GÖTEBORGS UNIVERSITET
INST FÖR SPRÅK OCH LITTERATURER

JAPANSKA

The Transmission of Musashi

An analysis of translation methods and differences in *The Book of Five rings*

Michael Bengtsson

kandidatuppsats
HT 2012

Handledare:
Martin Nordeborg
Examinator:
Noriko Thunman

Notations

Before the reader of this essay starts reading the analysis there are some points that need to be addressed concerning the overall state of the essay.

Firstly, it should be said that while a majority of source material and reference books were able to be acquired, there was one book listed by Wilson that I was unable to procure. That book was a translation of the *Gorinsho* by Naokatsu Nakamura, published in 1970 in Japan. My hope is that the information, or the text, in said book did not contain any substantial differences from the books included in this essay and any faults or mistakes resulting from this are solely my responsibility.

Secondly, whilst Wilson's translation contained at the end of his book a comprehensive bibliography listing the material he had employed, such an appendix did not exist in Cleary's case. Therefore, it was difficult to assess whether Cleary had used the same source material as Wilson. However, after analyzing both translations side-by-side extensively, there was too much correlation between them to otherwise suggest that Cleary had access to another, differing source text. As stated previously, any mistakes, errors and/or faults that may have been caused as a result of this is solely my responsibility.

1. Introduction

When translating a text, whether being fictional or non-fictional, it's possible that one might encounter different obstacles and difficulties in the process. The problem of translating foreign words with certain lexical and inherent cultural connotations that might not be readily available in the target-language is a very conspicuous one. Seidensticker posited in an article concerning his translation of *The Genji* that "to be able to read a language with complete understanding of stylistic refinements is not the same thing as to be able to write that language with literary distinction"[1]. Being able to accurately convey explicitly in the target-language the multitude of implicit meanings present in a foreign word might seem easy whilst reading a text due to oneself having the knowledge of the word or expression in question but can become a daunting task when trying to transmit that same knowledge into another language.

This problem is also vividly experienced by students in the advanced Japanese language-classes at Gothenburg University when they are tasked with translating Japanese texts of varying length and style into either Swedish or English. How does one translate for example the Japanese term *youkai* (Jp. 妖怪) adequately? Or as another example, heavily cultural-infused terms such as *itadakimasu* or *okaerinasai*?

In an article by James Hobbs he commented upon the fact that there were more untranslated Japanese expressions amongst the more recent translated Japanese novels in his sampling compared to literature translated during the 1950s or even the 1980s. He explains this with the theory that "knowledge of and interest in Japanese language and culture was certainly more widespread in 1999 than in 1955, or even 1989, hence the translator is perhaps able to be somewhat bolder and include words such as *mikan* and *manga*"[2]. While the sample chosen in his essay is insufficient to reach a general conclusion a question still presents itself: How should one go about translating lexical terms in older literature that might not even be commonly known in the texts country of

[1] Edward Seidensticker, *Chiefly on Translating the Genji* (Journal of Japanese Studies, Vol. 6 No. 1 1980) p. 17
[2] James Hobbs, *Bridging the Cultural Divide: Lexical Barriers and Translation Strategies in English Translations of Modern Japanese Literature* (1994) p. 4

origin, let alone in the target country. Should one retain their distinctive foreignness or should one aim to varying degrees assimilate it into the target-language?

With these questions serving as the cornerstone, the focus of this essay is to examine how Japanese cultural terms in different translations of the same Japanese medieval text, namely *Gorinsho* (Jp. 五輪書), or as it's more commonly known, *The Book of Five Rings*, were translated and whether the translators decided to preserve the lexical foreignness or whether how much it has been domesticated into, in this case, English.

As such, the questions that are aimed to be examined in this essay are:

To what degree has distinct Japanese terms been either foreignicised or domesticated in the chosen translations? And, if applicable, how does the translation of said terms into English differ between the chosen translations.

2. Gorinsho – Book of Five Rings

Since this essay's focal point is centred upon the Book of Five Rings, it seems prudent to give a short explanation to any that might not be familiar with this medieval text as to who wrote the text and what the apparent purpose of the text was.

Gorinsho was written by a samurai named Miyamoto Musashi in the second year of *shouhou*[3], ca. 1645 (Jp. 正保) and is a manual regarding Musashi's self-created swordsmanship style, *niten ichiryuu* (Jp. 二天一流), which teaches the simultaneous use of both samurai swords, the *daito* and *shoto* (Jp. 大刀, 小刀).

The book is organized in five chapters: The Earth, Water, Fire, Wind and Emptiness, each of the elements corresponding to the content extant within each chapter. Earth corresponds to the fundamental view Musashi held of martial arts; Water reflects the purity and fluidity within his own style; Fire, for battle, energy or quick change; Wind, for expounding upon other styles and Emptiness because this is the place from where all other activities come.[4]

William Scott Wilson writes in the preface to his translation of the text that Musashi intended for the book to serve as a guide for his disciples after he had passed away and was supposed to be a broad outline of the teaching they had received during their training with him.[5] One might surmise then that it was never Musashi's intention to let anyone else besides his disciples read the text that he had written, but of course, those are just pure speculations.

In his book Musashi stresses that martial arts was about the mind and a constituent of the Way. It cannot be bought and should never be relegated into simple decoration, and as Wilson clarifies "Conflict is real. The Way is real. The student must use his or her real experience to solve the two. And it is mind, far more then technique, that will be the enabler."[6] As such, Musashi stressed the essentiality of real experience, which can be

[3]In the William Scott Wilson translation, the date that the chapter was written is listed at the end of each chapter.
[4] William Scott Wilson, *The Book of Five Rings* (Shambala Publications 2002), p. introduction *xxviii*
[5] Ibid., p. introduction *xxx*
[6] Ibid., p. introduction *xxx-xxxi*

aptly shown in a phrase that is repeated incessantly in the book "you should investigate this thoroughly".[7]

Makoto Watanabe in his modern translation (Jp. 新訳 new translation) of *Gorin no Sho* writes that "[We] must, even in a globalised modern era, preferences aside, recognise the samurai named Musashi still as a 'Japanese representative'."[8]He also points out that even though its original intent was to be a martial-art manual, due to the multitude of ways one can read it has served as inspiration to entrepreneurs, athletes and *shogi* players (Jp. 将棋 Japanese 'chess')[9]. Another translation, by Shigeo Kamata, points out the fact that Musashi stresses diligent constant practice and not doing anything in one go but step by step and that this principle can be put to use no matter what field one endeavours in.[10]

3. Delimitations

As stated above, this essay will primarily focus upon exploring to the varying degrees various cultural-laden Japanese terms have been either foreignicised or domesticated and also how they have been translated in the chosen sample. As such, this essay will not present an exploration into the other various linguistic-related areas such as grammatical points, stylistic differences etc if they may be present in the texts.

However, if any points pertaining to the other linguistic-related areas besides the one primarily focused upon in this essay are discovered and if they are deemed to be of such importance to the text in general, e.g., translations that might dramatically alter the general meaning of a passage, they might be presented in the text. In such a case, it will be properly explained as to why such an article is deemed important by the author of the essay.

---

[7] In the text this is written in classic Japanese as 能々(よくよく)工夫すべし

[8] The above translation in its original rendering is as follows: 武蔵というサムライはが、グローバル化した現代にあっても、あいかわらず「代表的日本人」の一人であることは、好き嫌いは別として認めぬわけにはいかないのである。 Makoto Watanabe, *Gorinsho: Jiko wo migaki, jinsei ni katsu tame no hinto* (株式会社ＰＨＰ研究所 2010) p. maegaki 3

[9] Watanabe (2010) p. maegaki 4

[10] Shigeo Kamata, *gorinsho* (株式会社講談社 1986) p. hashigaki 3

4. Theoretical foundation

A non-freelance translator is quite limited in the freedom he gets when translating a certain text, having to conform to the client's wishes and instructions to create a text that is deemed acceptable for the specific purpose. However, a freelance translator, writes Venuti, has a choice when he decides how and to what extent he wants to translate a text. What Venuti means by "choice" in this matter can be illustrated quite aptly in a quote from a lecture in 1813 by the German theologian and philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher "…there are only two. Either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him; or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author towards him." Essentially, Schleiermacher allows the translator to choose between two methods of translation, either a domesticating method or a foreignising method, Venuti described both as

> A domesticating method, an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, bringing the author back home, and a foreignizing method, an ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad.[11]

In short, domestication aims to assimilate a translated text into the target-language culture by writing it as it might have been written in the target-language, eschewing the use of foreign words entirely. Foreignisation implies, by various degrees and methods, such as using archaic terms or idiosyncratic word-order, to retain the distinctive foreign flavour or as Venuti words it "this translation method must do wrong at home, deviating enough from native norms to stage an alien reading experience".

Mary Snell-Hornby points out however that Venuti's, and in retrospect also Schleiermacher's, theory falls short considering the cross-cultural society of today[12], where information of various cultures are readily available through different mediums. Regarding vocabulary and cultural-laden terms the lines might become blurred as terms that were originally construed within a specific culture become globalised and as such

[11] Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (Routledge 1995) p. 20
[12] Mary Snell-Hornby, *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?* (John Benjamins Publishing Company 2006) p. 147

can be used more freely than before. In the case of Japanese, as was briefly explored in the introduction section, the popularization of inherent Japanese terms grants the translator some freedom if he or she chooses to retain the words. But then what about terms that are still very much cultural-specific but primarily belong to another era? How does one deal with for example medieval terminology that might be known to the people in whose culture they were constructed but might only be rarely known by the target-language adherents?

Hobbs proposes three methods, or steps, that one might employ when dealing with cultural-specific terms, in his case this is primarily used regarding Japanese.

(1) Borrowings: using the cultural-specific terms as they are in the translation, whether the target-language readers might understand them or not.

(2) Borrowing with footnotes: Same as above but with footnotes indexed, usually in the back-end of the book, explaining the term in question

(3) Definition within text: this entails, in Hobb's expounding, to either retain the foreign word with a short definition coming immediately before or after the word. Or replacing the word with a, by the translator deemed, closely related word in the target-language. [13]

5. Previous research

Previous research centred around Japanese-English translation has been quite difficult to come by, as one search on Google scholar with various keywords, such as: Japanese-English translation, Japanese translation, Japanese-English translation articles etc. the articles pertaining to the subject in question seem to be quite limited. There was however, several articles regarding Japanese translation in a essay anthology named *Translation and Cultural Change* published in 2005, although these articles, written by Judy Wakabayashi, Yuri Furuno and Noriko Matsunaga-Watson, deal with translations from English to Japanese or Chinese to Japanese, not the opposite.

[13] Hobbs (2004) p. 3-11

Wakabayashi states in one of her articles that translation studies research is mostly a Eurocentric affair, dealing with Indo-European languages, which share a similar cultural background and are linguistically related[14]. She aims to try to counter this tendency by exploring the differences in syntax, lexicality, paragraph and essay construction etc. in two articles published in 1990 and 1991 and well as publishing an article about medical translation in 1996.

Seidensticker published a book titled *This Country, Japan* in 1979 where he states that the difficult of translation a Japanese text into a European language is "is greater by a considerable degree than is to be accounted for by the greater difficulty of the languages themselves" [15]. Furthermore, he wrote another articles in 1983 named *Chiefly on Translating the Genji*, delineating the various difficulties and contrivances that exist within *Heian*-style prose and poetry.

Chalmers Johnson published an article in 1980 named *Omote (explicit) and Ura (implicit): Translating Japanese political terms,* analysing the problems inherent in political translation where the political meanings of Japanese expressions and words can vary greatly. Another article, by James Hobbs in 2004, analyses the differences in translating Japanese terms and expressions in a modern Japanese literature sampling ranging from the 1950s to the 1980s.

While Johnson's article is interesting in its analysis of particular political uses of otherwise common Japanese lexical terms this essay does not focus around how vocabulary are used depending on the societal stratum, even though this might well be a target for future research. Hobb's essay however, presents some quite interesting viewpoints that might be utilised in this essay, especially the three "steps" described earlier under the theoretical foundation section.

[14] Judy Wakabayashi, *Translation Between Unrelated Languages and Cultures, as Illustrated by Japanese-English translation* (Translator's Journal, vol. 36, no. 2-3 1991) p. 414
[15] Edward Seidensticker, *This Country, Japan* (Kodansha International Ltd. 1979) p. 71-72

6. Analysis

The analysis of this essay, as delineated above, is about exploring the possible differences in lexical translation the translators employed when translating the book in question: whether they have retained or translated foreign terms and whether their vocabulary translations differ,. Therefore, the analysis will be partitioned into three sections according to the relevant category:

(1) Translation differences: where the translations of different Japanese terms differ between the translators and thus might make the text opaque or more lucid.

(2) Foreignisation/Domestication: instances where either the foreignisation or domestication method has been used in dealing with different Japanese terms, e.g., *ri.*

The two English editions chosen for this essay were written by William Scott Wilson and Thomas Cleary, both experienced translators of both Japanese and Chinese texts. The editions of their books are the latest published, 2002 and 1993 respectively, to account for any changes or alterations that the authors might have made up to the present version. For Japanese cross-reference three books are included, one by Makoto Watanabe (2010) and the other by Shigeo Kamata (1986). Both books include both the *shinyaku*, rendition from classical Japanese into contemporary Japanese, and the source text, making them ideal for cross-referencing. In addition, an edition of the source text excluding the *shinyaku* by Takayanagi Mitsutoshi published in 1942 will be used.

The general disposition of the analysed articles in the essay consists of presenting the article in question with a brief historical/cultural explanation of said article followed by the sentences or extracts pertaining to the analysed object. These sentences will be ordered by English translations at the top, subsequently followed by the two modern Japanese translations and by the source text. Furthermore, the examples in the essay will be written in the Japanese romanised writing system *romaji*, however, for the readers that wish to read the sentences in their original rendering these will be listed in an appendix at the end of the essay.

The authors of each text will be abbreviated to facilitate the analysis and these are shown as.

Wil: William Scott Wilson

Cl : Thomas Cleary

Wat: Makoto Watanabe

Ka : Shigeo Kamata

Tak: Mitsutoshi Takayanagi

6.1 Translation Differences

6.1.1 Niten ichiryuu - 二天一流

In the very first sentence that Musashi wrote down he names the style that he himself had created. While this might seem trivial the name itself is of utmost importance for an initial understanding of Musashi's art of swordsmanship. For within the name lay a principle that distinguished him from many contemporary styles of his day: he advocated the simultaneous use of both the long sword, *daito* or *katana*, and short sword, *shoto* or *wakizashi*, and it is evident throughout the text that he considers this way superior to other styles, which is most apparent in the Wind Scroll. Both translators have translated the appellation into English, although their respective translations differ somewhat, as is shown below.

Wil : I have named my own Way of the Martial Arts the "Two Heavens, One Style"…

Cl : The science of Martial Arts called the Individual School of Two Skies…

Wat: Watashi no okoshita hyouhou wo, niten ichiryuu to iu.

Ka : Waga hyouhou no michi wo niten ichiryuu to goushi….

Tak: Hyouhou no michi, niten ichiryuu to goushi…[16]

While the Japanese *shinyaku* renderings are consistent with the source text, the English translators differ in their translation of *ichiryuu* specifically. Wilson had translated the

[16] Wilson (2002) p. 3. Thomas Cleary, *The Book of Five Rings* (Shambala Publications 1993) p. 3.
Watanabe (2010) p. 16. Kamata (1986) p. 40.
Mitsutoshi Takayanagi, *Gorinsho* (Iwanami Bunko 1942) p. 6

term as “One Style” whilst Cleary’s version is rendered as “Individual School”. The Chinese character 流 which is the *ryuu* in *ichiryuu* are, in the case of Japanese martial arts, commonly translated as either style or school even to this day, however, the selection of “one” contra “individual” can produce quite differing interpretations.

Both translators, when translating this sentence, most certainly pictured the term *ichiryuu* to mean a style that unified the otherwise separated use of the long- and short-sword or, in Musashi’s case, *niten*. However, while “One Style” is unambiguous in its affirmation and emphasis on the two weapons being used in conjunction in Musashi’s style, the rendering “Individual School” might project onto the reader the sense that the swords are used separately and not in conjunction as was Musashi’s intention: “With a spear or halberd, there is no other way buy with two hands, but the sword and short sword are both weapons to be held with one hand”.[17] Another image one might receive through Cleary’s “Individual School” is that the style itself is separate from all other styles of swordsmanship and as such the techniques and principles that Musashi devised are not derived from the teachings of another school.

Regarding the matter of which one of the two is more appropriate is ultimately up to the reader to decide. Notwithstanding, for clarity that the style emphasises simultaneous use of both swords, “One Style” might be slightly more suitable.

6.1.2 Bunbu nidou – 文武二道

When Toyotomi Hideyoshi in the beginning of the Edo period created the then Japanese social strata, otherwise known as *shinoukoushou*[18] (Jp. 士農工商) it effectively placed the warriors of the previous Sengoku-era as the aristocrats of medieval Japanese society. Musashi writes in his book that “bushi wa bunbunidou to itte, futatsu no michi wo tashinamu koto, kore michi nari.*”* and in essence mean that culture, *bun*, and conflict or

[17] Wilson (2002) p. 16 The source text rendering is in Japanese: 槍、長刀、大道具は是非に及ばず、刀、脇差に於いては、いずれも片手にて持道具也。
[18] Takayanagi (1942) p. 9

war, *bu*, constitutes the way of the warrior. However, the translators differ in their translation of *tashinamu* (Jp. 嗜む) which provides two contrasting viewpoints.

Wil : The term ”warrior” speak of the ”Two Ways of Culture and Conflict” and to relish these is our way.
Cl : First of all, the way of warriors mean familiarity with both cultural and martial arts.
Wat: Somosomo bushi wa bunburyoudou to itte, futatsu no michi wo tashinamu no ga konpon to sareru.
Ka : Mazu bushi wa bunbunidou to itte, bun to bu no futatsu no michi wo tashinamu koto ga taisetsu de aru.
Tak: Bushi wa bunbunidou to itte, futatsu no michi wo tashinamu koto, kore michi nari.[19]

As is evident in the sentences above, the English translations of the word *tashinamu* are either “relish” or “familiarity”. If one considers that during the Edo period, where battles and skirmishes became scarce, the edifying of the warrior class was considered more important,[20] the two words seem both equally applicable, the first might evoke a sense of learning through affection whilst the other might evoke the image of being well-versed through necessity and/or affection. However, in an annotation made by Watanabe in his *shinyaku* he writes that “Musashi says that if one aims to study the Way, it is important to first relish [it]*”*[21] Thus one might infer from this that in Musashi’s case, familiarity does not necessarily equate to relish or affection towards something, which was deemed important by him.

Despite this, in the end it is Musashi’s personal opinion that one should relish the Way one aims to study, and if one considers another opinion that literacy amongst the warrior class should be taught from the young age of seven or eight[22] then there might well have been individuals who either relished and/or simply familiarized themselves with these Two Ways.

[19] Wilson (2002) p. 6. Cleary (1993) p. 5. Watanabe (2010) p. 24. Kamata (1986) p. 49. Takayanagi (1942) p. 7
[20] Thomas Cleary, *Code of The Samurai A Modern Translation of the Bushido Shoshinshu by Taira Shigesuke* (Tuttle Publishing 1999) p. 6-7
[21] Watanabe (2010) p. 26 Translation made by the author, original text: この道を究めようとするならば、まず「好く」ことが大切だ、と武蔵はいう。
[22] Cleary (1999) p. 6

6.1.3 Warrior/Knight – 士農工商

A mentioned above, in the Edo period a fourfold "caste"-system was promulgated by Toyotomi Hideyoshi. Called *shinoukoushou*, it effectively arranged the then decided upon four groups within Japanese society according to the order they appeared in the abovementioned compound character word (Jp. *jukugo* 熟語): samurai, *shi*, at the helm; farmers, or peasants, *nou*, as second; craftsmen, *kou*, as third; and lastly merchants, *shou*.[23] The term *shi* in this instance is the shortened form of *bushi* (Jp. 武士) who during the era when Musashi was alive were the ones who exercised power. In translating this term Wilson and Cleary have taken two different paths in dealing with the implicit meaning of the word.

Wil : …the Way of the Warrior…
Cl : …the ways of the knight…•[24]

Wilson has adopted the common translation "warrior" of the term *bushi*, or *shi*, which is the one that appears if one consults for example the *super daijirin* dictionary. Furthermore, if one looks up the word in for instance the *oubunsha kogo jiten*, the word *shi* corresponds to *bushi*, which would entail that the meaning is quite similar, that is warrior. In addition, the characters for *bushi* can also be pronounced *mononofu*, which has the same meaning.

Although, if one were to analyse the term *bushi* and look at the individual meanings of the two characters one would eventually realize that *bu*, means military or warrior, and *shi*, means either samurai or gentleman, therefore constructing the possible combination warrior-gentleman. Conducting such an analyse one might well argue that although "warrior" might be the more commonly used translation of the term *bushi*, the word that Cleary employs, knight, can be seen to be equally viable.

---

[23] Winston L. King, *Zen Arming The Samurai Psyche* (Oxford University Press 1993) p. 57
• As the three Japanese books included in this essay have the exact same wording they will not be displayed here,
[24] Wilson (2002) p. 8. Cleary (1993) p. 7.

6.1.4 The usage of the Left and Right Stances

In a passage in the Water Scroll, Musashi expounded upon the intended uses of what he called the "Five Stances" (Jp. *gohou no kamae* 五方の構え), the upper, middle, lower and left and right stances respectively. The interesting part of this passage concerns the delineation of the left and right stances, where the two translators have translated quite differently, as is shown below.

Wil : The Left-Side and Right-Side stances are those used to check the area above you and to the two sides.

Cl : The right and left guards are for places where there is no room overhead or to one side.

Wat: Kono sayuu no wakigamae wa, ue to yoko toga tsumatteiru heijo ni okeru kamae deatte…

Ka : Migihidari ni kamaeru no wa, ue ga tsukaete, waki no ippou ga tsukaeta tokoro nado de no kamae dearu,

Tak : Migihidari no kamae, ue no tsumarite, waki ippou tsumaritaru tokoro nado nite no kamae nari.[25]

When reading the Japanese texts one can see that the intended use of the left and right stances was in places were there were obstructions, or simply not enough room, either overhead or to one of the sides as is indicated in the word *tsumaru* (Jp. 詰まる) which means, amongst other things, to clog, choke or to be stopped. Cleary has translated in correlation with the Japanese texts and as such there is no ambiguities in what the purpose of the stances are. In Wilsons translation however, he has included the word "check" which is seemingly not present in any of the three Japanese texts. One conjecture might be that he chose the word "check" to indicate the individual's checking for obstructions in the directions pointed out in the text. Considering the uniform meaning in both the *shinyaku* by Watanabe and Kamata the word "check" in this case can plausibly be regarded as a mistranslation.

[25] Wilson (2002) p. 37. Cleary (1993) p. 29. Watanabe (2010) p. 111. Kamata (1986) p. 109-110. Takayanagi (1942) p. 31

6.1.5 One count/One beat – 一拍子

Amongst the techniques that Musashi expounded upon in his book, there are numerous ones that aim at seizing the advantage from the opponent, either attacking before the opponent can attack, or utilizing the opponent movements against himself. One of these techniques is called "teki wo utsu ni hitotsuhyoushi no uchi no koto" which aims to strike an opponent down instantaneously before he can even begin to make a decision to counter. Wilson and Cleary has translated this sentence almost identically, except for the term *hitotsuhyoushi*.

Wil : Striking you opponent in one count.
Cl : Striking down an opponent in a single beat.
Wat: Teki wo utsu toki no "hitotsuhyoushi" no datotsu ni suite.
Ka : Teki wo utsu hyoushi ni, hitotsuhyoushi no uchi to itte.
Tak: Teki wo utsu ni, hitotsuhyoushi no uchi no koto.[26]

As one can clearly see from the examples written above, Wilson has translated the term to mean "one count" whilst Cleary has rendered the term into "a single beat". While at a cursory glance Cleary's translation of the term might seem to be the most appropriate, since the term *ichi*, means one or single, and *hyoushi*, meaning rhythm or beat[27], a literal translation would be "single beat". However, if one considers the essence of the technique as being an instantaneous action before your opponent can react the term "one count" might be equally viable. The reason for this is that whether one uses the term "single beat" or "one count" both terms are unambiguous in their expression of a single instantaneous action within the span of either a heartbeat or a single count that leaves no room for any margin.

[26] Wilson (2002) p. 43. Cleary (1993) p. 35. Watanabe (2010) p. 123. Kamata (1986) p. 122-123. Takayanagi (1942) p. 35
[27] http://dic.yahoo.co.jp/ - hyoushi 拍子

6.1.6 Double action/Second Spring – 二のこし

Another technique, this one utilising the opponent movements against himself is called ”ni no koshi no hyoushi no koto” meaning that one feigns a move after the opponent has withdrawn and struck, striking where the opponent had completed his action and then striking him down in a second attack. The point of this technique is a two-fold step which incorporates a feint and a real strike in order to defeat one’s opponent. In this instance, the translator’s has in their translation emphasised different parts of the technique ostensibly in order to convey more importance to one specific part.

Wil : The double-action rhytm.
Cl : The rhytm of the Second spring
Wat: ”Ni no koshi no hyoushi” ni tsuite
Ka : ”Ni no koshi no hyoushi” to iu no wa
Tak: Ni no koshi no hyoushi no koto[28]

While there at first might seem to be no apparent difference in the English translations of this sentence, one might argue that emphasis is put by the translators on different parts of the technique denoting what they deem to be the most essential action as can be gathered from the text, while this might not be detriment to the understanding of the technique it might still alter the significance of one part or another.

In his translation, Cleary has opted to put the emphasis on the second part of the technique, i.e. the final blow. And one might infer from this that he viewed the feint-action as a means to an end and as such was not the essential part of the technique. Wilson, on the other hand, with him rendering the sentence as ”the double-action rhythm” puts emphasis on all the steps of technique as equally essential. The term *ni no koshi* present a problem in that it doesn’t explicitly express whether it is the second step or both steps that are essential. However, reading the entire paragraph one can see that in order for one to be able to strike the final blow, the feint movement is paramount in

[28] Wilson (2002) p. 43. Cleary (1993) p. 35. Watanabe (2010) p. 125. Kamata (1986) p. 125-126. Takayanagi (1942) p. 36

disrupting the opponents own rhythm.[29] As such, one might argue that Wilson's translation is more favourable since it puts equal emphasis on both actions within the technique.

6.1.7 Initiative/Pre-emption – 先

The notion of either an initiative or a pre-emptive action is ubiquitous in the English language as well as actions that occur before one's opponent has made any semblance of a move. The word *sen* used in this instance expresses just exactly this, and is used in conjunction with describing three different actions one can make before one's opponent. The translations are as follows

Wil : Takin the Three Initiatives
Cl : Three Preemptions
Wat: "Mitsu no sen" ni tsuite
Ka : Sente wo toru no ni mitsu no baai ga aru
Tak: Mitsu no sen to iu koto[30]

As stated previously, the two words used by the translators in essence express the same notion, taking an action before one's opponent. However, if one were to consider Musashi's teachings, he places the utmost importance in utilising these types of actions. These *sen*, which are divided into three, is paramount in gaining victory in a fight, Musashi even goes so far as to say that this teaching is the most vital in all martial arts.[31] As for the words in question, albeit having very similar meanings, slightly differ. The word "initiative" means improving or taking charge of a situation, whilst "pre-emption"

[29] Watanabe (2010) p. 125-126, the entire sentence is as such: 二のこしの拍子、我うたんとする時、敵ははや引、早くはりのこる様なる時は、我打と見せて、敵のはりてたるむ所を打、ひきてたるむ所を打。
[30] Wilson (2002) p. 64. Cleary (1993) p. 51. Watanabe (2010) p. 178. Kamata (1986) p. 161. Takayanagi (1942) p. 50-51
[31] Takayanagi (1942) p. 50. original rendering in Japanese: 先と云事兵法の第一也。

means forestalling, for example via and pre-emptive attack, an action before someone conducts it[32].

While this might seem trivial, the underlying notion of these three *sen* is to gain an advantage by taking charge of the situation before the opponent can. Watanabe, in his annotation of said paragraph uses the word initiative as a translation to *sen* and compares it with *shougi* and *igo* where gaining the initiative is the determining factor as to who will win[33], which coincides with Musashi's intention concerning *sen*. I would therefore argue that in this instance, whilst both words might be viable, "initiative" might be slightly more favourable to express the effect of taking charge of a situation.

6.1.8 Essence/Speciality – 専

In one passage, Musashi explains the importance of being able to fluster, or confuse one's opponent, in order to disrupt his rhythm or his senses to as to facilitate victory. Watanabe draws up an analogy of Musashi's duel with the famous swordsman Sasaki Kojiro at Ganryu Island where Musashi had seemingly fled from the duel before it had started. He writes that Kojiro, amongst other emotions, felt surprised, *kyou* (Jp. 驚), suspicious, *gi* (Jp. 疑) and perplexing, *waku* (Jp. 惑). In the end, this tactic of shaking Kojiro was allegedly what won Musashi the duel. Musashi writes at the end of the paragraph that "kore tatakai no sen nari" in reference to the flustering of the opponent. There are some contention between the translators on how to translate the word *sen* (Jp. 専) in said sentence.

Wil : This is a speciality of battle.

Cl : This is the essence of battle.

Wat: Kachi wo eru no ga tatakai de ha taisetsu dearu.

Ka : Kore ga sentou no youketsu dearu.

Tak: Kore tatakai no sen nari.[34]

[32] http://oxforddictionaries.com/ - initiative / pre-emption
[33] Watanabe (2010) p. 179-180
[34] Wilson (2002) p. 80. Cleary (1993) p. 65. Watanabe (2010) p. 218-219. Kamata (1986) p. 192-193. Takayanagi (1942) p. 62

The translators employ the words “essence” and ”specialty” respectively when translating *sen*. In contemporary Japanese, the character *sen* is usually connected with the word ”specialty” as is seen in the words *senkou*, major or specialty (Jp. 専攻), *senitsuni*, exclusively (Jp. 専一に) and *senka*, specialised studies course (Jp. 専科) which would render a translation into ”speciality” quite understandable. However, in another entry, where the character stands by itself the meaning changes to ”the foremost. The above all others most important”.[35] Likewise, in the *oubunsha kogojiten*[36] a search upon *sen* gives us the same interpretation as the one previously mentioned ”the foremost important”. In addition, the *shinyaku* translations of both Watanabe and Kamata uses such words as *taisetsu*, important (Jp. 大切) and *youketsu*, the most important part [of a thing] (Jp. 要訣)[37] which would indicate that the rendition ”essence” would be more suitable in this case.

Although, one could argue that the technique of flustering and/or confusing an opponent in combat would require significant skill and practice and could there be considered a speciality.

6.2 Foreignisation/Domestication

6.2.1 Shintouryuu – 新当流

In the beginning pages of the book, Musashi names his own style as well as writing somewhat of a short autobiography about his exploits and ventures up to his then current age at about sixty-two. In one of those passages he explains briefly his defeating of man named Arima Kihei of the *Shintouryuu* (Jp. 新当流) style of swordsmanship. Concerning

[35] http://dic.yahoo.co.jp/ - sen 専
[36] Oubunsha kogojiten 9th edition.- sen 専
[37] Watanabe (2010) p. 219, Kamata (1986) p. 193
http://dic.yahoo.co.jp/ - taisetsu 大切 – youketsu 要訣

this style, it is the first instance in the book where the translators have employed different translation strategies for dealing with Japanese cultural terms as is shown below.

Wil : My opponent was a martial artist of the Shinto Style, Arima Kihei, whom I defeated.
Cl : …I won over my opponent, a martial artist named Arima Kihei of the New Accuracy School
Tak: Sono aite Shintou ryuu Arima Kihei to iu hyouhousha ni uchikachi…

From the examples above, it becomes quite apparent that Wilson has decided upon retaining the original word in Japanese, preserving its historical implicit meanings whilst Cleary has translated the entire term into the target-language. It is quite interesting why Cleary opted for translation of the name into English since the word does not carry any cultural connotations beyond its historical relevance to Japanese swordsmanship and to the area where it was developed. The reader would probably be somewhat confused when reading either of the translations however since only a minority of people would know of the existence of these styles.

Both Wilson and Cleary have used footnotes at the end of the book to shed some light onto what this style actually entails. In Wilson's case he uses what Hobbs designates as "borrowing with footnotes", i.e. explaining an otherwise obscure word by footnotes in another part of the book.[38] Cleary also utilises this method, although his would be more appropriately named "definition without Japanese term with footnotes" since the Japanese term has been translated into the target-language and have footnotes explaining it. Considering that both Wilson and Cleary translated Musashi's style into English, as previously shown, Cleary might have wanted to continue the rhythm that began with Musashi's style.

6.2.2 Saké/Wine – 酒

In the same paragraph as the term for the four-fold social stratum, *shinoukoushou*, expounded upon above, Musashi delineated the vocations of the four classes: warriors, farmers, craftsmen and merchants, explaining what he thought was the most essential

[38] Hobbs (1994) p. 4-5

aspect of each stratum. However, these short expounding serve not only the purpose of constructing a specific representation of the strata but also point out their apparent differences in light of each-other and also affirm their respective roles in society. The way of the merchant is defined as living by gaining income from gathering various tools and making *sake*, Japanese rice wine. In rendering the word *sake* in their respective translations the translators have taking differing roads.

Wil : Following the Way of the Merchant, the man who makes saké…
Cl : Second is the way of the merchant. Those who manufacture wine…
Tak: Futatsu ni wa akinai no michi, sake wo tsukuru mono wa…

Interesting in this instance is both Wilson's rendering of *sake* as a semi-domesticated word, without italics as, according to Hobbs would usually constitute a borrowed word. Also interesting is Cleary's translation into simply "wine". In Wilson's case the writing of a distinctly Japanese cultured word in a semi-domesticated manner, i.e. in the manner that it would likely be written by target readers. He might have judged that in the contemporary globalised world the word is adequately common in the English language vocabulary so as there being no need to either write it in it Japanese *romaji* form or italicise it. This kind of choice might confuse the readers somewhat as they might no be sure whether this is a borrowed word or a word naturally belonging in the English language. Hobbs states "Italicization, and the acute accent on saké, effectively mark these items as borrowings, and spare readers the extra cognitive effort of noticing this for themselves."[39] Considering this, since it has the acute accent it might register as a foreign word, however, not italicising it makes it blend into the text, making it harder to spot.

Cleary, on the other hand, has translated *sake* into the common English lexical term "wine". Students of Japanese might wonder why he didn't translate the term into the subcategory "rice wine", which *sake* is. In an article written by Ernst-August Gutt he explains a notion called optimal relevance as "the search for optimal relevance would constrain me to express myself so that with minimal processing effort my partner can derive information that is adequately relevant to him"[40] which essentially entails that

[39] Hobbs (1994) p. 4
[40] Ernst-August Gutt (1991) in Lawrence Venuti, *The Translation Studies Reader* (Routledge 2000) p. 377

when translating a foreign term one should focus on those features that are most relevant to the reader. In this case since *sake* is a sub-category of wine, i.e. rice-wine, it would seem appropriate to employ "wine" which is the most relevant feature of the Japanese beverage.

6.2.3 Ken and Ri – 間/里

During the span of the book one comes across on four separate occasions the use of medieval Japanese measuring terms, terms that are rarely, if ever, used in today's contemporary Japan to denote measurements or distances. They are however, existent in medieval Japanese literature to express either literal distance, as in between two objects, to evoke representations of long distances through metaphors and similes. In Musashi's case he uses these measurements in similes and analogies to prove a point or to clarify the meaning of a specific technique. The two that appear in this book are *ri* (Jp. 里) and *ken* (Jp. 間) respectively and they have both a distinct measure in modern terms, *ri*[41] being 3,93 km and *ken* being about roughly 1,8 m. In their translations, Wilson and Cleary have opted to either retain the distinct cultural flavour by writing out *ri* and *ken*, or translate the terms into the English measurements "miles" and "yards".

Ken – 間

Wil : Or when the distance from the enemy exceeds twenty *ken*.

Cl : …where the opponent is more than forty yards away.

Wat: Higa no kankaku ga nijuu ken ijou no tatakai de ha…

Ka : Teki to no maai ga nijuu ken ijou aru baai…

Tak: Mata tekiai nijuu ken wo koete ha…[42]

[41] http://dic.yahoo.co.jp/dsearch?enc=UTF-8&p=%E3%82%8A&dtype=3&dname=2na&stype=0&pagenum=1&index=04598600

[42] Wilson (2002) p. 20. Cleary (1993) p. 19. Watanabe (2010) p. 75. Kamata (1986) p. 80-81. Takayanagi (1942) p. 19

Ri – 里

Wil : The journey of a thousand *ri* proceeds step by step.

Cl : Even though it is a path of one thousand miles, you walk one step at a time.

Wat: Nagai shugyou no doutei wo, hoippo to ashi wo hakondeiku no dearu.

Ka : Senri no michi mo ippo zutsu hakobu no dearu.

Tak: Senri no michi mo hitoashi ate hakobu nari…[43]

As was mentioned in the previous article concerning *sake* and wine, if one opts to convert the foreign term into the target-language the main consideration in this instance should be to convey the essential information about the term: that it is a unit of measurement. Since one *ken* is approximated to 1,8 m and one *ri* is approximated to 3,93 km, the usage of "yards" and "miles" to represent unit measurements in the target-language seems more than adequate. Cleary has also been quite true to the actual distance conveyed in the source text by equating twenty *ken* to forty yards and whilst another translating method could be to retain the measurement itself and just replace the unit of measurement.

Regarding the expression "a thousand *ri*" it is defined as an expression of very long distance[44], i.e. not representing an actual distance in itself but through the arbitrary measurement evoke a sense of unfathomable length. How does one translate such a metaphorical term? Wilson, as can be clearly seen, has retained the entire expression with its implicit cultural meanings to convey to the reader the sense of foreignness, whether they actually are privy to the implicit meanings inherent in the word. On the other hand, Cleary has simply replaced the word *ri* with its roughly English counterpart "miles" and left the measurement untouched. Some might argue that the measurement ought to also be changed but since the expression is more about the thought of an extremely long distance than an actual distance I would argue that the number need not be changed.

[43] Wilson (2002) p. 56. Cleary (1993) p. 46. Watanabe (2010) p. 165. Kamata (1986) p. 151-153. Takayanagi (1942) p. 45

[44] http://dic.yahoo.co.jp/ - senri 千里

6.2.4 Kemari/Oimatsu/Takasago/Shoji

These four Japanese-specific terms appear on only one occasion each within the book, which is when Musashi use them to demonstrate a point or make a simile to better explain a certain part of his teachings. While these terms might not be of utter significance, as they are Japanese cultural terms as well as were used in Musashi's teachings it seemed prudent to include them in this essay.

Kemari – 蹴鞠

Wil : Although those who play ***kemari*** do not fix their eyes on the ball
Cl : People playing football may not keep their eyes on the ball…
Wat: Mari wo keru toki, hito wa me wo mari ni tsukeru koto naku…
Ka : Mari wo keru hito wa, mari ni me wo tsuketeinai no ni…
Tak: Mari wo keru hito wa, mari ni yoku me wo tsukene domo…[45]

It should first be mentioned that the term *kemari* does not explicitly appear in the source text, although Watanabe has included it in his *shinyaku* with a brief explanation of the term "A game performed by aristocrats since old eras, where one kicked a ball at a fixed height without letting it fall"[46] which is consistent with the description one receives when looking it up in a dictionary.[47] The term is used when Musashi explains the "fixation of one's eyes" in other styles in the Wind Scroll and he employs it to accentuate his point that if one grows accustomed to something their eyes will not be fixed on a specific object or location but will be able to view all things simultaneously. Cleary translates this as "football" and whilst this type of game is not the football that the would commonly associate with the term, it is nonetheless as game where one kicks a ball with one's feet, hence the English rendering is quite apt.

[45] Wilson (2002) p. 101. Cleary (1993) p. 81. Watanabe (2010) p. 266-267. Kamata (1986) p. 227-229. Takayanagi (1942) p. 77
[46] Watanabe (2010) p. 267. Original rendering in Japanese: 蹴鞠（古代から行われた貴人の遊戯・一定の高さに鞠を蹴上げて落とすことなく蹴るもの）
[47] http://dic.yahoo.co.jp/ - kemari 蹴鞠

Oimatsu/Takasago – 老松/高砂

Wil : Also, in the play *oimatsu*...In the play *takasago*

Cl : Also, when "Old Pine" is played…And while "High Dunes" has a rapid tempo…

Wat: Mata, tsudumi ya taiko de "oimatsu" to iu kyoku…"Takasago" wa kyuu na choushi...

Ka : Mata nou no oimatsu wo...Takasago wa kyuu na kyoku de...

Tak: Mata hitaiko ni oimatsu wo...Takasago wa kyuu naru kurai...[48]

The plays, or dances, called *oimatsu* (Jp. 老松) and *takasago* (Jp. 高砂) are utilised to convey how important speed and rhythm are in martial arts, it is not about being either fast or slow, it is about conducting one's actions according to the present rhythm, which one acquires through practice.

Oimatsu and *takasago* are what is called a *youkyoku*, or Noh dance songs[49] (Jp. 謡曲) that were most likely well-known in the era when Musashi lived hence it not being explicitly expressed in the source text. Watanabe and Kamata write them as songs[50] (Jp. *kyoku* 曲) which is the most relevant information considering the contents of the paragraph.

As for the English translations, since the relevant information is already conveyed in the word *kyoku*, both the original Japanese rendering and the English roughly translated equivalent seems equally suitable, since the risk is small that what they are, i.e. plays, will not be conveyed properly. One of the few arguments against translating the term is that it might be more suitable to retain the distinctive foreignness by writing out the words in their original Japanese form.

[48] Wilson (2002) p. 104. Cleary (1993) p. 84. Watanabe (2010) p. 274-276. Kamata (1986) p. 232-234. Takayanagi (1942) p. 79-80

[49] http://dic.yahoo.co.jp/ - oimatsu 老松, takasago 高砂

[50] Watanabe (2010) p. 276. Kamata (1986) p. 233

Shoji – 障子

Wil : ...drive you opponent towards the theshold, the lintel, the door, the ***shoji***…

Cl : …when you are chasing them into doorsills, head jambs, doors, screens…

Tak: Zashiki nite shikii kamoi toshouji fuchi nado[51]

Shoji is used in this instance in Musashi's teaching about the value of correct positioning, i.e. the advantage one may garner when one utilises the object around oneself, such as the sun, light and various furniture, to take control of one's opponent. The *shoji* appears when he discusses the various objects one can employ whilst in room. The dictionary definition of *shoji* is a general definition of furniture that is used in partitioning up a room or blocking air from outside to enter the room. In the English translation there is either the definition of a "sliding door" or a "screen". [52] While it is not explicitly clear in the text which one of these Musashi's refers to, however, preceding *shoji* is the word *to*, which means door (Jp. 戸). Consequently, one could well assume that *shoji* in this instance refers to a screen. Again, as mentioned in the previous section, since the translated word "screen" contains the relevant information that the reader needs to associate the word with the actual object in question, there remains solely the question of whether one wants to preserve the foreign flavour or not.

[51] Wilson (2002) p.64. Cleary (1993) p. 50. Takayanagi (1942) p. 50

[52] http://dic.yahoo.co.jp/ - shouji 障子

7. Conclusion

As posited in the beginning, the intended aim of this essay was to explore as to what degree the book *Gorinsho* had been either foreignicised, alternatively domesticated, and how the translation into English differed between the chosen translations. The result after analysing both Wilson's and Cleary's version of the Japanese original is that only in Wilson's case did distinctly common Japanese terms retain their foreignness, whilst in Cleary's case all terms were translated into English, although some had annotations in the appendix of the book. Concerning the differing English translations between the translators, the most common tendency revealed from the analysis was that there were not that many apparent great differences between their translations. Usually, it was a matter of emphasis or lexical selection that might well be deemed trivial by some. The two major differences found in the analysis was the translation of the term *niten ichiryuu* and also in the section pertaining to the Left and Right Stances, where Wilson had included the word "check", which after scrutiny seemingly not present in the source text.

One might ask oneself why they are so distinct; why Cleary translated all the terms into English and had not preserved some in Japanese to create the kind of foreign flavour that Wilson had. Gutts writes in his article that "if we ask how the translation should be expressed, the answer is: it should be expressed in such a manner that it yields the intended interpretation without putting the audience to unnecessary processing effort"[53] "Putting the audience to unnecessary processing effort" could be interpreted as relevance and consistency. Consistency meaning that the "rhythm" is consistent throughout the text, the rhythm being the translation approach, or method, that the translator employ when translating a text. In this case, Wilson has opted for a foreign-flavoured rendering of the original, preserving cultural-specific terms in order to create a sense of "otherworldliness" or, in Venuti's words "sending the reader abroad". In contrast, Cleary assimilated the text into the target-language, "bringing the author back home" as it were. Altering the method mid-text would disrupt this rhythm and also

[53] Ernst-August Gutt (1991) in Lawrence Venuti, *The Translation Studies Reader* (Routledge 2000) p. 377

confuse the reader when the text starts to express itself in a way that it did not previously do.

Concerning Hobb's essay on differences in translating modern Japanese literature, the three methods he proposes provide an easy and smooth way for discovering translational tendencies within and between certain literature eras and/or differing literature genres. One could very well use these methods in a table, quantifying how many of each method actually occur to clarify the translations strategies employed. One could argue, however, that a fourth method could be added to the ones he posited: "definition without Japanese term with footnotes" as used by Cleary in explaining the *shintouryuu* style of swordsmanship earlier analysed. While the sample in this essay is certainly insufficient to determine whether this method is broadly used or not it is nonetheless something that should be taken into consideration.

However, the analysis wasn't without its issues. During the analysis I encountered one in particular, which was that the book itself did not contain as many cultural terms as I first thought it would. This would seem obvious to some since the aim of the book, as mentioned previously, was to convey the teachings of Musashi's self-created style to his disciples, and as such there is a distinct possibility that not many cultural-laden terms are present. The terms analysed in this essay were the ones that were deemed either culturally or contextually significant enough to be analysed and as such there were some words that were distinctly culture-laden, such as *sake*, *ri*, *ken*, *shinoukoushou* etc. whilst the majority of the words selected were actually translated into the target language.

One explanation for this could be that words that seemed like culturally connected Japanese terms might have been created by Musashi himself. Words such as *bunbunidou*, *hitotsuhyoushi*, and most notably *niten ichiryuu*. And as such while seeming to be cultural-laden, might not have any cultural or historical meaning beyond Musashi's own style and thus might have been deemed not necessary to retain it in its original Japanese rendering. The terms that retained the foreignness however, were words that were unambiguously ubiquitous in the Japanese culture, most likely used on a quotidian basis in that era.

7.1 Further Research

Due to the scope of this essay being quite narrow, with only two translations, there are several opportunities for future research. The most apparent being to include more samples into the essay, thus enabling a more in-depth analysis of medieval Japanese texts in general.

- Larger Scope: Widening the scope of the essay to not only include more translations of *Gorinsho* into English but also examining translations made into Swedish. Further to enable a more in-depth analysis of the translation of medieval Japanese texts the inclusion of other similar manuals of swordsmanship or samurai arts might be possible.
- Further exploring the cultural effects of domestication: To provide a more comprehensive of the cultural significance of translating Japanese lexical terms into another language one could analyse the effects a particular translation would have upon a cultural-laden word.

8. Appendix

6.1.1 Niten Ichiryuu 二天一流

Wat: 私の興した兵法、二天一流という。
Ka : 我が兵法の道を二天一流と号し。。。
Tak : 兵法之道、二天一流と號し。。。

6.1.2 Bunbu Nidou 文武二道

Wat: そもそも武士は文武両道どいって、二つの道をたしなむのが根本とされる。
Ka : まず武士は文武二道といって、文と武の二つの道をたしなむことが大切で ある。
Tak: 先武士は文武二道をいひて二ッの道嗜(たしなむ)事是道也。

6.1.4 The usage of the Left and Right Stances

Wat: この左右の脇構えは、上と横とが詰まっている閉所における構えであって
Ka : 右左にかまえるのは、上がつかえて、わきの一方がつかえた所などでのかまえである。
Tak : 右ひだりの構、うへのつまりて、わき一方つまりたる所などにての構也。

6.1.5 One Count/One Beat – 一拍子

Wat: 敵を打つときの「一拍子 」の打突について
Ka : 敵を打つ拍子に、一拍子の打ちといって
Tak : 敵を打に一拍子の打の事。

6.1.6 Double action/Second Spring – 二のこし

Wat: 「二のこしの拍子」について
Ka : 「二の腰の拍子」というのは
Tak : 二のこし(腰)の拍子の事

6.1.7 Initiative/Pre-emption

Wat: 「三つの先」について
Ka : 先手をとるのに三つの場合がある。
Tak : 三ッの先と云事。

6.1.8 Essence/Speciality – 専

Wat: 勝ちを得るのが戦いでは大切である。
Ka ：これが戦闘の要訣(ようけつ)である。
Tak : 是たゝかいの専也。

6.2.1 Shintouryuu – 新当流

Tak : 其あひて新當流有馬喜兵衛と云兵法者に打勝

6.2.2 Saké/Wine – 酒

Tak : 二ッにはあきないの道、酒を作るものは

6.2.3 Ken and Ri – 間/里

Wat: 彼我の間隔が二十間以上の戦いでは
Ka ：敵とのまあいが二十間以上ある場合
Tak : 又敵相(てきあひ)二十間をこへては

Wat: 長い修行の道程を、歩一歩と足を運んでいくのである
Ka ：千里の道も一歩ずつ運ぶのである
Tak : 千里の道もひと足宛はこぶなり

6.2.4 Kemari/Oimatsu/Takasago/Shoji

Wat: 鞠を蹴るとき、人は目を鞠に付けることなく
Ka ：鞠(まり)をける人は、鞠に目をつけていないのに
Tak : 鞠をける人は、まりによく目を付けねども

Wat: また、鼓や太鼓で「老松」という曲。。。「高砂」は急な調子
Ka ：また能の老松を。。。高砂は急な曲で
Tak : 又鞁太鼓に老松を。。。高砂はきうなるくらい

Tak : 座敷にても敷居鴨居戸障子縁など

9. Bibliography

Primary Sources

Cleary, Thomas (1993). *The Book of Five Rings A Classic Text on the Japanese Way of the Sword*. Boston: Shambala Publications
Wilson, William Scott (2002). *The Book of Five Rings.* Boston: Shambala Publications
Watanabe, Makoto (2010). *Gorinsho: Jiko wo migaki, jinsei ni katsu tame no hinto.* Tokyo: 株式会社ＰＨＰ研究所
Kamata, Shigeo (1986). *Gorinsho.* Tokyo: 株式会社講談社
Takayanagi, Mitsutoshi (1942). *Gorinsho.* Tokyo: 岩波文庫

Secondary Sources

Cleary, Thomas (1999). *Code of The Samurai A Modern Translation of the Bushido Shoshinshu by Taira Shigesuke.* Vermont: Tuttle Publishing
Gutt, Ernst-August (1991). Translation as Interlingual Interpretive Use. In Venuti, Lawrence (2000). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge
Hobbs, James (1994). *Bridging the Cultural Divide: Lexical Barriers and Translation Strategies in English Translations of Modern Japanese Literature*
King, Winston L. (1993). *Zen Arming The Samurai Psyche*. New York: Oxford Unviersity Press
Seidensticker, Edward (1980). *Chiefly on Translating the Genji* (Journal of Japanese Studies, Vol. 6 No. 1)
Seidensticker, Edward (1979). *This Country, Japan*. Tokyo: Kodansha International Ltd.
Snell-Hornby, Mary (2006). *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company
Venuti, Lawrence (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge
Wakabayashi, Judy (1991). *Translation Between Unrelated Languages and Cultures, as Illustrated by Japanese-English translation* (Translator's Journal, vol. 36, no. 2-3)

Electronical Resources

Canon Wordtank V300 – 旺文社古語辞典
Oxford Dictionaries Online - http://oxforddictionaries.com/
Yahoo 辞書 - http://dic.yahoo.co.jp/