'CASSETTE EFFECT' IN JAPANESE TRANSLATION WORDS

By

Masaomi Kondo

Daito Bunka University - Tokyo

This paper attempts to explore an aspect of the Japanese language used frequently in interpretation and translation. It refers in particular to the alleged 'cassette effect' of numerous words coined in the early years of the modernization of Japan in response to the need quickly to introduce Western thought. The cassette effect here refers to the impression these coined words, instantly recognizable to the native speaker, create in the minds of readers/listeners - the impression that they contain something of such great value and firmness that real thinking is unnecessary. It can, so to speak, be left to the words. When the abyss is realized between what one has superficially accepted and the other world of his or her daily existence, the person is proselytized. While it is useful to be aware of such a phenomenon, however, the use of these words is today unavoidable, and I will suggest that some positive results can be expected from this anomaly.

I. Language Situation Surrounding Inter-Cultural Encounters

When the Tokugawa shogunate was toppled and the Meiji Government came to power in Japan in 1868, it felt the urgent need to modernize itself generally. This policy was adopted in the face of the Western onslaught on Asia and more specifically to secure a more respectable place in the community of nations by revising a series of unequal treaties. These treaties impaired Japan's sovereignty and threatened its economic independence, but it was forced to conclude them with major powers both in its ignorance of the rules that governed international relations then and because of its inability to defend its national interests. There were not only efforts to build a modern nation in socio-political-industrial but also military and diplomatic terms. A number of intellectuals engaged themselves in the task of introducing Western social thinking and they felt that this had to be done quickly and *en masse*.

While their sense of urgency was certainly understandable and justifiable, the resulting rashness did bring about certain problems. For one thing, a variety of ideas and schools of thought were introduced almost simultaneously, sometimes with little understanding of their historical development or interrelationships. Written works were translated at face value and consequently the assumptions that were too self-evident to the original authors to need spelling out were often ignored. Yet such supposedly self-evident assumptions were, more often than not, of fundamental importance. For example, according to Professor Yasu, the German theory of the State was introduced to Japan in pre-war days unaccompanied by ideas about modern natural law which were a prerequisite to its proper interpretation (Yasu, 1978). This, according to Prof. Ishida, was a factor in linking the German organic theory of the State closely to the concept of family in traditional Japanese thinking, resulting in the (influential) theory of seeing the State as a big family in Japan (Ishida, 1984, p. 235). In this collusion of general ideas regarding the family and the German thinking on

the State, (Germany was held in high esteem in Japan then), the Emperor was naturally given the status of the patriarchial head with actual political power greater than ever before in the history of Japan.

One of the biggest and most pervasive problems encountered by these Japanese scholars in introducing modern Western thought to the Japanese public was how to translate the terminology used in various branches of Western science and scholarship, and particularly in the social sciences with which I am mainly concerned in this paper. How were they to translate such terms as democracy, freedom, society, rights, economy, '*aufheben*', etc.? Were they to search for equivalent words in Japanese? Equivalent in what sense and at what level? Were there, in fact, equivalents in Japanese? If not, were they to coin new words? Or were they to use the original words in phonetic transcription?

Obviously this problem was common to the vast majority of people in the non-Western world. It is the linguistic aspect of the complex problem of what really occurs when Western thought comes into contact with the indigenous elements in the non-Western world. Despite its strength and a certain degree of universality, it is a foreign and exogenous system of thinking. It was not at all the happy process sometimes portrayed with mock innocence of mutually beneficial exchanges of ideas among smiling traders of ideas. Nor was it always a spontaneous and voluntary acceptance of Western ideas.

Let us examine a number of available solutions in turn. The use of phonetic transcription was and is definitely not a viable option. In Indonesia they have opted for this strategy for many important terms such as *'demokrasi'* (democracy), *'demonstrasi'* (demonstration), *'demoralisasi'* (demoralization), *'polici'* (police), *'ekonomi'* (economic), *'ekonom'* (economist), *'egoisme'* (egoism), etc. (1). In Japan, as in other countries to varying extents, we do the same today more and more - not only in the case of scientific terms but almost indiscriminately in a variety of fields from computer science to audio equipment to fashion, and even in many Government publications (2). This has gone to the extreme of composing whole sentences of imported words phonetically transcribed except for the connecting words between them (3). This has recently come in for some criticism. But at the time of the original encounter with Western ideas this method definitely gave too great an impression of foreignness to the natives to secure easy acceptance, although some ingenious ways were devised to give both a translation of the word and the original (some of them are used even today).

One realizes that there was another option for these pioneering Japanese in the Meiji era. That was to adopt English in its entirety as Japan's national language. This is the choice of Singapore, for instance, and also of India, at least effectively for its intelligentsia (4). This had its counterpart in Meiji Japan in the policy of Arinori Mori, who, after having studied in the United Kingdom and the United States of America, served the new Government as a diplomat and became the Minister of Education in 1885. He seriously contemplated the possibility of making English Japan's national language, only to be dissuaded by one of his American friends to whom he had confided the idea. Similarly, after World War II, Naoya Shiga, one of the best known modern novelists in Japan, advocated the adoption of French as the nation's official language. In both cases such a radical solution was not looked on favourably in the prevailing socio-politico-cultural context.

More realistic alternatives for the Japanese intellectuals in the Meiji era boiled down to two: to look for the closest equivalent within existing Japanese vocabulary; or to coin new words by combining mostly two or sometimes three or four Chinese ideograms (5). The second alternative rests on the nature of these ideograms. Since each ideogram represents the essence of a meaning, it is a simple matter to combine a small number of them to express a new idea, thus, *jidou-sha*, self-moving-wheel (auto-mobile), *denwa*, lightening speech (telephone), etc.

This problem had a historical precursor in the early experiences of Christian missionaries in Japan. When Francisco de Xavier and other Jesuits came to Japan in the mid-16th century, they used Buddhist terms (such as *dainichi, joudo, jigoku*, and *ten'nin*) to describe Christian concepts for the first five or six years. This is said

was realized, some converts left the church, feeling betrayed. The missionaries subsequently decided to transcribe original Latin or Portuguese words phonetically: thus, *deusu* (Deus), *anima* (anima), *sakuramento* (sacrament), *perusona* (persona), and *eukarisuteia* (Eucarist) among others. It was thought that this was safer. Since this would prevent preconceived notions from affecting the understanding of Christianity on the part of the Japanese, a more proper and accurate understanding would be secured. It is interesting to note that Joao Rodrigues, who lived in Japan from the age of 15 and probably had a better command of Japanese than Portuguese or Latin, suggested the third possibility of coining new words to convey Christian concepts. His suggestion was rejected by fellow Jesuits in view of their past experience (Cooper, 1974, tr. 1991, pp. 272-274). Eventually, however, these phonetic transcriptions did result in new Japanese words being coined with the use of Chinese ideograms, thus *kami* for Deus, *reikon* for anima, *hiseki* for sacrament, *ikaku* for persona, and *seitai* for Eucarist.

The Meiji intellectuals as a whole, intent on enlightening the public in a hurry, eventually came to opt for the second method of coining new words for important ideas to be introduced to Japan, although there were a small number of intellectuals who tried to pursue the first method (6). Two people in particular, Amane Nishi and Hiroyuki Kato, are credited with literally inventing new combinations of Chinese ideograms to represent Western ideas that were new to the Japanese, and most of these neologisms are still in use today as part and parcel of the standard vocabulary in political science, law, sociology, religion, philosophy, economics and even in natural science. Among these neologisms were those that correspond to such English terms as economics, psychology, society, liberty, bureaucracy, theory, concept, ideal, instinct, connotation-denotation, induction-deduction, subjective-objective, and abstract-concrete (7).

This, indeed, was an accomplishment of a high order, and is generally said to have made a substantial contribution to the rapid modernization of the country (Kindaichi, 1988, p. 81), although this had to be supported by the relatively high sense of nationalism (rather than loyalty to tribes, clans, regions, etc.), and some degree of asceticism or voluntary discipline in the behavioral pattern. Some observers maintain that the use of Chinese ideograms greatly helped to prevent '*sophisticated ideas and difficult words from being monopolized by a small number of the privileged*' (Suzuki, 1975, p. 86).

Combining a few Chinese ideograms for new concepts and ideas was an effective method of propagating these ideas. Ideograms as such were familiar enough to many people, and they did convey some vague sense of their meaning. Since the new combinations were not part of the existing vocabulary, and since, by definition, they did not belong to *wago* (words of Japanese origin) vocabulary, they were not tainted and had less carry-over in meaning as well as less nuance or connotation to affect the understanding of the concepts to be propagated in misleading ways.

More importantly, since the physical objects as well as ideas were new, there had been no words to describe them. Naturally there is a certain commonality in the objects surrounding our life, in what we do in our daily lives, and even in the way we feel toward each other and our surroundings. But in the Meiji period there were many new 'things' to be named that were intro-duced to Japan, like railway trains, electricity, modern weapons, etc. If they presented no great difficulties in having new words coined for them, more abstract concepts that were related to new and different ways in which we relate to each other and the rest of the world - that is, the political-social-economic aspects of our life - certainly did. How could one explain that 'citizens' had certain 'freedoms' and 'rights' to those who were accustomed to a world of rigidity and stratification? It was safer, it was thought, to come up with neologisms to avoid preconceived notions from affecting the understanding of these and other entirely new concepts.

This method of dealing with Western learning, however, was not without certain deleterious effects.

II. What is the 'Cassette Effect'?

The new use of Chinese ideograms to

represent foreign (i.e. Western) ideas and concepts in social sciences worked disastrously in two diametrically opposite ways: one because the neologisms were Japanese, and the other in spite of the neologisms being Japanese.

The former essentially refers to the gradual process of change in the meaning of any word in any language. In the case of modernizing Japan, however, this common process had a sinister ring to it. The words newly coined to represent certain Western ideas shifted their meaning to embrace ever-increasing elements of indigenous thinking. Ultimately, far from serving the cause of receiving and accepting Western thought, this extolled the indigenous and rejected the universal. For example, Prof. Ishida analyzes the gradual shift in meaning of the Japanese words 'society' and 'state'. While 'society' became associated with Marxism and almost monopolized by it, 'state' gradually became integrated with a more traditional idea of national community, ultimately supporting the concept of 'the whole world under one roof', a slogan advocated during the Japanese expansion in Asia in the 1830's (Ishida, 1983 and 1984). When such concepts as citizens' rights and freedom were interpreted to be enjoyed by the people as a whole and not by individuals in facing state power, they became easily associated with a strong government because it was argued that people's rights can be attained only by having a strong state to deal with foreign countries (Ishida, 1989, pp. 46-48).

My emphasis in this essay is on the second, less frequently analyzed process. Although the neologisms were perfectly Japanese in that they were made up of many Chinese ideograms already known, they had a certain coloring that distinguished them from the rest of Japanese vocabulary: it was instantly apparent that these words were translations of some Western words, and that their real origins in the social sciences developed in the West. That meant there was something conclusive and perfected behind them.

What did this mean for the Japanese who were exposed to them? Some turned away from them totally because of this coloring (Ishida, 1984, p. 233). There has been a continuous stream of anti-modernism and anti-Westernization thinking in Japanese social thought, even though it may often have been submerged in the face of a more apparent pro-Westernization orientation. At a time when a people harbor ethnocentrism of their own (e.g. the old imperial China as Rodrigues saw it), or when the people look on the imported culture as satanic, this is likely to deter people from accepting the ideas expressed (8).

The other reaction to these newly-coined words in Japanese was to impose on the reader a blind acceptance of the words and the concepts they seemingly represented. Why? Because, according to Akira Tanabu, these words had a 'cassette effect'. These words sounded as if they contained something valuable, like good music on cassette tapes, something indisputable and beyond doubt in social thinking. Yanabu argues that these neologisms formed another layer of vocabulary which the Japanese could not relate to the real world. This actually increased their appeal to the people, who eventually swallowed them whole, so to speak. Ikutaro Shimizu describes this process as a *'jump from one bank to the other, with the eyes firmly shut. There was nothing else to do.'* (Shimizu, 1959, p. 165). Unless one did this, he or she would be ridiculed and declared incompetent and unqualified by peers.

For instance, the word 'society' was translated as *shakai,* but there had been another word with a similar meaning, *seken.* However, the word *seken* for us is something entirely different from the word *shakai.* They belong to different systems. They have different fields, which probably are in touch with each other and yet strangely foreign to each other. They co-exist but hardly merge. And people use them differently. We live in one world when we use the word *shakai* and in a different one when we use the word *sheken.* (Yanabu, 1972, pp. 41-42) (9).

Yanabu concludes that *"ever since the early years of Meiji, we have always used ready-made words for abstract thinking. To do our thinking we have used those words which we considered words of such substance as to be complete in themselves." "The more fundamental the concepts, the more distant from our daily life was the world in which these concepts were developed and perfected."*(Yanabu, 1972, p. 45) (10).

Yanabu has since pursued the matter further to deal with the same phenomenon not just for

individual words but for syntactic aspects of Japanese too. He asserts that excessive syntactical distortion of Japanese due to thoughtless and perfunctory imposition of original language structures has produced *'monsters of Japanese sentences'*, which produce essentially the same 'cassette effect' (Yanabu, 1983) (11). For example, the common use of inanimate subjects for verbs that indicate intentional acts in English, if imposed on Japanese, would produce precisely this type of sentence (see Kondo, 1988).

And what is wrong with this? It is wrong because *"those concepts that are taken to have been ready-made and complete tend to put a stop to the thinking of the person who is using them when he or she arrives at these words. When he or she arrives at words like zen-kindai (pre-modern), taisei (system), and sogai (alienation), thinking stops because the conclusions seem to be pre-empted by the words themselves. Both the person who poses the question and the person who tries to respond to it give themselves up to the words and are satisfied. The matter can now be rested with these words."* (Yanabu, 1972, pp. 45-56). The Japanese have thus been spared the experience of searching their souls regarding their use of the familiar word *seken*, when confronted with a new way of defining themselves vis-a-vis their surroundings. Shunsuke Tsurumi describes this as *"words functioning to cut off thinking from reality"* (Tsurumi, 1976, pp. 81-82).

However, one is bound to realize that there is a gulf between these ready-made concepts and the reality surrounding the Japanese in their daily life. Then a number of things can happen. For the very conscientious, a most excruciating agony would follow. For them a form of double standard has been exercised, speaking in one layer of language and living in another and failing to realize some possible inner conflicts between them. In other cases it might result in an outward eclecticism conveniently hiding the inner conflict to differing degrees.

But for the majority of people, *"the thinking that has been developed on the basis of these shibboleths crumbled like a castle made of paper playing-cards"* (Yanabu, 1972, p. 82). This collapsing of the paper castle is called by Yanabu a form of *tenko*, *tenko* literally meaning conversion and historically referring to the phenomenon of many socialists and communists giving up their ideology in the face of imprisonment, torture and other forms of repression in the Fascist 1930's. The cassette effect thus can be called *"the purely formal linguistic aspect of the phenomenon of tenko which characterizes modern Japan"* (Tsurumi, Shunsuke, 1976, p. 85). Yanabu emphasizes, however, that *"tenko does not just apply to a few intellectuals: it has constantly assaulted innumerable young people in this country."* (Yanabu, Akira, 1972, p. 16). As a figure of speech, one could say that many are proselytized.

III. Concluding Remarks

What are we to make of this provocative hypothesis, probing deeply into the spiritual life of the Japanese from the perspective of cultural contact with the West generally and that of translation more specifically? Are the Japanese still under the spell of the 'cassette effect' of the terms they themselves created? In terms of what it really means in their daily life and in what really matters, do the Japanese in effect not realize what they are reading, hearing and saying when they make use of coined words that are so prevalent in contemporary Japanese? And is that what they are doing when they listen to interpretation from other languages in conferences and negotiations? Is the Japanese in effect one person when he uses *wago*, words of Japanese origin, and quite another when he makes use of words made up of Chinese ideograms? Do the Japanese have a split-self, and are they schizophrenic in a profound sense of the word? Are translators and interpreters contributing to the perpetuation of this double life? And what about the state of mind of the interpreters themselves, working with Japanese, using not only *wago* and ideographic neologisms but also real English, French, and so on? Does essentially the same thing apply to other Third World countries as well, even if to a lesser degree?

To answer these and other questions, let us try to put the hypothesis into a broader perspective. First, the co-existence of two

different fields of language is not uncommon. Hayakawa speaks ironically of college students who are forced to read what they fail to comprehend properly but swallow the words and give them back at examinations. Those who are good at this would proceed to the graduate school, and, eventually, be teaching (Hayakawa, 1978, pp. 260-262).

One is reminded that in the study of synonyms in English, there is a double scale, 'Saxon' versus 'Latin', where *"the native word is more spontaneous, more informal and unpretentious, whereas the foreign one often has a learned, abstract or even abstruse air"* (Ullmann, 1977, p. 145). And in the case of English, *"for two hundred years and more, things intellectual, things pertaining to the spirit, were symbolized by words that had a flavour of remoteness, of higher courtliness, words redolent of the school rather than of the home, words that often had by their side humbler synonyms, humbler, yet used to express the things that are closer to our hearts as human beings, as children and parents, lovers and workers"* (Ullmann, 1977, p. 146). Watanabe also touches on it (Watanabe, 1979). One is also told that in English, native (or quasi-native) terms are sometimes avoided because *"they have become tainted and might call up undesirable associations"* (Ullmann, 1977, p. 146): thus 'sanguinary' instead of 'bloody', 'flourishing' instead of 'blooming', 'diabolical' instead of 'devilish', etc.

Ullmann mentions some cases of a *a triple scale* of synonyms, native, French, and Latin or Greek: begin - commence - initiate; end - finish - conclude; food - nourishment - nutrition; kingly - royal - regal; rise - mount - ascend; time - age - epoch. His characterization of each scale is: "the native synonym is the simplest and most ordinary of the three terms, the Latin or Greek one is learned, abstract, with an air of cold and impersonal precision, whereas the French one stands between the two extremes" (Ullmann, 1977, pp. 147-148). To a certain extent, these scales resemble *wago*, Chinese words introduced long ago, and the neologisms coined in Meiji Japan.

The German situation also seems somewhat similar to the Japanese case. On the one hand, many words of classical origin (classical to European languages - see below) are used almost as they are only with slight German adaptation, but they also have corresponding native synonyms that have been newly coined: *poetisch* - *dichterisch*; Oxygen - *Sauerstoff*; Television - *Fernsehen*, etc. Ullmann suggests that a similar situation can be found in other languages, including French (12).

After all, then, is all the talk about the cassette effect merely one of the numerous cases of languages influencing each other? Is my reference to the Third World in this essay therefore superfluous? Is this even merely what interpreters often refer to as 'register', or more generally as 'style'? Because apparently *"if more than one word is available for the expression of the same idea, the writer will select the one which is best suited to the context: the one which will carry the right amount of emotion and emphasis, which will fit most harmoniously into the phonetic structure of the sentence, and which will be best attuned to the general tone of the utterance"* (Ullmann, 1977, p. 151).

Even if the Japanese neologisms have had some degree of cassette effect and were a factor in the subsequent mass conversion to indigenous thinking on the part of the Japanese, is this not a temporary phenomenon? It is not much older than a hundred years? Furthermore, if the alleged mass conversion has actually occurred, why is there not a trend toward fundamentalism of a sort in Japan? Or is there?

What is it that is so particular about the Japanese case? Is this hypothesis about the cassette effect not another aspect of the Japan-is-unique syndrome?

My own assessment of the hypothesis is a more positive one in a number of ways. First, it should be realized that in the eyes of most Japanese (and other non-Western peoples) these neologisms represented things Western, which were assailing them with overwhelming might in political, economic and military as well as intellectual ways. This is probably not so much the case in the double or triple scale of synonyms in English and other Western languages.

Secondly, the hypothesis serves a purpose by highlighting a possible effect of different

registers and styles that is often neglected in traditional linguistics. The cassette effect with accompanying psychological pressures on the reader/listener and even with the resulting conversion may indeed be in operation in many other cases of language and cultural encounters. Possibly because of the subtlety of the effect and lack of drama in subsequent *tenko,* the phenomenon may not have caught the eyes of most observers.

Thirdly, I would maintain that this phenomenon is probably more acute in the Third World, naturally including Japan in this context. When a perceptive observer like Ullmann with perfect nonchalance describes such words as poetic, oxygen and television as *"international words of classical origin"* (Ullmann, 1977, p. 149), he misses a vital point. These words are neither international nor classical to those outside the Graeco-Roman tradition. Nor is almost all of the vocabulary in use in political science, sociology, anthropology, economics, law, astronomy and biology, etc. The gulf that separates the native words and 'international and classical' words for non-Westerners on the one hand and Westerners on the other seems not one of degree but of qualitative difference.

This leads to my fourth point, which is about the difference in attitude toward language between those who first developed various sciences (I am mainly thinking of social sciences) through the use of their native language and those who are confronted with the same sciences developed elsewhere. Without going into the methodology of science, the linguistic aspect of it can be described as follows. When new objects are invented, new social, economic, political, etc. phenomena appear, or when new ways of looking at reality are contemplated, these new entities are given names. A new name can be produced through one of the following three methods: 1) form a new word from existing elements (thus, tele-phone, smog, stagflation, etc.); 2) borrow a term from a foreign language or some other source (like the use of Latin words in English, of English words in Japanese today, and indeed of numerous Chinese words in Japanese in the seventh century, with pronunciation following the Japanese phonetic rules); and 3) alter the meaning of an old word. Ullmann says that *"among all the linguistic devices available, change of meaning is the simplest, the most discreet and perhaps the most elegant way of keeping pace with the progress of civilization"* (Ullmann, 1977, p. 210). And that has indeed been the case for most branches of science. Some existing word is taken and given a definition to refer to a certain, closely defined entity.

As a result, many English words have two groups of definitions: one for those in ordinary use, and the other for those in scientific use. The word 'real' is simple enough to understand in ordinary use, but it has a number of scientific uses; in law it refers to immovable property; in mathematics it means *"either rational or irrational, not imaginary"* (and rational and irrational also mean certain very specific things here); in optics it refers to an image formed by actual convergence of rays; in economics it means *"measured by reference to useful goods rather than money"* (therefore, taking the rate of inflation into account); and in philosophy it means *"existing in or having to do with things, and not words or thought merely"* (all from the *World Book Dictionary* by Thorndike and Barnhart). It is because each of these fields of study was developed in English that scientists were able to take old words, give them more specific meanings, and build a system of terminology in the most elegant way of development.

When they first read (heard) law, mathematics, optics, economics, etc., what did the Japanese find in terms of the use of the word 'real'? They found that the word had a number of very distinctive meanings, well defined in each field of study. To render, therefore, each of these meanings, all these different meanings were translated into Japanese by different words: e.g., *buttekina* or *fudousanno* in law, *jisssuuno* in mathematics, *jitsuzouno* in optics, *jishitsuno* in economics, and *jitsuzaitekina* in philosophy. We might also mention that 'real pearl' is *hon-shinju,* real silk is *shouken*, etc. And this word 'real' is by no means an exception (13). A similar situation may be found in other languages, but most probably not to this extent of systematic thoroughness, particularly in the Indo-European family of languages. While this eliminates a lot of

polysemy and therefore one source of confusion - as well as a source of creative flights of imagination - , inevitable use of these neologisms does give rise to a definitely different tone of voice: and far more than in the language in which that branch of science was originally developed. It does seem to me, therefore, quite worthwile to give a name to this phenomenon in Japanese (and probably in other non-Indo-European languages as well).

One could ask why it is that the late starters cannot follow through the entire process of development of different fields of study in their own language. Since different languages have their own semantic field that is different from that of other languages, it is hardly possible to locate a word in the native Japanese vocabulary (or possibly among half-Japanized Chinese words of long standing) that would cover all these meanings. But could one not assign a word that is vaguely similar to 'real' in meaning and try to stretch its meaning a little in the directions of its use in law, optics, economics, etc. as has been done in the West? The question surely is academic; first they had no time to do so, and more importantly it is intrinsically impossible to do so when they are presented with something already completed. To develop a field of study for the first time, forming a hypothesis with terms chosen from the existing vocabulary, discarding them if found inadequate, repeating the process until a more adequate system is built, is not at all easy. But to face something that is already complete in itself and have to learn it is no less easy. While the former is accompanied by the joy of creation, the latter is intractable.

Fifthly, I want to emphasize that some positive use can be made of the last point. While polysemy and semantic ambiguity in many English words point to where many fields of scientific study were born, and are nothing to be ashamed of, they could and often do cause problems. In a language like Japanese, some of these problems could be better defined and possibly solved. Kant is said to have remarked about German that it "has the good fortune to possess expressions which do not allow this difference to be overlooked. It possesses two very distinct concepts, and especially different expressions, for that which the Latin expresses by a single word" (this difference referring to the two meanings of *Bonum* ('anything good' and 'prosperity') and those of *Malum* ('anything bad or evil' and 'hurt, harm'). In exactly the same way, Japanese have at least five different words to express the different meanings one English word 'real' has. And if the nationalism of the formative period of modern nation states is different from the nationalism of the fascist-militarist period, and also from that of newly independent nations of the Third World in the 1940's and 1950's in some meaningful ways, then Japanese is better suited to the analysis of the differences because it "has the good fortune to possess... different expressions" for these different concepts, instead of calling them all 'nationalism'. Similarly, confusion and intra-school debate surrounding the concept of dependency in the discussion of Third World economies can possibly be better sorted out because there are at least two words to correspond to the two (or more) meanings of the term. The same applies to such terms as 'industry' and 'development' (14). Non-natives could possibly be better situated to analyze some of these terms because they are more distinctively perceived and less tainted in their minds.

My final point is the inevitability of resorting to the present-day combination of neologisms with ideograms. Since they are so much part and parcel of the contemporary Japanese language, it is almost inconceivable to refrain from their use. To try to use more native Japanese words in our professional practice would only give the impression of amateurism and intolerable vagueness. The Japanese individually should do their best not to be swayed or misled by such words. Then we can only hope that eventually fewer and fewer people will be affected by the cassette effect these words have.

On the syntactic level, however, I would like to insist that distortion of the Japanese language structure can and should be avoided. Translationese in any language is thoughtless and offensive. It still remains an effective method for frightening laymen (such as undergraduate students) away from genuine interaction with the translated/interpreted materials. Only in a few

exceptional cases should the transposition of English syntactical characteristics (such as the use of inanimate subjects for agentive verbs) be permissible (See Ch. X of this volume by Prof. Uchiyama).

I do not feel qualified to answer all the problems I have raised in this essay. More non-linguistic factors would probably have to be introduced to adequately deal with the issues anyway. Hopefully I have at least whetted the appetites of those with more versatile talents.

NOTES

1) There are also corresponding Javanese words as well for sociology (*ilmu mas yarakat* as well as *sociologi*), politics (*ilmu kenegasan* as well as *politik*), etc. It is conceivable that this double scale of synonyms has an effect similar to the cassette effect of the Japanese neologisms discussed in this essay.

2) This method was readily available in Japanese because the language has three co-existing systems of writing, *hira-gana, kata-kana and kanji*. Since the first two are nothing more than phonetic symbols, each denoting a syllable, *kata-kana* can be (and is) reserved for this purpose. The existence of the *kana* (or *gana*) syllabaries is a major characteristic of Japanese in comparison with Chinese, despite the use of the fairly large number of common ideograms.

3) One consequence of this practice for interpreters is that it is often possible to give the original English words in Japanese phonetic renderings and not the corresponding Japanese words.

4) One realizes by now that the same difficulty in cultural encounters with the West was faced by other Third World countries and regions. A closer study of how the problems were dealt with and what the result has been would be of great interest. Indeed, among Third World countries Japan seems one of the few where all the university lectures are given in its native language. Even then perhaps it is worth emphasizing that Japan certainly belongs to the Third World in cultural and intellectual, although not economic, terms.

5) A considerable number of Chinese words coined in China to translate Western objects and concepts were either borrowed as they were or adopted with slight modifications. Chinese translations of some Western books in mathematics and natural science were officially allowed in Japan already in 1720, although the country was generally closed to the world. An English-Chinese dictionary was also made available. Furthermore, some of the Chinese words adopted by the Japanese pioneers to express Western concepts were taken from classical Chinese writings in Confucianism and Buddhism. The use of Chinese in translation implied that these Meiji intellectuals as well as learned men in the Edo period were well versed indeed in Chinese, particularly in classical Chinese. Many wrote flawless Chinese and enjoyed composing Chinese poems of considerable literary merit even in the eyes of Chinese scholars. Since the man in the street lacked sufficient knowledge of Chinese ideograms or it took him a long time to learn them, however, some of the more liberal-minded advocated reduction in the number of ideograms in daily use, some more radical than others, depending on individuals. A few even called for a complete abandoning of Chinese ideograms in favor of *kana* syllabaries or even the Roman alphabet.

6) Yuchiki Fukuzawa (1835-1901) was probably the most influential man in Meiji Japan outside of government service in propagating Western knowledge, with his *Conditions in the West* and *The Encouragement of Learning* selling 150,000 and 700,000 copies respectively. He was conspicuous for his painstaking efforts at writing easy Japanese, accessible to those with scant knowledge of Chinese ideograms. His language philosophy was also applied to translation, although some of the words of his own coinage remain in use today, too.

7) Some of the terms thus introduced to Japan were translated variously by different scholars temporarily. Many of them were eventually eliminated. For instance, liberty or freedom was translated as *waganama*, *jishu*, *jiritsu*, *jichou*, *jiyuujizai*, and *jiyunin'i* before Fuzukawa popularized it as *jiyuu* to represent both of the original. See Ishida, 1989, Pt.1 for a lucid *exposé* of the concept and the word *jiyuu* in Japan's political history.

of the concept and the word *jiyuu* in Japan's political history.

8) It should also be taken into account that the nature of things foreign is a factor influencing the attitude of the receiver. When the early Jesuits came to Japan in the 18th century, they essentially represented pre-modern, mercantile, long-distance trading powers of a traditional character. But the four black ships that forced open the country in the mid-19th century had a modern industrial power behind them, it and its Anglo-Saxon origin having utterly overwhelmed Asia, if not the world. The perception of this foreign power as such made the Japanese more ready to accept the ideas contained in neologisms, either voluntarily with a genuine admiration for the achievement of modernity or grudgingly under the perceived threat of eventual domination by these powers if they refused to accept these ideas.

9) The connotative meaning of the word *seken* can be understood as follows. Takeo Dodi, the psychiatrist author of a long seller, *The Anatomy of Dependence* (The Japanese version had run 135 prints between 1971 and 1984), envisages three concentric circles in the way the Japanese perceive human relations. First, there is the inner circle to which members of one's family belong with whom there is no *enryo,* then there is the middle zone where *enryo* is at work; and then come the outer circle to which strangers belong with whom the need for *enryo* does not occur. (Doi. tr. Bester, 1973, p. 41) *Enryo* refers to 'restraint', 'holding back', or reservations one feels toward other persons. Haruiko Kindaichi feels that the word *seken* is applied to the second zone of human relations. (Kindaichi, 1988, pp. 234-235). Some social scientists naturally see the remnants of the mind-set that prevailed in the pre-modern village communities, where non-members of the community were treated very differently from the members. Kindaichi's first edition of *Nippongo* describes *seken* more bluntly as a *"realm where the individual is opposed and mocked"* (Kindaichi, tr. Hirano, 1978, p.198).

10) It should be generally noted here that there had been a double scale of synonyms in Japanese for a long time. For a long time Chinese words and ideograms have carried a detached, official and learned air in comparison with native Japanese words ever since they were first introduced to Japan in the seventh century. They mainly dealt with matters of bureaucracy, government institutions, Buddhism and Confucianism. Use of Chinese words and ideograms for Western objects and ideas therefore had a mutually enhancing effect on each other.

11) He also mentions that the equivalent of commas and periods in English, now part of standard practice in contemporary Japanese, have come to be used only since the Japanese started to translate English and other Indo-European languages.

12) See the opposition of the Academie to the importation of English words and its attempt to coin French equivalents.

13) The difficulty this presents with the interpreter/translator working into Japanese is apparent. In order to give an accurate rendition, he or she must first decipher whether or not the word is used in an ordinary sense or in a scientific sense, and then the corresponding term in Japanese.

14) As a specific instance of utilizing such a vantage point of non-native speakers of English regarding the use and development of the word 'industry', see Kondo, 1989. There it is shown inter alia that studies in Japan of the history of economics as well as comparative economic history have successfully dissected the original meaning of 'industry' in a far more meaningful way, while among English-speaking scholars the term seems to be taken too much for granted to deserve scientific analysis.

REFERENCES

Cooper, Michael, 1974, tr. Matsumoto, Tama, 1991, *Tsuuji Rodoriges (Rodrigues the Interpreter: An Early Jesuit in Japan and China),* Tokyo, Hara shobo.

Doi, Taeko, tr. Bester, John, 1971, *The Anatomy of Dependence*, Tokyo, Kodansha International (The original Japanese version entitled *Amae no kozo* was published in 1971 by Kobundo).

Hayakawa, Samuel I, 1978, *Language in Thought and Action,* 4th ed., New York, Harcourt

bunka to gengo shouchou (Political Culture and Language Symbols in Modern Japan), Tokyo, Tokyo University Press.

Ishida, Takeshi, 1984, *Nihon no shakaikagaku (Social Sciences in Japan),* Tokyo, Tokyo University Press.

Ishida, Takeshi, 1989, *Nihon no seiji to gengo (Politics and Language in Japan),* Tokyo, Tokyo University Press.

Kindaichi, Haruhiko, tr. & annoted by Hirano, Ueyo, 1978, *The Japanese Language,* Rutland, Vermont & Tokyo, Charles E. Tuttle.

Kindaichi, Haruiko, 1988, *Nippongo (The Japanese),* rev. ed., Tokyo, Iwanami shoten.

Kondo, Masaomi, 1988, 'Eigo niokeru museibutsu shugo no youhouto shakaikagaku no houhouron (Inanimate Subjects in English and the Methodology of Social Science)', (with English synopsis), *Daitobunka Daigaku Kiyo,* No. 24, pp. 1-21.

Kondo, Masaomi, 1989, Ch. 5, 'Eigo toshiteno industry to industrialization (industry and industrializations as in English)', and Ch. 6, 'Keizaigakushi, keizahishi niokeru industry no himi (Meaning of Industry in the History of Economics and Economic History)', in *Kaihatsu to jiritsuno keizaigaku (Economics of Development and Independence),* Tokyo, Doubunkan.

Shimizu, Ikutarou, 1959, *Ronbun no kakikata (On the Writing of Academic Ppaers),* Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten.

Suzuki, Takao, 1975, *Tozasareta gengo nohongo no sekai (the World of Japanese, a Closed Language),* Tokyo, Shincho sha.

Tsurumi, Shunsuke, 1976, 'Nihongo to nihon bunka (The Japanese Language and the Japanese Culture)', in *Iwanami Koza Nihongo I, Nihongo to Kokugogaku (Iwanami Lectures on the Japanese Language I, The Japanese Language and the Learning on the National Language),* Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten.

Ullmann, Stephen, 1977, (Ist ed. 1962), *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning,* Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Watanabe, Shoichi, 1979, 'Nihongo to gaikokugo (Japanese and Foreign Languages)', 'Eigo conpurekusu (Inferiority Complex vis-a-vis English)', in *Kokugo no ideorogi (Ideology of National Language),* Tokyo, Ohuokoron-sha.

Yanabu, Akira, 1972, *Honyakugo no ronri (The Logic of the Language of Translation),* Tokyo, Hosei University Press.

Yanabu, Akira, 1983, *Honyaku gakumon hihan (Criticism of Translation Academia)* Tokyo, Nihon honyakuka yousei Center.

Yasu, Seishu, 1976, 'Meijishoki ni okeru doitsu kokka shisou no juyou nikannsuru ichikousatsu' (A Consideration on how the German State Theory was received in the early Meiji Period)', in The Nihon Seiji Gakkai (The Political Science Society of Japan), ed., *Nippon niokeru seiou seiji shisou (Western Political Thought in Japan),* Tokyo, Iwanami shoten.