Jerzy Bańczerowski
Szymon Grzelak

Adam Mickiewicz University of Poznań

TRANSLATIONAL QUANDARIES AND SUGGESTIONS

If communication fails,
resorting to translation
may be helpful.

1. Introductory remarks[1]

To say that knowledge about extralingual reality is coded by means of various ethnic (natural) languages, and that each language does so differently is not especially revealing. Nevertheless, such a statement will serve as a convenient point of departure for our current inquiry. Within the code that each language applies in order to apprehend various aspects of the reality in question, there can be distinguished:

(i) a lexical subcode (lexification), and
(ii) a grammatical subcode (semification).

These two subcodes operate in every text of any ethnic language. Extralingual entities are coded lexically, grammatically, or lexico-grammatically. And, what is more, the lexical and grammatical codes at work in one language may differ from the respective codes in other languages to the extent that we can speak not only of grammatical but also of lexical relativism (cf. Levinson 1996:137; Kornacki 2010: 184).

As can be rightly inferred, the differences between languages in respect to lexical and grammatical coding mirror different, culture-specific, conceptualizations of the world. Ignoring these differences results in terminological and conceptual ethnocentrism manifesting, among other failures, the use of culturally insensitive terms for concepts profoundly differing and

---

varying across languages and cultures (Goddard 2005: 79; Clarke 1997: 128, Kornacki 2010: 155ff).

Translation is an operation of recoding a text coded in one language into a text coded in another language, and the differences in the language codes is an inexhaustible source of translational toil which involves the constant pursuit of translational (hereinafter tr-) equivalents. In searching for these equivalents it is advisable to be aware of the traps of the so-called cross-cultural universals which often turn out to be deceptive (cf. Lutz 1988: 38). The ability to effectively cope with lingual recoding must be thus presupposed during translation, all the more since we cannot eliminate translation from communication of which it is an inalienable component both intra- and interlingually.

If translation were impossible or unfeasible, communication would often turn into horrific incommunicability. The designation and signification of an unknown sign can be made understood, if this sign is recoded, that is to say, translated into another sign, and the latter is equivalent with the former. Every dictionary, be it monolingual or bilingual, proceeds as a consequence of translation. It is hard to point to an aspect of human communication which would be immune to this operation.

Interlingual translation creates the possibility for lingual cognition of a foreign language, since while looking for tr-equivalents we get an insight into the otherness of other languages by the mediation of our native language. Translation commends itself also in the metalingual cognition of a language, since it helps us with explaining metalanguage terminology by virtue of translating it into ordinary language. The expressions of an ethnic language may be translated into the formulae of a symbolic language for the purpose of approximating some of the properties of these expressions. In comparing languages it is impossible to escape translation (cf. Jakobson 2009: 45). We shall even risk to say, although it may sound paradoxical, that allolingual translation is in fact the lingual comparison of languages, that is, a comparison unaided by metalanguage.

Without further multiplying examples testifying to the ubiquitous presence of translation in communication, let us still express metaphorically our conviction that translation accompanies communication like a shadow. The unknown becomes known, if related to that already known by virtue of this multifunctional operation, considerably contributing to the lingual cognition of the world.

However, translation may also affect communication negatively. If translation fails, communication is bound to fail as well. The change of the intention of the original message may have far-reaching consequences.

In the intellectual development of humanity the role of translation cannot be overestimated, since it has contributed to the dissemination of knowledge worldwide, by way of the diffusion and exchange of ideas. In view of the undeniable great significance of translation for human communication, it deserves adequate research for the purpose of laying solid foundations for

a theoretical translatology that should subsequently be beneficial to translational practice as well.

2. Towards precision in theoretical translatology

Inspecting the present state of the art in translatology or the science of translation, one cannot help noticing that the general theoretical situation in this discipline is hardly satisfactory. Such an opinion seems to be justified, since there are quite a few disquieting phenomena, to which we would like to draw attention with the purpose of identifying unfavorable factors rather than simply reproaching translatologists.

Currently, translatology offers various theories, and their multitude is nothing reprehensible in itself, since there are many aspects of complex tr-reality to inquire into. However, none of these theories is formulated sufficiently precisely, in order to save unnecessary discussion as well. At least, such is the conviction of the authors of these lines, of course, if they are not mistaken.

Strictly speaking, the translational theories having been proposed thus far exhibit deficiencies both in their terminological and propositional components, whereby theoretical confusion and informational inflation prevail and perpetuate. Usually, these theories do not make a clear distinction between their primitive and defined terms or do not clearly explain the terms they make use of. Also the identification of their fundamental assumptions (postulates, axioms) as different from the derived (deduced) theorems is hardly feasible, if possible at all. Evidently, inadequacies of this and similar sort inhering in tr-theories to date could be overcome by their more precise formulation, in particular, by axiomatization.

However, speaking of axiomatization of tr-theories gives rise to doubts, whether the state of translatological research is yet sufficiently advanced, in order to venture such a risky enterprise. Or, to put this question differently, we may inquire, whether theoretical translatology is mature to the extent that such a precise formulation of its theories is now possible.

The postulate of precision in formulating tr-theories has undeniable virtues of which Wojtasiewicz (2007: 30) was already aware. The application of this postulate not only could contribute to providing exact and more penetrating insight into tr-reality but also it could facilitate the comparison of tr-theories, distinguishing the theories of genuine value for translation from those whose contribution is illusory or imaginary. In consequence, the precision being invoked here would help clearing the ground for theoretical translatology by eliminating certain theories or their fragments as a superfluous burden increasing informational inflation.

Without deliberating too much over the state of maturity of translatological research, a first step, on a trial basis, has been made towards the axiomatization of

a fragment of a legilinguistic tr-theory in Bańczerowski & Matulewska (2012). Subsequently, we shall try to examine whether some of the postulates formulated there are applicable to Japanese-English-Polish translation.

3. Aspects of translational equivalence

The term 'translational equivalence' is widely used in both theoretical translatology and translational practice. It has thus far attracted much attention on the part of linguists who endeavor to elucidate as precisely as possible various aspects of its semantic content (cf. Jakobson 1959). Generally speaking, the relation of tr-equivalence binding a translandive and a corresponding translative lingual unit reflects a considerable degree of semantic and pragmatic similarity between these units, and hence it necessarily comprises homosignification, that is, a sufficient degree of indistinguishability with respect to the meanings being conveyed. However, tr-equivalence seems to be attainable in various manners.

Subsequently, we shall briefly consider two possible approximations of tr-equivalence, namely, in terms of the relations of tr-convergence and tr-complementarity, while the latter is but a kind of tr-divergence. Such a possibility was explicitly expressed by the postulate of tr-equivalence formulated in Bańczerowski and Matulewska (2012). In light of this postulate, if allolingual units are sufficiently translationally equivalent, then they are sufficiently translationally convergent or permissibly translationally complementary. Putting it differently, tr-equivalence may be achieved by sufficient tr-convergence or by permissible tr-complementarity. Consequently, the understanding of these two relations is necessary for the understanding of tr-equivalence. Moreover, the explanation of the nature of these relations requires, in turn, their relativization to a set of translationally relevant dimensions (parameters), which may be both of a lingual and extralingual nature. Accordingly, tr-equivalence being considered here is relative to these dimensions, and thus not absolute.

The relation of tr-convergence binding allolingual units mirrors their coincidence in the tr-dimensions mentioned above. Such units are thus considered indistinguishable relative to these dimensions. The concept of convergence, as used here, necessarily embraces homosignification but is more comprehensive than this latter, since it is being determined also with respect to certain extralingual dimensions. Tr-convergence can never be complete but being gradable it may be assessed as sufficient or insufficient, accordingly.

The relation of tr-complementarity, in turn, connects those allolingual units which diverge with regard to certain tr-dimensions, and simultaneously converge with regard to others. Such units may be related hyponymously or co-hyponymously. The hyponym is always more specific than its hypernym. In consequence, the relation of tr-complementarity hinges upon tr-divergence

(opposition) as regards some hypo-dimensions, and tr-convergence as regards the respective hyper-dimensions.

Both tr-convergence and tr-complementarity could perhaps be interpreted in terms of semantic and pragmatic synonymy which is gradable by its very nature. The inspection of translational practice always has to do with units which are to a certain extent translationally divergent. However, it is necessary to find out whether this divergence is negligible, allowing for tr-convergence, or cannot be disregarded but nevertheless allows for permissible complementarity. Thus, a pair of allolingual phrases will be said to satisfy the postulate of tr-equivalence, being invoked above, if these phrases are bound by the relation of sufficient tr-convergence or the relation of permissible tr-complementarity. Comparative translatology should inquire into various translational solutions, while comparing translative texts produced in various languages for the same translandive text.

4. Diversity of translational complementarity

In securing tr-equivalence in the form of tr-complementarity between lingual units we may resort to the operations already indicated above, such as:
(i) hyponymization or
(ii) co-hyponimization.

The former operation provides for the association of a lingual unit in a translandive text with a corresponding hyponym in a translative text, and, analogously, the latter operation provides for the association of a lingual unit in a translandive text with a corresponding co-hyponym.

The semantic relationship obtaining between a hyponym and its hypernym can be interpreted in terms of designation and signification. Namely, the designation range of a hyponym is included in that of its hypernym and, conversely, the meaning (signification range) of a hypernym is included in each of its hyponyms. Co-hyponyms thus share the meaning of their hypernym but, at the same time, differ with each other in their meanings. Putting it differently, we can say that a hypernym, relative to its hyponyms, is more comprehensive in its designation and less comprehensive in its signification. And, in consequence, being poorer in meaning it is less specific (more general) than its hyponyms.

Tr-hyponimization is often applied in the case, when a lingual category grammaticalized (semified) in the language of the translandive text is not grammaticalized in the language of the translative text. This operation may be illustrated with the category of ***Iterativity*** which is grammaticalized in Polish but not in English and Japanese. Consequently, the Polish iterative verbs such as *biegać*, *jadać*, *jeździć*, *sypiać*, etc., when translated into English or Japanese, cannot be rendered by the corresponding single verbs but these verbs must

be further qualified for how frequent the action expressed by them occurs (cf. Wojtasiewicz 2007: 39)[2].

Some translational aspects of the interplay between Iterativity and Frequentativity will be exemplified below based upon sentences taken from Polish, English and Japanese, and such that they are, respectively, tr-equivalent.

(4.1)   *Mój przyjaciel jeździ często/czasami rowerem, by być sprawnym.*
(4.2)   *Jego szef lata często/czasami za granicę samolotem.*
(4.3)   *Często/czasami jadam w chińskiej restauracji.*
(4.4)   *On często/czasami sypia u swoich rodziców.*

(4.5)   *My friend often/sometimes rides a bicycle to keep fit.*
(4.6)   *His boss often/sometimes flies abroad by plane.*
(4.7)   *I often/sometimes eat at a Chinese restaurant.*
(4.8)   *He often/sometimes sleeps at his parents' house.*

(4.9)   *Yūjin wa kenkōiji no tameni yoku/tokidoki jitensha-ni noru.*
(4.10) *Kare no jōshi wa yoku/tokidoki hikōki-de kaigai-e iku.*
(4.11) *Tama-ni/yoku chūkaryouriten-de shokuji shimasu.*
(4.12) *Kare wa yoku/tokidoki jikka-ni tomaru.*

The verbs in the Polish sentences above signify the meaning of Iterativity and they may be qualified by adverbs such as *często* 'often', *czasami* 'occasionally', *zazwyczaj* 'usually' specifying lexically how frequent the action takes place. The verbs in the English as well as Japanese sentences are not iterative by themselves but together with adverbs such as *often*, *occasionally*, *usually*, *sometimes*, by which they may be qualified, the information on the Frequentativity of the respective actions is conveyed. Obviously, Frequentativity expressed lexically by the adverbs causes that the phrases consisting of the verb and adverb also express the meaning of Iterativity.

Let us suppose now that the adverbs qualifying the verbs in the Polish sentences (4.1) – (4.4) are left out, and these sentences assume the following form:

(4.13) *Mój przyjaciel jeździ rowerem, by być sprawnym.*
(4.14) *Jego szef lata za granicę samolotem.*
(4.15) *Jadam w chińskiej restauracji.*
(4.16) *On sypia u swoich rodziców.*

---

[2]   However, it seems that for some verbs in English simple present may convey in certain contexts the meaning of Iterativity.

The verbs in these sentences designate iterative actions but they no longer are specified for Frequentativity. Since English does not have the corresponding iterative verbs, the translation of the Polish verbs into this language causes difficulties in the sense that permissible tr-complementarity is hardly attainable. Of course, we can resort to the adverbs adduced above or the auxiliary verb *keep*. However, this operation would terminate in sentences (4.5) – (4.8), and would result in hypersignification of the English phrases in comparison with the respective Polish verbs. The former as hypersignificators (and hypodesignators) are richer in meaning and thus more precise than the latter, and just for this reason they may distort the intention of the author preferring to remain non-committal as regards Frequentativity.

As for the Japanese counterparts of the Polish sentences (4.13) – (4.16), they exhibit similar properties, as in the case of English, i.e. no Iterativity can be conveyed by the verbal forms alone and Frequentativity would have to be encoded by adverbial modifiers. However, expressing Iterativity by means of verbal inflexion is marginally possible, prevalently in colloquial Japanese. Sentences (4.9) – (4.12) could be paraphrased as follows.

(4.17)   *Yūjin-wa kenkō-no tameni jitensha-ni nottari suru.*
(4.18)   *Kare-no jōshi wa hikōki-de kaigai-e ittari suru.*
(4.19)   *Chūkaryōriten-de shokuji shitari suru.*
(4.20)   *Kare wa jikka-ni tomattari suru.*

Due to the properties of the underlying *-tari…-tari* construction, in which the aspectual suffix serves in the contemporary Japanese as a means of exemplification, sentences of this type presuppose the existence of some other intervening activity, unlike Polish iterative verbs. Adverbials, such as *yoku* 'often' or *tokidoki* 'sometimes', added to the above sentences would additionally specify the iterative meaning of verbal forms for Frequentativity. Moreover, this use of the suffix *-tari* seems to be dominant in embedded clauses rather than in the position of the final predicate.

The semantic distinction between the Polish iterative verbs and the corresponding English and Japanese frequentative phrases discussed above could perhaps be reflected upon by translational quasi-tautologies of the following sort:

(4.21)   *If my friend often/occasionally rides a bike, to mój przyjaciel jeździ na rowerze.*
(4.22)   *Jeśli mój przyjaciel jeździ na rowerze, then my friend often/occasionally/… rides a bike.*
(4.23)   *Moshi yūjin-ga yoku/tokidoki/… jitensha-ni notteiru naraba, to mój przyjaciel jeździ na rowerze.*

(4.24)   *Jeżeli mój przyjaciel jeździ na rowerze, yūjin-ga yoku/toki doki/…
          jitensha-ni notteiru.*

In conclusion, we can say that the Polish verb forms *jeździ*, *lata*, *jadam*, and *sypia*, and the English phrases *rides often*, *flies occasionally*, *dine often*, *sleeps occasionally* could in certain situations be considered, respectively, as permissibly complementary, since they are highly synonymous lexically, they signify Iterativity but differ as to Frequentativity.

The dimension (parameter) of ***Speech Level*** operating in Japanese is also a cause of translational troubles. The categories specified by the meanings of this dimension are grammaticalized to a relatively high degree in this language, and can be rendered only approximately, if at all, when translated into other languages. The categorization induced by the Speech Level permeates the communicative system consisting of three persons, that is, a locutor (the one speaking, 1st person), an allocutive (the one spoken to, 2nd person), and a delocutive (the one spoken about, 3rd person); (cf. Huszcza 1996: 50ff).

With the dimension of Speech Level at prior disposal, the locutor can express his/her relationship towards the allocutive, the delocutive, and even himself/herself having recourse to appropriate meanings belonging to this dimension. Among these meanings we can find such as the following: Plain, Polite, Honorific, Modest, etc. The choice of the lingual units signifying these meanings is determined by such factors as: degree of familiarity, differences in social status, age, gender, situation, etc. The significators of the Speech Level are grammaticalized (semified) in Japanese particularly within the verb and the noun. Thus, for example, we can say that Japanese verb inflects for Speech Level. The diversity of these inflectional forms encodes thus the meanings of which this dimension is comprised. Consequently, in languages in which the verb does not inflect for this dimension, Japanese verb forms cannot find tr-convergent counterparts among the corresponding verb forms of these languages. However, what is attainable in this case is at least complementarity, permissible under certain circumstances. For the sake of exemplifying some aspects of translation related to differences in Speech Level let us consider the following sentences:

(4.25)   *Ano hito-wa kono ronbun-o kaita.*
(4.26)   *Ano hito-wa kono ronbun-o kakimashita.*
(4.27)   *Ano kata-wa kono ronbun-o o-kaki-ni narimashita.*
(4.28)   *Ano kata-wa kono ronbun-o o-kaki-ni nararemashita.*

Each of these sentences translates as:

(4.29)   *S/he wrote an essay/thesis.*

But the verbs in the respective sentences represent different speech levels, since they signify different meanings and thereby establish different relationships of the locutor to the persons involved communicatively. In particular, the sentence (4.25) expresses Familiarity/Intimacy towards the hearer and Neutrality towards the person who performed the action; (4.26) expresses social distance/vertical relation between the speaker and the hearer and Neutrality towards the performer of the action; (4.27) and (4.28) convey, to ascending degrees, Honorificativity both towards the hearer and the performer. Thus, the Japanese verbs in these sentences signify meanings absent from the corresponding English verbs and thereby the former can be considered as hyposignificators of the respective latter.

Suppose now that sentence (4.29) should be translated into Japanese. Which of the four sentences (4.25) – (4.28) should the translator choose as an equivalent without interfering with the intention of the original text?

The category of **Number** may also be a source of translational inconvenience, since the opposition between Singularity and Plurality is only weakly grammaticalized (semified) in Japanese. For a quick exemplification of the problems related to this category we shall avail ourselves of the following sentences.

(4.30)   *Watashi-no ie-no ura-ni sakura-ga mō saiteiru. – Nanbon saite imasuka?*
'Behind my house a cherry tree/cherry trees is/are already blossoming. – How many are blossoming?'

(4.31)   *Gakkō-no kinjo-de ki-ga haeteiru. – Nanbon desuka?*
'In the neighborhood of the school a tree / trees are growing. – How many?'

(4.32)   *Yama-no ue-kara kōsō biru ga tōku-ni miemasu. – Nantō miemasuka?*
'From the top of the mountain a skyscraper / skyscrapers can be seen in the distance. – How many skyscrapers are there?'

Sentences (4.30) - (4.32) illustrate the same problem, namely, the divergence in coding the category of Number between Japanese and English. In (4.30) *sakura-ga* may be translated into English as either *a cherry tree/cherry trees*. But neither alternative is appropriate. If we choose Singular, then the question *How many?* appears odd. If, however, we decide on Plural, then the answer to this question *Only one* as an equivalent of Japanese *Ippon dake* 'only one', which is natural in Japanese in this case, appears odd in English. On the contrary, the reverse translation is not embarrassing, since both *a cherry tree/ cherry trees* can be translated as *sakura-ga*. Sentences (4.31) and (4.32) also exemplify the same kind of translational quandary.

A brief inquiry into tr-complementarity performed above shows the applicability of this operation in cases where a meaning is semified (grammaticalized) in one language, while it is not in another. In some situations of similar kind, looking for tr-equivalents may be relieved, at least to a certain extent, by resorting to lexical or contextual means. However, finding a tr-equivalent is sometimes impossible without interfering with the meaning of a translandive text.

Similarly to (4.21) and (4.22) we could construct translational quasi-tautologies reflecting upon the semantic opposition relative to the dimension of Number, which can be exemplified as follows.

(4.33) *Moshi niwa-ni sakura-ga saiteitara, then a cherry/cherries is/ are blossoming in the garden.*

(4.34) *If a cherry tree/cherry trees is/are blossoming in the garden, niwa-ni sakura-ga saiteiru.*

5. Translational equivalence fading in retranslation

By the operation of ***retranslation*** we shall understand translating again a translative text, that is, a text which results from a previous translation of another text. Repetitive retranslation specifies the corresponding ***retranslation chain*** which is simply a finite sequence of allolingual texts, and such that the first text in this sequence is a translandive text, the last is a translative text, and every intermediate text is both translative for the directly preceding one and translandive for the directly succeeding one.

In conformity with postulate 17, formulated in Bańczerowski & Matulewska (2012), the translational distance between the first and the last text of a retr-chain is directly proportional to the length of this chain, that is, to the linear distance between these texts in this chain. Thus, the longer the retr-chain, the larger an inevitable loss of tr-equivalence between these texts. Obviously, the postulate in question should be treated as a hypothesis requiring empirical confirmation (cf. Hejwowski 2004; Kopczyński & Kizeweter 2009).

In what follows a retr-chain consisting of three texts, a Japanese, its English translation, and Japanese re-translation, will be compared with the purpose of demonstrating fading tr-equivalence, as the chain proceeds.

　　ルース・ベネディクトが文化の類型を「罪の文化」と「恥の文化」の二つに分け、日本の場合を後者の典型としてあげて以来、それについて日本の学者の側から若干の批判があるにも拘らず、外国の日本研究者たちは大体それを承認しているように思われる。私自身は、どちらかといえば彼女の肩を持ちたい気がするが、それは日本人の心理に対する彼女の鋭敏な感覚に教えられることが多かったためで、彼

女の理論をそのまますべて鵜呑みにするつもりはない。むしろその点についてはかなり問題が存するといわねばならないのであって、まず第一に、私は彼女がその考え方に価値判断をしのびこませていることが問題であると思う。というのは、罪の文化は内面的な行動規範を重んじ、恥の文化は外面的な行動規範を重んずるという時、ベネディクトの主観において、前者が優れており、後者が劣っているとされていることは明らかなのである。第二の問題点は、彼女の考え方において罪と恥の感情が相互に全く無関係であるかのごとく前提されていることである。このことは事実と明らかに相違する。なぜならこの二つの感情は同一人物がしばしば同時に意識するものであって、相互に極めて密接な関係があると考えられるからである。すなわち罪を犯した人聞は、しばしばそのような罪を犯した自分を恥じるのではなかろうか。このようなわけで、ベネディクトの考えの前提自体にはかなりの問題が存するが、しかしそれにも拘らず、彼女が日本の文化を恥の文化として特徴づけることによって、何かある非常に大事なことをのべているという印象は否定することができないと思う。そこで以下この点をもっと詳細に検討してみることにしよう。

Takeo Doi, *Amae no kōzō*, 1977, p. 48.49

Ever since Ruth Benedict first distinguished two principal cultural patterns based respectively on the sense of guilt and the sense of shame and cited Japanese culture as the typical example of the latter, most foreign students of Japan seem, despite a certain amount of criticism from Japanese scholars, to have accepted her theory. I myself am on the whole disposed to side with her, but more for what we have learned through the sensitivity of her feeling for the Japanese psychology than from any desire to swallow her theories whole. They raise, in fact, a considerable number of questions, not the least of which is the fact that she allows value judgments to creep into her ideas. Specifically, it is evident that when she states that the culture of guilt places emphasis on inner standards of conduct whereas the culture of shame place emphasis on outward standards of conduct she has the feeling that the former is superior to the latter. A second difficulty is that she seems to postulate guilt and shame as entirely unrelated to each other, which is obviously contrary to the facts. One and the same person very often experiences these two emotions at the same time, and they would seem to have a very close relationship; the person who has committed a "sin" is very frequently ashamed of what he has done. Nevertheless, the impression still remains that in characterizing Japanese culture as a culture of shame she has pointed out something extremely important, and in what follows I shall examine this point in greater detail.

The Anatomy of Dependence, translated by John Bester, 1994, p. 48

The text below has been retranslated from the above English translation by a native speaker of Japanese without consulting the Japanese original.

ルース·ベネディクトが最初に、「罪」と「恥」を基準に2つの文化的特徴を対比させ、「恥」が日本文化の特徴だと述べて以来、日本人学者からの批判にもかかわらず、海外の研究者のほとんどは、彼女の理論を享受しているようだ。大かた私もベネディクトと同じ見解だが、彼女の全理論を納得したいというよりも、日本人へのベネディクトの繊細さを通じて知ったということのほうが多い。それらは、ベネディクトが自分の考えに多少なりとも文化価値判断を含めている為に、事実上かなりの問題を引き起こしている。具体的には、ベネディクトが、「罪の文化」を良心·自分の行動規範を重視したものであり、「恥の文化」は他人の行動規範を重視したものだと述べつつ、前者は後者より優れているとベネディクトが、感じていることが明らかな点である。二番目の問題は事実とは相反することだが、ベネディクトが「罪」と「恥」を全く関連性が無いと仮定しているように見える点である。同じ一人の人間が頻繁にこの2つの似通った感情を同時に感じる。そしてまた、罪を犯した人は同時それを恥と感じる場合が多いように、この2つの感情はお互い密接な関係があるように見える。それでもやはり、ベネディクトが、日本文化を「恥の文化」と特徴づけ、非常に重要だと指摘した何かがあるという印象を私はぬぐえない。この点について私はさらに詳しく見ていこうと思う。

Retranslation by Norie Mogi

Juxtaposing the first and the last text of the above chain reveals the main areas of divergence resulting from retranslation. Apart from lexical choices and arrangements of morphological elements varying between the respective members of the chain, the most prominent difference consists in the use of discourse markers and clause linking strategies. For example, the following alternations can be observed in the first sentence:

(i)   an adverb *first* was added in the English translation of the ...*irai* 'ever since' construction, which resulted in the additional *saisho-ni* 'first, initially' adverbial in the re-translated text, originally absent in the translandive text;

(ii)   the original verb *wakeru* 'divide' was translated to English as *distinguish*, which was then re-translated as *taihi-saseru* 'contrast';

(iii) in the opposition between the culture of guilt and shame, the culture of shame was referred to as *kōsha* 'the latter' in the Japanese original and was consistently translated as *the latter* into English. However, in the process

of retranslation, the translator decided to name the referent specifically as *haji* 'shame' without using any periphrastic means.

As can be seen, deviation from the original expression can occur at different stages of the re-translation chain. It can be carried over as a result of modifications introduced in earlier stages, as in (i) and (ii), or it may appear only in the later/final re-translation phase, as in the case of (iii).

6. Concluding remarks

For reasons of space and due to the limited scope of this contribution, we were only able to sketch above certain translational problems rather than offer a more elaborate in-depth analysis of them. At first, we indicated a permanent and important status of translation permeating the totality of human communication, both in intra- and interlingual perspective. And, this, in turn, should justify efforts towards enhancing precision in formulating translatological theories, in order to establish theoretical translatology as a more exact linguistic discipline.

Next, some aspects of tr-equivalence were submitted to discussion in terms of tr-convergence, tr-complementarity, and retr-chain, while language material was taken from Japanese, English, and Polish. The comparative examination of selected sentences from these languages with regard to translation has shown the approximative nature of translation. It seems that complete rendering of the content of the translandive text is rather unattainable. The resulting translative text is either less or more precise semantically than the corresponding translandive text. This lack of complete tr-convergence does not need to cause incommunicability, but at least we should be aware of it.

Semantic or pragmatic divergence is peculiar not only to translation but also to the totality of communication. Even the native linguators of the same language community are not capable of achieving complete intralingual semantic convergence while communicating, since their semantic knowledge and practice (pragmatic experience) always differ to some extent. Thus, if complete semantic convergence in monolingual communication is not attainable then it is even less attainable in allolingual communication aided by translation.

Consequently, we have to accept semantic divergence as an inalienable property of translation, a divergence which cannot be eliminated completely. In certain communicative situations one and the same degree of this divergence may be negligible, while in others it may distort the intention of the original message. What we should strive for is to reduce it to the smallest degree possible. The demon of unattainability of complete tr-equivalence in language communication cannot be ultimately driven off. What remains is to accept its presence as a communicative necessity.

Bibliography

Bańczerowski, J.; Matulewska, A. 2012. Towards the foundations of legilinguistic translatology. In: Knoppek, K.; Grzegorczyk, P.; Walasik, M. (eds.) *Proces cywilny. Nauka-Kodyfikacja-Praktyka. Księga jubileuszowa dedykowana Profesorowi Feliksowi Zedlerowi.* Warszawa: Lex.

Bogusławski, Andrzej, 2011. *Reflections on Wierzbicka's explications & related essays*. Warszawa: Bel Studio.

Bogusławski, A. 2012. A note on limits of provability of semantic equivalence. *Festschrift in Honor of Igor Melčuk.* Edited by Apresjan J.D. et al. (in press)

Catford, J. 1965. *A linguistic theory of translation. An essay in applied linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.

Clarke, J. 1997. *Oriental enlightenment: the encounter between Asian and Western thought*. London: Routledge.

Delisle, Jean; Woodsworth Judith (eds.). 2012. *Translators through history*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Evans, Nicholas; Levinson, Stephen. 2009. *The myth of language universals: language diversity and its importance for cognitive science*. Behavioral and Brain Sciences. (2009) 32, 429-92.

Goddard, C. 2005. *Languages of East and Southeast Asia. An introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hatim, Basil, 2001. *Communication across cultures. Translation theory and contrastive text linguistics*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Education Press.

Hejwowski, K. 2004. *Kognitywno-komunikacyjna teoria przekładu*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Huszcza, R. 1996. *Honoryfikatywność. Gramatyka, Pragmatyka, Typologia.* Warszawa: DIALOG.

Jakobson, Roman, 1959, On linguistic aspects of translation. In: R. A. Brower (ed.) *On translation*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 232-39. (Polish translation: O językoznawczych aspektach przekładu. In: Bukowski Piotr; Heydel Magda (eds.). 2009. *Współczesne teorie przekładu. Antologia*. Wydawnictwo Znak)

Kawamoto, Kōji; Inoue, Ken (eds.). 1997. *Honyaku no hōhō*. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppansha.

Kiefer, Ferenc, 1981. What is possible in Hungarian? *Acta Linguistica Hungarica.* 31. 147-185.

Kopczyński, Andrzej; Kizeweter, Magdalena, 2009. *Jakość i ocena tłumaczenia*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo SWPS.

Levinson, Stephen. 1996. Universals and variation in language and culture. In: Gumperz John J. and Levinson, Stephen C. (eds.) *Rethinking linguistic relativity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 133-145.

Lukszyn, Jurij (ed.), 1996. *Gramatyki translacyjne*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo TOPOS.

Lutz, C. 1988. *Unnatural emotions: Everyday sentiments on a Micronesian atoll and their challenge to Western theory.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lyons, John, 1977. *Semantics*, vol. 1 and 2, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Majewicz, A. 1985. *The grammatical category of aspect in Japanese and Polish in a comparative perspective – a typological approach.* Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

Newmark, Peter, 2008. *Approaches to translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Education Press.

Niemeier, S., Dirven, R. (eds.), 2000. *Evidence for linguistic relativity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nord, Christine, 2006. *Text analysis in translation. Theory, methodology, and didactic application of a model for translation-oriented text analysis*. Second Edition. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Pisarska, Alicja; Tomaszkiewicz, Teresa. 1996. *Współczesne tendencje przekładoznawcze*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

Reiss, Katherina. 1995. *Grundfragen der Übersetzungswissenschaft. Wiener Vorlesungen*. M. Snell-Hornby und M. Kadric (eds.). Wien: WUV-Universitätsverlag.

Reiss, Katherina; Vermeer, Hans, J., 1984. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Tabakowska, E. 2001. *Językoznawstwo kognitywne a poetyka przekładu.* Kraków: Wydawnictwo Universitas.

Tomaszkiewicz, T. 2008. Dokąd zmierza współczesna translatoryka. In: Myczko, K.; Skowronek, B.; Zabrocki, W. (eds.) *Perspektywy glottodydaktyki i językoznawstwa.* Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM. 313-324.

Toury, Gideon. 2012. *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Venuti, Lawrence, 2004. *The translator's invisibility. A history of translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Education Press.

Vermeer, Hans J., 1986. Übersetzen als kultureller Transfer. In: *Übersetzungswissenschaft – eine Neuorientierung*. M. Snell-Hornby (ed.). Tübingen: Francke. 30-53.

Vermeer, Hans J., 2001. Skopos and commission in translational action. *The translation studies reader.* Lawrence Venuti and Mona Baker (eds). London/New York: Routlege, pp. 221-232.

Wilss, Wolfram, 2001. *The science of translation. Problems and methods.* Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Education Press.

Wojtasiewicz, O. 2007. *Wstęp do teorii tłumaczenia.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Tepis. (First edition 1957).

Yanabu, Akira. 1982. *Honyakugo seiritsu jijō*. Tokyō: Iwanami Shoten.