Beyond the Book on the Shelf: The Value of Translation Theory

by

LoriAnn Dawn Lockhart

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Germanic Languages, Literatures and Linguistics

Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies
University of Alberta

© LoriAnn Dawn Lockhart, 2017

Abstract

For many, translation begins and ends with the book on the shelf; it is often thought to be the end product of a simple process of linguistic transfer between languages, completed by someone who simply has knowledge of both languages. However, this hardly captures the nature of translation and is at best a poor understanding of the act and field of translation. Each act of translation involves a complex negotiation between languages and cultures. The intricacies and complexities of each act of translation, which is grounded in translation theory, are not widely known. This is quite unfortunate as there are benefits to becoming familiar with the translation theories that ground the work of translators. Comparing and analyzing three translations of Yoko Tawada's "Das Fremde aus der Dose" I will demonstrate what we can learn about translation theory through the act of translation. I will explore the ways in which translation theory allows us to accommodate and appreciate the social nature of translation in useful and practical ways beyond the book on the shelf.

Dedication

For my husband, Mike, thank-you for your unfaltering love and support.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Carrie Smith-Prei, for her guidance throughout this project, for her patience, and encouragement. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Anne Malena and Dr. Andreas Stuhlmann, for their willing participation and invaluable feedback.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER 2: UM TAWADAS WERK KENNEN ZU LERNEN 6

SECTION 2.1: A PRIMER ON TAWADA'S OEUVRE 6
SECTION 2.2: A CLOSER LOOK AT "DAS FREMDE AUS DER DOSE" 21

CHAPTER 3: BEYOND THE BOOK ON THE SHELF 33

CHAPTER 4: WHERE TRANSLATIONS DIVERGE: COMPARING AND ANALYZING TRANSLATIONS OF "DAS FREMDE AUS DER DOSE" 52

SECTION 4.1: STRATEGIES 53
SECTION 4.2: PRELIMINARIES 57
SECTION 4.3: METHODOLOGY 58
SECTION 4.4: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS 59

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION 88

WORKS CITED 90

APPENDIX A: "DAS FREMDE AUS DER DOSE" 98

APPENDIX B: TRANSLATION ONE 99

APPENDIX C: TRANSLATION TWO 104

APPENDIX D: TRANSLATION THREE 109

Chapter 1: Introduction

Translation is sometimes seen as a simple process of linguistic transfer; that which is written in one language is without difficulty transferred to another language by someone who simply has knowledge of both languages (Bassnett, *Translation* 2). However, when we start to think about what happens when a text is translated, the intricacies of the process become apparent. Each act of translation involves a complex negotiation between languages and cultures, interpretation of the source text, and a reformulation into the target language (Bassnett, *Translation* 3). Adding to the complexity of translation is the possibility of translating a single text ad infinitum. David Bellos, translation theorist, writes, "any utterance of more than trivial length has no *one* translation; all utterances have innumerably many acceptable translations" (8). The variation in the translations of the opening line of Franz Kafka's "Die Verwandlung" or "Metamorphosis," as it is most often translated in English, illustrates this multiplicity. The short story begins with the sentence:

> Als Gregor Samsa eines Morgen aus unruhigen Träumen erwachte, fand er sich in seinem Bett zu einem ungeheuren Ungeziefer verwandelt. (62)

This sentence, although seemingly straightforward, has caused quite a lot of trouble for translators. In part, the difficulty lies in the ambiguity of the word *Ungeziefer*, which does not have a clear or direct translation in English. This sentence has been translated many times and in numerous different ways. Following are eight different examples of the variations that translators have produced (qtd. in Gooderham):

1. As Gregor Samsa awoke one morning from uneasy dreams he found himself transformed in his bed into a gigantic insect. (Edwin and Willa Muir 1993)

2. Gregor Samsa woke up one morning from unsettling dreams, he found himself changed in his bed into a monstrous vermin. (Stanley Corngold 1972)

3. One morning, upon awaking from agitated dreams, Gregor Samsa found himself, in his bed, transformed into a monstrous vermin. (Joachim Neugroschel 1993)

4. When Gregor Samsa awoke one morning from troubled dreams, he found himself changed into a monstrous cockroach in his bed. (Michael Hofmann 2007)

5. As Gregor Samsa woke one morning from uneasy dreams, he found himself transformed into some kind of monstrous vermin. (Joyce Crick 2009)

6. One morning Gregor Samsa woke in his bed from uneasy dreams and found he had turned into a large verminous insect. (John Williams 2014)

7. One morning, as Gregor Samsa woke from a fitful, dream-filled sleep, he found that he had changed into an enormous bedbug. (Christopher Moncrieff 2014)

8. When Gregor Samsa woke one morning from troubled dreams, he found himself transformed right there in his bed into some sort of monstrous insect. (Susan Bernofsky 2014)

All of these are "acceptable translations"; they all capture the meaning of the German sentence, none would be considered incorrect, nor is one *more* correct than another. But how and why is it that so many translations of one sentence exist? Bellos offers one suggestion, he writes: "The variability of translations is incontrovertible evidence of the limitless flexibility of human minds. There can hardly be a more interesting subject than that" (9). As limitless and flexible as human ingenuity is, so too is the number of potential translations. However, these variations are not simply due to the "limitless flexibility" of human ingenuity. The diverse ways in which the various translators chose to render elements of the above sentence, for example, *Ungeziefer* in English (vermin, cockroach, bedbug, etc.), how Gregor's dreams are described (fitful, uneasy, troubled, etc.), and the syntactical differences between the sentences are representative of the variety and number of theories and strategies that the translators applied when translating the text. Translation theory is not only the reason that variability exists in translation, it also helps to explain how and why it exists.

Andrew Chesterman asserts that "[a] translation is [. . .] a theory: the translator's theory, posed as a tentative solution to the initial question of how to translate the source text" (*Memes* 116). According to Chesterman, "theories themselves come in many shapes and sizes: some are a good deal more formalized than others, some are empirical, others are metaphorical; some are at a high level of generality, others more specific" (*Memes* 2). That is to say, that whether formalized or not, translators have a theory of translation from which they draw and also develop when translating. This theory may incorporate multiple other theories, be quite broad, or change depending on the type of text being translated. Chesterman uses the term 'theory' "in a wide and rather loose sense that derives from the

etymology of the word: a theory is taken to be a set of concepts and statements that provides a systematic perspective on something, a perspective that allows us to understand it in some way, and hence perhaps to explain it" ("A Causal Model" 15). In this sense of the word, the conception of theory is quite broad, encompassing formal theories as well as informal theorizing.

As seen with the "Metamorphosis" example above, the end product, or the book on the shelf, is perhaps the most visible and obvious benefit or product of translation theory. The public sees this product, but they do not necessarily have access to, or knowledge of, the theory that has gone into making it what it is. Although it may not be explicitly obvious, there is a great deal more to translation theory than the book on the shelf. Translation theory has much more to offer than just this product; there is much to learn from theory, and there are benefits to interaction with theory.

In this thesis I will be working with three translations of German-Japanese author Yoko Tawada's "Das Fremde aus der Dose" in order to demonstrate what we can learn about translation theory by translating a text, and in particular what variability between translations of the same text represents. Further, I will explore the ways in which translation theory allows us to accommodate and appreciate the social nature of translation in very useful and practical ways. I will begin by introducing Tawada's work in general, then take a closer look at her short text, "Das Fremde aus der Dose," followed by a discussion of the value and importance of translation theory beyond its role in the production of translated texts and what it has to offer, after which I will compare and analyze the translations within the framework of the previous discussion. My goal is to

draw attention to the importance of translation theory as a whole and its potential value beyond its primary application in the production of translated texts.

Chapter 2: Um Tawadas Werk kennen zu lernen

Section 2.1: A Primer on Tawada's Oeuvre

Yoko Tawada was born in Tokyo, Japan in 1960; she studied literature at Waseda University in Tokyo before relocating to Hamburg, Germany in 1982. She received her Ph.D. in German literature from the University of Zurich. Since 2006 she has resided in Berlin (Wright, "Introduction" 3). She is a prolific writer and has published numerous books, articles, and short stories. She writes both in her native language, Japanese, and her adopted language, German. Tawada has been awarded many literary prizes for her work, including Japan's prestigious Akutagawa Prize in 1993 and, in 1996, Germany's Adelbert von Chamisso Prize, the highest honour bestowed upon a foreign-born author; she has established herself in both Japan and Germany as one of the most important writers of her generation (Bernofsky, "Translator's Note" VII).

Tawada's work is often described as being in-between these two languages and cultures (Baur; Bernofsky, "Translator's Note" VII; Slaymaker 6); this in-between-ness becomes an important theme in much of her work, and a catalyst for delving into other themes relating to language and culture. It is also where she positions many of her characters. The text that will be the focus of this thesis, "Das Fremde aus der Dose," is one of her earlier works, first published in an Austrian journal called *Manuskripte* in 1990, and again in 1996 and 2008 as part of a collection of her short stories titled *Talisman* (Bernofsky, "Disorientated" 449).

I have chosen to engage with Yoko Tawada's work because she has unique insights on language and culture; and her texts display in their themes and topics a broad

understanding of translation. She describes her writing as between languages, a space where non-verbal or preverbal thoughts exist that she then translates into language, German or Japanese (qtd. in Eshel). For her, the act of writing is an act of translation; in a sense her text has already been translated once, and translating it into English is yet another translation. Because she incorporates her theory of language into her work, translating her work is in part deciphering her theory of language and translation. In addition, the negotiation between languages and cultures and ambiguity of what is foreign and familiar are pervasive themes throughout "Das Fremde aus der Dose" in particular, thus making it an ideal text in which to anchor a discussion of translation theory.

Inspired by such writers as Walter Benjamin, Tawada incorporates both poetic style and theoretical discussion into her thought-provoking texts (qtd. in Eshel). "Das Fremde aus der Dose" is one such example of this poetical-theoretical style of writing. This text is neither exclusively an entertaining narrative, nor solely a theoretical text presenting an argument; it is somewhere in-between, incorporating elements of both, which is fitting for Tawada, as "in-between-ness" is a central theme in her work.

When working with a Tawada text it is important to consider it within the broader context of the body of her work as she tends to deal with a particular set of themes and concepts in her writing: the function of language beyond communication, focusing on its physiological features, the materiality of language, the arbitrary relationships between sign and signified, foreignness, space between cultures, cultural translation and the inaccessibility thereof, identity, and gender. Tawada's unique style of writing incorporates "defamiliarizing techniques" and she has a "tendency to foreground structures and properties of language" through "metalinguistic reflection" (Wright, "Introduction" 4).

Additionally, she tends towards sentences that are syntactically less complicated or minimalist. It has been argued that her minimalist style is a strategy, used to support "the fiction of the first-person narrator moving with wonder through a new language" rather than a reflection of Tawada's proficiency in the German language (Gelzer, qtd. in Wright, "Introduction" 4). What follows is a brief description of some of these aspects of Tawada's work as well as an analysis of "Das Fremde aus der Dose," which will serve to draw attention to these features. This discussion will not only focus on key features of Tawada's work, but it will also provide a frame of reference to draw on throughout the analysis of the translations that follow.

Many of Tawada's texts draw attention to the difficulty of cultural translation; that is, "the translation of native or indigenous concepts, which includes both verbal and non-verbal acts" (Wright, "Introduction" 12). Cultural translation may include literary translation, but it also extends far beyond translating texts. It involves the facilitating of understanding of cultural customs, concepts, and ways of life from one culture to another. This encompasses a vast number of ideas, concepts, and practices, including but not limited to such things as the way people dress, whether they shake hands or not, how they address one another, religious practices, the way in which their society is set up, how their cities are organized, etc. This type of information is undoubtedly difficult to translate. Consider the gesture of a handshake; it is one thing to explain to Culture B that Culture A shakes hands when they greet one another, but in order for Culture B to gain an understanding of the significance of the practice within Culture A, further explanation of the social, psychological, and historical background that underpins the gesture is required.

In Tawada's short text "The Talisman,"[1] translated into English by Susan Bernofsky and published in the collection *Where Europe Begins*, the narrator, new to the city, experiences the difficulty of cultural translation first hand. The narrator is intrigued by the behaviour of her neighbour, Gilda, whom she describes as "nervous," and who, based on the text, seems to have a mental illness of sorts. Gilda's nervousness leads her to fast for a week or two. Gilda explains that she is fasting primarily because of the "many poisons in food," but also because "she ha[s] too much excess flesh on her body" (95). The narrator accepts Gilda's fasting, noting: "Every culture has its own purification ceremony, or several of them. In this city, however, the ceremony has no predetermined day, time or opening prayer. There are no specifications, or at least no rules I could recognize as such" (95). Although the narrator has an understanding of what it means to fast, it is linked to a cultural practice that has religious connotation. This is quite different from what Gilda intends to do. Gilda's fasting has more to do with appearance, cultural expectations around female bodies, and a sudden interest in what she perceives to be health, rather than a ritual purification. The narrator and Gilda have very different understandings of the practice of fasting: for one, it is a ritual purification, and for the other, it is a pragmatic act, not related to spirituality. In order for the narrator to appreciate Gilda's notion of fasting, she must separate her preconceptions about it and gain an understanding of the cultural framework within which Gilda understands it.

Tawada often uses comparisons between cultures, usually Japanese and German, to draw attention to the difficulty of cultural translation in her texts. For example, she may not explicitly write that it is difficult for someone in Culture X to understand Concept Y in

[1] The short text, "The Talisman," is not to be confused with the collection of short stories within which the German original is published, *Talisman.*

Culture Z; instead she may use her characters and their observations about a particular cultural practice or behaviour to subtly draw attention to these differences, as seen in the previous example. Her narrators often notice differences between cultures, ask questions, make assumptions, and speculate as to the meaning of certain practices or behaviours. Through her narrator, she encourages the reader to contemplate the implications of these observations and comparisons between cultures, and to reflect on the cultural specificity of such practices or behaviours and also how a cultural outsider may view them. An example of this can also be found in "The Talisman:"

> I didn't know the name of the evil force these women were trying to protect themselves from with this talisman's help. They never revealed its name to me, and I still haven't made a concerted effort to find out what it is. Where I come from, people say you should never utter the name of a dangerous being aloud. (92)

The "talisman" that the narrator is referring to is not a talisman at all, but actually simply refers to the earrings that women commonly wear. The narrator seeks to find meaning in the practice of wearing this "talisman" within her own cultural frame of reference. Tawada writes, "[w]here I come from," thus drawing comparisons between her own culture and this new culture. She makes assumptions about the objects from the frame of reference of her cultural origin: this new culture is religious, they believe in dangerous beings from which one needs protection, the object must be a talisman, the reason no one talks about the evil force is perhaps because its name should not be spoken. She attempts to understand this practice through her own cultural experiences; unfortunately, her attempt fails and the objects remain misunderstood:

> I had read in a book that there are cultures in which part of the sexual organ is cut away during the initiation rite. A different part of the body can be substituted, however; the feet, for example, or the ears. In this case not the earring itself but merely the perforation of the earlobe would be significant. (93)

The basis of her understanding of the object is misplaced; her understanding is grounded in her own cultural frame of reference, which does not have the same points of reference as her new cultural setting. Cultural artifacts and understanding cannot simply be transferred between cultures, but instead must be mediated through interpretation or some form of translation. Something so simple in one culture that it is almost unnoticeable, namely women wearing earrings, does not translate into the other culture; it is neither fully understood nor well explained, as there is no equivalent concept of it in the receiving culture. Likewise in a literary text, the reader also negotiates meaning based on her own cultural frame of reference. Translation is a window into another culture, yet when the reader encounters words or concepts, which have no equivalent in the target language, understanding is limited. Jiří Levý writes, "It is frequently the case that the target language does not have at its disposal an expression that is as semantically broad or ambivalent as an expression found in the original [language]" (38). An example of this would be encountering the French word *flâner* in a literary text. This verb was "defined in the nineteenth century as the art of leisurely strolling the streets of Paris, without any particular goal or destination, simply for the pleasure of soaking up the beauty of the city," people who do so are referred to as "*flâneurs*" ("Untranslatable"). There is no clear or direct translation for this word in English. However this verb is translated, whether the translator retains the French word and adds a footnote, or supplements the translation with an

explanation, for the reader who has never been to Paris, this word poses a problem. This word is not simply a verb; it is linked to a concept, rooted in a specific culture, within a particular city (Paris). No *explanation* of how beautiful the city is would be a sufficient substitution for *experiencing* Paris first hand.[2] Although this is not a difficult concept to explain, it is difficult to translate because it is so deeply rooted in the source culture. In order for the foreign reader to really grasp the meaning, the translator must navigate an intricate negotiation between cultures.

This outsider perspective is a key feature of Tawada's German-language prose writings, many of which are narrated from this perspective, usually a Japanese woman, living in a foreign culture (Wright, "Introduction" 4). She often situates her narrators between two languages and cultures; as outsiders they are made to navigate between the two, often with difficulty and ample misunderstanding. The narrators have a unique role in her texts; not only are they telling the story, they are often the protagonists, and at the same time one step removed from the text, capable of observing, analyzing, and commenting on the actions of the characters without influencing the narrative. This multi-faceted role of the narrator allows for a unique perspective: in a way it distances the narrator from the text, which also distances the reader from the text. It encourages the reader to engage with the text from different perspectives and analyze the text in a way similar to that of the narrator, rather than simply following the narrator through the text. The narrator of "Das Fremde aus der Dose" is a Japanese woman living in Germany. In this text, the reader witnesses the narrator's struggle to fully function within a German cultural

---

[2] This assertion is based on Frank Jackson's Knowledge Argument against Physicalism in which he argues that without experiential knowledge of something, one cannot know everything there is to know about that said thing. See Jackson's 1986 article, "What Mary Didn't Know," for his detailed argument.

setting considering her Japanese origin as her frame of reference. She finds herself caught between these two languages and cultures, simultaneously belonging to both and yet also alienated from each of them. At one point in the text the narrator describes Sasha, a woman she met at a bus stop, as follows: "She must have been in her mid-fifties. I don't remember what color her hair was. I didn't learn to register hair-colors as a child, and so I still can't do this" (86). Because the narrator grew up in Japan, she was not accustomed to using hair colour to describe people; this presumably because it is not a defining feature of a person since the vast majority of people in Japan have black hair. Although aware of the common practice of including hair colour in the description of a person, the narrator finds herself alienated from it and not able to participate in the practice herself. Further, she is no longer fully connected to her Japanese heritage in that her relationship with the language, her native tongue, has become somewhat strained: "But at the same time I realized that my native tongue didn't have words for how I felt either [. . .] Often it sickened me to hear people speak their native tongues fluently. It was as if they were unable to think and feel anything but what their languages so readily served up to them" (87-8). She is an outsider, disconnected, and estranged from all language and culture.

Tawada's use of the outsider perspective of her narrator allows her to "foreignize and even exoticize the familiar" in her writing (Wright, "Introduction" 5). Tawada's own knowledge of German society does not influence her narrators; she allows her narrators to encounter this new culture as if they were outsiders, with no prior experience or knowledge of it. They make no assumptions about the culture based in western knowledge they would presumably not yet have acquired; instead, their assumptions are based in their own cultural frame of reference, from which they are also estranged. Her narrators, like

Tawada herself, are between languages and cultures. Without Tawada's influence, her narrators observe and reflect on the things they encounter.

Through her foreign narrators, Tawada draws attention to relatively mundane concepts and objects, those so common they may be previously unobserved or unnoticed by the cultural group to which they belong, and she defamiliarizes them through the eyes of her narrator. Returning to "The Talisman," the story provides an example of the way in which Tawada's narrator "foreignizes" or "exoticizes" such objects in the form of the earrings. In the opening paragraph the Japanese narrator notices "many women who wear bits of metal on their ears" and that "they have holes put in their earlobes especially for this purpose" (91). When the narrator finally asks her friend about this, the friend "replie[s] indifferently that the earring was simply a piece of jewellery and had no meaning at all" (93). The narrator is suspicious of this simple explanation; she reflects on the possible functions and value of these objects, as she is convinced they are more than a fashion statement. It is her outsider perspective that causes her reflection on the objects. Because she is unaccustomed to this new cultural setting, she perceives all aspects of it as foreign. "As cultural outsiders Tawada's narrators are not privy to the contextual knowledge that would automatize their readings of these signs", in this case, earrings (Wright, "Introduction" 15). She is unable to read the cultural signs and cues that are common to this new culture. She attempts to decipher them by reflecting on their use and meaning, and by asking questions. In the same way that Tawada's narrators reflect on aspects of their new surroundings, so too is the reader encouraged to critically reflect and ask questions. Bernofsky comments, "Tawada's work asks that we pay close attention to all the different frames of reference represented in a book, including our own" ("Disorientated"

453). The North American reader of the translated text lacks both the German and the Japanese contexts. She is not unlike Tawada's narrators, who are also outside of all contexts, or at the very least displaced between them.

When it comes to translating this text, the translator may wish to establish a familiar context for the reader by manipulating the translation in such a way that it fits within her cultural context; in other words, domesticating or naturalizing the translation. On the other hand, the translator may wish to push this sense of displacement and choose to translate closer to the original text, retaining foreign elements of the original that place the text outside of a familiar context or far from the reader's familiar points of reference. In a sense, replicating the experience of the narrator in the translation. Tawada writes, "at the moment you start thinking about the different things, the forms of the objects, the names, etc., they start to become . . . enigmatic [. . .]. [A]n enigma does not exist *a priori*. You have to create it through the thinking process" (qtd. in Totten 96). Earrings, from this perspective, become strange objects, the use of which requires explanation. The strangeness of wearing earrings may not be conspicuous to someone who has grown up in a culture in which it is common practice for women to wear earrings; they may not realize that perhaps this practice is culturally specific. Since many of Tawada's narrators are distanced from the culture in which they reside, they are able to look at familiar objects in new and interesting ways, a difficult task for someone who is immersed in the culture. Her narrators closely, perhaps too closely, observe through the "distorting mirror of another culture and language" or the unique perspective of another culture and language in order to reveal what is strange in the familiar (Maehl 81). Tawada uses this perspective in her texts to draw attention to those

things that are familiar to one culture, yet from the perspective of an outsider may seem exotic or foreign.

In order to create this perception Tawada employs what Chantal Wright refers to as "retrospective foreignization" [3] in her texts ("Introduction" 10). "Retrospective foreignization" as Wright describes it, is the deliberate "distortion that emerges from the process of recreating her [Tawada's] initial sense of alienation," which she experienced when she first moved to Germany and was confronted with a different language and culture ("Introduction" 10). It is retrospective in that Tawada is looking back and drawing on her personal experiences of when she first came to live in Germany for inspiration in her texts. The foreignization aspect refers to the way in which Tawada perceived her surroundings: as an outsider in a new cultural setting, everything—the city, the language, the customs—was unfamiliar. The effect of "retrospective foreignization" results from Tawada's reflections on and analysis of her earlier perceptions, experiences, and frames of reference. It is another defamiliarizing technique that she utilizes in her writing. This is the perspective from which Tawada writes; she draws on her own personal experience, but intentionally adds in elements and scenarios that are fictional, embellished, or simply invented for the purpose of emphasizing her point (Wright, "Introduction" 10). In so doing, she makes everyday things—things very common and familiar to one culture—seem very strange, obscure, or foreign. In Tawada's text "Von der Muttersprache zur Sprachmutter" translated as "From Mother Tongue to Linguistic Mother" by Rachel McNichol, the narrator describes an instance where she observed a peculiar exchange between a woman and a pencil:

---

[3] Lawrence Venuti is a strong proponent of foreignization in translation and writes extensively on the topic.

> One day, I heard another woman in the office complaining about her pencil: "This stupid pencil! It's gone mad! It refuses to write today!" Every time she sharpened it and tried to write with it, the lead snapped. In the Japanese language, you cannot personify a pencil in this way. A pencil can neither be stupid nor go mad. I have never heard anyone in Japan complaining about a pencil as if it was a person. (139)

In certain cultural settings the personification of inanimate objects is very common and mutually understood by members of the cultural group. Yet as Tawada's narrator points out, this practice is culturally specific and the practice not only makes little sense in other cultures, but certain linguistic systems do not allow for the personification or anthropomorphization of inanimate objects.

This leads to another unique feature of Tawada's work: she tends to "foreground structures and properties of language itself" through "metalinguistic reflection" (Wright, "Introduction" 4). "Tawada texts draw attention to another dimension of language, which extends its function beyond the purely communicative, and focuses on its associative physiological features" (Wright, "Introduction" 12). Her texts often deal with her ideas about language, linguistic systems, including the characters or symbols that comprise those systems, and how they are used. The manner in which these elements of language come together to create meaning is important for Tawada and is explored in "Das Fremde aus der Dose." Here, the narrator is concerned with letters, sounds, and discrepancies between words, images, and concepts. Tawada writes, "I already knew the alphabet when I arrived in Hamburg, but I could gaze at the individual letters for a long time without recognizing the meaning of the words" (85). Her narrator seeks meaning, but instead finds only letters. The narrator's perspective reflects Tawada's personal view on the topic; that is, letters,

characters, or any linguistic symbols must be assigned meaning. Letters hold no meaning in and of themselves, only when combined do they form words and sentences that have meaning. In the lecture “Schrift einer Schildkröte,” ‘Tortoise Writing,’ given in Tübingen in 1998, Tawada remarked: “The letters of the alphabet are incomprehensible creatures. By themselves they are free of all meaning and therefore unpredictable. Only when they are combined do words come into meaning” (qtd. in Wright, “Introduction” 17). Tawada’s narrators see letters as strange and even meaningless. Because of this they are able to reflect on the structure and properties of the letters themselves separate from the letters’ function as meaningful linguistic symbols. Tawada implies that the way in which letters are put together to make words is arbitrary. “Tawada’s conclusion is that the letters of the alphabet are inherently untranslatable, since they are only phonetic representations with no inherent signifying power” (Wright, “Introduction” 18). In and of themselves they represent sounds, but have no inherent meaning. Instead, what they represent appears entirely subjective. In a way Tawada’s writing is also translating; translating letters into words, prescribing meaning, and determining appropriate form.

The way that Tawada perceives elements of language provides insight into her view of translation. She believes that even one’s mother tongue is a translation of non-verbal or pre-verbal thoughts. In an interview with Monika Totten, Tawada states, “I think it an illusion to believe the mother tongue to be authentic. The mother tongue is a translation from non-verbal or pre-verbal thoughts” (qtd. in Totten 95). Tawada says of herself, that she “lives between two languages, in the space where no language is, and is trying to translate something that has no form into one language” (qtd. in Eshel). Tawada’s texts start at a place “where no language is,” in other words, her preverbal thoughts, and from

there she translates her thoughts into a language (German or Japanese) and she writes. Following Tawada's line of thinking, then all language is a translation and translation happens not only between languages, but also on a more basic level between thoughts and language.

Questions as to the nature of language are pervasive throughout Tawada's work. Returning to the previous example of the relationship between the woman and her pencil in "Von der Muttersprache zur Sprachmutter," Tawada writes:

> The German language was at the bottom of what I saw as a strange relationship between that pencil and the woman. In German, it was possible for the pencil to offer the woman resistance, and in return, for the woman to assert her power over the pencil by complaining about it. Her power consisted in the fact that she could talk about the pencil, whereas the pencil was dumb. (140)

The narrator not only describes a social difference between these cultures—the curious relationship between the woman and her pencil—but also a linguistic one: the reason she is able to have this relationship and that she is able to describe it in this way, is because of the structure of the German language. Simply put, the rules concerning the way nouns work with verbs in German allow the woman to berate her pencil in such a way that would not be possible in Japanese. As the narrator previously pointed out, this is not possible in all languages due to the linguistic rules and structures of other languages. Tawada draws a connection between language and culture here: without the linguistic system in place to describe the relationship, the relationship or concept of this type of relationship would not exist. A tension between illegibility and obsessive interpretation arises both with the characters in her texts and for the reader engaging with her texts.

Illustrated in the above discussion, Tawada's texts are directly concerned with language and culture. As Tawada herself is between two cultures, so are her narrators. She places her narrator outside of the familiar culture in order to make observations and question common assumptions. Interpretation is an important part of any translation; the way in which the translator understands the text and how she interprets it influences her translation of it. Translating Tawada's texts can be difficult for this reason. As Tawada's characters are made to navigate their surroundings and decipher the signs they encounter, so too are translators made to not only decipher the language they encounter, but also interpret meaning and relay this in their translations. In translating Tawada, not only are we applying theories of translation, but also uncovering her theory of translation and language. Her prose texts can be seen as representations of her "theory" of language, translation, culture, or meaning. In a way, translating a Tawada text is translating her "theory". She makes visible the process of translation and the role of theory in her texts as reflected in her writing style, characters, and her understanding of writing and the writing process. The difficulty of cultural translation that is depicted in Tawada's work is mirrored in literary translation as well. Not only does the literary translator mediate the differences between two cultures, but also combines the additional aspect of language as a further layer of complexity.

The next section will take a closer look at "Das Fremde aus der Dose," which will further illustrate Tawada's interest in language and culture.

Section 2.2: A Closer Look at "Das Fremde aus der Dose"

"Das Fremde aus der Dose" is written in fragments, purposely lacking a clearly defined direction in which the text will take. Thus, Tawada leaves room for the reader to interpret meaning in the text and draw her own conclusions. Narrated in the first person, the text begins with a general remark about illiteracy, then jumps to a discussion about the shape of letters, then to friends who cannot read, followed by observations of foreign facial expressions, Chinese characters, tuna fish, and finally the act of reading people as if they are text. It is the narrator who connects these passages together. Typical of Tawada texts, the narrator is an outsider; she lives in Hamburg, but comes from Japan. She has no name, yet when considered in light of other Tawada texts, this character is made up of, at least in part, Tawada's own experiences as an outsider in a foreign city. It is the narrator who guides the reader through the text. The narrator not only describes particular experiences and observations, but also analyzes and reflects on them before jumping to the next fragment.

Further, similar to Tawada's broader body of work, this text centers on issues of language and culture. The following will discuss how aspects of this text relate to translation and translation theory, in particular, the way in which Tawada engages with the concept of reading, how she questions connections between signs, symbols, and their associative meaning, and lastly, how she portrays the difficulty of communicating differences between cultures.

The text begins with the following assertion: "In any city one finds a surprisingly large number of people who cannot read" (85). Tawada qualifies her statement: "Some of them are still too young, others simply refuse to learn the letters of the alphabet. There are

also a good many tourists and workers from other countries who live with a different set of characters altogether. In their eyes, the image of the city seems enigmatic, veiled" (85). It could be assumed that the narrator is simply making a statement based on her observations; she suggests that literacy rates in many cities are surprisingly low. But Tawada's assertion is meant to reveal more than a simple observation about literacy rates. Progressing through the text, it becomes clear that she is hinting at a more complex observation than the ability to function within a linguistic system, whether it is one's own or adopted. What she is really interested in is what constitutes the ability to read. Tawada seems to be suggesting that the concept of reading be broadened. That is, one needs more than the competency within a linguistic system to *read*, more than language itself. What it means to read extends beyond reading letters and words to reading culturally specific signs, symbols, and even people (behaviours and expressions).

Throughout the text the characters encounter signs and symbols that need to be deciphered, but not necessarily *read*. Tawada illustrates this with the characters of Sasha and Sonia. She writes, "Apart from reading and writing, the two of them were able to manage everything they needed to live their lives" (87). These are two women in their mid-fifties, neither of whom can read, and yet both are able to function quite well in society. It is not conventional reading (i.e.: reading the alphabet), but instead observing, a modified type of reading, which allows them to do so. Tawada seems to be advocating for a broader concept of reading that includes observation; she is implying that one's ability to read the alphabet is a limited notion of what it means to read. The narrator herself expresses her inability to read despite her knowledge of the alphabet: "I already knew the alphabet when I arrived in Hamburg, but I could gaze at the individual letters for a long time without

recognizing the meaning of the words" (85). We know that the narrator is not illiterate because she knows the Japanese language; however, it is the German language and culture with which she has to become literate. Language is but one element used to describe and represent culture, but language itself is limited, even for the native speaker. The narrator remarks: "Most of the words that came out of my mouth had nothing to do with how I felt. But at the same time I realized that my native tongue didn't have words for how I felt either" (87).

The inability to read, in this text, extends to reading the body[4] (body language, expressions, and behaviours) and facial expressions in particular. The narrator remarks of Sasha: "Whenever she saw me she gazed at me intently and with interest, but she never attempted to read anything in my face [. . .] She didn't want to "read" things, she wanted to observe them, in detail" (86). For Sasha, observing was more important than reading. Although she was unable to read, she understood, and was able to navigate through life by observing her surroundings. Tawada's narrator comments, "I often found that people became uneasy when they couldn't read my face like a text. It's curious the way the expression of a foreigner's face is often compared to a mask" (86). The German people with whom the Japanese narrator came into contact could not read her facial expression. Despite their desire to read her expression or find something familiar in her expression, they failed to decipher it. This experience is not unique to Tawada's narrator, foreign facial expressions can be difficult to decipher and interpret; this difficulty is at least in part due to

[4] For another interpretation, see Slaymaker who suggests that for Tawada, "Bodies and body parts provide more than a metaphor and imagery when talking about language; language is comprised of and concretizes our bodies" (9). In the same collection, Hiltrud Arens reflects on the relationship between the body of language (Sprachkörper) and the language of body (Körpersprache) as seen in Tawada's texts (71).

difference between cultures. According to psychologist Rachael Jack,[5] people from different cultures think about facial expressions in different ways and there are cultural differences in the way people communicate (25). Jack's research found that different cultures rely on different cues and signals when reading facial expressions. For example, people of East Asian descent tend to look to someone's eyes for expressive information, whereas, those of Western Caucasian descent tend to look to the eyebrows and mouth for this information (24). In the context of "Das Fremde aus der Dose," Sasha was unable to read the narrator's facial expressions because she was not literate in Japanese culture. Similarly, the reader, not familiar with the cultural other may fail to understand the full extent of a translated text that includes foreign cultural elements. Cultural misunderstandings are not limited to the reader. Despite the translator having a firm grasp of the language, a translator not well versed in the culture of the source language may fail at correctly interpreting the meaning of a text.

The statement that there are an alarming number of people who cannot read, then, has double meaning: these people cannot function within the linguistic system of the culture in which they find themselves, but language aside, they are not able to function within the cultural system in which they find themselves because they cannot read, decipher, or understand the signs, symbols, practices, habits, customs, behaviours, etc., that are unique to their adopted culture. The people the narrator is referring to are illiterate in regards to the language (linguistically illiterate), but also the adopted culture, as they are unable to read the signs and symbols of the cultural other; they are culturally illiterate. In

[5] Rachael Jack has done research on cross-cultural communications, specifically looking at representations of facial expressions of emotion. See her article, "Internal Representations Reveal Cultural Diversity in Expectations of Facial Expressions of Emotion," for further information.

order for these people to become culturally literate, and for the foreign culture to become accessible to them, the foreign culture must be translated for them. The text draws attention to this. The translator's role then becomes quite important, as she is not only translating the text, but also providing a glimpse into the source culture.

Despite a broadened view of what it is to read, written and spoken language for Tawada is by no means dispensable, as it is language that can fix the meaning of what is observed to a concrete image or object. Rather than dispensing with language, she wants her reader to embrace it by actively thinking about it in a critical and reflective way, considering its function and analyzing its use. At the end of "Das Fremde aus der Dose," the narrator decides not to read anything in writing for a day; instead, she chooses to observe everything. She observes the people in the street and she compares them to letters (89). The people on their own are like isolated letters, but when they come together they form words and sometimes sentences (89). This could be interpreted in different ways. When people come together they literally form words by engaging in conversation with each other (speech). This implies a view of language as inherently social, that there is no private language; instead, it is shared and only has meaning within a social context. This idea could extend to culture as well: culture is not private, it is shared and its importance relates to its social function. An alternative interpretation, the idea that letters themselves have no objective meaning, echoes Tawada's theory of language. She thinks that a letter by itself is not language; it has no objective meaning. Tawada implies that meaning is constructed within a social context. The act of translation reflects this idea; it is communication between cultures, set within a social and cultural context.

Connected to the idea of reading, Tawada questions connections between signs, symbols, and their associative meaning. These connections and associations are automatic for someone who is immersed in the culture; however, Tawada's foreign narrator perceives the associations of letters, words, and signs as arbitrary. She does not identify necessary connections between them, nor is their meaning fixed within a particular context. For her, these associations are certainly not automatic, and she instead must contemplate their meaning, seeking to interpret the signs, symbols, and objects around her. Tawada writes "[A]t the moment you start thinking about the different things, the forms of the objects, the names, etc., then they start to become alive and . . . enigmatic. They all of a sudden seem enigmatic and thus acquire meaning [. . .]. [A]n enigma does not exist *a priori.* You have to create it through the thinking process" (qtd. in Totten 96). Through her narrator, Tawada does precisely this with everyday objects around her and even the city itself: "In their eyes, the image of the city seems enigmatic, veiled" (85); everything is in need of interpretation. Further, Tawada's narrators, in their naivety, often misread and misinterpret signs. For example, the narrator purchases a tin can at the grocery store (89). The Japanese woman on the label bears no connection to the tuna inside. Judging solely on the label, one might assume there to be a Japanese woman inside. We might consider this a naïve assumption (Of course one cannot purchase canned human at the supermarket!), but Tawada would challenge the reader to consider under what circumstances one would associate an image of a Japanese woman on a tin can with tuna. It seems a rather arbitrary connection. Only with prior knowledge of the place of this object within the broader cultural context, would it make sense that a Japanese woman on a tin can indicates a can of tuna. That is to say that recognition of brands, logos, and words all play a role in making the connection between

the Japanese woman and tuna. These connections are often based within a cultural context. Despite how automatic the association is between, for example, the iconic apple with a bite missing and the Apple brand in a Canadian or American setting. It is undoubtedly an arbitrary connection, which is culturally based. The same logo displayed in a remote village lacking all access to technology, and brand awareness would likely find this an odd or random connection. Tawada's foreign narrator, who is willing to take the label at face value, expects that what is on the outside will relate to its contents; she is incapable of making automatic associations and is continually surprised when there is a disconnect between symbols, signs, and meaning. Her inability to make these automatic associations is no doubt exaggerated; however, Tawada uses the narrator's exaggerated naivety as a tool to guide her reader through the process of defamiliarization, creating an enigma through the thinking process. Tawada herself has been through this process, her narrator is experiencing it, and by proxy her readers and translators may also experience it. This is a lesson for translators, who, like Tawada, but not always to the same extent, are between two or more languages.

Another arbitrary connection that Tawada discusses is Sonia's beloved soap, the outside package of which bears no immediate or necessary connection to the soap inside (89). Based on the beautiful butterflies on the outside packaging, one would assume, and likewise our narrator does, that the contents of the package have some sort of connection to butterflies or nature; but instead, the content of the package is merely soap. However, Sonia does not question her packages of soap. She recognizes the package and immediately, and correctly, associates it with soap. This automatic association is possible because of Sonia's familiarity with the product. Similarly, Tawada's narrator could learn to make this

same association, but instead she subjects the product to “the thinking process”. The narrator is curious about how the packaging relates to the contents and why the packaging relays such a vastly different message about the contents than what the contents actually are, namely soap. She wonders how the package and contents are to be understood. Some of the packages had “soap” written on them. She wonders: without language to fix the meaning and to identify the contents, would the contents and their meaning change (89)? This leads her to question language and letters altogether.

The narrator describes the way in which she perceives her new and foreign language; before she could read the language, she would observe the letters, specifically the structure or the anatomy of the letters. I use the term “anatomy”, as throughout the text there is an underlying emphasis on the physicality, the structure, and form of the letters, drawing parallels to the human body. She notices the physical shape of letters. For Tawada, it is not only the complexity and profundity of the text that is important, but also the characteristics of language that contribute to interpretation of a text. She comments: “It’s not the depth of the text but its surfaces, such as letters, the sound of words, slips of the tongue, and verbal games, which have something to do with the unconscious. And this surface is more conspicuous to someone who has not learned the language as her mother tongue” (qtd. in Totten 96). The narrator is able to observe the letters in this way, because unlike those already familiar with the linguistic symbols, whose reading and understand of which would be immediate, she, as an outsider, is yet to associate letters and their potential meaning when combined as words. Tawada suggests that non-native speakers are more attentive to the visual and acoustic characteristics of letters and words (qtd. in Brandt 7). The narrator echoes Tawada’s own view that letters, in and of themselves, are

incomprehensible and void of meaning. Tawada employs defamiliarization, challenging her reader to consider language, letters, and linguistic symbols in light of how meaning is created and communicated. For Tawada, there exists a chasm between letters, which are merely physical shapes or forms, and language, words, and sentences all of which have meaning.

Tawada is not only interested in the physicality of language, but also the physical effect of language on the body. In an interview with Carsten Klook Tawada remarked, "Dass der Körper sich immer wieder verändert [. . .] Und auch durch die Sprache kann es passiert sein, dass sich der Körper verändert." 'That the body is continually changing [. . .] And also through language it can happen that the body changes' (my trans.; 3). Language has a physical effect on the narrator; she describes her reaction to speaking and hearing the sounds of specific letters: "The Ö sounds, for example, stabbed too deeply into my ears and the R sounds scratched my throat" (87). Language physically irritates her; the sound of certain letters becomes something that disturbs her. She hints at a corporeality of language; it is not simply spoken, it is something that you physically feel. It may even taste a certain way: "I repeated the S sounds in my mouth and noticed that my tongue suddenly tasted odd. I hadn't known a tongue, too, could taste of something" (86). Not only did the language make her tongue feel different, she was aware of the taste of her tongue, a peculiar sensation. It is as if the foreign language attached itself to her tongue like a foreign object.

In an interview with Amir Eshel, Tawada was asked what effect her adopted language has had on writing in her native language and vice versa. Tawada responded that it allows her to distance herself from the languages. This distance, in turn, allows her to be

aware of features of the language that a native speaker, fully immersed in the language and not exposed to other languages, may not be. She notes that she is able to identify beautiful or strange words and characters, thereby engaging with the language in a different way, one that is better seen from the outside than the inside (qtd. in Eshel). From an outsider perspective, the oddities and associations of a specific language become more apparent because they are not inherent or automatic.

Lastly, “Das Fremde aus der Dose,” like many other Tawada texts, highlights the difficulty of communicating differences between cultures. This is perhaps best seen in the passage where the narrator expresses her inability to describe the differences between her culture of origin and German culture: “This difference was painted on my skin like a foreign script which I could feel but not read” (87). The “foreign script” became part of her identity, but more so, part of her physical body. The connection between language and culture becomes physical in that she could feel the foreign language and culture changing her body. “Every foreign sound, every foreign glance, every foreign taste struck my body as disagreeable until my body changed” (87). She implies that the difference was obvious to her in that it was visible on her skin, yet at the same time difficult to describe. Tawada draws similarities between one’s skin and one’s mother tongue: “[T]his language [Japanese, her mother tongue] became for me my exterior skin” (qtd. in Brandt 4). In this sense, language becomes something corporeal, something that moves, and has materiality. For Tawada, language lives and changes (qtd. in Eshel). Tawada uses her narrator to challenge her reader to consider the connection between bodies and language, biology and culture, and the effect each of these has on the other. In an interview with Bettina Brandt, Tawada describes the relationship with foreign words as something that is consumed, she states:

"These foreign words [. . .] can also slowly transform themselves and become meat and then, ultimately, they can become my flesh. [. . .]. [T]his bodily image is also quite concretely linked to the feeling that I get when I pronounce words in a foreign language" (4, 5). The foreign language affects the physical organs and bodily systems required in speech production and language retention (the tongue, mouth, lips, brain, nervous system, etc.). Since the foreign language is not something one is born with, as is skin or one's mother tongue (albeit, thrust upon one, in Tawada's opinion), the foreign language alters the body in a unique and tangible way.

In the final section of the text, the narrator likens people to letters, "I observed the people I saw on the street as though they were isolated letters" (89). The people come together to forms words, sometimes sentences, but never did these people, represented by letters, have any connection to cultural content. Tawada incorporates her own theory of language into the text: letters in and of themselves hold no meaning, they have no contents, they are like empty vessels. The narrator questions whether language and people have or make up cultural content. Tawada does not explicitly state what she means by "cultural content", except that it is something to be discovered by continuing to explore what lies beneath the surface.

Tawada's work is imbued with reflections on language, culture, and transfer of meaning, which relates directly to the act of translation. In an interview regarding her recent translation of Tawada's "Etüden im Schnee" 'Memoirs of a Polar Bear,' Susan Bernofsky comments: "If you speak your native tongue fluently, for her [Tawada] that is the problem. Tawada is always exploring what happens when you actually start thinking about what you are saying and how" (qtd. in Sobelle). Bernofsky is specifically referring to

Tawada's feeling towards linguistic fluency (speaking your native tongue fluently), but I think it would be appropriate to extend this to culture as well. In an essay reflecting on translating Tawada's work, Bernofsky states, "Tawada's work has long concerned itself with the idea that we can never really know our own language until we find ourselves in the position of hearing it as though it were a foreign tongue" ("Disorientated" 453). To reiterate, I think this can extend to culture, as it is fluency itself that Tawada is challenging. Fluency in one's own language and culture can blind one to idiosyncrasies, making it difficult to recognize the uniqueness of one's own culture, and prevent one from critical reflecting on the cultural norms and analysis thereof. "[I]t is only by contrast with the radically other that we can truly see who we are" (Bernofsky, "Disorientated" 453). Cultural translation has to do with transfer of meaning between cultures, it is best done in such a way that the receiving culture is left with a more comprehensive understanding of the origin culture.

Chapter 3: Beyond the Book on the Shelf

In Chapter 4 I will examine the effect of different theories on the outcome of a translation by comparing and analyzing three translations of Tawada's "Das Fremde aus der Dose." In this chapter, however I will argue for the value of translation theory itself, which extends far beyond its use in the production of translated texts to serve a function in the social framework of both the source and target language cultures.

As previously discussed, I am borrowing from Chesterman's broad notion of theory; he describes it in its etymological sense from the Greek noun, *theoria*, which "originally meant a way of seeing, a perspective from which to contemplate something, so as to understand" (*Can Theory Help Translators?* 2). This sense of the word carries a double meaning, one of "the outward sense of 'a looking at, a viewing' and the inner sense of 'contemplation, speculation'" or "to see and contemplate" (*Memes* 2). According to Chesterman what constitutes a translator's theory of translation need not be an "official" theory, which one may learn in an academic setting; it may be the result of experience, a way of approaching a text or a translation problem (*Memes* 2). Chesterman acknowledges that many translators think they do not need theory, yet he argues "that a translator must have a theory of translation: to translate without a theory is to translate blind [. . .] theoretical concepts can be essential tools for thought and decision making during the translation process" (*Memes* 3). Theory helps to establish a conceptual framework within which the translator works and offers "conceptual parameters in which translation problems can be formulated with precision and a particular choice can be made with the help of reasons that take into account not just the foreign text and its culture, but also the

receiving language and its culture" (Venuti, *Invisibility* 274). Working within conceptual parameters helps the translator to create a cohesive text that accounts for both the source and target languages and cultures. Translation theory influences and guides a translator in the choices she makes while translating. However, the relationship between theory and practice is not straightforward, as translation theory also emerges from the practice of translation. Indeed, there is much to learn about theory from practicing translation, yet the existing body of theory from which translators draw cannot be ignored. These existing theories are not merely abstract concepts, they are meant to be used and applied. Susan Bassnett asserts, "theory was not to exist in the abstract, it was to be dynamic and involved in a study of the specifics of translation practice" ("Translation Turn" 124). The translations of "Das Fremde aus der Dose" illustrate the relationship between applied theory and the outcome of a translation. The theory applied to each translation had an impact on the final product. Translation One primarily drew on the strategies of *foreignization*, while Translation Two was primarily informed by strategies of *domestication* (Strategies of *foreignization* and *domestication* will be discussed further in Chapter 4.) As each was translated according to different theories, and employed different strategies and methods, so too are the outcomes of the translations different.

Conversely, it could be argued that the variability present in the three translations of "Das Fremde aus der Dose" are due to stylistic variations between the translations and choices the translators made, instead of applied theory. After all, the English language is flexible and there are numerous ways to express the same sentiment, thus variations in translation are to be expected. While there is undoubtedly truth in this observation, this explanation fails to account for *all* of the variations in the text. This is to suggest that it is

not simply that Bernofsky and I translated the text differently, of course we did, but this is to say that the differences arise not because the translators are different, but more importantly, the differences arise because different theories and strategies were applied while translating, which contributed to differences in the final products. Chesterman claims that "A translation is therefore a theory: the translator's theory, posed as a tentative solution to the initial question of how to translate the source text" (*Memes* 116). He goes on to write,

> In accordance with the etymology of the word, too, the translator's theory thus represents a *view* of the source text, the translator's view. The translation is a representation of how the translator *sees* the source text: "sees" also in the sense of "understands, interprets". (*Memes* 117)

Along Chesterman's line of thinking then, as translators, Bernofsky and I understood and interpreted the text differently, which caused us to draw on particular strategies when translating to produce a unique translation to serve a specific purpose. This is evidence of an important relationship that exists between theory and practice, such that the theory applied affects the translation outcome. Other factors that contribute to variations in translations are the goals of the translator, the purpose of the translation, and the intended audience. While the production of translations or the book on the shelf may be the most immediate, applicable, or visible value of translation theory, the value of translation theory does not end here; it extends beyond this to a serve social function that represents the diversity of languages and cultures and is directly relevant to issues of subjectivity, ideology, and cultural difference.

With this diversity in mind, a translator need not adhere to one single theory when translating a particular text; there are many reasons why a translator would use a certain theory over another. A translation is done for a specific purpose, within a given context, and it is often directed towards a specified audience considering such factors as demographic, education, age, etc. Because of this, methods of translating are not mutually exclusive, which entails that translators are not limited to choosing only one theory or strategy when translating; they may draw from multiple theories while translating a single text. To illustrate, one translator, when translating a text (X) in a single instance may incorporate theory (Y) and produce translation (Z). However, in a different instance of translating text (X), the same translator may draw on theory (A) and produce translation (B). Yet in another instance of translating text (X) the same translator may incorporate a combination of multiple theories in order to produce her translation; part of theory (Y), some of theory (A), and also draw on theories (C) and/or (D) to produce yet another different translation (E). This can go on and on, incorporating the vast number of theories and strategies of translation. But why use a particular theory or theories (or combinations of theories) to produce multiple different translations? There are factors to consider, such as the nature of the message, the audience, and the purpose or purposes of the author and, by proxy, of the translator (Nida 156). Translation serves a purpose; to accomplish this purpose, theory is applied in a specific way, or a specific theory is applied instead of another. When thinking about the purpose of the translation, we can consider such factors as, but not limited to, whether it is for educational purposes: is it meant to teach us about another culture, language, people, group, or is there a moral or lesson that is meant to be gleaned from the story, is there is a political message, or is it simply for entertainment?

To illustrate, consider an original text, the intention of which is encouragement and to uplift the intended audience. The translator, although with a different target audience, wishes to retain the spirit of the text in the translation, so that the target audience receives the message in the same way as the original audience. That the translator is concerned with matching or retaining the relationship between the audience and message, signals according to Eugene Nida, a translation of dynamic equivalence (159). Now, if the text is difficult for the intended audience to relate to, for whatever reason—culturally distant, different social dynamic, change of language over time—then perhaps it is not appropriate to adhere closely to the form of the original, as strategies of foreignization might recommend. "A translation of dynamic equivalence aims at complete naturalness of expression, and tries to relate the receptor [audience] to modes of behavior relevant within the context of his own culture; it does not insist that he understand the cultural patterns of the source-language context in order to comprehend the message" (Nida 159). If the purpose of the translation is to encourage and uplift, and this message would be lost if the text is translated in this manner, then perhaps it is not truth and fidelity to the original text that should guide the translation. Instead, the translator may choose another theory or strategy to accommodate the changes that need to be made to the text in order retain the spirit or message of the text.

This same text may be translated for the same audience with a different purpose. Perhaps the translator is less concerned with the translated text serving the same purpose as the original, and instead is more interested in the sociological factors—race, gender, political environment—that influenced the original text and wishes to make these elements apparent in the translation. The translator may wish to translate in such a way that the

audience is exposed to these sociological factors, thus interacting with the text in a different way than the original was intended. This would be along the lines of what Nida would classify as formal equivalence: “Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form [syntax and idioms] and content [themes and concepts]” (159). Nida goes on to explain that “This type of translation is designed to permit the reader to identify himself as fully as possible with a person in the source-language context, and to understand as much as he can of the customs, manner of thought and means of expression” (159). The target audience may not be encouraged by the text, as was the original intention of the text; however, the intention of the translator in this example was not to encourage the audience, she had a different purpose in mind—learning from the text, using the text to better understand the culture and people for which it was originally written. How the text is translated affects how the audience interacts with it.

The cultural setting into which or from which the text is translated will have a bearing on the outcome. This can be considered in terms of the relatedness of the cultures and languages or the “cultural and linguistic distance” between source and target (Nida 160). A text translated into English for a Canadian audience may not be appropriate for an English-speaking American or British audience. Even though English is the shared language, there are differences between the languages and certainly between the cultures that would justify different translations of a text for each audience. The languages and certain points of reference differ enough that despite the many similarities, each has different words that refer to the same things. Chesterman explains that “many translations of one text, especially canonized ones, are to be expected, every generation has a different view and different expectations of what a translation should be” (*Memes* 118). He insists

that there is more than one way to translate, and refuses any notion of exclusive correctness (*Memes* 118). Even within one English-speaking country each generation, each culture, and subculture could potentially require a translation tailored specifically to it.

Not only are there different ways to translate a text (or different theories to apply when translating), there are also many reasons to translate a text, reasons which contribute to variations in the final translation, each one supported by or requiring a different theory of translation. Thus variation in the translation may have to do with the message the translator is trying to convey, or the purpose for producing the translation in the first place. For Venuti, interpretation plays a major role in the outcome of the translation. He writes, "A translation does not communicate the source text itself but the translator's interpretation of it" (Venuti, "Translation Changes Everything" 114). Venuti suggests that a translator may use the text or manipulate the translation in a certain way so as to fulfill a specific purpose. Translations are done for different purposes and this has to do directly with how they are translated—identity, gender,[6] politics,[7] etc. The differences apparent in these types of translations are due to more than style. Ideology, political leaning, purpose, time and place it was created, for whom it was created, and interpretation of the text are factors that contribute to different outcomes in the translation.

To accommodate the different types of messages, diverse purposes of translators, and prospective audiences, different translations are required. This entails that a great many theories are also required in order to accommodate the vast number of reasons to translate and audiences for whom to translate. It is applied theory that aids in the

---

[6] For further reading on gender and translation see Luise Von Flotow's *Translation and Gender*, Sherry Simon's *Gender in Translation*, and Lori Chamberlain's "Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation."

[7] For further reading on the politics of translations see Gayatri Spivak's "The Politics of Translation" in *Outside in the Teaching Machine.*

production of diverse translations. Returning to the translations of Tawada's "Das Fremde aus der Dose," despite all of the translations having been created for an English-speaking audience, the translations are not the same; this is in part due to the fact that different theoretical models were applied in the production of each, and each highlights different aspects of the original text.

Thus far I have discussed the value of translation theory in regards to its production of translated texts and I have suggested that translation theory serves a social function in that it helps to accommodate the diverse purposes of translation, messages conveyed, and audiences. This broad view of theory that allows for multiple viable translations may be disconcerting for some translators and theorists who are hoping to develop definitive translations of texts, or have an allegiance to specific translation, because in this view, the translator's task is never finished, as there can potentially be an infinite number of translations of a single text. This may seem somewhat daunting. The Indeterminacy of Translation thesis proposed by Willard Van Orman Quine[8] is helpful for understanding how to contend with the consequential multiplicity of translations. According to Quine, there is no reason to prefer one translation to another, there is no definitive translation, and translations are never complete. Instead, translations suit a purpose, a time, a place, but they can be continually edited, and continually revisited. It is neither my intention to offer a defense or entertain objections of his thesis, nor to examine how it has been received and developed; rather his thesis is relevant to the way in which Tawada's and other texts are translated. It helps to explain how there can be variety in translations of the same text, the difficulties faced in translation, as well as how to understand translation theory.

[8] Quine's thesis is not without criticism; following its publication, Quine himself wrote many papers clarifying and defending his thesis against critics.

The essence of Quine's Indeterminacy of Translation Thesis can be stated as the claim that "manuals for translating one language into another can be set up in divergent ways, all compatible with the totality of speech dispositions, yet incompatible with one another. In countless places they will diverge in giving, as their respective translations of a sentence of the one language, sentences of the other language which stand to each other in no plausible sort of equivalence however loose" (24). Quine is suggesting that translations may be produced that not only adequately follow the linguistic rules of the language in question, but also successfully communicate between languages, yet at the same time when compared with other translations of the same text, they are incompatible with each other. Aside from such obvious problems as a sloppy translation, or an ill-equipped or inept translator, Quine suggests that there is no reason to prefer one translation to another. Christopher Hookway adds, "when we adopt one of these [translation manuals] rather than another, we are guided by its utility in facilitating cooperation or conversation rather than by the thought that it alone assigns their 'true' meanings to expressions of the alien [source] language" (127). Thus resulting in the indeterminacy of translation. Quinean scholar, Roger Gibson, describes two such varieties of indeterminacy of translation:[9] the first is the indeterminacy of reference and the second is the indeterminacy of intension or "meaning" (69), which is the set of necessary and sufficient conditions under which a term is applicable (Crystal 238). Neither type of indeterminacy seeks to provide an answer of there being a uniquely correct translation.

Indeterminacy of reference can be thought of in the following way: "Some sentences can be translated in more than one way, and the various versions differ in the reference

[9] Also discussed in Hylton's article "William van Orman Quine."

that they attribute to parts of the sentence, but not in the overall net import that they attribute to the sentence as a whole" (Hylton). In other words, the term's referent or what the term refers to is where the indeterminacy lies. The sentences may have different specific referents, yet the overall meaning of the sentence does not change in a significant way between the different translations, and successful communication is uninhibited. To illustrate indeterminacy of reference, Quine uses the example of a linguist attempting to translate an unknown language. A native speaker of the language in question points at a rabbit and utters the term "Gavagai". Quine suggests that this sentence might be translated in the following ways:

T1: There's a rabbit.

T2: Rabbithood is manifesting itself there.

T3: There are undetached rabbit parts. (48)

In each of these sentences it is not specifically clear if the referent is "rabbit," "rabbithood," or "undetached rabbit parts." Despite the lack of a specific or determinate referent, communication is still possible and it does not really matter what the specific referent is. Considering Quine's view of communication, which is rooted in behaviourism,[10] successful "communication is judged by smoothness of conversation, by frequent predictability of verbal and nonverbal reactions, and by coherence and plausibility of native testimony" (Quine 43; Hylton), any of these are acceptable translations. As long as each of these sentences facilitates successful communication none is more correct than the other. To

[10] A behaviourist requires behavioural evidence for any psychological hypotheses. "Quine took a behaviourist approach to the study of language. He claimed that the notion of psychological or mental activity has no place in a scientific account of either the origins or the meaning of speech. To talk in a scientifically disciplined manner about the meaning of an utterance is to talk about stimuli for the utterance, its so-called "stimulus meaning"" (Graham Sec. 4).

explain further, if the linguist says to her colleague “Pet the rabbit,” “Pet the rabbithood manifesting itself there,” or “Pet the undetached rabbit parts” and she pets the rabbit, this would be judged as successful, because the shared communication elicited the desired response or behaviour, namely, petting the rabbit. Despite the referent not being determinate the communication was still successful. If on the other hand, the response of the colleague was not to pet the rabbit, but instead to eat it, this would be judged as unsuccessful communication, because the elicited behaviour is contrary to the desired response; the communication between the linguist and her colleague failed. In other words, for Quine determinate meaning is not a necessary condition for successful communication.

To further illustrate, consider the following mathematical expressions of “5”:

A: 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1

B: 1 + 4

C: 5

According to Quine, what is important is the “overall net import” or elicited response from each of these expressions. It does not matter which of the three specific expressions are employed. Successful communication is determined by the behaviour between speakers. So I might ask a grocery clerk for 5 apples or 4+1 apples. As long as I get the intended behaviour, communication is successful. The “overall net import” or significance of my utterance is not dependent on determining the meaning of my words. The ways in which we can go about representing this information are “limited only by one’s ingenuity” (Hylton). Quine suggests that without being privy to the source language, it would be close to impossible to fully understand the precise intended referent. But Quine does not see this as a problem, because indeterminacy of reference need not inhibit communication. That

successful translation occurs is not cast in doubt by anything Quine says; his claim, indeed, is that translation may be possible in a multitude of ways (Hylton).

Indeterminacy of intension has to do more with meaning than reference. Quine suggests that some of the differences in translation have to do with more than different referents; instead, these differences are attributed to a different understanding of the language, perhaps a different interpretation of the meaning of the referent (Hylton). Since translation is a hermeneutic activity, how the translator understands the text undoubtedly influences how she translates it. Susan Bassnett writes, "translation and interpretation are not separate activities" (*Translation* 92); in other words, the act of translation requires interpretation on the part of the translator. Interpreting the text includes how she understands the context of the text, its place in history, intertextuality that may be present, and meaning she believes the author intended to convey. If each translator interprets the text in a different way, the result will be a multitude of translations. In the classroom setting, we tend to agree that some popular texts, those often read and much researched, have more or less *correct* interpretations, yet we allow for variation in interpretation if it can be supported with evidence and further research; it need not be limited to the common or popular interpretation. The field of literary criticism depends on the fact that texts are open to interpretation. One of the first tasks of the translator then, is to try to understand and interpret the text with which she is working. The way in which the translator interprets the text is a result of education, training, experience, perspective, purpose, and intention. Likewise, the "choice of a specific sentence may seem like chance, but it is really a result of education, experience and memory" of the translator (Venuti, *Invisibility* 274).

Because these are unique to each translator, we can expect translations to differ between translators.

Gibson summarizes the two types of indeterminacy as follows: "[E]ssentially, "meaning" and reference are indeterminate on behavioural grounds and that to inquire beyond the (possible) behavioural evidence for a unique "meaning" or a unique referent of a[n] [. . .] expression is folly [. . .] We give up hope of determinacy (of "meaning" and reference), and we recognize that there is no fact of the matter regarding unique translation" (70). As determinacy of meaning and reference with translation cannot be attained, we are left with indeterminacy of translation, which entails that translation is possible in many ways and that definitive translations do not exist.

Quine's Indeterminacy of Translation Thesis has been criticized for leading to the impossibility of translation.[11] If both referents and meaning are indeterminate, then it seems that any translation, let alone a *correct* translation would be impossible. Further, that choosing one translation over another would somehow fix the meaning of the target language to the source language indefinitely. However, I do not think this is the point that Quine is trying to make. For Quine, language choice has to do with pragmatics and he is less concerned with truth or correctness (Hookway 135). If this is the case, then what we are left with is not a lack of translation, but rather a multiplicity of translations. In other words, there is no *one* way to translate; instead, there are many. As translators, we can embrace this multiplicity. Anneke van Luxemburg-Albers "believe[s] that the [indeterminacy] thesis offers an explanation and as such a foundation for the necessary creativity in the act of translation" (173). Furthermore, van Luxemburg-Albers suggests that the thesis leads to

[11] For criticisms of Quine's thesis, see John Searle's "Indeterminacy, Empiricism, and the First Person" as well as H. P. Grice and P. F. Strawson's article "In Defense of a Dogma."

the following assertions: “that translation is a hermeneutic activity implying interpreting, that this activity relies on for its correctness only the conventional and changeable rules of the competent speech-actor and as such on intersubjectivity, that in consequence, translation can be done defensibly and always differently” (173-4). Returning to the multiple translations of “Das Fremde aus der Dose,” and considering Quine’s thesis, the differences between the translations are then necessary, unavoidable, and welcomed. A theory of translation that accounts for the variation of translations can be of great use to the study and practice of translation.

In other words, there is no singular, “one translation” of a text. Given the complexity of human beings, which allows us to prize different values, it is reasonable to think, as Quine suggests, that there is an indeterminate amount of translations. And translation theory is exactly that which allows us to appreciate this and to accommodate this. That is, translation theory is not just a theory informing us about a variety of translations, but it allows us, from a unique perspective, to appreciate the diversity of human conditions and variety of lived experiences. Undoubtedly, translators work with text and the primary object of study is text; however, an equally important object of study is human beings, in context, embodied, and embedded within specific cultures. That is to say that the field of study would not exist without a linguistic focus on the written word, yet expanding the scope of study to include the cultural and sociological factors that influence translation has made it more comprehensive, more interdisciplinary, and ultimately more accessible, appealing to a larger audience than those immediately involved in translation studies (Bassnett, *Translation* 28). This describes the “cultural turn” in translation studies as

articulated by Bassnett and Lefevere in the collection of essays, *Translation, History, and Culture*.

Karim Mattar further describes the "cultural turn" as that which "liberated translation theory from a mechanical reliance on Applied Linguistics, which prioritized questions of equivalence, authenticity, and substitution between what were termed the Source Language and Target Language, and foregrounded the interfacing of cultures embodied in the language and the act of translation" (42). This broader view of the study of translation recognizes the interconnectedness of translation and culture, language, society, community, and people; in other words, the intrinsically social nature of translation. Within this broader context the value of translation theory becomes most obvious. Lefevere comments: "The study of translation can teach us a few things not just about the world of literature, but also about the world we live in" (27). Translation theory is about humanity, human nature, and translation theorists know this. Lefevere suggests, that there are "lessons" to be learned from the study of translation. These lessons serve to exemplify the value of translation theory beyond the most obvious value, namely the book on the shelf. They can be loosely organized into two interrelated categories: linguistic and cultural.

Perhaps best seen through history and observing linguistic patterns over time, is the impact that translation has on both the target language and the source language. Lefevere writes: "Translation affects the target language and the source language; it introduces innovations into a literature, it is the main medium through which one literature influences another, and it forces a language to expand" (24). Through translation, languages develop and grow; this can include the introduction of new words, concepts, and syntactical constructions into a language. Early translators adhered to an "underlying principle of

enriching their native language and literature" in their approach to translation (Bassnett, *Translation Studies* 54), thus learning from source languages and literatures and using that knowledge to benefit the target languages and literatures. Edith Grossman views this as a reciprocal relationship between languages and cultures, essential for language and literature. She states: "The impact of the kind of artistic discovery that translation enables is profoundly important to the health and vitality of any language and any literature" (Grossman 17). Interaction between languages facilitates creative expansion in both the language itself and the literature of the culture. This may mean exploring new genres or styles of writing dominated by a particular culture, for example, the adoption of the Japanese Haiku poem in English literature. Bassnett views translation as playing an important role in both preserving and developing languages (*Reflections* 145). To illustrate the preservation of language through translation, consider the King James Version of the Bible; this text is a compilation of ancient Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic texts translated into 17th Century English, what we now perceive to be archaic and quite unlike 21st Century English. This translation is not only representative of 17th Century English, but in a concrete way it embodies and preserves it. Studying translations and surrounding theory also reveals attitudes about language and the way in which language is used. Translation affects the target language by introducing new ways of thinking, writing, and reading (Venuti, *Invisibility* 126).

Equally important are the cultural "lessons" to be learned. Venuti recognizes that "translation wields power in the construction of identities of foreign cultures" (*Invisibility* 14). Through translation the reader encounters other cultures; the perception of these cultures can be influenced, both positively and negatively, by these literary interactions.

Venuti also warns the reader "not to take one translation as representative of an entire foreign literature" and instead encourages the reader to "compare it to translations of other works from the same language" (*Translation Changes Everything* 114). In addition to shaping the readers' perception of the source culture, "translation can tell us about the self-image [or self perception] of a culture at a given time, and the changes that self-image undergoes" (Lefevere 27). It does this by informing us "about the strength of a poetics and/or an ideology at a certain time simply by showing us the extent to which they were interiorized by people writing translations at the time" (Lefevere 27). Translation also serves to ensure the survival of cultural artifacts; this refers to the texts themselves as historical objects that should be preserved, but also the content of these texts, which informs us about the source culture at a specific time and place in history. Translation allows us "to encounter other cultures and expose ourselves to difference" and "to allow ideas to circulate" (Wright, *Literary Translation* 19). The "exchange of ideas, insights and intuitions, reciprocity of thought facilitated and enhanced by translation of works from other cultures is significant" (Grossman 52). Translation has been one of the primary ways in which we engage with, learn about, and from other cultures.

Furthermore, translation can serve a political function. It can be potentially subversive or potentially conservative; it can challenge ideologies and political agendas; it reveals power relations and manipulation (Lefevere 27; Venuti, *Invisibility* 126). There exist dissident translators who use translation to resist and subvert hegemony, or those who simply wish to bring about social change through the words of others. Venuti asserts, "discourse produces concrete social effects" (*Invisibility* 128). That is to say that language and speech have an effect on culture. Wright offers a more cautious claim, that translation

"has a cognitive value and the potential to effect change in individuals and perhaps also in society" (Wright, *Literary Translation* 20).

In Chesterman's words, "Its [translation theory's] value is in its application, in its social usefulness" (*Can Theory Help Translators?* 2). Translation helps to accommodate the 'multi-ness' of the world in words. These "lessons" serve to exemplify the value of translation by drawing attention to the way in which translation is used, its effects on languages and cultures, and what can be learned from studying translation. Translation theory, the foundation on which translation is built, is adaptable; it is meant to be dynamic, accommodating and changing to reflect the diversity of human thought. It can be seen as a tool to fit a purpose—a tool that comes in many different shapes and sizes (when applied, the end product can vary considerably). That we can use translation as a tool like this, as a multi-purpose tool, also allows us to accommodate the many purposes of translation.

Despite how masterfully a translation may be crafted, or how well it captures the essence of a text, there is no such thing as *one definitive* translation of a text. More appropriately, there are translations of texts that have had various theories applied to them and so the end results—the translations themselves—are different. The variety of theories used to produce different translations can be attributed to such factors as the intention of the translator, the perceived intention of the author, purpose of the translation, aims, goals, the message the translator is trying to relay or convey, whether the translator is trying to relay the same message as the author (if that can be truly known). Considering these factors, there is good reason to think that a translation is never truly complete and that the translator's work is never done. However, this need not be discouraging, as van Luxemburg-Albers suggests, there is great benefit to the indeterminacy of translation. Not

only does it justify the “necessary creativity” in translation, it is dynamic, and allows us to accommodate and appreciate the complexity of humankind.

Chapter 4: Where Translations Diverge: comparing and analyzing translations of "Das Fremde aus der Dose"

There is no single way to go about translating a text; translators employ many different strategies, methods, and theories during the process of bringing a text from the source language to the target language. However, these many different strategies, methods, and theories are not always explicitly obvious in the final translation. To achieve this veiling is often the goal of the translator. Despite the translation being a product of this theoretical foundation, this dimension of the final translated text remains abstract to readers. This chapter focuses precisely on this element of the translated text. When translated texts, specifically different translations of the same text, are compared to one another, the theoretical foundation or underpinnings can best be identified and the specific choices of the translator observed. Comparing translations of the same text allows the variations between the texts to become more obvious. Identifying where and how the translations diverge and what the differences are, facilitates a discussion about why differences exist and how they affect the text. Despite all telling the same story, a close comparison of the three translations of "Das Fremde aus der Dose" reveal differences in the language used (word choice), in the interpretation of the original text by the translator, and the intended focus of the translator (explain or emphasize).

The focus of this chapter will be to compare and analyze the three translations of Tawada's "Das Fremde aus der Dose," provided as appendices to this thesis. My comparative analysis will loosely follow one of James Holmes' methods for analyzing translations, the distinctive feature method (89). I will provide and discuss examples of the

significant variations between the three translations with a focus on their differences, the choices made by the translator in specific cases, and what this means for translation theory. The examples discussed will demonstrate what we can learn about translation theory from Yoko Tawada's work and ultimately the effect of different theories on the outcome of a translation.

Section 4.1: Strategies

I completed Translations One and Two following specific theories; Translation Three was completed by Susan Bernofsky, literary scholar and translator.[12] For Translation One (see Appendix B) I used strategies of foreignization. Translation Two (see Appendix C) was written with the goal of domesticating the translation, so that it reads more fluently for a native English speaker in a North American setting. The main reason for choosing these two strategies has to do with the nature of Tawada's text (see Appendix A for the original text). Her texts blur the lines between foreign and familiar, challenging her readers and translators to ponder preconceived notions of what it is to be foreign. Choosing strategies of domestication and foreignization in the translations reflects this theme in the text. The specific theories and strategies influencing Translation Three (see Appendix D) are not explicitly stated, however based on my analysis of Bernofsky's text it seems to fall somewhere in between foreignizing and domesticating strategies, borrowing from each, yet not adhering to either completely.

[12] "Das Fremde aus der Dose" was the first text of Tawada's that Bernofsky translated; since then she has continued to translate many of Tawada's works, *Where Europe Begins* is one such collection of translated Tawada texts.

Foreignization and domestication describe two different strategies in translation, which date back to Friedrich Schleiermacher[13] and are based on his theory of translation. In his essay "Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens" (published in 1815 and translated into English as, "On the Different Methods of Translating"[14]), he first articulated the distinction between two types of translation. Schleiermacher asserts that each translator is required to make a choice: "Either the translator leaves the writer in peace as much as possible and moves the reader toward him; or he leaves the reader in peace as much as possible and moves the writer toward him" (49). According to Schleiermacher, the translator either seeks to make the author read as though he or she had originally written in the target language, or the translator writes in such a way so as to remind the reader that the original text was written in a different language, allowing "certain marks of foreignness to remain, both in language use (word choice and syntax) and in details that might strike target-language readers as unfamiliar" (Bernofsky, "Schleiermacher's Translation Theory" 176). This also means that the techniques associated with foreignizing and domesticating are not limited to the language used in the text, but may also apply to the cultural content of a text. For example, in a domesticated translation, instead of having people eating a traditional food of the country, the translator may North Americanize the food or the tradition surrounding the food. For example, instead of eating *Bratwurst* at *Karneval* people may eat a *hotdog* at a *festival*. In a foreignzed translation, the translator is more likely to keep the reference to the traditional food and explain or footnote any customs around the food (Bernofsky, qtd. in Randol).

---

[13] In more recent years, Lawrence Venuti has formulated a modernized conception of these terms and has written extensively on foreignization. See Venuti's *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation.*
[14] Translated into English by Lefevere in 1977 (qtd. in Venuti, *Invisibility* 85).

The effect of foreignizing a translation is a reminder that the text was originally written in another language. It can be described as "allowing the features of the source language to influence the language of the target text" (Bernofsky, "Schleiermacher's Translation Theory" 175). Even though the target audience may not be able to understand the language of the original text, a foreignized translation will "bring the reader to the writer," this may involve changing the way the language is used, but retaining the foreign cultural references, linguistic style, and structure of the original. There is no exact prescription for how to foreignize a translation. Bernofsky comments, "Whether Schleiermacher intended the foreignness of the translated text to pervade each of its lines, or whether the foreign elements were to be occasional reminders of the text's foreign origins, is nowhere specified" ("Schleiermacher's Translation Theory" 177). That is to say that translators have interpreted Schleiermacher's foreignization in different ways: sometimes the foreign elements are minimal, almost subtle; other times they are extensive and foregrounded. Foreignization enables the reader to better appreciate the "otherness" of the text, as it tends to retain more elements of the original in the translation.

Tawada's work lends itself well to foreignization, especially considering her views on fluency. Fluency implies uninhibited understanding and effortless communication, such that one need not process the information; it is instead automatic or "readily served up" (Tawada, "Das Femde aus der Dose" 88). Since she in interested in exploring what happens when you actually start thinking about what you are saying and how, fluency poses a problem for Tawada (Bernofsky, qtd. in Sobelle). When you start to think about *how* language is used instead of just using it, it becomes quite complicated. The thinking process brings to light the intricacies and nuances of language and renders aspects of language

obscure. Even though Tawada desires that her readers think about *how* language is used instead of just using it, she implies that an uninhibited understanding of language, a fluency of language, cannot be achieved. Rather than a fluent reading of her texts, she may prefer the reader to be forced to think. Additionally, she tends to "foreignize" and "exoticize the familiar" through her narrators (Wright, "Introduction" 5). Which means that even for her original target audience, she explicitly attempts to portray familiar elements as foreign, as discussed in the previous example regarding earrings. In a way, she is implementing foreignizing strategies in her texts.

In contrast, a domesticated translation reads as if it were written in the target language; it allows for natural and easy reading. The previously discussed "dynamic equivalence" as proposed by Nida is a domesticating strategy. To domesticate a translation is to make its language and cultural references meaningful, relevant, and easily understood by the audience for which the text is being translated. It may involve (to varying degrees) changing words, phrases, sentence structure, syntax, similes, metaphors, culturally specific references, and even names of people or places in order to give the text a "domestic" or "familiar" feel. That is, the sense that it was written by a native speaker, immersed in the language and culture of the language in which it is being translated. Lawrence Venuti, describes domesticated translation in the following way: "A fluent translation is immediately recognizable and intelligible, "familiarised," domesticated, not "disconcerting(ly)" foreign, capable of giving the reader unobstructed "access to great thoughts," to what is "present in the original" [. . .] the translated text seems "natural," that is, not translated" (*Invisibility* 5). In other words, it reads fluently and naturally; as if it were written in the target language, in this case English. What some may consider barriers to

understanding or barriers to fluency may be removed, altered, or anglicized (more specifically, for my purpose, North Americanized) in order for the foreign text to be accessible to the reader. Similar to foreignization, there is no *one way* to domesticate a text, and a text can be domesticated to different extents. With my domesticated translation of "Das Fremde aus der Dose," I attempted to make Tawada's work more accessible to English-speaking audiences, more natural sounding, easier to read and understand by anglicizing elements of the text such as the German names, the syntax, and adding in explanatory elements that would facilitate the readers understanding of the text.

In some ways foreignizing and domesticating can be seen as producing opposite results, yet in practice the boundaries are not as clear. It is rarely the case that a single theory or strategy will be employed in a translation. A translator is likely to borrow from different strategies for one translation, as they need not be mutually exclusive (Bassnett and Lefevere, *Constructing Cultures* 8). I too, borrowed from other strategies; however, when faced with a choice as how to translate a word or passage I looked to these strategies to inform my decision.

Section 4.2: Preliminaries

I completed Translation Two approximately eight to ten months after completing Translation One. I purposely distanced myself from Translation One when I decided to complete Translation Two, as I did not want to be influenced by the way in which I translated the text the first time. After completing Translation Two, I revisited, revised, and edited Translation One. These two translations are translated according to different strategies or theories as previously mentioned. I had previously read Bernofsky's

translation, but while translating I again distanced myself from the text to as to minimize its influence on my own translations.

The body of Translation One contains 1344 words, Translation Two contains 1363 words, Translation Three (Bernofsky's) contains 1321 words, and the original German contains 1269 words. The German version is shorter than each of the English translations by as many as 52 to 94 words.

Translation One retains the German spelling of the character names: *Sascha* and *Sonja*, while in the other two translations the names have been changed to the anglicized spelling: *Sasha* and *Sonia*. As Translation One was translated according to foreignizing strategies, it follows that the names would retain their original German spelling. Because this recurs throughout the entire text, it will not be discussed in each example when noting differences and similarities between the translations.

Section 4.3: Methodology

In order to conduct a comparison of the texts, I placed the original text and each translation side-by-side and read through each line-by-line, sentence-by-sentence, making note of similarities and differences in each translation as I read through each text. I borrowed loosely from Holmes' distinctive feature method (89) as a framework for how to approach the comparative analysis of the translations. This method is one of two that Holmes suggests for scholars who are analyzing translations. In Holmes' conception, the analyst would not have access to the translator or her theory or strategies of translating the text; instead, the analyst would use the relationship between the source text and the target text to determine the theory or strategies, which the translator utilized in her translation.

Holmes suggests that as the scholar works through the text, she create a list of "distinctive features," which strike her as "significant and deserving of comparative analysis," this list may also be presented in a hierarchical order (89). As I am both scholar and translator in the case of two of these translations, and am aware of the theories and strategies I employed in my translations, the first part of his methodology does not apply. However, following Holmes' suggestion, I created a list of "distinctive features," more specifically, the amount and level of variation between the translations and where the translations diverged from each other. Working through the translations, I noted what I considered to be minimal or stylistic variations (for example preposition use, or only one or two words changed in a sentence), variations that affected the overall tone of the translation, and the changes that I felt to be most significant in the text (often due to the translator's interpretation of the passage). The comparative analysis will summarize my findings, starting with the minimal or stylistic variations and work towards the more significant variations, presenting examples and discussing the significance of these variations along the way.[15] My analysis undoubtedly flows from my observations and personal experience translating, but also the many translation theorists I have researched.

Section 4.4: Comparative Analysis

Among the three translations, I was surprised to find sentences and parts of sentences that read almost word for word; for example, Tawada writes, "Einige von ihnen sind noch zu jung dafür." All three render this as: "Some of them are still too young." In

[15] I will refrain from making qualitative statements about each of these translations, as it is not my goal to judge the quality or prescribe a particular method of translating; instead, it is important to focus the discussion on the differences between the translations.

another example, the original text is as follows: “Ich glaube nicht, daß dieser Buchstabe mich an die Gestalt einer Schlange erinnerte.” Again, in all three translations this sentence appears as: “I don’t think this letter reminded me of the shape of a snake.” Later, Tawada writes: “und die R-Laute kratzten in meinem Hals;” in all three translations it appears as: “and the R-sounds scratched in my throat.” Finally, “Zum ersten Mal im Leben konnte sie lesen” has been translated as “for the first time in her life, she could read” in all three translations. These similarities may have been expected for Translations One and Two, since they were both translated by myself, despite the fact that they were completed months apart; however, I did not expect to find these similarities with Bernofsky’s translation (Translation Three), since strategies differed between the translations. There is however, a relatively simple explanation for these similarities: despite applying different theories or strategies to the text as a whole, some sentences and phrases tend to be quite straightforward, lacking room for interpretation or creative licence. They are easily understood in German and effortlessly translated into English.

In the following examples there is also very little variation between the sentences, however these differences are due primarily to word choice by the translator:

Example One:

Original	Die Frau, die ich damals an dieser Haltestelle kennenlernte, hatte einen Namen, der mit S anfing: Sascha. Ich wußte sofort, daß sie nicht lesen konnte.
Translation One	The woman whom I got to know at this bus stop had a name that began with S: Sascha. I knew immediately that she could not read.

Translation Two	The woman I got to know at this bus stop had a name that began with S, Sasha. I knew right away that she could not read.
Translation Three	The woman I met at this bus stop had a name that began with S: Sasha. I knew at once she couldn't read.

Translation two omits "whom" and replaces "immediately" with "right away." Translation three also omits "whom," replaces "got to know" with "met" and also replaces "immediately" with "at once."

Example Two:

Original	Eines von ihnen gehörte zu einem chinesischen Restaurant, das »Goldener Drache« hieß. Zwei chinesische Schriftzeichen leuchteten golden und grün.
Translation One	One of them belonged to a Chinese restaurant called "Golden Dragon." Two Chinese characters shone gold and green.
Translation Two	One of them belonged to a Chinese restaurant called "Golden Dragon." Two Chinese characters gleamed gold and green.
Translation Three	One of them belonged to a Chinese restaurant called "The Golden Dragon." Two Chinese characters shone gold and green.

Translation Two replaces "shone" with "gleamed." Translation Three adds "the" in front of "Golden Dragon."

Example Three:

Original	Sonja verstand nur das Bild des Phönix und den Inhalt: die Seife.
Translation One	Sonja understood only the image of the phoenix and the contents: soap.
Translation Two	Sonia only understood the image of the phoenix and the contents: soap.
Translation Three	Sonia understood only the picture of the phoenix and the contents: soap.

Translation Two begins "Sonia only understood" and the rest of the sentence is the same. Translation Three simply replaces "image" with "picture."

Again, the similarity between the sentences is largely due to the relatively straightforward meaning of the German sentence; there is little room for interpretation. The minor changes between the translations have more to do with word choice, anglicizing syntax, and use of synonyms or "synonymy" (Chesterman, *Memes* 102), than anything else. Comparing just the three translated texts, one might identify this as simply "intralingual translation" or "an interpretation of the verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language" as Roman Jakobson may describe it (233); in other words, each text uses words or phrases that are more or less synonymous. The exception is in the sentence: "Sonja understood only the image of the phoenix and the contents: soap" from Translation One. In which I specifically placed the verb "understood" in the second position in the sentence so

as to mirror the German syntax, which also places the verb in the second position. This was done in an effort to maintain the foreignizing effect throughout the translation.

Variation in the way prepositions were translated appears in the three translations, but in most cases it does not affect the overall translation. It has to do more with the difficulty of translating prepositions than overall understanding or interpretation of the text. Translation consultant Edward Hope writes, "[P]repositions are a trap for the translator. They often don't mean what they seem to mean, and we cannot consistently translate a preposition in one language by one particular preposition in another" (402). Prepositions can be difficult to translate between German and English. Prepositions are simply not equivalent between languages; for example, in English we wait *for* people; however, in German we do not wait *für* people, the direct equivalent in German, instead we wait *auf* people, or "on" people. Even though *für* can be translated as *for*, it does not have the equivalent meaning in both languages in all contexts. Between the two languages there are many such 'false friends': the German preposition *bei*, for example, sounds like the English preposition *by*, however it is translated most often as: at, near, with, for, or on (depending on context). Finally prepositions tend to be contextually based. If I am going to the park, in German "Ich gehe *in* den Park," but if I am going to Germany, in German "Ich gehe *nach* Deutschland," or if I am going to the University, in German "Ich gehe *zur* Universität." In all of these examples, I am going *to* a place; in English the same preposition, *to*, is used, while in German, each of these contexts requires a different preposition. To illustrate with an example from the text, the German preposition *vor* has numerous translations in English depending on context, including but not limited to: before, ahead,

beside, in front of, at, etc. Below are examples of the variations for *vor* in Translations One, Two, and Three (the corresponding preposition is in italics):

Original	Ich blickte zum Beispiel jeden Tag auf die Plakate *vor* der Bushaltestelle [. . .]
Translation One	For example, everyday I looked at the posters *at* the bus stop
Translation Two	For example, everyday I looked at the posters *around* the bus stop
Translation Three	For example, every day I looked at the same posters *beside* the bus stop

If someone were to provide illustrations of these sentences, the posters would be in different orientation to the bus stop in each drawing. One can imagine that in certain types of documents, such as a surgical textbook or legal document, the translation of prepositions must be quite precise. However, for my purposes, despite each translation containing a different preposition, the meaning of the text does not change in a significant way. This is fortunate. As such, for the most part, despite the many variations in prepositions between the translations, they will be ignored throughout the comparison unless the change in preposition influences the meaning or interpretation of the text.

The use of contractions also varies in each translation; Bernofsky's translation includes many, while Translations One and Two do not. In English, the use of contractions is discouraged in formal writing, yet in short stories, and other informal writing it would be appropriate to include them, depending on the tone or level of orality of the text. In

German, contractions function differently than in English. They are most often used to combine prepositions and indefinite articles. For example: “in das Haus” becomes “ins Haus,” which translates as “in the House;” “an dem Tisch” becomes “am Tisch,” which translates as “on the table.” Unlike English, the use of these contractions does not signal formality or informality in writing, it is simply the standard. There are other examples of contractions, such as the common question, “Wie geht’s” which is a contraction of “Wie geht es dir”. Others exist as well, which are often found in non-standard regional or colloquial dialects. Since German does not employ the use of contractions in the same way as English, the words that have been replaced with contractions in Bernofsky’s translation do not have the option of being contractions in German. To illustrate: Bernofsky translated “Sie wollte nichts ‘lesen’” as “She didn’t want to “read”” and “Sie wird zwar eine Analphabetin bleiben, da sie nicht das ‘Alphabet’ lesen kann” as “She’ll always be illiterate, since she can't read the letters of the alphabet.” Bernofsky’s use of contractions gives the English text a less formal, more conversational tone. It gives the impression of a flowing style, and adds a colloquial tone to the text, almost as if Tawada is talking to us through Bernofsky and that the words flow easily. However, I was not certain that the German text actually signalled for the use of contractions. This is not simply a benign observation about word choice, spelling, or perhaps word count; the use or not of contractions affects the overall tone of the translation.

When I completed my translations of this text and compared them to Bernofsky’s, her use of contractions was striking. After many revisions of my translations and further research into Tawada’s views on fluency and where and how she situates her narrators in her texts, as previously discussed in Chapter 2, I decided that limiting the use of

contractions might actually be more in line with Tawada's own theory of language and translation. There are two points to consider here. First, the use of contractions creates a more fluent reading experience for the reader; it is also closer to the natural speech of a native English speaker. While this creates a fluent and natural sounding translation, it is precisely this fluency with which Tawada may take issue. Speaking one's native tongue fluently is a problem for Tawada; she wants to know what happens when you actually start thinking about what you are saying (Bernofsky qtd. in Sobelle). Even in this text, the narrator comments: "Ich ekelte mich oft vor den Menschen, die fließend ihre Muttersprache sprachen. Sie machten den Eindruck, daß sie nichts anderes denken und spüren konnten als das, was ihre Sprache ihnen so schnell und bereitwillig anbietet" (43). In Bernofsky's translation, "Often it sickened me to hear people speak their native tongues fluently. It was as if they were unable to think and feel anything but what their language so readily served up to them" (88-9). Tawada does not want her narrator to fluently speak the language nor fluently navigate her surroundings; instead, she wants her narrator to be confronted with language and forced to actually think about what she is saying and doing. Likewise, this lack of fluency could be extended to her readers in translation. Even though the German text does not make this distinction, it is a reasonable choice for the translator, based on this interpretation of the text, because it is consistent with Tawada's views on language and fluency.

Second, contractions are difficult for non-native speakers of English. As basic as contractions are to the native reader, they add unnecessary complexity to the text for the

non-native reader (Weiss 51[16]). Tawada's narrator is not a native speaker and her level of fluency is not clear to the reader, nor is it specifically stated in the text, except that she remarks:

> Als ich nach Hamburg kam, kannte ich zwar schon alle Buchstaben des Alphabets, aber ich konnte die einzelnen Buchstaben lange angucken, ohne die Bedeutung der Wörter zu erkennen. Ich blickte zum Beispiel jeden Tag auf die Plakate vor der Bushaltestelle und las niemals die Namen der Produkte. (40)

In Bernofsky's translation:

> I already knew the alphabet when I arrived in Hamburg, but I could gaze at the individual letters for a long time without recognizing the meaning of the words. For example, every day I looked at the same posters beside the bus stop but never read the names of the products. (85)

This indicates that at the very least she was not fluent when she first arrived in Hamburg. Nothing is stated about the development of her language skills at the time the story is written. If German had contractions equivalent to those in English, based on the narrator's status as non-native speaker and non-fluent cultural outsider, it could not be assumed that she would in fact use them. Translating the text with contractions signals to the reader a level of competency with the language that is not necessarily supported in the text and it assumes too much about the narrator's linguistic ability. In light of these considerations, throughout both of my translations, especially Translation One that follows foreignizing

[16] Also see Gaertner-Johnston's "Don't Use Contractions?" and Chapter 3 of the *Microsoft Manual of Style for Technical Publications*.

strategies, I limited the use of contractions, thus creating a less informal, more colloquial, or fluent tone.

The following "distinctive features" would be considered the highest in the hierarchy, in terms of Holmes' method; for my purposes, these are where the translations most diverged from each other or in the most significant ways. Many of the differences among the translations are subtle, however there are times when the differences manifest themselves in more obvious ways, because it seemed that the translator was adding in a personal interpretation, an explanatory element, or simplifying the translation in some way. There was a correlation between variation in translation and room for interpretation in the text. That is, where the text was not explicitly clear about its intended meaning, purposefully vague, or left open for the reader to decipher meaning, the translations tended to have more variation. The final translations reflect the translators' interpretation of the passage in the text, as Bassnett may remind us, "translation and interpretation are not separate activities" (*Translation* 92). As seen in the previous examples, sentences that are relatively straightforward in German do not produce much variation in English, except some minor sentence structure changes and the use of synonyms. However, one exception to this will be discussed. Long and linguistically complex sentences, which are quite common in German texts, also produced more variation in the English translations. To illustrate the differences between the translations it is best to look at examples. I will not discuss every variation that exists between these three translations, as space is limited and they are not all relevant to my overall project. I will limit my discussion to highlighting the most relevant differences; that is, differences that constitute the implementation of a theoretical framework.

The first example of variation in the translations is from the opening sentence of the second paragraph of the text. So close to the beginning of the text, the wording of this sentence is important as it helps to establish the tone of the text and further informs the reader of the subject of the text.

> Tawada's original: Als ich nach Hamburg kam, kannte ich zwar schon alle Buchstaben des Alphabets, aber ich konnte die einzelnen Buchstaben lange angucken, ohne die Bedeutung der Wörter zu erkennen.
>
> Translation One: When I came to Hamburg, I already knew all the letters of the alphabet; but I could look at the individual letters for a long time without deciphering the meaning of the words.
>
> Translation Two: Despite already knowing all the letters of the alphabet when I came to Hamburg, I couldn't understand the meaning of the words just by looking at the individual letters.
>
> Translation Three: I already knew the alphabet when I arrived in Hamburg, but I could gaze at the individual letters for a long time without recognizing the meaning of the words.

Each of these sentences relays the same general information or context, yet this is done in very different ways. German and English have different rules for word order; the syntax of Translation One, within the constraints of the linguistic rules of each language, is closest to Tawada's original. Translation Two has prioritized meaning over form, taking the liberty to

drastically change the sentence structure in order to communicate the meaning of the sentence (what Nida may refer to as 'dynamic equivalence'). Translation Three implemented an "emphasis change" (Chesterman 104); it has adjusted the word order to emphasize knowing the alphabet over the location, Hamburg, of the narrator. Additionally, what I find noteworthy is the variation in the translation of the German word *erkennen* in each of the translations: Translation One uses *deciphering*, Translation Two *understand*, Translation Three *recognizing*. I am not convinced that this variation is due to mere synonymy as seen in previous examples. Instead, I think that the translators' interpretation of the text has influenced the word choices made. Brian Nelson and Brigid Maher assert, "Literary translation is anything but a mechanical task. It is, to begin with, an act of interpretation. Both close readings (applied literary criticism) and a form of writing (an art and craft)" (2). Then, following Nelson and Maher, each of these words—deciphering, understand and recognizing—was chosen based on both creative writing style and interpretation of the source text. Translation One's use of *decipher* implies that the narrator is trying to figure out a code or solve a puzzle; *understand* in Translation Two implies that the narrator is attempting to perceive the meaning or significance of the words; *recognize* in Translation Three implies a familiarity or lack thereof with the meaning of the words. Whether the narrator is deciphering, understanding, or recognizing the meaning of words, it impacts the reader's perception of the text, especially since this sentence is found close to the beginning of the text and greatly contributes to the overall tone of the text.

Linguistically complex sentences tended to produce a higher degree of variability in the translations. Not only is there more room for interpretation, but decisions regarding syntactical changes must also be made in order for the sentence to be rendered intelligibly

in English. Here is an example of a more linguistically complex sentence that also allows for interpretation on the part of the reader:

> Tawada's original: Nicht nur das »S«, sondern auch die anderen Buchstaben des Alphabets hatten im Unterschied zu einer lebenden Schlange weder Fleisch noch Feuchtigkeit.
>
> Translation One: Not only the letter 'S,' but also the other letters of the alphabet had, in contrast to a living snake, neither flesh nor moisture.
>
> Translation Two: None of the letters of the alphabet, including the "S," resembled a living snake, as they had neither flesh nor breath.
>
> Translation Three: Not only the S, but all the other letters as well differed from live snakes in that they lacked both moisture and flesh.

Both the construction and content of this sentence are simply odd. It seems obvious that letters are not living, and of course they would have neither flesh nor moisture, yet considering Tawada's interest in the physicality of letters, their shape, and what they represent it is not out of place in the context of the text. I found this sentence difficult to render intelligibly in English as I was concerned that altering it too much would take away from its meaning; likewise not altering it enough would render it unintelligible to the reader. In Translation One, in an effort to "accentuate its strangeness" (Berman 241), I again kept the wording and structure as close to the German as possible in keeping with strategies of foreignization. However in Translation Two I attempted to create an

anglicized construction of this sentence that would sound more natural to a native English speaker, as this is such an unusual sentiment to express; rarely do we consider the moisture of snakes or lack thereof in letters. Instead of *moisture*, I substituted the word *breath*, applying an "abstraction change" (Chesterman 103) in an effort to make the translation less abstract. My interpretation of this passage for Translation Two is that it refers to not only the anatomical qualities of letters, which clearly interests Tawada, but also life and the qualities associated with living things (like snakes), not just the quality of being moist. With this interpretation, *breath* is an appropriate match; not only is it synonymous with life, but it is also moist. Additionally, I think *breath* fits better within the North American cultural context as it is neither too odd nor foreign, as I think *moisture* comes across. Furthermore breath is more closely associated with life than moisture. In the same vein, *blood* may have been an alternative substitution as they form a collocation, however the words *flesh* and *breath* work together to create a rhythm in the sentence. Bernofsky's translation also creates a more naturalized or anglicized construction of this sentence. Her sentence demonstrates two elements of creativity in translation: linguistic and literary (Boase-Brier 54). Bernofsky's translation is not constrained by following the German sentence structure or specific word choice (as seen in her use of the verb *lacked* instead of *had*); instead she appears to be more concerned with communicating the meaning of the sentence.

As previously noted, short and straightforward sentences tended to produce relatively uncomplicated translations with little variation. Following is one exception to this. The sentence, although seemingly accessible, produced variation in the translations due to the fact that its meaning is somewhat ambiguous.

Tawada's Original: Sascha konnte jede Art Unlesbarkeit mit Ruhe akzeptieren.

Translation One: Sascha accepted every kind of illegibility.

Translation Two: Sasha accepted her inability to read neither faces nor text.

Translation Three: Sasha complacently accepted all forms of illegibility.

Translation One is the closest to the German; however, its simple construction neglects the layered interpretation of this sentence. I wanted Translation Two to capture the layered interpretation at which Tawada was hinting. My approach to this sentence was based loosely George Steiner's "Hermeneutic Motion" (312). Although on the surface, this short sentence is easy to translate, within the context of the text I assumed that it was weighted with meaning beyond its apparent simplicity; I *trusted* that there was 'something there' to be understood (Steiner 312). However, I found it somewhat difficult to render in English as it required "break[ing] a code" or "decipherment" (Steiner 313). Reading this sentence, I immediately had questions: Whose illegibility or illegibility of what? Sasha cannot read words, she cannot read faces, but is this sentence meant to refer only to her inability to read or beyond that? For Steiner, this "decipherment is dissective"; it is aggressive (318). My decipherment of the sentence was based on my interpretation of the text, which I then incorporated into my domesticated translation. The result was my specifying what Sasha could not read, namely faces and text. Even though this construction adds content to the text, given my interpretation of the sentence, I found it appropriate. Bernofsky's addition of *complacently,* on the other hand, provides context about the character of Sasha, while

allowing the reader to decide or interpret for herself to what the *illegibility* specifically refers.

The following two examples illustrate the amount of variation that is possible within translations of one text. The passages demonstrate how different strategies affect the outcome of the translation. Again, in keeping with foreignizing methods, Translation One closely follows the German sentence structure and wording. Translation Three is also careful to work within the confines of the language, adding creative elements, words, and phrases that aid in fluency. However, it is Translation Two in which the most variation is evident. It diverges from Translations One and Three by adding descriptive elements to the translation that are absent in the original.

Example One:

> Tawada's Original: Sie war wahrscheinlich Mitte fünfzig. An die Farbe ihrer Haare kann ich mich nicht erinnern. Weil ich es als Kind nicht gelernt habe, kann ich mir nicht die Farbe der Haare merken.
>
> Translation One: She was probably mid-fifty. I cannot remember the colour of her hair. Because as a child I did not learn how to, now I do not notice the colour of hair.
>
> Translation Two: She was probably in her mid-fifties. I do not remember her hair colour. As a child growing up in Japan I never really learned to differentiate between people based on their hair colour.

> Translation Three: She must have been in her mid-fifties. I don't remember what color her hair was. I didn't learn to register hair colors as a child, and so I still can't do this.

Translation Two is meant to sound natural, and to be easily read and understood by the reader. Without embellishing the text, I specified the narrator's cultural heritage in the translation so as to provide context and to facilitate the reader's understanding of the passage. I employed the technique of explication or addition; whereby I "introduced information into the target language which is present only implicitly in the source language, but which can be derived from the context or the situation" (Vinay and Darbelnet 342). The narrator is not simply describing Sasha; she is describing cultural differences between Germany and Japan. At this point in the text, the reader does not yet know that the narrator is Japanese, we know she is new to Hamburg, but not her ethnicity, as this information comes later in the text. The reader may know that Tawada herself is Japanese, and if so, can make some assumptions about her narrator, or perhaps draw conclusions that the narrator may also be Japanese; however, it is not explicitly stated at this point. Not having a clear idea about her ethnicity, the narrator's discussion of hair colour may be lost in translation. I added information to Translation Two so as to incorporate an explanatory element into it further explicating the implicit cultural heritage of the narrator. Although not an obligatory addition, it is to the benefit of the reader. It also adds to the narrative by providing background information on the narrator that was previously unknown. It allows the reader a glimpse at the perspective from which the narrator views the world. However, as seen in both Translations One and Three, not adding this information does not take away from the translation. It may even allow the reader more room to speculate about what the

narrator means and to come to her own conclusions about the narrator or to make her own inferences based on her own interpretation of the text.

In the second example, which follows, Tawada describes the scene in a way that reflects how her narrator perceives it. This allows for interpretation on the part of the reader and the translator. Again, Translation Two, in which I have utilized strategies of domestication, diverges most from the other translations by including an explanation of Sonia's condition, which is absent in the original and the other translations.

Example Two:

Tawada's Original: Sascha stand oft an dieser Bushaltestelle, um ihre Freundin abzuholen. Denn Sonja, so nannte sie ihre Freundin, konnte nicht alleine aus dem Bus aussteigen. Ihre Arme und Beine konnten nicht gemeinsam ein Ziel erreichen, weil sie sich nicht an eine Anweisung hielten.

Sascha drückte Sonjas Arme und Beine zusammen und rief ein paar Mal ihren Namen, als könnte der Name ihre Glieder zu einer Einheit bringen.

Translation One: Sascha often stood at this bus stop in order to pick up her friend, since Sonja, that is what she called her friend, could not get off the bus alone. Her arms and legs could not work together to achieve a unified goal, because they could not follow instructions.

Sascha pushed Sonja's arms and legs together and called her name a couple of times, as if saying her name might bring her limbs to a unity.

> Translation Two: Sasha often stood at this bus stop waiting to pick up her friend, Sonia, who needed help getting off the bus. Sonia had some sort of muscular disorder, which prevented her arms and legs from working together properly.
>
> Sasha would push Sonia's arms and legs together and repeat her name, as if this coaxing would get her limbs to cooperate.

> Translation Three: Sasha often waited at the bus stop to meet her girlfriend. For Sonia - that's what she called her friend - was unable to get out of the bus on her own. Her arms and legs were incapable of working in unison toward a single goal, they couldn't all follow the same directions at once.
>
> Sasha pressed Sonia's arms and legs together and called her name a few times, as though the name could bring harmony to her limbs.

Including the added explanation in Translation Two provides context and allows the reader to have a clearer understanding of Sonia's condition. Again employing the use of explication, I brought to light "something which was implied in or understood through presupposition in the source text [and] overtly expressed [it] in translation" (Séguinot 108). On the other hand, omitting this explanation allows the reader to speculate about Sonia's condition along with the narrator, who as an outsider, may not fully understand or be familiar with Sonia's type of disability (it may be foreign to her). If this is the case, it follows that her perception of the situation would be limited, describing what she sees, but lacking a complete understanding of Sonia's condition. These different considerations and interpretations of the text are manifest in the translations.

In the next passage Tawada's narrator is not only expressing Tawada's personal view on translating language and culture, but also her own experiences learning about or acclimating to the German language and culture. This passage exemplifies Tawada's notion of the physicality of language and culture, and how she understands language to physically affect the body. This is an example of Wright's "retrospective foreignization"; the narrator's perceptions are based on Tawada's own experiences. This is important for the translation; as this passage reflects Tawada's theoretical perspective, there is pressure on the translator to express this clearly and accurately in English, so as to communicate her message.

> Tawada's Original: Jeder Versuch, den Unterschied zwischen zwei Kulturen zu beschreiben, mißlang mir: Der Unterschied wurde direkt auf meine Haut aufgetragen wie eine fremde Schrift, die ich zwar spüren, aber nicht lesen konnte. Jeder fremde Klang, jeder fremde Blick und jeder fremde Geschmack wirkten unangenehm auf den Körper, so lange, bis der Körper sich veränderte. Die O-Laute zum Beispiel drängten sich zu tief in meine Ohren und die R-Laute kratzten in meinem Hals. Es gab auch Redewendungen, bei denen ich eine Gänsehaut bekam, wie zum Beispiel »auf die Nerven gehen«, »die Nase voll haben«, oder »in die Hosen gehen«.

> Translation One: Every attempt to describe the difference between the two cultures failed. The difference was applied directly to my skin like foreign writing that I could feel, but not read. Every foreign tone, every foreign glance, and every foreign taste had an unpleasant effect on the body until such time as the body changed. The 'O'

> sounds, for example, pierced too deep in my ears and the 'R' sounds scratched in my throat. There were also expressions that gave me goose bumps. For example, "auf die Nerven gehen," "die Nase voll haben," or "in die Hosen gehen."
>
> Translation Two: Every attempt I made to describe the differences between the two cultures failed. The difference was inscribed directly on my flesh like a foreign script that I could definitely feel, but not read. Every foreign sound, every foreign sight, every foreign flavour had an unpleasant effect on my body, until my body gradually changed over time. The O-sounds, for example, rang too deep in my ears and the R-sounds scratched in my throat. There were also phrases that gave me goose bumps. For example: "to grate on one's nerves," "to be sick of something," or "to go belly up."
>
> Translation Three: Every attempt I made to describe the difference between two cultures failed: this difference was painted on my skin like a foreign script which I could feel but not read. Every foreign sound, every foreign glance, every foreign taste struck my body as disagreeable until my body changed. The Ö sounds, for example, stabbed too deeply into my ears and the R sounds scratched my throat. Certain expressions even gave me goose flesh, for instance "to get on his nerves," "fed up to here" or "all washed up."

One difference between the translations is the way in which *der/den Körper* was translated. In English this is simply *the body* (*der/den* is the masculine definite article in the nominative case and the accusative case, in English they both translate to *the*); however, Translations Two and Three both translated this as *my body*. Although a seemingly minor

change, this does change the meaning of this sentence. The use of *der/den* in the original text stands out, as in the previous and following sentences, the narrator is talking about her personal (and physical) relationship to, or experiences with, the German language. It seems natural that this sentence would also be about her personally, however, the use of *the body* instead of *my body* is intentional. It seems as though she is making an observation that is meant to extend beyond herself, commenting on the effect of language on all bodies. Additionally, this change of language distances the reader from the text, employing a Brechtian *Verfremdungseffekt* (distancing or alienating effect); the reader is closely following the narrator's personal experience of having her body covered in foreign writing (seemingly unpleasant, imposing at the very least) and then the reader is abruptly distanced from the narrator, and no longer reading about *her* body, but *the* body, presumably extending to all bodies which are between languages and cultures. It seems that the choice of using *the body* or *my body* depends on the translators' interpretation of the text, stylistic approach, and what they choose to emphasize in the text, which is appropriate as translation is a form of literary commentary (Wright, Literary Translation 6).

Another striking difference between these translations is how the expressions at the end of the passage—"auf die Nerven gehen," "die Nase voll haben," and "in die Hosen gehen"—are presented in the translations. Idioms are not easily translated between languages; of course, different languages have different points of reference, often an equivalent does not exist in the target language, or the expression contains culture-specific items (Baker 68). In light of the context of this passage—talking about physicality of language, language and body, how language affects the body—there are two considerations

that need to be kept in mind when deciding how to translate these expressions: idiomatic meaning and literal meaning; Tawada's narrator is troubled by both. The narrator has a physical reaction to the language. It is not only how the language sounds, but also how it feels and how her body reacts to it. In Translation One, I kept the expressions in the original German. I felt that the cognates *Nerven* and *nerve*, and *Nase* and *nose* were similar enough for the reader to speculate as to what these expressions refer. Additionally, I wanted this translation to have a foreign feel about it, distancing the reader from the text; keeping these expressions in German helps to accomplish that goal. However, in Translation Two, my primary concern was to use English expressions that related to the body, focusing on those that made awkward bodily associations, so that if someone were to picture in their mind what was being expressed, they may feel uncomfortable, similar to how Tawada's narrator feels. In other words, creating an unpleasant mental image or association, for example, the mental image of grating on someone's nerves. My second concern was to use expressions that had similar meaning to those that Tawada had used, following Mona Baker's strategy of using an idiom of similar meaning and form (72). Translation Three focuses more on finding equivalent expressions in English, ones that would convey the same meaning, but dissimilar form (Baker 74). The result of employing these different strategies is three different end products, each emphasizing different aspects of the text. How this information is presented, how the text is translated, has implications for how the reader interprets and analyzes the text.

As mentioned previously, translating Tawada's work is an exercise in deciphering her theory of language. The following examples contain passages implicitly imbued with Tawada's theory of language, as such, attention is required so as to not misrepresent her

views or ascribe to her opinions that are not her own. Decisions in translating this passage included: whether to translate as closely as possible to the text and possibly risk not communicating the intended meaning to the reader, translating in such a way that it oversimplifies the text, possibly taking away from Tawada's enigmatic style, or adding to the text in such a way as to explain the text. Done carelessly, a translation would miss the nuances of the language and the underlying significance of the text.

Example One:

> Tawada's Original: Einmal war auf der Seifenschachtel ein Phönix und darauf stand in einer feinen Schrift »Seife«, was Sonja natürlich nicht lesen konnte. Sonja verstand nur das Bild des Phönix und den Inhalt: die Seife.
>
> Nur weil es die Schrift gibt, dachte ich mir damals, hat man auf die Verpackung einen Phönix gemalt anstatt ein Stück Seife. Was könnte sonst die Bedeutung des Inhalts, nämlich die Seife, festhalten, wenn die Schrift nicht da wäre? Es würde dann die Gefahr bestehen, daß die Seife sich im Laufe der Zeit in einen Phönix verwandelt und wegfliegt.

> Translation One: Once, on the package, there was a phoenix upon which in fine print was written "soap," which Sonja naturally could not read. Sonja understood only the image of the phoenix and the contents: soap.
>
> Only because there is writing, I thought to myself at the time, could a phoenix, instead of a bar of soap be painted on the outside of the package. What other meaning could the contents, namely the soap, have if the writing was no

longer there? The danger would become that the soap, over the course of time, would change into a phoenix and fly away.

Translation Two: One time the package had a phoenix drawn on it and above it the word soap was subtly written, which of course, Sonia could not read. Sonia only understood the image of the phoenix and the contents: soap.

The only reason someone was able to draw a phoenix on the package instead of a bar of soap, I thought to myself, was precisely because of the writing on the package. What other meaning could the contents, namely the soap have, if the writing were not there? There would be a danger of the soap, over the course of time, turning into a phoenix and flying away.

Translation Three: Once the box the soap came in bore a phoenix on which the word "soap" was written in fine print that Sonia of course couldn't read. Sonia understood only the picture of the phoenix and the contents: soap.

Only because there is such a thing as written language, I thought to myself, could they paint a phoenix on the box instead of a piece of soap. What else could fix the meaning of its contents, i.e. the soap, if the letters weren't there? Then there would be the danger that the soap might, in the course of time, turn into a phoenix and fly away.

As seen above, *feinen Schrift*, referring to how the word *Seife* (soap) is written on the packaging, has been translated differently in all three translations. *Schrift* may be translated as handwriting, writing, letters, a text, or font (Wright, “Introduction” 13).

Translations One and Three describe the writing as *fine print*, whereas in Translation Two I describe the word soap as *subtly written*. My use of *subtly written* in Translation Two draws attention to the way in which the word soap, as a whole is written, also its appearance and location. Translation One and Three, on the other hand, draw attention to the specific letters of the word soap; the letters are fine and printed. Although this does not change the overall meaning of the translation, as presumably fine print is subtle, the use of different words draw attention to different aspects the text. This text emphasizes writing, text, and the letters of the alphabet, as these are the types of elements in the text that the translator should take into consideration when deciding how to translate this passage.

The second sentence of this passage is where the most divergence is seen. This is yet another enigmatic sentence. But this short passage, despite its veiled meaning, is quite important to the text overall. In this brief passage Tawada alludes to the arbitrary nature of the connection between signs or symbols and their established meaning. This passage could even be interpreted as Tawada subverting the established connections between signs or symbols and their established meaning. While each translation effectively communicates the subtleties of Tawada's view, Bernofsky's use of *fix the meaning* signals a theoretical shift in the writing. This wording is not in the original, however this notion is definitely present and Bernofsky emphasizes this element of the text in her translation. When translating this text, and especially passages like this one, it is important to take into consideration the purpose of the text in the source language and the target language. Tawada wants her reader to evaluate preconceptions and think critically, this passage is intended to facilitate that; it is intended to prompt the reader to ask questions about language, how it works, about the relationship between letters and words, and words and

meaning. Following Nida's 'dynamic equivalence' which aims to reproduce the same response in the target language audience as was intended in the source language audience, it was my intent to translate in such a way as to prompt the reader to pose the same types of questions as she read.

Example Two:

> Tawada's Original: Es muß einen Moment gegeben haben, in dem die Kombination dieser Wörter zufällig mehrere Sätze bildete und in dem ich diese fremde Stadt wie einen Text hätte lesen können. Aber ich entdeckte niemals einen Satz in dieser Stadt, sondern nur Buchstaben und manchmal einige Wörter, die mit dem »Inhalt« der Kultur direkt nichts zu tun hatten. Diese Wörter motivierten mich hin und wieder, die äußere Verpackung zu öffnen, um eine weitere Verpackung darunter zu entdecken.

> Translation One: There must have been a moment in which the combination of these words, by chance, made sentences and in which I could have read this foreign city as a text. But I never discovered a sentence in this city, but only letters and sometimes a few words, which had nothing directly to do with the "content" of culture. These words compelled me, every now and again to remove the outer packaging, in order to uncover another layer of packaging beneath.

> Translation Two: There must have been a moment in which the combination of these words randomly made more sentences and through them I would have been able to read this foreign city like a text. But I never discovered a sentence in this city, only letters and sometimes a few words that directly had to do with the 'content' of

> culture. Every now and then these words motivated me to remove the outer packaging in order to discover another layer of packaging beneath.
>
> Translation Three: There must have been a moment in which the combinations of these words formed, quite by chance, several sentences in which I might have read this foreign city like a text. But I never discovered a single sentence in this city, only letters and sometimes a few words that had no direct connection to any "cultural content." These words now and then led me to open the wrapping paper on the outside, only to find different wrapping paper below.

In this short passage Tawada questions the connections between language and culture, the process by which words become text, how to describe cultural context within and by proxy across languages, and challenges her reader to do the same. This passage shares the difficulties of the previous example; it too is imbued with a theory of language and written in an unconventional way. How the translator interprets the meaning of the sentence undoubtedly affects the translation. Venuti reminds us that “translation is an interpretive task” and that there are many possible interpretations of a text (*Translation Changes Everything* 4). This passage contains the text’s single explicit reference to “dem ‘Inhalt’ der Kultur,” or “cultural content,” or “the content of culture,” a pervasive theme throughout the text. Other important considerations for translating this passage are appropriately rendering Tawada’s use of metaphor, analogy, and the flow of her text. Despite the variations in these three translations, all three avoid adding to the translation to simplify it or explain meaning and instead leave room for the reader to interpret the text herself. After reading this passage, the reader has the impulse to go back to the beginning and re-read it,

in a way having removed one layer of packaging during the first reading, and ready to discover the next.

In this chapter I have compared and analyzed examples of the variations between the three translations of "Das Fremde aus der Dose" and I have examined the choices made by the translator in specific cases. Despite Tawada not using overtly complicated language in her writing, her texts are dense with layers of meaning, which allows for great variation in the translations of her works into English. The ways in which these translations diverge are due to the translator's theories, strategies, and methods of translating. The examination of these translations exemplifies the important relationship that exists between theory and practice, such that theory has the potential to affect the translation outcome. These divergences are also a result of the translator's interpretation of the text, as literary analysis plays an important role in literary translation (Wright, *Literary Translation* 6; Nelson and Maher 2). The differences between the translations reflect what the translator wished to convey or emphasize in each of the translations.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

In summary, it has not been my goal to prescribe or describe what translation theory should look like, nor what it should entail. Neither have I advocated for a specific theory of translation. Instead, I have endeavoured to draw attention to the importance of translation theory as a whole and its practical value beyond its primary use (i.e.: the production of the book on the shelf). I have utilized the work of contemporary writer Yoko Tawada to aid in this endeavour. Through the process of comparing and analyzing the translations of her work, the social and interpretive nature of translation is revealed; and the creativity, flexibility, and the indeterminacy of translation become evident. Translating Tawada's work is a reminder that translation is not only a linguistic exchange, but also a cultural exchange. Additionally, this process has served to demonstrate that it is not simply the act of translation that is important, but also the way in which it is done; that is to highlight the role of theory in translation.

Through the act of translation, it becomes apparent that translation theory serves a social, practical, and useful function in that it meets the needs of human beings by representing their diversity in translation, thus facilitating an understanding and explanation of the diversity in and between cultures. It enables communication between diverse groups of people and moves language forward. That there are so many theories and strategies of translation reflects the diversity of humankind. In other words, that humankind is heterogeneous, demands many theories to accommodate their social, cultural, and linguistic needs when it comes to facilitating communication; what is appropriate for one culture may not be for the other.

Translation theory provides concrete and conceptual tools for translators, but it is also useful and valuable for theorists, practicing translators and for people in general. It allows us to appreciate and accommodate the diverse inter- and intra-cultural exchanges necessary between people in the world today. This field of study is exceedingly practical, not only because it allows us to read texts not originally in our language, but because of what we can learn in the process, about cultures, people, power, language, ourselves and others. That this field is so practical entails that it should be accessible so others can see and understand its value. However, somewhere along the way there has been a disconnect between the academic translation theorist and the non-academic reading public. Unfortunately, this disparity between academic and non-academic is common in many fields of study. Yet more unfortunate in translation studies because of the nature of what is studied: communication, facilitating communication. Grossman asserts, that the "exchange of ideas, insights and intuitions, reciprocity of thought facilitated and enhanced by translation of works from other cultures is significant" (52). To facilitate this continued exchange, the field must remain accessible in order for people to engage with it and learn from it. Work must be done to bridge that gap by bringing theory to the people so they can discover the importance, value, and usefulness for themselves.

Works Cited

Arens, Hiltrud. "Das kurze Leuchten unter dem Tor oder auf dem Weg zur geträumten Sprache: Poetological Reflections on the Works by Yoko Tawada." *Yoko Tawada: Voices From Everywhere.* Edited by Douglas Slaymaker, Lexington Books, 2007, pp. 59-75.

Baker, Mona. *In other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. Routledge, 1992.

Bassnett, Susan. *Reflections on Translation.* Multilingual Matters, 2011.

---. "The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies." *Constructing Cultures*. Multilingual Matters, 1998, pp. 123-140.

---. *Translation*. Routledge, 2014.

---. *Translation Studies*. 4th edition. Routledge, 2014.

Bassnett, Susan, and André Lefevere. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation.* Multilingual Matters, 1998.

---. *Translation, History, and Culture*. Pinter Publishers, 1990.

Baur, Linda. "Schreiben zwischen sinnlicher Sprachlust und sprachtheoretischem Interesse." *Medien Observationen*, 1997. www.medienobservationen.lmu.de/artikel/literatur/tawada.html. Accessed 6 April 2016.

---. "Yoko Tawada: Writing Between Sensual Joy and Theoretical Interest in Language." *Medien Observationen*, 1997. www.medienobservationen.lmu.de/artikel/literatur/tawada_engl.html#notes1. Accessed 6 April 2016.

Bellos, David. *Is That a Fish In Your Ear? Translation and the Meaning of Everything.* Faber and Faber, 2011.

Berman, Antoine. "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign." Translated by Lawrence Venuti. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. 3rd edition, Routledge, 2012, pp. 240-253.

Bernofsky, Susan. "Disorientated Language: On Translating Tawada." *Yoko Tawada: Poetik der Transformation*. Edited by C. Ivanovic, Stauffenburg, 2010, pp. 449-453.

---. "Schleiermacher's Translation Theory and Varieties of Foreignization." *The Translator*, vol. 3, no. 2, 1997, pp. 175-192, DOI: 10.1080/13556509.10798997.

---. "Translator's Note." *Where Europe Begins*. New Directions, 2002.

Boase-Beier, Jean. *A Critical Introduction to Translation Studies*. Continuum, 2011.

Brandt, Bettina. "Ein Wort, Ein Ort, or How Words Create Places: Interview with Yoko Tawada." *Women in German Yearbook: Feminist Studies in German Literature and Culture*, vol. 21, 2005, pp. 1-15.

Chamberlain, Lori. "Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation." *Signs*, vol. 13, no. 3, 1988, pp. 454–472. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/3174168. Accessed 1 August 2017.

Chesterman, Andrew. "A Causal Model for Translation Studies." *Intercultural Faultline.*, Edited by Maeve Olohan, St. Jerome Publishing, 2000, pp. 15-27.

---. *Memes of Translation: the Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory.* John Benjamins, 1997.

Crystal, David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics.* 6th edition. Blackwell Pub., 2008.

Eshel, Amir. "A Conversation with Yoko Tawada." *Internet Archive,* Stanford University DLCL, 18 Feb. 2009. https://archive.org/details/AConversationWithYokoTawada. Accessed 13 Jun. 2017.

Gaertner-Johnston, Lynn. "Don't Use Contractions?" *Business Writing*. 18 April 2006. www.businesswritingblog.com/business_writing/2006/04/dont_use_contra.html. Accessed 13 Jun. 2017.

Gibson, Roger F. *The Philosophy of W.V. Quine: an Expository Essay.* University Presses of Florida, 1982.

Gooderham, WB. "Kafka's Metamorphosis and its Mutations in Translation." *The Guardian*. 13 May 2015 14.03 BST. www.theguardian.com/books/booksblog/2015/may/13/kafka-metamorphosis-translations. Accessed 13 April 2016.

Graham, George, "Behaviorism," The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Spring 2017 Edition, https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2017/entries/behaviorism/. Accessed 25 July 2017.

Grice, H. P., and P. F. Strawson. "In Defense of a Dogma." *The Philosophical Review*, vol. 65, no. 2, 1956, pp. 141–158. www.jstor.org/stable/2182828. DOI: 10.2307/2182828

Grossman, Edith. *Why Translation Matters.* Yale University Press, 2010.

Holmes, James S. *Translated! Papers On Literary Translation and Translation Studies.* Rodopi, 1988.

Hookway, Christopher. *Quine: Language, Experience and Reality.* Polity, 1988.

Hope, Edward. "Translating Prepositions." *The Bible Translator*, vol. 37, no. 4, 1986, pp. 401-412, www.ubs-

translations.org/tbt/1986/04/TBT198604.html?num=401&x=0&y=0&num1=. Accessed 26 July 2017.

Hylton, Peter. "Willard van Orman Quine." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Winter 2016 Edition, https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/quine/#pagetopright. Accessed 25 July 2017.

Jack, Rachel, et al. "Internal Representations Reveal Cultural Diversity in Expectations of Facial Expressions of Emotion." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, vol. 141, no. 1, 2012, pp. 19-25, DOI: 10.1037/a0023463.

Jackson, Frank. "What Mary Didn't Know." *The Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 83, no. 5, 1986, pp. 291–295. www.jstor.org/stable/2026143. Accessed 7 August 2017.

Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." *On Translation*. Edited by Reuben Brower, Harvard University Press, 1959, pp. 232-239.

Kafka, Franz. "Die Verwandlung." *Reader*. Edited by Helga Mitterbauer. University of Alberta, Fall 2014, pp. 64-92.

Klaudy, Kinga. "Explication." *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies.* Edited by Mona Baker and Kristen Malmkjær, Routledge, 2001, pp. 80-84.

Klook, Carsten. "Die Wortreisende." *Zeit Online*, 16 Sept. 2008. www.zeit.de/online/2008/38/yoko-tawada. Accessed 14 Jun. 2017.

Lefevere, André. "Translation: its Genealogy in the West." *Translation, History, and Culture.* Pinter Publishers, 1990, pp. 11-27.

Levý, Jiří. *The Art of Translating.* Translated by Patrick Corness. John Benjamins, 2011.

Maehl, Silja. "Canned Foreign: Transnational Estrangement in Yoko Tawada." *Alien Imaginations: Science Fiction and Tales of Transnationalism.* Edited by Ulrike Küchler, et al, Bloomsbury Academic, 2015, pp. 73-92.

Mattar, Karim. "Orhan Pamuk and the Limits of Translation: Foreignizing the Black Book for World Literature." *Translation & Literature*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2014, pp. 42-67, DOI: 10.3366/tal.2014.0135

Microsoft Manual of Style for Technical Publications. 3rd edition. Microsoft Press, 2004.

Nelson, Brian, and Brigid Maher. *Perspectives On Literature and Translation: Creation, Circulation, Reception.* Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2013.

Nida, Eugene A. *Toward a Science of Translating: with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved In Bible Translating.* E. J. Brill, 1964.

Quine, W. V. *Word and Object.* New edition. MIT Press, 2013.

Randol, Shaun. "Interview with Susan Bernofsky." *Words without Borders.* 30 April 2013. http://www.wordswithoutborders.org/dispatches/article/interview-with-susan-bernofsky. Accessed 11 June 2017.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. "On the Different Methods of Translating." Translated by Susan Bernofsky. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. 3rd edition, Routledge, 2012, pp. 43-63.

Searle, John R. "Indeterminacy, Empiricism, and the First Person." *The Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 84, no. 3, 1987, pp. 123–146. www.jstor.org/stable/2026595. DOI: 10.2307/2026595.

Séguinot, Candace. "Pragmatics and the Explication Hypothesis." *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction,* vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 106-114.

Simon, Sherry. *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission.* Routledge, 1996.

Slaymaker, Douglas. Introduction. *Yoko Tawada: Voices from Everywhere.* Lexington Books, 2007, pp. 1-11.

Sobelle, Stefanie. "Susan Bernofsky Walks the Tightrope: An Interview about Translating Yoko Tawada's "Memoirs of a Polar Bear"." *Los Angeles Review of Books*. 9 Nov 2016. https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/susan-bernofsky-walks-the-tightrope-an-interview-about-translating-yoko-tawadas-memoirs-of-a-polar-bear. Accessed 8 June 2017.

Spivak, Gayatri. "The Politics of Translation." *Outside in the Teaching Machine.* Routledge, 1993, pp. 179-200.

Steiner, George. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation.* Oxford University Press, 1976.

Tawada, Yoko. "Canned Foreign." Translated by Susan Bernofsky. *Where Europe Begins*. New Directions Books, 2002, pp. 85-90.

---. "Das Fremde aus der Dose." *Talisman*. Konkursbuch Verlag C. Gehrke, 2008, pp. 40-45.

---. "From Mother Tongue to Linguistic Mother." Translated by Rachel McNichol, *Manoa*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2006, pp. 139–143. www.jstor.org/stable/4230450. Accessed 13 Jun 2017.

---. *Talisman*. Konkursbuch Verlag C. Gehrke, 2008.

---. "The Talisman." Translated by Susan Bernofsky. *Where Europe Begins*. New Directions Books, 2002. pp. 91-96.

---. “Von der Muttersrpach zur Sprach Muttter.” *Talisman*. Konkursbuch Verlag C. Gehrke, 2008, pp. 9-15.

---. *Where Europe Begins*. Translated by Susan Bernofsky and Yumi Selden. New Directions Books, 2002.

“Top 10 ‘Untranslatable’ French Words.” *The Local: France’s News in English.* www.thelocal.fr/galleries/culture/ten-french-words-that-are-untranslatable-in-english. Accessed 24 July 2017.

Totten, Monika. “Writing in Two Languages: A Conversation with Yoko Tawada.” *Harvard Review*, no. 17, 1999, pp. 93–100. www.jstor.org/stable/27561312. 1 March 2017.

van Luxemburg-Albers, Anneke. “The Indeterminacy of Translation or Whether, and if so in What way, Willard van Orman Quine Undermines the Rebuilding of the Bridge of Brommel or not.” *Translation Studies: The State of the Art*. Edited by Kitty M. van Leuven-Zwart and Ton Naaijkens, Rodopi, 1990, pp. 171-178.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: a History of Translation.* 2nd edition. Routledge, 2008.

---. *Translation Changes Everything: Theory and Practice.* Routledge, 2013.

Vinay, J. and Darbelnet, Jean. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: a Methodology for Translation.* J. Benjamins Pub. Co., 1995.

Von Flotow, Luise. *Translation and Gender: Translating in the "Era of Feminism”.”* St. Jerome Pub., 1997.

Weiss, Edmond H. *The Elements of International English Style: a Guide to Writing Correspondence, Reports, Technical Documents, and Internet Pages for a Global Audience.* M.E. Sharpe, 2005.

Wright, Chantal. "Introduction." *Yoko Tawada's Portrait of a Tongue: an Experimental Translation.* University of Ottawa Press, 2013, pp. 1-22.

---. *Literary Translation.* Routledge, Taylor & Frances Group, 2016.

Appendix A: "Das Fremde aus der Dose"

The original text, "Das Fremde aus der Dose," was removed because of copyright restrictions. Original source:

Tawada, Yoko. "Das Fremde aus der Dose." *Talisman*. Konkursbuch Verlag C. Gehrke, 2008, pp. 40-45.

Appendix B: Translation One

"The Foreign from out of the Can"

Written by Yoko Tawada

Translated by LoriAnn Lockhart

There are in every city, an astoundingly large number of people who cannot read. Some of them are still too young to read; others refuse to learn the characters. There are also many tourists and workers from other countries who live with other characters. In their eyes, the image of the city appears as if enigmatic or veiled.

When I came to Hamburg, I already knew all the letters of the alphabet; but I could look at the individual letters for a long time without deciphering the meaning of the words. For example, every day I looked at the posters at the bus stop and never read the names of the products. I know only that on one of the most beautiful of these posters the letter 'S' appeared seven times. I don't think this letter reminded me of the shape of a snake. Not only the letter 'S,' but also the other letters of the alphabet had, in contrast to a living snake, neither flesh nor moisture. I repeated the 'S' sounds in my mouth and noticed while doing so that my tongue suddenly tasted foreign. Until then, I did not know that the tongue could also taste like something.

The woman whom I got to know at this bus stop had a name that began with S: Sascha. I knew immediately that she could not read. Every time she saw me, she looked at me intensely and interested; but when she did, she never attempted to read anything on my

face. Back then I experienced this often; people became uncomfortable when they could not read my face like a text.

It is curious that a foreign facial expression is often compared to a mask. Is this comparison based on the desire to discover a familiar face behind the foreign one?

Sascha accepted every kind of illegibility. She did not want to 'read' anything, but instead observe everything precisely. She was probably mid-fifty. I cannot remember the colour of her hair. Because as a child I did not learn how to, now I do not notice the colour of hair.

Sascha often stood at this bus stop in order to pick up her friend, since Sonja, that is what she called her friend, could not get off the bus alone. Her arms and legs could not work together to achieve a unified goal, because they could not follow instructions.

Sascha pushed Sonja's arms and legs together and called her name a couple of times, as if saying her name might bring her limbs to a unity.

Sascha and Sonja lived together in an apartment. Three times a week a caretaker came and did everything that had to be taken care of in writing. Besides reading and writing, they could do everything that they needed to in life.

I was invited over for coffee a couple times. There were questions that Sascha and Sonja never asked me, even though everywhere else I encountered such questions. These questions began with, "Is it true that the Japanese…". That is, most people wanted to know whether what they had read in a newspaper or magazine was true or false. Questions that began with, "Is it also true that in Japan…" were often asked of me. I could not answer them. Every attempt to describe the difference between the two cultures failed. The difference was applied directly to my skin like foreign writing that I could feel, but not read. Every

foreign tone, every foreign glance, and every foreign taste had an unpleasant effect on the body until such time as the body changed. The ‘O’ sounds, for example, pierced too deep in my ears and the ‘R’ sounds scratched in my throat. There were also expressions that gave me goose bumps. For example, “auf die Nerven gehen,” “die Nase voll haben,” or “in die Hosen gehen.”

Most words that came out of my mouth did not capture how I felt. But I realized that even in my mother tongue there is no word to adequately describe how I felt. I just had never perceived this until I had begun to live in a foreign language.

I often became disgusted by people who fluently spoke their mother tongue. They gave the impression that they could not think or feel differently than what their mother tongue so quickly and eagerly offered them.

From our bus stop one could not only see the advertisement posters, but also the signs of some restaurants. One of them belonged to a Chinese restaurant called “Golden Dragon.” Two Chinese characters shone gold and green. The first meant “gold” and the second meant “dragon,” I explained to Sascha, as she had looked at the sign for a long time. Sascha then said to me that the second character actually had a similar figure to a real dragon. It is indeed possible to see an image of a dragon in the character. The box at the top right could be a dragon head and the streaks on the right side remind me of the back of a dragon. But Sascha knew that it was not a picture of a dragon, because she asked me whether I could also *write* it.

A couple of weeks later Sascha showed me a teacup and said that she had discovered the “dragon” symbol on it. Indeed, the cup did have the character on it. Sascha had found it in a shop and immediately bought it. For the first time in her life, she could

read. I then wanted to teach her even more characters. She will remain illiterate, because she cannot read the “alphabet,” but she can now read a character and knows that the alphabet is not the only writing system in the world.

In front of the bus stop there was a small store in which Sascha occasionally purchased soap for Sonja. Sonja loves the soap; more precisely, she loves the packaging of the soap. The packaging of the soap was misleading because the outside of the package was painted with butterflies, birds or flowers, even though the contents are soap. There are not many products on whose package is painted something that has nothing directly to do with its contents. When Sonja received one of these packages from Sascha, she immediately unwrapped it and then wrapped it back up again.

Once, on the package, there was a phoenix upon which in fine print was written “soap,” which Sonja naturally could not read. Sonja understood only the image of the phoenix and the contents: soap.

Only because there is writing, I thought to myself at the time, could a phoenix, instead of a bar of soap be painted on the outside of the package. What other meaning could the contents, namely the soap, have if the writing was no longer there? The danger would become that the soap, over the course of time, would change into a phoenix and fly away.

Once I bought a small tin can at the supermarket that had a Japanese woman painted on it. I opened the can at home and saw a piece of tuna inside. The Japanese woman seemed to have turned into a piece of fish during the long sea voyage. I experienced this surprise on a Sunday because I was determined not to read any writing on Sundays; instead, I observed people whom I saw on the street as if they were isolated letters. Sometimes a couple of people sat together in a café and, for a while, formed a word. Then

they separated in order to form a new word. There must have been a moment in which the combination of these words, by chance, made sentences and in which I could have read this foreign city as a text. But I never discovered a sentence in this city, but only letters and sometimes a few words, which had nothing directly to do with the “content” of culture. These words compelled me, every now and again, to remove the outer packaging, in order to uncover another layer of packaging beneath.

Appendix C: Translation Two

"Foreign from the Can"

Written by Yoko Tawada

Translated by LoriAnn Lockhart

In every city there are a surprising number of people who cannot read. Some of them are still too young to read; others refuse to learn the specific characters. There are also many tourists and foreign workers who live with a different set of linguistic symbols. In their eyes, the image of the city is enigmatic, somewhat concealed.

Despite already knowing all the letters of the alphabet when I came to Hamburg, I couldn't understand the meaning of the words just by looking at the individual letters. For example, every day I looked at the posters around the bus stop and yet never read the names of the products. I only know that on the most beautiful of the posters the letter "S" appeared seven times. I don't think this letter reminded me of the shape of a snake. None of the letters of the alphabet, including the "S," resembled a living snake, as they had neither flesh nor breath. I repeated the S-sounds in my mouth and noticed that my tongue suddenly tasted foreign. Until then I didn't know that the tongue was something you could taste.

The woman I got to know at this bus stop had a name that began with S, Sasha. I knew right away that she could not read. Every time she saw me she looked at me intently and interested, but she never tried to read anything from my facial expression. At the time I often got the impression that people became uneasy when they could not read my face like a text.

It is odd that the facial expression of a foreigner is often compared to a mask. Is there the underlying wish in this comparison that a familiar face will be discovered behind the foreign one?

Sasha accepted her inability to read neither faces nor text. She didn't want to "read," but rather observe everything closely. She was probably in her mid-fifties. I do not remember her hair colour. As a child growing up in Japan I never really learned to differentiate between people based on their hair colour. And still now, I am unable to do it.

Sasha often stood at this bus stop waiting to pick up her friend, Sonia, who needed help getting off the bus. Sonia had some sort of muscular disorder, which prevented her arms and legs from working together properly. Sasha would push Sonia's arms and legs together and repeat her name, as if this coaxing would get her limbs to cooperate.

Sasha and Sonia lived together in an apartment. Three times per week a caretaker came to their home and attended to everything that needed to be done in writing. With the exception of reading and writing, they could do everything they needed to in life.

I was invited to their home for coffee a couple of times. There were questions that Sasha and Sonia never asked me even though I encountered such questions everywhere else. These questions began with, "Is it true that Japanese people…". That meant that most people wanted to know whether what they had read in a newspaper or magazine was true or false. Questions that began with "Is it also true that in Japan…" were also asked of me. I could not answer them. Every attempt I made to describe the differences between the two cultures failed. The difference was inscribed directly on my flesh like a foreign script that I could definitely feel, but not read. Every foreign sound, every foreign sight, every foreign flavour had an unpleasant effect on my body, until my body gradually changed over time.

The O-sounds, for example, rang too deep in my ears and the R-sounds scratched in my throat. There were also phrases that gave me goose bumps. For example: “to grate on one’s nerves,” “to be sick of something,” or “to go belly up.”

Most of the words that came out of my mouth did not express how I actually felt. Even in my mother tongue I did not have the words to adequately describe how I felt. I had never experienced this until I began to live in a foreign language.

I was often sickened by the people who spoke their mother tongue fluently. They gave the impression that they could not think or feel anything besides that which their mother tongue so quickly and eagerly offered them.

From our bus stop you could see not only the different posters and advertisements, but also the signs of quite a few restaurants. One of them belonged to a Chinese restaurant called “Golden Dragon.” Two Chinese characters gleamed gold and green. As Sasha stared at the sign, I explained to her that the first character meant “gold” and the second meant “dragon.” Sasha said to me that the second character looked like a “real” dragon. It is in fact possible to see the image of a dragon in the character: the small box in the upper right could be a dragon’s head and the lines on the right side remind me of a dragon’s back. I knew that Sasha knew that this was not a real “image” of a dragon, because she asked me if I could also *write* this character.

A couple weeks later Sasha showed me a teacup and said that she had discovered the “dragon” character upon it. Indeed the “dragon” character was on the cup. Sasha had found it in a shop and immediately bought it. For the first time in her life, she could read. I wanted to teach her even more characters. She would remain illiterate, because she cannot

read the “alphabet.” However she is now able to read a character from another alphabet and knows that the German alphabet is not the only writing system in the world.

In front of the bus stop there was a small shop in which Sasha occasionally purchased soap for Sonia. Sonia loves this soap; more precisely, she loves the packaging that the soap comes in. The packaging was deceptive: there were butterflies, birds, and flowers drawn on it, yet inside it simply contained a bar of soap. There are not many products whose outer packaging is decorated with something that has nothing to do with its contents. Whenever Sonia received a package of soap from Sasha, she would immediately unwrap it and then wrap it back up again.

One time the package had a phoenix drawn on it and above it the word soap was subtly written, which of course, Sonia could not read. Sonia only understood the image of the phoenix and the contents: soap.

The only reason someone was able to draw a phoenix on the package instead of a bar of soap, I thought to myself, was precisely because of the writing on the package. What other meaning could the contents, namely the soap, have, if the writing were not there? There would be a danger of the soap, over the course of time, turning into a phoenix and flying away.

I once purchased a small tin can at the grocery store, the label of which displayed the image of a Japanese woman. I opened the can at home and saw a piece of tuna inside. It seemed that during her long sea voyage, the Japanese woman must have turned into a piece of fish. I experienced this surprise on a Sunday, because I was determined not to read any writing on Sundays. Instead I closely observed the people I saw in the street, as if they were individual letters. Sometimes a couple of people sat together in a café and for a while they

would make a word. Then separated to make a new word. There must have been a moment in which the combination of these words randomly made more sentences and through them I would have been able to read this foreign city like a text. But I never discovered a sentence in this city, only letters and sometimes a few words that directly had to do with the ‘content’ of culture. Every now and then these words motivated me to remove the outer packaging in order to discover another layer of packaging beneath.

Appendix D: Translation Three

"Canned Foreign"

Written by Yoko Tawada

Translated by Susan Bernofsky[17]

In any city one finds a surprisingly large number of people who cannot read. Some of them are still too young, others simply refuse to learn the letters of the alphabet. There are also a good many tourists and workers from other countries who live with a different set of characters altogether. In their eyes, the image of the city seems enigmatic, veiled.

I already knew the alphabet when I arrived in Hamburg, but I could gaze at the individual letters for a long time without recognizing the meaning of the words. For example, every day I looked at the same posters beside the bus stop but never read the names of the products. I know only that on one of the most beautiful of these posters the letter S appeared seven times. I don't think this letter reminded me of the shape of a snake. Not only the S, but all the other letters as well differed from live snakes in that they lacked both moisture and flesh. I repeated the S sounds in my mouth and noticed that my tongue suddenly tasted odd. I hadn't known a tongue, too, could taste of something.

The woman I met at this bus stop had a name that began with S: Sasha. I knew at once she couldn't read. Whenever she saw me she gazed at me intently and with interest, but she never attempted to read anything in my face. In those days I often found that people became uneasy when they couldn't read my face like a text.

[17] Reproduced here with the express permission of both the translator, Susan Bernofsky, and the publisher, New Directions Books. Full citation found in Works Cited, page 95.

It's curious the way the expression of a foreigner's face is often compared to a mask. Does this comparison conceal a wish to discover a familiar face behind the strange one?

Sasha complacently accepted all forms of illegibility. She didn't want to "read" things, she wanted to observe them, in detail. She must have been in her mid-fifties. I don't remember what color her hair was. I didn't learn to register hair-colors as a child, and so I still can't do this. Sasha often waited at the bus stop to meet her girlfriend. For Sonia— that's what she called her friend— was unable to get out of the bus on her own. Her arms and legs were incapable of working in unison toward a single goal, they couldn't all follow the same directions at once.

Sasha pressed Sonia's arms and legs together and called her name a few times, as though the name could bring harmony to her limbs.

Sasha and Sonia shared an apartment. Three times a week someone came to attend to whatever written business there was. Apart from reading and writing, the two of them were able to manage everything they needed to live their lives.

A few times they had me over for coffee. There were questions Sasha and Sonia never asked, though I encountered these questions everywhere I went: mostly they began, "Is it true that the Japanese…." That is, most people wanted to know whether or not something they'd read in a newspaper or magazine was true. I was also often asked questions beginning, "In Japan do people also…." I was never able to answer them. Every attempt I made to describe the difference between two cultures failed: this difference was painted on my skin like a foreign script which I could feel but not read. Every foreign sound, every foreign glance, every foreign taste struck my body as disagreeable until my body changed. The Ö sounds, for example, stabbed too deeply into my ears and the R

sounds scratched my throat. Certain expressions even gave me goose flesh, for instance "to get on his nerves," "fed up to here" or "all washed up."

Most of the words that came out of my mouth had nothing to do with how I felt. But at the same time I realized that my native tongue didn't have words for how I felt either. It's just that this never occurred to me until I'd begun to live in a foreign language.

Often it sickened me to hear people speak their native tongues fluently. It was as if they were unable to think and feel anything but what their language so readily served up to them.

From our bus stop one could see not only the various billboards but also the signs for a few restaurants. One of them belonged to a Chinese restaurant called "The Golden Dragon." Two Chinese characters shone gold and green. The first character meant "gold," and the second "dragon," I explained once to Sasha as I saw her staring at this sign. Sasha then pointed out that the second character was even shaped something like a "real" dragon. And in fact it is possible to see the image of a dragon in this character: the little box in the upper right-hand corner might be a dragon's head, and the lines on the right side remind me of a dragon's back. But Sasha knew it wasn't a "picture" of the dragon— she asked me whether I, too, could write it.

A few weeks later Sasha showed me a teacup and said that she'd discovered the "dragon" symbol on it. Indeed, the cup did bear this sign. Sasha had seen it in a shop and immediately bought it. For the first time in her life, she could read. Then I wanted to teach her some more characters. She'll always be illiterate, since she can't read the letters of the alphabet, but now she can read one character and knows that the alphabet isn't the only system of writing in the world.

Next to the bus stop was a small shop in which Sasha sometimes bought Sonia a bar of soap. Sonia loves soap, or, rather, she loves the packaging it comes in. The packaging was misleading: the paper on the outside was painted with butterflies, birds or flowers even though all it contained was soap. Very few products have pictures on the package that aren't immediately connected in some way to their contents. Sonia always unwrapped the soap right away when Sasha gave her some, then wrapped it up again.

Once the box the soap came in bore a phoenix on which the word "soap" was written in fine print that Sonia of course couldn't read. Sonia understood only the picture of the phoenix and the contents: soap.

Only because there is such a thing as written language, I thought to myself, could they paint a phoenix on the box instead of a piece of soap. What else could fix the meaning of its contents, the soap, if the letters weren't there? Then there would be the danger that the soap might, in the course of time, turn into a phoenix and fly away.

Once, in the supermarket, I bought a little can that had a Japanese woman painted on the side. Later, at home, I opened the can and saw inside it a piece of tuna fish. The woman seemed to have changed into a piece of fish during her long voyage. This surprise came on a Sunday: I had decided not to read any writing on Sundays. Instead I observed the people I saw on the street as though they were isolated letters. Sometimes two people sat down next to each other in a café, and thus, briefly, formed a word. Then they separated, in order to go off and form other words. There must have been a moment in which the combinations of these words formed, quite by chance, several sentences in which I might have read this foreign city like a text. But I never discovered a single sentence in this city, only letters and sometimes a few words that had no direct connection to any "cultural

content." These words now and then led me to open the wrapping paper on the outside, only to find different wrapping paper below.