THE *MUGEN* NOH STRUCTURE IN TRANSLATION: A STUDY OF TWO ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF TANIZAKI JUN'ICHIRŌ'S *ASHIKARI*[1]

Rihito Mitsui
Waseda University

Introduction

Ashikari 蘆刈 (*The Reed Cutter*) by Tanizaki Jun'ichirō 谷崎潤一郎 (1886–1965) has been translated into English twice. This is unusual for the author's works, except for *Shisei* 刺青 (*The Tattooer*) and *Shunkinshō* 春琴抄 (*The Story of Shunkin* or *A Portrait of Shunkin*). The case of *Ashikari* is worth examining because the two versions were translated and published in contrasting contexts. The first translation, by Okita Hajime 沖田一 (1905–1985) and Roy Humpherson (dates unknown), was titled *Ashikari* and published alongside *The Story of Shunkin* in 1936 by Japanese publisher Hokuseidō Press 北星堂書店, in a book named *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin: Modern Japanese Novels*. In the 1930s, modern Japanese novels were mostly translated by Japanese, sometimes working alongside native English speakers, but they did not prevail as much as Noh plays in the English-speaking world. The second translation, by Anthony H. Chambers, was titled *The Reed Cutter*, and it appeared with another of Tanizaki's works, *Shōshō shigemoto no haha* 少将滋幹の母 (*Captain Shigemoto's Mother*), in a book published in 1994 by a major American publisher, Alfred A. Knopf, named *The Reed Cutter and Captain Shigemoto's Mother: Two Novellas*. This translation was produced in the 1990s when contemporary Japanese authors such as Murakami Haruki 村上春樹 (1949–) had gained recognition in the United States beyond the stereotyped image of modern Japanese literature fixed by the works of Tanizaki, Kawabata Yasunari 川端康成 (1899–1972), and Mishima Yukio 三島由紀夫 (1925–1970) during the 1950s and 1960s. The present essay compares these two translations of *Ashikari* to show how the different contexts influenced the translated text itself.

[1] Author's Note: I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Michael Emmerich, Dr. Satoko Shimazaki, and Dr. David Lurie for their insightful comments as well as to Dr. Matías Chiappe Ippolito for his editorial suggestions. This work is supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) Grant-in-Aid for Fellows Grant Number JP20J12553.

The study begins by outlining the background of each translation in terms of the translators and publishers. This study considers the purpose of the publication and the target audience by analyzing the materials accompanying the translation. Gérard Genette's notion of "paratext" is useful for examining this issue. According to Genette, paratexts accompanying the text, such as the author's name, title, preface, and illustrations, certify the existence, reception, and consumption of the text in the form of a book.[2] Paratexts are composed of peritexts, which are paratexts that exist in the same volume of a book, and epitexts, which are all other paratexts except for peritexts.[3] The peritexts studied in this article include a foreword, a glossary, footnotes by translators, and a dust jacket produced by publishers. The epitexts analyzed in this article comprise translators' memoirs and academic papers, publishers' advertising materials, and reviews published in magazines and newspapers. By focusing on the paratexts, this study compares the translation strategies of the two versions of *Ashikari*.

Another key factor in this study is how the classical *mugen* Noh structure, to which *Ashikari* can be compared, was transferred in each translation. The reading of this structure in the novella presupposes that while the narrator depicts the landscape as *waki* (the supporting actors of a Noh play), the other man tells his father's love story as *shite* (the main actor). The major reason why critics see this structure in Tanizaki's novella is that it not only clarifies the roles of the characters but also compensates for the other man's vanishing in the ending. This article argues that the visibility of the translation and the translator emphasized by the paratexts, which connects the reader to the original culture, evokes the *mugen* Noh structure even further. In addition, this examination proposes a new conception of the translator as *waki*. Thus, this case study explores the role of the translator from a different perspective than that of the so-called linguistic equivalence between the original and the translated text by considering the input of translators of *mugen* Noh.

***Ashikari*, *Mugen* Noh Structure, and Invisibility**

Tanizaki's *Ashikari* was serialized in November and December 1932 in the magazine *Kaizō* 改造. In April 1933, it appeared in book form with 500 limited copies produced by the offset printing of Tanizaki's

---

[2] Gérard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, trans., Jane E. Lewin (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 1.
[3] Ibid., 4–5.

handwriting. This edition was titled *Jun'ichirō jihitsubon Ashikari* 潤一郎自筆本蘆刈 (*The Reed Cutter: Jun'ichirō's Handwriting Edition*). Regarding such a specific printing format, Tanizaki wrote, in his essay "Sōtei mandan" 装幀漫談 ("Rambling about Book Design"), published in *Yomiuri Shimbun* on June 16th and 17th, 1933, that a literary work consists not only of content but also of form and format, such as the book design, paper quality, and typeset.[4] The handwritten edition, bound in Japanese style and produced with *ganpishi* (traditional Japanese paper), shows Tanizaki's commitment to form and format and evokes classical Japanese writing. Equally important to the history of its publication, it must also be mentioned that *Ashikari* was included together with *Kaoyo* 顔世 in the first edition of the novella *Shunkinshō*, published in December 1933 by Sōgensha 創元社.

Ashikari begins with the narrator's visit to the Minase Shrine on a September evening. While strolling, he recalls the world of classical works, such as *Masukagami* 増鏡. Then, while reciting poetry and drinking *sake* beside the Yodo river, the narrator hears a sudden rustle in the reeds and realizes that a man is sitting beside him. After offering him *sake*, this man tells the narrator about his father's love story. According to the man in the reeds, his father, Seribashi Shinnosuke, had fallen in love with a widow from a wealthy family named Oyū and wished to marry her. However, Shinnosuke noticed that he would not be able to do so because Oyū had already had a baby with her deceased husband, and her relatives did not want a quick remarriage because of the customs at that time; instead, he married her younger sister, Oshizu. However, Oshizu knew that Shinnosuke and Oyū loved each other, so she suggested to Shinnosuke that the two of them remain chaste to be faithful to Oyū. After Oyū's baby passed away, she remarried amid rumors of the relationship between her and Shinnosuke. In the end, the man in the reeds reveals to the narrator that he is the son of Oshizu. Once the narrator asks the man whether Oyū is nearly eighty years old, the latter vanishes.

This unexpected ending stimulated discussions among critics such as Kōno Taeko and Hata Kōhei about who the man in the reeds really is.[5] Also, the structure of the work was often likened to the *mugen* Noh form. *Mugen* Noh is a way of classifying plays "featuring deities, the spirits of

[4] Tanizaki Jun'ichirō, "Sōtei mandan: Jō," *Yomiuri Shimbun*, June 16, 1933.
[5] Kōno Taeko, "Kaisetsu," in Tanizaki Jun'ichirō, *Ashikari, Manji* (Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha, 1985), 286–287, Hata Kōhei, *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō* (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1989), 139–140.

plants and animals, and the ghosts of humans,"[6] in contrast with *genzai* Noh, which "refers to plays featuring people alive in the dramatic present."[7] From the perspective of *mugen* Noh, the narrator in Tanizaki's *Ashikari* assumes the role of *waki*, the "secondary role in noh,"[8] while the man in the reeds plays the role of *shite*, "Literally, doer; refers to the main role in noh, kyōgen, and early kabuki."[9] Particularly, Mikame Tatsuji first highlighted the relationship between *Ashikari* and Noh in 1973, around forty years after its publication. Mikame argues that *Ashikari*'s structure can never be separated from that of *nogaku*, one of the two traditional styles of Japanese theatre together with *kyōgen*.[10] According to Mikame, the narrator appears as *waki*. This character first refers to the purpose of his stroll. Then, in the manner of *michiyuki* (the lyric composition of a traveler describing the scenery throughout a journey), he also describes the landscape and sites seen on the way to his destination. The man in the reeds, however, appears as *shite*. He tells the narrator the story of his father, then vanishes. Mikame concludes that this ending, which evokes *mugen* Noh, leaves Oyū in the world of beauty for eternity, generating a modern *Nohgaku* world.[11]

Many critics agree that *Ashikari* resembles the *mugen* Noh structure. Noguchi Takehiko argues that the man vanishes after recounting his delusion of a beautiful woman in a way typical of *mugen* Noh and adds that he might actually be the spirit of the narrator's obsession with an ideal woman.[12] Hata Kōhei claims that *Ashikari* has a *mugen* Noh structure in which the main topic

---

[6] Karen Brazell, ed., "Glossary of Theatrical Terminology and Index to Illustrations," in *Traditional Japanese Theater: An Anthology of Plays* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 539.
[7] Ibid., 529.
[8] Ibid., 548.
[9] Ibid., 545.
[10] Mikame Tatsuji, "Tanizaki no 'Ashikari' ni okeru nōgaku teki kōsei," *Kaishaku* 19/7 (1973), 40. This text is reprinted, with revisions, in Mikame Tatsuji, *Kindai bungaku no tenkyo: Kyōka to Jun'ichirō* (Tokyo: Kasama shoin, 1974), 142. According to Mikame, Amino Kiku's article is the only study to refer to the connection between Tanizaki's *Ashikari* and Noh. Amino suggests that *Ashikari* was inspired by Noh. See Amino Kiku, "'Ashikari' sonota," *Tenbō* 49 (1950), 106–108.
[11] Mikame, *Kindai bungaku no tenkyo*, 159.
[12] Noguchi Takehiko, *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō ron* (Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha, 1973), 206.

is the man in the reeds' love toward his mother, who is Oyū rather than Oshizu, and that the narrator plays the role of *waki*.[13] As Hata indicates, the sympathy and affection that the narrator feels for the lady of Eguchi when recalling Zeami's play *Eguchi*, in which the *shite* transforms into the bodhisattva Samantabhadra and vanishes in the moonlight of the western skies, enhances the dreamlike effect in *Ashikari*.[14] Another factor in considering that *Ashikari* has a *mugen* Noh structure is that its *bunkobon* – the Japanese paperback edition, which is most readily available today – includes Chiba Shunji's commentary explaining that *Ashikari* is based on the aforementioned Noh play *Eguchi,* which itself has the *mugen* Noh form.[15]

The poet, novelist, and translator Ikezawa Natsuki, in his commentary following Tanizaki's volume of the best-selling *Nihon bungaku zenshū*, a series of collected works of Japanese literature edited by Ikezawa himself, mentions that the man's vanishing into the darkness of time bears a resemblance to the composition of *mugen* Noh.[16] In a recent study, Shibata Shōji writes that the man in the reeds gets possessed by the spirit of Shinnosuke in a way typical to the *mugen* Noh structure.[17] Through the lens of these critics and commentators, *Ashikari*'s *mugen* Noh structure assigns the man in the reeds the role of the protagonist as *shite* and the narrator that of the listener as *waki*. This structure also suggests that Shinnosuke appears as a ghost whose spirit has transcended and taken over the man in the reeds. It also transforms *Ashikari* into a requiem for the man or his father, whom the narrator himself mourns, hence emphasizing the idea of freeing the spirits of the dead.

However, critics such as Ōishi Naoki reject the clear *mugen* Noh structure and argue that the man in the reeds' story is a fantasy that the narrator is imagining.[18] According to Ōishi, the narrator views not the actual

---

[13] Hata, *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō*, 139–140.
[14] Ibid., 186.
[15] Chiba Shunji, "Kaisetsu," in Tanizaki Jun'ichirō, *Yoshinokuzu, Ashikari* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1986), 168–169.
[16] Ikezawa Natsuki, "Kaisetsu," in Tanizaki Jun'ichirō, *Ikezawa Natsuki kojin henshū nihon bungaku zenshū 15: Tanizaki Jun'ichirō* (Tokyo: Kawade shobō shinsha, 2016), 481.
[17] Shibata Shōji, *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō: Bi to seimei no aida* (Tokyo: Bensei shuppan, 2021), 197.
[18] Ōishi Naoki, "'Kindai' teki jikan tono kōsō, aruiwa, 'biteki moderune' mondai," *Bungaku geijutsu* 31 (2008), 7.

site of the Minase Shrine but an illusion he has created by reading *Masukagami* and Gotoba's poetry, so the place where the man in the reeds appears is also part of the narrator's inner vision.[19] Hence, in this reading, the existence of the man in the reeds embodies the narrator's conception of the odd relationship between Shinnosuke, Oyū, and Oshizu. This structure disregards the man in the reeds' identity, whether Shinnosuke and Oyū had a relationship or not, and the issue of the man's sudden vanishing in the ending. Instead, it presents the narrator as the protagonist of *Ashikari*, which is contrary to that of reading it within the *mugen* Noh structure.

This second approach shows that *Ashikari* offers distinct reading experiences that vary with the interpretation of the structure. Along those lines, the two translators interpreted *Ashikari*'s structure differently. The translator of the 1936 version, Okita Hajime, mentions in a short epitext the memory of his co-translator, Roy Humpherson, and that the story is the narrator's fantasy from the middle that the narrative suddenly comes back to reality at the end.[20] Although the description of the stroll is the narrator's actual experience, the man in the reeds, Shinnosuke, Oyū, and Oshizu are part of the narrator's imagination. Then again, the 1994 translator, Anthony H. Chambers, clarified in an epitext, this time an academic book he published in the same year as *The Reed Cutter*, that: "[t]he structure of Tanizaki's *The Reed Cutter* is close to that of *Eguchi*. It is hard to know which play or plays served as a model for the novella, but *Eguchi* is a likely candidate, and in any case, it is clear that Tanizaki borrowed and adapted the *mugen* nō structure."[21] In the next section, this study examines how these different interpretations affect the translated texts. The first translation portrays the fantasy of an ideal love concocted by the narrator, who can be identified with Tanizaki, while the second translation depicts the requiem for the deceased who longed for the loved one, at the end of which the narrator, as *waki*, liberates the spirit of the man, who serves as *shite*. This contrast shows that, depending on the translation strategy, the focus of the novella shifts.

It must be added that the *mugen* Noh structure is related to the issue of invisibility because the narrator never actually sees Shinnosuke, Oyū, or Oshizu, who exist only in the recount of the man in the reeds, and also because the man vanishes in the ending. The *mugen* Noh structure makes this

---

[19] Ibid., 17 and 20.
[20] Okita Hajime, "Gyotaku," *Bungaku seishin* 1 (1950), 44.
[21] Anthony Hood Chambers, *The Secret Window: Ideal Worlds in Tanizaki's Fiction* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 47.

disruption in the realistic narrative acceptable, compensating for both forms of invisibility. However, the issue of invisibility is further complicated in translation because the *mugen* Noh structure relies on familiarity with Noh among the target language culture. This, in turn, requires the translator to be more present in the translated text.

The concept of "invisibility" in translation was coined by Lawrence Venuti. Venuti uses the term "to describe the translator's situation and activity in contemporary Anglo-American culture."[22] He laments that a translated text is typically valued for its fluency, which makes the translation seem "not in fact a translation, but the 'original' and creates 'the illusion of transparency.'"[23] Venuti argues that this situation causes "a domesticating practice, an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to receiving cultural values, bringing the author back home," and instead advocates for "a foreignizing practice, an ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad."[24] Venuti emphasizes that domestication and foreignization are not binary opposites but "ethical effects" in translation.[25] Foreignization entails ethical resistance to the dominant style, discourse, and text selection, based on the relationship between the source language culture and the target language culture in the Anglo-American framework. For this reason, in Venuti's view, the translator's visibility starts from an implicit assumption that one culture is superior to another and indicates said translator's resistance to the hegemonic culture.

However, this article understands the terms visibility/invisibility in a different sense than Venuti. The focus is neither fluency in the text nor resisting the asymmetrical relationship between the original and receiving culture. In this study, these terms refer to how and to what extent the translator participates at the paratextual level in the interpretation of the translated text. The translator's visibility also shows that the work is indeed a translation and makes the *mugen* Noh structure likewise visible. Ultimately, an approach to the translations that regards *Ashikari* as a novella with a *mugen* Noh structure invites us to consider the translator's role as *waki*. In

[22] Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2008). Reissued in Routledge Translation Classics series, 2018, 1.
[23] Ibid.
[24] Ibid., 15.
[25] Ibid., xiv.

such a light, the translation itself is a metaphor of *mugen* Noh in the sense that it summons the original in a different form and releases its spirit into the receiving culture. In the 1936 translation by Okita Hajime and Roy Humpherson, the translators step back to let the author move forward. They do this by rewriting the structure without adding detailed information. In the 1994 translation by Anthony H. Chambers, the translator steps forward to make the translation visible and to move the reader to the original culture, accompanying the author and helping him in a sort of performance. This contrast arises from the variation in the visibility of the translators and the reception of Japanese literature in different contexts. The next section further examines the backgrounds of the two translations.

Contrasting Conceptions of Japanese Literature in the 1930s and 1990s

Ashikari was first translated into English in Shanghai by the aforementioned Okita Hajime, a Japanese scholar of American literature who studied the history of Shanghai, and Roy Humpherson, an ex-British Army captain.[26] Okita was a teacher of English in Shanghai Kyoryū Mindanritsu Nihon Kōtō Jogakkō 上海居留民団立日本高等女学校 (Girls' High School for Japanese Residents in Shanghai), and Humpherson moved to that city after working at the British Embassy in Tokyo. According to Okita, he chose *Ashikari* and *Shunkinshō* as the source texts because he regarded the novellas as appropriate for introducing Japanese literary works and culture outside Japan, though he claimed that it would be almost impossible to fit Tanizaki to anglophone literary tastes.[27] In Japan, the translation was published by Hokuseidō Press, an editorial house that dealt mainly with English-language textbooks and introductory books about Japan. In the press catalog, a page of *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin* has a catchphrase that says: "[The] Most Exquisite Japanese Novels of Today!"[28] These epitexts show that *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin* was published with the specific purpose of introducing Japanese literature and culture in a new context. The peritexts

---

[26] I have referred to Okita, Humpherson and Hokuseidō Press in my study on the translations of *Shunkinshō*: Rihito Mitsui, "Narrative Structure in Two English Translations of Tanizaki Jun'ichirō's *Shunkinshō*," *Bulletin of the Graduate Division of Letters, Arts and Sciences of Waseda University* 66 (2021): 797–824.

[27] Okita, "Gyotaku," 43.

[28] Hokuseidō Press, *Hokuseidō shuppan tosho sō mokuroku* (Tokyo: Hokuseidō Press, 1938).

within the translation support this intention. The "Biographical Note" explains that Tanizaki's style has "a peculiar charm for foreign readers by virtue of its literary 'purity' and freedom from Western influence."[29] Also, the translators include a map of the Kansai area and the setting of the work at the beginning of *Ashikari*, and they offer a glossary to explain Japanese terms at the back of the book. The paratexts clarify that the translation was produced to benefit readers unfamiliar with Tanizaki and Japanese culture.

It must be mentioned that *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin* did not have a major impact in Japan, though prior to its English publication, there was a debate on whether *Shunkinshō* should be translated at all.[30] *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin* was, however, well-received in Shanghai. According to Okita, the translations sold well, which gave Humpherson a reputation as a translator and provided him with a position in charge of the literary reviews in *The North-China Daily News*.[31] With regards to the book's reception in the English-speaking world, Donald Keene (1922–2019) argues that *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin* was obscure in the United Kingdom and the United States because it was published in Tokyo.[32] However, a review did appear in *The Times Literary Supplement* in 1936,[33] mentioned in the latter part of this essay when analyzing translation strategies.

In the 1930s, British and American presses rarely published translations of modern Japanese novels. Noh, however, with its supernatural structure and poetic perspective, was well-received by modernist writers of the early twentieth century, such as Ezra Pound (1885–1972) and William Butler Yeats (1865–1939). After Marie Stopes' (1880–1958) 1913 publication of *Plays of Old Japan: The Noh*, the first book focusing on Noh plays and their translations, another influential volume, *"Noh," or,*

---

[29] Roy Humpherson and Hajime Okita, "Biographical Note," in Tanizaki Jun'ichirō, *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin: Modern Japanese Novels* (Tokyo: Hokuseidō Press, 1936b), iv.

[30] Mitsui, "Narrative Structure in Two English Translations of Tanizaki Jun'ichirō's *Shunkinshō*," 807.

[31] Okita, "Gyotaku," 45.

[32] Donald Keene, "Kaigai Tade kū mushi," in Tanizaki Jun'ichirō, *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō zenshū dai jūroku kan: Furoku jūni* (Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha, 1958), 1.

[33] John Otway Percy Bland, "Japanese Character," review of *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin*, by Jun'ichirō Tanizaki, trans. Roy Humpherson and Hajime Okita, *The Times Literary Supplement*, 1820, December 19, 1936.

Accomplishment: A Study of the Classical Stage of Japan, was released in 1916 by Ernest Fenollosa (1853–1908) and Pound.[34] Although Pound notes that "[t]he vision and the plan are Fenollosa's" and that "[i]n the prose I have had but the part of literary executor,"[35] his stylistic contribution to the translation was significant. T. S. Eliot (1888–1965) wrote an essay, "The Noh and the Image," in which he calls Pound and Fenollosa's work "a textbook" because of Fenollosa's notes; he also criticizes it by saying that "they have made the book appear a service to literature, like a good doctor's thesis, rather than as literature itself."[36] Regardless, despite disagreeing with Pound's use of Irish diction, Eliot writes that "when the writing is most like Mr. Pound it also presents the appearance of being most faithful to the original."[37] He further describes Pound's translation as "a remarkable triumph of translator's skill: it is certainly English, and it is certainly new in English."[38] As presented by Eliot, Pound appears to be visible in the translated text. This is particularly noticeable in light of how Noh theatre approaches emotion. According to Eliot, the phantom-psychology of Orestes and Macbeth in Western theatre, for instance, is substantially different from the Japanese way of depicting a ghost in plays: "In the former cases the ghost is given in the mind of the possessed; in the latter case, the mind of the sufferer is inferred from the reality of the ghost."[39] Implicit in Eliot's thinking is the fact that translating Japanese texts of this kind entails importing the structure for spectral apparitions to the receiving language culture. Furthermore, his review highlights Pound's achievement in doing so through the poetic perspective he brought to the translation and shows that the supernatural themes in Noh were already recognized at the time by readers with different backgrounds.

Although Okita and Humpherson possibly knew of Pound's translation and the studies on Noh plays conducted outside Japan, they may

---

[34] Before the publication of Stopes' book, Noh plays were translated as part of books about Japanese literature, such as Basil H. Chamberlain's (1850–1935) *The Classical Poetry of the Japanese* in 1880 and William G. Aston's (1841–1911) *A History of Japanese Literature* in 1899.

[35] Ezra Pound, "Note," to *"Noh," or, Accomplishment: A Study of the Classical Stage of Japan*, by Ernest Fenollosa and Ezra Pound (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1917).

[36] T. S. Eliot, "The Noh and the Image," *The Egoist* 4/7 (1917), 102.

[37] Ibid., 103.

[38] Ibid.

[39] Ibid.

not have focused on the *mugen* Noh structure when translating *Ashikari*. The "Foreword" of *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin* indicates that "Japanese words have been left untranslated; partly because many of them are the names of things which have no exact equivalent outside Japan, and partly because they were thought to be in keeping with the slightly exotic atmosphere of the stories."[40] Considering that most of these untranslated words gathered in the "Glossary" are Japanese objects and historical terms, what the translators mean here by "exotic" is the atmosphere Tanizaki's style creates through references to concepts inherent to Japan and its classical works, all of which conveys "a peculiar charm for foreign readers."[41] The "Biographical Note" also mentions that "[a]mong readers of discrimination, [Tanizaki's] reputation now is unsurpassed by any other living Japanese author" and that *Ashikari* and *Shunkinshō* "created something like a sensation in Japanese literary circles."[42] Thus, the paratexts show that Humpherson and Okita aimed to introduce Japanese literature by translating Tanizaki's works for new readers. This intention fitted the purpose of Hokuseidō Press, which published introductory books on Japan written in English alongside translations of Japanese literature.

However, it should be noted that neither translator was a specialist in translating Japanese literature. Indeed, Okita writes that, since Humpherson could not read the original text, he produced a preliminary translation before revising it with his co-translator.[43] This reflects how Japanese writers tried to introduce their own literature outside of Japan at the time. Although it is necessary to further analyze the readership in each case, a textual analysis of the translation does allow us to examine how *Ashikari* was received. This article argues that the translators' and the publisher's purpose of introducing Japanese literature outside of Japan succeeded in the sense that it presented Tanizaki's work as something representative of Japanese literature. In light of the stereotypic image of Japan held by readers unfamiliar with Tanizaki, this implies that the translation might have been received as a story of restricted love in a feudal society rather than a novella about the author's specific vision and reworking of ideal love within the history of Japanese literature.

---

[40] Roy Humpherson and Hajime Okita, "Foreword," in *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin: Modern Japanese Novels* (Tokyo: Hokuseidō Press, 1936a), i.
[41] Humpherson and Okita, "Biographical Note," iv.
[42] Ibid., iii and iv.
[43] Okita, "Gyotaku," 43.

When *The Reed Cutter* appeared in 1994, the situation surrounding translations of modern Japanese literature changed significantly. American trade publishers, including Knopf, Grove Press, and New Directions, started to publish translations of Japanese works in the 1950s. Particularly, Knopf's translation project, launched in 1955 by editor Harold Strauss (1907–1975), and Kawabata's Nobel Prize in Literature in 1968 greatly contributed to the dissemination of modern Japanese literature outside of Japan. In an interview about the first two works of the said project, Osaragi Jirō's 大佛次郎 (1897–1973) *Kikyō* 帰郷 (*Homecoming*), translated by Brewster Horwitz (1924–1954), and Tanizaki's *Tade kū mushi* 蓼喰ふ虫 (*Some Prefer Nettles*), translated by Edward G. Seidensticker (1921–2007), which were both published in 1955, Strauss expressed his hope that Tanizaki would become a Nobel Prize-winning author and that the two translations would reach and influence intellectuals (*interi sō*).[44] Tanizaki actually achieved recognition with Knopf's publication of *Some Prefer Nettles* and Seidensticker's 1957 translation of *Sasameyuki* 細雪 (*The Makioka Sisters*), as well as Howard Hibbett's (1920–2019) translation of *Kagi* 鍵 (*The Key*) in 1961. There was also a collection of his short stories titled *Seven Japanese Tales* in 1963 and *Fūten rōjin nikki* 瘋癲老人日記 (*Diary of a Mad Old Man*) in 1965, translated by Hibbett. Indeed, he was nominated for the Nobel Prize seven times.[45] However, Knopf's translations of Tanizaki, Kawabata, and Mishima may have created a limited image of modern Japanese literature. Edward Fowler calls it "the postwar image of Japan in America – an exoticized, aestheticized, and quintessentially foreign land quite antithetical to its prewar image of a bellicose and imminently threatening power."[46] Fowler also points out that the texts to be translated were selected by Strauss and a limited number of experts of his acquaintance, such as Keene, Seidensticker, and Ivan Morris

---

[44] Harold Strauss, "'Kikyō' to 'Tade kū mushi' amerika de shuppan," *Asahi Shimbun*, December 1, 1954.
[45] Tanizaki was nominated in 1958, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965. Refer to the Nomination Archive: "Nobel Prize Outreach AB 2021," *NobelPrize.org: The Official Website of the Nobel Prize,* Sep 27, 2021 (accessed October 1, 2021, https://www.nobelprize.org/nomination/archive/show_people.php?id=12374).
[46] Edward Fowler, "Rendering Words, Traversing Cultures: On the Art and Politics of Translating Modern Japanese Fiction," *The Journal of Japanese Studies* 18/1 (1992), 3.

(1925–1976).[47] Hibbett should be added to the list. All of this shows that translations of Japanese literature in the United States developed under the influence of trade publishers in affiliation with experts from domestic academic institutions.

By the time *The Reed Cutter* was published in the early 1990s, 1994 Nobel Prize winner Ōe Kenzaburō 大江健三郎 (1935–), Abe Kōbō 安部公房 (1924–1993), and Endō Shūsaku 遠藤周作 (1923–1996) had already gained recognition. However, it was the generation born after the war that conveyed a new image of Japanese literature beyond that produced in the 1950s. For instance, the influential magazine *The New Yorker* published Murakami's *Tībī pīpuru* TV ピープル ("TV People"), translated by Alfred Birnbaum, in the issue of September 10, 1990. Likewise, a collection of short stories titled *Monkey Brain Sushi: New Tastes in Japanese Fiction*, edited by Birnbaum and published in 1991 by Kōdansha International (a New York branch of the Tokyo-based major publisher Kōdansha), also introduced new authors born in the aftermath of the war. In the introduction of this anthology, Birnbaum describes "Kawabata, Tanizaki, and Mishima, or even Abé, Endo, Oé" as "staples of the older diet"[48] and excludes their works. He specifies that the collection includes authors who "were all born and raised in an Americanized postwar Japan" and "who will go on to cater to the nineties."[49] Birnbaum's intent to create a new trend in Japanese literature is substantially different from that of reviewers of the translation of Tanizaki's *Manji* 卍 (*Quicksand*) and *The Reed Cutter and Captain Shigemoto's Mother*, both published in 1994, who tried to show an image of the author unchanged from that of the 1950s. Lee Lescaze, for instance, writes in a 1994 review titled "Three Tales of Obsession" that, "Tanizaki, one of Japan's most prized novelists of the century, is probably best known in the U.S. for 'Some Prefer Nettles' and 'The Makioka Sisters.'"[50] Kitty Chen Dean mentions, in another review of the same year, that the translations imply "[g]ood news for Tanizaki fans: the master Japanese novelist, author of *The Makioka Sisters* and *Some Prefer*

---

[47] Ibid., 12, n. 25.

[48] Alfred Birnbaum, "Introduction," in *Monkey Brain Sushi: New Tastes in Japanese Fiction* (Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1991), 1.

[49] Ibid., 1 and 4.

[50] Lee Lescaze, "Three Tales of Obsession," review of *Quicksand* by Jun'ichirō Tanizaki, trans. Howard Hibbett, and *The Reed Cutter and Captain Shigemoto's Mother* by Jun'ichirō Tanizaki, trans. Anthony H. Chambers, *The Wall Street Journal*, February 24, 1994.

Nettles […] is ably represented by two new translations" and that the novellas "explore Tanizaki's recurrent theme of obsessive love."[51] These reviews indicate that Tanizaki was still recognized in the 1990s by those two works published 40 years before. They also indicate that he was still regarded as old-fashioned and as one of the canonized Japanese authors.

This article argues that Chambers' *The Reed Cutter* was an attempt to challenge Tanizaki's canonization following Seidensticker translations rather than reinforce it. Chambers can be described as part of the next generation of pioneers in modern Japanese literature translation. He received a Ph.D. in Japanese literature from the University of Michigan in 1974 by writing the dissertation *Tradition in the Works of Tanizaki Jun'ichirō*, following Seidensticker's ideas.[52] In 1980, Chambers translated Tanizaki's essay "Shunkinshō Kōgo" 春琴抄後語 ("Postscript to 'A Portrait of Shunkin'"), which appeared in the prestigious academic journal of Sophia University, *Monumenta Nipponica*. Soon after, he also translated *Bushūkō hiwa* 武州公秘話 (*The Secret History of the Lord of Musashi*) and *Yoshinokuzu* 吉野葛 (*Arrowroot*) as one book, *The Secret History of the Lord of Musashi and Arrowroot*, published in 1982 by Knopf. Knopf. They also released his *Chijin no Ai* 痴人の愛 (*Naomi*) in 1985. In 1994, Chambers produced *The Reed Cutter and Captain Shigemoto's Mother*, as well as an academic work entitled *The Secret Window: Ideal Worlds in Tanizaki's Fiction*, published by the Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University. Thus, Chambers added variety to translations of Tanizaki's works and contributed to the development of Tanizaki studies.

Chambers regards *Some Prefer Nettles* and *The Makioka Sisters* as "orthodox" novels, characterized by dialogue and objective description.[53]

---

[51] Kitty Chen Dean, review of *The Reed Cutter and Captain Shigemoto's Mother: Two Novellas* by Jun'ichirō Tanizaki, trans. Anthony H. Chambers, and *Quicksand* by Jun'ichirō Tanizaki, trans. Howard Hibbett, *Library Journal* 119/1 (1994), 169.

[52] Anthony H. Chambers, *Remembering Tanizaki Jun'ichirō and Matsuko: Diary Entries, Interview Notes, and Letters, 1954–1989* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2017), 1. Chambers mentions that Seidensticker suggested that Chambers consider Tanizaki, Iwano Hōmei 岩野泡鳴 (1873–1920), and Mori Ōgai 森鷗外 (1862–1922).

[53] Jun'ichirō Tanizaki and Anthony H. Chambers, "Postscript to 'A Portrait of Shunkin': Shunkinshō Kōgo," *Monumenta Nipponica*, 35/4 (1980), 458–459.

Ashikari's form, on the other hand, he calls "essay-novel."[54] Likewise, he considers *Captain Shigemoto's Mother* an essay-style novel that does not follow an orthodox structure either.[55] Seidensticker produced an abridged translation, "The Mother of Captain Shigemoto," which he included in the anthology *Modern Japanese Literature: From 1868 to Present Day*, edited by Keene and published by Grove Press in 1956. Seidensticker wrote that the translation was abridged due to space limitations and to make it fit a form familiar to the English-language reader since the original often resembles an essay.[56] By translating these essay-style works in the 1990s, then, Chambers approached Tanizaki's coherent theme of love from a different angle than his two canonized works and Seidensticker. In addition, his text selection and translation strategy, including the style reminiscent of classical writing, went against the new wave of Japanese literature in the 1990s, which depicted the post-Americanized Japan. In that sense, Chambers' translation can also be interpreted as an attempt to counter the new generation of translators like Birnbaum and their stance against old Japanese authors.

Furthermore, an examination of the peritexts of *The Reed Cutter* helps consider the translator's role and the target audience. First, in terms of book production, translators in the 1990s were more visible than those in the 1950s. The dust jacket of the first edition of *Some Prefer Nettles* did not even include the translator's name, nor did that of *The Makioka Sisters*, though the back flap included it. By contrast, the dust jacket of the 1994 first edition of *The Reed Cutter and Captain Shigemoto's Mother* includes Chambers' name, and the back flap further describes his academic career, including the titles of his other translations. Clarifying the translator's name and record in the peritexts stresses his qualifications as a specialist in Japanese literature. Second, regarding the book content, there was a general increase in the number of footnotes in translations. While *Some Prefer Nettles* (200 pages) features one footnote and *The Makioka Sisters* (501 pages) includes 17, *The Reed Cutter* (51 pages) has 29 footnotes, and *Captain Shigemoto's Mother* (122 pages) has 27. The fact that Chambers' earlier translations published by Knopf, *The Secret History of the Lord of Musashi and Arrowroot* and *Naomi*, included no footnotes, shows the translator's emphasis on them in *The Reed Cutter and Captain Shigemoto's Mother*. Knopf allowed Chambers to add

---

[54] Ibid., 458.
[55] Ibid., 459.
[56] E. G. Seidensticker and Anzai Tetsuo, *Sutandādo eigo kōza dai ni kan: Nihonbun no hon'yaku* (Tokyo: Taishūkan shoten, 1983), 205.

footnotes this time, something which commercial publishers would have hesitated to offer. These arrangements enabled Chambers to make himself more visible and directly explain the original cultural context. This means that the publisher expected the translator, as an expert in the field, to mediate between original and translation, not to be the translator behind the author.

The target audience likely included not only the established Tanizaki reader but also a wider audience. Chambers belonged to the academic community as a professor of Asian language and literature at Wesleyan University, which might have led him to assume that students and scholars of Japanese literature would be part of his readership. However, since Knopf is not an academic or university press but a commercial one, the publication aimed not only for a limited academic readership but also to reach the general reader. This duality in the target audience is evidenced by the fact that *The Reed Cutter and Captain Shigemoto's Mother*'s has many footnotes, on the one hand, and that it does not have an introduction, on the other hand. Having many footnotes means that reading it requires specific information that a specialized scholar needs to make clear to the reader. Not having a preliminary introduction that gives a fixed direction to the reading indicates that the assumed audience was someone knowledgeable about Tanizaki who did not require a considerable amount of background information before reading the text but also wanted to jump immediately into the text without any prior academic guidance. This device shows that the translation was intended to function as a scholarly one, not a completely specialized one.

These observations bring to light the differences in the reception of translated Japanese literature between the 1930s and the 1990s. In the 1930s, modern Japanese novels were rarely translated into English, and Tanizaki was not known outside Japan. Noh plays were already recognized within the modernist movement, albeit focusing on adapting their poetic aspects rather than presenting the original context in detail. *Ashikari* was an early attempt by non-specialist translators of Japanese literature to introduce Japanese novels that went against the reader's expectations outside Japan. By contrast, *The Reed Cutter* was translated by an experienced American scholar and translator in the 1990s, when the English-language reader already regarded Tanizaki as one of the canonized Japanese authors and expected contemporary writers to provide a different aesthetic than his. Knopf assumed a general educated reader that was familiar with the literary canon, just as Chambers assumed the academic community of Japanese literary studies as his readership. The translator, positioned as a specialist in Japanese literature, therefore reflects a situation in which there was already an

established reading base in the English-speaking world, which allowed Chambers to provide this wider audience with a direct presentation of the cultural context through the mere use of footnotes. A textual comparison of the 1936 and 1994 translations reveals how the assumptions of the target audience affected the translated text and how the translator became part of each version.

The Translator's Visibility and the *Mugen* Noh Structure in Different Translation Strategies

The above examination explored the translators' and the publishers' purposes in publishing their translations of *Ashikari* and assessed the reception of translated Japanese literature. The following analysis aims to demonstrate how these factors affected the translated text. It is a close reading that does not focus on mistranslations or the equivalence between the source text and the translation. During the analysis, this article cites the source text and the translated texts because it helps illustrate how each translator renders the original text with a different target audience in mind.[57] Focusing on the

---

[57] The source text is cited from *Ashikari*, the version of which is included in *Shunkinshō* published in 1933. Considering that Humpherson and Okita's signatures appear in the 1935 foreword to the translation (Humpherson and Okita, "Foreword," ii.), the following four versions of *Ashikari* are the ones that Okita could have had access to: the one published in 1932 in *Kaizō*; the handwritten one of 1933; that appended to *Shunkinshō* in 1933; and the one included in Sōgensha's 1934 新版春琴抄 *Shinpan Shunkinshō* (*Shunkinshō: New Edition*). There are some corrections between the 1932 version, the handwritten version, and the 1933 version. The 1934 version is based on the one included in *Shunkinshō* in 1933, but *hentaigana* (variant *hiragana*) is replaced by *hiragana*. By contrasting Humpherson and Okita's translation with the four versions of *Ashikari*, it is likely that Okita used the 1933 version included in *Shunkinshō* or the 1934 version as his main source. On the other hand, the colophon of *The Reed Cutter and Captain Shigemoto's Mother* notes that the translation is "based on the ChuoKoron-sha, Inc., editions of *Ashikari*, published in 1973" (Jun'ichirō Tanizaki, *The Reed Cutter and Captain Shigemoto's Mother: Two Novellas*, Anthony H. Chambers, trans., New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1994), which would confirm that the source of Chambers' translation is the version in the publisher's 1973 complete works

mugen Noh structure influences the reading experience. In order to examine the paratexts and the style of each translation, it is important to first analyze the section of *waka* poetry in the text:

- Source text by Tanizaki
  君なくてあしかりけりと思ふにもいとゞ難波のうらはすみうき.[58]
- Translated text by Humpherson and Okita
  On the lonely shores of Naniwa
  The reeds grow drearily;
  In solitude I yearn for you
  By this deserted sea.[59]
- Translated text by Chambers
  How wretched I am without you, cutting reeds!
  Life at Naniwa Bay grows harder still to bear.*[60]

  *Anonymous, *Shūiwakashū* (compiled early in the eleventh century) #540. "Ashikari," the original title of the novella, comes from this poem. The word denotes "reed cutting" and "reed cutter," and connotes "wretched," "miserable." Naniwa is an old name for Osaka.[61]

---

of Tanizaki. A comparison of the 1933 and 1973 versions shows that the difference lies in the fact that the *hentaigana* are replaced with *hiragana*. Thus, it is likely that Humpherson and Okita's translation on the one hand, and Chambers' on the other, are both based on the 1933 version with *hentaigana* replaced by *hiragana*. Therefore, the 1933 publication is cited as the source text by replacing *hentaigana* with *hiragana* for convenience in this study. Traditional character forms (*kyūjitai*) have been replaced with their simplified equivalents (*shinjitai*). Relevant excerpts from all three primary texts are underlined for emphasis.

[58] Tanizaki Jun'ichirō, "Ashikari," *Shunkinshō* (Osaka: Sōgensha, 1933), 109.

[59] Jun'ichirō Tanizaki, "Ashikari," in Roy Humpherson and Hajime Okita, trans., *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin: Modern Japanese Novels* (Tokyo: Hokuseidō Press, 1936), 3.

[60] Jun'ichirō Tanizaki, "The Reed Cutter," in Anthony H. Chambers, trans., *The Reed Cutter and Captain Shigemoto's Mother: Two Novellas* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1994), 3.

[61] Ibid.

Ashikari begins with the above *waka*. In Humpherson and Okita's text, the poem, which stresses the protagonist's feelings and characterizes the setting, does not include the meaning of reed "cutting" and reed "cutter." In the foreword, they refer to the difficulty of conveying the double meaning: "It is seldom possible to reproduce a play on words in a foreign language. Moreover, the word *ashikari* is itself an abstruse archaism, the real significance of which is not readily grasped even by a Japanese. *Ashi* has the double meaning of *reed* and *bad*; while *kari,* besides meaning *cut*, is a verbal termination in the Literary Style. All efforts to render this into English of suitable brevity were unavailing, and it was finally decided to retain the original Japanese title."[62] This explanation, together with the fact that the translated text does not offer information about the poem's appearance in previous classical works, compels the reader to question the author's identity. The poem is directed to a reader unfamiliar with Japanese literature and affects the final scene.

In contrast, Chambers' translation has the two terms "wretched" and "cutting reeds" to attempt to preserve the double meaning of *Ashi* and *kari*. Furthermore, with the detailed footnote, Chambers notes the original title's derivation from an anonymous poem, when it was composed, the denotation and connotation of the word, and the fact that the name of the place is an old one. This means that, from the very beginning of the novella, Chambers connects the text with classical Japanese literature. Moreover, the fact that it is a translation becomes patent to the reader.

- Source text by Tanizaki

  それにちやうどその日は十五夜にあたつてゐたのでかへりに淀川べりの月を見るのも一興である.[63]

- Translated text by Humpherson and Okita

  As it happened to be the night of *Jugoya*, the Full Moon Festival, I should have the pleasure of viewing the moon from the banks of the Yodo on my way home.[64]

- Translated text by Chambers

  What is more, the day corresponded to the fifteenth of the Eighth Month by the old calendar – on my way home I

---

[62] Humpherson and Okita, "Foreword," i.
[63] Tanizaki, "Ashikari," 112.
[64] Tanizaki, "Ashikari," Humpherson and Okita, trans., 6.

could enjoy the view of the full moon from the banks of the Yodo river.*[65]

*The Eighth Month fell in mid-autumn. The full moon of that month being considered the most beautiful of the year, it was customary to hold elaborate moon-viewing parties on the fifteenth, the night of the full moon.[66]

The next example highlights a scene where the narrator connects the moon to a time in the past, following the descriptions of the character's stroll, reminiscent of *michiyuki* in *mugen* Noh. The translators explain the cultural context of moon-viewing in different ways. Humpherson and Okita add the phrase "the Full Moon Festival" to "*Jugoya*." In the glossary at the back of the book, "*Jugoya*" is described as "Festival of the Full Moon. Aug. 15th. (Lun Cal.)." "Lun Cal." is an abbreviation of "lunar calendar," which means the old calendar here. Chambers not only explains traditional moon-viewing in a footnote but also adds the phrase "the Eighth Month by the old calendar" to the body text. The usage of "the Eighth Month," not "August," is distinguished from the narrator's reference to "September" at the beginning of this novella. The emphasis here makes the reader expect that the moon in the subsequent narration will be connected to the past.

It must be noted that, in the translations, the reader's conception of the temporal setting is different from that of Tanizaki's *Ashikari*. Humpherson and Okita's explanation and Chambers' footnote and added words create three layers of time; namely, the time of the old calendar, the time when the primary narrator lived, and the time when the reader receives the translation in 1936 or 1994. There is another layer of time in the footnote in Chambers' translation. The additional layers of time emphasize the lag between the original and the translations, once again making the translator visible.

- Source text by Tanizaki

さあ、もう一献おすごしなされませ、さあもう一献と矢つきばやに三杯までかさねさせてその三杯目の酒をわたしが飲んでゐるあひだにやをら「小督」をうたひ出した.[67]

---

[65] Tanizaki, "The Reed Cutter," Chambers, trans., 5–6.
[66] Ibid., 6.
[67] Tanizaki, "Ashikari," 133.

- Translated text by Humpherson and Okita

> He was so pressing that I drank three cups in quick succession, and while I was drinking the third one he began to sing '*Kogo*,' slowly and deliberately.[68]

- Translated text by Chambers

> Here, please have another… and another, he said, quickly refilling my cup twice, and as I drank the third cupful he began slowly to sing *Kogō*.*[69]
>
> *A nō play by Komparu Zenchiku (1405–1468). In the best-known section, a messenger searches for the emperor's beloved Kogō under a full moon in Sagano, on the western edge of Kyoto. He finds her by following the sound of her koto.[70]

In this scene, the man in the reeds sings *Kogō* to the narrator, a piece where the protagonist looks for his beloved under the moon, just as in Tanizaki's *Ashikari*. Moriyasu Masafumi notes that *Kogō*, sung by the man in the reeds, who manifests by the moon's invitation and vanishes into the moonlight, serves as a prelude to the story of Shinnosuke and Oyū.[71] Humpherson and Okita describe '*Kogo*' as the "Title of a song. A woman's name" in the glossary.[72] They do not detail the content of the Noh play. The reader is required to imagine why the man "slowly and deliberately" sings the song that includes a woman's name.

Chambers, however, clarifies in the footnote that *Kogō* is a Noh play and alludes to a connection between the setting in *The Reed Cutter* and *Kogō* by adding the phrase "in Sagano, on the western edge of Kyoto." While strolling and describing the landscape, the narrator of *The Reed Cutter* recounts that "the villages with their many bamboo groves, the design of the farmhouses, the shape of the trees, and the color of the soil recall the outskirts around Saga, and one feels that the Kyoto countryside extends to this

[68] Tanizaki, "Ashikari," Humpherson and Okita, trans., 23.
[69] Tanizaki, "The Reed Cutter," Chambers, trans., 20–21.
[70] Ibid., 21.
[71] Moriyasu Masafumi, *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō: Asobi no bungaku* (Tokyo: Kokusho kankōkai, 1983), 269.
[72] Roy Humpherson and Hajime Okita, "Glossary," to *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin: Modern Japanese Novels* (Tokyo: Hokuseidō Press, 1936c), 171.

point."[73] Indeed, the added explanation encourages the reader to imagine the relationship between the setting of *The Reed Cutter* and that of *Kogō*. This deliberate connection can also be interpreted as a stronger visibility for the translator.

Not only *Kogō* but also other Noh plays that connect the moon with a beloved woman are alluded to in the narration:

- Source text by Tanizaki

  お伺ひしたいのはいまわたしどもがこうしてゐる此の洲のあたりにもむかしは江口の君のやうな遊女どもが舟を浮かべてゐたのではないでせうか、此の月に対してわたしの眼前にはうふつと現はれてくるものは何よりもその女どものまぼろしなのです.[74]
- Translated text by Humpherson and Okita

  I believe that on the water near this very sandbank, the courtesans from Eguchi used to row about in pleasure boats, didn't they? Perhaps you can tell me about them. When I am enjoying the moonlight on a night like this, it is such visions that rise before my eyes.[75]
- Translated text by Chambers

  Do you suppose that courtesans like the Lady of Eguchi poled their boats around this sandbar? That, more than anything else, is what I see as I look at the moon – visions of those women floating dimly before my eyes.[76]

This part of the original references the Noh play *Eguchi* by Zeami, and the narrator refers to the women in it when viewing the moon. Humpherson and Okita render the phrase as "the courtesans from Eguchi," merely dealing with "Eguchi" as a place name, but Chambers translates it as "courtesans like the Lady of Eguchi." Using "the Lady of Eguchi" as a woman's name reminds the reader of the character in the Noh play *Eguchi* more clearly than in Humpherson and Okita's translation. It should be noted that Humpherson and Okita do not explain *Eguchi* in the glossary, and Chambers does not add a footnote on it either. This means that neither explicitly connects *Ashikari* with the *Eguchi* Noh play here. However, the moon can be interpreted as a symbol

---

[73] Tanizaki, "The Reed Cutter," Chambers, trans., 10.
[74] Tanizaki, "Ashikari," 136.
[75] Tanizaki, "Ashikari," Humpherson and Okita, trans., 25.
[76] Tanizaki, "The Reed Cutter," Chambers, trans., 22.

of the past that likewise reminds the reader of the classical work. In this way, the narrator's ideal vision of women (the woman in *Eguchi*) is tied to that of the man in the reeds (who tells his father's story after singing *Kogō*). Indeed, as Mishima Junko points out, the different spaces of Oyū, Shinnosuke, and Oshizu are connected through the image of the moon.[77] This strengthens the idea that the moon functions as a symbol to overcome time and space.

Many references to classical works in *Ashikari* relate to the narrator's subjectivity. During his stroll, the narrator describes the landscape by citing various works. Notably, he visits the Minase Shrine because it had been in his mind since he first read *Masukagami*. The Minase Shrine is connected to the narrator's reading experience of *Masukagami*, which requires the reader to construct the landscape according to the literary references of the narration, not as an actual historical place. *Masukagami* stimulates the reader to imagine the scene painted by the man in the reeds, in which Oyū enjoys the moon viewing. The citation below appears when the narrator pictures Gotoba's pavilion while strolling in the Minase Shrine. In Humpherson and Okita's translation, *Masukagami* is described as "That celebrated, anonymous, XIVth century chronicle, the *Masukagami*, or *Mirror of Mirrors*."[78] In Chambers' translation, *Masukagami* is referred to as "*The Larger Mirror*"[79] with a footnote elaborating: "*Masukagami*, a fourteenth-century historical narrative. The Genkyū era began in the Second Month of 1204 and ended in the Fourth Month of 1206."[80] The point is that the citations from *Masukagami* are translated with different types of paratexts, revealing disparate translation strategies.

- Source text by Tanizaki

  「夏の頃水無瀬殿の釣殿にいでさせ給ひて、ひ水めして水飯やうのものなど若き上達部殿上人どもにたまはさせておほみきまゐるついでにも<u>あはれいにしへの紫式部こそはいみじくありけれ</u>、かの源氏物語にも近き川のあゆ西山より奉れるいしぶしやうのもの御前に調じてとかけるなむすぐれてめでたきぞとよ.[81]

---

[77] Mishima Junko, "Tanizaki Jun'ichirō 'Ashikari' no kōzō: Koten kaiki no naijitsu," *Kokugo kokubun* 77/1 (2008), 4.
[78] Tanizaki, "Ashikari," Humpherson and Okita, trans., 3.
[79] Tanizaki, "The Reed Cutter," Chambers, trans., 3.
[80] Ibid.
[81] Tanizaki, "Ashikari," 116.

- Translated text by Humpershon and Okita

  "One summer's day, attended by a number of officers of the Household, the Emperor was refreshing himself with iced water and *suihan* in the Fishing Pavilion; and when the wine was being served, he suddenly exclaimed, "What an amusing woman Murasaki Shikibu must have been! She related in the *Tale of Genji* that on one occasion someone presented to the Emperor *ayu* from a near-by river, and *iwabushi* caught in a mountain stream, and straightway cooked them in the Imperial Presence; truly a most diverting idea.[82]

- Translated text by Chambers

  His Majesty went out one summer to the angling pavilion at Minase Palace, where he shared ice water and cold rice porridge and other dishes with some young nobles and courtiers.* When the drinking began, he said, How wonderful was Murasaki Shikibu! Her *Tale of Genji* is truly splendid: his son and the others prepared trout for Genji from a nearby stream, and bass from the Katsura River.[83]

  *Gotoba is deliberately re-creating the scene at the beginning of "Wild Carnations" (*Tokonatsu*). See Murasaki Shikibu, *The Tale of Genji*, translated by Edward Seidensticker (Knopf, 1976), p. 441. In the original *Genji*, the "wine and ice water and other refreshments" of Seidensticker's translation include the porridge that Gotoba eats here.[84]

Humpherson and Okita define *suihan* as "A summer drink made of rice" in the glossary, *ayu* as "The sweet-fish. (Plecoglossus Altivelis)," and *iwabushi* as "Small fresh water rock-fish."[85] In their translation, the task of relating Gotoba's actions to *The Tale of Genji* and the narrator's in *Ashikari* to *Masukagami* is assigned to the reader. Chambers, however, explicitly states in the footnote that Gotoba follows the character of *The Tale of Genji*.

---

[82] Tanizaki, "Ashikari," Humpherson and Okita, trans., 9.
[83] Tanizaki, "The Reed Cutter," Chambers, trans., 8–9.
[84] Ibid., 9.
[85] Humpherson and Okita, "Glossary," 171–172.

Chambers also cites Seidensticker's *The Tale of Genji* with page numbers. The footnote implies that the narrator in *The Reed Cutter* follows Gotoba and produces a multi-layered world. This information connects the internal text with the external one. Here, *The Reed Cutter* offers different layers of time: that of *The Tale of Genji*, that of *Masukagami*, that of Tanizaki's *Ashikari*, that of *The Reed Cutter*, and that of the footnote. These layers reveal the translator's intent to deliberately connect these times. Also, in this fragment, Humpherson and Okita explain items typical of Japan in the glossary, which does not include reference page numbers. By contrast, Chambers uses a footnote at the bottom of the same page to give the reason for citing the classical works. The paratextual difference in the two translations indicates to what extent each translator participates in the reading.

The examples in the translated texts of *waka*, the moon viewing, and the associations with Noh plays clarify the distinct ways in which the two translations refer to classical Japanese literature. In addition, the above excerpt of *Masukagami* shows the departure in style. In the sentence, "he said, How wonderful was Murasaki Shikibu!" Chambers links the narrative to the dialogue without quotation marks and uses a capital letter after the comma. This differs from how Humpherson and Okita use quotation marks for Gotoba's remarks. This translation strategy can also be seen in the narrative of the narrator and the man in the reeds. In Humpherson and Okita's translation, the story of Shinnosuke, Oyū, and Oshizu is presented as a dialogue between the narrator and the man in the reeds using quotation marks. The dialogue between the characters is also written with them. This way, the dialogue is distinguished from the narrative, and the reader can easily know who speaks. Humpherson and Okita rewrite the narrative structure and make themselves invisible to benefit a target audience unfamiliar with Japanese literature.

In contrast, Chambers omits the quotation marks in the dialogue, in line with Tanizaki's original text. Tanizaki omits quotation marks for most dialogue and deviates from modern Japanese punctuation with many uses of *hiragana*. He even justifies this characteristic style of *Ashikari* in "Shunkinshō kōgo," an essay published in *Kaizō* in 1934 in which he explains the narrative technique he used in *Shunkinshō* (1933):

> I chose this form after studying the technique of George Moore in *Heloise and Abelard* and later works, and of the classical Japanese novel from *Genji Monogatari* on. As everyone knows, it is hard to distinguish dialogue from

> narrative in the rainy-night passage of 'Hahakigi' in *Genji*, and hard to know who starts talking where, but the beauty of Japanese prose is most apparent in such passages. This intrigues me, and I have paid special attention to the links between narrative and dialogue. In *Manji*, I accommodated the reader to the extent of providing quotation marks, but I did away with them in *Ashikari*.[86]

In the above passage from "*Shunkinshō kōgo*," Chambers, who also translated it into English with the title "Postscript to 'A Portrait of Shunkin': Shunkinshō Kōgo," adds a footnote to show that "Roy Humpherson and Hajime Okita undo Tanizaki's efforts by using quotation marks and starting each speech on a new line."[87] He also mentions in an introduction to this postscript that "[t]he translators of *Ashikari* […] restore all the punctuation and indentations that Tanizaki so carefully excised" and argues that "[t]ranslations of Tanizaki's fiction, too, might well benefit from more ambitious attempts to duplicate his stylistic devices."[88] "Postscript to 'A Portrait of Shunkin'" and Chambers' introduction to it were published in *Monumenta Nipponica* in 1980, fourteen years before the publication of *The Reed Cutter*, and were aimed at an academic reader rather than a wide audience. Even so, this translation and introduction from 1980 can be read as an intertextual preface to *The Reed Cutter* of 1994, already hinting that *Ashikari* needs to be translated in a different style from Humpherson and Okita's. Hence, Chambers attempted to produce a style reminiscent of classical Japanese writing, even maintaining narrative ambiguity. The following is his style:

> The man nodded vigorously. Yes, yes, it's just as you say. I suppose it's natural for an ordinary person to get that way with age, but even when I was a child my father took me every year, on the evening of the Fifteenth Night festival, for a walk of five miles or more under the moon, and those

---

[86] Jun'ichirō Tanizaki, "Postscript to 'A Portrait of Shunkin': Shunkinshō Kōgo," trans. Anthony H. Chambers, *Monumenta Nipponica* 35/4 (1980), 462.
[87] Ibid.
[88] Tanizaki and Chambers, "Postscript to 'A Portrait of Shunkin': Shunkinshō Kōgo," 460.

> days come back to me on the Fifteenth Night. Come to think of it, my father said what you have just said: You probably won't understand the sadness of this autumn night, he often told me, but a time will come when you do understand. What's that you say? Did your father love the moon of the Fifteenth Night that much? And why did he take you on a walk of five miles or more when you were still a small child? Well, I was six or seven the first time he took me along.[89]

Chambers attempts to overcome Humpherson and Okita's translation style that separated narrative and dialogue. In the above sentences, Chambers omits quotation marks for direct speech and does not use indentation. He also uses personal pronouns as if it were direct speech. In such a way, Chambers obscures "the links between narrative and dialogue" and produces a hazy and fluid effect with long paragraphs. *The Reed Cutter* has 51 pages but only 16 paragraphs. This strategy creates the atmosphere of classical writing and obfuscates the story of the narrator and the man in the reeds. With the vague narration and veiled pronouns such as "I" and "you," the man in the reeds' story about Shinnosuke, Oyū, and Oshizu is told as if with the narrator's voice. The effect also enhances the supernatural element in the novella. All these are what Chambers himself calls "more ambitious attempts to duplicate [Tanizaki's] stylistic device." While Humpherson and Okita adapt the style to fit the English novels of their time, Chambers attempts to retain the approach of the original Japanese text.

The last sentence of the novella reveals a difference in the translators' interpretations concerning the reception of translated Japanese literature and its readership.

- Source text by Tanizaki

> わたしはをかしなことをいふとおもつてでもゝうお遊さんは八十ちかいとしよりではないでせうかとたづねたのであるがたゞそよそよと風が草の葉をわたるばかりで汀にいちめんに生えてゐたあしも見えずそのをとこの影もいつのまにか月のひかりに溶け入るやうにきえてしまつた.[90]

---

[89] Tanizaki, "The Reed Cutter," Chambers, trans., 23–24.
[90] Tanizaki, "Ashikari," 197.

- Translated text by Humpherson and Okita

> Thinking this strange, I said: "But surely, Oyu must be very old by now – almost eighty!"
>
> But where he had been sitting, there was nothing to be seen save the tall grasses swaying and rustling in the wind. The reeds which grew down to the water's edge were fading from sight, and the man had vanished like a wraith in the light of the moon.[91]

- Translated text by Chambers

> That's odd, I thought. But Miss Oyū would be nearly eighty years old by now, wouldn't she? I asked, but there was only the rustle of the wind blowing across the grasses. I could not see the reeds that covered the shore, and the man had vanished as though he had melted into the light of the moon.[92]

In the end, the man vanishes in the moonlight, described as a symbol of transcending time and space, as mentioned above. Humpherson and Okita add the word "wraith," which means a ghost that can be seen before or after a person dies. The addition of "wraith," arising from Okita's interpretation of the man in the reeds as the narrator's fantasy, is targeted at a reader unfamiliar with Japanese literature in order to compensate for the man's sudden vanishing. The poem at the beginning of *Ashikari* is echoed in this ending as if it was composed by the man or "wraith," which sounds as if it presented the novella's theme at the very beginning. Also, withholding information about the origin of the poem encourages the reader to wonder who the composer is. Such an echo functions as a supernatural explanation for the invisibility of the protagonist and emphasizes the mysterious relationship between Shinnosuke, Oyu, and Oshizu. The term "wraith" blurs the boundary between the narrator's fantasy and what he actually saw. In Humpherson and Okita's translation, therefore, the story told by the man in the reeds is interpreted as the narrator's fabrication, inspired by viewing the moon. Hence the main focus is on the narrator, while the man in the reeds and Shinnosuke are cast as imaginary creations of the former.

Since English readers had absorbed Noh through the modernist movement, there is a possibility that the word "wraith" encouraged them to

---

[91] Tanizaki, "Ashikari," Humpherson and Okita, trans., 67.
[92] Tanizaki, "The Reed Cutter," Chambers, trans., 53.

imagine a ghost from the Noh tradition. However, the only contemporary review of *Ashikari and the Story of Shunkin* outside Japan, published in *The Times Literary Supplement*, notes that "[i]n both the romantic love theme is delicately presented, with undertones of poetic feeling and pathos; but it remains secondary in importance, as tradition prescribes, to the fundamental law of duty and self-sacrifice."[93] The reviewer mentions neither the ghost nor the *mugen* Noh structure. With the reception of English translations of Noh plays already established in the English-speaking world, *Ashikari* could have been referred to as a novella that followed a *mugen* Noh structure even much earlier than such a notion's acknowledgment in Japan. But instead, the review stressed the restraints in the protagonists' display of love in their society, which fixed *Ashikari* within the typical pattern of writing about Japanese literature. Humpherson and Okita's intention to introduce Japanese literature and their attempt to move away from the translated text by rewriting the narrative structure as though the translation was the original succeeded in that their work was received as what was considered typical Japanese literature in their context.

On the other hand, in Chambers' translation, the disappearance of the man in the reeds into the moonlight is associated with various classical works, which inspires the reader to relate the character's invisibility to *mugen* Noh. In his review, Ian Buruma mentions that "the storyteller appears and then vanishes as mysteriously as the ghost in a Noh play,"[94] which assumes that readers in the 1990s were aware of the concept of "the ghost in a Noh play." The ending further demonstrates a *mugen* Noh structure, in which the narrator plays the role of *waki* and the man in the reeds that of *shite*. This structure focuses on the man in the reeds as possessed by Shinnosuke, while the narrator draws out the protagonist's tale and acts as a listener, ultimately functioning as the one to metaphorically release the spirit of Shinnosuke. In this way, the structure simulates that of a requiem for the deceased and his unfulfilled love rather than the narrator's imagination. Richard Eder writes that while *Quicksand*, translated by Hibbett and published in the same year, is "fluent and polished," Chambers' *The Reed Cutter and Captain*

---

[93] Bland, "Japanese Character," December 19, 1936.

[94] Ian Buruma, "Fatal Attractions: In Junichiro Tanizaki's Fiction, the Readiness to Die Is the Ultimate Form of Sensual Pleasure," review of *Quicksand* by Jun'ichirō Tanizaki, trans. Howard Hibbett, and *The Reed Cutter and Captain Shigemoto's Mother* by Jun'ichirō Tanizaki, trans. Anthony H. Chambers, *The New York Times*, February 13, 1994.

Shigemoto's Mother is "seemingly rougher and more 'foreign' sounding, evokes the distance of centuries as well as cultures."[95] The review reflects the emphasis that the translator placed on the transcendence of time and space, as well as his association with classical Japanese literature. *The Reed Cutter* exemplifies a way of presenting the original cultural context directly to a 1990s audience through the use of a style foreign to the latter and reminiscent of classical Japanese writing.

The textual analysis has shown that the visibility of the translator in the case of Chambers helps the *mugen* Noh structure to become more visible in the case of Humpherson and Okita. Yet, Chambers hints at the possibility of this structure rather than showing it explicitly. Although he mentions in one of his academic essays that "[t]he structure of Tanizaki's *The Reed Cutter* is close to that of *Eguchi*,"[96] in his translation, he does not refer to it at all. The *mugen* Noh structure is, hence, not entirely obvious but visible to readers as a construction of the translated text. Chambers himself writes, about the narrative structure of *Ashikari*, that "[the man] has heard it from his father and tells it to the narrator, who in turn recounts it to the reader, adding appropriate comments and descriptions of his own."[97] Chambers' translation strategy stresses that his text is indeed a translation and makes the translator participate in the story by adding his footnotes. This participation leads me to argue that the reader conceives of the translation itself as if it were the *mugen* Noh, in which the translator plays a supporting role suggestive of *waki*. In terms of *mugen* Noh, the translator releases not only the spirit of the narrator and the man in the reeds but also that of the original author. Nogami's viewpoint of the four roles that *waki* originally played develops this argument.

According to Nogami, *waki* was the one who spoke first; the one who asked a question; the one who received an appreciation; and the one who was neither the same type of character as *shite* nor the contemporary of it.[98] In *Ashikari*, the narrator does indeed play these roles of *waki*. In the

---

[95] Richard Eder, "Confession as the Ultimate Deception," review of *Quicksand* by Jun'ichirō Tanizaki, trans. Howard Hibbett, and *The Reed Cutter and Captain Shigemoto's Mother* by Jun'ichirō Tanizaki, trans. Anthony H. Chambers, *Los Angeles Times*, February 27, 1994.
[96] Chambers, *The Secret Window*, 47.
[97] Anthony Hood Chambers, "Tradition in the Works of Tanizaki Jun'ichirō" (Ph.D. diss., The University of Michigan, 1974), 91–92.
[98] Nogami Toyoichirō, "Waki no butaiteki sonzai riyū," *Nō no yūgen to hana* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1943), 207–208.

translations of *Ashikari*, so do the translators. In this structure, the relationship between the translator and the original author can be likened to that of *waki* and *shite*. Continuing this metaphor, the translator summons the author from the past to the present, making him appear in a different form than the original and releasing his spirit. Being translated with a strategy that focuses on the form of the original text, *Ashikari* succeeds in making the *mugen* Noh structure apparent and upholds the harmonious bond between translator and author.

Conclusion

This article has revealed that the context of the two translations of *Ashikari* influenced the selection of their respective target audiences and the content of each of the translated texts. The article has also shown that two translations of the same work can function in different ways. In the 1930s, Humpherson and Okita rewrote the narrative structure of *Ashikari* in order to step behind the author for the audience's benefit. It is possible to understand their lack of focus on the *mugen* Noh structure by their assumption that Japanese literature had not spread widely outside Japan. Rather, they assumed that the story functioned as a novella set within a foreign culture and included many exotic references. Even if the combination of the added term "wraith" with the man's vanishing in the ending could have produced the effect of the *mugen* Noh structure, the translation worked within the stereotyped narrative pattern ascribed to Japanese literature at the time.

Alternatively, Chambers emphasized the link between his translation and classical Japanese literature with its particular style. This translation appeared in the 1990s when new contemporary Japanese authors were being accepted through English translations that went beyond the old-fashioned image of modern Japanese literature during the postwar period. Against this background, Chambers' translation challenged Tanizaki's established literary canonization, which began in the 1950s. The textual analysis of Chambers' translation strategy revealed that *The Reed Cutter* was, in fact, a translation with a visible translator that managed the foreign effect of classical Japanese literature despite being written in English. It stood on the assumption that this would draw the attention of a wider audience, including the academic community at the time, familiar as they were with modern Japanese literature and Tanizaki's works. In this situation, *The Reed Cutter* invited the reader to imagine the *mugen* Noh structure created by the narrator and the man in the reeds. Within this strategy, the visible translator, who accompanies the author and implicitly presents the *mugen* Noh structure,

suggests a concept of the translator as *waki*. Thus, this study has tried to unlock new horizons for literary translations, which can exist as individual works rather than just as secondary products to the original. Furthermore, the paratextual and textual analysis of translations not only offered different interpretations of the same original work in terms of the translator's participation in the reading, but also proposed a new conception of translation itself by employing the metaphor of *mugen* Noh.