

# **The Japanese Shakespeare**

Language and Context in the  
Translations of Tsubouchi Shōyō

**Daniel Gallimore**

First published 2025

ISBN: 978-1-032-27700-4 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-27701-1 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-29377-4 (ebk)

**3**

## **A Voice for Shakespeare in Modern Japan**

CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0

DOI: 10.4324/9781003293774-3

The Open Access versions of this Chapter was funded by  
Daniel Gallimore.

### 3 A Voice for Shakespeare in Modern Japan

The presence of Shōyō's "voice" in his Shakespeare translations is defined by what he calls the "two poles" of his translating style, namely the "rhythm" (*chōshi*) and "warmth" (*jōmi*) of Shakespeare's language from which they are derived.<sup>1</sup> Shōyō understands the importance of rhythm from his native literature in generating momentum across the line and creating meaningful patterns and correspondences that can extend across a whole play. It also carries considerable cultural capital, being associated with particular genres and writers and promoting communication within a society. He refers, for example, to Bakin-*chō*, namely the rhythmic style and prosody of the early nineteenth-century novelist Takizawa Bakin, as a rhythm that he might imitate in his translations, but at the same time is bound to consider how audiences will respond to such a style and what its usage will say about the original texts. For the same reason, he is concerned that the use of *shichigochō*, the seven-five syllabic meter common to kabuki, may support a misleading equivalence between Shakespeare and kabuki.

Warmth is a more nebulous concept than rhythm. As I have suggested, Shōyō may sometimes confuse his personal response with Shakespeare's rhetoric, but warmth is a trope for the power of that rhetoric to provoke in him a heightened awareness of the flux of his individual reality, and together with rhythm is therefore a basic emanation of what he regards as Shakespeare's "hiddenness," and resonates as such through his translation choices. He is drawn to any kind of stylistic diversity that expresses that flux and to striking words and turns of phrase that assert the uniqueness and individuality of another's character or situation. He writes that

language corresponds to every type of class and character of man. The same content may vary in style of expression according to person, time, situation, and temperament. How Shakespeare's characters speak depends on class, character, occupation, upbringing, locality, gender, and age. He can be both fearfully funny and fearfully direct. He has a courteous side to him as well, and an artlessness. He can be both articulate and inarticulate, gentle yet intrusive, noble yet intimate, valiant, magnanimous, flippant, sincere, and natural. Shakespeare's pen delves into the heart of all things, and yet he is also skilled at mixing these styles, at weaving them together poetically, musically, and mellifluously, in a way that is pleasing to be heard.<sup>2</sup>

Translation is always to some extent an abasement of the source, whether by exaggeration or reduction, especially if the source is Shakespeare.<sup>3</sup> However hard Shōyō may try to reproduce Shakespeare's stylistic diversity and felicity, he must also respect his modernising culture's demand for communicative and narrative flow, since to deny the latter risks both compromising Shakespeare's realism and reverting to the hierarchy of *ga* and *zoku*, i.e. "refined" and "vulgar" (even if that hierarchy is sometimes present in Shakespeare). Within this matrix of a metaphorical warmth that may tend to obscurity and a metonymic rhythm that risks glibness, this chapter surveys a range of techniques characteristic of Shōyō's translating style.

### **The Potential of Seven-Five Syllabic Meter**

Shōyō's use of syllabic meter is central, for example, to the argument about kabuki stylisation in his Shakespeare translations, because it is the meter of the narrative sections of kabuki and *jōruri* drama and is frequently heard in dialogue and chanted sections as well. Yet quite apart from his wish to create out of Shakespeare translation a drama that is distinct from native genres, Shōyō also wants to avoid a naïve correlation of *shichigochō* with iambic pentameter and other Shakespearean meters, writing that "the limp rhythms of seven-five meter are quite incapable of conveying the energy and crackle of the original text," that "the narrative style [of *jōruri* and kabuki] is too verbose," and more generally that

the rhythms of Shakespeare are considerably loftier than those of Chikamatsu, more diverse and profound, and thus the language of Chikamatsu is insufficient in itself for translating Shakespeare.<sup>4</sup>

We need to examine the function of *shichigochō* in kabuki texts as Shōyō's main point of reference, the extent to which he actually does use the meter in his translations, and the extent to which it is empty and redundant or else an active and meaningful ingredient in shaping and interpreting the line, even in the way that Shakespeare's meters work.

Fives and sevens are used in a limited number of combinations, usually five-seven, seven-five, and seven-seven, and are said to sound poetic because of their historical normative function in Japanese poetry and drama and their natural frequency in the spoken language; a distinction is made between the more forceful, rising poetic of five-seven meter (*goshichichō*) and the softer, more graceful quality of seven-fives. Similar to stress-based meter in English, the repetitive use of this meter generates a sense of momentum, regularity, and expectation, with one phrase leading into the next, while the contrast between long and short creates various opportunities for semantic contrasts. Against the tendency of Shakespeare's prosody to establish connections between ideas and images, syllabic meter is less associative, serving more to articulate the inner qualities of what is being said.<sup>5</sup>

Chikamatsu offers numerous examples of the potential of *shichigochō* for refined dramatic effects. The consistent use of the meter in the following excerpt,

which is the opening of the final scene of *Sonezaki shinjū* in which the lovers Tokubei and Ohatsu make their final journey towards their double suicide, contrasts heightened feelings of dramatic excitement and poetic remorse.<sup>6</sup> The tolling of the temple bell sets the tone of a scene in which every moment and every syllable count:

NARRATOR.

Kono yo no nagori. [7] Yoru mo nagori. [6 with pause]  
*Farewell to this world, and to the night farewell.*  
 Shini ni yuku mi wo [7] tatoueba [7]  
*We who walk the road to death, to what shall we be likened?*  
 adashi ga hara no [7] michi no shimo. [5]  
*To the frost by the road that leads to the graveyard,*  
 Hitoashi zutsu ni [7] kiete yuku. [5]  
*Vanishing with each step we take ahead:*  
 Yume no yume koso [7] awarenare. [5]  
*How sad is this dream of a dream!*

TOKUBEI.

Are kazoereba [7] akatsuki no. [5]  
*Ah, did you count the bell? Of the seven strokes*  
 Nanatsu no toki ga [7] muttsu narite [5]  
*That mark the dawn, six have sounded.*  
 nokoru hitotsu ga [7] konjō no. [5]  
*The remaining one will be the last echo*  
 Kane no hibiki no [7] kiki osame. [5]  
*We shall hear in this life.*

OHATSU.

Jakumetsu iraku [7]

OHATSU./TOKUBEI.

to hibiku nari. [6 with pause]  
*It will echo the bliss of nirvana.*

The energy of the meter comes from the alternation of the sevens and fives and continuation of each seven into a five to complete the phrase. The metrical perfection of this particular excerpt makes it a fine example of the heightened romantic style of Chikamatsu *jōruri* and kabuki that Shōyō found attractive, ending on a harmonious double seven. Chikamatsu's romanticism is primarily his idealisation of love in death through the totality of his literary and dramatic technique, including the use of chant and *shamisen* accompaniment, but quite apart from his dramatic skill (and possibly influenced by his reading of English poetry) Shōyō regards Chikamatsu as a fine lyrical poet who appeals to sight and sound. The challenge of translating Shakespeare in the style of Chikamatsu is mainly that of transposing Shakespeare's often long and complex phrases and sentences into shorter, if musically denser, syllabic groupings.<sup>7</sup> Yet *shichigochō* is not only the prosody of classical drama but also the meter Shōyō adopts in some of his

own dramatic writing; for example, the mellifluous opening chant of *Shinkyoku Urashima* (New Musical Drama Urashima, 1904),<sup>8</sup> which Ueda Bin praised for its poetic beauty:<sup>9</sup>

Yose kaeru [5] kamiyo nagara no [7] oto no nami, [5] chiri ni yō toki [7]  
shirabe kana. [5]

*Oh, the divine melody the waves sing, rising and falling unceasingly since  
the age of the gods.*

This first line is in the style of Noh *utai*, but most of the ensuing lines are either spoken or chanted in the typical styles of kabuki or *jōruri*, most commonly the operatic *nagauta* style in kabuki dance drama,<sup>10</sup> and these are consistently in seven-five meter. As in Chikamatsu, even quite ordinary dialogue can be written in this meter, as when Urashima's parents worry where their son has got to:<sup>11</sup>

Ano yūgetsu no [7] honomeku kage no [7] nokoru uchi, [5] kaeraba  
[4] koko ni machi [5] tomokaku mo [5] ima ichido [5] satoite miru me  
[7] hana saku ka. [5] Tada uki miru ka. [7] Kari no yo wa [5] oyako no  
enishi [7] usu akari. [5]

FATHER.

I'll wait until the moon sets, and if he returns then because of you, I shall  
see him one more time.

MOTHER.

Just one last time . . .

FATHER.

I will tell him what I have to say, and we shall see if that has any effect.

BOTH.

We cannot tell.

CHANT (*takemoto*).<sup>12</sup>

The line connecting sons with their parents in this ephemeral world is a  
feeble one indeed.

In this example, we see how the longer seven syllabic suits the parents' heightened angry tone, but that it subsides sadly into a five as the father admits – *usu akari* – their lack of actual control over their son.

Syllabic meter comes naturally to a musical drama like *Shinkyoku Urashima* where most of the lines are chanted, and the musical styles borrowed from kabuki determine how the language is to be spoken and chanted. It is also a feature of *kōdan*, the traditional genre of oral storytelling that was revived in the Meiji era and relevant both to Shōyō's rather cerebral style of reciting Shakespearean texts (discussed at the beginning of Chapter 4) and to his style of lecturing on Shakespeare in which he quoted liberally from his own translations.<sup>13</sup> While the normative matrix of kabuki and *kōdan* is lacking in Shakespeare, *shichigochō* has a clear potential for expressing the shifting moods of Shakespeare's poetic drama,

especially those written before 1914 as Shōyō was finding his way towards a more contemporary, less classical style. He uses the meter to translate the opening line of Hamlet's fourth soliloquy, "To be, or not to be," in both the 1909 version and 1933 revision cited here before shifting into a looser medley of syllabics that could nevertheless be elided to sound like *shichigochō* through the actor's vocal modulations (3.1.55–63);<sup>14</sup> this latter possibility (for example, that *aruiwa* could be pronounced *arwiwa*) is indicated with oblique strokes in the square brackets:

To be, or not to be – that is the question;  
 世に在る、世に在らぬ、それが疑問ぢゃ。  
*Yo ni aru*, [4 with pause] *yo ni aranu*, [5] *sore ga gimon ja*. [7]

Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer  
 The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune  
 残忍な運命の矢や石投を、只菅堪へ忍んでをるが男子の本意か、  
*Zanninna* [5] *unmei no* [5] *ya ya ishinage wo*, [7] *hitasura tae* [6/7] *shinonde oru ga* [7] *danshi no hon'i ka*, [8 with pause/7]

Or to take arms against a sea of troubles  
 或は海なす艱難を逆へ撃って、  
*aruiwa umi nasu* [8/7] *kannan wo* [5] *mukaeutte*,<sup>15</sup> [6 with pause]

And by opposing end them; to die: to sleep –  
 戦うて根を絶つが大丈夫の志か？死は ... ねむり ...  
*tatakaute* [5] *ne wo tatsu ga* [5] *daijōbu no* [6/5] *kokorozashi ka?* [six with question mark] *Shi wa* ... [2] *nemuri* ... [3]

No more, and by a sleep to say we end  
 に過ぎぬ。眠って心の痛みが去り、  
*ni suginu*. [4 with pause] *Nemutte kokoro no* [8/7] *itami ga sari*, [6 with pause]

The heartache and the thousand natural shocks  
 That flesh is heir to: 'tis a consummation  
 Devoutly to be wished.  
 此肉に附纏うてをる千百の苦が除かるゝものならば ... それこそ  
 上もなう願はしい大終焉ぢゃが。  
*kono niku ni* [5] *tsukimatoute oru* [8/7] *senbyaku no* [5] *kurushimi ga* [5] *nozokaruru* [5] *mono naraba* [5] ... *Sore koso ue mo* [7] *nō negawashii* [7] *daishūen ja ga*. [8/7] . . . .

Reading Shōyō's translation, we sense (as I have suggested) that Shakespeare's sentences are simply too long and expansive to support a strict use of the meter. The first line is like the lines in the Chikamatsu excerpt, setting one idea or image

against another – “To be, or not to be”/“Farewell to this night, and to the night farewell.” – but it is clear from the rising syllabic of two fives leading to a seven and for the emphasis the rise places on *sore* (“that”) that the syllabic will occur just the once and instead function as a metonym for rising emotion (the emotion that arises from indecision), and that this rising movement will recur throughout the speech, as in *Sore koso ue mo naru negawashii daishūen ja ga*, “a consummation devoutly to be wished.” Moreover, the conventional syllabic at the beginning creates an expectation that Hamlet is about to say something of great significance, and this expectation is sustained through the movement of phrases towards choice rhythmical expressions such as *ya ya ishinage* (“slings and arrows”), *negawashii daishūen*, *Sore ga kokorogakari ja* (“there’s the rub,” 64), *shinonde orō zo* (“who would bear,” 69), *Yo no ryōgyaku* (“whips . . . of time”), *nukoi no setsunasa* (“pangs of . . . love,” 71), *saiban no modokashisa* (“the law’s delay”), and *kono iyana yo ni, ase wo nagashite* (“sweat under a weary life,” 76).<sup>16</sup>

In Shōyō’s translations generally, the preponderance of final particles such as *ja* and *zo* and auxiliary verbs like *oru* can seem surplus to the line; there are plenty of those in this speech too, but they are effectively contained by the diction and metrical shifts. The diction is shaped by Hamlet’s imaginative trajectory (life’s “calamities” leading into the prospect of life after death), which in the translation is shaped by a repetitive series of noun phrases, for example *ryōshin ga* (“conscience,” 82) and *hito wo okubyō mono ni* (“cowards of us all”). Repetition also generates rhythm in the phrase *ogoru yatsubara no ōhei* (“the arrogance of arrogant people”) for “the proud man’s contumely” (70), and Shōyō takes a liberty translating “time” in “whips . . . of time” (69) as *yo*, where *yo* literally means “world” echoing the *yo* in the first line.

Shōyō comments that a literary style is appropriate where “Shakespeare’s structures are controlled more by grammar,” implying that such a style will inevitably foreground the formal features of the line.<sup>17</sup> Hamlet’s soliloquy is figurative but not grammatically complex; the feeling of control comes not so much from the language as from the dilemma in which the protagonist finds himself. Shōyō’s use of syllabic meter is mainly a stylistic choice, but it may also be a metonym for a recognisable conflict between tradition and modernity in which Hamlet’s rather wayward use of sevens and fives reflect a reluctant acceptance of a code (or “grammar”) of honourable revenge and suicide associated with that meter in kabuki. It initiates a conversation among Shōyō’s late Meiji audiences just as it does in Hamlet’s mind.

A more strictly conventional use of *shichigochō* occurs in Shōyō’s version of Ariel’s song “Full fathom five” in *The Tempest* (1.2.397–405):<sup>18</sup>

Full fathom five thy father lies,  
Of his bones are coral made;  
Those are pearls that were his eyes,  
Nothing of him that doth fade  
But doth suffer a sea-change  
Into something rich and strange.

Sea-nymphs hourly ring his knell.  
 Ding dong.  
 Hark, now I hear them.  
 Ding dong bell.

五尋深き水底に、  
 御父上は臥したまふ。  
 御骨は珊瑚、眞珠こそ  
 その以前君が御龍眼。  
 御體の一切朽ちもせて、  
 寶と化しぬ海に入りて。  
 聞かずや海の女神等が  
 ディーン・ドーン！  
 あれ々、君を弔ふ鐘！  
 ディーン・ドーン、ベルゝ！

*Itsuhiro fukaki* [7] *minazoko ni*, [5]  
*Onchichiue wa* [7] *fushi tamau*. [5]  
*Mihone wa sango*, [7] *shinju koso* [5]  
*Sono kami kimi ga* [7] *onmanako*. [5]  
*Gyotai no nabete* [7] *kuchi mosete*, [5]  
*Takara to kashinu* [7] *umi ni irite*. [7]  
*Kikazu ya umi no* [7] *megamira ga* [5]  
*Dīn dōn!*  
*Are are, kimi wo tomurau kane!*  
*Dīn dōn, beruru!*

This is a more classical style of syllabic that loosely contrasts sevens to do with scale and authority with more subordinate fives: “five fathoms” (*itsuhiro*) with the “bottom of the sea” (*minazoko*), “respected father” (*onchichiue*) with “lying prone” (*fushi tamau*), “bones” (*mihone*) and “coral” (*sango*) with “pearls” (*shinju*), and so on. As the meter of classical Japanese poetry as well as drama, the syllabic suits the remarkable lyricism of Ariel’s song, and with its imagery of nymphs, treasure, and plunging into the sea hints erotically at the meeting between Ferdinand and Miranda that is to follow.<sup>19</sup> As in Hamlet’s soliloquy, the syllabic frames the more emotional and disordered dialogue between the two young people in which Ferdinand finds another kind of treasure.

Another model mentioned by Shōyō is that of Bakin-*chō*, the pacey syllabic style associated with the novelist Takizawa Bakin that was in popular use up to the 1880s. In the following example from Bakin’s most famous work, *Nansō Satomi hakkenden* (The Eight Dog Chronicles, 1814–42), the syllabic meter is light in tone, supporting a rapid accumulation of narrative details and the inclusion of speech, dialogue, and quotation:<sup>20</sup>

Ori kara tsuguru [7] yakoe no [4/5] niwatori ni, [5] Shino wa kokoro, wo [7]  
 “Oku no ma naru, [6/7] nishin mezamashi [7] tamawanana. [5] Toku toku.”

[4/5] To isogashi [5] tatsureba, [5] Hamaji wa yōyaku [8/7] tachiagari, [5] “Yo mo akeba [6/7] kitsu ni hamenan [7] kudakake no, [5] madaki nakite [6/7] sena wo yaritsutsu.” [7] Sore wa koi seshi [7] kusamakura, [5] sore wa tabi yuku [7] imose no wakare, [7] tori mo nakazu wa [7] yo mo akeji, [5] yakezu wa hito no [7] me mo sameji. [5] Urameshi no [5] tori no ne ya. [5] Yo ni Ausaka no [7] afu yoi wa ara de, [8/7] yurusanu seki wa [7] waga ue ni, [5] ariake no tsuki zo [8/7] haka naki.’ [4/5]

*Outside, roosters began to crow, and Shino grew anxious. “Your parents in the back room,” he said, “they’ll be waking up any moment. Hurry! Hurry!” At last Hamaji stood up. As she did, she recited a poem:*

*When dawn comes  
I’ll feed them to a fox,  
the damn roosters –  
though it’s still dark,  
they’ve made my lover leave.*

*“If the roosters hadn’t crowed, dawn wouldn’t have come. And if dawn hadn’t come, people wouldn’t be waking up. I hate the sound of their crowing. No night will ever hide us and allow us to meet again.”*

This is a lively, resourceful prosody that moves easily between the pragmatism of the narrative (the couple’s rude awakening) and the *ga* aesthetic of the moon at dawn, and the rhythmic momentum of the syllabic can be said to embody a remorseless logic of cause and effect. Shōyō admits to having been “intoxicated” with Bakin’s writing as a youth,<sup>21</sup> and its restlessness suggests a parallel with Shakespeare’s history plays, since in comparing the history plays to Bakin and Bakin’s contemporary, the comic novelist Shikitei Sanba, in the preface to his translation of *Henry IV*, Part 2, Shōyō finds the former “strangely close in spirit” to his Meiji sensibility: Shakespeare’s historical characters have a “self-awareness” lacking in a work like *Hakkenden* where, if anything, the characters are in constant retreat from their selves.<sup>22</sup> Yet one reason for avoiding Bakin-*chō* in his translations is that as poetic prose the continuous feeling of tension imposed by the syllabic meter projects onto readers a simultaneous struggle with inner passions and desires – what Daniel Poch calls “their inner dog,”<sup>23</sup> or the reality that “desire continually resurges from within a sphere of benevolence”<sup>24</sup> – that is not necessarily the effect of Shakespearean prosody, whose momentum is orchestrated across the line as an imitation of internal thought processes. This possibility may be more subliminal than overt: Glynne Walley mentions Bakin’s relatively “unobtrusive” use of *shichigochō*, arguing that “for the reader unconcerned with such things, the metrical sections are experienced merely as passages of particularly intense or lovely (and perhaps difficult to parse) description.”<sup>25</sup> Shōyō may hear all kinds of echoes of that style in Shakespearean drama; his problem is more the didactic ends to which Bakin’s seductive language is heading.

Shōyō contrasts Bakin’s “fluid” usage of *shichigochō* with Chikamatsu’s “neutral” style,<sup>26</sup> implying that Bakin lacks the Shakespearean impartiality he finds in Chikamatsu’s *sewamono*, but Shōyō’s own style is always mixed, relying on multiple literary models, and the relative freedom of Bakin’s syllabic (his frequent use of eight and six pairings as well as traditional sevens and fives) makes it an attractive resource. One straightforward parallel with the prior excerpt presents itself in the scene from *Romeo and Juliet* where the lovers are separated by the dawn after their marriage night (3.5.1–16):<sup>27</sup>

JULIET.

Wilt thou be gone? It is not yet near day.  
It was the nightingale, and not the lark,  
That pierced the fearful hollow of thine ear.  
Nightly she sings on yond pomegranate tree.  
Believe me, love, it was the nightingale.

逝うとや？夜はまだ明きやせぬのに、怖つてござるお前の耳に聞えたは雲雀ではなうてナイチンゲールであつたもの。夜毎に彼處の柘榴へ來てあのやうに囀りをる。なあ、今のは一定ナイチンゲールであらうぞ。

*Inou to ya?* [5] *Yo wa mada* [4] *akyasenu no ni*. [6/7] *Kowagatte* [5] *gozaru omae no* [7] *mimi ni kikoeta wa* [8/7] *hibari dewa nōte* [8/7] *naichingēru* [7] *de atta mono*. [6/7] *Yogoto ni asoko no* [8] *jakuro e kite*, [6] *ano yō ni* [5] *saezuri oru*. [6/7]. *Nā, ima no wa kitto* [7] *naichingēru* [7] *de arou zo*. [5]

ROMEO.

It was the lark, the herald of the morn,  
No nightingale. Look, love, what envious streaks  
Do lace the severing clouds in yonder east.  
Night’s candles are burnt out, and jocund day  
Stands tiptoe on the misty mountain tops.  
I must be gone and live, or stay and die.

いやいや、旦を知らする雲雀ぢや、ナイチンゲールの聲ではない。戀人よ、あれ、お見やれ、意地の悪い横縞めが東の空の雲の裂目にあのやうな縁付けをる。夜の燭火は燃え盡きて、嬉しげな旦めが霧立つ山の巔に足を爪立てゝ立つてゐる。速う往ねば命助かり、停まれば死なねばならぬ。

*Iya iya*, [4/5] *asa wo shirasuru* [7] *hibari ja*, [4/5] *naichingēru* [7] *no koe dewa nai*. [7] *Koibito yo*, [5] *are miyare*, [5] *iji no warui* [6] *yokojimame ga* [6] *higashi no sora no* [7] *sakeme ni ano yōna* [8] *heri wo tsuke oru*. [7] *Yoru no tomoshibi wa* [8] *moetsukite*, [6/7] *ureshigena*

[5] *ashitame ga* [5] *kiri tatsu yama no* [7] *itadaki ni* [5] *mō ashi wo*  
 [5] *tsuma daiete* [5] *tatte iru.* [5] *Hayō inureba* [7] *inochi tasukari,* [7]  
*todomareba* [5] *shinaneba naranu.* [7]

JULIET.

Yond light is not daylight; I know it, I.  
 It is some meteor that the sun exhales  
 To be to thee this night a torchbearer  
 And light thee on thy way to Mantua.  
 Therefore stay yet; thou need'st not to be gone.

あの光明は朝ぢやない、いえいえ、朝日ではないわいの。ありや太陽がお前の爲に、今宵マンチュアへの道案内に炬火持の役さしよとて、急に呼出した光り物ぢや。ぢやによつて大事な、まだ逝しやるには及ばぬわいの。

*Ano hikari wa* [6/7] *asa ja nai,* [5] *ie ie,* [4/5] *asahi dewa* [5] *nai wai no.* [5] *Arya taiyō ga* [7] *omae no tame ni,* [7] *koyoi Manchua e* [8/7] *no michishirabe ni* [7] *taimatsumochi no* [7] *yaku sasho tote,* [6/7] *kyu ni yobidashita* [7] *hikarimono ja.* [6/7] *Ja ni yotte,* [5] *daiji nai,* [5] *mada inasharu ni wa* [7] *oyobanu wai no.* [7]

This is a heightened style that matches the couple's vitality with the movement of the Bakin line: read syllabically, more melancholy expressions such as *Inou to ya?* ("Wilt thou be gone?") seem like natural fives, and brighter phrasings such as *asa wo shirasuru* ("the herald of the morn") are sevens. Juliet is also strikingly assertive in her use of the masculine particles *wai* and *zo*, and the classical *nu* negative characteristic of Shōyō's style with which Romeo and Juliet end the second and third speeches (each saying "no" for their different reasons) carries an erotic frisson.

### The Shōyō Line

What might be called the "Shōyō line" is not the seven-five prosody of Chikamatsu or Bakin but is more loosely based on syllabic meter in the way that its energy comes from syllabic breaks and the contrast of shorter phrases with longer ones. In Shakespeare, the emphasis is usually on thematic content rather than narrative detail, and likewise Shōyō tends to emphasise significant words (often nouns) in a sentence and phrase. One example is that of Prospero's soliloquy on "the great globe itself" (4.1.146–58) in his *Tempest* translation.<sup>28</sup>

Shōyō's is not conventionally syllabic, and the positions of syllabic breaks between phrases may be difficult to justify, but as indicated in the first three blocks of the transcript the prosody hovers around the seven grouping, and may sometimes be exactly seven-five or five-seven; this technique can be tentatively described as an abstraction of *shichigochō*. The words are not stressed in the manner of Shakespeare's English,

but what Shōyō calls the “musicality” of the lines arises noticeably from tensions between short vowels and double vowels, diphthongs and double consonants, as in *kono daichikyū sono mono mo* (“the great globe itself”), where the diphthong and double vowel in *daichikyū* (“great globe”) create a slight hiatus that is met by the rush of short *o* morae in the next three words, *sono mono mo* (the “thing itself”). The likely emphases in phrases within the last three blocks are also indicated:

You do look, my son, in a moved sort,  
As if you were dismayed. Be cheerful, sir.  
ああ、婿どの、きつう駭いて氣を揉んでみなさるやうぢゃが、  
何も心配には及ばん。  
*Ā*, [3] *muko dono*, *kitsū* [7] *odoroite ki wo* [7] *monde inasaru* [7] *yō ja ga*,  
[5] *nanimo shinpai* [7] *ni wa oyoban*. [7]

Our revels now are ended.  
餘興はもう濟んだのぢゃ。  
*Nagusami wa* [5] *mō sunda no ja*. [7]

These our actors,  
As I foretold you, were all spirits and  
Are melted into air, into thin air;  
あの俳優共は、豫て話しておいた通り、みんな精靈ぢゃによって、  
空気の中へ、薄い空気の中へ、溶け込んでしまうた。  
*Ano yakushadomo wa*, [9] *kanete hanashite* [7] *oita tōri*, [7] *minna seirei*  
[7] *ja ni yotte*, [5] *kūki no naka e*, [7] *usui* [3] *kūki no naka e*, [7] *toke-*  
*konde* [5] *shimouta*. [5]

And – like the baseless fabric of this vision –  
ああ、此幻影の、礎もない假建物と同じやうに、  
*Ā*, *kono maboroshi no*, *ishizue mo nai karidatemono to onaji yō ni*,

The cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces,  
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,  
あの雲に沖る樓臺も、あの輪奐たる宮殿も、あの莊嚴なる堂塔も、  
此大地球其者も、  
*ano kumo ni hiiru rōdai mo*, *ano rinkantaru kyūden mo*, *ano sōgon naru*  
*dōtō mo*, *kono daichikyū sono mono mo*,

Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve,  
いや、此地上に有りとあらゆる物一切が、やがては悉く溶解して、  
*iya*, *kono chijō ni ari to arayuru mono issai ga*, *yagate wa kotogotoku*  
*yōkai shite*,

And like this insubstantial pageant faded,  
Leave not a rack behind.

今消え去った彼の幻影と同様に、後には泡沫をも残さぬのぢゃ。  
*ima kiesatta ano maboroshi to dōyō ni, ato ni wa hōmatsu wo mo nokos-*  
*anu no ja.*

We are such stuff  
As dreams are made on, and our little life  
Is rounded with a sleep.

吾々は夢と同じ品柄で出来てゐる、吾々の瑣小な一生は、眠りに  
始まって眠りに終る。

*Wareware wa yume to onaji shinagara de dekite iru, wareware no sasaya-*  
*kana isshō wa, nemuri ni hajimatte nemuri ni owaru.*

Shōyō's line is essentially an imitation of the flow or continuity of the Shakespearean line, in this case between the materiality of objects (e.g., buildings) and the reality of change that is represented by verbs such as "end" and "melt." He deploys a range of techniques, including contrasts between long and short phrases and syllables, euphony, flexible word order, deixis (the pronouns *kono* and *ano*, "this" and "that"), and the use of particles. Since there are no definite or indefinite articles in Japanese and even demonstrative pronouns such as *kono* and *ano* are avoided, Shōyō's use of *kono* and *ano* eight times in this short speech gives it a highly theatrical flavour, taking its cue from the phrase "These our actors." The phrase *nanimo shinpai ni wa oyoban* is an elaborate rendition of a phrase meaning "Don't worry" (with *nanimo* reassuringly emphatic, "no need to worry"); the particle *wa* is not grammatically essential but allows the phrase to flow, and the negative construction also makes it sound more detached and poetic. The series of short *a* vowels in *wareware no sasayakana isshō* ("our little life") can suggest the congruence of a shared experience, while the diversity of vowels in *ima kiesatta ano maboroshi to dōyō ni* ("like this insubstantial pageant faded") tropes the diversity Shōyō claims to find in Shakespeare. One poetic addition is the verb *hiiru*, written with a character meaning "open sea" (*oki*) as an image of the towers "at sea" among the clouds. One mistake is *shinagara de dekite iru*, where *de* means that human life is made from the same "stuff" as "dreams" rather than generating its content.

What might seem like Chikamatsu about this illustration of Shōyō's style is its sustained musicality; what might seem like Bakin is the accumulation of phrases in the prose medium. There is little wasted, and Shōyō was perhaps thinking of this speech in particular when he wrote in his afterword to the translation that

Shakespeare's uniqueness lies in his language rather than what he actually says. In the case of *The Tempest* which is half like a musical drama in its style, to disregard its musical qualities would be just as good as killing it. That is the difficulty of translating Shakespearean drama.<sup>29</sup>

Like "To be, or not to be," Prospero's soliloquy is a speech one would expect Shōyō to have wanted to translate with special care. Both speeches are metonyms for the

plays in which they are found, the first about the dilemma of action and the second about the theatre of life, and they are also metonyms of Shōyō's broader appreciation of the playwright; Prospero's meditation asserts an ideal of Shakespeare's art that Shōyō probably learnt from Dowden.<sup>30</sup> Whether the relative sonority of these two examples will stand out from their context because Shōyō is less competent at – or less interested in – translating other Shakespearean styles (the prose banter of Stephano and Trinculo, for example) or because they stand out already in the source is a question beyond the scope of this study, but one can certainly examine how the rhetorical techniques discussed earlier are carried over into the translation of dialogue, prose, and so on. In his review of the 1911 *Hamlet*, Sōseki sets his unfavourable view of Shōyō's style against his view that

Shakespeare's lines, just like Noh and *utai*, have this peculiar rhythm and timbre that must be decisively grasped if one is to sustain an audience's interest. Neglect this point, and one ends up losing both the poetry in a phrase like *seiran kozue wo fukiharatte* ["brushing the treetops with mountain mist"] and the colloquial force of a phrase like *Oi chotto kite kure* ["come here a moment"].<sup>31</sup>

It is unclear whether Sōseki is implying that Shakespeare's language is better suited to translation or adaptation in the Noh genre than the kind of complete translation that Shōyō had attempted as an imitation of kabuki's diversity, or whether he felt that Shōyō had simply not tried hard enough in doing what he did do, but it is a point that Shōyō appears to take seriously as he seeks a more integrated translating style in his final, fifth period.

Caliban's speech to Stephano and Trinculo, "Be not afeard" (3.2.133–45), is a memorable speech that Shōyō translates in a distinctly colloquial and unsonorous style:<sup>32</sup>

- CALIBAN. Art thou afeard?  
おのし怖ってるのかい?  
*Onoshi kowagatteru no ka?*
- STEPHANO. No, monster, not I.  
うんにゃ、俺ア怖っちゃアみない。  
*Un nya, oreya kowagaccha inai.*
- CALIBAN. Be not afeard.  
怖らなくても可いよ。  
*Kowagaranakute mo ii yo.*

The isle is full of noises,  
Sounds and sweet airs that give delight and hurt not.  
此島にゃア、常任、音がしてみて、いろんな聲や美しい音色がするけれども、どうもしゃアしないや、只面白いばかりだ。  
*Kono shima nya, shocchū, oto ga shite ite, ironna koe ya ii neiro ga suru keredomo, dōmo shā shinai ya, tada omoshiroi bakari da.*

Sometimes a thousand twangling instruments

Will hum about mine ears;

どうかすると、幾つとも知れない道具の音が、俺の耳の傍で、ツワン  
ツワンと鳴らア。

*Dō ka suru to, ikutsu tomo shirenai dōgu no oto ga, ore no mimi no soba de,  
tsuwan tsuwan to narā.*

and sometimes voices,

That if I then had waked after long sleep,

Will make me sleep again;

かと思ふと、長アく眠て起きた後でさへも、又眠たくなるやうな人の  
聲が聞えることもあらア。

*Ka to omou to, nagāku nete okita ato de sae mo, mata nemutaku naru yōna  
hito no koe ga kikoeru koto mo arā.*

and then in dreaming,

The clouds, methought, would open and show riches

Ready to drop upon me, that when I waked

I cried to dream again.

さうしていつの間にか夢を見てみると、空の雲が漸々に開いて、い  
ろんな寶物が今にも頭の上へ墮落ちかかるやうになるんだ、で、  
俺、目が覺めると、嗚呼、もう一度夢が見たいって叫くんだ。

*Sōshite itsu no ma ni ka yume wo mite iru to, sora no kumo ga dandan ni aite,  
ironna takaramono ga ima ni mo atama no ue e okkochi kakaru yō ni narun  
da, de oreme ga sameru to, ā mō ichido yume ga mitaitte wamekun da.*

STEPHANO. This will prove a brave kingdom to me, where

I shall have my music for nothing.

*Koitsa sutekina ōkoku da wai, ōsama wa tadamonme de motte ongaku ga kikareru.  
こいつア素的な王國だわい、王さまは無代で以て音學が聞かれる。*

Shōyō chooses to depart from the source in which Caliban, having “learnt” Prospero’s language, utters the speech in a version of blank verse, but instead of rendering it in anything like Prospero’s elegant style it is in the inflected vernacular that Shōyō adopts for lowlife characters throughout his translations. In the source, each of Caliban’s lines except the second (“Sometimes a thousand twangling instruments”) contains eleven syllables rather than the ten of iambic pentameter. This extra syllable, which noticeably disrupts the iambic rhythm in lines such as “The clouds, methought, would open and show riches,” gives the speech a hybrid texture of poetry and prose that subtly defines Caliban’s relationship with the other characters. Caliban stands apart from the symmetries of Prospero’s Renaissance world view and finds his being in the natural environment that Prospero has tamed. He is excited by this environment and feels some pride in his role as a teacher of the island’s “qualities” (1.2.403), first to Prospero and here to Stephano and Trinculo, from whom his manner of speaking hardly differs in Shōyō’s translation. The vernacular is heard in the endings *arā*, *narā*, and *wai*,

and there is a touch of excess in the long sentence *Sōshite itsu no ma ni ka* as he struggles to contain his wonder. More than in the source, Caliban cannot control his feelings with the structured repetitions that Prospero uses, but relies on affective expressions like *dō ka suru to* (“sometimes”) and *ka to omou to* (“if I think about it,” again for “sometimes”). His identification with the island is heard in the assonance of the second sentence where the *sh-* in *shima* (“island”) is repeated in *shocchū* (“constantly”), *shite* (“does”), *shā shinai* (meaning “does not make an ugly noise”), and *omoshiroi* (“pleasant”). Caliban may not, therefore, sound as sonorous as Prospero in Shōyō’s translation, but this colloquial style is nevertheless rhythmical and musical, contrasting phrases and segments of varying length in an abstraction of syllabic meter, and also self-aware and intentional. Lacking the connotations of Shakespeare’s blank verse, Shōyō seems concerned that Caliban will end up sounding too much like Prospero, and thus seems more emphatic of Caliban’s subaltern role.

For a third example, Portia’s speech on “The quality of mercy” (4.1.180–201) would have been well known to Shōyō’s Taishō audience as the central speech of *The Merchant of Venice* and was included in the gramophone record he made for Nippon Columbia Records in 1933.<sup>33</sup> Shōyō’s Portia effects her disguise as a male lawyer with her use of the masculine particles *ja* and *wai* and authoritative tone. As with the previous examples, the lack of stressed syllables and unbroken length of the sentences gives the speech a distinctly syllabic feel:<sup>34</sup>

The quality of mercy is not strained:

慈悲は據ろなく施すべきものではない。

*Jihi wa yondokoro naku hodokosubeki mono de wa nai.*

It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven

Upon the place beneath.

慈悲は、春の小雨の自からにして地を潤すが如くに、降るものぢや。

*Jihi wa, haru no kosame no onozukara ni shite chi wo uruosu ga gotoku ni, kudarū mono ja.*

It is twice blest:

其徳澤は二重である。

*Sono tokutaku wa nijū de aru.*

It blesseth him that gives and him that takes.

慈悲は、之を興ふる者にとっても幸福であれば、受ける者にとっても幸福なのぢや。

*Jihi wa, kore wo ataeru mono ni totte mo kōfuku de areba, ukeru mono ni totte mo kōfuku na no ja.*

’Tis mightiest in the mightiest; it becomes

The throned monarch better than his crown.

慈悲は最も偉いなる人に在って、更に最も偉いなる美德となる。

此徳が君主の胸に在れば、其光は金の冠にも幾倍する。

*Jihi wa mottomo ōi naru hito ni atte, sara ni mottomo ōi naru bitoku to naru. Kono toku ga kunshu no mune ni areba, sono hikari wa kin no kanmuri ni mo ikubai suru.*

His sceptre shows the force of temporal power,

The attribute to awe and majesty,

Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings.

彼の國王が手に持たせらるゝ笏は、彼の俗界に於ける威力や□嚴の標章たるに過ぎないが

*Kano kokuō ga te ni motaseraruru shaku wa, hon no zokkai ni okeru iryoku ya songen no mejirushi taru ni suginai ga*

Just as “mercy” is “twice blest,” Shōyō benefits from both the shape of the Shakespearean line and the force of his native syllabics to give the speech a remarkably balanced and centred quality. The series of short *o* vowels – nine in the first line – seem to imitate the patter of “the gentle rain from heaven,” while the regular disruption to the vowel sequences by words containing double consonants, such as *yondokoro* (“forcibly”) and *mottomo* (“most”), and to a lesser extent the double vowels in words such as *kōfuku* (“happiness”), can be said to frame the speech’s rhetorical purpose, which is to extol the “quality of mercy.” Shōyō omits “quality” from the first line, probably because a literal rendering such as *jihi no tokushitsu* would sound abstract and unpoetic, but as I have suggested compensates for that omission with the syllabic patter of the rainfall. Similarly, he omits the abstract “dread and fear of kings,” and compensates for that omission with a dramatic gloss on “scepter” as that which an enthroned monarch might “hold in his hand” (*te ni motaseraruru shaku*). As a more general illustration of Shōyō’s translating style the successive rhythms (or syllabic patter) of the phrases works to channel their momentum towards the end of the line, which in Japanese word order is usually a verb and in Shōyō’s case often the expressive copula *ja* or a strong final particle such as *ga*.

The word *nijū* meaning “double” in “twice blest” may be a deliberate pun on “Jew” to suggest that temporal mercy is worth twice that of Shylock’s demand for justice because (as Portia argues) of the former’s deference to divine judgement: “We do pray for mercy,/And that same prayer doth teach us all to render/The deeds of mercy.” (4.1.196–8). In both the 1914 translation and 1933 revision, Portia’s “Therefore, Jew” (193) is translated *Dakara, Jiu yo*, using a now archaic character for Jewry 猶 meaning “still” or “yet.” This may be echoed in the 1933 revision (although not in 1914, where *mōsu* is used for “say”) in Shōyō’s rendering of Portia’s line as she comes down on Antonio’s side, “Tarry a little. There is something else” (301), *Iya, choto mate. Mada iu koto ga aru*. (literally, “Stop it and wait a moment. There is still another thing to say.” where *iu* is another word for “say”). In seeming to ignore the possibility of divine judgement, Shylock exposes himself to Portia’s judgement.

One final point to be made about the Shōyō line is that especially in the case of set speeches such as “The quality of mercy” and “To be, or not to be,” he will

incline to translate their first lines with particular care, establishing basic phonic patterns and a syllabic rhythm that will shape the speech as a whole. We can look, for example, at how Shōyō translates the opening lines of not just “To be, or not to be,” but of all seven of Hamlet’s soliloquies in the 1933 revision:

1. O that this too too solid<sup>35</sup> flesh would melt,  
Thaw and resolve itself into a dew (1.2.129–30)

おゝ、此硬き剛き肉が、何とて溶け融解けて露ともならぬぞ！  
*Ō, kono kataki kowaki niku ga, nani tote toke torokete tsuyu to mo naranu zo!*<sup>36</sup>

The intense alliteration underscores Hamlet’s frustration at his limitations.

2. O all you host of heaven, O earth – what else? (1.5.92)

おゝ、ありとある天の神々！下界にありとあらゆる神！  
*Ō, ari to aru ten no kamigami! Gekai ni ari to arayuru kami!*<sup>37</sup>

A repeated word play on *ari* emphasises the feeling of alarm in Hamlet’s expression.

3. O, what a rogue and peasant slave am I! (2.2.485)

おゝ、何たる無頼漢の土百姓ぞ俺は！  
*Ō, nantaru narazumono no tsuchihozeri zo ore wa!*<sup>38</sup>

Again alliterative, with a Shakespearean inversion at the end, *zo ore wa*, “am I.”

4. To be, or not to be – that is the question (3.1.55)

世に在る、世に在らぬ、それが疑問ぢや。  
*Yo ni aru, yo ni aranu, sore ga gimon ja.*<sup>39</sup>

A perfect five-seven-seven syllabic.

5. ’Tis now the very witching time of night  
When churchyards yawn and hell itself breathes out  
Contagion to this world. (3.2.378–80)

今こそ夜の丑三つ時、墓は口を開き、地獄よりは毒気を送る。  
*Ima koso yoru no ushi mitsudoki, haka wa kuchi wo hiraki, jigoku yori wa dokuki wo okuru.*<sup>40</sup>

The lack of stressed double consonants in this line gives it a crisp syllabic quality.

6. Now might I do it. But now ’a is a-praying.  
And now I’ll do’t (3.3.73–4)

今こそ遂げう、恰どよい、祈の最中。いで、怨を。  
*Ima koso togō, chōdo yoi, inori no saichū. Ide, urami wo.*<sup>41</sup>

The word *ima* for “now” is foregrounded by the sound plays in Shōyō’s distinctly breathy rendition.

7. How all occasions do inform against me  
And spur my dull revenge. (4.4.31–2)

見る事、聞く事が俺を譴めて鈍った宿志を勵ましをる！

*Miru koto, kiku koto ga ore wo semete nibutta kokorozashi wo hagemashi oru!*<sup>42</sup>

A typical Shōyō paraphrase with the phrase *miru koto, kiku koto* (“seeing and hearing”) explaining that Hamlet is spurred to revenge by everything that he sees (and hears) going on at Elsinore.

A conspicuous feature of this selection is the prevalence of the short *o* vowel in comparison with the other four vowels:<sup>43</sup>

*a* ~ 38 occurrences (excluding with separate vowels such as in *ai*)

*i* ~ 33

*u* ~ 26 (including 1 double vowel)

*e* ~ 14

*o* ~ 60 (including 3 double vowels)

In all but the second soliloquy, and enhanced by items like *kono*, *koso* and *koto*,<sup>44</sup> the profusion of *o* sounds gives the speeches a focussed, urgent quality that is appropriate to Hamlet’s state of mind, and with the near lack of double consonants, also sounds regularly syllabic; the lines roll off the tip of the tongue. In all but the sixth, the lines are also unified by striking repetitions and internal rhymes, notably the crisp *k* and *t* alliterations in the first soliloquy and the phonic connection between *mitsudoki* (the “witching hour”) and *dokuki* (“poisonous air”) in the fifth. Here as elsewhere, euphony is a feature of the Shōyō line.

### Repetition and Keywording

The previous section outlined some basic characteristics of Shōyō’s translating style, above all the attention to rhythm and musicality. What I have been calling the Shōyō line is more expansive than the prosodies of post-war translators, and although still readable adopts numerous usages that are nowadays seldom heard. It may therefore “sound” unique to contemporary ears, but that uniqueness is not necessarily equivalent to Shakespearean uniqueness and works with other devices such as repetition to convey the diversity (and indeed uniqueness) that Shōyō values about Shakespeare. Prosody is mainly focussed on the individual phrase and speech. This section looks at the repetition of words across translations as a whole (keywording) in what may have been a deliberate strategy on Shōyō’s part. Shōyō hints as follows at the potential of keywording in his 1928 essay on Shakespeare translation:

The same thought or feeling may be subject to diverse interpretations. When Japanese scholars first translated Shakespeare they were surprised to discover

this diverse style occurring so frequently. It seemed that Shakespeare created texts rich with feeling, stridently saying the same thing again and again. That is how it seemed to them, although in the end it is a technique born from the necessity of drama. Lines which are written to be heard rather than read need to be repeated, so that skilled reciters and experienced actors will be able to agree on their meaning without being able to explain them. Composers such as Wagner work out their logic through the methodical repetition of lyrics. If you translate the same thing without varying your expression, then you may naturally feel you are wasting something and thereby harming the original. This is a particularly important point when translating Shakespeare with his rich vocabulary and universal rhetoric.<sup>45</sup>

Shōyō, as a translator and a dramatist himself, understands the necessity of repeating words and motifs as a strategy for conveying the source texts' thematic coherence.

Friederike von Schwerin-High offers several examples of keywords that recur in Shōyō's *Tempest* translation,<sup>46</sup> and seem both to have a metonymic function and – as relatively commonplace items that are easily repeated and remembered by audiences – to contrast with more distinctive phrasings. The main example she gives is the verb *oboeru*, “to remember,” which (in all except the following first example) he writes with a character meaning “written record” (*ki*) rather than the two usual characters meaning “remember.” Schwerin-High comments that this unusual choice of character “invests the act of remembering with both consistency and depth.”<sup>47</sup> Almost all the examples occur in Prospero's long conversation with Miranda in 1.2, where aside from the narrative function of recalling what has brought the two to the island, they emphasise the importance of memory to the formation of Miranda's character and Prospero's plan of achieving reconciliation.

Shōyō is translating Shakespeare's play, where we find that the word “remember” and related forms such as “remember'st” occur six times in 1.2 out of a total thirteen in the play as a whole, and likewise the noun “remembrance” three out of six times. Shakespeare too presumably would wish to establish memory as a thematic and narrative device in this long opening scene, and Shōyō's unusual choice of character and the fact that all but one of his thirteen uses of *oboeru* occur in 1.2 of the translation are evidence of a possible deliberate keywording.<sup>48</sup> Moreover, since all these twelve instances involve Miranda, it seems no coincidence that the character *ki* shares a *kanji* radical (*bushu*) with the word Shōyō uses for “princess,” *kisaki*, as follows:<sup>49</sup>

覚 standard usage for *oboeru*  
 記 Shōyō's variation for *oboeru*  
 妃 “princess”

The thirteen instances are listed as follows, with only the first one using the standard character:

1. The direful spectacle of the wreck which touched

The very virtue of compassion in thee

(Prospero, 1.2.26–7)

あの怖ろしげな難船の有様に、深い惻隱を覚えたのも道理ぢやが  
*Ano osoroshigena nansen no arisama ni, fukai awaremi wo oboeta no mo mot-  
tomo ja ga*<sup>50</sup>

2. Canst thou remember

A time before we came unto this cell?

I do not think thou canst

(Prospero, 1.2.38–40)

其方は此窟へ来た前の事を覚えてゐるか？よもや覚えてはゐまいなう  
*Sonata wa kono iwaya e kita mae no koto wo oboete iru ka? Yomoya oboete wa  
imai nou.*<sup>51</sup>

4. Certainly, sir, I can.

(Miranda, 1.2.41)

いゝえ、ちゃんと覚えてをります。

*Iie, chanto oboete orimasu.*<sup>52</sup>

6. By what? By any other house or person?

Of any thing the image, tell me, that

Hath kept with thy remembrance.

(Prospero, 1.2.42–4)

どうして？家か人かに記憶があるか？何でも可い、覚えてゐるものを  
ば言つて見なさい。

*Dōshite? Ie ka hito ka ni oboe ga aru ka? Nandemo ii, oboete iru mono wo ba  
itte minasai.*<sup>53</sup>

8. 'Tis far off,

And rather like a dream than an assurance

That my remembrance warrants.

(Miranda, 1.2.44–6)

遠い前に . . . . . 分明とは覚えてはゐませぬけれど . . . . .  
夢のやうに。

*Tōi mae ni . . . . . Hakkiri to wa oboete wa imasenu keredo . . . . . yume no  
yō ni.*<sup>54</sup>

9. But how is it

That this lives in thy mind? What see'st thou else

In the dark backward and abysm of time?

If thou rememb'rest aught ere thou can'st here,

How thou cam'st here thou mayst.

(Prospero, 1.2.48–52)

どうしてそれを覚えてゐるぞ？何かまだ他に、深い昏い来し方に見えるものは無いか？こゝへ来ぬ前の事を覚えてゐるなら、どうして爰へ来たか覚えてみさうなものぢや。

*Dōshite sore wo oboete iru zo? Nanika mada hoka ni, fukai kurai koshikata ni mieru mono wa nai ka? Koko e konu mae no koto wo oboete iru nara, dōshite koko e kita kamo oboete isōna mono ja.*<sup>55</sup>

12. But that I do not.

(Miranda, 1.2.52)

それは覚えてをりませぬ。

*Sore wa oboete orimasenu.*<sup>56</sup>

13. To think o'th' teen that I have turned you to,

Which is from my remembrance.

(Miranda, 1.2.64–5)

覚えてはみぬけれども、嘸其時父様に御苦勞をかけたであらうと思ふと！

*Oboete wa inu keredomo, sazo sono toki totosama ni gokurō wo kaketate arou to omou to!*<sup>57</sup>

A feature of most of these examples is for either the short *o* vowels in the *oboe* stem to be echoed in contingent words like *yomoya* (“surely not”) and *orimasenu* or else to precede distinctly literary constructions like the insertion of the particle *wa* before a classically inflected form of the present progressive like *inu* or *imasenu*. In other words, not only may *oboeru* be a metonym for memory but it is supported by a trope for the cultural authority Prospero has been instilling in his daughter.

Memory – along with invention, arrangement, style, and delivery – was one of the five canons of classical rhetoric. Prospero does not teach his daughter how to make a speech but does instil in her a sense of identity that can begin only with the memories that regimes such as his usurping brother Antonio’s find it convenient to erase; the mixture of compassion and impatience with which she responds to her father will soon lead her into the arms of Ferdinand, heir to Prospero’s enemy Alonso, and is thus part of Prospero’s plan of revenge. Prospero’s mastery of the elements (his “rough magic”) can be considered a trope for the rhetorical argument of his revenge, and exercises of mind over matter, rhetoric, and magic are related to each other in the Renaissance epistemology, as they were for Shōyō and his contemporaries when they appropriated rhetoric together with the “magic” of Western science and technology in the era of modernisation. The initial interest was mainly in eighteenth-century rhetoricians such as Hugh Blair, whose seminal *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* (1783) was published in a Japanese translation in 1880. One text that focussed specifically on literary composition rather than oratory was Alexander Bain’s *English Composition and Rhetoric* (1867), whose translation by Kikuchi Dairoku in his *Shūji oyobi kabun* (Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, 1879) Shōyō later acknowledged as an influence on *Shōsetsu shinzui*.<sup>58</sup> Shōyō’s particular contribution was his *Biji ronkō* (Theory of Rhetoric, 1893) in

which he distinguishes between what he calls the “emotional style” and “feeling power” (*jō*) of literature and the “knowing power” (*chi*) and “willing power” (*i*) of non-literary texts.<sup>59</sup>

Devices such as keywording serve to enhance the emotional power or warmth of a translation by developing motifs repetitively in a range of literary and dramatic contexts, but they are not didactic, and in the case of Shōyō’s *Tempest* translation can even be said to enhance the sense of wonder that is intrinsic to his theory of “hidden ideals.” Repetition implies consistency (or faithfulness to an idea), and rhetoric’s reward for its consistency is a heightened awareness of human diversity as in what may be regarded as the play’s most memorable speech, when Miranda encounters the wider world for the first time (5.1.181–4). This is a quotation with which Shōyō’s readers in 1915 would probably have not been familiar but which he might, as it were, have wanted to teach them:

O wonder!  
How many goodly creatures are there here!  
How beauteous mankind is! O brave new world  
That has such people in ’t.

The world may no longer be “brave” or “new” for Prospero, but for all his faults Prospero’s revenge is ultimately benevolent, forestalling the murder of Alonso and Gonzalo by Antonio and Sebastian in 2.1 and freeing Ariel and Caliban at the end of the play. Moreover, just as Shōyō is unable to explain Shakespearean creativity in his theory of “hidden ideals,” neither can Prospero rationalise the mystery of human personality, and this sense of mystery or wonder is verbalized in Shōyō’s translation through the repetition of a word, *fushigi*, that means just that: “strange,” “mysterious,” or “wonderful”; it was originally a Buddhist term dating back to the ninth century connoting experience that transcended rational explanation.<sup>60</sup> As an everyday word in the Meiji era, its usage can be said to mirror the frequency of “strange” in particular in the Shakespearean corpus (348 times in total, compared with 394 times of “nature”), not to mention “strangeness” as a commonplace of Shakespeare criticism. *Fushigi* occurs twenty-six times in Shōyō’s translation, which is the same number of occurrences as “strange” (with the related “strangely,” “strangeness” and “stranger”) in the source text,<sup>61</sup> and is given especial prominence in Miranda’s speech:<sup>62</sup>

まア！不思議な！おゝ、まア多数の立派な生類！人間といふ者は、まア、何たる美しいものぢや！かういふ人達の住んでいる處は、まア、何という見事な、新らしい世界であらう！  
*Mā! Fushigi na! Ō, mā ōzei no rippana seirui! Ningen to iu mono wa, mā, nantaru utsukushii mono ja! Kō iu hitotachi no sunde iru tokoro wa, mā, nan to iu migotona, mezurashii sekai de arou!*

This is not necessarily a literary translation, serving more as an approximation of Taishō schoolgirl speech – the colloquial *rippa* (“good”) and *migoto* (“great”) also

occur frequently in Shōyō's translations – but the context is highly dramatic, and it comes as the culmination of a string of more literary usages, of which nine are cited as follows:

1. my zenith doth depend upon

A most auspicious star  
(Prospero, 1.2.181–2)

予の栄枯盛衰は不思議な一つの瑞星に懸つてゐる  
*washi no eiko seisui wa fushigina hitotsu no zuisei ni kakatte iru*<sup>63</sup>

*Fushigi* here is a weak equivalent of “most auspicious,” and instead the sense of wonder is transferred to the parallel (and slightly unusual) phrases *eiko seisui* (for “zenith”) and *hitotsu no zuisei* (meaning “lucky star”). At the same time, *fushigina* gives a rhythmic focus to the sentence.

2. The strangeness of your story put

Heaviness in me.  
(Miranda, 1.2.307–8)

父様のお話が、あんまり不思議なので、つい眠たうなつた。  
*Totosama no ohanashi ga, anmari fushigi na no de, tsui nemutō natta.*<sup>64</sup>

The compact structure of the source is considerably expanded,<sup>65</sup> with “strangeness” becoming an adjectival phrase meaning “rather strange.”

3. No wonder, sir,

But certainly a maid.  
(Miranda, 1.2.428–9)

おゝ、不思議な者ではない。わたしは處女ぢや。  
*Iie, fushigina mono de wa nai. Watashi wa musume ja.*<sup>66</sup>

The translation crisply captures the self-control of Miranda's response to Ferdinand's inquiry of the previous line as to whether she “be maid [i.e., unmarried virgin] or no.”

4. But for the miracle,

I mean our preservation  
(Gonzalo, 2.1.6–7)

併しながら、吾々のやうに不思議の冥助を得るものは  
*Shikashi nagara, wareware no yō ni fushigi no myōjo wo eru mono wa*<sup>67</sup>

*Myōjo* connotes protection by the Japanese gods and Buddha. The paraphrase conveys Gonzalo's religious awe at the party's preservation, with a hiatus after *shikashi nagara* leading into an expansive structure of twenty-one morae.

5. Misery acquaints a man with/strange bedfellows!

(Trinculo, 2.2.38–39)

窮すりやとんだ不思議な相方と同衾をするものだなア。  
*Kyū surya tonda fushigina aikata to dōkin wo suru mono da nā.*<sup>68</sup>

The use of *fushigi* captures the humour of Trinculo's aphorism, even if it is not exactly what he means by strangers lying with each other.

6. but follow thee,

Thou wondrous man.

(Caliban, 2.2.160–1)

俺はおのしに従ふよ、おのし偉い偉い不思議な人！  
*Ore wa onoshi ni shitagau yo, onoshi erai erai fushigina hito!*<sup>69</sup>

The duplication of adjectives such as in *erai erai* is typical of Shōyō's style, and combines here with *fushigi* to convey the vulnerability of Caliban's situation and with the repetition of the archaic pronoun *onoshi* to generate a dynamic rhythmical expression.

7. They vanished strangely!

(Francisco, 3.3.40)

奇怪な塩梅に消えてなくなりました。  
*Fushigina anbai ni kiete nakunarimashita.*<sup>70</sup>

The translator adopts Shakespeare's technique of juxtaposing two words of similar meaning to convey the drama of Francisco's expression.

8. who most strangely

Upon this shore where you were wrecked, was landed

(Prospero, 5.1.160–1)

不思議にもお前さんがたが難船せられた其同じ岸邊に上陸して  
*Fushigi nimo omaesangata ga nansen serareta sono onaji kishibe ni jōriku shite*<sup>71</sup>

As in the source, *fushigi* is well positioned to introduce the compressed structure of Prospero's explanation.

9. This is as strange a maze as e'er men trod

(Alonso, 5.1.242)

人間のつひぞ辿ったこともない實に不思議な八重襷路とも評すべきぢや。  
*Ningen no tsui zo tadotta koto mo nai jitsu ni fushigina yae dazukimichi tomo hyō subeki ja.*<sup>72</sup>

This considerable expansion gives weight to the key word *fushigi*.

An even more audible nexus occurs in the contrast between the word *baka*, meaning “foolish,” “stupid,” or “idiotic,” and *bakemono*, meaning “spirit” or “monster,” which is heard particularly in the scenes with Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo, for example in 3.2.27–32:<sup>73</sup>

TRINCULO. Wilt thou tell a monstrous lie,/being but half a fish and half a monster?

CALIBAN. Lo, how he mocks me! Wilt thou let him, my lord?

TRINCULO. ‘Lord’, quoth he! That a monster should be/such a natural!

CALIBAN. Lo, lo, again!

トリン 半分は化者で、半分は魚の癖に、人間並に人様の悪口なんか吐きやアがるない！

カリバ あれ！あいつめ、あんなに俺を馬鹿にするだに！おのし、あれを放任ツとくか、殿さま？

トリン 殿さまだと言やアがる！あいつはお化ではなくって大馬鹿だ！

カリバ あれ！また俺を馬鹿にしてる！

T: *Hanbun wa bakemono de, hanbun wa sakana no kuse ni, ningen nami ni hitosama no akkō nanka hozasayāgaru nai!*

C: *Are! Aitsume, anna ni ore wo baka ni suru da ni! Onoshi, are wo ucchattoku ka, tonosama?*

T: *Tonosama da to iyagaru! Aitsu wa obake dewa nakutte ōbaka da!*

C: *Are! Mata ore wo baka ni shiteru!*

In this excerpt, we see that while the dictionary definition of *baka* meaning “foolish” is absent from the source, the word occurs three times in the translation, meaning respectively “to mock” (*baka ni suru*), “a natural idiot” (*ōbaka*), and to render the subtext in Caliban’s interjection. “Fool” is a common Shakespearian item in its various forms (“foolish,” “fools,” etc.), occurring almost seven hundred times in the Complete Works and nine times in *The Tempest*, but remarkably Shōyō’s *baka* occurs a total of eighteen times in the translation (common though as it is as an insult in modern Japanese). On the other hand, “monster” occurs thirty-eight times in the source against only twenty-five times in the translation. *Bakemono* usefully echoes *baka*, but since its basic meaning is “ghost” or “phantasm,” Shōyō might want to avoid that nuance. As Schwerin-High comments, while compared with other Japanese translations, “Shōyō’s realism does not seem to magnify the [play’s] magical aspects,” it does heighten “the general strangeness and complexity of the text . . . through his provision of new keywords and through his multi-dimensional *furigana* glossing.”<sup>74</sup>

The following selection indicates the versatility of Shōyō’s usage. In 3, *baka* substitutes for “Fie” to reinforce a tone of reproach in Antonio’s backbiting, and in 10, meaning “stupid wild geese,” it explicates the source’s reference to barnacle geese, while the repetitions in 6, 7, and 11 may even develop the common Shakespearian theme of folly. Shōyō four times adopts the equivalent *ahō* from Kansai dialect, although not as one might expect to mark a difference between a *baka*-speaking ruling class of Prospero and the mainland aristocracy and an *ahō*-speaking subaltern class of natives and servants, but rather probably because *ahō* sounds even more

offensive in a context where the standard *baka* is the norm. Prospero calls his daughter *ahō* (“Foolish wench”), and in 8 *baka* and *ahō* are juxtaposed in an ingenious (if not exactly precise) rendering of Stephano’s jingle “Flout ’em and scout ’em.”

1. Dull thing, I say so  
(Prospero to Ariel, 1.2.285)  
馬鹿、さう言うてをるわい。  
*Baka, sō iute oru wai.*<sup>75</sup>
2. Foolish wench  
(Prospero, 1.2.480)  
阿呆めが！  
*Ahōme ga!*<sup>76</sup>
3. Fie, what a spendthrift is he of his tongue!  
(Antonio referring to Gonzalo, 2.1.26)  
馬鹿な無駄口を利きたがる男もあつたものだ！  
*Bakana mudaguchi wo kikitagaru otoko mo atta mono da!*<sup>77</sup>
4. not a holiday/fool there would give a piece of silver.  
(Trinculo referring to England, 2.2.25)  
お祭日のお馬鹿さん  
*osajitsu no obakasan*<sup>78</sup>
5. A most poor credulous monster! Well/drawn, monster, in good sooth.  
(Trinculo to Caliban, 2.2.112–113)  
馬鹿正直に、虚誇を眞に信けやがる化もの！  
*Baka shōjiki ni, hora wo ma ni ukeyagaru bakemono!*<sup>79</sup>
6. A most ridiculous monster  
(Trinculo, 2.2.162)  
馬鹿々々しい化者もあつたものだ。  
*Bakabakashii bakemono atta mono da.*<sup>80</sup>
7. Servant monster? The folly of this island!  
(Trinculo, 3.2.4)  
化奴だ！此島の馬鹿々々しさッたら無いや！  
*Bakeyakko da! Kono shima no bakabaka shisattara nai ya!*<sup>81</sup>
8. Flout ’em and scout ’em,  
And scout ’em and flout ’em  
(Stephano, 3.2.121–2)  
奴等を馬鹿に爲う。奴等を阿呆に爲う。  
*Yatsura wo baka ni shiyō. Yatsura wo ahō ni shiyō.*<sup>82</sup>

9. Though fools at home condemn 'em.

(Antonio referring to travellers, 3.3.27)

井内の蛙だけが疑つて彼れ此れ言ふのです。

*I no uchi no kawazu dake ga utagatte kare kore iu no desu.*<sup>83</sup>

10. We shall lose our time,
- 
- And all be turned to barnacles
- 
- (Caliban, 4.1.247–8)

今に皆な馬鹿アな雁の鳥にされッちまふ

*ima ni minna bakāna gan no tori ni sarecchimaufu*<sup>84</sup>

11. What a thrice-double ass
- 
- Was I to take this drunkard for a god,
- 
- And worship this dull fool!
- 
- (Caliban, 5.1.296–8)

俺まア何で馬鹿だつたか、あんな酔ひどれを神様だと思つて、あんな馬鹿者を拜んだりなんかしてゐた！

*Ore mā nande baka datta ka, anna yoidore wo kamisama da to omotte, anna bakamono wo ogandari nanka shite ita!*<sup>85</sup>

The qualities of wonder and strangeness schematised here are relevant to the aspect of mystery or hiddenness in Shōyō's Shakespeare, and folly to a negative trait of incoherence for which he berates so-called lesser writers. Moreover, and as Shōyō well knows, just as stylistic diversity tends to support thematic development in Shakespeare's plays, the repetition of commonplace items such as *fushigi* and *baka* in the translations can be seen to accompany literary inflexions and more unique lexical choices. To the extent that Shōyō is able to compensate lexical ordinarieness with literary sophistication, what is reductive about his translations is not so much the choice of words like *fushigi* and *baka* but the assumption that his stylistic mixing will be equivalent to Shakespeare's. The assimilative qualities of Shakespeare's style may for some Japanese readers seem unbalanced and disjointed in Shōyō's translations with their different ranges of linguistic and cultural reference, but this is not to deny the openness of Shakespeare's texts to interpretation and Shōyō's role in interpreting them, nor the openness of the translations themselves to interpretation.

### Phonetic Glossing

Keywording acts metonymically to enhance the interpretive potential of a translation. Shōyō's technique of inserting *furigana* symbols (*rubi*)<sup>86</sup> to indicate phonetic readings of *kanji* and *kanji* compounds is more metaphorical in effect, serving to reproduce an illusory depth within the line or phrase. This convention dates from the early seventeenth century, and became widespread in the Meiji era as literacy

rates grew with the introduction of compulsory primary education and a reading public established itself. Since the use of *kanji* was not fully standardised until after 1945, and writers such as Shōyō would often use characters that exceeded the knowledge of readers educated even to high school level, *rubi* were clearly helpful to both writers and readers. Shōyō may have had a pedagogic purpose of promoting literacy through his translations, since he contrasts the breadth and diversity of Shakespeare's vocabulary with the Yamanote dialect that emerged as standard Japanese in the 1920s,<sup>87</sup> but his purpose is mainly literary in the way that *rubi* often indicate alternatives to the standard, expected reading.

These alternatives are usually more rhythmical and speakable than the standard readings, and (like Shakespeare's tropes of juxtaposition and repetition) can function metaphorically to defer meaning. The technique was commonly used in literary texts by Shōyō's contemporaries (although more sparingly),<sup>88</sup> but even when (as is usually the case, even in Shōyō's translations) there is no deviation, the use of *rubi* creates a visual rhetorical impression by default. Shōyō avoids the wholesale rendition of Shakespeare's language in classical style for the same reason as the Meiji novelists, namely that it was too allusive and suggestive for the pace of a modern narrative, but by way of compensation he finds in *rubi* a means of asserting the symbolic richness and strangeness of Shakespeare's poetic drama.

A striking example of the technique comes in the opening shots of the quarrel between Oberon and Titania in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (2.1.46–50) as Shōyō translated it in 1915:<sup>89</sup>

OBERON. Ill met by moonlight, proud Titania.

TITANIA. What jealous Oberon? Fairies, skip hence.

I have foresworn his bed and company.

OBERON. Tarry, rash wanton. Am not I thy lord?

TITANIA. Then I must be thy lady.

オビロ けん しき や 尊と大家さん、わるい處ところで逢あったねえ月夜つきよに。  
*Kenshikiyasan, warui tokoro de atta nē tsukiyo ni.*

チテー なん 何なですって、嫉妬家やっかみさん！ . . . . 妖精すだまら、さとっさとお跳とび。わ  
たしやアあの人ひととは  
けっ 決して一いっしょに臥ねたり遊あそんだりははずしない筈はずだから。  
*Nan desutte, yakkamiya-san! . . . Sudamara, sassato otobi, watashā ano hito to wa kesshite issho ni netari asondari wa shinai hazu dakara.*

オビロ ま 侍まちな、向むかう見みずの淫蕩者いたづらもの。予われは汝おまえの殿とのさまぢやアないか？  
*Machi na, mukōmizu no itazuramono. Ware wa omae no tonosama jā nai ka?*

チテー おまえ ぢや、わたしは汝おくさまの奥様おくさまでなくわけッちやならない譯わけだ。  
*Ja, watashi wa omae no okusama de nakuccha naranai wake da.*

The *kanji* for “proud” is written *sondai*, one of several collocations for “pride,” but the phonetic reading is *kenshikiya*, which besides sounding more acerbic than *sondaiya* means something slightly different, “an opinionated person.” In reply, Titania calls her husband *yakkamiya* (written *shittoya*), which echoes a popular expression for jealousy, *yakimochi*, literally “a roasted rice cake.” The translation characterises Titania as a type of modern woman speaking above her station, even if in *kyōgen* comedy it is usually the wife who is jealous of the husband, and yet the tone is set for the dialogue that follows. “Fairies” is written *yōsei* but pronounced *sudama*, which is a type of shape-shifting mountain and river spirit from Chinese mythology and Japanese folklore; the word is both more mellifluous than *yōsei* and more specific to its Japanese context. Likewise, Oberon’s “rash wanton” (2.1.64) is translated *mukōmizu itazuramono*: *mukōmizu* means “not looking where you are going” and *itazura*, “mischief maker,” is written *intō*, meaning “degenerate” or “debauched.” The two characters in this compound each contain the radical for “water” that would also place Titania in the category of river spirits, as well as expressing her mutable nature.

Through this differentiation of the two writing systems (*kanji* and *kana*), readers become involved in the association of sound and image and rewarded for recognising discrepancies between given and expected readings when they arise. *Rubi* is, therefore, a technique that privileges readers’ subordinate status as language learners, and (like keywording) may even support links or patterns made across a text, transferring to readers something of the translator’s rhetorical interest in what I have been calling the strangeness of the source. In a tribute published a few months after Shōyō’s death, Hattori Yoshika comments that

The frequent use of *furigana* is a preferred technique of Dr. Tsubouchi, and may as such seem a little eccentric as a response to the nuances of Shakespeare’s vocabulary. In my own view of the Japanese language I prefer to write without *furigana*, and yet Dr. Tsubouchi’s translations would have been impossible without their use, which is a point borne out by Dr. Ōtsuki in his note on *furigana* in the *Daigenkai* dictionary, and the *furigana* add depth and colour to the vocabulary.<sup>90</sup>

Hattori next quotes a string of *kanji* compounds from the translations, each one glossed prodigiously with its *rubi*, and states that

Their application is not only interesting in their context, but through their expressiveness and by dint of necessity make the translations even more readable than the original text. Of course in actual performance this rhetorical purpose will be completely lost in many cases and as a result, as has been commented, will gradually lose their stylistic purpose as directions for reading, and yet they remain a major feature of Dr. Tsubouchi’s Shakespeare translations.<sup>91</sup>

Hattori had studied English literature at Waseda under Shōyō, later becoming a leader of Japan’s free verse movement. His teacher’s *rubi* must have seemed to him a striking innovation, because in his article he places it first among a roster of

the translator's stylistic techniques. In contrast to a view of Shōyō's translations as being overly theatrical and lacking in poetic depth, Hattori suggests that *rubi* made both the translation and the original text easier to understand, referring here to Ōtsuki Fumihiko, the pioneer of Japanese lexicography,<sup>92</sup> and he makes the subtle point that, far from imposing on readers a way of reading the text, the technique is in any case obsolescent.

Shōyō's *rubi* are mainly intended to make the translations more readable but, for example, in his 1919 translation of 2.4 of *Henry IV*, Part 1, the purpose is clearly rhetorical as well. This is one of the play's memorable lowlife scenes in which Falstaff boasts to the young Prince Hal about being attacked and robbed on the highway earlier in the day, and Hal knows that Falstaff is exaggerating events because he was one of the robbers. The mood changes towards the end of the scene when news arrives of rebellion, and Hal prepares for his summons the next day before his father the king by role-playing the meeting with Falstaff. This scene epitomises the tension between poetic licence and historical veracity, and indeed the potential of poetic drama to speak the truth of history that Shōyō found fascinating in Shakespeare's history plays, and like many Japanese Shakespeareans since, he was attracted by the character of Falstaff. In his preface to the translation, Shōyō describes Falstaff as a greater "natural" even than Hamlet and Cleopatra, labelling him *goraku tonbō* ("pleasure dragonfly"), which was Shōyō's own nickname as a student.<sup>93</sup>

Like most of the *Falstaff* scenes, this one is written in prose rather than blank verse, and its poetic values are expressed through word play and a lively turn of phrase rather than meter; *rubi* also may compensate for the absence of poetic form. The translation provides various examples of the technique, starting with the first line, where Hal asks Poin, "Ned, prithee come out of that fat room" (2.4.1), "fat" meaning "stuffy" or "full of stale air."

ネット、おい、頼む、その脂肪臭い室から出て来て  
*Neddo, oi, tanomu, sono abura kusai heya kara dete kite*<sup>94</sup>

"[F]at" is written *shibō* but pronounced *abura kusai* ("stinking of fat"), which is more speakable, eliding with *heya* for "room." Shōyō supposes that this stuffy room is one smelling of old food and cooking oil, and thus makes a link with Falstaff's main physical characteristic. Falstaff dominates the scene, its Rabelaisian detail an extension of the grossness (or fatness) of his imagination. In Hal's speech that follows (3–5), "hogsheads" is read *bōdara*, a dried cod, which is a visual equivalent of the sound play on "loggerheads" and "hogsheads." Yet *bōdara* is written as *donkan*, a collocation for "dull brute," and given a further twist with the substitution of *kan*, meaning "guy," for *kan* "feeling," as *donkan* usually means "dull" or "insensitive":

POINS. Where hast been, Hal?

PRINCE. With three or four loggerheads, amongst three or/fourscore hogsheads.

おほだる ぼうだら ひき ところ  
 大樽が六七十、鈍漢が三四頭といふ處にみた。  
*Ōdaru ga rokunanajū, bōdara ga sanyonhiki to iu toko ni ita.*<sup>95</sup>

Within the rest of Hal's long speech, there are a couple more notable examples: *dontenkan* (written *ikakeya*, "tinker"),<sup>96</sup> for "I can/drink with any tinker in his own language" (17–8), and *nobetsu ni* (written *renzokuteki ni*, "continually"),<sup>97</sup> in "do thou never leave calling 'Francis!'" (30). *Dontenkan* echoes *donkan* ("dull brute") and may also pun with *tenkan* ("epileptic"), besides suiting the phonological context in *mō donna dontenkan to demo* ("with any tinker"). *Nobetsu ni* also suits its context, *sono aida onoshi wa nobetsu ni* ("you never stop"), and through the repetition of the *no* phoneme imitates the rhetorical emphasis made by inverting the verb in the source. In short, the tonal value of these *rubi* is Hal's humorous contempt for Falstaff's lowlife companions.

Shōyō frequently uses the character *nanji* for the Shakespearean "thou" but with two or more different readings depending on context, for example *kisama* in "Wilt thou rob this leathern jerkin, crystal-/button, not-pated" Falstaff (68–9), where *kisama* has the derogatory sense of "rogue." Shōyō handles this convoluted insult by putting the verbal structure at the beginning:

ちや、汝きさまはいよいよ引剥ひっぱいでしまはうてのか？あなめしの柔革胴衣らよつきの、水 晶すみしやう  
 鈕ぼたんの、五分刈頭ふがりあたまの、瑪瑙指輪めなうゆびわの、鼠股引ねずみももひきの、毛絲紐けいとひもの、辯口くちまへの好いい、  
 スペインぶくろ  
 西班牙囊すぺいんぶくろの . . . . .

*Ja, kisama wa iyooyo hippaide shimaoute no ka? Ano nameshira yokki no, suishō botan no, gobu gariatama no, menō yubiwa no, nezumi momohiki no, keito himo no, kuchimae no ii, Supein bukuro no . . . . .*<sup>98</sup>

Shōyō translates Poin's "cunning match" ("what/cunning match have you made with this jest of the/drawer?," 87–9) with the word *ganrōmono*, "plaything" or "mockery," but spoken *chōsaibō*, literally "dandy roving."<sup>99</sup> He usually writes foreign words like the names of characters in *katakana*, having abandoned the early Meiji practice of rendering foreign names in *kanji*, but makes an exception for Harry Percy's nickname, Hotspur, which he writes *Atsuhakusha*, combining *atsu* for "hot" and *hakusha* for "spur," but the pronunciation indicated as *Hottosupā*.<sup>100</sup> Hotspur becomes a legend of time and place, and the nickname is developed in the caricature, "he that kills me some six or seven dozens of/Scots at a breakfast" (100–1); *Sukottorandojin* ("Scots") is written with the Meiji compound for the country rather than in *katakana*.<sup>101</sup>

At the end of Hal's prelude, just before Falstaff enters, "says" in "Rivo! says the drunkard" (108) is written with the character for *sakebu* ("shout") but pronounced *ganaru* ("yell," "scream").<sup>102</sup> Thus, Shōyō combines the simplicity of "says" with the obscurity of the drinking cry "Rivo!" (which he writes with the original Roman letters). Shōyō often gives *katakana* readings for classical gods such as Jupiter and Mars, but in Hal's rhetorical question, "Didst thou never see Titan kiss a dish a butter" (115), "Titan" (the red-faced Roman sun god, nodding at Falstaff) is simply *taiyō* (the sun, with the first character *tai*, "fat"), and "butter" is written *gyūroku* ("cow's ferment") but read *batā*, the modern word.<sup>103</sup> When the butter melts in "the sweet tale of/the sun" (116–7), "tale" meaning "persuasive speech" is translated *benkō* but read *kuchimae*. They both mean "manner of speaking," but *kuchimae* is softer and more humorous than *benkō*, comprising two native words, *kuchi* and *mae*.

The choice between *benkō* and *kuchimae* amounts to two basic tropes available to Shōyō in his translations, namely the cultural distinction between native Japanese words (*wago*) inherited from Old Japanese and *kango* (words borrowed originally from Chinese), and secondly, the orthographic similarities between different *kanji*; *wago* are usually more colloquial, and *kango* (like *rubi*) add stylistic flourish, even more so in Shōyō's time when the number of *kango* in common use was much lower than it is today.<sup>104</sup> One example of orthographic similarity is found in the translation of Hal's rhetorical question cited earlier, where *suishō botan* ("crystal-button") and *keito himo* ("caddis-garter") end with characters containing the same element, 鈕 (*botan*, "button") and 紐 (*himo*, "string"); the character 丑 (*ushi*) by itself means "Ox" in the Chinese zodiac, 金 "gold" or "metal," and 糸 "thread." This connection can be said to articulate the nature of Hal's (and Shakespeare's) rhetoric as being at once both pointed and regular ("buttoned") and "stringed" or connective.

In the examples I have been discussing, Shōyō's *rubi* work to lighten the tone of the dialogue. Other typical *rubi* readings with the purpose of speakability are *wake* for *riyū* ("reason") and *kecchi* for *rettō* ("inferior"). Falstaff's "Zounds" (229, "God's wounds") is written *seigon* ("solemn oath") but pronounced *Zaunzu*.<sup>105</sup> The scene includes numerous more distinct usages, such as when Falstaff suggests that "If reasons were as plentiful as blackberries" (232–3), and "plentiful" is translated literally *kata* but the reading *fundan* ("abundant") sounds more lavish.<sup>106</sup> Another example of matching *rubi* to the prosody, and in this case to the pithiness of the source, is heard when Hal reveals that he and Poin were the robbers all along:

We two saw you four set on four, and bound/them, and were masters of their wealth. (246–7)

お前たち四人が四人の者を襲つて、それを絞つておいて、物を奪つたのを、おれたち二人は、ちやんと見てゐたんだよ。

*Omaetachi yottari ga yottari no mono wo osotte, sore wo shibotte oite, mono wo totta no wo, oretachi futāri wa, chanto mite itan da yo.*<sup>107</sup>

*Yottari* ("four people") is the less usual reading than *yonin*, and introduces the string of rhymes on *ott-*.

When Falstaff tells Hal, "I knew ye as well as he that made/ye." (259–60), the verb for "make" is *tsukuru* ("create") but read *koshiraemasutta*, which has the rhetorical nuance of "fashioned" and is in a polite register.<sup>108</sup> In this speech, Falstaff uses the word "instinct" three times in succession (262–4):

but/beware instinct. The lion will not touch the true prince;/instinct is a great matter. I was now a coward on instinct.

けれども本能は恐ろしいもんだ。獅子は眞の王の子にア齒を觸れないといふが、成程本能は偉いもんだ。おれア其本能の故で臆しちゃまつたんだ。

*Keredomo insuchinkuto wa osoroshii mon da. Shishi wa honto no ō nya ha wo furenai to iu ga, naruhodo, insuchinkuto wa erai mon da. Orea sono insuchinkuto no sei de oku shicchimattan da.*<sup>109</sup>

“Instinct” is rendered with the standard collocation *honnō*, but because Falstaff is talking about something rather different from the usual run of human and animal instincts, the reading in all three cases is the Japanese pronunciation of the English, *insuchinkuto*. Falstaff tries to recover his honour by claiming that even if he did not recognise Hal he knew “instinctively” who he was, and “The lion will not touch the true prince” (263). Tsubouchi may be foreignising this type of instinct as a myth of kingship unfamiliar to Japanese readers, but it is significant that *honnō* (while unspoken) is echoed by the word *hontō* for “true” in “true prince” (263 and 266), implying that a Japanese audience hearing the word *insuchinkuto* for the first time might guess “instinctively” that that is what Falstaff was talking about.

A few final examples illustrate the value of *rubi* for enhancing the speakability and textuality of Shōyō’s translations, and in these cases the gist is towards domestication. Just as English *insuchinkuto* hints at the potential alienation of Falstaff from the prince, in other words to a time when Hal will have a royal body of his own and thus no need of Falstaff’s corporeality, their present relationship is grounded pragmatically in a shared cultural context. It is this context of shared jokes and drinking words that makes the scene a challenge to translate and for Japanese readers to grasp, and so a few choice *rubi* can only serve to point the way. For example, Hal jokes that with the storm clouds of war approaching, women’s virtue will soon become as cheap as the studs or hobnails on soldiers’ boots (352–4):

Why then, it is like if there come a hot June and/this civil buffeting hold, we shall buy maidenheads as/they buy hobnails: by the hundreds.

ぢや、何だね、此盛暑になつて、尚此内亂が續いてるやうだと、  
なん このどよう なほこのないらん つづ  
くつ びよう か さんざい いく みづあげ で き  
 沓の鉾を買ふぐらゐの散財で、幾らも破瓜が出来るなう。

*Ja, nan da ne, kono doyō ni natte, nao kono nairan ga tsuziteru yō da to, kutsu no byō wo kau gurai no sanzai de, ikura mo mizuage ga dekiru nō.*<sup>110</sup>

The summer heat is rendered with the word *seisho* (“height of summer”), but since June is still the rainy season in Japan, where the summer does not begin until the end of July, the reference to June is dropped, and the word is read *doyō*, the so-called “dog days” when the rains stop and traditionally braised eel (*unagi*) is eaten to store energy for the scorching heat. *Mizuage* (here written *haka*, “defloration”) is the coming-of-age ceremony for apprentice geisha that was sometimes a sexual initiation as the patron sponsoring the teenage girl had the right to take her virginity. Hal’s joke is prompted by Falstaff’s that “You may buy land now as/cheap as stinking mackerel” (350–1), and Shōyō may be registering the connection with fish, since written differently (but pronounced the same), *mizuage* can mean “gross profits” or a “haul of fish.”

Shōyō's solution might be criticised for lack of subtlety, but is arguably no less subtle than the source, and affirms a dichotomy between the foreignised and in that sense mystical instincts of the crown and the popular culture that Hal has absorbed under Falstaff's tutelage. In *Shōsetsu shinzui*, Shōyō had criticised the *gesakubon* novels of the late Edo era for being short on psychological depth and high on local, often lurid detail,<sup>111</sup> and this is a similar dichotomy to the one confronting Hal around a popular culture that is sensually gratifying but that he must eventually master if he is to acquire the mystical authority (or, as it were, psychological astuteness) of kingship. This tension is inscribed in the *rubi*.

In the vignette that follows, where Falstaff is pretending to be Hal's father, Hostess Quickly exclaims, "O the father, how he holds his countenance!" (382):

おやまア！ほんとに、<sup>おでこしほひ</sup>下等芝居そつくだわねえ。はゝゝゝゝ！  
*Oyamā! Honto ni, odeko shibai sokkura da wa nē. Ha ha ha ha ha!*<sup>112</sup>

*Odeko* means "forehead," a cue for Falstaff to mimic the king with comically raised eyebrows, but written *katō*, "inferior" or "low class," the phrase means "just like in an inferior play." Shakespeare's Quickly praises Falstaff's ability to keep a straight face, whereas the comparison Shōyō makes with a particular dramatic genre may be meant as a cultural pointer for readers wondering whether Falstaff is being serious or not.

In conclusion to this battle of wits, Falstaff boasts that "If I become not a cart as/well as another man, a plague on my bringing up" (483–4), referring to the carts that were used for transporting condemned men to the gallows, adding that "I hope I shall/as soon be strangled with a halter as another" (484–5).

すると、おれも<sup>おな</sup>同じ<sup>いんがぐるま</sup>因果車<sup>しやうばん</sup>のお相伴<sup>たぶん</sup>だ！お多分<sup>も</sup>に洩れ<sup>このくび</sup>ないで、此首<sup>ね</sup>根<sup>こ</sup>ッ子を<sup>くび</sup>縊<sup>ら</sup>れ<sup>ッ</sup>ちま<sup>ふ</sup>だらう。

*Suru to, ore mo onaji ingaguruma no oshōban da! Otabun ni morenaide, kono kubinekkō wo kubirareccchimau darou.*<sup>113</sup>

literally, "If you let him in, I too will partake of my destiny, and be hanged by the scruff of my neck like all the others."

This is an idiomatic translation in which *ingaguruma* means "wheel of fortune" (the Buddhist chain of cause and effect), connecting with the pun on "major" (the major premise or logic of Hal's argument) made at the beginning of the speech with the town "mayor" or sheriff who would accompany the condemned man to the gallows. In other words, by rejecting Hal's premise that he is a coward, he admits his own premise, which is that he is not, and that he is honourable enough to accept the consequences, or effect, of his self-belief and be hanged for it. Shōyō's rhythmical translation, with the half rhyme on *oshōban* ("partaker") and *otabun* ("majority" or "others") and *k* alliteration in the final phrase, bypasses the obscure reference to the hangman's cart and so keeps the humour at the audience's level.<sup>114</sup>

These examples exhibit a rhetoric of translation that post-war translators have manipulated by more covert means. The pre-war convention of *rubi* comes between the elaborate woodblock technology of pre-modern Japan, in which the insertion of *furigana* was often as much decorative as functional, and the imported technology of modern movable type that together with the efficiencies engineered by mass education enabled a gradual internalisation of the reading process that rendered *rubi* largely redundant. This is a transition that Shōyō could have perhaps foretold from his role in the development of modern Japanese drama, which replaced the elaborate gestures of kabuki drama with the more discrete styles of Western acting. In this respect, his *rubi* glossings may be seen as further evidence of the histrionic quality of his translating style.

### Archaism

Archaism is a powerful norm in Shōyō's Shakespeare translations and in literary translation in general. In a recent study, Krzysztof Filip Rudolf asserts that

archaization, far from being merely an idle ornament, serves as a powerful vehicle for frequently suppressed emotions, doubtless constituting the very core of human experiences. The yearning for stability, the innocence embodied in culturally conditioned images of the prelapsarian bliss, the simplicity of the bygone existence, and the sepia-tinged visions of Arcadian harmony – all these subtly intertwined pictures and mental constructs constitute, to a variable degree, the very core of the archaizing motion.<sup>115</sup>

Shōyō's style is noticeably more archaic than that of post-war Shakespeare translators and contemporary writers who sought to develop their ideas through an integrated modern style. Although there is an inevitable crossover in his era between Edo Japanese and the modern language that resulted from language reform, Shōyō's approach to reform was gradualist, guided (as Seth Jacobowitz suggests) by aesthetic concerns, above all "his desire to read literary texts as invested or encoded with illusory depth."<sup>116</sup> The question then becomes whether Shōyō's archaisms can indeed recreate this illusion of depth, and if they can, whether they release those "suppressed emotions" that are central to Rudolf's description, and whether those come from Shakespeare, from his native culture and experience or somewhere more universal.

The strategy of archaism serves ideally to reproduce this illusion of depth rather than a more superficial equivalence of Shakespeare and Japanese drama, and yet to start with one wonders whether the nostalgia Rudolf regards as "inseparable" from archaism<sup>117</sup> is compatible with Shōyō's apparently modern view of Shakespeare's realism; in other words, whether a heavily archaistic translation can succeed in heightening readers' awareness of their lived reality or simply leave them yearning for the past. Yet, as Rudolf argues, archaism is subtly different from nostalgia, being a conscious strategy (rather than emotion) that manipulates nostalgic feelings for purposes that may in fact have little to do with hierarchies of past and present:

“Archaization is always creative, never recreative, since one is incapable of bringing the past, as it once was, back to life.”<sup>118</sup>

One such creative purpose is that of defamiliarisation, which by extending the perceptual distance between reader and source may suit Shōyō’s agenda of “hidden ideals,” or the illusion that Shakespeare’s creative source is remote to the point of being impenetrable. Archaism may also reproduce Shakespeare’s own archaizing tendency, not to mention the inherent conservatism of his vision that goes beyond a divisive obsession with causes to allow readers to experience their reality for themselves,<sup>119</sup> and for Shōyō it relates to the basic kabuki device of setting plot innovations (*shukō*) against traditional narrative frameworks (*sekai*). Calling the latter “vertical” and the former “horizontal,” Barbara E. Thornbury explains that

The vertical represented the past in its complete and unchanging form and the horizontal represented the present in its unfolding and ever-changing form. Although the so-called vertical plot gave primary definition to a play, the horizontal plot was needed to bring a work out of the past into the present.<sup>120</sup>

As an example of this intersection, Watanabe Tamotsu discusses the technique of *jitsu wa*, meaning “actually” or “as a matter of fact,” whereby in Mokuami’s *Miyakodori nagare no shiranami* (The Great Thief of the Miyakodori Brothel, 1854), the bandit Tengū Kozō Kiritarō disguises himself as a courtesan, Hanako, but is in actual fact a young nobleman and fugitive called Yoshida Matsuwakamaru;<sup>121</sup> these three personae represent the different “worlds” (*sekai*) of the outlaw, brothel, and court nobility. Hanako becomes credible as a courtesan because she is already disguising another self, and with Matsuwakamaru an innocent victim of family rivalries the technique of *jitsu wa* is characteristic of Mokuami’s dramaturgy in questioning conventional roles, particularly his sympathy for tragic rogues (*shiranami*) which attracted the young Shōyō at around the same time as he was encountering Shakespearean sympathy. As a narrative technique, Watanabe comments that the main purpose

of interposing different worlds is to lend depth to the space of the narrative. The layering of three worlds on top of each other gives that space a historical credibility that cannot be achieved within a single world alone.<sup>122</sup>

These techniques resemble Shakespeare’s techniques for generating multiple perspectives, starting with the many cases of mistaken identity in the comedies. Just as kabuki characters are made meaningful by existing in a historical continuum, techniques such as disguise and cross-dressing liberate characters from the transfixing gaze of their immediate environment and enable them more fully to inhabit the past that created them.

In his *Measure for Measure* translation, Shōyō even makes a keyword of the *jitsu* in *jitsu wa*; *jitsu* occurs – mainly in *kanji* compounds such as *jijitsu* (“fact”)

and *shinjitsu* (“truth”) – some sixty-nine times in the translation in contrast to just forty-three occurrences of “true,” “truly,” and “truth” in the source.<sup>123</sup> Shōyō’s repetitions foreground a theme and narrative device of truth in the play, namely the Duke’s kabuki-like disguise as Friar Lodowick, the unmasking of the hypocritical Angelo, and Isabella’s relentless honesty, which is related to the psychological realism that Shōyō admires about the play’s characterisations. The translation is not in fact notably archaic, and *jitsu* is a modern word.

Shōyō’s archaisms should not be considered as ends in themselves but, as I have suggested, as one of a range of devices that give his translations their essential “warmth.” Shakespeare himself is arguably most archaic in his use of classical allusions, in particular to the Ovidian mythology that represents the topos of natural desire without Christian guilt. The kabuki tradition may have seemed too close in time to Shōyō’s audience, too fraught with cultural capital, for it to serve an identical purpose, but like the way that classical references in Shakespeare opened up a possibility that early modern audiences were not bound by their contemporary post-Reformation culture, so too for Shōyō’s audience that – *jitsu wa* – a foreign writer like Shakespeare might have something to say to them. Moreover, since in Shōyō’s theory his response to Shakespeare is to some extent shaped by the eighteenth-century *mono no aware* aesthetic of Motoori Norinaga discussed in the previous chapter, Shōyō may hope quite simply that by infusing his translations with a little of the same pathos, he might arouse an awareness that Shakespeare resounds in his readers’ cultural context as well.

This chapter has already illustrated the archaic feel of Shōyō’s translations with regard to their use of syllabic meter and particles such as *ja* and *wai*. Shōyō’s style, by his own admission, becomes considerably more contemporary and less archaic in the fifth period (1914–28) in which he translated the majority of the plays, and therefore demands contextualisation. For sheer audibility, Shōyō sounds most consistently archaic in his choice of honorific forms, particles, and verbal inflexions, which usually come at the ends of sentences and occur with far greater frequency than archaic noun and verb choices. After 1914, Shōyō tends to opt for modern forms such as the copulas *da* and *de aru*, but even the later translations include archaisms such as *ja* and the honorific copula *gozarimasuru*, which nowadays is heard only in kabuki and samurai television dramas. Shōyō usually uses *ja* as a contraction of the copula *de aru*. In the late Edo and Meiji eras, this usage would have been associated with the Kamigata dialect of western Japan, but since Shōyō translates Shakespeare into standard Japanese rather than into any local dialect his frequent usage of the *ja* copula functions rather as an archaic alternative to the modern copulas (and possibly as an echo of Kamigata kabuki). It also sounds more dramatic and assertive than the modern copulas, and even nowadays can be used in that way.<sup>124</sup> Shōyō does use dialectal variations for lower-class characters in his translations, for example the mechanicals in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, but *ja* is used by a broad section of characters: Claudius and Ophelia as well as Hamlet. As for *gozarimasuru*, it had already been replaced by *gozaimasu* as the standard usage by the end of the Edo era.

Shōyō's translations from late Meiji, notably the 1909 *Hamlet*, provide a fuller range of examples of what may be meant by archaism in Shōyō's style. As a cross-section, the following archaisms occur – and modern usages do not occur – in Act 3 of the 1909 translation.<sup>125</sup> These usages can be contrasted with a majority of inflexions and particles that are commonly used in modern colloquial Japanese:

Modern usages	64.4%	Archaisms	35.6%
modern dictionary verb form	151	- <i>masuru</i> inflexion	63
connective <i>te/de</i> verb form	190	<i>gozarimasuru</i> (archaic copula)	41
plain past ( <i>ta/da</i> )	159	archaic sound changes (e.g. <i>omoute</i> and <i>kurushimuru</i> ) <sup>126</sup>	91
conditional - <i>ba</i>	77	<i>ja</i> (archaic copula)	97
negative copula <i>nai</i>	33	<i>nari</i> (archaic copula)	11
- <i>nu</i> negative	80	<i>ba</i> particle (“if”)	33
- <i>zu</i> negative	23	<i>wai</i> particle (emotive)	33
- <i>mai</i> negative	12	<i>zo</i> particle (emotive)	17
<i>da</i> , <i>desu</i> and <i>de aru</i> (modern copulas)	0	<i>nou</i> , <i>gana</i> , and <i>zoi</i> particles <sup>127</sup>	15

These figures are impressionistic, excluding common particles such as *ga* and *no* that occur in both pre-Meiji and reformed Japanese, but become meaningful when compared with Shōyō's Taishō translations, for example in the opening scenes of *Richard III* (1918) and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (1926), where he has all but abandoned archaic grammar:<sup>128</sup>

	1918	1926
modern <i>da</i> and <i>desu</i> copulas	49	63
connective <i>te/de</i> verb form	85	62
plain past ( <i>ta/da</i> )	33	47
modern dictionary verb form (including <i>iru</i> )	80	40
plain present negative (including <i>nai</i> )	20	37
polite affirmative <i>masu</i> form	8	13
<i>de gozaimasu</i> (polite copula)	2	13
<i>to iu</i> construction (“which means”)	12	2
- <i>rya</i> (conditional) and - <i>cha</i> contractions	12	8
archaic particles ( <i>ja</i> , <i>wai</i> , <i>ze</i> , and <i>zo</i> )	1	15

The main deviations are that Richard sometimes uses the casual *rya* contraction and Speed, Valentine's clownish servant in *The Two Gentleman of Verona*, three times uses the dialectal *gozansu* form for the polite copula *gozaimasu*.<sup>129</sup> Tozawa and Asano's translation of *Julius Caesar*, published two years before the 1909 *Hamlet*, is also more noticeably modern. The following figures are for their translation of 3.2 of the source, comprising 287 lines, in which, following Caesar's assassination, Brutus and then Antony make funeral orations, each competing for the support of the Plebeians:<sup>130</sup>

modern verb inflexions	410	
– <i>nu</i> negative	15	
<i>zo</i> particle	10	
– <i>mai</i> negative	6	73.2%
classical verb inflexions	130	
<i>ja</i> (archaic copula)	20	
<i>nari</i> (archaic copula)	6	
other archaic particles ( <i>ba, nou, wai, and yai</i> )	5	26.7%

Shōyō's 1909 *Hamlet* is a recognisably modern text in terms of its sentence structures and inflexions, since it was after all the translation of foreign writers such as Shakespeare that spurred the modernisation of Japanese, but the preponderance of archaisms such as the *-masuru* inflexion further distinguishes it from the early postwar translation of the same play by Fukuda Tsuneari. In 3.1 (which includes the "To be, or not to be" soliloquy), Fukuda is more likely to follow the grammatical standard of ending sentences with an inflected verb phrase, and (apart from the object particle *wo*) is slightly less likely to end with a particle. Shōyō also uses longer sentences:<sup>131</sup>

<i>Shōyō (1909)</i>	(221)	<i>Fukuda (1955)</i>	(278)
verb phrase	87	verb phrase	153
noun phrase	34	noun phrase	34
modern particles ( <i>e, ka, kai, mo, mono, na, ni, no, wa, wo, ya, and yo</i> )	54	modern particles ( <i>e, ga, hazu, ka, koso, na, ni, to, mo, wa, and wo</i> )	80
archaic particles and particle combinations ( <i>ba, degana, ja, ja wae/wai, ja zo, wai, wai no, wai yai, yai, zo, zoi, and zo ya</i> )	42	archaic particles ( <i>zo</i> )	5
other	4	other	6

The difference can be further illustrated by a brief comparison of the two's translations of Claudius' speech as follows (3.1.161–6):

Love! His affections do not that way tend.  
 Nor what he spake, though it lacked form a little,  
 Was not like madness. There's something in his soul  
 O'er which his melancholy sits on brood  
 And I do doubt the hatch and the disclose  
 Will be some danger

Shōyō (1909)<sup>132</sup>

戀ぢや? いやいや戀ではないわい。只今彼れが言うたことは、聊か條理を缺いてをれど、

*Koi ja? Iyaiya koi dewa nai wai. Tadaima kare ga iuta koto wa, isasaka kotowari wo kaite oredo,*  
 狂人のやうでもない。何か心中に鬱々と孕み育つるものがある  
 わい、  
*kyōjin no yō demo nai. Nanika shinchū ni utsuutsu to hagukumi sodatsuru mono ga aru wai.*  
 自然それが孵つたなら容易ならぬことが出来る。  
*shizen sore ga kaetta nara yōi naranu koto ga dekiu*

Fukuda (1955)<sup>133</sup>

恋！いや、そうとは思えぬ。いささか脈絡を欠いてはいるが、言葉の節々、どうして  
*Koi! Iya, sō to wa omoenu. Isasaka myakuraku wo kaite wa iru ga, kotoba no fushibushi, dōshite*  
 狂人などであるものか—腹になにかある。あいつはそれを鬱々としてはぐくんでいる。  
*kyōjin nado de aru mono ka – koshi ni nanika aru. Aitsu wa sore wo utsu-utsu toshite hagukunde iru.*  
 孵ったら、取返しのつかぬことにもなろう。  
*Kaettara, torikaeshi no tsukanu koto ni mo narou.*

Shōyō's version, comprising seven units, leans heavily on the emotive particle *wai* rhyming with the negative *nai*, with both repeated; the expression *Koi ja?* and double verb *hagukumi sodatsuru* for “hatch” are also quite consciously theatrical. Fukuda's version of ten units runs more easily into verbal constructions such as *kaite wa iru* and *nanika aru*, and sounds altogether lighter and more detached.

The actual modernity of Shōyō's early twentieth-century translations is also worth emphasising in contrast to the unreformed language of his 1884 *Julius Caesar*. Translating Antony's eulogy over the slain body of Brutus (5.5.69–73),<sup>134</sup> Shōyō uses classical inflexions like the obligatory *beshi* that occur sparingly in the 1909 *Hamlet*, and unlike his modern translations the text is not organised into regular Shakespearean sentences with periods but rather as phrasal sequences that make little clear distinction between one sentence and the next. In other words, it is in the style of classical *jōruri* (*inpontai*), which none of his later translations will resemble:

This was the noblest Roman of them all:  
 All the conspirators save only he  
 Did that they did in envy of great Caesar.  
 He only, in a general honest thought  
 And common good to all, made one of them.

アッこれぞ誠に羅馬國の、賢士の賢士、  
*Atsu kore zo makoto ni Rōma koku no, kenshi no kenshi,*  
 well – this one – (particle) – truly – the Roman state – wise among the wise –

義人の義人、たぐひ稀なる蓋世の、英傑なりしを惜しむべし、  
*gijin no gjin, tagui mare naru gaisei no, eiketsu narishi wo oshimubeshi,*  
 righteous among the righteous – without parallel and peerless – the  
 great man (i.e., Caesar) –

敢なく黄泉の鬼となりしか、往る日獅威差殿下  
*aenaku yomiji no oni to narishi ka, inuru hi Shīzaru denka*  
 begrudgingly – tragically – a soul in Hades – he became – of past  
 times – his majesty Caesar –

をば、陰かに謀つて刺殺なせし、三十餘名の徒黨の  
*wo ba, hisoka ni hakatte sekisatsu naseshi, sanjū yomei no totō no*  
 (emphatic particles) – secretly – conspiring – his assassination – having  
 done – around thirty conspirators

中にて、誠と國家の利福の爲に、只々全般の自由の爲めに、  
*uchi nite, makoto kokka no rifuku no tame ni, tadatada zenpan no jiyū*  
*no tame ni,*  
 – among – truly – the state – for the common good – only – the general  
 freedom – for the sake of –

身を犠牲にして企に、興せし者は只一人、  
*mi wo gisei ni shite kuwadate ni, kumi seshi mono wa tada hitori,*  
 his body – sacrifice – meaning to – together with – that person – only  
 one of them –

此マアカス舞婁多須あるのみ  
*kono Mākasu Burutasu aru nomi*  
 this Marcus Brutus – it is – only

The 1913 translation, by contrast, is a model of modern clarity, with the repetitions of the *ta no da* construction for “he was” underscoring Octavius’ charitable view of “honourable” Brutus:<sup>135</sup>

これは徒黨中の最も高潔な羅馬人であつたのだ。此男一人の他は、  
*Kore wa totō chū no mottomo kōketsuna Rōmajin de atta no da. Kono*  
*otoko ichinin no hoka wa,*  
 this one – among the conspirators – the most noble – Roman – he was –  
 this one man – apart from –

何れも大シーザーを嫉み憎むの餘りにしたのだ。此男のみが、  
*izuremo dai Shīzā wo sonemi nikumu no amari ni shita no da. Kono*  
*otoko nomi ga,*  
 each of them – great Caesar – jealous of – and hating – too much – they  
 were – this man – only –

全く公共の爲に、一般の利福の爲に、正しい考で  
*mattaku kōkyō no tame ni, ippan no rifuku no tame ni, tadashii kangae de*  
 entirely – for the public good – for the general benefit – in his honest  
 thoughts –

其仲間に加はつたみたのだ。  
*sono nakama ni kuwatte ita no da.*  
 his companions – was joining with

Written for stylised declamation by a bunraku or kabuki narrator, the 1884 version is considerably more grandiloquent than Antony’s terse tribute in the source, with which Shakespeare surprises us after the doubts Antony has previously raised about Brutus’ honour in his speech to the crowd in 3.2 (“For Brutus is an honorable man,” 91). The 1884 version combines the descriptive and speech (*serifu*) modes of *jōruri* to maximise the pathos of Brutus’ death, sounding inevitably like the finale to some bunraku play on the theme of honour. Shōyō adds a lot to the source: Kishi Tetsuo and Graham Bradshaw comment that his adaptation “contains both descriptions of what is not necessarily visible, like the characters’ inner feelings, and rather coercive comments on the dramatic significance of a particular situation.”<sup>136</sup>

The 1909 *Hamlet* has the advantage of regularly lineated sentences and speeches but was still too fussily classical for the likes of Kawatake Shigetoshi.<sup>137</sup> In this translation but to a markedly lesser extent in his fifth stage, Shōyō appropriates archaism to his twin poles of rhythm and warmth, but seldom to the extent that it becomes kabuki language. We can look at a specific example, namely the interjection *hate* (pronounced with two short vowels unlike the English “hate”), which Shōyō uses throughout his translations and which occurs in 5.1 of the 1909 *Hamlet* (the Gravediggers’ scene) a striking fourteen times: this works out at once every twenty-one lines of the three hundred lines of source text compared with a total fifty-four times over the remaining 3,400 lines. *Hate* expresses surprise and even wonder, meaning something like “Well!” or “Why!” and although it is not entirely obsolete, it is a typical kabuki expression. In Chikamatsu’s *Sonezaki shinjū*, the courtesan Ohatsu says to Tokubei as they make their final journey: *Hate shinuru kakugo ga kikitai* (“Well, I am prepared to die”).<sup>138</sup>

In most of the following examples, *hate* is clearly an addition to the source. Shōyō uses the word to frame the Gravedigger’s storytelling, in particular relating to Yorick’s skull; the Gravedigger with his humour and long view enables Hamlet to embrace his own narrative and so carry on his struggle. This is a scene in which the separate worlds of the Renaissance prince and the clown who lives by his wits coincide to state the play’s central theme of mortality:

1. About Adam’s profession, the Gravedigger says that “‘A was the first that ever bore arms” (5.1.33), *Hāte, icchi hajime ni gojōmon wo tsuke sasshita hito ja.*<sup>139</sup> Shōyō’s *hate* is inserted as a prefix to his answer to the 2nd Man’s question “Was he a gentleman?”, and inflected with a long vowel to denote the Gravedigger’s status. This example connects the Gravedigger’s narrative with the play’s

- broader narrative of sin and redemption, specifically the original sin of Old Hamlet's murder.
2. The Gravedigger answers the riddle with which he has pestered his companion: "The houses [a grave-maker] makes lasts till doomsday" (55), *Hate hakahori ga tsukuru sumai, ōsabaki no hi made mo tsuzuku wa sa*.<sup>140</sup> With the alliteration in the first two words, the Gravedigger comically relishes his profession's authority that stretches to the crack of doom, and hints at the deaths in the final act for which his services will likely be once more requested.
  3. The Gravedigger makes a grotesque ballad of his profession: "But age with two stealing steps/Hath clawed me in his clutch/And hath shipped me into the land/As I had never been such" (67–70), *Itsu no ma ni yara to shinami ya yosete,/ ora ga kubitama shikka to tsukama./Hate wa shimane ni nageagerarete,/kawari hateta yo konna mono ni*.<sup>141</sup> These two instances are different from the others because the *kanji* form is used, meaning "in conclusion" rather than "well," but they still hint at the play's overall narrative framework.
  4. Now Hamlet uses the word, shifting the focus from the Gravedigger's comic detachment to the physical reality of the skulls: "Why, e'en so" (83), *Hate, masa ni sō ja*.<sup>142</sup>
  5. Hamlet realises that the grave the Gravedigger is digging might be for a woman: "What woman then?" (124), *Hate, doko no hito no tame ni kiku no ja*.<sup>143</sup> This usage leads on to Hamlet's discovery of the awful truth that Ophelia has committed suicide. Shōyō heightens this dramatic revelation by reconfiguring the gender difference as the biblical difference between "man" and "wo-man" ("female man"), perhaps in allusion to Adam and to Hamlet's earlier quibble on "body" and "thing" in 4.2.<sup>144</sup> It is not until the Gravedigger's "One that was a woman" that *onna* ("woman") is used: before the words are *mono* and *hito* for "person," with the Gravedigger comically mistaking Hamlet's *mono* in *nani mono no tame ni* ("What man dost thou dig it for?", 122) for the other meaning of *mono* as concrete "thing," written with a different character.
  6. This example is also humorous, as the Gravedigger declares what everyone believes to be the reason Hamlet was sent to England: "Why, because 'a was mad" (142), *Hate, ki no chigatta ni yotte*.<sup>145</sup>
  7. As is this one: "Why, here in Denmark" (152), *Hate, moto wa ōjisama ja ga na, kono Denmāku koku no*.<sup>146</sup>
  8. In the next example, as the Gravedigger rehearses his expertise in practised phrases, *hate* is again literal: "Why, sir, his hide is so tanned with his/trade that 'a will keep out water a great while" (160–1), *Hāte, omaesama, shōbaigara de kawa ga nameite oru ni yotte, daibun no aida mizu wo hajikimasuru*.<sup>147</sup>
  9. In a final dramatic revelation, the Gravedigger appears to boast of his royal connections, with the archaic *gozarimasu* copula adding flourish: "This/same skull, sir, was, sir, Yorick's skull, the king's jester" (170–1), *Hate, kono sharekotsu wa Yorikku no dokuro de gozarimasu, ōsama no odōbō de gozarimashita wai*.<sup>148</sup>

The last four examples are all spoken by Hamlet and relatively straightforward, as he has subsumed the Gravedigger's comic narrative into his tragicomic viewpoint: "Why, I will fight with him upon this theme" (255), *Hate, kono koto dake wa*;<sup>149</sup>

as Hamlet challenges Laertes, he says “I’ll do’t” (266), *Hate, ore mo shite mishō wa*,<sup>150</sup> and “And if thou prate of mountains let them throw/Millions of acres on us till our ground” (269–70), *Nan ja, issho ni umeraretai, hate, ore mo issho ni umeraryō wai*;<sup>151</sup> and finally over Ophelia’s body, “I loved you ever – but it is no matter” (279), *Yo wa onushi wo ai shite otta ni . . . Hate, kamau koto wa nai*.<sup>152</sup>

Shōyō clearly liked the word, because when he came to revise the play in 1933 all but one of the *hates* remained.<sup>153</sup> Only half of the previous examples are formal equivalents of source words, with the others rendering the subtext, and even more than the previous examples of keywording, *hate* resounds throughout the scene. Moreover, in Shōyō’s dichotomy of *ninjō* and *fūzoku*, this kabuki archaism associates the Gravedigger with the latter, making him comically accepting of his role in a hierarchy that Hamlet challenges, and to the extent that the Gravedigger and his assistant do accept their role they also take pride in their occupation, as when the Gravedigger questions the right of Ophelia as a suicide to Christian burial (5.1.6–8):

GRAVEDIGGER. How can that be, unless she [Ophelia] drowned  
herself in her own defense?  
OTHER. Why, ’tis found so.

Professional pride develops into quite a heated argument that foreshadows the fight between Hamlet and Laertes over who has loved Ophelia the most. In this dialogue at least, the earthiness of their speech is conveyed through the heavy use of final particles:<sup>154</sup>

Kō. *Waga mi wo kabaute mi wo nageta no demo nai ni, honshiki to iu koto ga aru kai yai?*  
her body – defending – body – threw (into the water) – unless – a proper burial – can it be? – bah! (particle)  
OTSU. *Demo, sore ga oyakunin sa ano iiwatashi ja wai no.*  
but – that – the official – his judgment – it is – (double emphatic particles)

The archaic *hate* is supported by an undercurrent of archaism in particles such as *ja* and *wai*, which is solely emphatic in purpose and occurs fifteen times in the scene and *ja* thirty-three times. Nor is it necessarily fanciful to suggest that *wai* echoes phonically the repetition of the interrogative “why,” which occurs eighteen times in the scene out of a total fifty-five instances in the play as a whole. By way of parallel, Shōyō translates the first word in the first sentence of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, “Now, fair Hippolyta, our nuptial hour/Draws on apace” (1.1.1–2), with the archaic *nau*, although the word is pronounced *nō* with the sense of “Listen to me!” rather than the temporal “now.”<sup>155</sup>

One theme of this book has been Shōyō’s comic acceptance of the impossibility of his task. Shōyō’s archaisms are primarily creative interpretation, but just as Hamlet’s nostalgia is for the lost innocence of his childhood, they may also embody a nostalgia for the relatively fixed roles of feudal society (of his samurai father, for example) that, ironically, is affirmed through the challenge of Shakespeare translation. Shōyō

finds his response to Shakespeare in his native culture, but for all the real and imagined similarities his nativism exposes him to Shakespeare's ultimate foreignness.

### Lexical Diversity

Shōyō's archaizing tendency comes across not so much as an end in itself but as an inevitable outcome of his engagement with Shakespeare's texts, and is therefore only one dimension of his broader appreciation of Shakespeare's lexical variety. What he notices first and foremost about Shakespearean drama is "the remarkable wealth of its vocabulary, its diversity, and the freedom with which the writer deploys it."<sup>156</sup> Shōyō slightly underestimates the size of Shakespeare's vocabulary at fifteen thousand words,<sup>157</sup> but the point for him is the breadth of Shakespeare's usage which

includes everything from classical archaisms to the popular language of the Elizabethan age, slang, dialect, foreign words and neologisms. His language corresponds to every social class and human character type, and the same content may vary in style of expression according to the individual, period, situation, and the mood and temperament.<sup>158</sup>

Shōyō's priority, therefore, is to find fitting equivalents for the range of Shakespeare's lexicon. One historical advantage he has is the considerable growth in Japanese vocabulary and native literacy rates over the course of his career, evidenced and advanced by Ōtsuki Fumihiko's modern Japanese dictionaries and the influx of *kango* (Sino-Japanese words and character compounds), many of them neologisms resulting from the new terminologies and fields of knowledge introduced through the Meiji goals of modernisation and Westernisation. Shōyō had himself popularised the word *shakai* ("society") in his early novel of social mores, *Tōsei shosei katagi*.

Between 1869 and 1915, the proportion of *kango* to native Japanese words (*wago*) listed in Japanese dictionaries is estimated to have shifted from a ratio of 21.5% to 35.4% in 1869 to 55.0% to 22.6% in 1915.<sup>159</sup> The feudal society into which Shōyō had been born was predominantly local and agricultural, with a majority peasant class speaking local dialects and having limited reading ability; economic development in Meiji and Taishō Japan and the growth in literacy rates were facilitated by a corpus of old and new Sino-Japanese words with fixed meanings that could be learnt at school. When Sōseki complains of the difficulty of Shōyō's Japanese in his *Hamlet* translation, he may from his own teaching experience have been referring to the limited *kanji* knowledge of a semi-educated majority, but (as the drama critic Atsumi Seitarō was to comment) the literacy divide had become somewhat less of an issue by the time of the translator's death in 1935,<sup>160</sup> and Shōyō may have contributed to this developmental process through the repeated use in his translations of modern *kango* and phonetic *furigana* readings. This final section looks first at how Shōyō's translation of a single word, the keyword "nature" in *King Lear*, employs a range of collocations that is certainly as diverse as what Shakespeare meant by the word, and then at a selection of personal pronouns as a further example of the translator's lexical diversity.

The word “nature” occurs thirty-eight times in *King Lear*, and has been a key topic in the play’s critical history, with John F. Danby arguing in his *Shakespeare’s Doctrine of Nature: A Study of “King Lear”* (1948) that Shakespeare’s tragedy dramatises this single word as a defining theme of early modern English discourse. As I explained in Chapter 2, “nature” also relates to Shōyō’s realism. It is translated by Shōyō in order of occurrence as follows:

1. Lear asks his eldest daughter Goneril to tell him how much she loves him “That we our largest bounty may extend/Where nature doth with merit challenge.” (1.1.52–3) “Nature,” meaning “natural affection,” is translated here *kōkō* 孝行 “filial duty,”<sup>161</sup> the Confucian notion of the obligation that children must naturally feel for their parents.
2. Lear is furious with Cordelia for refusing to flatter him, behaviour “Which nor our nature, nor our place can bear” (172). This “nature” contrasts Lear’s individual temperament with his “place” or rank (*mibun*), and is translated simply as *sei* 性,<sup>162</sup> “temperament.” That the basic meaning of *sei* is “sexuality” suggests how deeply Lear’s pride has been rattled.
3. When Lear condemns Cordelia as “a wretch whom nature is ashamed/Almost t’acknowledge hers” (213–4), Shōyō expands the sense of “nature” here to mean literally her “present parent,” *genzai no oya* 現在の親,<sup>163</sup> Lear himself.
4. France defends his future wife Cordelia’s self-restraint as no more than “a tardiness in nature” (237), which Shōyō calls *mochimae* 持前,<sup>164</sup> a person’s inherent characteristics.
5. In his self-introductory soliloquy, the bastard Edmund declares that “Thou, Nature, art my goddess” (1.2.1). Shōyō uses what is now the most familiar collocation, and a Meiji coinage, *daishizen* (“great nature”) 大自然.<sup>165</sup> *Shizen*, like *fushigi*, is an old Buddhist word denoting things that exist in and of themselves, but with modernisation gained wider usage as a scientific term and in contexts such as literary naturalism.
6. In the same speech, Edmund describes the illicit sexual activity that begot him as “the lusty stealth of nature” (11). Shōyō omits this one and paraphrases the sense with a candid phrase meaning “avoiding inquisitive looks and taking [sexual] pleasure in procreation.”<sup>166</sup>
- 7/8. Edmund’s father, Gloucester, contrasts the rational explanation of natural occurrences such as “eclipses in the sun and moon” (103) with a political truth that human behaviour is often swayed by irrational superstitions: “Though the wisdom of Nature/can reason it thus and thus, yet nature finds itself/scourged by the sequent effects. Love cools, friendship/falls off, brothers divide” (103–7). Shōyō paraphrases the first “nature” as “scientists,” *rigakushadomo*, where *ri* 理 has the traditional meaning of “the laws of nature,” and the second is translated *shizenkai* 自然界, “the natural world,”<sup>167</sup> and therefore one that encompasses human behaviour as well.
9. Shōyō paraphrases the third instance in Gloucester’s speech, “The King falls from bias of nature” (111), with a phrase meaning that the king has betrayed his natural instincts or tendencies. Shōyō here juxtaposes two words for “nature,”

- sei no shizen* 性の自然,<sup>168</sup> literally the “nature of his temperament,” to suggest that more than lesser mortals the king’s “nature” is bound symbiotically to the natural world to which all are subject.
10. When Edmund describes his legitimate half-brother Edgar’s “nature” as “so far from doing harms/That he suspects none” (178–9), and Shōyō for the first time uses *seishitsu* 性質,<sup>169</sup> meaning “character,” for “nature.”
  11. Confronted by Goneril’s unkindness, Lear begins to regret his earlier rejection of Cordelia, “Which like an engine wrenched my frame of nature/From the fixed place” (1.4.280–1). Shōyō translates “frame of nature” literally as *hongu no seijō* 本具の性情,<sup>170</sup> the “main tool of my disposition,” where *seijō* is a less common collocation than *seishitsu*.
  12. Echoing Edmund’s previous soliloquy, Lear prays to the gods to avenge Goneril’s apparent ingratitude: “Hear, Nature, hear, dear goddess, hear” (289). Shōyō translates this “nature” as “the Creator,” *zōka no ongami* 造化の御神,<sup>171</sup> in an introduction to the curse that follows (“Into her womb convey fertility” etc., 292).
  13. In another outburst of *amour propre*, Lear declares to the Fool that “I will forget my nature: so kind a father!” (1.5.31). Shōyō translates “nature” here as *jō* 情,<sup>172</sup> “warmth” or “feeling.”
  14. When Kent hits back at Oswald with the words “nature disclaims in thee” (2.2.53), Shōyō again uses *zōka* in a phrase that means “nature has no memory of having made you.”<sup>173</sup>
  15. Cornwall vents his rage at Kent as an uncouth man who is unable – unlike Goneril and Regan – to conceal his true feelings with flattery: Kent “constrains the garb/Quite from his nature” (95–6). This nature becomes *mochimae*, Kent’s basic temperament.<sup>174</sup>
  16. In a moment of insight, Lear declares that “We are not ourselves/When nature, being oppressed, commands the mind/To suffer with the body” (2.2.296–8). Shōyō here omits “nature” in a considerable paraphrase that uses the *zaru wo enai* construction, meaning “have no choice but to be,” in this case “have no choice but to suffer.”<sup>175</sup> *Kokoro* 心 for “mind,” but literally meaning “heart,” is a powerful word in the Japanese lexicon that may also connote this hidden nature.
  17. Regan bluntly reminds her father: “O sir, you are old:/Nature in you stands on the very verge/Of her confine” (335–6). “Nature” is again omitted in the translation in a paraphrase that means “your life expectancy has reached a dead end [*yukidomari*].”<sup>176</sup>
  - 18./19. Lear for the time being does not doubt the integrity of his second daughter’s “nature,” using the word twice in the same speech: “Thy tender-hefted nature shall not give/Thee o’er to harshness” (360–1), and “Thou better know’st/The offices of nature, bond of childhood,/Effects of courtesy, dues of gratitude” (366–8). In the first instance, we hear *kidate* for the first time, although written and meaning the same as *seishitsu* 性質, probably so as to elide with the phrase as a whole, *sonata wa yasashii kidate ja ni yotte* (“because you have a gentle nature”),<sup>177</sup> but perhaps also as a nod to Shakespeare’s unusual usage, “tender-hefted”; “heft” means “weight” or “importance,” and this sense of intrinsic rather than superficial gentleness is conveyed by Shōyō’s mellifluous construction. In the second instance, “nature” is *mochimae*.<sup>178</sup>

- 20./21./22. “Nature” occurs three times in rapid succession in Lear’s parting shot to Goneril and Regan as he defends his requirement of a full posse of knights to serve him: “Allow not nature more than nature needs” (455) and “nature needs not what thou gorgeous wear’st” (458). In the first case, Shōyō contrasts *shizen* with *ningen* (“human beings”) to explain that human beings need no more than their natural requirements for warmth, dignity, and so on demand, and in the second case the modern word *shizen* is also used.<sup>179</sup>
23. Running mad on the heath at night, Lear howls at the storm to “Crack nature’s molds, all germens spill at one/That makes ingrateful man!” (3.2.10–11). “Nature” is again “creation,” the “creative force of nature,” *zōka*.<sup>180</sup>
24. A little later in the scene, Kent declares of the storm that “Man’s nature cannot carry/Th’ affliction, nor the fear” (50–1). “Nature” here becomes “man’s body,” *karada* 体.<sup>181</sup>
25. Almost the same word, *ningen no karada* 身体 (“human body”),<sup>182</sup> is used when Kent again complains that “The tyranny of the open night’s too rough/For nature to endure” (3.4.2–3).
26. When Lear once again fumes at Goneril and Regan, “Nothing could have subdued nature/To such a lowness but his unkind daughters” (76–7), Shōyō uses *arisama* 有様, meaning “state” or “condition” (literally, “the way things are”).<sup>183</sup>
27. As Edmund callously justifies his betrayal of his father Gloucester with the words “nature/thus gives way to loyalty” (3.5.2–3), “nature” is rendered *ko no michi* 子の道, “the way of the child.”<sup>184</sup>
28. In the mock trial scene, Lear asks of his daughters whether there is “any cause in nature that make/these hard hearts?” (3.6.74–5). “Nature” is omitted but paraphrased with a phrase meaning “something or other that was there in the first place.”<sup>185</sup>
29. As Gloucester arrives to warn of the plot against his master Lear, Kent reassures him that “Oppressed nature sleeps” (94). “Nature” is again omitted, and the sense paraphrased with a phrase meaning “he can sleep now he is exhausted”:<sup>186</sup> sleep is a healthy and natural response to what he has endured.
30. The blinded Gloucester, unaware that it is Edmund’s treachery that has led to his eyes being cut out, urges Edmund to “enkindle all the sparks of nature/To quit this horrid act” (3.7.85–6). Shōyō renders the sense of filial love with *kōshi no jō* 孝子の情,<sup>187</sup> the feeling of a dutiful child for its parent.
31. Albany expresses his disgust at his wife Goneril’s inhuman conduct: “I fear your disposition;/That nature which contemns its origin/Cannot be bordered certain in itself” (4.2.32–4). Both “disposition” and “nature” are rendered as *kidate* 気立 (“temperament”),<sup>188</sup> which this time is pronounced as it is written.
32. Over the sleeping Lear, the Doctor tells Cordelia that “Our foster nurse of nature is repose” (4.4.12). “Nature” becomes *jintai* 人体, the “human body.”<sup>189</sup>
33. Gloucester believes his life to have come to an end: “My snuff and loathed part of nature should/Burn itself out” (4.6.39–40). “Nature” is again rendered as “body,” *karada*.<sup>190</sup>
34. Lear presents his fallen state as a model of the integrity that once eluded him: “Nature’s above art in that respect” (86). This “nature” is *shizen*, and “art” is *jinkō*, or “artifice.”<sup>191</sup>

35. When Gloucester is reunited with Lear, calling him “O ruined piece of nature” (130), “nature” is *daishizen*, connecting with “This great world [*daiseikai*]/ Shall so wear out to naught” (130–1) in the next line.<sup>192</sup>
36. The Gentleman hopes Lear will calm down if he sees Cordelia again, for she is a “daughter/Who redeems nature from the general curse/Which twain have brought her to” (201–3). Shōyō expands the sense of “nature” with a phrase meaning the “bad reputation” that women in general have acquired due to her elder sisters’ behaviour, contrasting that with Cordelia’s “pious heart” (*gokōshin* 御孝心).<sup>193</sup>
37. Reunited with her father, Cordelia prays to the “kind gods” to “Cure this great breach in his abused nature” (4.7.15–6), and Shōyō expands the sense with a sonorous phrase that does indeed sound like a prayer: *gyakutai no tame ni osoroshū sokonaware mashitashintai ya seishin* (“the body and soul that have been horribly hurt by abuse”).<sup>194</sup>
38. Edmund, mortally wounded by Edgar in combat, makes contrition for the evil he has done: “Some good I mean to do,/Despite of mine own nature” (5.3.241–2). In Shōyō’s translation, *honjō* 本性 is Edmund’s original but not irredeemable nature.<sup>195</sup>

Within this list the collocations that are repeated are *shizen* (5 times), *karada* (4), *mochimae* (3), *zōka* (3), *kidate* (2), and *jō* (also read *nasake*) (2). The character *sei* also acquires currency, and typically for Shōyō, almost all the examples involve some degree of paraphrase. Although it is clearly impossible for Shōyō to use a single word for Shakespeare’s “nature,” it is significant given the anti-Platonic undercurrent of his theory of “hidden ideals” that “nature” as a word that opens on to a complex historical discourse behind the play and encompasses so many meanings that it is almost a Platonic symbol in itself, should lose that symbolic power through the range of Shōyō’s collocations. That is by force of necessity, but it does suggest, at least at the linguistic level, the difficulty Shōyō has from his cultural background of reaching into the “hidden ideals,” Platonic or otherwise, that drive Shakespeare’s creativity. The difference with Shōyō’s keywording is that words such as *fushigi*, in addition to developing themes and motifs, may have a numinous quality in his native culture that corresponds with that of Platonic symbolism in Shakespeare’s culture.

Reviewing the revised translations (*shinshūbon*) shortly after the translator’s death, Hattori Yoshika lists a number of examples of how he feels Shōyō’s lexical choices “enrich the meaning and texture” of his translations,<sup>196</sup> which is what Shōyō means by *jōmi*. One striking example is Shōyō’s use of personal pronouns, where he goes beyond the familiar Shakespearean distinction between “you” and “thou” to express nuances of meaning. Hattori lists seventeen words for “you” and eighteen for “I” that Shōyō uses.<sup>197</sup> The following selection from his *Othello* revision (which had just been released at the time of Hattori’s article and which Hattori singles out for praise) gives an indication of the diversity of Shōyō’s usage.

Personal pronouns are often avoided in Japanese where they are not required to make sense, which makes their appearance in Shōyō’s translations all the more striking. As *Othello*’s paranoia starts to take hold in 3.3, and *Desdemona* innocently

asks him, “How now, my dear Othello?” (283), the question becomes *Nē, anata, dō nasutta no?*,<sup>198</sup> where *anata* is commonly used by wives to address their husbands and expresses the affection implied by the English question. Personal pronouns occur seven times over the next seven lines, as when Othello complains “I have a pain upon my forehead, here” (288), and yet only once is a pronoun used in the Japanese, when Desdemona offers to treat her husband’s headache, “Let me but bind it hard, within this hour/It will be well” (290–1), which Shōyō translates correctly with a conditional construction, *Watashi ga kittsūku yuwaeta nara*, literally “If I [*watashi*] bind it hard.”<sup>199</sup> *Watashi* is not strictly necessary here, but like the *anata* it dramatises the couple’s relationship from Desdemona’s point of view as one founded on mutual trust and love, and she uses *watashi* (and the softer *watasha*) and *anata* throughout the translation in this way. The two pronouns are always written in the feminine *hiragana* in Desdemona’s case rather than the more formal and masculine *kanji*, except for a few instances in the last two acts as Othello becomes more openly aggressive. In 4.2, when Desdemona implores her husband on her knees to explain “what doth [his] speech import?” (31), and he brusquely retorts “Why, what art thou?” (34), Shōyō uses both *hiragana* and *kanji* to assert her fidelity when Shakespeare uses only “your”:

Your wife, my lord: your true and loyal wife. (35)

*Anata* 貴郎 *no tsuma desu, anata* あなた *no teijitsuna tsuma desu.*<sup>200</sup>

The first *anata* is archaic, used to address husbands and lovers, and contrasts with Othello’s *kisama* for “thou,” which is also archaic and written with a *kanji* 汝 that bluntly denotes his male superiority in the relationship. Other readings of *anata* (and the more informal *anta*) include 貴君 by the Duke and Othello, where *kimi* 君 can be used for both equals and inferiors, and 閣下, which is normally read *kakka*, meaning “your lordship,” and used by Othello as he calmly defends his suit against Desdemona’s father Brabantio, who is indignant that his daughter wants to marry a black man; this *anata* translates Othello’s “Good signior” (1.2.60).<sup>201</sup> Where other male characters use the informal masculine *ore* and the more polite *boku*, Iago frequently calls himself *temae* (although read *watashi*), which sounds aggressive and even rude, and Cassio uses *unu* for “you,” which is positively insulting.

Emilia, who is Iago’s wife and Desdemona’s confidante, also uses *watashi* (written in *hiragana* rather than *kanji*) to refer to herself, but twice uses *onoshi*, which is an archaic “you” or “thou” that by the time of the late Edo era was used mainly towards servants and other subordinates. This is shortly after Othello has strangled Desdemona, and she tells him “thou hast killed the sweetest innocent/That e’er did lift up eye” (5.2.197–8):

*onoshi wa kono yo no naka ni ikite ite ittō kawairashii, nan no tsumi mo nai  
ohitori wo koroshagattan da.*<sup>202</sup>

The archaism contrasts with the otherwise contemporary register of the sentence, and Emilia next uses *onoshi* when she once again accuses Othello, “O thou dull

Moor, that handkerchief thou speak'st of" (223): *Ō, onore, Mūa no ōbakarōme! Onoshi ga ima itta hankachi tei no wa.*<sup>203</sup> With the first sentence meaning "Oh, you [pejorative], you stupid great Moor!", Emilia clearly submits to her husband's early modern racism, but Shōyō's is a warm translation that suits the warmth of Emilia's loyalty to Desdemona.<sup>204</sup>

\* \* \* \* \*

This chapter has taken a broad look inside Shōyō's Shakespeare translations in an endeavour to understand how he recreates the rhythm, warmth, and diversity that he valued in Shakespeare. Two general points are the attention Shōyō pays to the sound of the language and the extent to which his translating style becomes more contemporary after the 1911 "kabuki *Hamlet*" (even if we find him still using *hate* and *kisama* in his 1935 *Othello* revision). A third and more covert point concerns his use of paraphrase.

The rhythmicality of Shōyō's style is based in the seven-five syllabic meter of his native drama, and even as an abstraction of that meter often has a sustained syllabic quality that is supported by phonic harmonies. Its warmth is evident more from readerly techniques such as keywording, phonetic glossing, and archaism. Although the translations may sometimes sound like kabuki, I have tried to avoid a blank equivalence with kabuki since, apart from his early *Julius Caesar* adaptation, Shōyō is always translating rather than adapting Shakespeare as a preliminary to performance by modern Japanese actors, and I am mainly interested in how he rises to the line-by-line challenges posed by Shakespeare's language. Shōyō's approach is as much scholarly and critical as it is artistic, and especially given his belief in Shakespeare's "hiddenness," his translations are unlikely to amount to anything like a coherent interpretation, kabuki or otherwise, even if he does use cohesive effects. Shōyō tries, in other words, to leave his translations open to interpretation, and similarly I hope that my analysis will encourage further study, for example of a wider and more generically balanced selection of the translations and in his use of substantives and local dialect.

## Notes

- 1 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Jibun no honyaku ni tsuite," in *Shōyō senshū*, supp. vol. 5 (1977), 257. *Jōmi* 情味 (literally "emotional flavour") is defined as "emotional depth" or "appeal to human feelings"; *chōshi* is written 子.
- 2 Ibid., 260.
- 3 See, for example, Antoine Berman's influential thesis, "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign" (1995), in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2021), 247–260, where Berman lists twelve "deforming tendencies" found in translations, among which "clarification," "ennoblement," and "expansion" are relevant to Shōyō's tendency to paraphrase.
- 4 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Nihon de enzuru *Hamuretto*" (1907), in *Sheikusupia kenkyū shiryō shūsei*, vol. 2, ed. Sasaki Takashi (Tokyo: Nihon Toshō Centre, 1997), 200–1.
- 5 Resonance is also an important concept in Japanese poetics, whether *hibiki* ("echo") or *nioi* ("odour"), albeit usually too subtle for the dramatic flow of the Shakespearean line.

- 6 Mori Shū, Torigoe Bunzō, and Nagatomo Chiyoji, eds., *Chikamatsu Monzaemon shū*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1974), 77. Trans. Donald Keene, *Four Major Plays of Chikamatsu* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 51–2.
- 7 Tsubouchi Shōyō, “Chikamatsu no jōruri” (1890), in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 8 (1977), 669–70. The same argument can be made about imitating the syllabic style of Shōyō’s kabuki mentor Kawatake Mokuami, whose mastery of *shichigochō* was if anything greater than Chikamatsu’s.
- 8 Tsubouchi Shōyō, “Shinkyoku Urashima” (1904), in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 3 (1977), 2.
- 9 Ueda Bin, “*Shingakugekiron* narabi ni *Shinkyoku Urashima*,” *Kabuki* 56 (1904): 1. Ueda’s translation of European symbolist poetry, *Kaichōon* (The Sound of the Tide, 1905), is considered the outstanding literary translation of the late Meiji era.
- 10 Like an operatic aria in the way that a single dancer dances a set piece at the front of the stage, and therefore representing a parallel with Shakespearean soliloquy. There also seems to me a parallel between the transition from Noh *utai* to kabuki style and Shakespeare’s mixing of classical and more modern modes of expression.
- 11 “Shinkyoku Urashima,” 21–2.
- 12 An intense style of *shamisen* accompaniment that contrasts with the lighter tone of *nagauta*.
- 13 *Kōdan* reciters are usually seated at a desk or lectern.
- 14 Tsubouchi Shōyō, *Hamuretto* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1933), 114.
- 15 As an example of Shōyō’s technique of phonetic glossing discussed later in this chapter, *mukae* is written with a character that means to “fight back” when *mukaeru* means to “welcome,” suggesting that Hamlet in a sense “welcomes” his fate.
- 16 *Hamuretto* (1933), 115.
- 17 “Jibun no honyaku ni tsuite,” 256.
- 18 Tsubouchi Shōyō, “Temupesuto” (1915), in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 4 (1977), 78–9.
- 19 The sea has a range of erotic connotations in Japanese culture that Shōyō had previously explored in *Shinkyoku Urashima*, where the princess Otohime in the disguise of a turtle gives the poor fisher boy Urashima Tarō a ride on her back to her father the Dragon King in his palace at the bottom of the sea.
- 20 Nakamura Yukihiko and Mizuno Minoru, eds., *Akinari/Bakin: kanshō koten Nihon bungaku*, vol. 35 (Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 1977), 275. Trans. Chris Drake, in Shirane Haruo, ed., *Early Modern Japanese Literature: An Anthology, 1600–1900* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 908.
- 21 Tsubouchi Shōyō, “Kyokutei Bakin” (1920), in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 12 (1977), 297.
- 22 Tsubouchi Shōyō, “Henri yonsei dainibu” (1919), in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 4 (1977), 484.
- 23 Daniel Poch, *Licentious Fictions and the Nineteenth-Century Japanese Novel* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2019), 81.
- 24 *Ibid.*, 62.
- 25 Glynne Walley, “Translator’s Introduction,” in Kyokutei Bakin, *Eight Dogs, Or, “Hakkenden”*: *An Ill-Considered Jest*, trans. Glynne Walley (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University East Asia Program, 2021), xxx. Walley further comments on the text’s linguistic sophistication (xxix).
- 26 “Temupesuto,” 45.
- 27 Tsubouchi Shōyō, *Romio to Jurietto* (Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1910), 142–3.
- 28 “Temupesuto,” 145.
- 29 *Ibid.*, 46.
- 30 *Ibid.*, 44, where Shōyō expounds (but does not quote) Dowden’s influential view that “we identify Prospero in some measure with Shakspeare himself. It is rather because the temper of Prospero, the grave harmony of his character, his self-mastery, his calm validity of will, his sensitiveness to wrong, his unfaltering justice, and with these, a certain abandonment, a remoteness from the common joys and sorrows of the world, are characteristic of Shakspeare as discovered to us in all his latest plays. Prospero is a harmonious and fully developed will” (Edward Dowden, *Shakspeare: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1875), 417).

- 31 Natsume Kinnosuke, “Tsubouchi-hakase to *Hamuretto*” (1911), in *Sōseki zenshū*, vol. 16 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2019, facsimile ed.), 397.
- 32 “Temupesuto,” 128–9.
- 33 The recording is available in two parts on YouTube at [www.youtube.com/watch?v=Zu4gNuQwjf8](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Zu4gNuQwjf8) and [www.youtube.com/watch?v=4zjMLYWilUw&t=25s](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4zjMLYWilUw&t=25s) (hatayaen), accessed 16 November 2023.
- 34 Tsubouchi Shōyō, *Venisu no shōnin* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1933), 163–4.
- 35 “Sallied” (“assailed”) in the First Quarto reading adopted in the Arden Third Shakespeare edition rather than the First Folio reading “solid” in the late Victorian editions (e.g. Dowden’s Arden) available to Shōyō.
- 36 *Hamuretto* (1933), 20.
- 37 *Ibid.*, 49.
- 38 *Ibid.*, 106.
- 39 *Ibid.*, 114.
- 40 *Ibid.*, 151.
- 41 *Ibid.*, 156.
- 42 *Ibid.*, 188.
- 43 According to one recent analysis, *o* occurs slightly less in everyday Japanese than other vowels (Tamaoka Katsuo and Makioka Shōgo, “Frequency of Occurrence for Units of Phonemes, Morae, and Syllables Appearing in a Lexical Corpus of a Japanese Newspaper.” *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers* 36, no. 3 [2004]: 531–47), which from a present perspective would make Shōyō’s usage of it all the more distinctive.
- 44 In Japanese poetics, the consonant *k* is said to have a bright, clear quality.
- 45 “Jibun no honyaku ni tsuite,” 261.
- 46 Friederike von Schwerin-High, *Shakespeare, Reception and Translation: Germany and Japan* (New York: Continuum, 2004), 180.
- 47 *Ibid.*
- 48 Shōyō’s reason for not using *oboeru* is likely to be stylistic. For example, Gonzalo’s “remember whom thou hast aboard” (1.1.19) becomes “you must not forget” (*wasurechai ikan zo*).
- 49 The *bushu* (or *kanji* radical) which often indicate the meaning and reading of characters.
- 50 “Temupesuto,” 61.
- 51 *Ibid.*
- 52 *Ibid.*
- 53 *Ibid.*, 62. In this line, the topic of “remembrance” is rendered initially with a noun, *kioku* (memory) that contains the *ki* character, but is read with the softer *oboe* (the noun form of *oboeru*).
- 54 *Ibid.*
- 55 *Ibid.*
- 56 *Ibid.*
- 57 *Ibid.*, 63.
- 58 See Massimiliano Tomasi, *Rhetoric in Modern Japan: Western Influences on the Development of Narrative and Oratorical Style* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2004), 65–6.
- 59 Tsubouchi Shōyō, “Biji ronkō” (1893), in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 11 (1977), 30.
- 60 An earlier version of my discussion of Shōyō’s repetition of *fushigi* appeared in my article, “Tsubouchi Shōyō to Sheikusupia no ‘fushigi,’” *Society of Humanities*, Kwansai Gakuin University, *Jinbun Ronkyū* 72, no. 3 (2022): 65–90.
- 61 Shōyō’s reason for not using *fushigi* more than twenty-six times in his translation is, as ever, semantic. For example, Prospero’s “to my state grew stranger” (1.2.76) becomes *dandan kokuji ni tōzakatte* (“gradually distanced from affairs of state”) (“Temupesuto,” 63) and in Ariel’s song “something rich and strange” (402) becomes *takara to keshinu* (“changing into treasure”) (*ibid.*, 79); the latter usage evokes the beauty of coral and pearls rather than the subjective state implied by *fushigi*.
- 62 *Ibid.*, 161.

- 63 Ibid., 68.  
64 Ibid., 73.  
65 See Note 3.  
66 Ibid., 80.  
67 Ibid., 85.  
68 Ibid., 106.  
69 Ibid., 113.  
70 Ibid., 132.  
71 Ibid., 160.  
72 Ibid., 164.  
73 Ibid., 122–3.  
74 Schwerin-High, 200.  
75 “Temupesuto,” 72.  
76 Ibid., 83.  
77 Ibid., 86.  
78 Ibid., 105.  
79 Ibid., 112.  
80 Ibid., 113.  
81 Ibid., 121.  
82 Ibid., 127.  
83 Ibid., 131.  
84 Ibid., 151.  
85 Ibid., 167.  
86 *Kana* symbols (also called *yomigana* or *rubi*) printed above or to the right of *kanji* characters to indicate their intended pronunciation. When modern printing technology was imported from Britain in the early Meiji era, the type size adopted for *furigana* was equivalent to what British printers of the time called “ruby” type.  
87 “Jibun no Shēkusupiya honyaku ni tsuite,” 263. Shōyō does not use *rubi* in the Japanese readers he wrote for primary school pupils in the 1900s for the obvious reason that these were meant to test and develop pupils’ knowledge of *kanji*.  
88 The inclusion of *rubi* depended on the educational level of the target readership. The anthology *Kindai gikyoku shū*, ed. Sofue Shōji (Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 1974), indicates its use in a selection of popular plays from the Meiji and Taishō eras. Most of the writers anthologised use *rubi* sparingly, while the literary translations of ten Shakespeare plays by Tozawa Koya and Asano Hyōkyō (1905–9) were published almost entirely without *rubi*.  
89 Tsubouchi Shōyō, “Manatsu no yo no yume” (1915), in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 4 (1977), 211.  
90 Hattori Yoshika, “Shinshūbon to Tsubouchi-hakase,” *Saō Fukkō* 20 (1935): 3.  
91 Ibid., 3–4.  
92 Ōtsuki’s *Genkai* [Sea of Words] dictionary, considered the first modern Japanese-language dictionary and modelled on *Webster’s Dictionary*, was published in 1889–91, and his posthumous *Daigenkai* [Great Sea of Words] in 1932–7.  
93 Tsubouchi Shōyō, “Henrī yonsei daiichibu” (1919), in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 4 (1977), 309.  
94 Ibid., 368.  
95 Ibid.  
96 Ibid., 369.  
97 Ibid.  
98 Ibid., 371. The full speech reads: “Wilt thou rob this leathern-jerkin, crystal-/button, not-pated, agate-ring, puke-stocking, caddis-/garter, smooth-tongue, Spanish-pouch?” (2.4.68–70).  
99 Ibid., 373.  
100 Ibid.

- 101 Ibid. 國人.
- 102 Ibid., 374.
- 103 Ibid.
- 104 This is described by Yanabu Akira's "cassette effect" (or "jewel box") theory of Japanese translation, namely that the use of *kanji* in translations of foreign texts, whether from Chinese in pre-modern times or from European languages since the Meiji era, conveys to Japanese readers an expectation of significance even when the source meaning is unfamiliar to them; for Shōyō, this trope may be sufficient in itself to connote Shakespeare's illusory depth. See Yanabu Akira, "Translation in Japan: The Cassette Effect," *TTR: traduction, terminologie, redaction* 22, no. 1 (2009): 19–28.
- 105 "Henrī yonsei daiichibu," 380.
- 106 Ibid.
- 107 Ibid., 381.
- 108 Ibid., 382. Falstaff is referring to Hal's father, the king.
- 109 Ibid.
- 110 Ibid., 387.
- 111 "Novels in Japan have traditionally been regarded as tools for education, with their main purpose typically being to promote virtuous behaviour and condemn wickedness. The reality, however, is that the only stories people actually want to read have been those containing luridly violent or obscene material": Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Shōsetsu shinzui" (1884–5), in *Tsubouchi Shōyō shū* (1969), 3.
- 112 "Henrī yonsei daiichibu, 389.
- 113 Ibid., 394.
- 114 Apart from "major" which is written *daiteian* ("major premise") and read *mējoa*, and "sheriff," which is also written in *kanji* and read *mēyōa*, there are no divergencies between *kanji* and *rubi* in this speech.
- 115 Krzysztof Filip Rudolf, *Archaization in Literary Translation as Nostalgic Pastiche* (New York: Peter Lang, 2019), 7–8.
- 116 Seth Jacobowitz, *Writing Technology in Meiji Japan: A Media History of Modern Japanese Literature and Visual Culture* (Boston, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2014), 221.
- 117 Rudolf, 151.
- 118 Ibid.
- 119 The Shakespeare translator learns to distinguish between words Shakespeare uses that were not archaic in his time but are considered so nowadays (e.g. "forsooth," "perchance") and medievalisms that would have been considered archaic, such as "eyne" ("eyes") and "hight" ("be called").
- 120 Barbara E. Thornbury, *Sukeroku's Double Identity: The Structure of Edo Kabuki* (Ann Arbor: Michigan Papers in Japanese Studies, 1982), 21.
- 121 Watanabe Tamotsu, *Kabuki no kotoba* (Tokyo: Taishūkan Shoten, 2004), 226–31.
- 122 Ibid., 230.
- 123 I examine this keywording in my article "Shōyō's Realism and Shakespeare's Real Women: The Case of Isabella," Kwansei Gakuin University, *Journal of the Society of English and American Literature* 67 (2023): 1–24.
- 124 *Ja* is still common in western Japan, although less so in Kansai where it was replaced by *ya* in the late Edo era, and more generally characterises the speech of old men. It is also heard in the standard negative colloquial *ja nai* ("is not").
- 125 Tsubouchi Shōyō, *Hamuretto* (Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1909), 106–66.
- 126 In modern Japanese, written and pronounced *omotte* and *kurushimeru*. Up to and including his Shakespeare revisions of the early 1930s, Shōyō's preference is for classical orthography, for example *kefu* for *kyō* ("today"), and old-style *kanji*, neither of which was officially reformed or standardised until after 1945.
- 127 *Nō* solicits either attention or agreement (equivalent to the modern *ne* particle), *zoi* indicates mild emphasis, and *gana* unfulfilled hope or uncertainty.

- 128 Tsubouchi Shōyō, *Richādo sansei* (Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1918), 1–14, and Tsubouchi Shōyō, *Verōna no futashinshi* (Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1926), 1–13.
- 129 For example, *sorya* short for *sore wa* (“that is”) and *kerya* for the conditional inflexion *kereba*. *Gozansu* is still used in the eastern Kantō region, but to Shōyō’s readers would have probably sounded like a kabuki usage.
- 130 Tozawa Koya and Asano Wasaburō, trans., *Juriasu Shīzā* (Tokyo: Dai Nihon Tosho, 1907), 128–53.
- 131 *Hamuretto* (1909), 106–18, and Fukuda Tsuneari, trans., *Hamuretto* (Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1988), 81–90.
- 132 *Hamuretto* (1909), 117. The 1933 revision differs only in two small details.
- 133 Fukuda, 89.
- 134 Tsubouchi Shōyō, “Shīzaru kidan: jiyū no tachi nagori no kireaji” (1884), in *Shōyō senshū*, supp. vol. 2 (1977), 437–8.
- 135 Tsubouchi Shōyō, *Jūriyasu Shīzā* (Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1914), 221.
- 136 Tetsuo Kishi and Graham Bradshaw, *Shakespeare in Japan* (London: Continuum, 2005), 7.
- 137 A twenty-two-year-old Kawatake played Voltimand in the 1911 Bungei Kyōkai production, and later commented that Shōyō’s “translation was heavy in formal traditional language, which was hard to follow when presented on stage.” Quoted in Fujikura Takeo, “Child Drama for Domestic Presentation: The First Known Japanese Concept of Child Drama,” *Youth Theatre Journal* 18 (2004): 117.
- 138 *Chikamatsu Monzaemon shū*, vol. 1 (1974), 74.
- 139 *Hamuretto* (1909), 216.
- 140 *Ibid.*, 217–18.
- 141 *Ibid.*, 219.
- 142 *Ibid.*, 220.
- 143 *Ibid.*, 223.
- 144 “The body is with the King, but the King is not/with the body. The King is a thing” (4.2.25–6): Hamlet’s taunting of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern that a king can assert his authority in name as well as person. The opening line of the play, spoken by Barnardo, is “Who’s there?” (1.1.1), which Shōyō translates *Nani mono ja?* (*ibid.*, 1), literally “What person is it?”
- 145 *Ibid.*, 224.
- 146 *Ibid.*, 225.
- 147 *Ibid.*, 226.
- 148 *Ibid.*, 227.
- 149 *Ibid.*, 234.
- 150 *Ibid.*
- 151 *Ibid.*
- 152 *Ibid.*, 235.
- 153 Iago uses *hate* throughout both the 1911 *Othello* translation and its 1935 revision.
- 154 *Hamuretto* (1909), 214.
- 155 “Manatsu no yo no yume, 191.
- 156 “Jibun no honyaku ni tsuite,” 259.
- 157 Nowadays estimated at over twenty thousand words, with some 1,700 words being the first recorded use.
- 158 “Jibun no honyaku ni tsuite,” 259.
- 159 Akamatsu Nobuhiko, “Literary Acquisitions in Japanese-English Bilinguals,” in *Handbook of Orthography and Literacy*, ed. R. Malatesha Joshi and P. G. Aaron (New York: Routledge, 2005), 481.
- 160 Atsumi Seitarō, “Nihon in okeru *Hamuretto* jōenshi,” *Saō Fukkō* 1 (1933): 33.
- 161 Tsubouchi Shōyō, *Riya ō* (Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1912), 5.
- 162 *Ibid.*, 13.

- 163 Ibid., 16.  
 164 Ibid., 17.  
 165 Ibid., 24.  
 166 Ibid., 25.  
 167 Ibid., 32.  
 168 Ibid.  
 169 Ibid., 37.  
 170 Ibid., 61.  
 171 Ibid., 62.  
 172 Ibid., 70.  
 173 Ibid., 88.  
 174 Ibid., 91.  
 175 Ibid., 106.  
 176 Ibid., 109.  
 177 Ibid., 112.  
 178 Ibid.  
 179 Ibid., 119.  
 180 Ibid., 128.  
 181 Ibid., 132.  
 182 Ibid., 139.  
 183 Ibid., 144.  
 184 Ibid., 153.  
 185 Ibid., 162.  
 186 Ibid., 163.  
 187 Ibid., 174.  
 188 Ibid., 187.  
 189 Ibid., 198.  
 190 Ibid., 206.  
 191 Ibid., 210.  
 192 Ibid., 214.  
 193 Ibid., 219.  
 194 Ibid., 228.  
 195 Ibid., 265.  
 196 Hattori, 3.  
 197 Ibid., 5–6.  
 198 *Oserō* (1935), 139.  
 199 Ibid., 140. *Kittsūku* (“tightly”) is conventionally written *kitsuku* but as *kittsūku* nicely physicalises Desdemona’s binding her husband’s head.  
 200 Ibid., 206.  
 201 Ibid., 21.  
 202 Ibid., 270–1.  
 203 Ibid., 273.  
 204 Emilia’s expression may echo the racism of Desdemona’s father Brabantio in 1.2 when he asks Othello, “O, thou foul thief, where hast thou stowed my daughter?” (62), the first part of which Shōyō translates *Ō, onore, kegawashii tōzokume* (ibid., 21).

## References

- Akamatsu Nobuhiko. “Literary Acquisitions in Japanese-English Bilinguals.” In *Handbook of Orthography and Literacy*, edited by R. Malatesha Joshi and P. G. Aaron, 481–96. New York: Routledge, 2005. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203448526>.

- Atsumi Seitarō. “Nihon in okeru *Hamuretto* jōnshi” [Productions of *Hamlet* in Japan]. *Saō Fukkō* 1 (October 1933): 30–6.
- Berman, Antoine. “Translation and the Trials of the Foreign.” 1995. In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 247–60. London: Routledge, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429280641-28>.
- Danby, John F. *Shakespeare’s Doctrine of Nature: A Study of “King Lear”*. London: Faber & Faber, 1948.
- Dowden, Edward. *Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1875.
- Fujikura Takeo. “Child Drama for Domestic Presentation: The First Known Japanese Concept of Child Drama.” *Youth Theatre Journal* 18 (May 2004): 107–21, <https://doi.org/10.1080/08929092.2004.10012567>.
- Fukuda Tsuneari, trans. *Hamuretto* [Hamlet]. 1967. Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1988.
- Gallimore, Daniel. “Shōyō’s Realism and Shakespeare’s Real Women: The Case of Isabella.” Kwansei Gakuin University, *Journal of the Society of English and American Literature* 67 (March 2023): 1–24.
- . “Tsubouchi Shōyō to Sheikusupia no ‘fushigi’” [Strangeness in the Shakespeare Translations of Tsubouchi Shōyō]. Society of Humanities, Kwansei Gakuin University, *Jinbun Ronkyū* 72, no. 3 (December 2022): 65–90.
- Hattori Yoshika. “Shinshūbon to Tsubouchi-hakase” [The Revised Shakespeare Translations of Dr Tsubouchi]. *Saō Fukkō* 20 (May 1935): 2–10.
- Inagaki Tatsurō, ed. *Tsubouchi Shōyō shū* [Works of Tsubouchi Shōyō]. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1969.
- Jacobowitz, Seth. *Writing Technology in Meiji Japan: A Media History of Modern Japanese Literature and Visual Culture*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2014, <https://doi.org/10.1163/9781684175628>.
- Keene, Donald, trans. and ed. *Four Major Plays of Chikamatsu*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.
- Kishi Tetsuo and Graham Bradshaw. *Shakespeare in Japan*. London: Continuum, 2005.
- Mori Shū, Torigoe Bunzō, and Nagatomo Chiyoji, eds. *Chikamatsu Monzaemon shū* [Works of Chikamatsu Monzaemon], vol. 1. Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1974.
- Nakamura Yukihiko and Mizuno Minoru, eds. *Akinari/Bakin: kanshō koten Nihon bungaku* [Anthology of Classical Japanese Literature: Akinari and Bakin], vol. 35. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 1977.
- Natsume Kinnosuke. “Tsubouchi-hakase to *Hamuretto*” [Dr. Tsubouchi’s *Hamlet*]. 1911. In *Sōseki zenshū* [Complete Works of Natsume Sōseki], vol. 16, 393–8. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2019.
- Poch, Daniel. *Licentious Fictions and the Nineteenth-Century Japanese Novel*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.7312/poch19370>.
- Proudford, Richard, Ann Thompson, David Scott Kastan, and Henry R. Woudhuysen, eds. *The Arden Shakespeare Third Series: Complete Works*. London: Bloomsbury Arden, 2020.
- Rudolf, Krzysztof Filip. *Archaisation in Literary Translation as Nostalgic Pastiche*. New York: Peter Lang, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.3726/b15408>.
- Schwerin-High, Friederike von. *Shakespeare, Reception and Translation: Germany and Japan*. New York: Continuum, 2004, <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781472555489>.
- Shirane Haruo, ed. *Early Modern Japanese Literature: An Anthology, 1600–1900*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Shōyō Kyōkai, ed. *Shōyō senshū* [Selected Works of Tsubouchi Shōyō], 17 vols. (1927–8; reprinted with 5 supplementary volumes). Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō, 1977–8.
- Sofue Shōji, ed. *Kindai gikyoku shū* [Anthology of Modern Japanese Plays]. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 1974.
- Tamaoka Katsuo and Makioka Shōgo. “Frequency of Occurrence for Units of Phonemes, Morae, and Syllables Appearing in a Lexical Corpus of a Japanese Newspaper.” *Behavior*

- Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers* 36, no. 3 (May 2004): 531–47, <https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03195600>.
- Thornbury, Barbara E. *Sukeroku's Double Identity: The Structure of Edo Kabuki*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Papers in Japanese Studies, 1982.
- Tomasi, Massimiliano. *Rhetoric in Modern Japan: Western Influences on the Development of Narrative and Oratorical Style*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780824840570>.
- Tozawa Koya and Asano Wasaburō, trans. *Juriasu Shizā* [Julius Caesar]. Tokyo: Dai Nihon Tosho, 1907.
- Tsubouchi Shōyō. "Biji ronkō" [Theory of Rhetoric]. 1893. In *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 11, 1–155, 1977.
- . "Chikamatsu no jōruri" [Chikamatsu's Puppet Plays]. 1890. In *Shōyō senshū*, supplementary vol. 3, 161–9, 1978.
- , trans. *Hamuretto* [Hamlet]. Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1909.
- , trans. *Hamuretto* [Hamlet]. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1933.
- , trans. "Henrī yonsei daiichibu" [King Henry IV, Part 1]. 1919. In *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 4, 305–475, 1977.
- , trans. "Henrī yonsei dainibu" [King Henry IV, Part 2]. 1919. In *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 4, 477–659, 1977.
- . "Jibun no honyaku ni tsuite" [About My Shakespeare Translations]. 1928. In *Shōyō senshū*, supplementary vol. 5, 254–77, 1977.
- , trans. *Jūriyasu Shizā* [Julius Caesar]. Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1914.
- . "Kyokutei Bakin" [Kyokutei Bakin]. 1920. In *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 12, 295–317, 1977.
- , trans. "Manatsu no yo no yume" [A Midsummer Night's Dream]. 1915. In *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 4, 171–304.
- . "Nihon de enzuru Hamuretto" [Performing Hamlet in Japan]. 1907. In *Sheikusupia kenkyū shiryō shūsei* [Research Materials on the Reception of Shakespeare in Japan], vol. 2, edited by Sasaki Takashi, 196–202. Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Centre, 1997.
- , trans. *Oserō* [Othello]. Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1911.
- , trans. *Oserō* [Othello]. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1935.
- , trans. *Richādo sansei* [King Richard III]. Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1918.
- , trans. *Riya ō* [King Lear]. Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1912.
- , trans. *Romio to Jurietta* [Romeo and Juliet]. Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1910.
- , trans. "Shīzaru kidan – jiyū no tachi nagori no kireaji" [Amazing Tale of Caesar: The Lingering Sharpness of the Sword of Freedom]. 1884. In *Shōyō senshū*, supplementary vol. 2, 293–439, 1977.
- . "Shinkyoku Urashima" [New Musical Drama Urashima]. 1904. In *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 3, 1–99, 1977.
- . "Shōsetsu shinzui" [The Essence of the Novel]. 1885–6. In *Tsubouchi Shōyō shū*, 3–58, 1969.
- , trans. "Temupesuto" [The Tempest]. 1915. In *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 4, 1–169, 1977.
- , trans. *Venisu no shōnin* [The Merchant of Venice]. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1933.
- , trans. *Verōna no futashinshi* [The Two Gentlemen of Verona]. Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1926.
- Ueda Bin. "Shingakugekiron narabi ni Shinkyoku Urashima" [Review of Tsubouchi Shōyō's *Theory of Musical Drama and Shinkyoku Urashima*]. *Kabuki* 56 (December 1904): 1–8.
- Walley, Glynn. "Translator's Introduction." In *Kyokutei [Takizawa] Bakin, Eight Dogs, Or, "Hakkenden": An Ill-Considered Jest*, translated by Glynn Walley, xi–xlv. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University East Asia Program, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501755194-003>.
- Watanabe Tamotsu. *Kabuki no kotoba* [Kabuki Words]. Tokyo: Taishūkan Shoten, 2004.
- Yanabu Akira. "Translation in Japan: The Cassette Effect." *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Redaction* 22, no. 1 (January 2009): 19–28, <https://doi.org/10.7202/044780ar>.