'Vegemite, Possums and BYO': translation strategies in the formation of Japanese perceptions of Australia

Shani Tobias, Leah Gerber, Cathy Sell
Monash University, Clayton, AUSTRALIA

ABSTRACT
Literary translation plays an important role in shaping perceptions of one country and its cultural context in another. After a brief background survey, the paper identifies five key phases in the translation of Australian literature into Japanese. It then goes on to examine ways in which cultural references in Australian literary works are translated into Japanese through a case-study analysis of two Japanese anthologies of Australian short stories. The pedagogical aims of the anthologies, the translation strategies used by editors and translators and translational norms in the Japanese context, are explored, highlighting in particular the common methods of *warichū* (in-text annotation), and *rubi* (glossing) and their effects on readers.

KEYWORDS: anthologies, Australian literature, cultural specific items, Japanese, norms, translation strategies.

Introduction

Literary translation plays a vital role in shaping perceptions of one country and its cultural context in another. This is the underlying assumption of the 'Windows on Australia' project (2009-2012)[1] carried out by Monash University's Translation and Interpreting Studies program and funded by the Cultural Agency Limited (CAL) and the Australia-Japan Foundation (AJF) Grants Program.[2] Broadly speaking, the project sought to explore perceptions of Australia and Australian culture as represented in contemporary translated Australian literature in certain non-Anglophone languages (Italian, Spanish, Chinese and Japanese).[3] This particular paper forms part of the project and uses two Japanese anthologies of short stories by key Australian writers as a limited case study to explore Japanese approaches to translating Australian cultural references. The first anthology,[4] published in two volumes in 1983, was introduced to Japanese readers as

1 See: http://www.austlit.edu.au/specialistDatasets/WindowsOnAustralia

2 CAL is a not for profit rights management organisation that enables the use of text and images in return for fair payment to writers, visual artists and publishers. The Cultural Fund supports a wide variety of projects which aim to encourage, and provide practical assistance to Copyright Agency's members and the Australian cultural community. The Australia-Japan Foundation was established by the Australian Government in 1976 to expand and develop contact and exchange between the peoples of Australia and Japan and to help project positive images of Australia and Japan in each other's country. See: http://ajf.australia.or.jp/en

3 Data from German was also collected and analysed by colleagues at the Free University Berlin. (See: http://windowsonaustralia.net.au/). Overall, we found 961 translations into Japanese, of which 671 were romance novels, 95 were detective fiction, 89 were science fiction and 39 were historical fiction. These results are likely to be a reflection of broader genre preferences among Japanese readers and not specific to translations of Australian literature.

4 *Gendai Ōsutoraria tanpen shōsetsushū* (現代オーストラリア短編小説集) Editorial and translational supervision by Michio Ochi and Yuriko Momo, 1983.

representing canonical Australian literature of the 20th Century[5] and the second anthology,[6] published in 2008 aims to represent Australian 'multicultural' society and literature. Thus the anthologies were chosen for this case study because of their explicit purpose to 'represent' the Australian 'Other' to Japanese audiences in an array of forms and from varying time periods, allowing for an examination of the translation approaches and strategies used to achieve this purpose. Whilst contrasting the findings of this research with other more genre-specific case studies into the translation of popular fiction (romance, detective novels etc.) into Japanese would more than likely yield further interesting results, this particular study remains dedicated to an analysis of the translation of cultural references in works by some of Australia's leading writers.[7] In this paper, we adopt Toury's notion of description (1995) to describe and analyse particular translation strategies, which we identify according to Leppihalme's typology (1997). This enables us to examine translation strategies in a corpus of works and contextualize the discussion with reference to associated paratexts, Japanese translational norms and the historical phases of Australian-Japanese literary translation, without adopting a prescriptive approach.

Background

Translations account for approximately eight to ten percent of all Japanese literary publications, about seventy percent of which are translations from English, that is works first published in the US or UK.[8] In the initial years following the Second World War, the market for translated literature in Japan was dominated by canonical works of European literature and those of prizewinning European authors, which went on to become bestsellers in Japan. From the mid-1960s onwards, interest shifted towards American fiction, which became the most-translated national literature in Japan. The focus was on popular novels, which have dominated bestseller lists since the 1990s (Matsunaga-Watson 2005).

While there have been far fewer translations of Australian fiction into Japanese, a significant number (961 works in total[9]) – has been translated in the period 1950 to 2010. The relative scarcity of translated Australian literature in international markets prior to 1950 can be related to the very late emergence of an Australian literary market, especially when compared with other more 'dominant' markets such as Europe, the UK and the US. Furthermore, the notion, held by both British and Australians, that Australian literature was somehow inferior to that of the British colonisers prevailed during the first half of the 20th century: it was thought that Australian writing was only the 'poor relation' of English literature (Nile & Walker 2001: 284). At this point only 15% of books sold in Australia in 1948 were of Australian origin (Lyons 2001: 404).

---

[5] Vol. 1 contains works from 1892-1969 and Vol. 2 contains works from 1964-1980.

[6] *Daiyamondo doggu (tabunka o utsusu) gendai Ōsutoraria tanpen shōsetsushū* (ダイヤモンド・ドッグ《多文化を映す》現代オーストラリア短編小説集). Edited by Kate Darian-Smith and Yasue Arimitsu, translational supervision by Yasue Arimitsu, 2008.

[7] A freer translation approach is generally evident in translations of popular fiction. For example, the term *chōyaku* (超訳;'hyper-translation') has been coined to describe the way Sidney Sheldon's novels are 'translated' into Japanese, freely adapting them to enhance the entertainment effect. 'Hyper-translation' is printed on the cover of these books, which have proven exceptionally popular in Japan (Matsunaga-Watson 2005).

[8] This total excludes children's books, as cited in, *An Introduction to Publishing in Japan 2010-2011*, Japan Book Publishers' Association, 2010. Available online at [http://www.jbpa.or.jp/en/pdf/pdf01.pdf] (accessed 20 January 2012).

[9] Note that this figure includes 671 romance novels published by specialist publishing companies such as Harlequin Enterprises and its subsidiaries.

Only post-1945, when the book market in Australia was consolidated and publishers became independent, did this begin to change.

Up until this point, not only were Australian cultural outputs generally deemed to be second-rate but, due to its distance and unforgivingly arid and diverse landscape, Australia was commonly regarded by outsiders as 'the Antipodes'. In Blainey's words: "their people seemed to walk upside down" (2001: 320). Yet early patriotic sentiments developed by early Australian writers focused on precisely those features of Australia that the colonisers had found so strange and confronting: namely, images of the landscape. In romanticising these images, the 'alien' (negative) was rearranged into the 'exotic' (positive) and these newly packaged 'cultural symbols' went on to become very powerful images for both Australian and international audiences, rendered strongly in the arts, although Australians would often regard their environment as unpleasant and unforgiving, despite its many exquisite elements. During the 1970s and 80s, the Australian Tourism Commission would also zone in on these iconic images of natural Australia (e.g. beach, outback, flora and fauna) to attract new communities of tourists, while film and television propagated similar, now stereotypical, images of Australia (e.g. the *Crocodile Dundee* films of the 1980s and long-running television soaps such as *Home and Away*).

Five Key Translation Phases

Preliminary research carried out as part of the 'Windows on Australia' project focused largely on bibliographical data collection and indicates that one of the key triggers for the introduction of Australian literature into Japan was Patrick White's Nobel Prize for Literature awarded in 1973. This prompted three Japanese translations of White's novels: *The Eye of the Storm* (1973) as well as the much older *Voss* (1957) and *The Aunt's Story* (1948),[10] which illustrates the influence of literary awards on texts that are selected for translation into Japanese,[11] a fact that is also mentioned by Fujimoto (2007) as an important reason for the translation of Canadian literature into Japanese.

In the 1980s, several Australian literary works appeared in Japanese, including Xavier Herbert's *Poor Fellow My Country* (1975),[12] Colleen McCullough's *The Thorn Birds* (1977),[13] Miles Franklin's *My Brilliant Career* (1901),[14] and a number of anthologies compiled by the translators such as *A Collection of Australian Poetry of the 20th Century*,[15] *Australian Literature: A Collection of Australian Short Stories*,[16] and *An Anthology of Modern Australian Short Stories*

[10] *The Eye of the Storm* was translated in 1974 as *Taifū no me* (台風の目) by Hirō Mukai. *Voss* was translated in 1975as *Vosu: Ōsutoraria tankenka no monogatari* (ヴォス: オーストラリア探険家の物語) by Michio Ochi. *The Aunt's Story* was translated in 1976 as *Oba no monogatari* (伯母の物語) by Suzu Iwabuchi.

[11] For example, eight recipients of Australia's Miles Franklin Award since 1960 have had at least one full-length novel translated into Japanese ('Windows on Australia' data).

[12] Translated as *Kawaisō na watakushi no kuni* (かわいそうな私の国) between 1978 and 1983 by Michio Ochi. The publication of this work in Japanese was one of the key ways in which the Japanese public learned about the history of persecution of indigenous Australians (Arimitsu 2011)

[13] Translated as *Sōn Baazu* (ソーン・バーズ) by Yuji Tanaka in 1984.

[14] Translated as Waga seishun no kagayaki (わが青春の輝き) by Fumiko Inoue in 1982

[15] *Nijisseiki Ōsutoraria shōkai* (二十世紀オーストラリア詩紹介). Translated by Yasuko Claremont in 1985.

[16] *Ōsutoraria no bungaku: tanpen kessaku sen* (オーストラリアの文学—短編傑作選) Translated and edited by Mikio Hiramatsu in 1982.

(the first anthology used for our case study to follow).[17] The latter two anthologies included works by the prominent writers Henry Lawson, Judith Wright, Peter Carey, Murray Bail and Frank Moorehouse. Arimitsu (2011) cites a social realist agenda as the main motivation for the selection of these works, with a focus on observation and description of the society and landscape. Additionally, Geoffrey Dutton's seminal reference work *A History of Australian Literature* (1964) was translated into Japanese in 1985,[18] while two Oceania-focused periodicals – *Oceanian Studies* and *Southern Hemisphere Review* – were launched in Japan in the mid-1980s. These texts played a vital role in introducing Australian (and New Zealand) literature and culture to Japan, and were part of a growing interest in Australian literary studies and scholarly exchange.

Arimitsu cites a further phase in the introduction of Australian literature into Japan, namely the translation of works by Aboriginal authors; Kath Walker's *Stradbroke Dreamtime* (1972)[19] and Sally Morgan's *My Place* (1987)[20] are two of the better-known examples (2011: 9). The 1980s was a time when the Australian government was actively marketing Australia as a unique destination for Japanese tourists and students and provided funding for many of the Japanese translations discussed.

The 1990s and early-to-mid 2000s saw additional commercial publications of prize-winning authors such as Peter Carey[21] and Richard Flanagan.[22] However, in paratextual material such as the translator's afterword and in newspaper reviews, these writers were introduced to Japanese readers as contemporary award-winning writers, without making their Australian background explicit. This is part of a 'universalising' tendency within the Japanese publishing industry noted by Fujimoto (2007: 6) whereby works translated from English 'are exposed to a danger of being consumed in Japan simply as commodities or symbols of "Western" culture in general' rather than introduced and contextualized within the local (in this case Australian) society and literary system. Thus, Arimitsu argues, literary translation did not necessarily promote knowledge about Australia among Japanese during this phase; instead, perceptions of "an Australia with its very rare animals and plants, its beautiful natural environment, and sometimes its White Australia Policy" remained prevalent (2011: 10). It was not until 2008, with the publication in Japan of *Diamond Dog: An Anthology of Contemporary Australian Short Stories Reflecting a Multicultural Society*,[23] (the second anthology analysed in our case study) that multicultural or transnational Australian literature was showcased to Japanese readers.

---

[17] *Gendai Ōsutoraria tanpen shōsetsushū* (現代オーストラリア短編小説集) Editorial and translational supervision by Michio Ochi and Yuriko Momo, 1983.

[18] *Ōsutoraria bungakushi* (オーストラリア文学史) Editorial and translational supervision by Michio Ochi, 1985.

[19] Translated as *Yume no sutoradoburōkutō* (夢のストラドブローク島) by Atsuko Onogi in 1981.

[20] Translated as *Mai pureisu – Aborijinaru no ai to shinjitsu no monogatari* (マイ・プレイス―アボリジナルの愛と真実の物語) by Megumi Kato in 1992.

[21] *Illywhacker* was translated as *Iriwakkā* (イリワッカー) by Takayoshi Ogawa in 1995, Yoko Miyagi translated *Oscar and Lucinda* (*Osukā to Rushinda*; オスカーとルシンダ) in 1991, *Jack Maggs* (*Jakku Magguzu*; **ジャックマッグズ**) in 2000, and *The True History of the Kelly Gang* (*Kerī Gyangu no shinjitsu no rekishi*; ケリー・ギャングの真実の歴史) in 2003.

[22] Sachie Watanabe translated *Gould's Book of Fish* (Gūrudo gyoruigajō; グールド魚類画帖) in 2005 and *The Unknown Terrorist* (Sugatanaki terorisuto; 姿なきテロリスト) in 2009.

[23] *Daiyamondo doggu (tabunka o utsusu) gendai Ōsutoraria tanpen shōsetsushū* (ダイヤモンド・ドッグ《多文化を映す》現代オーストラリア短編小説集). Edited by Kate Darian-Smith and Yasue Arimitsu, translational supervision by Yasue Arimitsu.

In 2011/2012, a new initiative was launched by the Australia-Japan Foundation to fund up to $25,000 annually to a publisher (Gendai Kikakushitsu Publishing Co. Ltd) for approximately ten years to publish novels by contemporary Australian writers who have not yet been translated.[24] The first translation[25] (published in early 2012) was David Malouf's *Remembering Babylon* (1993), which is the first novel-length work by Malouf to be published in Japanese. This is to be followed by Tim Winton's *Breath* (2008), and other authors being considered include Kate Grenville, Andrew McGahan, Alex Miller, Kim Scott and Christos Tsiolkas,[26] all of whom represent contemporary Australian writing with a strong transnational focus.[27]

In summary, Australian literature has been introduced into Japan through five key translation phases, starting with the 1970s trigger of Patrick White's Nobel Prize; then the 1980s period of growing interest in Australian studies and literature within the Japanese academic community and increased Australian government support for translation projects accompanying closer ties between the countries (especially in tourism, business and scholarly exchange); the translation of literary works by indigenous writers; followed by a focus on award-winning writers in the 1990s-2000s; and finally a new initiative to translate contemporary Australian writers who have hitherto not appeared in Japanese, particularly targeting multicultural and transnational writers and works.

In this paper, two of the anthologies mentioned above and published in two different phases will be analysed with a view to examining the way in which translation strategies shape the readers' perceptions of Australia. The first, 現代オーストラリア短編小説集(上、下) (*An Anthology of Modern Australian Short Stories* Vol. 1 and Vol. 2, published by Hyōronsha in 1983), is situated within the 1980s phase of translation into Japanese, during which the social realist agenda was prominent in text selection. Hereafter abbreviated as *Gendai Australia*, it includes thirty works from Australian writers published between 1892 and 1980, including Henry Lawson, Xavier Herbert, Alan Morrison, Hal Porter, Peter Cowan, Barry Oakley, Morris Lurie, Frank Moorhouse, Murray Bail and Peter Carey.[28] The second anthology,『ダイヤモンド・ドッグ《多文化を映す》現代オーストラリア短編小説集』(*Diamond Dog - An Anthology of Contemporary Australian Short Stories Reflecting a Multicultural Society*, published by Gendai Kikakushitsu in 2008) fits within the most recent translation phase and contains sixteen works representing themes and writers from 'multicultural' Australia published between 1985 and 2007, comprising works by Nicholas Jose, Eva Sallis, Lily Brett, David Malouf, Enid Leo, Tim Winton, Uuyang

[24] One novel is to be published each year as part of a series termed *Ōsutoraria gendai bungaku kessaku sen* オーストラリア現代文学傑作選 **(**Masterpieces of contemporary Australian literature).

[25] Translated by Rumi Musha.

[26] This information was provided by Prof. Yasue Arimitsu, President of the Australian Studies Association of Japan and one of the project's initiators, in a personal interview on 16 December 2011.

[27] According to an internal document supplied by the Australian Embassy in Tokyo, the project's key aims include forging a market for Australian literature in Japan, increasing understanding of contemporary Australia, promoting an accurate and advanced image of Australia through literary culture, and increasing discussion about Australia among the Japanese public and scholars.

[28] A full list of authors follows: Henry Lawson, Katharine Prichard, Vance Palmer, Xavier Herbert, Alan Marshall, John Morrison, E.O. Schlunke, John O'Grady, Gavin Casey, Hal Porter, Dal Stivens, Judah Waten, Peter Cowen, David Campbell, Judith Wright, David Ireland, Peter Mathers, Barry Oakley, Randolph Stow, Morris Lurie, Frank Moorhouse, Colin Johnson, Murray Bail, Michael Wilding, Peter Carey, Barry Hill, Roger Pulvers, Vicki Viidikas, Ross Davy.

Yu, Trevor Shearston, Sally Morgan, Fabienne Bayet-Charlton, Kim Scott, Merlinda Bobis, Lolo Houbein, Sunil Badami, Matthew Condon, and Mandy Sayer. Both anthologies received assistance from the Australian government in the form of grants from the AJF and the Australia Council for the Arts.

Culturally Specific Items, Translation Strategies and Norms

Aixela defines the term 'culturally specific items' (CSI) as

> those textually actualized items whose function and connotations in a source text involve a translation problem in their transference to a target text, whether this problem is a product of the non-existence of the referred item or of its different intertextual status in the cultural system of the readers of the target text. (1996:58)

Here this includes aspects of Australian culture as well as Australian English linguistic expressions that are familiar to Australian readers but largely foreign to other readerships. These include items such as geographical references, flora, fauna and the natural landscape, physical objects such as food and clothing, aspects of Australian English (including slang, colloquialisms and accent), cultural practices or activities, cultural concepts (such as mateship, etc.) and proper names as well as other aspects particular to Australian society. These CSIs situate the source texts (STs) firmly within the socio-cultural context of Australia, characterising them with a quality that might be called 'Australianness'.

Newmark's discussion of translation and culture acknowledges the particular difficulties that arise when translators are faced with "cultural deposits" both in the form of grammatical structures specific to certain languages, as well as 'cultural words' (as distinct from 'universal' or 'personal' words), which are usually not translated literally, but rather by use of "an appropriate descriptive-functional equivalent" (Newmark 1988: 95). More broadly, Newmark's definition of communicative and semantic translation (1981) includes the basic question of whether to either (a) leave cultural aspects within the source language culture or (b) transfer foreign elements into the target language culture, which prioritises a smoother, more target-reader focused translation. In Venuti's terms, such questions concern the decision whether to domesticate or foreignize (1995: 19–20). This introduces factors beyond the translator's subjective method, such as the dominant 'tradition' of certain cultures in literary translation; Venuti's example is the Anglo-American translation culture that, he argues, prioritizes a domesticating approach (1995: 21).

Yet, within these two poles, there is an extensive range of strategies available to translators faced with CSIs in the ST, the identification of which enables a more nuanced analysis and description. Ritva Leppihalme (1997: viii), drawing from Archer (1986), uses the term "culture bumps" to describe situations when "culture-bound elements hinder communication of the meaning to readers in another language culture". She has discussed many of the strategies for dealing with these in her study of the translation of allusions: pre-formed linguistic features which imply some kind of meaning, often discernable only by the bi-cultural reader. She identifies nine different kinds of translation strategies, and categorizes them as follows : (i) use of a standard translation, (ii) minimum change, that is, a literal translation, without regard to connotative or contextual meaning, (iii) extra allusive guidance added in the text, (iv) the use of footnotes, endnotes, translator's notes and other explicit explanations not supplied in the text but explicitly given as

additional information, (v) stimulated familiarity or internal marking, that is, the addition of intra-allusive allusion, (vi) replacement by a TL item, (vii) reduction of the allusion to sense by rephrasing, (viii) re-creation, using a fusion of techniques, that is, a creative construction of a passage which hints at the connotations of the allusion or other special effects created by it, and finally (ix) omission of the allusion (1997:82).

When faced with 'Australianness' in the ST, the Japanese translator may, in theory, adopt any or even all of these nine strategies. Strategy (ii), for example - borrowing the ST term directly, even if it does not exist in the target language (TL) - in the case of English-Japanese translation may involve transliteration of the English term, rendering it phonetically in *katakana*, the phonetic Japanese script used for writing foreign words. The reference may instead be rendered literally, through the use of calque, "the direct appropriation of a particular CSI into the TL through literal translation" (Munday 2012: 87). However, neither of the above strategies explains any implicit cultural connotations. Alternatively, the translator may attempt to explicate the CSI either intra-textually or extra-textually, adopting strategies (iii) or (iv) in Leppihalme's categorisation. Strategies that have a more 'domesticating' effect on the ST include employing a generic term instead of the CSI (similar to (vii)) or an alternative CSI but one that is common knowledge in the target culture. The translator may decide to delete the CSI completely (ix), or, more extremely, replace it with a reference to the target culture that is seen as functionally equivalent (vi) (e.g. 'cricket' becomes 'baseball') (Tobias 2006).

Toury (1995) maintains that before the micro-level decisions about strategies are made, translators are guided by an 'initial norm' as to their overall approach: whether to adopt a foreignizing style that generally gives preference to the ST, or whether to domesticate the translation to conform to TL conventions and cultural norms as much as possible. This choice will be influenced by what Chesterman terms 'expectancy' norms, namely the expectations of TT readers about what an appropriate translation should look like, which are often reinforced by publishers, reviewers and other professionals in the literary system (Chesterman 1997). Therefore, examining the two anthologies, we ask: what strategies are employed in Japanese translations of Australian literature, where the 'culture bumps' between languages and cultures are significant and what effects are these strategies likely to have on Japanese perceptions of Australia? We also ask how concordant these strategies are with both the pedagogical aims of the anthologies (given their location within the five translation phases we have identified) and Japanese translation norms and reader expectations.

Strategies for Translating 'Australianness' into Japanese

The Japanese translation of *An Anthology of Modern Australian Short Stories*, the first of our two anthologies under discussion, was a founding initiative of the Australia and New Zealand Literary Society of Japan, established in 1979. Several of the translations in the anthology were produced or reviewed by members of this new scholarly organization who had specific interests in Australian literature. The editors, Michio Ochi and Yuriko Momo, are also academics and translators in their own right; in Japanese they are referred to as 監訳 (*kanyaku*: translation supervisors) because of their role in overseeing and editing the translations in the anthology. Published in 1983, when the whole notion of Australian literature was still relatively new in Japan, it is clear from Ochi's afterword that the purpose of the anthology was to introduce Japanese readers to texts by a range of key Australian literary figures of the twentieth century.

Given this context, we argue that it can be assumed that the intention of the translation project was to highlight (rather than brush over) any specifically Australian content, or 'Australianness', so that readers could learn about a nation, literature and culture that, at the time, had a comparatively low profile in Japan. One might therefore expect the use of translation strategies that preserve the Australian CSIs ((ii) in Leppihalme's typology), or at least explain them to readers ((iii) or (iv)). Given the lack of translations of Australian literature available at the time, the target readership at least had to have been open to new translations with a more peripheral place in the Japanese polysystem (Even-Zohar 2000).

Despite the 25 years between the publication dates of the two anthologies, *Diamond Dog* (2008) was also produced with the intention of introducing aspects of Australian society to Japanese readers, but this time the focus was on contemporary multicultural society. The co-editor/translation supervisor, Yasue Arimitsu, was also one of the translators of *Gendai Australia*.[29] When Professor Arimitsu was interviewed for this project,[30] she explained that a major motivating factor behind the publication of *Diamond Dog* was to introduce Japanese readers to the multicultural reality of Australia, an aspect about which many Japanese had little knowledge. This indicates not only a clearly identified interest in target culture readers learning about other cultures through translation, but also a clear expectation that the TT will fulfil, in some way, its self-appointed role of educating readers beyond the stereotypical presentations of Australia. One of the important target audiences Arimitsu had in mind was undergraduate students planning to study English in Australia. She describes how she had noticed how her students enjoyed learning about foreign cultures through literature, but had little access to contemporary Australian texts, and it was this that motivated her to compile the new anthology.

Both in text selection and translation strategy for this anthology, the editors' purpose was to show the cultural hybridity and changing nature of identity(ies) in Australian society and literature. In the afterword of *Diamond Dog*, Arimitsu explains how, with regard to style, punctuation and use of *kanji*, the editors aimed to respect the approach of each translator so as to make sure that each story was internally consistent and the qualities of the original were conveyed. [31] Overall, however, the editorial policy was also to use annotations as much as possible, especially to explain cultural references relating to unique expressions referring to the Australian landscape, such as the names of flora and fauna. With regard to Australian English, Arimitsu notes that if this is rendered in standard Japanese it loses its local flavour, so the overall translation approach was to transliterate the Australian expressions into *katakana* and use this as a ルビ (*rubi* or gloss). These two methods described by Arimitsu in her afterword, annotations and rubi, were in fact, found to be the two most common approaches to translating cultural items, not only in *Diamond Dog*, but also in *Gendai Australia*.[32] Both these strategies fall under Lepihalme's third category, being explanations or guidance provided within the text to help readers understand the CSI. Each is discussed in turn in the following two analyses.

---

[29] She is also the current President of the Australian Studies Association of Japan and former head of the ANZ Literary Society.

[30] Personal interview, 16 December 2011.

[31] The stories in *Diamond Dog* are translated by: Yasue Arimitstu, Wataru Sato, Masaya Shimokusu, Keiji Minato, and Daita Watanabe (all are scholar-translators).

[32] This overlap is likely to be due to the similar purpose of the anthologies (at a broad level, to educate readers about Australian society and literature) and may well be also accounted for by the fact that Arimitsu was involved with the *Gendai Australia* project and later co-editor of *Diamond Dog*.

Annotation

Annotation is used prolifically in both anthologies to explain cultural references, especially food and place names, not as footnotes or endnotes, but rather as in-text notations in the form of two double-stacked lines of half-size font in brackets immediately after the word or concept that needs to be explained. This form of annotation is called 割注 (*warichū*) in Japanese. Depending on the number of cultural references requiring explanation, some stories contain very few annotations, while others include up to three annotations on a page. We have also examined the paratexts accompanying Australian fictional works translated into Japanese and found that out of a corpus of fifty-three works, the translator stated in seven of the prefaces/afterwords that they had adopted this in-text notation method in their translation. This suggests that while annotation is not a strategy employed in a majority of cases, it is also not particularly unusual. Since the in-text notation breaks the flow of the narrative, it draws attention to the fact that there is an element in the source text that needs to be explained.

Transliteration of the term followed by an in-text notation is a common strategy in the anthologies when translating food. For example, 'vegemite' is translated as ベジマイト〔塩辛く、濃い茶色のペースト状の食品で、オーストラリア人がサンドイッチやトーストに塗って食す〕 (*bejimaito* [a salty, dark brown paste that Australians spread on sandwiches and toast]);[33] 'lamingtons' becomes ラミントン〔チョコレートをコーティングしたスポンジケーキ〕 (*raminton* [chocolate-coated sponge-cake]);[34] and 'fish and chips' becomes フィッシュ・アンド・チップス〔新聞紙に包んで売っている、魚のフライとフライドポテト〕 (*fisshu ando chippusu* [fried fish and chips sold wrapped in newspaper]).[35] In contrast, 'steak and eggs' is translated literally as ステーキと卵 without any added explanation.[36] Annotations function to help improve the accuracy of readers' perceptions as to what Australians eat, but also to highlight the cultural differences and exoticize the 'other', as readers try to imagine what a 'salty, dark brown paste" tastes like, or are shocked to learn that Australians eat food wrapped in newspaper. Without annotations, as in the literal translation of 'steak and eggs' strangeness is not emphasised. Of course, if Japanese readers paused to think, they may regard steak and eggs as an odd combination, but without an annotation, could easily skim over it. Annotations communicate contextual knowledge to fulfil a pedagogical purpose, and their prevalence in these anthologies is an indication of the prominence of that purpose.

As well as food, this method of in-text notation frequently follows place names to describe their location and perhaps why they are famous. For example, 'Toorak Road' is given as ツーラック通り〔メルボルンの高級住宅地〕 (*Tsūrakku-dōri* [a wealthy residential area in Melbourne]),[37] and 'Harry's Café de Wheels' in Sydney is described as ハリーズ・カフェ・デ・ウィールズ〔ウルムルー湾の波止場近くにある、ミートパイで勇名な持ち

[33] In the translation of "An Earnest Parable" by Merlinda Bobis. Translated by Yasue Arimitsu as *Tan no gūwa* (舌(タン)の寓話) (in *Diamond Dog*).
[34] In the translation of "Collective Silences" by Sunil Badami. Translated by Yasue Arimitsu as *Chinmoku fūfu* (沈黙夫婦) (in *Diamond Dog*).
[35] In the translation of "American Dreams" by Peter Carey. Translated by Ikuko Shōji as *Amerika no yume* (アメリカの夢) (in *Gendai Australia*).
[36] In the translation of "Uncle Fred's Christmas" by John O'Grady. Translated by Tsuneko Sakai as *Fureddo tottsuan no kurisumasu* (フレッドとっつあんのクリスマス) (in *Gendai Australia*).
[37] In the translation of "Nightshift" by John Morrison. Translated by Tadahiko Tamura as *Yakin* (夜勤) (in *Gendai Australia*).

帰りの店】 (*Harīzu cafe de wīruzu* [a takeaway shop famous for meat pies near the Woolloomooloo waterfront]).[38] In other words, the purpose of annotations here is to fill perceived gaps in cultural knowledge between the source and target readers and provide information about geographical localities that helps readers better understand the context and themes of the story. Yet this sort of detail is often more than many Australian readers would be aware of, demonstrating again the importance of the pedagogical rather than literary purpose of this strategy.

In-text notations are also used in the translation of other CSIs, such as providing metric equivalents for measurements given in 'feet' and 'yards' and to describe terms used to refer to people. For example, the slang expression 'wogs' is given as ウォッグ【英語が話せない移民】 (*woggu* [immigrants who can't speak English]),[39] although the explanation here fails to provide the changing meanings and usage of the term.[40] 'Possum', as the nickname a mother uses for her daughter, is rendered as ポッサムちゃん (*possamu-chan*); the Japanese name suffix *chan* making readers aware that it is a term of endearment. This is then described as 【オーストラリア、ニュー・ギニアおよび周辺の島々に生息する有袋類の小動物。夜行性で主に樹上で生活する】 (small marsupials that live in Australia, New Guinea and surrounding islands. Nocturnal and mainly live in trees.)[41] There are other examples where particular customs are explained for the Japanese readership. For example, when the ST mentions that a group of people bought a bottle of wine to take to a restaurant, the BYO' (Bring Your Own) system is annotated as follows 【アルコールの販売許可を得ていないレストランなので、酒は持ち込み】 (customers can bring their own alcohol to restaurants that do not have a liquor license).[42]

Certainly, through in-text notations, Japanese readers can learn about aspects of Australian culture and society they would not pick up themselves if the term was borrowed or calqued without explanation or a strategy such as omission of the CSI or substitution with a TL reference were adopted. The explanation added intra-textually (Leppihalme's category (iii)) both highlights cultural differences, and then attempts to provide the reader with a more nuanced understanding of the Australianness within the text. In-text notations can also be seen to be one of the clearest ways of responding to Venuti's (1995) call to make the translator visible in the text. Each time the reader encounters the annotation, they are made aware that they are reading a text that has undergone a process of linguistic and cultural translation and manipulation and is not a transparent copy of the original.

However, such visibility is not for everyone. For some readers, these annotations, which appear as insertions within the text, undoubtedly disrupt the flow of the story, even more so than footnotes or endnotes. A mother calls her daughter "possum", and instead of being able to focus on the interaction between the characters, the Japanese reader is interrupted by an explanation of

[38] In the translation of "Breathing Amber" by Matthew Condon. Translated by Keiji Minato as *Iki o suru anbaa* (息をするアンバー) (in *Diamond Dog*).
[39] "Collective Silences".
[40] "Wog" refers primarily to immigrants from Mediterranean countries and was originally a pejorative term, but the negative connotations have softened as some immigrants have started using it to refer to themselves.
[41] In the translation of "Twenty Pink Questions" by Fabienne Bayet-Charlton. Translated by Wataru Sato as *Pinku iro no shitsumon* (ピンク色の質問) (in *Diamond Dog*).
[42] In the translation of "It's Just the Full Moon" by Vicki Viidikas. Translated by Taiko Tan as *Mangetsu no yoru* (満月の夜) (in *Gendai Australia*).

marsupials. Although only half-size in font, the fact that the annotations immediately follow the word or concept encourages readers to actually read them, as opposed to footnotes or endnotes, which are easier to ignore. Footnoting is less common in Japanese literary texts written vertically, but endnotes are one way of avoiding undue disruption while still providing background cultural information. Yet this is likely to greatly discourage the reader from referring to the notes because of the effort required to flick through to the end of the story and locate the note each time, a process most people would find too laborious. Thus the use of in-text notation in these anthologies foregrounds the uniqueness of Australian culture in the minds of readers, and the translators/editors of these two anthologies evidently consider cultural instruction a primary purpose of their literary translation projects.

Rubi (Glosses)

The Japanese term ルビ (*rubi*) comes from the English 'ruby', a 5.5 point font used for annotations in printed documents. This was about the same size as that used for printing glosses in the early Meiji period (Ariga 1989). The small type (normally in the phonetic *kana* script) is printed alongside words (on the right side in vertical texts or above in horizontal texts), often as a reading aid to indicate the pronunciation of difficult Chinese characters (*kanji*) or non-standard pronunciations, and it is commonly called *furigana*. *Rubi* are also used as a literary device; since *kanji* represent meaning and *furigana* are phonetic, the difference between these can be exploited to create a pun or extended meaning. The same logic can be employed as a translation strategy to convey the meaning of foreign words within a Japanese translation where this is deemed important.[43] Especially as a means of translating dialect and non-standard uses such as slang or culture-specific terms, *rubi* offers translators into Japanese a unique foreignizing strategy not available in other languages. Nevertheless, being a form of "extra allusive guidance added in the text", *rubi* can be seen as part of Leppihalme's category (iii) as well.

Rubi defamiliarizes the language by asking readers to read their own language as though it were a foreign one. It combines the visual interpretation of the *kanji* ideographs with the aural interpretation of the *furigana*. *Rubi* may also be used as an alternative to in-text notation when brevity is important, since the term that is glossed is usually one word or a short phrase, rather than a long explanation. However, it is sometimes used in combination with annotation, as we shall see. *Rubi* involves, as Ariga says in the context of Japanese literature, an "intricate polyphonic and polysemic interplay" (1989: 335). When used as a translation strategy, it involves creating a kind of "interlanguage", which is very relevant to translation studies scholars who have shown an interest in hybrid strategies that go beyond a traditional source/target dichotomy (Wakabayashi 2006). The code-mixing of source and target expressions goes some way towards embodying the ideals of theorists such as Walter Benjamin, Antoine Berman and Lawrence Venuti in "preserving the foreign character of the ST in a way that radically expands the horizons of the target language" (Levy 2011). It does not indicate direct equivalence between the standard term and the gloss, but rather provides 'guidance' to the reader that a CSI is used in the ST.

[43] For example, the translator can preserve the original sound of a proper name (such as "Firebolt" in the Harry Potter series) using the transliteration as *furigana* (katakana) above the kanji which represents its meaning: 炎 の 雷 (ファイアボルト). In other words, the *rubi* asks the reader to read 炎の雷 (which literally means "flame thunder" and is usually pronounced *honoo no kaminari*) as *faiaboruto*.

In the two anthologies analysed, *rubi* is most commonly used to convey Australian English. For example, the slang expression 'Bluey', referring to someone with red hair, is given as "赤毛(ブルーイ)" (the furigana *burūi* as a gloss for the kanji meaning red hair).[44] The greeting 'G'day' is translated as こんにちは(グ・ダイ) (indicating that *konnichiwa* should be pronounced *gudai*).[45] The extent of the translators' efforts to retain Australian English in the TT can be seen through such renderings as 夕食(ティー) for 'tea' (with the furigana *tī* as a gloss for the standard *kanji* meaning dinner).[46] Terms used in the Australian colonial farming context, such as 'squatters', 'selections' and 'jackaroos', were also transliterated as *rubi*, with the standard Japanese words explaining their meaning: (牧場の所有者(スクォッター) (farm owners), 国の払い下げ(セレクション)で得た農地 (farmland obtained as a result of government land grants), and 牧場の見習い人たち(ジャッカルー) (apprentice farmers)).[47]

Yet, since CSIs and colloquialisms are so embedded in their context, *rubi* may only be partially effective because it usually cannot convey the pragmatic effect or the social and historical connotations of the expressions as used within Australia. When the ST uses slang to refer to indigenous Australians, such as the term 'blackfellas' (which is used by indigenous Australians to describe themselves, but may be considered offensive if used by white Australians, depending on the context) or a derogatory term such as 'boongs', these are also retained in the TT by using the transliterated glosses for the standard term with which Japanese readers are more familiar - *aborijini* (アボリジニたち(ブラック・フェラズ) and アボリジニ(ブーンズ)). Consequently, the gloss is written alongside a word which is itself borrowed and transliterated from the English 'Aborigine'. While this strategy makes readers aware that these alternative expressions exist, it does not indicate which is derogatory, and readers may not be able to infer this from the context. This is also illustrated when 'redneck' is glossed as "country person" (lit.) (田舎者(レッドネック)),[48] which does not have the same connotations of being poor, Caucasian, uneducated and unsophisticated.

Where the Australian accent is particularly important in the story, the translator has used *rubi* to convey it. For example, in "The Wolves from the North", the following sentence appears:

> The guy spoke in a heavy accented Australian-English, " 'ave a drink, mite!"

This is translated as「アブァ・ドリンク, 一杯どうだ、マイト！」[49] so that " 'ave a drink" is transliterated as a gloss for the Japanese colloquial expression (lit. how about a drink), whereas "mite" is simply transliterated (borrowed) without providing the meaning, relying on the context and the knowledge of the reader. *Rubi* is also used for the following dialogue in the same story: "Then you must be Choinese?" (「てぇことは、お前はチョイニーズ, 中国人か？」), whereby the *kanji* word for Chinese has the *furigana choinīzu*, as opposed to the normal transliteration

[44] "Nightshift".
[45] "Collective Silences".
[46] "Collective Silences".
[47] "Collective Silences".
[48] "Breathing Amber".
[49] In the translation of "Wolves from the North" by Ouyang Yu. Translated by Yasue Arimitsu as *Kita kara yatekita urufu* (北からやってきたウルフ) (in *Diamond Dog*).

(*chainīzu*). However, in her translation of 'Collective Silences', the same translator does not convey the accent in the phrase "'a pillara the community' said the Mair", instead translating it in standard Japanese without *rubi* as 市長は父を町の「柱」と呼んでいだ (the mayor called my father a 'pillar' of the town). This is most likely because while the ST draws attention to the accent, it is not as functionally important within the text as in the former case, and therefore a translator would be less likely to choose a strategy such as *rubi* that highlights and explains the Australianness in the text.

In some cases the translator has realized that *rubi* alone will not sufficiently convey cultural or intertextual references and has therefore chosen to combine *rubi* with an in-text notation. For example, 'new Australians' is transliterated as a gloss for 'new immigrants', and the historical context is defined: 新移民（ニュー・オーストラリアン）〔特にヨーロッパ人の移民のこと。第二次大戦後はヨーロッパ各地からの移住希望者に広く門戸を開くようになった〕 (particularly referred to European immigrants. Australia opened its doors to immigrants from various parts of Europe after WWII).[50] The technique is also used to explain double meanings, such as the description of "stevedores going to Yarraville - nightshift - 'down on the sugar'": 行先はダウン・オン・ザ・シュガー, 砂糖の船付場。〔ダウン・オン・ザ・シュガーには「文無しで」の意味もある〕.[51] 'Down on the sugar' is transliterated as a gloss for 'sugar docks' in Japanese, and the annotation explains that the phrase also has the meaning of being penniless.

Whether to use *rubi* or annotation or both may be a matter of individual preference and in anthologies translated by several translators, this may account for the differences. For example, one translator uses the transliteration of 'outback' as a gloss for the word *okuchi* - a *kanji* compound meaning 'hinterland/inland/back country' (奥地（アウトバック）),[52] while a different translator transliterates and then annotates this same word as アウトバック〔オーストラリアの内陸部の不毛地帯、ブッシュよりも奥地を指す〕[53] (*autobakku* [barren areas of Australia's interior, refers even more to the hinterland (*okuchi*) than "bush"]). The latter strategy provides more information, even comparing 'outback' to the Australian concept of 'bush', while the former strategy is more succinct and less disruptive to the narrative flow. As mentioned previously, the editorial policy, at least for the *Diamond Dog* anthology, was to respect the choices of each translator as much as possible.

Evidently *rubi* has both limitations and advantages as a translation strategy. Readers without some understanding of English or the linguistic and sociocultural connotations of the term cannot usually gain full benefit from the use of *rubi*, other than being able to recognise the term as Australian English and perhaps pronounce it in their head. But at least the *rubi* strategy caters for such readers by providing the standard Japanese translation, unlike the strategy of simply borrowing the foreign word in transliterated form without any explanation or annotation. Furthermore, due to the high prevalence of *katakana* loan words in the Japanese language and the fact that all Japanese learn some English at school, certain words are likely be familiar to most readers, so when these are used in *rubi* in a marked way (contrasting with their knowledge of

[50] "Uncle Fred's Christmas".
[51] "Nightshift".
[52] In the translation of "The Drover's Wife" by Murray Bail. Translated by Wakiko Matsumura as *Hitsuji ōi no nyōbō* (羊追いの女房) (in *Gendai Australia*).
[53] "Breathing Amber".

British or American English) it becomes instructive for readers in their understanding of the Other. Even those readers with little English are made aware that they are reading a text situated firmly within an Australian national context and literature. The use of *rubi* is neutral in the sense that it does not attempt to adapt Australian English to a local Japanese dialect, which would recontextualise its image in a completely different setting. It was therefore regarded by the translators and editors of these anthologies as useful for indicating the differences of Australian speech, even if nuances could not be explained adequately.[54]

Conclusion

The above analysis shows that in these two anthologies the translation and editorial approach favours a ST-oriented norm, in particular employing strategies that explain CSIs, in line with category (iii) of Leppihalme's model. These primarily involve borrowing the SL reference but adding 'guidance' in the form of in-text annotation, or *rubi*, or a combination of the two. Such translation methods are not unusual in the history of translation into Japanese. They date back to the ninth century when Japanese scholars formulated a special method of decoding Chinese texts through annotating the Chinese characters, a method known as 漢文訓読 (*kambun kundoku*). Moreover, in the late nineteenth-century Meiji period, when translation from European languages played a hugely important role in the modernisation of Japan, the 'translation style' or 翻訳調 (*honyaku-chō*), which can be referred to as a kind of 'translationese' (Furuno 2005) came to the fore, whereby many foreign words (largely from English) were imported as transliterations and a literal approach was generally preferred. Translation in Meiji Japan largely had a pedagogical purpose – to learn from the 'West' so as to strengthen and modernise the nation – and the source-oriented translational norms facilitated this purpose. The context and role of translation in Japan is very different today, but the pedagogical purpose of making Australia known to Japanese readers is prominent in these anthologies as well, and the Japanese public remains comparatively tolerant of a defamiliarizing style despite the trend towards a freer translation approach, especially in the translation of popular novels (Furuno 2005). The use of 'borrowing' (transliteration) continues to be popular, because in the age of globalisation and the internet, loan words are being imported into Japanese at an increasingly rapid rate, and Japanese people seem to quickly accept these as new expressions (Furuno 2005). As Donald Keene says,

> The Japanese have rather a different taste in translation, often enjoying the foreignness of the idiom, which may persuade them that somehow, miraculously, they are reading a work in a language they do not know. (Keene 1992: xiv)

This accounts for the acceptance of the *rubi* strategy, which simultaneously borrows the foreign idiom and explains it. The in-text notation strategy was also ultimately deemed acceptable, although the disadvantages of extensive use in terms of readability were also recognised. For example, Arimitsu mentioned that although the publisher of *Diamond Dog* expected her to use endnotes to explain cultural aspects, she asked them to allow her to use in-text notation, since endnotes were not as useful for this educational purpose.

Translation projects such as these, specifically designed to provide a representative collection of Australian literature in Japanese (in the case of *Gendai Australia*) and introduce Australian

[54] This point was mentioned in relation to strategies adopted in *Diamond Dog* by Prof. Arimitsu when she was interviewed for this project.

multiculturalism to the Japanese readership (*Diamond Dog*) can also be viewed as deliberate attempts to buck the trend towards more universalised representations of non-Japanese literature in Japan. Fujimoto (2007) describes the tendency towards a 'universalising' approach to the translation of national literatures into Japanese by which authors are introduced according to the international awards they have won, emphasising their global significance rather than highlighting the particular local context from which they write. As Arimitsu herself notes, the categorizations of 'national literatures' are eroding, even in Japan, and an author's nationality is not usually important for readers themselves, who care mainly about whether the book is interesting to read (2011: 8). Even so, such a universalizing approach to the promotion of Australian literature in Japan, especially if combined with domesticating strategies for translating CSIs such as substitution, omission or paraphrasing, would have the effect of negating the social context surrounding a text and would not be as successful in changing readers' perceptions about Australia. Hence the very explicit attempts by the editors of *Gendai Australia* to select texts from a range of representative Australian authors and provide a clear contextual introduction to them in the Afterword, and the clear purport of *Diamond Dog* to introduce texts that represent the diversity of multicultural Australia. This approach is then combined with the quite prolific use of annotation and *rubi* to explain Australian cultural references.

The funding for these projects provided by organisations such as the AJF and the Literature Board of the Australia Council of the Arts also indicates that there is institutional support behind the translation of Australian literature into Japanese,[55] and that literary translation is regarded by the Australian government as important in promoting a more accurate image of Australia abroad, as well as forging a market for Australian cultural products.[56] An interesting avenue for further research would be to further investigate the role of sponsors and publishers in determining which texts – and not just those anthologized - are selected for translation. The importance of issues such as agency and power relations in these decisions has been highlighted by theorists such as Lefevere (1992).

While the choice of translation strategies is an important factor in how Australian literature is perceived in Japan, strategies are also likely to differ according to the particular target audience (for example, whether the translations are mainly for Australian Studies students and academics or whether they target a more general readership). The strategies discussed in this paper, combined with translators' prefaces or afterwords, may fulfil the pedagogical function of introducing Australian literature to a Japanese readership through these anthologies, but there is of course a tipping point beyond which a translation replete with borrowed terms and annotations becomes laborious to read and loses its literary value. Although Japanese translational norms are

[55] The Australia Council's Literary Sector Plan 2011-2012 states that "within the context of a relatively small national marketplace for literary writing, it is vital for Australian writers to break into more lucrative international markets," and the promotion of Australian literature internationally, including support for translation, is part of the Literature Board work plan. Retrieved February 19, 2012, from Australia Council website: http://www.australiacouncil.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/103485/Literature_Sector_Plan_1112_publication_format.pdf

[56] The Literature Board website states that "For many years Australian writers have been leaders in promoting our culture internationally through sales and performances of their works (in English and in translation), appearance at festivals and by their regular winning of, and shortlisting for, major international literary awards." http://www.australiacouncil.gov.au/about_us/our_structure/artform_boards/literature_board/australian_literature_abroad (Australia Council website, accessed 19 April 2013).

still somewhat accepting of these strategies as mentioned, the trend is still towards a less literal approach in general. Moreover, in terms of reader perceptions, placing constant emphasis on cultural differences in the text through borrowing and explanation can have the effect of making Australia appear overly-exotic and strange, by drawing readers' attention to the unfamiliar rather than the common aspects to which a Japanese readership can just as easily relate.

Literary translators are keenly aware of these pitfalls, which is why any decision to adopt a particular strategy is a result of a negotiation process between ST and TT according to which "in order to get something, each party renounces something else, and at the end everybody feels satisfied since one cannot have everything" (Eco 2003:6). Occupying an 'intercultural' space, translators who encounter culture bumps must decide on the extent to which they ought to flatten them and render them invisible, or highlight and/or explain them to the reader. In terms of literary translation's role in creating or reinforcing certain perceptions of the Other, the strategies of annotation and *rubi* are two useful tools in a translator's armory that can at least promote a more nuanced understanding of cultural difference, as we have seen. In particular, as Wakabayashi (2006) notes, although *rubi* is a strategy that originated in the Japanese context, it could conceivably be employed in an innovative and experimental way in translations into other languages. This kind of strategy challenges "dichotomies such as source/target language, source/target text, and sound/meaning" (2006:34) by producing an explicit and creative interaction between languages and cultures within the text and giving new significance to the role of the translator as a negotiator and mediator.

Main Author's Address:
Dr Shani Tobias
School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics
Monash University, VIC 3800, Australia
Shani.Tobias(a)monash.edu

References

Aixela, Javier Franco (1996) 'Culture-Specific Items in Translation', in Román Álvarez, M. Carmen África Vidal (eds) *Translation, Power, Subversion,* Clevedon; Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, 52-78.

Archer, Carol (1986) 'Culture Bump and Beyond', in Joyce Merrill Valdes *Culture Bound: Bridging the Cultural Gap in Language Teaching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 170-178.

Ariga, Chieko (1989) 'The Playful Gloss. Rubi in Japanese Literature', *Monumenta Nipponica*, 44(3): 309-335.

Arimitsu, Yasue (2011) 'The Contemporary State of Academic Appraisal of Australian Literature in Japanese Universities', *Antipodes*, *25*(1): 7-13.

Blainey, Geoffrey (2001) *The Tyranny of Distance: How Distance Shaped Australia's History*, 21st Century ed. Sydney: Pan Macmillan.

Chesterman, Andrew (1997) *Memes of Translation: the spread of ideas in translation theory*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Darian-Smith, Kate and Yasue Arimitsu (eds) (2008) *Daiyamondo doggu <Tabunka shakai o utsusu> Ōsutoraria tanpen shōsetsu shū* [*Diamond Dog - An Anthology of Modern Australian Short Stories Reflecting a Multicultural Society*], Tokyo: Gendaikikakushitsu Publishers.

Eco, Umberto (2003) *Mouse or Rat? Translation as Negotiation*, London: Phoenix.

Even-Zohar, Itamar (2000) 'The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem', in Lawrence Venuti (ed) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London/New York: Routledge, 192-197.

Fujimoto, Yoko (2007), *Is CanLit Lost in Japanese Translation?* Paper presented at TransCanada Two: Literature, Institutions, Citizenship. Available online at [http://transcanadas.ca/media/pdfs/fujimoto.pdf] (Accessed 15 January 2012).

Furuno, Yuri (2005) 'Translationese in Japan', in Eva Hung (ed) *Translation and Cultural Change: Studies in history, norms and image-projection*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 147-160.

Keene, Donald (1992) 'Translation and Comparative Literature', in Cornelia N. Moore, Lucy Lower (eds) *Translation East and West: a cross-cultural approach: selected conference papers*, Honolulu, Hawaii : College of Languages, Linguistics, and Literature, University of Hawaii and the East-West Center, xiii-xxv.

Lefevere, Andre (1992) *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, London and New York: Routledge.

Leppihalme, Ritva (1997) *Culture bumps: An empirical approach to the translation of allusions*, Clevedon U.K.; Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Levy, Indra (2011) 'Introduction - Modern Japan and the trialectics of translation' in Indra Levy (ed) *Translation in Modern Japan*, Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 1-12.

Lyons, Martyn (2001) 'The Book Trade and the Australian reader in 1945', in John Arnold and Martyn Lyons (eds) *A History of the Book in Australia 1891-1945: A National Culture in a Colonised Market*, St Lucia, Qld: University of Queensland Press, 401-407.

Matsunaga-Watson, Noriko (2005) 'The Selection of Texts for Translation in Postwar Japan: An Examination of One Aspect of Polysystem Theory', in Eva Hung (ed) *Translation and Cultural Change: Studies in history, norms and image-projection*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 161-173.

Munday, Jeremy (2012) *Introducing Translation Studies*, 3nd Edition, London and New York: Routledge.

Newmark, Peter (1981) *Approaches to Translation*, Oxford and New York: Pergamon Press.

Newmark, Peter (1988) *A Textbook of Translation*, London: Pearson Education Ltd.

Nile, Richard and David Walker (2001) 'The "Paternoster Row Machine" and the Australian book trade, 1890–1945' in Martin Lyons and John Arnold (eds) *A History of the Book in Australian 1891-1945: A National Culture in a Colonised Market*, St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 3-18.

Ochi, Michio and Yurkiko Momoko (eds) (1983) *Gendai Ōsutoraria tanpen shōsetsushū* (jō, ge) [*An Anthology of Modern Australian Short Stories* (Vol. 1 and Vol. 2)], Tokyo: Hyoronsha.

Tobias, Shani (2006) **'**Culture-specific Items in Japanese-English Literary Translation: Comparing Two Translations of Kawabata**'**s "Izu no Odoriko"", *Monash University Linguistics Papers*, 5(1): 27-35.

Toury, Gideon (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Venuti, Lawrence (1995) *The Translator**'**s Visibility: A History of Translation*, London and New York: Routledge.

Wakabayashi, Judy (2005) 'The Reconceptualization of Translation from Chinese in 18th Century Japan' in Eva Hung (ed) *Translation and Cultural Change: Studies in history, norms and image-projection*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 121-145.

Wakabayashi, Judy (2006) 'Translating in a Forked Tongue: Interlinear Glosses as a Creative Device in Japanese Translations', *Translation and Interpreting Studies 1(2): 3-41.*