

From Thick to Quick Translation: The Translator as Reader in Times of Globalization

Herrad Heselhaus

I'd like to begin with what should [...] be an obvious point. That the translator should make an attempt to grasp the writer's presuppositions, pray to be haunted by the project of the original¹.

After decades of lofty abstract discussions about the quality and essence of translation, the intertextual scenarios it creates, the conflict of cultural or linguistic difference and identifying strategies of understanding, and the variables of truthfulness and fidelity, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, who I am quoting from her chapter on "Translation into English" of *An Aesthetic Education in the Era of Globalization*, announces that we are back to basics: "the translator should make an attempt to grasp the writer's presuppositions", in other words: the translator should try to understand what the author wrote, and become a careful reader of the original text in order to render his or her translation². Spivak adds: "Translation is not just the stringing together of the most accurate synonyms by the most proximate syntax"³. It is not enough that a translator knows the language of the original to a certain extent, which enables him or her to find similar words and suitable sentences in the target language, more than that, he or she needs to be aware of the intellectual, historical, philosophical and aesthetic horizon of the original text.

Spivak then continues by giving several examples showing how highly qualified "translators into English" fail when translating the complex writings of outstanding thinkers of our times: One example she gives is a translation of Karl Marx's *Capital*, where the German word "inhaltslos" in the phrase "inhaltslos und einfach" is rendered as "slight in content" – one possible reading of the German word "inhaltslos" – instead of "contentless" – another possible reading of "inhaltslos". Spivak supports the second translation arguing that it resonates with Marx's philosophical materialist views⁴. Another example she gives is a quote from an English translation of Jacques Lacan, where

Lacan rejoices in his typical style, coming up with the intriguing rhetorical creation “Je vais vous raconter une petite apologue,” playing on the double meaning of “apology” and “apo-logos”. The translator turned this into the simple English sentence “I will tell you a little story”⁵ and obviously fell far short of the intended meaning and style in Lacan’s French original.

The problem that Spivak is concerned with has been described in various ways: Deploring the same shortcomings, Kwame Anthony Appiah has coined the positive term “thick translation”⁶ to describe a presentation that is well aware of the original author’s background and multilayered expressions. Appiah is echoing Clifford Geertz’s proposal of a culturally well-informed and context-dependent interpretation in intercultural settings in “Thick Description: Toward an Interpretative Theory of Culture”⁷. Spivak refers to Jacques Derrida – the French philosopher she has so often translated herself – and his concept of the “protocols of a text”, which, according to her, the reader needs to enter in order to be able to understand “not the general laws of the language, but the laws specific to *this* text”⁸, the singular code developed in a particular text. And therefore Spivak declares: “And this is why it is my sense that translation is the most intimate act of reading, a prayer to be haunted”⁹. As a result of reading, a translation is always also an interpretation of the original, an interpretation so encompassing that it cannot avoid a single line or word of the original text. Translating then becomes an act of “intimacy”, not only in the sense of closeness and adherence (in time and endeavor) or familiarity, but also in the Derridian sense of entering the protocols of the text, of being “inside”, or, more carefully put, of being “inside out”. When Spivak argues that the translation is a “prayer to be haunted”, she refers not only to the greatest desire of the translator to be heard by the original, accepted, and to be granted his text, nor to his never-ending self-critical fear of failure¹⁰, but also to the danger of betrayal so ubiquitous in this intimate relationship of translation and original.

Spivak is of course aware that the examples she has given in the beginning of her text, the pieces of English translation from German (Marx and Kant) and French (Lacan and Foucault), are from a close neighborhood and that her criticism here could be considered as rather severe, depending on how many of such shortcomings may be found in these book-size translations of elaborate philosophical thought and intellectual puns:

And, although I chose my four opening examples in order to avoid cultural nationalism, it is of course true that the responsibility becomes altogether more grave when the original is not written in one of the languages of Northwestern Europe¹¹.

Spivak has presented these English translations of “Northwestern European” languages “in order to avoid cultural nationalism”, i.e. to make explicit that her analysis of translations from Indian languages into English, which covers the rest of this chapter, is not induced by any national characteristics or “nationalist” ideas and structures, but transcends essentialist conceptualizations of culture and language. She also may have felt that this gesture was necessary because of the harshness of her upcoming criticism of tendencies of “quick translating” in our era of globalization, culminating in the sarcastic verdict on an incident in which a “would-be translator” claims to be able to translate from Bengali to English by simply declaring “*bangla porte jani*” / “I can read Bengali”. Spivak comments:

It is time now to mention the other obvious point – the translator must not only make an attempt to grasp the presuppositions of an author but also, and of course, inhabit, even if on loan, the many mansions, and many levels of the host language. *Bangla porte jani* is only to have gained entry into the outer room, right by the front gate¹².

Here Spivak, of course, vents her rightful anger or disappointment caused by the many low-quality translations that have mushroomed in the last decades, as a side-effect of globalization:

For a variety of reasons, the market for quick translations from such languages is steadily on the rise. Since the mid-1970s, it has been enhanced by a spurious and hyperbolic admiration not unrelated to the growing strength of the so-called international civil society. [...] It is here that the demand for translation – especially literary translation, a quick way to “know a culture” – has been on the rise. At this point, we translators into English should operate with great caution and humility¹³.

Quick translation is not limited to India, nor to translations into English. They can be found everywhere in these accelerated times of globalization, where everybody is tempted to take a shortcut to get a piece of the cake. It has also been on the rise in Japan, answering to a local market, dominantly monolingual, which is being supplied with quick translations as comfortable bullet trains to internationalization. A minute comparison of quick and thick translations can show what is happening and how readers (and authors) are missing out and why the situation has become so deplorable. But since there rarely is a thick and a quick translation in the same language of the exact same text, here it will have to suffice to give a minute critical analysis of a translation of a given literary text, in order to learn about the different effects of thick and quick translations. Such an analysis of concrete data also offers prospective translators of literary texts strategies to avoid the pitfalls of quick translation.

Before turning to the systematic textual analysis of a given translation of a literary text, let us first consider some basic assumptions about translating, translation analysis and evaluation: A translation always differs from the original by the mere fact that it uses different words of a different language. There can be no one-hundred percent identity between the original text and the text of the target language. The question we are concerned with here is, to what extent it is permissible for a translation to change the wording and structure and expressions of an original text and to interfere with its meaning. There is, of course, the possibility that a translation swerves far away from the original, leaves it behind and opens up new dimensions of meaning and perspective. But in such a case, we do no longer speak of a “translation”, such a text enters a new category, that of “adaptation”, which is well distinct from the category of “translation” by the simple fact that it is published in a different way: while a translation is published under the name of the author of the original – in its most artistic versions (e.g. Paul Celan translating Giuseppe Ungaretti) giving the translator’s name next to the original author’s name – an adaptation is published under its own author’s name for the simple reason that it has emancipated itself from the original text and is therefore valued in itself, for its own new creative horizon. This is not ordinarily the case with translation. The translator owes too much to the creativity of the original author. Successful translators can be praised for their mastership in the craft of translation, that is, for their understanding of the thickness of the original text and for the amount of cre-

ativity with which they treat the original text within the restraints of that text – Derrida called this “the protocols of the text”. The exception, of course being the encounter of translating poet with original poet, as in the case of Celan and Ungaretti mentioned above, where the translation will be regarded in the framework of the original author as well as in the framework of the translating poet.

Translators have a Janus-shaped task to fulfill: on the one hand they answer to the original text, on the other hand they are turned towards their own audience. This aspect of their work is reflected in two general approaches by literary criticism, that can be described as “retrospect-contrasting” and “prospective-functional”¹⁴. The first term usually referring to a comparison between translation and original, while the second term is referring to the relationship the translation creates with its own new audience. However, the analysis in hand is combining both approaches: though it may look at first sight as if it were mainly interested in the way the translator has treated the original text, it is in fact motivated as much by the relationship of text and original as by the results offered to the foreign readers of the translation. Do the changes made by the translator serve a better (or for that matter equal or adequate) understanding of the text of the original as it is rendered in the translation? What does the audience of the translation gain for their understanding of the original horizon of the text, or in Spivak’s words what do they gain for their understanding of the presuppositions of the original text?

The main focus point then in evaluating a translation is to analyze necessary and optional changes performed by the translator – including, of course, changes that may at first sight not be considered as changes at all because they seem literally very close to the original text, but because of connotations and associations in the target language they may in fact constitute interferences with the meaning of the original text. The standard example here being Walter Benjamin’s comparison of “vin et pain” in French with “Wein und Brot” in German¹⁵.

Analysis of pieces of translation is highly important for translation standards and evaluation methods: Evaluation is central to any professionalization in translation (and translation studies), because it does not only provide concrete examples of mistakes and problems, but even more so, it allows deeper and deeper insight into the art of translating, and thereby constantly improves the profession¹⁶. As for the evaluation method, this can only be quantitative assessment in the sense that in high standard

translation there usually is no “right” or “wrong” (as in grammatical questions), but only “more appropriate” or “less appropriate”. Thus the following analysis will be structured by two defining parameters, one assessing the range of the substitution from “close” to “distant” and the other assessing the range of motivation from “necessary changes” to “willful manipulation”. Real translation mistakes, however, must be treated like grammatical mistakes and described as “wrong” because they are not based on an intentional choice by the translator but on the inability to understand the original language or meaning of the text. Such translation mistakes should not happen and ought to be corrected by the necessary proof reading of a third party before publication, even in the case of a quick translation.

Since Spivak has covered with her analysis translation from non-Western languages into English, here we will ask what happens when a Western literary text is translated into a non-Western language. To make the problem juicier, the Western literary text will not be taken from the afore-mentioned “Northwestern languages”, but nevertheless bordering on that area, geographically and culturally: it will be Italian. The target language, too, will be particular in that it does not belong to the vast number of languages that have experienced Western colonization, but presents a deviant history: it will be Japanese. There is of course another reason for this choice, too: the original text, the translation of which is chosen for analysis, is a perfect example because it discusses exactly the problem at hand. The original literary text to be used here is nothing less than Antonio Tabucchi’s brilliant little short story “Nuvole”.

“Nuvole” was published in Antonio Tabucchi’s (1943 – 2012) anthology of short stories *Il tempo invecchia in fretta* in 2009¹⁷. A Japanese translation was written by Tadahiko Wada (和田忠彦) and published three years later – just before Tabucchi died – in an anthology entitled 『時は老いをいそぐ』¹⁸. There are also, among others, a German (2010), French (2010) and a rather late English (2015) translation¹⁹, all of which allow comparison of translation and sustain the argument of this analysis, even though they will not enter explicitly into the investigation of the Japanese translation²⁰.

Antonio Tabucchi’s short story “Nuvole” presents a conversation, almost in real time, of a young Italian school girl, Isabella, with a soldier who turns out to be suffer-

ing from depleted uranium attracted while serving in a peace-keeping mission during the Balkan wars. It is the girl who first addresses the soldier and starts a conversation in which she presents her views on Italian identity and Italian school education and stereotype behavior. In the course of the conversation it becomes clear that she is traumatized by the brutality of war which she encountered in her hometown hospital in the shape of two refugee children who were severely mutilated. She also suffers from the divorce proceedings of her parents. During this conversation Isabella does not learn a lot about the soldier's identity, not even his name, yet she notices his dependency on medicine which he has to take on an hourly schedule. Towards the end of the conversation, which is somewhat like a pedagogical dialog, the soldier teaches Isabella the art of interpreting the shapes of clouds in order to foretell the future.

*

Let us begin our analysis of the Japanese translation with necessary changes demanded by the target language which are unavoidable if the translation is to be read smoothly by the foreign reader, in this case a Japanese reader. Of course the argument of "necessity" does not apply equally strong to all examples from the Japanese translation of Antonio Tabucchi's "Nuvole" given below:

1. The first difference to be mentioned then is the title 「雲」/ "Nuvole" (129/53) which in the Italian original has a plural marker while the Japanese translation refrains from explicit plural marking. This deviation from the Italian original is necessary since the title does not refer to the plurality of clouds in the text, but to a collective category which in many European languages can be rendered in the plural with or without a definitive article. To ignore the plural marker in this case, means to follow the presupposition of the original text.
2. Another example of unavoidable necessary changes is the following convincing solution: 「暮らしが蝶が舞うみたいに優美になる」 for the Italian "e la loro vita sarà graziosa come il volo di una farfalla" (158/74), where a slight change of words is required by the aesthetic expression of the imagery that has to be conveyed in Japanese.

3. 「一日中日陰にいるのね、あなた」と女の子がいった。「海水浴きらいなの？」[...]「あなたってよんでもかまわないかしら？」/“Stai qui all’ombra tutto il giorno, disse la ragazzina, non ti piace fare il bagno? [...] Ti posso dare del tu?” (131/55):

A main problem for the Japanese translation of this story is the fact that the Italian original oscillates between polite and familiar addresses expressed by “lei” and “tu” in order to express the girl’s uneasiness towards the soldier and the power play between both interlocutors. This is a main feature of the Italian original which runs through the length of the whole text. Japanese does neither have such obvious expressions as the Italian “lei” and “tu” nor can it switch as easily between them because of customs of polite language and address usages that allow little variation of this kind, especially when a school girl is addressing a grown-up stranger. The translator tries to avoid these shortcomings by using the word 「あなた」 which, however, is not as clear in its usage as the Italian difference of “lei” and “tu”. Interestingly, the English translation is confronted with a similar problem because of the use of “you” in both familiar and polite speech. Here the English translator sometimes added the address “sir” to clarify the amount of formality used in the word “you”. Reading sessions of the Japanese translation with native Japanese speakers have shown that the Japanese translation is not at all as clear in the usage of formality variations as the Italian original, and that the reader of the Japanese translation is floundering when trying to understand the intention of such changes and related commentaries. One may even say that the Japanese translation loses this aspect of Tabucchi’s story almost completely. The problem becomes even more difficult when the text explicitly refers to these changes in formality as in 「おや、あなたってよんでくれないのかい？」/“Non mi davi del tu?” (138/60). Here the Japanese fails to catch up with the original meaning.

4. Another problem for the Japanese translation is that Tabucchi makes the girl say endless sentences without any punctuation. It would be very awkward to try and copy that in Japanese, therefore the Japanese version has much shorter sentences.
5. Another big problem for Japanese translations is metaphorical usages of agency

with inanimate, unconscious agents so typical for Western languages, in politically aware texts also often used as a rhetorical trick to express ideological criticism: p.141: 「コカ・コーラとマクドナルドは誰一人アウシュヴィッツに連れてなんかいかなかった。[...]でもね、あそこにも理想はあったってこと、考えてみたことないかな、イサベル？」 / La Coca-Cola e il McDonald's non hanno mai portato nessuno ad Auschwitz, [...] invece gli ideali sì, ci avevi mai pensato, Isabel? (141/62). Here, in the Italian original the man clearly states that it is the ideals that took people to Auschwitz, while the Japanese text, being unhappy with making something as abstract as ideals the agent of such a concrete action, remains less clear about agency and thereby about responsibility to be conferred. There could have been a more suitable solution closer to the Italian original though.

6. It also seems to be the case that many Japanese literary translations prefer comparison over metaphor thereby interfering with the artistic and aesthetic expression of the original. For example the following comparison in Japanese 「はるか遠く、^{うわぐすり}釉薬をかけたみたいなきのなかを。」 is chosen to express the metaphor in “lontanissimo, nel cielo di smalto” (157/73).
7. There are also less important differences between the Italian original and the Japanese translation, such as for example the metaphors for tanning and the culturally informed attitude towards sunbathing used in the original and its Japanese translation (「小麦色の日焼け止め」 for “l’abbronzante dorante” (132/56)).
8. Certain exclamations cannot be translated closely by the Japanese language, thus the translator is forced to give an acceptable and adequate Japanese variation, for example here 「まあ」 as a “translation” for “Dio mio”, which, of course, does not only change the expression of the utterance but also the atmosphere of the conversation. Exclamations pose a well-known problem between Japanese and Western languages due to differences in cultural expressions and behavioral patterns.
9. Negative name-calling or even swear words, so popular in some Western texts

also demand changing in Japanese which is not at all as outspoken in such events: 「あなた、まさか、あのディスコテカに通う困ったひとたちといっしょじゃないわよね？」 / “non sarai mica un viziato come quelli che vanno in discoteca?” (142/63). The Japanese translation softens the negative expression “viziato”.

10. Similar is the next case, where the Italian is more expressive and belligerent than the Japanese translation which prefers conservative criticism (“you shouldn’t overhear other people’s talk”) over outright attack: 「立ち聞きするなんて」 / “Sei uno spione.” (153/71).

*

Now, we will move on to examples where changes are not absolutely necessary and therefore open to discussion:

11. The following example reflects the problem of deciding between a domesticating or foreignizing tendency in a literary translation: The Japanese translation changes a bedside table into a sofa, obviously in order to familiarize the sleeping furniture in the scene to the customs of a Japanese reader: 「母さんがソファに置いていた本で。」 / “I’ ho letto in un libro che mia madre ha sul comodino” (140/61).
12. In the next example, however, the translator opts for the opposite solution, he keeps the Italian technical term of “ginnasio” even though he could have easily rendered it in Japanese because of the similarity of numbering in the school systems of both countries: 「中学一年を終えたところ。三年が終わったら、ギムナジウムに行くつもり。」 / “Ho finito la prima media, ma dopo la terza andrò al ginnasio.” (150/68). Here, he seems to be interested in pointing out the differences between Japanese and Italian schools.
13. In the following case it is not really clear why the translator thought he needed to replace the original fruit shake with a freshly squeezed fruit juice: 「搾り立て

のジュース」 / “frullato di frutta” (148/67). This poses neither any translation problems nor does the deviant translation serve to familiarize the kind of juice to Japanese customs.

14. Really difficult for translations are of course puns and explicit discussions of words, be it their linguistic make-up or their semantic fields. The following two examples show two ways of how to deal with such problems. The girl discovers a misprint of an Italian dish in the foreign menu card of the restaurant. The Japanese translator sticks with the original Italian name, which he renders in katakana: 「やっと、フェットウチーネ・アッラ・アッラッピアータが出るのよ。本当いうとね、メニューには『フェットウチーネ・アラ・アッラッピアータ』って書いてあるけどそれでもわたしたちの知ってるパスタにはちがいないんだから。たまには綴りの間違いくらい大目に見てあげたっていいじゃない。」 / “offrono finalmente fettuccine all’arrabbiata, per la verità sul foglietto del menu c’è scritto fetucine all’arrabbiata, comunque dovrebbero essere le nostre, certe volte all’estero bisogna perdonare gli errori di ortografia.” (142/63). In this case, he could have easily exchanged the complicated katakana writing with a misprint of the kanji of any suitable dish in order to get the same effect. He is, however, creative enough to shift the spelling mistake away from its position in the Italian text to a new position in the Japanese text, which he may have found more convincing for Japanese readers: The mistake in the Italian original “fetucine” instead of “fettucine” is moved to アラ・アッラッピアータ instead of アッラ・アッラッピアータ. By choosing to stick with the Italian original, however, he creates new problems, because now he has to make an additional change in the following sentence, a mistake which does in fact interfere with the intended meaning of the original text and slightly sabotages one of its messages. This is because the Japanese translator changed a significant element of the scene concerned with the misspelling on the menu. In the Italian original the girl is correcting a mistake done by foreigners to her own language on their restaurant menu in their foreign country. In the Japanese version, however, the girl is correcting an Italian word the misspelling of which is due to Japanese katakana and not due to Italian orthography. The thrust of the criticism in the Japanese text is turned away from the misspelling in the original language (which

is the language of the girl) to a misspelling in a katakana transliteration, and therefore the translator is then forced to drop the “all’estero”, meaning “abroad” which doesn’t make any sense anymore in the Japanese version and to rewrite the strong Italian expression of possession “le nostre” (fettucine) as 「わたしたちの知ってるパスタ」, meaning “the pasta that we know” and thereby omitting the nationalistic tendency which is once again expressed by the young girl in this particular sentence.

15. The second example of this kind is even trickier, because it involves a pun on Italian verb construction patterns, which the Japanese translator is unable to replace by anything similar or suitable in the Japanese language. Here the translation is indeed very awkward: 「わたしたちの人生は成長する以外にもない」「そんな『成長する』っていう意味の “evoluire” なんて動詞、ないわ」イザベッラが言った。「そういうときはちがう動詞を使うの。 ”evol-vere” って」「すごいな、でも生物学のことばにはあるんだ。」 / “nella vita facciamo altro che evoluire. – Evoluire è un verbo che non esiste, disse Isabella, si dice evolvere. – Brava, però in biologia esiste.” (153/70). Could he not have created a similar problem in the Japanese language?

16. Another way of dealing with similar problems is the fascinating possibility of Japanese script to add an interlinear version to a word (furigana) and thereby giving it two readings at the same time and enlarging the scope of meaning. A practice very often used when introducing Japanese translations of foreign concepts for the first time or when offering new and alternative interpretations of familiar words: 「ネフェロマンフィーア雲占い」 [...] ネフェロス」 “Nefelomanzia. [...] nefele” (156/73). Here, Japanese makes use of furigana to give the original term and the Japanese translation at the same time. Unfortunately, the translator then willfully changes the Greek word “nefele” given by the soldier, who, by the way, does not at all appear to be a reliable philologist, to a very creative “nefelos” in Japanese. The motivation of this change again remains unclear. Is it supposed to make the Japanese uninformed reader believe that the compound word “nefelomanzia” is created out of the two Greek words “nefelos” and “manzia”?

*

So far we have only dealt with translation problems in this Japanese translation of “Nuvole” ranging from absolutely necessary changes because of linguistic or cultural differences to more questionable changes the translator may have chosen for whatever reasons, some obvious, some rather opaque. These problems do also occur more or less in texts that endeavor to render a convincing and elaborate thick translation. We have not yet really entered the realm of quick translation, even though some of the last examples already point in that direction.

Let us start with a systematic analysis of some more or less willful changes that may or may not intervene with the message of the original short story written by Antonio Tabucchi, depending on the results of an interpretation, and then go on to the really serious problems that do not only show the poor “quick” quality of this translation but even question its status as an acceptable translation as such. A final interpretation will show to what extent this particular translator has modified the Italian original and thereby thwarted its artistic and intellectual quality.

We will start with some willful omissions and replacements, which at first glance may sometimes seem unimportant. A broader look at the whole text, however, will show to what extent these many changes interfere with the original meaning and what is at stake. All in all, one must say that this translation of Tabucchi’s short story creates some significant 70 changes on 34 Japanese pages or 25 Italian pages, in other words, an average of 2 to 3 differences for every page.

17. The Japanese translator omits the explanation why the girl accosted the stranger with “tu”; could it be because he thought that the fact that Italian teachers may allow their pupils to call them in such a familiar way could confuse the Japanese reader? 「わたしのクラスではね、おとなをよぶときにもそうするんだけど、父と母には…」 / “Nella mia classe diamo del tu anche ai grandi, [...], alcuni professori ce lo permettono, ma i miei genitori...” (131/55).
18. The translator also drops the explanation that Isabella and the two other pupils who visit the hospital are the best pupils in their class, probably in order to familiarize the situation to Japanese educational customs that generally try to

avoid such ranking of pupils: 「つまり、わたしとシモーネとサマンサがだけで、わかるかしら？」 / “cioè io con Simone e Samantha, quelli più bravi, mi spiego?” (151/69).

19. The Japanese translation omits several times the attribute “dear” in the soldier’s address of the girl: 「イサベル、それからずっと今までつづいている」 / “cara Isabèl, esiste da sempre.” (156/72). It thereby loses this rhetorical element in the speech of the soldier. (In addition, in this sentence there is also a slight difference in the time frame of the existence of geography the soldier has offered.)
20. A random change of words: the Italian “existential disagreements” becomes in Japanese “disagreements in character”: 「どうしてかわかる？それはね、パパとママのあいだには性格の不一致があるんだって、そう言うの。そう言えばあなたにはわかる？」 / “E sai perché?, perché fra lei e papà ci sono dissensi esistenziali, hanno detto così, ti dice qualcosa?” (154/71). Though 「性格の不一致」 may be the appropriate psychological term in Japanese, the translation loses here the irony of the existentialist dimension of the “dissensi esistenziali” in the Italian original.
21. The translation is not as unambiguous as the Italian: 「おとなしい羊が一頭だけだと人間の成長をあらわしている」 / “il mite agnello da solo rappresenta le evoluzione dell’umanità” (160/75). The Japanese 「人間」 could also refer to individual development and not only to the development of humankind, while the Italian original is specific.
22. The Japanese translation tries to copy the Italian neologism “cirrinus lambs”, consisting of noun and adjective, but renders it as “cirrinus sheep”, thereby losing the Christian connotation: 「巻き羊雲がふたつか。」 / “Due agnelli cirrini.” (160/75).
23. Here the Japanese text speaks of an attack, not a crisis, and then explains that emotions may become strange when growing up. In the Italian original, the girl says that a psychologist told her that she has developmental problems: 「成長期

にあるちょっとした発作なんですって。成長期で具合がおかしくなるんだって、心理学者が言ってたわ。」 / “è solo una piccola crisi di età evolutiva, è che ho problemi dell’età evolutiva, lo ha detto lo psicologo.” (149/68).

24. A mistranslation of “impatient” as “worried”: 「不安げに女の子は訊ねた。」 / “chiese lei con voce ansiosa.” (161/76), and a little later the choice 「気をもんでる」 for the Italian verb “si inquieta” (162/76). In both cases the attitude and emotions of the characters in question are changed. While this is not so important in the case of the flat character of the mother, it is important in the case of the main character of the girl Isabella.
25. While the Italian original uses the following sentence to explicitly state that nefelomanzia is an art of interpretation, the translator avoids the direct translation of the word “interpreting”: 「きみが雲を読み取って」 / “sei tu che devi interpretarle.” (161/76). And this, even though, this text is obviously about “the art of interpretation”.
26. Regarding the several instances of discussions of the use of war to make peace between the soldier and the girl, the translation tends to ignore the fine nuances in the original and thereby interferes with the much more sophisticated argument of the original text: 「でもとくに、もし戦争が平和の役にも立つんだとしたら、それは歴史の問題ってことでしょう。わかる。」 / “soprattutto se la Guerra può servire alla pace, è stato questo l’argomento di storia, mi spiego?” (151/69). Here, the Italian text asks more carefully than the translation “whether” war can serve peace.
27. The next example is similar: While the original gives a very logical opposition of “just” and “unjust”, the translation bends the logic of the argument by changing “unjust” into “bad”: 「ひとつは正義の戦争で、もうひとつは悪の戦争だ。」 / “una è giusta e l’altra è ingiusta.” (160/75). Since there is a repetitive motif of logical argument in Tabucchi’s story, this is a more serious problem than it may look at first sight.

28. In the translation the girl says that the soldier tried to make peace, but made war, while the Italian original simply combines the actions of war and peace and sets them apart by the conjunction “but”, which shows much more vividly the confusion of the young girl and functions as an underlying criticism of the concept of making peace by making war in general: “you who made war, but made peace”. 「戦争はしてたけど、平和をつくりだそうとしたんだって言う。」 / “tu che facevi la guerra però facevi la pace”. (147/66).
29. The translator drops the repetitive “I don’t want to complicate things“, which in the original shows the reader that the text is about the lack of motivation to investigate complicated matter: 「肝腎の話にもどるけど、きみはどこで生まれたの？」 / “non voglio più fare il complicato, veniamo al sodo” (145/65).
30. The translation changes the contents of the girl’s answer. In the original she refers to the swimming not to her appetite, but the translation says: 「泳ぐのならあとだってできる」とイサベッラは答えた。なんだかわたしまで食欲なくなってきちゃったし」 / “Lo posso fare [un bel bagno] anche più tardi, rispose Isabella, ora è passata la voglia anche a me”. (146/66). This mistake is probably due to the omission of a part of the original text just before this phrase.
31. The translator invents a book that never appears in the original: 「本ばかり読んでいる」 / “leggere”. (146/66). The Italian text does not specify what the man is reading, it could well be a newspaper.
32. The following example represents several cases where the Italian original expresses more of a fighting spirit in the girls discourse than the Japanese version allows: 「こう訊くのだって理屈に合ってるわよね。」 / “la mia è una domanda logica, se permitti.” (148/67). This could be considered as unavoidable cultural difference, but an interpretation of Tabucchi’s short story can show to what extent this interferes with the story’s message, since the conversation between soldier and girl can be characterized as rhetorical power play.
33. The same problem again: 「どうしてあなたにそれがわかるの？」 / “E tu

- come lo sai?” (153/70). In the Italian version the girl is again more belligerent.
34. Again in the Italian text the girl is much more straightforward and contesting the words of the soldier than she is in the Japanese version: 「ほんとうにそうなの?」 / “Sei proprio sicuro?” (161/75).
 35. In the following case, it is the soldier’s comment which is changed in Japanese. He expressly argues that Coca-Cola will quench his thirst in order to tease the girl who vented her disdain for such unhealthy soft drinks earlier on: 「のどが渴いてね」 / “mi disseta. (148/67). The translation again loses the fighting spirit of both interlocutors.
 36. With the following change, the translation already interprets the situation, while the original leaves the reader to decide for him- or herself: 「かすかにむっとした声で女の子はつぶけた。」 / “disse con una voce leggermente alterata” (147/66).
 37. While the translation still depicts Isabella as crestfallen, the original describes her as “jaunty”: 「イザベッラの両手はまた砂の中にあった。なかば戸惑った様子で、ふっと笑声をもらした。」 / “Isabella aveva di nuovo le mani nella sabbia, ma aveva assunto un’aria quasi sbarazzina, fece una risatina breve.” (154/71).

*

The following examples manipulate the meaning of the original Italian text. We will start here with changes that give the impression that this particular translator of Italian belles-lettres is not very familiar with Italian idiomatic usage. In Spivak’s words one could assume that he has not even “gained entry into the outer room, right by the front gate”. What we are concerned with here are outright translation mistakes. And it looks as if there has been no proof reading for this translation before publication, so quickly was it composed and delivered:

38. The translation fails to understand the meaning of the Italian original text. The sentence given in the Japanese version doesn't make any sense at all in this context, because the soldier has no spots on his body. There seems to be a misunderstanding between two meanings of the Italian word "ticchio" as "caprice" and "ticchio" as "spots": 「なのになまさか、からだに斑点がでたからってくらいで、[...] あなたなにか問題があるのよ。」 / "non puoi dire queste cose perché ti è saltato il ticchio. [...] Secondo me hai qualche problema." (148/67).
39. Again the translator does not seem to understand the original Italian text. It is astounding that he obviously does not even worry whether his translation makes any sense at all. The Italian original means "to get something to eat" and not "to get a filling for a tooth", which is absolutely nonsensical in this situation: 「たぶん歯に詰め物でもしてもらって」 / "forse hai bisogno de mettere qualcosa sotto i denti." (148/67).
40. The Japanese text mistranslates the Italian phrase which means "don't take it to heart / don't work yourself up over it": 「きみがとやかくいうことじゃない」 / "non te la prendere." (154/71).
41. The translation renders "competence" / "competenza" as "competing": 「〈蝶だな〉競うように男が言った。」 / "Farfalla, disse l'uomo con competenza." (158/74).
42. Again the translator exchanges the original meaning with a version that does not make much sense at all in this context; the Italian text is very clear and straightforward; the sentence means that she dropped the tray she was carrying: 「それでね、キウイとティラミスのをせたお盆をぶつけられて、わたしが泣き出して」 / "così a me è caduto il vassoio con i kiwi e il tiramisù, mi sono messa a piangere". (152/69).
43. The Italian phrase means that she was about to say "carinissimo", but managed to replace the word by "singolare", and not that she used to say "carinissimo" until corrected by her teacher: 「それまでかわいいってばかりいていたものだ

から.] / “facevo per dire carinissimo.” (132/55).

44. In the translation the man says he “watched” the war, in the original he says that he “participated in it”: 「言っただろ、戦争はしてなかった、見てただけだって。」 / “Ti ho detto che non la facevo, vi assistevo.” (150/68). From an ethical as well as an argumentative point of view this is quite a difference.

*

The last seven examples quoted above have clearly demonstrated how doubtful the translator’s knowledge of the Italian language is, and how little he obviously cares about ethics and correctness while translating. In view of these linguistic shortcomings, it seems to be only fair to suspect further shortcomings on the interpretative level of the text as well. We shall therefore have a closer look at more deviations, and try to understand to what extent the original Italian text and its meaning have been violated by the translator:

45. The Japanese translation omits the first part of the sentence, the criticism that the soldier is “unmotivated”, probably because it may sound too cheeky a remark towards an adult, and again softens the girl’s discourse: 「あなたがその気になれないのは、わたしに言わせれば、ストレスのせいよ。」 / “È perché non sei motivato, secondo me il tuo è stress.” (140/61). However, it should be clear by now, how important the rhetorical power play of these two interlocutors is and to what extent Tabucchi’s story reflects on Italian popular political opinions, commonplaces and stereotypes.
46. The girl contradicts the adult in the original, declaring that his claim does not seem plausible at all: 「〈この浜辺ってこと？〉イサベッラは立ち上がると両手を腰に当てて、海を眺めていた。」 / “In questa spiaggia? , chiese Isabella, scusa, ma non mi sembra possibile, senza offesa”. (147/66). The Japanese translation drops all the words showing the girl’s strong disbelief.
47. In general, the Italian “paese” can signify “country” as well as “village”. By

choosing the translation “village” the Japanese text fails to understand the historical dimension of the utterance, namely the territorial changes in the north of Italy. The changing of a village’s name may remind the Japanese reader of administrative restructuring processes in Japanese recent communal history, instead of reminding the reader of historical geographical changes brought about by war between European nations. The fact that in this passage “paese” is signifying a region and not a village is supported by the comparison with Tuscany and Sicily the soldier makes in this context. 「たとえばわたしは、地図に載っていない村で生まれたんだ。いまは名前が変わってしまってるね。」 / “io per esempio sono nato in un paese che sulla carta geografica non c’è perché ora lo chiamano in un altro modo”. (144/64).

48. The Japanese translation loses the “realistic” dimension of the following critical comparison and thereby also the juxtaposition of fable (“favola”), fairytale and reality in the argument of the soldier: 「きちんと見れば [...] すぐわかる。」 / “da un punto di vista reale” (145/65). (Furthermore, the Japanese sentence-ending in this example stresses the understanding, while the Italian original, on the contrary, stresses the artificiality of the argument).
49. The translation renders “riposo” as a “break” (a “breather”) between actions, and thereby loses two additional metaphorical meanings topically connected to “warrior and rest”, i.e. the idea “to calm down” and to “rest in peace”. The Italian original hints at the topical meaning by explaining that this is “classic” imagery – one may think of the legend of Barbarossa and Kyffhäuser and the like. Contrary to that, taking a break between actions is not a classical European topic. Literally the translation also transforms the original classic (topos) into “ancient logic” or argument. 「言ってみれば、戦士の休息ってところかな [...]. たとえ戦士は戦争をしていなくても根っこのところは戦士なんだ。だから戦士はむかしの戦場で休息を取るべきなんだ。むかしながらの理屈さ」 / “Diciamo che è il riposo del guerriero [...] anche se il guerriero non faceva la guerra in fondo era un guerriero, e il guerriero deve trovare riposo dove prima ci fu guerra, è un classico.” (149/67). By choosing “breather” instead of “resting” with the connotation of “dying”, this translation also undermines the important

argument of the short story concerning the effect of depleted uranium the soldier is suffering from. While the Italian text opens up a discussion on the danger of depleted uranium ammunition and its pernicious effects on the health of the servicemen who use it, the translation plays down exactly this important inquiry of Tabucchi's short story. The effect of this mistranslation could be seen clearly by the reactions of Japanese native readers who had no doubt about the fact that the soldier will recover from whatever sickness he has. While for the Italian reader, as well as for similarly informed Western readers, the connection of warrior and rest overshadows the state the soldier is in, and questions his survival chances.

50. The same happens in the next example which is connected to this argument. The translator omits the important rhetorical argument of the soldier concerning his professional state of existence: 「そんなことを知っているのは、わたしが軍人だから」と男が答えた。「というより、だったと言ったほうがいいかな。いまは退役しているわけだから」 / “Lo so perché sono un militare, rispose l'uomo, o meglio, lo ero, ora sono in pensione, diciamo così.” (138 / 60). While the original stresses the fact, that the soldier is not really retired, by adding “diciamo così” (let's call it that way), the translation omits this and renders the serviceman as unambiguously retired, as if there were no medical, political, ethical problems involved in his so-called “retirement”.
51. The next problem is also very serious because it is connected to the discussion of politics in Tabucchi's story. It is completely impossible to understand why the translator omitted some six lines from the Italian original, lines which convey the important argument of the connection of Italian national history, public official Italian perception and education of national history and Italian historical responsibility with the historical Italian complicity with Nazi Germany. Here is the mutilated Japanese version of the Italian original: 「よく考えさせてちょうだい」女の子は答えた。「お昼のときにでも考えてみるから。」”Ma quelli erano nazisti, obiettò Isabella, gente orribile. – Perfettamente d'accordo, disse l'uomo, i nazisti erano gente davvero orribile, ma anche loro avevano un ideale e facevano la guerra per imporlo, dal nostro punto di vista era un ideale perverso, ma dal loro no, in quell'ideale avevano una grande fede, agli ideali bisogna starci attenti,

che ne dici, Isabèl? – Ci devo pensare, rispose la ragazzina, magari ci penserò a pranzo [...]” (142/62). (The underlined passage has not been translated! Its content is as follows: “But those were Nazis, objected Isabella, horrible people. – I totally agree, said the man, the Nazis were truly horrible people, but they too had an ideal and went to war to impose it, from our point of view it was a perverted ideal, though for them it wasn’t, they had great faith in that ideal, you have to be careful with ideals, isn’t that true Isabèl?”²¹ This passage is extremely important not only to Italian readers who may be prone to avoid war crime responsibility for World War II, but also for Japanese readers who may also be tented in the same way, using the crimes of Nazi Germany as a scapegoat in order not to face their own historical responsibility. For Tabucchi’s story the argument that ideals may lead to (war) crimes is absolutely important. He offers here an argument and a call for action for Italians, which may well be echoed by Japanese readers, namely to reinvestigate their own concepts and ideals instead of taking a complacent or even ignorant stance regarding historical responsibility.

52. The discussion of war crimes and responsibility is taken up again in the argument concerning the soldier’s involvement in the Balkan wars. The young girl is very fierce about his responsibility for the destruction of houses. Again the translator willfully changes the argument of the girl: 「だったらおじさんはどうして家を壊したりしたの？」 / “Ma allora lei distruggeva le case?” (138/60). In the original, the girl clearly reproaches the serviceman for having destroyed houses, while in the translation she only asks for the reason why. Again, this may be due to the fact that the translator wanted to familiarize the text to Japanese behavior which would not allow such outright criticism directed towards a grown-up stranger. This does, however, severely interfere with the argument of the text.

Let us now move on to examples which show to what extent translation does not only interfere with semantic elements, i.e. meanings of words, phrases, arguments and semantic fields or imagery, but also with aesthetic, i.e. formal, elements. Many of the above examples have shown to what extent the translator manipulates the wording and the argument of both interlocutors, and particularly the utterances of the young girl. We have also seen that he comes up with mistranslations which are not even logi-

cal and hardly intelligible to Japanese readers.

53. Logic, however, is an important element of Tabucchi's text, as can be shown by one of the first exchanges of arguments between the two interlocutors: 「でもね、きみはみんなが日に焼けなければいけないって思ってるの？」女の子は考え込んだ。「どうしてもかかっていえば、そんなことない。ううん、どうしてもなんてことない。どうしてもってことはほかにあるから。」[...]「きみは論理的な女の子だ」 / “*ma credi che sia obbligatorio abbronzarsi? La ragazzina rifletté. – Proprio obbligatorio no, niente è obbligatorio, a parte le cose obbligatorie [...] tu sei una ragazza logica.*” (133/56). The translation does not follow the logic of the argument, which is very unfortunate since it is an argument about logic. While the original says that nothing is mandatory except mandatory things, which is a highly logical utterance arguing $a = a$, and by the way extremely funny, the translation completely loses the logic of the argument and says that there are also things existing which are mandatory, which is not a logical statement at all. Thus the following comment by the man, namely that the girl is logical, becomes completely meaningless.
54. Again, the translation fails to see the elaborate argument concerning logic in the original text: 「理屈はわかるよね？」 / “*ti sembra logico?*” (144/64). While the translator assumes that the statement this question refers to is logical and makes the soldier ask whether the girl understands this logic, the original calls the logic of the earlier statement into question.

As we have seen, Antonio Tabucchi does not only make logic an important topic of this story, explicitly and implicitly. He also uses word play to produce a creative and constructive atmosphere in his text in spite of the seriousness and gloominess of the contents of the conversation presented. This creativity and humor is completely lost to the translation.

55. One example of word play, completely lost by the translation, and evidently, hard to copy in Japanese is the following exaggerated use of superlative with which Tabucchi can discredit the idea of national identity and chauvinism: The Japanese

translation gives 「イタリア人そのものよ」 or 「根っからイタリア人」 for the Italian “italianissima” (134, 144/57, 64), which goes so well with Isabella’s fondness of the word “carinissima”. Though the Japanese translation cannot simply copy this word play, it fails to come up with something of a similar effect.

56. Another example of word play is Tabucchi’s creative juxtaposition of “war” and “peace” in one term, which the translation simply renders with the usual term for a peacekeeping army, again, losing the pun completely: 「わたしが請け負っていたのは、平和維持軍というやつだった。」 / “la mia era una missione bellica di pace.” (138/60).

There are the following two passages, where Tabucchi explicitly refers to aesthetic conceptions of art, literature, language and philosophy; this translation misses both:

57. One is a discussion of the impossibility of translation from ancient to modern texts because of a change in linguistic make-up which the soldier stipulates when comparing ancient Greek with modern languages. He argues that modern languages have become too swift – we could now say: too quick – to properly translate ancient texts: 「何かをつたえようと急ぐあまり、掻く摘んでばかり言うようになってそのうち分析する習慣がなくなってしまう。」 / “nella fretta di comunicare diventano sintetiche e così facendo perdono l’analisi.” (159/74). The translator’s choice of words loses the linguistic pun on “synthetic” and “analytic” languages, which could have been rendered easily in Japanese.
58. The translator also fails to render the word play on “form and substance” concerning the art of *nefelomanzia* given in the Italian original: 「なぜなら、この術ではかたちが大事なんだ。」 / “perché in quest’arte la forma è la sostanza.” (156/72).
59. The translation also loses the allusion to Sheherazade as a narrative construction pattern in the final sentence of the short story and thereby fails to understand the narrative and ironical meaning of the final sentence of the girl and, with

this, also fails to understand the argumentative thrust of Tabucchi's story on the whole: 「答えは明日ね, してあげる」 / “Te lo dico domani, rispose.” (162/77). The translation renders “dico” as “I will answer” and leaves the girl at the end of the story in a state of obedient closure, while the original has “I will tell (say to) you” which picks up Sheherazade's survival strategy and narrative power play.

60. The greatest and most astounding manipulation of the translator, however, is the “translation” of a mere page number of Strabo's main oeuvre which the soldier is quoting from towards the end of the story: 「とストラボンが言っている. 第一の書三十四頁だ.」 / “Strabone, pagina trentuno del libro principale.” (160/75). The Japanese translation changes the page number from 31 to 34, as if there were a Japanese translation of Strabo's book that the Japanese reader could consult. However, the ironic highlight of Tabucchi's story is that he makes the soldier quote from a book that has never even existed and therefore could never have been translated. A point, which again is missed by this translator, who seemed to have been all too busy to come up with a quick translation of an incredibly artistic, elaborate and thick original text.

*

Let us assume for a moment that there is some legitimacy to quick translations; their *raison d'être* then being, that such literary translations provide a quick way to “know a culture”, as Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak pointed out. In other words, these translations serve to provide the reader with inside information about other countries or cultures. Now, what can we learn from this particular Japanese translation of Antonio Tabucchi's short story “Nuvole”? Several times the translator uses Italian nouns the meaning of which the reader can learn from this text: for example “ginnasio”, “fettuccine all'arrabiata”, or the subjects being taught in Italian school such as Latin and Greek authors or Italian modern history. However, the translation neither develops a compelling systematic method in the way it approaches these Italian words (and concepts), which have more of an “exoticizing” than a didactic effect on the reader, nor does it offer the reader any insight at all in Italian behavior or way of life as exemplified by the young girl or the sick soldier. The heated discussion and belligerent power

play of the two characters, so elaborately developed in Tabucchi's original, could have served so well as a means to understanding cultural diversity, especially when Japanese readers are targeted. As a matter of fact, the Japanese translator has familiarized especially the behavior of the young girl to an extent that she appears surprisingly "Japanese" when compared to the Italian original by an informed reader. So, even if the intention of this translator was to give a quick translation in order to serve international understanding, he fails to achieve this aim. – There is not a word of explanation concerning his methods and style of translation in the afterword to this publication of Tabucchi's stories into Japanese²².

But is it acceptable at all to give a quick translation of a text as elaborate as "Nuvole" by an artist as outstanding as Antonio Tabucchi? Is there not some ethic constraint which binds the translator to serve the best of the artist as suggested by translation theorists such as Benjamin, Derrida, de Man and Spivak?²³ How far can a translator swerve from the text of the original? Do we accept similar deviations when digesting interpretations of music or reproductions of works of art? The author of a text to be translated usually has little insight into the qualifications of his or her would-be translator. It is a relationship of trust with which the author or his publishing house welcomes the work of the translator. Should there not be some self-restraint by translators, or better: the community of translators, such as mutual and open criticism of their work in public or a professionalization which safeguards basic standards?

This translation is nothing but a shallow replica of the original text; it does not even abide by the most basic ideal of "stringing together the most accurate synonyms by the most proximate syntax", which Spivak rejected as too low in quality to be acceptable. And it certainly has not entered the "protocols of the text", nor has it understood "the laws specific to this text" by Antonio Tabucchi. It falls far short of the complexity with which Tabucchi presents his short text, of the irony and humor that highlight the Italian original, and the political and ethical message the original text sends out to its readers. And most important, it fails to understand the enormous momentum that Tabucchi gives to the logic of the arguments by which he draws the reader of his text into the story, forcing him or her to take up the thread of discussion, the hints and allusions and to verify for him- or herself the facts about Italian involvement in World War II, of NATO involvement in the Balkan wars, of the pernicious effects of depleted uranium ammunition, of Strabo's contribution to geography and the art of *nefelomanzia*. It ig-

noses all the outstanding characteristics: the intriguing negotiation of fantasy, fairytale, historical truth and convincing rhetoric that make up the fabric of this compelling Italian original. And most ironic, it even missed the explicit self-reflective argument against “quick translation” that Tabucchi’s original text offers in the discussion of the shortcomings of modern translation which is described as too hasty to yield a successful and acceptable result.

Notes

- 1 Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak: “Translation into English”, in: Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak: *An Aesthetic Education in the Era of Globalization*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012), p.256 (with correction of the printing mistake by H.H.).
- 2 For Walter Benjamin’s and Jacques Derrida’s concepts of the “Aufgabe”, the “task” the translator has to fulfill and the “debt” he has to pay back, see Herrad Heselhaus: “The Times of Translation: Walter Benjamin’s *Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers*”, in Department of Literature and Linguistics, Tsukuba University, *Studies in Language and Literature vol. 54* (2008), pp. 83-121.
- 3 Spivak, op.cit., p. 256.
- 4 Ibid. Spivak quotes from Karl Marx: *Capital*, vol. 1, translated by Ben Fowkes (London: Penguin, 1990), p. 90
- 5 Spivak, op.cit. p. 257. Spivak quotes from Jacques Lacan: *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*, translated by Alan Sheridan (New York: W. W. Norton, 1978), p. 95.
- 6 Kwame Anthony Appiah: “Thick Translation”, in: *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti (New York: Routledge, 2000), p. 331-343.
- 7 Clifford Geertz: “Thick Description: Toward an Interpretative Theory of Culture”, in: Clifford Geertz: *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973).
- 8 Spivak, op.cit., p. 257.
- 9 Ibid., p. 257.
- 10 See Herrad Heselhaus (op.cit.) for a more detailed analysis of these concepts and relationships.
- 11 Spivak, op.cit., p. 257.
- 12 Ibid., p. 258. Please note the repetition of the metaphor of intimacy: “inhabit” “the many mansions”.
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 Paul Kußmaul: *Kreatives Übersetzen*, (Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2007²), pp. 36.
- 15 Walter Benjamin: “Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers“, Nachwort zu Charles Baudelaire: *Tableaux parisiens*, in: Walter Benjamin: *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. IV/1, ed. by Tillman Rexroth, (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1972), pp. 9-21.
- 16 Kußmaul, op.cit., pp. 36.
- 17 Antonio Tabucchi: “Nuvole”, in: *Il tempo invecchia in fretta* (Milano: Giangiacomo Fel-

- trinelli Editore, 2009), pp. 53-77.
- 18 アントニオ・タブッキ：「雲」, in : 『時は老いをいそぐ』, (東京：河出書房新社, 2012), 和田忠彦 (翻訳), pp. 129-162. The Japanese title of the book already presents some problems, but it shall stay uncommented because the analysis here is limited to the short story alone.
- 19 Antonio Tabucchi: “Wolken”, in: Antonio Tabucchi: *Die Zeit alert schnell*, (Munich: Hanser, 2010), translated by Karin Fleischanderl. Antonio Tabucchi: “Les Nuées”, in: Antonio Tabucchi: *Le temps vieillit vite*, (Paris: Gallimard, 2010), translated by Bernard Comment. Antonio Tabucchi: “Clouds”, in: Antonio Tabucchi: *Time Ages in a Hurry*, (New York: archipelago books, 2015), transl. by Martha Cooley and Antonio Romani.
- 20 Here I would like to express my gratitude for comments from various Japanese colleagues, such as Toshiaki Oya, Chizuko Yoshimizu, Etsuko Aoyagi, and special thanks also to Anubhuti Chauhan and Shunsuke Moribayashi.
- 21 Quoted from the English translation: op.cit., p. 54.
- 22 Cf. the afterword of 和田忠彦 in : アントニオ・タブッキ：「雲」, in : 『時は老いをいそぐ』, (東京：河出書房新社, 2012), 和田忠彦 (翻訳) pp. 207-218.
- 23 Cf. Herrad Heselhaus: „Übersetzen zwischen Metapher und Metonymie. Walter Benjamins *Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers* mit Paul de Man“, in: *Neue Beiträge zur Germanistik*, vol. 11, (2012), pp.71-85. Compare also Randall Couch: “Burning Down the House. Ethics and Reception in Poetry Translation”, in: Elena Grigorenko et al.: *Writing. A Mosaic of New Perspectives* (New York: Psychology Press, 2012), pp. 401-413.