者には、この名前はいささか珍妙にひびき、わざわざ捜しだしてきてつけたのだと思われるかもしれぬが、それはけっして捜しだしてきてつけたりしたのではなく、いたって自然にそうなったのであり、ほかの名前をつけることはなんとしてもできなかったのだということを、ここではっきりと申しあげておきたい、ではなぜこんな珍妙な名前につけられることになったのかといえば、こんなわけからなのだ。[14, p. 194].

お役人の名前はてえと、バシマチキン。この名を見ただけで、やっこさんの名字がに由来するってことがわかります。それはそうなんですが、じゃあ、いついかなる時に、どんな具合にこの名字が短靴から発生したのかについちゃあ皆目わからない。親父も爺さんも姉婿も、要するにバシマチキン家の連中は、年に三度ばかり靴底を張り替えるだけで、年がら年中長靴をはいてあるきまわっているんですから、わけがわからない。で、名前のほうはってえと、アカーキー・アカーキエヴィチ。お読みになっている読者のなかには、そりゃ変な名前だ、なんだか取って付けたような名前だねとおっしゃる方がいらっしゃるかもしれませんが、これ、別段凝って付けたわけじゃございません。どうあってもほかの名にすることが出来ない事情があったんです。[15, p. 70–71].

Ura's translation made full use of those characteristics unique to the narrative style of "The Overcoat", thus resulting in a vivid, lively sounding narration. Contrary to Kimura's translation that impacts a more serious impression on readers, Ura's translation is extremely expressive in its narrative, making suggestive allusions to the reader at times, while at others seeming to play innocent, effectively giving it the exact same distinctive sound as that of "The Overcoat". Also, Ura's use of both 'da/de-aru' and 'desu/masu' form at the end of sentences provides the narrative with a pleasing sense of variation.

As *rakugo* is a traditional art, it is inevitable that its narrative style will at times sound old-fashioned when used in the present day. However, adoption of such a style for translation does not necessarily mean the final product will result in something that seems out-dated or inferior. Rather, translators can use this framework to inject fresh spirit and style, resulting in innovative and creative translation.

For instance, Jeremy Munday, a translation theorist, speaking of Ezra Pound, stated that "in his translations, (he) sought to escape from the rigid strait-jacket of the Victorian/Edwardian English tradition by experimenting with an archaicizing (and not necessarily clear) style which Venuti links to his own foregnizing strategy" [16, p. 167]. Pound intentionally made full use of English prior to the Elizabeth era in order to translate Italian poems written in the 13th century. Although this translation did not likely gain a large readership, it made a valuable contribution as a creative experiment in translation.

Translating Gogol's works by imitating *rakugo* in its style was also a creative experiment just as Pound undertook in his archaic-style translation. By translating the work with the extra essence of *rakugo* uncommonly seen in novels, they, as Russian formalists would say, defamiliarized ordinary Japanese which had been automatized as a writing style for novels. As this example shows, when translating foreign cultures, translators will always carry over foreign landscapes and foreign ways of thinking into the target language; however at the same time, it is possible for them to seek out other possibilities for translation by adopting different writing styles.

Conclusion

We have observed translation strategies adopted in three different Russian novels newly retranslated into Japanese.

The new translation of "The Brothers Karamazov" by Kameyama aimed at gaining a wider readership of Dostoevsky among Japanese. For the convenience of readers, Kameyama added detailed notes in his translation about not only the background of the novel but also the Eastern Orthodox Church, education system, currency, censorship, social classes, judicature, and police system of the time in which the novel was set. After the translation of "The Brothers Karamazov" was published, "Crime and Punishment" and "Demons" followed, and he also published several books on Dostoevsky. In so doing, Kameyama has laid out various possibilities for interpreting Dostoevsky's works. For Kameyama, who it is said claims that his mission is to promote a better understanding of Dostoevsky among Japanese, the translation of "The Brothers Karamazov" seems to have been the first step towards that goal.

The new translation of "First Love" by Numano adopted the polite spoken form for ending sentences, the 'desu/masu' form, which has been rarely seen in Japanese novels. Most readers felt that overall the novel carried a softer impression due to the use of this uncommon form. More than 100 years ago, Shimei Futabatei, after wavering for some time eventually adopted the 'da/de-aru' form of written language for his translation, but if he had ended up choosing the 'desu/masu' form, it begs the question, would the standard form for novels now rather be 'desu/masu'? If those who read "First Love" give even a passing thought to this possible alternative history for Japanese literature, nothing could give me greater pleasure.

Ura's new translation for "The Overcoat" was a new trial imitating *rakugo* in its style based on the features of Gogol's narration style. There may be nothing that seems more further apart than Russian literature and Japanese traditional performing art; however, Ura's efforts, with his skilled sense of wording, worked pleasantly well, and the translation is an outstandingly good match for Gogol. This experiment was a delightful surprise for Japanese readers, and should be highly acclaimed as a valiant challenge to seek new alternative possibilities of writing style for Japanese novels by defamiliarizing its style.

These three vastly different endeavors together comprise an important part in the history of translation of Russian literature into Japanese, which has for over 100 years now actively sought out ever more new possibilities in translation.

Bibliography

1. Venuti L. Translation Changes Everything: Theory and Practice / Lawrence Venuti. – London and New York: Routledge, 2013. – 271 p.

2. Достоевский Ф.М. Полное собрание сочинений: в 30 т. / Ф.М. Достоевский. – Л.: Наука, 1976. – Т. 14. – 512 с.

3. Dostoevsky F. Karamazofu no kyodai: in 5 vol. / F. Dostoevsky / Trans. Ikuo Kameyama. – Tokyo: Kobunsha, 2006. – Vol. 2. – 501 p.

4. Heilbrun C.G. The Garnett Family / Carolyn G. Heilbrun. – New York: The Macmillan Company, 1961. – 214 p.

5. May R. The Translator in the Text: on Reading Russian Literature in English / Rachel May. – Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1994. – 209 p.

6. Venuti L. The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation / Lawrence Venuti. – London and New York: Routledge, 1995. – 365 p.

7. Turgenev I. Hatsukoi / I. Turgenev / Trans. Kyoko Numano. – Tokyo: Kobunsha, 2006. – 184 p.

8. Kawamura J., Ikeuchi O. Honyaku no Nihongo / Jiro Kawamura, Osamu Ikeuchi. – Tokyo: Chuokoron-sha, 2000. – 404 p.

9. Тургенев И.С. Полное собрание сочинений и писем: в 28 т. / И.С. Тургенев. – М.-Л.: Издательство Академии наук СССР, 1963. – Т. 4. – 614 с.

10. Futabatei S. Futabatei Shimei zenshu: in 8 vol. / Shimei Futabatei. – Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1985. – Vol. 2. – 624 p.

11. Futabatei S. Futabatei Shimei zenshu: in 8 vol. / Shimei Futabatei. – Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1985. – Vol. 4. – 491 p.

12. Egawa T. Gaito – Rakugo yaku no kokoromi / Taku Egawa // Sovieto bungaku. – 1984. – № 87. – P. 34–71.

13. Гоголь Н.В. Собрание сочинений: в 7 т. / Н.В. Гоголь. – М.: Художественная литература, 1977. – Т. 3. – 304 с.

14. Gogol N. Gogori zenshu: in 7 vol. / N. Gogol / Trans. Midzuho Yokota. –Tokyo: Kawade Shobo Shinsha, 1976. – Vol. 3. – 394 p.

15. Gogol N. Hana, Gaito, Sasatsukan / N. Gogol / Trans. Masaharu Ura. –Tokyo: Kobunsha, 2006. – 372 p.

16. Munday J. Introducing Translation Studies / Jeremy Munday. – London and New York: Routledge, 2008. – 256 p.

THE JAPANESE TRANSLATIONS OF RUSSIAN LITERATURE: DOSTOEVSKY, TURGENEV AND GOGOL

Kyoko Numano, Tokyo State University of Foreign Studies (Japan). E-mail: nukyoko@wmail.plala.or.jp

DOI: 10.32342/2523-4463-2018-2-16-8

Key words: *translation, Russian Literature, Japanese, rakugo, Dostoevsky, Turgenev, Gogol.*

This paper focuses on three Japanese translations of Russian literary works of Dostoevsky, Turgenev and Gogol, and examines the characteristics and issues concerning each piece.

The new translation of Dostoevsky's novel, The Brothers Karamazov, translated by Ikuo Kameyama, puts readability above all else. Foreignization, taking the Lawrence Venuti term, has been commonly adopted as a translation strategy in Japan. However in Kameyama's new translation one can arguably say the method used is that of domestication. Contrary to this, Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky took a foreignization approach in their new English translation of Dostoevsky's works, despite the fact that Constance Garnett, the most renowned translator of Russian literature into English originally employed the domestication approach. This shows that Japanese translations of Russian literature are exhibiting a shift in the opposite direction to English translations.

The Japanese translation of Turgenev's short novel, First Love, translated by Kyoko Numano, is distinctive in its use of the 'desu/masu' form instead of 'da/de-aru', which is usually adopted in Japanese novels. Put briefly, these are two different forms used to end sentences: the former is used in honorific spoken language and the latter in written language. Previously, Japanese was in "diglossia"; in other words, there was a large gap between the more classical literary style and the colloquial style. In the Meiji period, however, FUTABATEI Shimei made an attempt at unifying the two language forms by employing a colloquial style in his novel Ukigumo, and again in his translation of Turgenev's short story, Meeting.

The Japanese translation of Gogol's short story, The Overcoat, translated by Masaharu Ura clearly imitates rakugo in its style. Prior to this, Taku Egawa, after reading the article 'How Gogol's "Overcoat" is Made' by Russian formalist Boris Eikhenbaum, found that Gogol's style exhibited aspects common to rakugo, and made attempts at translation using the unique style. Ura then took over the inclination, and in doing so was able to skillfully draw out Gogol's distinctive narrative. Although the storytelling of rakugo sounds archaic today, Ezra Pound once intentionally translated Italian poems into English using an archaic style. This suggests that it is possible for archaic, peripheral translations to, on the contrary, be viewed as new and creative in form.

References

1. Venuti, L. Translation Changes Everything: Theory and Practice. London and New York, Routledge, 2013, 271 p.

2. Dostoevskij, F.M. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenij: v 30 t.* [The Complete Works: in 30 vol.]. Leningrad, Nauka Publ., 1976, vol. 14, 512 p.

3. Dostoevsky, F. *Karamazofu no kyodai: in 5 vol.* [The Brothers Karamazov: in 5 vol.]. Trans. Ikuo Kameyama. Tokyo, Kobunsha Publ., 2006, vol. 2, 501 p.

4. Heilbrun, C.G. The Garnett Family. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1961, 214 p.

5. May, R. The Translator in the Text: on Reading Russian Literature in English. Evanston, Illinois, Northwestern University Press, 1994, 209 p.

6. Venuti, L. The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation. London and New York, Routledge, 1995, 365 p.

7. Turgenev, I. *Hatsukoi* [First Love]. Trans. Kyoko Numano. Tokyo, Kobunsha Publ., 2006, 184 p.

8. Kawamura, J., Ikeuchi, O. *Honyaku no Nihongo* [Japanese in translation]. Tokyo, Chuokoron-sha Publ., 2000, 404 p.

9. Turgenev, I.S. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenij i pisem: v 28 t.* [The Complete Works and Letters: in 28 vol.]. Moscow, Leningrad, Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR Publ., 1963, vol. 4, 614 p.

10. Futabatei, S. *Futabatei Shimei zenshu: in 8 vol.* [Complete Edition by Shimei Futabatei: in 8 vol.]. Tokyo, Chikuma Shobo Publ., 1985, vol. 2, 624 p.

11. Futabatei, S. *Futabatei Shimei zenshu: in 8 vol.* [Complete Edition by Shimei Futabatei: in 8 vol.]. Tokyo, Chikuma Shobo Publ., 1985, vol. 4, 491 p.

12. Egawa, T. *Gaito – Rakugo yaku no kokoromi* [Overcoat – attempt of translation in rakugo-style]. *Sovieto bungaku* [Soviet Literature], 1984, no. 87, pp. 34-71.

13. Gogol, N.V. *Sobranie sochinenij: v 7 t.* [Complete Edition: in 7 vol.]. Moscow, Hudozhestvennaja literatura Publ., 1977, vol. 3, 304 p.

14. Gogol, N. *Gogori zenshu: in 7 vol.* [Complete Edition: in 7 vol.]. Trans. Midzuho Yokota. Tokyo, Kawade Shobo Shinsha Publ., 1976, vol. 3, 394 p.

15. Gogol, N. *Hana. Gaito. Sasatsukan* [The Nose. The Overcoat. The Government Inspector]. Trans. Masaharu Ura. Tokyo, Kobunsha Publ., 2006, 372 p.

16. Munday, J. Introducing Translation Studies. London and New York, Routledge, 2008, 256 p.

Одержано 21.09.2018.