Divided Languages?

Diglossia, Translation and the Rise of Modernity in Japan, China, and the Slavic World

Judit Árokay · Jadranka Gvozdanović
Darja Miyajima *Editors*

Springer

Transcultural Research – Heidelberg Studies on Asia and Europe in a Global Context

Series Editors:

For further volumes:
http://www.springer.com/series/8753

Judit Árokay • Jadranka Gvozdanović •
Darja Miyajima
Editors

Divided Languages?

Diglossia, Translation and the Rise of Modernity in Japan, China, and the Slavic World

Springer

Editors
Judit Árokay
Institut für Japanologie
University of Heidelberg
Heidelberg

Jadranka Gvozdanović
Slavisches Institut
University of Heidelberg
Heidelberg

Darja Miyajima
Slavisches Institut
University of Heidelberg
Heidelberg

ISSN 2191-656X ISSN 2191-6578 (electronic)
ISBN 978-3-319-03520-8 ISBN 978-3-319-03521-5 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-03521-5
Springer Cham Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014930287

Cover image: Calligraphy by Toshiko Toribuchi-Thüsing.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Preface

Standard languages are in most cases based on culturally significant textual traditions. By virtue of representing cultural heritage, standard written languages often differ from contemporary spoken varieties. In cases of a strict functional differentiation between the written and the spoken language, we encounter diglossia in accordance with the definition that was coined in 1959 by Charles Ferguson. In Ferguson's definition "Diglossia is a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation." Although such functional differentiations may persist over centuries, many cases of dissolution of diglossia have been attested over the past centuries. The exact nature of these processes differs widely in different cultures and language societies reflecting the linguistic, cultural, and social changes in the surrounding culture.

The present volume comprises the papers presented at an international conference titled "Linguistic Awareness and Dissolution of Diglossia," which was held in July 2011 at the University of Heidelberg, Germany, as part of the research project "Language and Cultural Translation: Asymmetries in the Emergence of Modern Written Languages" within the Cluster of Excellence "Asia and Europe in a Global Context: Shifting Asymmetries in Cultural Flows." The aim of the conference was to reevaluate and compare the processes of dissolution of diglossia in East Asian and in European languages, especially in Japanese, Chinese, and in Slavic languages. To this extent, specialists from China, Japan, Great Britain, Germany, and the United States were invited to report on their research focusing on aspects of the dissolution of diglossic situations.

Initially, in the framework of the project "Language and Cultural Translation: Asymmetries in the Emergence of Modern Written Languages," the center of our interest was the dissolution of the diglossic situation in Japan during the nineteenth

century in comparison with Eastern Europe. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, the Japanese culture opened up to European influences and literary translations introduced new literary models, which led to a new awareness of the functional possibilities of the spoken language. This formed the background of the *genbun itchi* movement in Japan, a language reform that promoted the spoken language to the status of the literary language. Because similar processes had occurred in Russia one century earlier and because translations from Russian played a crucial role in introducing new literary and linguistic models to Japan at the end of the nineteenth century, we have concentrated on the complicated entanglement between the two languages in their different functional varieties and tried to highlight the parallels and asymmetries of this process. Japan is often referred to as a translating nation, a culture where translation has always played a crucial role in administration and in religious, social, and literary life. For centuries the Chinese had been the major source for information that spanned political ideologies and aesthetic concepts, but by the middle of the nineteenth century translations of Dutch, English, German, French, and Russian texts became prevalent. In the field of literature, hundreds of titles were translated during the first decades of cultural contact, which brought about changes that nobody would have expected or intended. In the process of its evolution, modern Japanese developed its own subsystems; that is, various styles with fixed functional areas came into being. In addition to the socio-political approach that has dominated research in the last decades, a linguistic approach is essential to understand the process of evolution that formed today's uniform written Japanese.

This linguistic and cultural situation found close parallels with the Russian duality between written and spoken language that lasted until the beginning of the nineteenth century. By the turn of the nineteenth century (i.e. only a few decades earlier than in Japan) elements of written and spoken language became integrated into a new, differentiated literary language. Before the nineteenth century, the literary language of Russia had been based on the Old Church Slavonic tradition: an archaic language of biblical translations based on texts from the end of the first millennium AD. This language, which has been fundamental to the transmission of cultural knowledge in Slavic religious and in literary traditions, differed from Russian and other Slavic local vernaculars. The spoken and the written language formed two different varieties of Slavic with complementary functions, and it thereby constituted a single diglossic whole. In the eighteenth century, the translation of French literature into Russian created a need for new forms of expression that could not be modeled on the biblical language. This loosened the boundaries of the written norm by blending elements of the spoken into the literary language; the functional differentiation of the diglossic situation became transformed into a thematic and stylistic differentiation between archaic and spoken elements within the new literary style. By the turn of the nineteenth century, elements of written and spoken language became integrated into a new differentiated whole in the artistic writings of Pushkin, the "father of the modern literary language," for his contemporaries, and for the writings of the subsequent generation. Needless to say, the Russian literary language of this time still contained remnants of the old diglossic

situation (in the sense that functionally differentiated varieties were used by the same linguistic community). Translating Russian literary works from that period into Japanese produced a new consciousness in Japan about the possibility of uniting functionally differentiated varieties into a single, stylistically complex whole.

The first group of papers in this volume discusses diglossia as a special type of functional variation. In pre-modern times, literary languages were subject to strict norms of form and function and were representative of cultural heritage, education, and social status. This conditioned relatively closed systems. With the advent of modernity, however, the need to open-up the literary language in order to fulfill additional functions caused the adoption of vernacular elements in what may be called a dissolution of diglossia. All the papers in this group discuss the dissolution of diglossia either as a spontaneous process conditioned by functional needs or as a dismantling process steered by an authority. The distinction between dissolution and dismantling is discussed explicitly for contemporary Czech (cf. Bermel), but similar processes can also be observed in Chinese during the twentieth century (cf. Kaske), leading to a multilevel diglossia of the traditional literary language (such as Mandarin in China), regional languages which contain elements of the literary language and regional dialects (such as Cantonese), and the dialect vernaculars (cf. Su). These new diglossic situations of the 'standard-with-dialects' type are characterized by a redistribution of symbolic functions (cf. Li) in which the literary standard language preserves the symbolic function of national unity and cultural heritage but the regional languages carry regional identities. In all the discussed instances, dissolution of diglossia entailed a shift on the level of socio-cultural evaluation and of functional distribution between the literary language and the vernacular (cf. Gvozdanović).

The second group of papers discusses linguistic awareness and the changing perception of varieties. The papers collected in this group discuss the level of socio-cultural evaluation of varieties as expressed by poets, writers, and linguists, and compares these explicit evaluations with the linguistic practices of the same authors. The precondition for the dissolution of diglossia was, generally speaking, the awareness of the historicity of language and the discovery of the vernacular. In pre-modern language societies, historical language variants were traditionally associated with authority and status, while the spoken ones were held to be a degenerative form of language. This may explain why historical languages like Latin in Europe, Church Slavonic in Russia, Classical Chinese in China, Japan, Korea and Indochina, or classical written forms of Japanese and Chinese were used for centuries in written communication. But how did the change come about? In Japan, the perception of language changed radically during the early modern period, and by the beginning of the nineteenth century the way was being paved to abandon the rigid bipolar differentiation of language as elegant (i.e. classical written) or vulgar (i.e. spoken) and for recognizing the potentials of the vernacular (cf. Árokay). The process of transition that was prompted and set in motion by the far-reaching Western influence on Japanese society and language at the end of the nineteenth century reveals interesting parallels and similarities with the *Questione*

della lingua in Renaissance Italy, where the introduction of Italian as a literary idiom was at stake (cf. Tomasi). In China, the awareness of the need for a new written language was prompted by a similar situation as in Japan. While a clear-cut functional differentiation of the written and spoken forms of Chinese had persisted for centuries, there was a growing consciousness, especially among Chinese literati familiar with Western culture and languages, of the impediments of a static classical language that was not adaptable to changing social and cultural realities (cf. Miyajima). The modern written idiom proved an important tool in overcoming the rigid social structure of the early modern era. As a vernacular shared by "the people" it helped to develop modes of political and social participation and became the idiom of new public media. However, the entanglement of different styles of written Japanese proved an obstacle to the dissolution of diglossia. While literary texts were mostly written in the new style from the beginning of the twentieth century onward, legal texts proved to be the most tenacious conservers of the classical languages (*kanbun* and literary Japanese), which were in use for several decades after (cf. Lee).

The third group of papers discusses the role of translation in the dissolution of diglossia. Contact with other languages played a crucial role in transforming traditional written languages. The model of European languages like English, German, French, or Russian, where diglossia had vanished by the nineteenth century, was an important impetus for language reform in East Asia. However, it was due to the influence of translation that a new vocabulary and new modes of expression developed, thereby facilitating the adaptation of new cultural techniques. Translation is seen as active language brokering in which the translator not only adjusts to the target culture, but also has an active voice and is able to reshape the receiving culture both linguistically and culturally (cf. Yokoyama). Translation in the early period of Japanese modernization had to grapple not only with cultural difference but also with the highly complex linguistic situation in Japan. In the tradition of translation into Japanese, the approximative retelling was successively replaced by translating with a much closer linguistic and cultural correspondence to the source text (cf. Angles). While the contact with Western languages forced translators to become conscious about language varieties it also prompted language change. In order to achieve the necessary correspondence with the text, the language of the receiving culture had to be adapted. Indeed, predicate structures that are in common usage today can be traced back to linguistic innovations that came into being for the first time as a result of this (cf. Kawato). Although the stylistic richness of the classical idiom could not be abandoned easily, successive translations reveal the increased presence of linguistic innovations in Japanese during the *genbun itchi* period (cf. Hoozawa-Arkenau), testifying to the crucial role of translation in the dissolution of diglossia.

We would like to thank the contributors, first, for accepting the invitation to our conference held in Heidelberg during the summer of 2011 and for the timely delivery of their articles for this volume. A special thanks to Naini Robinson who helped the non-native speakers to correct their English texts, gave valuable advice regarding composition, and also cast an eye over the Japanese and Chinese

terminology. We would also like to thank Katharina Kunz and Dominik Wallner who assisted in organizing the conference, and Catherine E. Moir and Susanne Wallner for their invaluable help with proof-reading.

Technical Notes

The Japanese and Chinese names that appear in this volume are in the traditional Japanese and Chinese order, with the surname before the given name. Some of the authors are referred to by their pen names following the same convention. For the transcription of Japanese the modified Hepburn system was used, while Chinese names and terms are transcribed in Pinyin.

Heidelberg
Autumn 2013

Judit Árokay
Jadranka Gvozdanović
Darja Miyajima

Contents

Part I Diglossia and Functional Variation

Understanding the Essence of Diglossia 3
Jadranka Gvozdanović

Czech Diglossia: Dismantling or Dissolution? 21
Neil Bermel

Diglossia and Its Discontent: The Linguistics of National Crisis in Early Twentieth-Century China 39
Elisabeth Kaske

Diglossia in China: Past and Present 55
Jinzhi Su

Shifting Patterns of Chinese Diglossia: Why the Dialects May Be Headed for Extinction 65
Chris Wen-Chao Li

Part II Linguistic Awareness and Changing Perceptions of Varieties

Discourse on Poetic Language in Early Modern Japan and the Awareness of Linguistic Change 89
Judit Árokay

***Genbun itchi and Questione della lingua*: Theoretical Intersections in the Creation of a New Written Language in Meiji Japan and Renaissance Italy** 105
Massimiliano Tomasi

Linguistic Awareness and Language Use: The Chinese Literati at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century 119
Darja Miyajima

Homogenization or Hierarchization?: A Problem of Written Language in the Public Sphere of Modern Japan 141
Yeounsuk Lee

Part III Diglossia and Translation

Modeling the Shifting Face of the Discourse Mediator 161
Olga T. Yokoyama

Translation Within the Polyglossic Linguistic System of Early Meiji-Period Japan 181
Jeffrey Angles

***Genbun itchi* and Literary Translations in Later Nineteenth-Century Japan: The Role of Literary Translations in Forming the "*De-aru*" Style** 207
Michiaki Kawato

The Role of Russian in the Dissolution of Diglossia in Japan: Translations by Futabatei Shimei 223
Noriyo Hoozawa-Arkenau

Contributors

Jeffrey Angles Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo

Judit Árokay Institute of Japanese Studies, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg

Neil Bermel School of Modern Languages and Linguistics, University of Sheffield, Sheffield

Jadranka Gvozdanović Institute of Slavic Studies, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg

Noriyo Hoozawa-Arkenau University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg

Elisabeth Kaske Department of Modern Languages, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh

Michiaki Kawato Faculty of Science and Engineering, Chūō University, Tōkyō

Yeounsuk Lee Graduate School of Language and Society, Hitotsubashi University, Tōkyō

Chris Wen-chao Li Department of Foreign Languages, San Francisco State University, San Francisco

Darja Miyajima Institute of Slavic Studies, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg

Jinzhi Su Institute of Applied Linguistics, Ministry of Education, Beijing

Massimiliano Tomasi Department of Modern and Classical Languages, Western Washington University, Bellingham

Olga T. Yokoyama Department of Applied Linguistics, University of California, Los Angeles

Part I
Diglossia and Functional Variation

Understanding the Essence of Diglossia

Jadranka Gvozdanović

Abstract An investigation of different types of diglossia leads to the differentiation of two levels: (i) level A of socio-cultural constructs, with an opposition of the standard language or variety (normative, associated with an authority, valued as high) and one or more non-standard varieties (valued as low on the abstract level of socio-cultural constructs but associated with social proximity and the interlocutors' common ground), and (ii) level B of functional language choices in actual communicative situations (where, for example, the high variety is the unmarked choice in formal situations and the low variety, or varieties, in informal situations, and any deviation from the unmarked pattern is functionally marked). This paper demonstrates that diglossia, as a functional differentiation of coexisting varieties, is only a special instance of general rules for functional language choice. By examining different diglossic situations, medieval and modern, this paper shows that functional choices at level B are intimately connected with level A of socio-cultural evaluations and that the relation between these two levels can and usually does change over time.

Keywords Socio-cultural constructs • Functionally determined language choices • Comparative diglossia • Political styles

Introduction

Diglossia is a functionally differentiated coexistence of formal and informal language varieties, such that a codified superposed variety is acquired by formal education and used for written literature and formal spoken purposes where it has the status of a high variety (i.e., H), in contradistinction to a low variety (or low

J. Gvozdanović (✉)
Institute of Slavic Studies, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg
e-mail: jadranka.gvozdanovic@slav.uni-heidelberg.de

J. Árokay et al. (eds.), *Divided Languages?*, Transcultural Research – Heidelberg Studies on Asia and Europe in a Global Context, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-03521-5_1,

varieties, i.e. L) used for ordinary conversation. Ever since the notion of diglossia was defined by Ferguson (1959), various aspects of this linguistic division and its actual and potential persistence have been discussed in the literature, showing that diglossia-like phenomena are widespread among the languages of the world. The present paper examines critically the notion of diglossia in view of empirical evidence on functional differentiation. It demonstrates that although the definition proposed by Ferguson aims at being general, it in fact applies to a specific subset of diglossia with reference to canonized written genres, and even these allow for some variation. In line with Bermel's (2001) analysis of standard Czech versus (colloquial and) common usages that exhibit degrees of 'officiality' versus 'unofficiality,' I shall argue for a more flexible and strictly functional understanding of diglossia emerging from dynamically coexisting systems in speech communities (as conceived by Even-Zohar 1979, 1997 in terms of 'polysystem'). Analyses of diglossia situations in cultures as different as early modern Russian and Japanese of the Meiji period show that the underlying rules are, in fact, surprisingly uniform, but when applied to different languages and cultures they may yield different outcomes.

Diglossia

Ferguson (1959) defined the following characteristic features of diglossia:

1. Function (the H variety is used in formal situations, the L variety in informal situations);
2. Prestige (superiority of the H variety);
3. Literary heritage in the H variety;
4. Acquisition (primary acquisition of the L variety, acquisition of the H variety in the course of formal education);
5. Standardization of the H variety (whereas the L variety is assumed to have no codified norm);
6. Stability of diglossia due to adjustment and borrowing;
7. Grammar (H has grammatical categories not present in L and has an inflectional system of nouns and verbs which is much reduced or totally absent in L);
8. Lexicon (existence of many paired items, one in H and one in L, referring to fairly common concepts frequently used in both H and L, where the range of meaning of the two items is roughly the same and the use of one or the other immediately stamps the utterance or written sequence as either H or L);
9. Phonology (Ferguson assumes that H and L have a single phonological structure in which L phonology is basic and H constitutes a supra- or parasystem; this comes to the fore in possibility of substitution of H phonemes by L phonemes).

For diglossia to emerge, according to Ferguson (1959), there must be a sizable body of literature that embodies some of the fundamental values of the speech community (prototypically, a nation) and can therefore adopt the symbolic value

for this community. In due course, the indigenous variety may develop into a new standard language through the formation of additional regional center(s) where this variety is spoken.

Ferguson assumes that a standard-with-dialects situation is not diglossic as long as the standard language is based on an indigenous variety primarily acquired and spoken in that region.

Next to a fundamentally correct diagnosis of formally and functionally asymmetrical relations in diglossic situations, it is necessary to question the exact nature of the binary division assumed by Ferguson to be true for H and L varieties, as well as the assumption that the L variety lacks a norm in a diglossic speech community. Two factors were crucial in this development: the introduction of a prescriptive written norm and of the concept of nation, which conditioned choosing the principal national symbol of a national language and its standardization. We shall assume that these factors revert often polyglossic situations of pre-national periods into diglossic situations that, in part, have persisted until the contemporary modern era.

In contemporary modern times, the strict division between written and oral language of the kind described by Ferguson has become more of an exception than a rule. Modern mass-communication media has widened the opportunities to transgress the boundaries between oral and written canons of communication and even to combine the distinct varieties within one communicative act. This has brought about a tension between language standardization and actual language practices that are reminiscent of pre-national periods, and thus standardization often turns into a political issue.

This paper will focus on two significant examples of diglossia connected with the establishment of a national language based on former low varieties.

The first case study concerns Russia where a complex linguistic situation had existed since the introduction of literacy in the context of conversion at the end of the tenth century AD. At this point Old Church Slavic, the South Slavic language of the church, became the language of cultured literacy in Russia. Although Old Church Slavic was another Slavic language and was at that time understandable to local Russians, it differed from Russian in grammar, phonology, and lexicon. Old Church Slavic remained the language of the Russian sacral literacy until early modernity, but its validity for the other domains of literacy persisted until its difference from the spoken language became too great and the need for a language adequate to serving additional secular purposes of governance became too pressing. In medieval law texts (such as the 1282 copy of the *Novgorodskaja kormčaja*) and treatises, a chancellery language developed that featured a more complex syntax (including subordination) and a more complex morphology (including participles) than spoken Russian at that time. This variety included grammatical elements known from Old Church Slavic texts (such as a more elaborate tense system that was found in the chancellery language but was absent from spoken Russian, cf. also Zaliznjak 1995, 155). In addition, the chancellery language used Old Church Slavic lexical expressions that were not known to Russian at that time.

Besides the chancellery language there was also the linguistic mode used in medieval chronicles. Here the language was Russian enriched in syntax and

morphology with the same Old Church Slavic elements as the chancellery language. However, the choice of lexical elements depended on the reported topic with the effect that Old Church Slavic and medieval Russian lexical elements could coexist within one text. This tradition of chronicle writing persisted until the modern period.

In addition to these early attestations of medieval Russian writing styles, we know that oral styles also existed in a canonized form through folk poetry (known as *byliny*, but attested only since the seventeenth century) and in non-canonized communicative forms recorded in Novgorod birch-bark texts since the eleventh century. In conclusion, next to Old Church Slavic, there were distinguished traditions of writing in local Russian that used elements from Old Church Slavic and distinguished oral traditions.

Old Church Slavic had absorbed local influences in phonology and morphology to the extent that the Russified version of Old Church Slavic as the sacral language in Russia had to be purged of these Russian influences by the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century. After this cleansing, Old Church Slavic and Russian were divided languages with alternative lexical expressions. Strictly speaking, in terms of Ferguson's dichotomy the diglossic situation in Russia has only existed in Russia since the normative cleansing of Old Church Slavic and its restrictive use in formal functions.

Still, the Russian situation reveals that Ferguson's notion of how diglossia may develop is oversimplified (although the author himself points to intermediate variants as languages develop). The Old Russian linguistic situation (until the fifteenth century) was not a diglossia (as had been assumed by Uspensky 1984, 1987 following Ferguson) or triglossia (as assumed by Remnëva 2003 with reference to the chancellery language as the third variety), but rather a polycentric linguistic situation, as assessed by Worth (1977, 254). In this polycentric linguistic situation, "there were several types of language, each bound to a specific social function, and each with its own set of phonetic, morphological, syntactic and lexical norms." This would later provide an important basis for the Russian literary language.

According to Worth (1977, 253) there is no evidence that enables us to posit the existence of a neutral core in medieval Russian (discussed in reference to the Kievan times). If a literary language is viewed as a codified neutral core "whose internal coherence serves as the point of departure for characterizing all deviant styles" (1977, 252), then medieval Russia did not have a literary language. Uspensky (inc. 1984) also argued that there was no neutral variety (or register) in medieval (Muscovite) Rus. This complex situation was thereby significantly different from Ferguson's description of diglossia.

If we apply Ferguson's systemic criteria to the history of Russian, the outcome is a polycentric situation in which in terms of prestige, Old Church Slavic ranked higher than chancellery Russian, which in turn ranked above colloquial Russian. This hierarchy corresponded with a different degree of permeability for colloquial Russian elements, which were barred from Old Church Slavic but acceptable in the chancellery language. Old Church Slavic elements, on the other hand, were

acceptable in all the registers. Indeed, it was only appropriate to speak of sacral content using Old Church Slavic lexemes. Later, with the increasing prominence of secular domains, including scholarship, the functional boundaries of the registers eroded and there arose a successive need for new expressions, for which only the living spoken language could provide the basis. The holiness of Old Church Slavic slowly vanished and by the eighteenth century it could even be used ironically (as demonstrated by Novikov's satirical journals).

Ferguson's criterion of codification of only the H variety is somewhat problematic because other varieties have formulaic conventions and obey internal norms as well, although these were not petrified through formal education. Old Church Slavic initially had only internal norms transmitted by tradition and through formulaic conventions and developed codified norms only during the periods when local Russian was "cleansed" (in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and seventeenth centuries, accompanied by Old Church Slavic grammars and dictionaries since the end of the sixteenth century). This made it too far removed from local Russian and an unlikely candidate for innovations. Thereafter, Old Church Slavic remained petrified in its earlier form, and only Russian could provide the basis for the language innovations that became necessary with the opening of new intellectual fields. Western influences came to Russia with the Enlightenment, which aimed at educating people in their own language. Indeed, Issatschenko (1975, 49) dates Russian diglossia to the period from the eleventh until the seventeenth century. Next to literary and scholarly developments, it was also the rise of Russian national consciousness which promoted further development of the Russian language.

The new polyvalent national language as it was developing during the eighteenth century (accompanied by linguistic and cultural discussions about Western and indigenous Slavic elements) integrated general Slavic, Old Church Slavic, and Russian lexical elements according to stylistic rules for genres (in Lomonosov's Russian grammar, 1755, and Predislovie o pol'ze knig cerkovnyx, 1758); in Pushkin's literary work the boundaries of genres were finally abandoned. This outcome was a polyfunctional national language with roots in the polycentric tradition of Russian medieval texts. The polycentric norms as they developed throughout Russian history show that this was a relatively straightforward development.

Parallel to sacral Old Church Slavic and legal Russian texts (containing Old Church Slavic elements), medieval Russian chronicles developed a third variety of written language that was less framed than the sacral and legal varieties and allowed for combining elements of the other two, as well as spoken language. The *First Chronicle of Novgorod* (preserved in a copy from the end of the thirteenth/beginning of the fourteenth century, based on an original that was two centuries older) typically uses Old Church Slavic lexemes when describing sacral or noble people and Russian when describing "ordinary" people. This can be compared with other medieval chronicles like the *Nestor Chronicle* (probably from Kiev, the center of Russian Christianity), preserved in a copy from the fourteenth century. Hüttl-Folter established that Old Church Slavic provided a linguistic basis while Russian was used mainly for "reasons of pragmatic adequacy, for concrete descriptions, and for

Table 1 Old Church Slavic and Russian lexemes with the same denotative meaning used in the *First Chronicle of Novgorod* (Source: Dietze 1984)

Old Church Slavic (frequency)	Russian (frequency)	Meaning
glava (28)	*golova* (34)	'Head'
grad(ŭ) (227)	*gorod(ŭ)* (249)	'Town'
mrŭtvyi (1)	*mertvyi* (27)	'Dead'
mladyi (3)	*molodyi* (8)	'Young'
mraz(ŭ) (6)	moroz(ŭ) (6)	'Frost'
strana (61)	*storona* (41)	'Side'
xram(ŭ) (5)	*xorom(ŭ)* (18)	'Temple; stately house'

reported speech" (cf. Hüttl-Folter 1983, 97–98). However, in the *First Chronicle of Novgorod* the distribution of Old Church Slavic and Russian lexical forms was more or less even. This can be illustrated by the above data based on the later fifteenth-century copy of the *First Chronicle of Novgorod* (Table 1).

The distribution of Old Church Slavic and Russian lexemes does not reveal a uniform significant bias in any direction: lexemes belonging to both registers were more or less equally at the scribe's disposal. However, their usage was by no means random. Old Church Slavic lexemes had a sacral or an elevated connotation, and Russian lexemes were used in everyday contexts. In the absence of any significant distributional skewing and knowing that the distribution was not random, it is reasonable to assume that the choice between Russian and Old Church Slavic was functionally motivated.

1. <1239> *i mnogo selŭ potratiša okolo Pleskova i stojaša pod* ***gorodomŭ*** *nedělju,*
   no ***goroda*** *ne vzjaša*
   and many villages destroyed around Pleskov and stood under town week
   but town not took
   'and they destroyed many villages around Pleskov and besieged the town for a week, but the town they did not take'
2. <1238> *i tako poganii vzjaša* ***gradŭ*** *i isěkoša vsja mužska polu*
   and so pagans took town and slayed all (of) male gender
   'and so the pagans took the town and slayed all of male gender'
3. <1240> *na Ierusalimŭ xotja plěniti svjatyi* ***grad***
   on(to) Jerusalem wanting (to) plunder holy town
   'on(to) Jerusalem wanting to plunder the holy town'

For the designation of another town—Pleskov—the scribe from Novgorod used the Russian expression in (1). For his own town (its center, including the sacral part) the scribe used the Old Church Slavic expression in (2). These examples are from the older copy of the *First Chronicle of Novgorod*, dating from the end of the thirteenth/beginning of the fourteenth century. In the later copy from the fifteenth century the same principle applied, as is illustrated by the Old Church Slavic form

in the context of the holy town Jerusalem in (3) (these and the following examples originate from Nasonov's edition *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis'*, (Nasonov 1969).

In addition to these examples, where the difference between Old Church Slavic and Russian depends on the outcome of different phonological rules, subtle differences in meaning and corresponding usage options existed. This can be illustrated by the use of *běsŭ* 'evil spirit, devil', a marker of Old Church Slavic usable in the high register and the elevated style of the neutral register, and *diavolŭ* 'devil, evil spirit', common in neutral and low registers. In the *First Chronicle of Novgorod*, there are 31 occurrences of *běsŭ* and 32 occurrences of *diavolŭ* (+10 occurrences of *diavolĭ,* the possessive form), c.f. Dietze (1984, 31; 49). This distribution is roughly even, but the use is not. Consider the following examples from the later copy (*Komissionnyj spisok*):

4. <1073 > *vŭzdviže diavolŭ kotoru vŭ bratĭi a sii jaroslavici byvši meždju soboju v raspre velici*
   instigated devil quarrel among brothers and these sons of Jaroslav having been among themselves in dispute great
   'Devil instigated a quarrel among the brothers and these sons of Jaroslav having been in a great dispute among themselves'
5. <1074 > *Prestavisja Fedosij igumenŭ Pečerĭskago monastyrja skažem že i uspenie ego malo Fedosij bo imějaše obyčaj vnegda že prixodjaštu postnomu vremeni v nedělju maslennuju v večerŭ po obyčaju celovavŭ bratĭju i poučivŭ ix kako provoditi imŭ postŭnoe vremja vŭ molitvaxŭ v noštĭnyx takože i dnevnyx i bljustisja ot pomyslŭ lukavyx i ot běsovĭskago nasijania; běsi bo vsivajutĭ pomyšlenija černcemŭ poxotenija lukava*
   passed away Fedosij patriarch of monastery of Pečera let us tell his accomplishment bit Fedosij thus had custom approaching Lenten time on Palm Sunday evening as customary having kissed brethren and taught them how to spend Lenten time in prayers at night as well at daytime and beware of wicked thoughts and of evil temptation; for evil (spirits) instigate thoughts in monks of wicked desire
   'Fedosij, the patriarch of the Pečera monastery, passed away; let us tell a bit about his accomplishments: as Lenten time was approaching, Fedosij had the custom on Palm Sunday evening, having kissed the brethren, to teach them how to spend the Lenten time in prayers night and day and beware of wicked thoughts and of evil temptation; for evil spirits instigate in monks thoughts of wicked desire'

Based on comparable rules of functional distribution in this chronicle, which reports more often about the death of remarkable people than that of ordinary people, there are 52 instances of *umreti* 'die' and 138 instances of *prestavitisja* 'pass away' (+ two instances of *prěstavitisja*, in accordance with the OCS norm). Church members and rulers 'pass away' whereas the others 'die' as in the following example:

6. <1154 > sŭgnaša novgorodci Sudila s posadničĭstva i po izgnanii 5 denĭ umre
   expelled Novgoroders Sudilo from government and after expelling 5. day died

'Novgoroders expelled Sudilo from government and on the fifth day after the expelling he died'

These examples illustrate the fact that next to the macro-text, the micro-textual episode is decisive for alternative lexical choices: *diavolŭ* is characteristic of secular contexts, whereas *běsi* is characteristic of religious contexts. These lexemes occur in the text not only with their denotative but also with their connotative characteristics. They can co-occur in the text because they are not identical and each contributes (a) to the characterization of the text, and (b) to the connotative characteristics within the text. In the *First Chronicle of Novgorod*, the description of sacral events (including connection with sacral places) and of sacral or elite persons necessitated the usage of Old Church Slavic forms as an expression of esteem, whereas Russian forms were adequate for describing ordinary persons and events. Thereby, not just single lexical items but entire formulaic frames had to be taken into account (as shown, for example, by Worth 1981, 238 etc.).

These findings coincide with the conclusions reached by Hüttl-Folter's investigation of (Old Church Slavic) TRAT versus (Russian) TOROT alternatives in the medieval *Nestor Chronicle* mentioned above. Hüttl-Folter (1981, 209) lists the following motivations for the use of TOROT forms:

1. Pragmatically adequate presentations of facts relating to Rus' = basic motivation (75 TOROT)
2. Direct speech (59 TOROT)
3. Realistic presentation of concrete facts (49 TOROT)

Secondary concomitant motivations:

4. Stylistic variation with synonymous *trat*-forms (21 cases)
5. Sporadic motivations (semantic, phraseological, euphonic, contextual, and technical reasons, i.e. division of words at the end of the line).[1]

In Russia, this functional variation allowing elements of Old Church Slavic and Russian to co-occur, persisted until the seventeenth century, as illustrated by the sixteenth century *Domostroj* (*Household Rules*), a northern Russian book intended to enlighten people about religious and household norms. In this book the textual parts devoted to sacral matters contain Old Church Slavic forms that are absent from the everyday-life descriptions. In the eighteenth century, Lomonosov (1755, 1758) formulated his theory of the three styles, defined by the lexical elements and divided over genres (for example, odes had to be composed in the high style, featuring Old Church Slavic and general Slavic elements; the neutral style was adequate for tragedy, satire etc., and the low, vernacular style, for comedy etc.). This reveals that, functionally speaking, even after the Old Church Slavic

[1] However, I do not agree with Hüttl-Folter's (1981, 211) statement: "If a scribe replaced—for whatever reason—one TOROT by the corresponding TRAT, while copying the text, he would simply make a reverse change in the following lines, whenever the next exchangeable Slavonism occurred."

codification and cleansing of Russian elements, Russia did not have a diglossia but a polyglossia. This situation persisted until the eighteenth century when, due to new secular genres and Western influences, new forms of expression were needed for which the Russian language could be the only model and creative basis. The result was an elevation of Russian to the level of a polyfunctional national language in which the Old Church Slavic lexical elements enriched the Russian lexical stock under preservation of their connotative properties. This marked the final dissolution of the divided-language situation in Russia, which in the end was effectuated not by grammarians, but by writers, above all Alexander Pushkin, who was able to creatively employ the Russian language in new functions, enriched by the stylistic value of Old Church Slavic elements. This period of language unification, which culminated in Pushkin's oeuvre in the 1830s, coincided with the major period of national identity construal in Russia.

As shown above, the basis for Pushkin's innovation was present in the Russian cultural heritage of chronicles, including the *First Chronicle of Novgorod* and others, where the Old Church Slavic and Russian lexical stocks co-occurred with different denotative and connotative functions. For medieval chronicles, the choice of alternative lexical elements was thematically prescribed; in early modernity it was prescribed by genre, and for modern writers it became and remained a matter of free choice.

From the Russian Middle Ages until early modernity, diglossia between Russian and Old Church Slavic existed on the level of socio-cultural constructs (featuring the distinction between high, sacred Old Church Slavic and everyday Russian), but the actual language communication allowed for intermediate varieties based on functionally motivated choices.

Close parallels to this pattern of variation exist in unrelated languages such as Japanese of the Meiji period, during which e.g. descriptions of nature followed the older *bungo* (i.e. high) variety, whereas the *kōgo* variety (with less prestige) was used to depict persons who did not have a high social standing. In both Russian and Japanese divided-language situations, narrative characters as a rule spoke their characteristic language and were also usually depicted in that same language.[2]

The essence of diglossia (or polyglossia) lies in functional complementarity. Complementarity differs subtly from the heterogeneity discussed by Even-Zohar

[2] It was during the *genbun itchi* movement of the Meiji period that, in contradistinction to the previous writing convention in *bungo*, *kōgo* morpho-syntax took dominance and became the basic code, with *bungo* roots increasingly occurring with *kōgo* desinences. These regularities do not fit the definition of code-switching (cf. Muysken 2005; Poplack 2007), but are a matter of language shift.

Formal markers of varieties or registers have a strong indexing function and are employed appropriately, for example in medieval Russia the Old Church Slavic name *Vladimirĭ* was used for nobility and the corresponding Russian name *Volodimirĭ*/*Volodimerĭ* was used for commoners.

Next to this indexing function of what may be called register markers, there is also a framing function performed by function words such as particles. For example, Russian Germans in Siberia are, as a rule, bilingual. Their German speech is usually framed by Russian discourse markers such as *vot* 'and so it happens' (cf. examples from Blankenhorn 2002).

(1979, 1997) in connection with his Polysystem Theory. Even-Zohar (1979, 11) assumed that each system contains both synchrony and diachrony, each of which is also a system separately and together they yield a system of systems that intersect with each other and partly overlap. Therefore, we are dealing essentially with polysystems that are structured wholes and the various coexisting systems within them are interdependent.

Even-Zohar obviously views polysystems as socio-cultural constructs that are obvious to the external observer but not necessarily to the inner participants, that is, to the people who employ polysystems functionally. In other words, Even-Zohar's polysystems are socio-cultural constructs, whereas the interdependent coexisting systems come to the fore in the actual communicative situations where they fulfill functional considerations. I propose to call the level of socio-cultural constructs 'level A', and the level of functional language choices, 'level B'.

In the contemporary Slavic world, a well-known instance of a divided-language situation with intermediate varieties in the sense of registers exists in Czech. Traditionally termed diglossic, also Czech 'diglossia' applies to level A (i.e. the level of socio-cultural constructs), whereas the practical level B exhibits a much more complex situation.

Czech distinguishes between the standard language based on the written language norm of the sixteenth century and the contemporary spoken language, especially the Bohemian regiolect, which has acquired a supra-regional status as 'common Czech', next to Moravian and Silesian. In addition, there is an educated neutral spoken variety, which is close to the standard language but also comprises regional elements, called 'colloquial Czech.'

The concrete usage of these varieties in contemporary written texts, investigated by Čermák (1987) and especially Bermel (2001), shows that the lexical items from these sources exhibit degrees of acceptability in written texts (Čermák 1987, 142) and, moreover, that this applies to phonology, morphology, and syntax as well (Bermel 2001, 53; 59; 65). While most features are neutral and acceptable across registers, some are marked for their register and either confined to it or used on purpose as a marked deviating form in the opposite register (such as standard-language elements used for irony in common Czech, described by Hammer 1985). Bermel's analysis (2001, 2010) of contemporary Czech usage establishes five registers:

1. The official written register (traditionally assigned to standard Czech), which is not appropriate for informal styles of speech,
2. Neutral register (traditionally assigned to standard or to common Czech) with a wide range of applicability,
3. Unmarked unofficial (traditionally assigned to colloquial Czech or to common Czech), used for depicting speech,
4. Marked unofficial (traditionally assigned to common Czech, or rarely to colloquial Czech), acceptable for depicting speech, but not stylistically neutral,
5. Highly unofficial (traditionally assigned to common Czech), non-standard and rarely used in written dialogue.

The choice of these registers is related to the topic and formality of the discourse situation, but in addition probably also to what Auer (2007) calls 'social style,' namely, linguistic means employed for identity construal in conversation.[3] The social dimension was a given dimension in the past, and it became a matter of relatively free choice only with the rise of modernity.

Czech and Russian show that complex relations can exist between symbolic values on the level of socio-cultural constructs on the one hand, and the functional employment of linguistic elements associated with the socio-cultural constructs on the other. Ideally, there should be an immediate mapping between the levels of socio-cultural constructs and of function, but functional needs are so multifaceted that mixed mappings are required.

Ferguson's notion of diglossia referred to both levels without systematically distinguishing between them. However, it is necessary to distinguish these levels in order to acquire a deeper understanding of the processes involved.

Socio-Cultural Constructs and Functional Choices

Having established the referential and the social dimension of the functional choice of varieties, we should now pose a question about limits: Are the coexisting varieties, as systems, fully open as has been assumed by Even-Zohar? And what is it that defines a variety, a register, and a style?

In spite of the general potential of coexisting varieties to be open to new elements, especially but not only in the lexicon, there are ongoing negotiation processes in speech communities about what is and what is not considered acceptable within a variety (exemplified, for example, by the Czech orthography wars analyzed by Bermel 2007). This shows that consciousness about limits of varieties in concrete functional implementations, is in fact a reflection of the socio-cultural construal of these varieties at level A, with effects on level B. There are explicit language norms connected with each standard and/or written and/or high variety, and there are usually implicit language norms connected with any variety, accompanied by mechanisms of accommodation.[4]

The proposed distinction between the level of socio-cultural constructs (level A) and the level of concrete functioning (level B), comes to the fore most clearly in periods of rethinking the standard norm, especially in diglossia-like situations where the previous standard norm is partly artificial and not indigenously spoken in any area of the country. This was the case with Serbo-Croatian in Croatia, which

[3] For practical purposes, I shall continue to use the term 'style' in the traditional sense of the only partially conventionalized set of syntactic and lexical choices. 'Register' is characterized by implicit or explicit norm(s) at all language levels.

[4] In spontaneous language use, change occurs due to abduction mechanisms in the sense of Andersen (2001), by which language acquisition is steered by guessing about matches to the internalized system.

was basically, but not entirely, standardized on the basis of the Hercegovinian dialect (outside of the Croatian national territory). The idea of Serbo-Croatian had emerged in the nineteenth century as an offspring of a South-Slavic nation-state construal and the linguistic common denominator was chosen for the standard language, allowing for regional adaptations of Serbo-Croatian, which remained artificial. Thus the standardized norm of the Croatian variety of Serbo-Croatian was not equal to the spoken language of any of its cultural centers (not even Dubrovnik, which was probably nearest to the standard norm). This is why the dismantling of Serbo-Croatian to the benefit of Croatian in Croatia may be seen as an instance of dissolution of diglossia, albeit one that was mainly restricted to the lexical level.[5]

Since the 1990s there have been separate official national languages valid for the broad central region of what used to be Yugoslavia, and each of these national languages is based on the cultural heritage of the corresponding national tradition. Linguistically, this dissolution has not been drastic at all. Whereas before the dissolution standard Serbo-Croatian was a polycentric (sometimes referred to as 'pluricentric') language with Croatian, Serbian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin variants, now these are separate languages. In order to strengthen their identity, normative processes have set in to introduce archaic elements known to these varieties before the common standardization but left out of the former standard norm. The former standardization processes are now being reverted. Each of these languages is set back in time to its cultural foundations. For Croatian, this also includes borrowed elements that were adapted to the indigenous norm in the linguistic past (such as German borrowings, which were adapted to the Croatian norm and exerted influence on Croatian word formation rules since the Middle Ages, but especially during the eighteenth century and before the national movement of the nineteenth century).

The contemporary shift to the new standard norm of Croatian, which reflects cultural heritage, affects only a minority of the lexicon and an even smaller part of the grammar. The new norm contains the lexical stock preserved in older Croatian texts, with a clear symbolic function, reflected by the mass media as well. The Croatian language of mass media is a clear instance of a shift at the level of sociocultural constructs and not a spontaneous shift arising from language functioning. The shift consists mainly of lexical revaluation of pairs of items with the same denotative meaning but of a different origin and therefore—to the best knowledge of the philologists—of a different value in the standard system; whenever possible, only indigenous Croatian lexemes are carriers of the new standard norm. This change of approach also comes to the fore in the distributional statistics of these items. In contrast to the Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian period, during which the specific Croatian lexemes were marginalized and lexemes common to Croatian and Serbian

[5] The standard varieties of Serbo-Croatian in the republics of Yugoslavia had relatively few systematic differences in phonology, morphology, and syntax; about 20 % of the lexical stock differed. The phonological and grammatical differences remained and the amount of lexical differences has increased since each of the former republics acquired national independence.

(in some cases originally Serbian) were preferred, in the new Croatian national period (in place since 1991) only lexemes with an attested status in the Croatian language before the Yugoslav state have been admitted. This has led to a situation in which, within a decade, a shift in frequency occurred in a limited set of lexical item-pairs from Serbo-Croatian expressions to the alternative Croatian expressions (the former were, in the sense of official variety, partly comparable to Old Church Slavic, and the latter to Russian).[6]

Tables 2 and 3 illustrate the fact that significant shifts occurred in the part of the lexicon denoting official persons and events (such as *ambasada* - > *veleposlanstvo* 'embassy') and in cases where Croatian originally had a markedly different expression from Serbian (*tokom* - > *tijekom* 'during') or a different word-formation suffix (*čitalac* - > *čitatelj* 'reader', *-telj* being an old Croatian suffix).[7]

The new Croatian norm was propagated in newspapers, in the core lexicon used for reporting the news. Literary works were slower in adopting it, as can be seen from Table 3

A comparison of Tables 2 and 3 shows that, for example in the item-pair *ambasador—veleposlanik* 'ambassador,' *ambasador* was the only expression considered correct Serbo-Croatian and admitted to the mass media during Yugoslav times. At the end of the twentieth century, for the Croatian Standard language, the overall percentage of 95 % for *veleposlanik* demonstrates that the standard value has been reverted and that now the Croatian expression is the basic, neutral norm whereas the Serbo-Croatian expression is considered deviating. This is a clear instance of change at the level of socio-cultural constructs, by which a clear preference for Croatian accompanied the introduction of Croatian as the official national language. This process started with official terminology but now, one decade later, the intermediate group has also edged towards a full shift and the linguistic situation is stabilizing. The sensibility for this discriminatory group of items is very high, and the correct form is expected, not only in formal situations.

Finally, let me mention that the Croatian census of 2001 made it possible to ascertain the languages spoken by the inhabitants of Croatia. According to this census, 89.63 % of the Croatian population are Croats, 4.54 % are Serbs, 0.47 % Bosnians and there are other smaller minorities. The Croatian language is spoken by 96.12 % of the population; only 0.05 % Croats declared to also speak Serbo-Croatian (which, in Croatia, is traditionally called 'Croato-Serbian'). Serbian is spoken by 1.01 % of the (Serbian) population, and only 0.11 % of them declared speaking Serbo-Croatian. This would mean that both varieties of the former polycentric (or pluricentric) standard language Serbo-Croatian have practically vanished within one decade, an unprecedented pace of language death. But it is

[6] These items result from the research project "Institutionalization of New Norms in Croatian," financed by the German Research Council 2000–2004, project leader J. Gvozdanović.

[7] In addition to the indigenous lexicon and word-formation models, calques based on German were preserved and provided a basis for word-formation models in Croatian, such as German *Bahnhof* - > Croatian calque *kolodvor* 'train station,' which are absent from Serbian.

Table 2 Serbo-Croatian versus Croatian synonymous pairs with a significant switch in the distribution: the Serbo-Croatian period (Moguš 1999, 1930s–1970s), the 1990s following the declaration of Croatian independence (CNC, over nine million lexical items), the newspapers of the period 1998–2000 (MCC cf. Gvozdanović (2010))

	Moguš (M): 1930s–1970s, one million attestations		Croatian National Corpus (CNC) 1990s–2000, over nine million attestations		Mannheim Croatian Corpus (MCC) 1998–2000, over nine million attestations	
Variant	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
advokat—odvjetnik 'lawyer'	27–4	87:13	30–527	5:95	16–1318	1:99
ambasador—veleposlanik 'ambassador'	21–0	100:0	368–474	44:56	89–1712	5:95
autoput—autocesta 'highway'	10–3	77:23	9–903	1:99	17–369	4:96
činilac—činitelj 'factor'	37–1	97:3	33–36	48:52	4–70	5:95
čitalac—čitatelj 'reader'	24–3	89:11	55–912	6:94	24–914	3:97
davalac—davatelj 'issuer'	7–0	100:0	8–40	17:83	7–75	9:91
dobrovoljac—dragovoljac'volunteer'	3–0	100:0	62–185	25:75	56–1032	5:95
gledalac—gledatelj 'spectator'	48–0	100:0	28–553	5:95	70–1758	4:96
hapšenje—uhićenje 'arrest'	6–0	100:0	51–245	17:83	15–472	3:97
kasarna—vojarna 'barracks'	19–1	95:5	60–186	24:76	10–331	3:97
kompozitor—skladatelj 'composer'	8–7	53:47	106–331	24:76	21–472	4:96
omladina—mladež 'youth'	71–8	90:10	78–564	12:88	36–1429	2:98
posjetilac—posjetitelj 'visitor'	24–0	100:0	34–333	9:91	42–775	5:95
raskršće—raskrižje 'cross-roads'	43–1	98:2	35–89	28:72	3–228	1:99
saopćenje—priopćenje 'message'	31–0	100:0	13–581	2:98	1–2382	0.04:99.96
saopćiti—priopćiti 'convey a message'	25–1	96:4	40–217	16:84	5–1589	0.3:99.7
sekretarica—tajnica 'secretary'	2–0	100:0	34–220	13:87	23–737	3:97
štampa—tisak 'print'	53–4	93:7	51–931	5:95	36–1697	2:98
štampati—tiskati 'print'	7–7	50:50	11–168	6:94	16–278	5: 95
tokom—tijekom 'during'	25–7	78:22	126–2444	5:95	53–4787	1:99

likely that if these same speakers underwent a language test in Serbo-Croatian they would probably perform quite well. What has died out in this case is not the language itself but its status as the standard variety at the level of socio-cultural constructs.

Conclusion

The discussion of the instances of so-called diglossia in medieval Russian as compared with two contemporary Slavic languages, Czech and Croatian, yields surprisingly similar results. In the past, as much as in present times, the choice of

Table 3 Distribution of Serbo-Croatian versus Croatian synonyms over time and genre (Moguš's dictionary of one million attestations covers the 1930s–1970s, Croatian National Corpus covers the 1990s, the presented data are from 05.05.2002 and the total number of items 9 156 446; Mannheim Croatian Corpus covers the end of the twentieth century and contains over nine million items from daily newspapers)

	M	CNC	CNC	CNC	CNC	CNC	CNC	MCC
Variant	1930s–1970s	1990s inform. newspapers	1990s inform. journals	1990s inform. books	1990s literary prose	1990s essays, interviews	1990s total	Newspapers 1998–2000 Total
ambasador-veleposlanik 'ambassador'	**21–0**	125–537	2–0	0–4	2–0	0–0	**368–577**	**89–1712**
avion-zrakoplov 'airplane'	**100–5**	176–366	0–1	14–2	3–2	1–0	**315–390**	**726–1964**
čitalac-čitatelj 'reader'	**24–3**	6–507	2–9	6–196	2–10	27–88	**55–912**	**24–914**
izvještaj-izvješće 'report'	**55–0**	312–798	2–2	93–123	19–2	1–4	**521–948**	**769–2297**
oficir-časnik 'officer'	**68–7**	65–239	0–0	20–45	15–31	3–1	**153–343**	**103–533**
prisutan-nazočan 'present'	**104–2**	446–800	23–7	262–46	46–7	5–4	**933–906**	**720–1376**
uniforma-odora 'uniform'	**49–14**	79–72	1–0	19–66	12–18	2–0	**208–185**	**120–239**
zakletva-prisega 'oath'	**9–4**	38–28	0–0	12–2	5–3	0–0	**65–42**	**45–99**

code depends on socio-cultural evaluation of language-choice possibilities and symbolic values with respect to communicative conventions (level A) and on functional evaluation of communicative effects and depicted entities and events (level B). The level of socio-cultural constructs was to a large extent prescriptive for functional possibilities in the Middle Ages, and the relation between these levels has allowed for increasing choices since the beginning of modernity. In addition, processes of national identity construal were the most powerful vehicle behind promotion of spoken languages to the status of standard languages, accompanied by dissolution of diglossia.

On the level of socio-cultural constructs, co-existing language varieties in a speech community have clear limits, an identity, and possibly a "value" (H versus L or non-H) attached to them. "Value" is, as a rule, connected with the official status, its conceptual basis, and the authority warranting the official status. On the level of function, however, the limits are not so clear and the varieties are permeable to elements from other varieties which is prevented only by standardization and formal education.

On the functional level, intermediate and mixed varieties exist in diglossic situations and even persist to some extent after diglossia dissolution (such as the language variation in Pushkin's work, which partly continues the variation used in medieval chronicles). Dissolution of diglossia is essentially a change on the level of socio-cultural constructs with subsequent functional consequences.

References

Andersen, Henning. 2001. "Actualization and the (uni)directionality of change." In *Actualization. Linguistic Change in Progress,* edited by Henning Andersen, 225–249. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Auer, Peter, ed. 2007. *Style and Social Identity. Alternative Approaches to Linguistic Heterogeneity*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bermel, Neil. 2001. *Register variation and language standards in Czech*. München: Lincom.

———, 2007. *Linguistic Authority, Language Ideology, and Metaphor; The Czech Orthography Wars*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

———, 2010. "O takzvané české diglosii v moderním světě." *Slovo a slovesnost* 71(1): 5–30.

Blankenhorn, Renate. 2002. "Variabilität von Sprachkompetenz und Sprachverhalten bei Bilingualen." *Beiträge der europäischen Linguistik POLYSLAV* 5: 21–30. *Die Welt der Slaven*.

Čermák, František. 1987. "Relations of spoken and written Czech." *Wiener slawistischer Almanach* 20: 133–150.

Dietze, Joachim. 1984. *Frequenzwörterbuch zur jüngeren Redaktion der ersten Novgoroder Chronik*. München: Sagner.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1979. "Polysystem Theory." *Poetics Today* 1979 I, 1–2: 287–310.

———. 1997. "Factors and Dependencies in Culture: A Revised Draft for Polysystem Culture Research." *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée* XXIV (1, March): 15–34.

Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. "Diglossia." *Word. Journal of the linguistic circle of New York* 15: 325–340.

Gvozdanović, Jadranka. 2010. "Jezik i kulturni identitet Hrvata." *Kroatologija* 1: 39–57.

Hammer, Louise. 1985. *Prague Colloquial Czech: A Case Study in Code Switching*. PhD diss., Indiana University.

Hüttl-Folter, Gerta 1981. "The lexical heritage from the Old Russian chronicles and the formation of literary Russian." In *The Formation of the Slavonic Literary Languages*, edited by Stone, Gerald and Dean S. Worth, 207–214.

———. 1983. "Zur ostslavischen Lexik im *načal'nyj svod* und in der Nestorchronik." In *Studia Slavica in Honorem Viri Doctissimi Olexa Horbatsch: Festgabe zum 65. Geburtstag. Bd. l: Beiträge zur oststawischen Philologie (I),* edited by Gerd Freidhof, Peter Kosta, and Michael Schütrumpf, 77–87. München: Sagner.

Issatschenko (=Isačenko), Aleksandr V. 1975. Mythen und Tatsachen über die Entstehung der russischen Literatursprache. Wien: ÖAW.

Lomonosov, M. 1755. Rossijskaja grammatika. Sanktpeterburg: Pri Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk.

Lomonosov, M. V. 1758. Predislovie o pol'ze knig cerkovnyx v rossijskom jazyke. In: Lomonosov, M.V. 1952. *Polnoe sobranie sočinenij*, 7, 585–592. Eds. V. V. Vinogradov, S. G. Barxudarov, G. P. Blok. Moskva, Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Moguš, Milan. 1999. *Hrvatski čestotni rječnik*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Muysken, Pieter. 2005. *Bilingual Speech*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nasonov, A.N., ed. 1969 *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis': staršego i mladšego izvodov*. The Hague: Mouton.

Poplack, Shana. 2007. "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish *y termino en espanol:* toward a typology of code-switching." In *The Bilingual Reader,* edited by Wei Li, 213–243. London: Routledge.

Remnëva, Marina L. 2003. *Puti razvitija russkogo literaturnogo jazyka XI–XVII vv*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta.

Uspensky (= Uspenskij), Boris A. 1984. "The language situation and linguistic consciousness in Muscovite Rus' the perception of Church Slavic and Russian." In *Medieval Russian Culture*, edited by Henrik Birnbaum, and Michael S. Flier, 365–385. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Uspenskij, Boris A. 1987. *Istorija russkogo literaturnogo jazyka (XI–XVII jazykov)*. München: Sagner.

Worth, Dean S. 1977. *On the structure and history of Russian*. München: Sagner.

———. 1981. "Vernacular and Slavonic in Kievan Rus.'" In *The Formation of the Slavonic Literary Languages*, edited by Stone, Gerald and Dean S. Worth, 233–241. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.

Zaliznjak, A.A. 1995. *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt*. Moskva: "Jazyki russkoj kult'tury."

Czech Diglossia: Dismantling or Dissolution?

Neil Bermel

Abstract This contribution looks at two trends in the evolution of Czech diglossia over the past 100 years that can be described as the 'dismantling' and 'dissolution' of the diglossic language situation. *Dismantling* concerns official attempts to reach a 'rapprochement' between H and L by modifying the prescribed description of H to incorporate elements from L. *Dissolution* concerns unofficial changes resulting from societal upheaval and technological advances that have caused a blurring between public and private space and between the formal and informal spheres. The evident retreat of the H code, 'Literary Czech,' calls into question the extent to which Ferguson's classic definitions still apply in the Czech lands. Official changes have attempted to maintain the functionality and prestige of H, but have frequently merely enriched H with previously proscribed features of the dominant L code, 'Common Czech.' Unofficial changes have seen L expand into domains that were previously the exclusive preserve of H. Attitudes characteristic of diglossic language situations continue to sustain the distinction, while the actual functional uses of the two varieties have already departed substantially from a diglossic language situation.

Keywords Diglossic retreat • Dismantling • Dissolution • Literary Czech • Common Czech • Language attitudes

Introduction

Diglossia can be defined as a type of register variation, a "linguistic variation that is stratified by context of use only and not by the social identity of the user" (Hudson 2002, 3, paraphrasing Halliday 1968). This more traditional and narrow view of

N. Bermel (✉)
School of Modern Languages and Linguistics, University of Sheffield, Sheffield
e-mail: n.bermel@sheffield.ac.uk

J. Árokay et al. (eds.), *Divided Languages?*, Transcultural Research – Heidelberg Studies on Asia and Europe in a Global Context, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-03521-5_2,

diglossia effectively differentiates it from societal bilingualism, which was the focus of much research into diglossia in the 1970s and 1980s. It will prove useful as it allows us to focus on certain aspects of social attitudes towards diglossic codes without wading into the waters of imperialism, colonialism, post-colonialism, and other factors that play a role in societal bilingualism.

Ever since the emergence, in the mid-nineteenth century, of a de facto national standard based on an archaic variant of the written language, Czech has served as the Slavonic world's best-known example of a diglossic language situation; most contemporary descriptions start from this assumption (see, for example, Janda 2005; Short 1991; Janda and Townsend 2000; Grygar-Rechziegel 1990; Micklesen 1978) even though some go on to question it (for example, Giger 2003; Dickins 1995; Eckert 1993). The Czech linguistic tradition has taken note of, but not typically worked with, the term *diglossia,* preferring instead concepts like *functional styles* or *functional varieties* that are more generally applicable and less specific to the Czech situation (see, for example, Daneš 1999 [1988]; Sgall et al. 1992; Cvrček 2008, although note its greater applicability in Čmejrková and Hoffmannová 2011).

The belief in Czech diglossia is rooted in the pervasive and noticeable differences between H and L varieties of the language on the phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical levels. In Bohemia, where 60 % of the country's population resides, the H variant known as 'Literary Czech' is learned at school and serves as the medium for official and formal communication, both spoken and written, while the L variant, 'Common Czech,' fulfills all other language functions. The absence of 'Common Czech' in the eastern third of the country, where various local dialects and interdialects occupy the L position, has supposedly helped to maintain the prestige and functionality of 'Literary Czech,' which is said to have a 'superdialectal' range that makes it the only truly national code.

This contribution will first recap the geography and historical sources of diglossia in the Czech language community. It will then examine the contemporary language situation and how paths of diglossic retreat in Czech can be classified either as attempts at dismantling or as trends in dissolution. My focus will be on the attitudes towards variation, oscillation, and mixing of codes rather than on proving the existence of examples of such variation. The reasons for this are twofold. First, examples are plentiful in today's media-saturated world, whereas only a couple of generations ago the preservation and dissemination of non-published texts was rare. Any sounding into the prevalence of codes will yield a plethora of non-H data from contemporary language and reveal a paucity in the records before the advent of cheap storage and public dissemination of oral works; however, this tells us nothing about the actual prevalence of such data. Second, I will contend that attitudes, rather than actual usage, are perhaps the only key means of measuring the degree to which Czech can still be considered a diglossic language situation.

Geography and Historical Roots

Czech is spoken by roughly 10.5 million speakers in a geographically compact and monolingual area in Central Europe. There are diaspora communities around the world, but few have maintained Czech beyond the second or third generation. Roughly 60 % of the population of the Czech Republic lives in the country's western (Bohemian) dialect zone, which is geographically the largest dialect area and includes the capital, Prague. The dialects here are differentiated minimally, and their more marked features tend to be confined to the smaller towns and villages. The term 'Common Czech' (*obecná čeština*) is typically applied to all the spoken varieties in this region and especially to the variety that is essentially superregional across the Bohemian speech area. The eastern third of the country, which dialectally and historically divides into the larger region of Moravia and the smaller area of Silesia in the northeast, shows much more variegation. Dialects are more profoundly differentiated here and there is no unifying "Moravian" or "Silesian" superregional code.

The historical roots of Czech diglossia can be traced in any number of publications. They stem from the changing fortunes and status of Czech during the period (1500–1850) in which the modern European standard languages took shape.

Prior to 1620 Czech enjoyed the status of an emerging literary and administrative language. Despite the occasional attempt at standardizing, no single standard or set of orthographic conventions existed. The 1620 defeat of Czech Protestant nobles by Habsburg Catholic forces at the Battle of White Mountain set in motion a train of events that over time reduced the importance of Czech in many official contexts and is often referred to as the "time of decline" (*doba úpadku,* for a discussion of this see Starý 1995).

The imposition of more direct rule from Vienna and an expansion of the use of German at the expense of Czech caused a contraction in the spheres of use for the Czech language. As early as 1627, German became the language of transaction throughout the empire, supplanting Czech as the language of administration, education, and commerce. Czech retained its official status alongside German, but it gradually vanished from the major urban registers (*desky*) between 1730 and 1774 (Havránek 1980 [1936], 72). Higher education in Czech ceased in the 1600s; there were moves to restrict the primary teaching of Czech, but it continued sporadically and at a low level throughout the period (Gammelgaard 1996, 23; Auty 1956, 243).

This functional contraction was by no means uniform or complete. Writing in Czech continued, and there were even efforts to expand the language's functional domains. Linguists like Rosa attempted to write grammars in Czech in order to demonstrate its applicability in linguistic discourse (Jelínek 1971, 19–20).

The period from 1300 to 1600 had seen many profound changes in the phonology and morphology of Czech, which were only partially reflected in the conservative writing practices of the time. These processes continued, albeit at a slower pace, throughout the Baroque epoch; one notable feature of Baroque Czech was the

gradual opening of the written language to some of these innovations, which had previously been ignored. There was considerable variation in written practice where it existed: "Baroque Czech" was often inclusive of certain innovative linguistic features, although each author treated them differently (Havránek 1980 [1936], 73–74; Jelínek 1971, 18–20; Stich 1987, 121).

The end of the eighteenth century marked the beginning of the National Revival (*národní obrození*) in the Czech lands, as elsewhere across Central and Eastern Europe. Renewed interest in the Czech literary patrimony manifested itself first in the appearance of several grammars of Czech (Tomsa 1782; Dobrovský 1792; Pelcl 1795), which took as their starting point the written language of the sixteenth through to eighteenth centuries. The choice of grammatical forms and phonological features sanctioned in each handbook was largely a matter of the author's personal taste. Although the so-called Kralice Bible of 1579–1593 was a significant reference point for all the authors, some legitimacy was granted to features and forms that had not appeared in that relatively early work (details in Havránek 1979, 88–89).

The National Revival soon passed from a renewed interest in things past to a concerted effort to resurrect the language's use in more spheres. The period from 1810 to 1820 saw the ascendance of Dobrovský's relatively conservative feature set as a model for contemporary writing and even for speaking as previously Germanized households underwent voluntary "Czechification" (Čuřín 1985, 192).

Following a phase of expansion and consolidation of this standard, the period from 1850 to 1890 can be characterized as the rise of the so-called knife-grinders (*brusiči*). The term is based on a metaphor in an early Czech grammar, Jiří Konstanc's 1674 *Lima linguae bohemicae (Whetstone of the Czech Language)*. In it, he proposes that the language is a tool, much like a knife. The grammar book we use to shape or hone our language is thus the whetstone. By extension (and by slightly mixing the metaphor), the grammarian who writes the grammar becomes the maker of the whetstone, or the knife-grinder (see Thomas 1991, 21–22). These "grinders" attempted to return the language to an even purer and less sullied state than that described in Dobrovský's work. They were determined to root out real and perceived adulterations (mostly Germanisms) to the language and thereby make it fitter for use. In so doing, they introduced a slew of real and mock archaisms into the written language of the period.

At the end of the nineteenth century the most common spoken code, which was by that point quite far removed from the "approved" standard, was labeled insufficient for prestigious forms of communication. The standard code, meanwhile, had undergone a process of lengthy differentiation from the most common spoken code, so that it was understood to have sufficient prestige to present an alternative to German. It was promulgated as a variety for the whole nation—with an established literary pedigree stretching back centuries—and was supported by a growing educational establishment and standardization industry. The entire situation, as Gammelgaard (2002, 613) notes, was characterized by a consistent preference for "quality over efficiency" and this formed the basis for the current language situation.

The Basics of Czech Diglossia Today

In his 1959 article, Ferguson sets out a number of criteria that make a language system diglossic. These can be summarized as follows: (1) Coexistence of two varieties, of which (2) one has a prestige connected to the (3) history of letters that the other lacks. The (4) H form is learned, while L is acquired as a native variety; as a learned variety (5) H has codified standards found in handbooks, which L lacks, having only a set of generally accepted norms. The position of both varieties vis-à-vis each other (6) is stable. As regards the differences between them, (7) the grammatical inventory of L is a reduced version of H, and (8) much of the lexicon is shared, although there are numerous doublets in everyday vocabulary that distinguish the two varieties from each other, while (9) the varieties share a phonemic inventory (Ferguson 1959).

In general, Bohemian Czech can be mapped onto many of these criteria.

1. There exist two varieties, 'Literary Czech' (LitC) as the H code, and 'Common Czech' (ComC) as the L code. The differences can be seen in parallel versions of referentially identical pairs of sentences, which exhibit phonemic, morphological, and syntactic differences (Table 1):

   Overlap between the varieties (i.e. situations where both are suitable) remains uncommon. In the vast majority of situations only one variety is felt to be suitable. LitC (H) is used for scholarly, technical, discipline-specific, legal and administrative writing, on TV, and in newspaper and radio reporting. ComC (L) is used in ordinary informal spoken communication. Selection of the "incorrect" variety causes embarrassment or creates a feeling of inappropriateness (Ferguson wrote of "ridicule," but this is too strong for Czech).
2. LitC (H) has a prestige that ComC (L) lacks. This is a critical point that we will return to. The prestigious position of LitC holds not only in Bohemia with respect to ComC but also obtains in the standard/dialect situation found in Moravia and Silesia.
3. The heritage of Czech letters belongs to LitC (H); ComC (L) is not directly connected with classical literary activity. This again holds true for Moravian dialects.
4. LitC (H) is not acquired actively in natural conversation; speakers must consciously learn to express themselves in it (i.e. to write and speak) through formal instruction. They will, of course, be exposed to LitC even before school age, seeing it on television, hearing books read aloud, etc., but active acquisition for most people occurs in school. Hudson (2002, 5) labels this the one marker shared by all diglossic situations: the fact that L is the "native tongue" of all speakers as distinct from non-diglossic dialect/standard dichotomies, where class or social differences may mean that some people are "dialect speakers" and others are "standard speakers." In Czech the use of the H and L varieties is still said to be governed by functional and/or situational criteria, not by social striation.
5. LitC (H) has codified standards that can be found in prestigious handbooks, whereas ComC (L) has generally accepted norms; that is, a common "inventory

Table 1 Examples of differences between literary and 'Common Czech'

H:	S	Takovými	lidmi	bychom	nemluvili
L:	S	Takovejma	lidma	bysme	nemluvili
	With	$Such_{INSTR\text{-}PL}$	$People_{INSTR\text{-}PL}$	$Would_{1PL}$	$Not\text{-}talk_{PL}$
	O		tvém	bytě	
	Vo	Tom	tvym	bytě	
	About	$That_{LOC\text{-}SG}$	$Your_{LOC\text{-}SG}$	$Flat_{LOC\text{-}SG}$	

We would not talk about that flat of yours with such people (Sgall et al. 1992, 4)

of linguistic devices used by a language community" (Nebeská 1996, 17), but it lacks codified standards.

6. The position of both varieties vis-à-vis each other is changing but its general outline has existed since the beginning of the nineteenth century. For Fishman (2002) this stability, rather than the learning dichotomy, is the one absolutely necessary characteristic of a diglossic situation.
7. The grammatical inventory of ComC (L) is in some respects a reduced version of the grammatical inventory of LitC (H). The complexity and diversity of categories is largely the same in both varieties (e.g. there is no wholesale asymmetry in the number of cases or tenses available), but in ComC there is a reduction in the diversity of patterns and forms available for each function: the L variety has fewer separate paradigms and more syncretism.
8. LitC and ComC share the vast majority of their lexicon, but nonetheless there are numerous doublets in their everyday vocabulary that allow us to describe an utterance as "belonging" to H or L. For example, in kinship terms we can note *otec* > < *táta* (father), *matka* > < *máma* (mother), *bratr* > < *brácha* (brother), *sestra* > < *ségra* (sister), *strýc* > < *strejda* (uncle); in other everyday words we see *dům* > < *barák* (house), *tlačítko* > < *čudlík* (button), *dívka* > < *holka* (girl), *hoch* > < *kluk* (boy).
9. LitC and ComC together share a single phonemic inventory, although the distribution of these phonemes and their relationships to each other are different in each variety.

Diglossic Retreat

In evaluating the retreat of diglossia in the Czech lands, I will use two shorthand terms: *dismantling* and *dissolution*.

By *dismantling* I mean efforts "from above" to reduce the frequency of functional differences between the two varieties. There have been efforts at a *large-scale dismantling* of the existing written standard that includes opening it to all elements of the L code used widely across Bohemia; these have some currency in the academic mainstream as defensible language policy options, but are not viewed as being acceptable to the general public. Among the proponents have been

prominent Czech linguists like František Čermák (in English see e.g. Čermák 1993, 39, or on the "cultural 'terrorism' of the written language" see Čermák 1987, 140) and Petr Sgall (see in particular contributions such as Sgall 1990, 1998–1999; English publications include Sgall 1994; Sgall et al. 1992, among others) and younger Czech scholars like Václav Cvrček, who have focused on the role of codificatory practice in keeping ordinary usage originating in L formally excluded from the sphere of H (Cvrček 2008), as well as some distinguished foreign scholars of the Czech language situation like Charles Townsend (2003). A view favoring *partial dismantling* is more widespread among the linguists who write the officially sanctioned codificatory manuals; their approach is to evaluate each ComC element individually over time and where these are judged to have achieved a degree of "neutrality" in register, the codifiers admit them to LitC. This, of course, entails a series of subjective judgments by a committee of the appointed, and their particular decisions are always subject to heated debate *ex post facto*.

Dissolution is the result of developments coming from below in which a blending and mixing of the two codes occurs, blurring the perception of a clear boundary between the two varieties. By *blending* I mean changes in the evaluation of items. For example, what was a colloquial/conversational form in L begins to be perceived as a neutral spoken form; or what had been neutral written H at one time comes to be perceived as archaic, stilted, or learned. *Mixing* refers to the development of new hybrid genres, in the Czech context typically favoring the expansion of L forms into domains previously reserved for H. For example, in underground and *samizdat* literature of the Communist period, the use of spoken forms, idiom, and syntax from L emerged as a narrative style (e.g. in works like Jiří Svoboda's *Autostopem kolem světa* and in the fiction of Bohumil Hrabal, which moved from official publication to *samizdat* and back again, see Svozil 2008). In contemporary literature, this preference for L forms has now moved into mainstream fiction as a common form of confessional first-person narration (witness the widely acclaimed novels *Hrdý Budžes* and *Paměť mojí babičce* as well as the monumental *Sestra,* to name but a few). The growth of television also fostered the use (sometimes inadvertent) of L forms in public settings; as film and video-making became cheaper and moved into amateur realms, this tendency intensified and today amateur videos free of any "standardizing" influence can be made available to the world on YouTube. Ferguson's main example of a hybrid written genre was the informal note (to a relative or servant), but the explosion of informal, practical, and immediate forms of writing such as e-mail, texting, tweeting, and instant messaging have made aspects of writing more akin to that of speaking, thus fostering the use of L forms in writing.

Dismantling as an Historical Process

LitC in its modern incarnation was, even at the beginning of the nineteenth century, somewhat different from other H codes in that it had always been intended as a "language of the people," not of the elite. It was revived, after all, to challenge the

dominance of German in the kingdom, and the Czech language was at the time predominantly known as the spoken language of the rural population. However, as LitC was propagated extensively to the Czech public starting in the 1820s, Czech schooling spread rapidly. For instance, Newerkla (2003, 191–193) shows that by 1875, 80 % of Czechs in Plzeň attended Czech schools (where German was, of course, taught, but Czech was the primary language of instruction).

As noted earlier, in the corpus planning plane LitC took on an ever more puristic bent after the mid-nineteenth century. At the same time, on the status-planning plane, extremes of belief about the spheres in which LitC should apply were moderated. There was a growing recognition, even among purists, that ordinary speech behavior cannot be substantially modified. As opposed to the earlier revivalists (*buditelé*), many later knife-grinders resigned themselves to a diglossic situation in which they could influence only certain aspects of people's linguistic behavior. We can observe a change in the way linguists understood language, moving from late nineteenth-century positivism to early twentieth-century determinism.

By *positivism* here I mean a view in which speech is moldable and language habits can be assimilated to the desired norm. For example, the linguist Martin Hattala wrote:

> In this action [i.e. language], men of course are led by laws, which are in general so esoteric and secret that not even an educated man knows all of them nor can he recognize them until he has learned for himself the great majority of them; that is, aside from those concerning sounds and declension and conjugation, everything else is primarily a matter of habit, which inevitably prevails in every language. The uneducated man then speaks only according to this [habit], which is of course completely regular in its own way and adapted to the laws of the language, being similar in its way to bees, who make their honeycomb with amazingly precise regularity and fill them with honey, without ever having learned any of what they might need for this purpose or have to spare. For this reason M. Muller is right to describe the strength of habit in this way among others:
>
> "Like everything in the world, language too of course changes unceasingly; but man is not able to master these changes as he wishes, that is, to create them or stop them when he might want. It would be just as pointless to attempt to change the laws governing language or put a stop to the arbitrary invention of words as it would be to attempt to change those laws by which the circulation of blood in our bodies is governed or by which our body over a particular time to one extent or another puts on weight. For man can only gain mastery over nature to the extent that he knows her laws and keeps them: in this way, poets, wise men and linguists can master language only to the extent to which they know its laws and can dispose them" (Hattala 1877, 120; translation by Bermel).

Hattala thus still believes in the power of the individual to overcome his linguistic predestination and influence his own language, but he clearly views this as an activity for the social elite, while the masses will continue to speak "as their beaks have grown," to translate a Czech saying. This sort of attitude sets the scene for the Czech purism of the twentieth century.

In concert with this, we can see a *determinist* trend growing throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. In this account, speech is a natural phenomenon and language habits cannot be altered reliably; codification should therefore, out of necessity, adjust where current recommendations diverge greatly from

habit and practice. Thus, throughout this early period the focus of diglossic practice narrowed to the arena of public discourse, namely in writing and speech fulfilling some official function or role.

The following statement found in *Naše řeč* (*Our Language*), a journal founded to combat the "decline" in standards during the early part of the twentieth century and widely regarded as a purist organ, is characteristic of this *determinism*:

> Although the humanists returned to classical Latin, it was still a dead language. Live speech forges irrepressibly forward in its development, and even in times of so-called decline, language does not go backward but forward, even if the arc of its development is broken. Every attempt to revive expressions that have died off must therefore end in failure. If by some chance, through pressure from an authority such as schools, etc. we managed to revive e.g. the genitive of negation in all the places it had formerly appeared, [. . .] once the pressure let up just a little, the elemental wave of linguistic development that had abandoned it in the first place would sweep it away (Naše řeč, unsigned, 1925, 20–21; translation by Bermel).

Even purists were cognizant to some extent of the fact that they were fighting a losing battle; the author enjoins those of like mind to choose their linguistic battles carefully and not to waste their effort. Meanwhile, reformers like Vilém Mathesius saw this as an opportunity to use scholarship to rationalize and target intervention selectively at aspects of the standard language:

> It would be quite possible to rely solely on the refining influence of authorial practice and on the language commentary of non-linguists gifted with a delicate sensibility for semantic nuance and rhythm and the melody of speech. These forces sufficed to form and refine the majority of standard languages that arose before the nineteenth century, and these are the most refined languages in the world. But the current state of linguistic theory enables us to accelerate the process of refinement a bit through scholarly intervention—and anyway, the current position of standard Czech is rather different from that of the great cultural languages at the time of their refining (Mathesius 1932, 25; translation by Bermel).

As this determinist attitude gathered pace, it came to moderate even purist views of the language, but its most obvious outlet was in the development of "Prague School" functionalism, which began to take shape in the 1920s.

In both the positivist and determinist trends we can see a number of continuities in the development of Czech language culture in the period 1870–1950. There continues to be a special role for the LitC and the H functions it encompasses, and all sides acknowledge the ongoing need for regulation that will ensure that LitC remains "fit for purpose" even if in some accounts it will be more limited in its application.

One bellwether of change is the series of manuals that later came to be known as the *Rules of Czech Orthography* (*Pravidla českého pravopisu*). After the privately published *Orthographical Index* (*Pravopisný ukazatel*) of 1886 came out, a government commission was formed to provide an officially sanctioned manual for use in schools across the Czech-speaking lands of Austria-Hungary. The first edition was published in 1902 under the title *Rules Regarding Czech Orthography and Morphology* (*Pravidla hledící k českému pravopisu a tvarosloví*), and was revised at ever-lengthier intervals. At first, each version contained a grammar, spelling, and

punctuation manual, and a spelling and grammar dictionary. After 1957 the manual was split into two editions, one for the general public, focused on common words and usage, and one for editorial use, focused on the widest possible range of vocabulary; grammatical information was found only in the dictionary section of the general public edition.

The Rules of Czech Orthography and its predecessors can serve as a handy indicator of dismantling activities. Over the years, the handbooks have gradually admitted more and more features into LitC that would previously have been labeled as ComC. This began in 1902 on a purely lexical level when efforts were made to standardize vowel length in many words where written usage had previously been varied and inconstant. In the 1940s and 1950s the focus shifted in part to morphology: we begin to see admission of a few ComC morphological forms that had previously been excluded from LitC. This trend gathered pace starting in the 1960s and continued through the 1980s when more and more ComC morphological forms were admitted (for examples see Bermel 2007,108–110, 112–115, 121–122, 129–131). A reaction to this was registered beginning in the 1990s, with a return to and preference for some more conservative, pre-communist-era forms, but by and large the pressure to "admit" to the standard forms previously regarded as belonging to varieties "outside" it—most notably ComC—has continued.

In this timeline, it is possible to see orthography as a "garden path" where that which starts as orthographic standardization can turn easily into language engineering. Attempts to introduce consistency lead to decisions that produce simplification. One form is favored over another for the way it contributes to the creation of a more easily understandable overall system, and "quality" loses out to "efficiency" in the striving to limit the number of places where one function corresponds to two forms. This has obvious repercussions for a diglossic grammar.

As we move from spelling to grammar we can see how in the early history of the *Rules* (1902–1921), codification of spelling frequently relates to word derivation and word formation. The word *srdce* (heart) previously had the diminutives *srdéčko* or *srdečko*, but the latter is decreed to be preferable in the earliest rules (1902, 151). From here it is just one short step to rationalizing morphology along the same lines. The 1941 rules give the conjugation of the verb *mazat* (spread) as *mazĭ*/*mažu* (1941, XLV), listing the traditional H variant first and the newly codified L variant second. By the next major revision, the forms are given in the opposite order, with L before H: *mažu*/*mazĭ* (1958, 184).

Thus, codification of ComC forms seems to happen in two or three stages. First, the new form is admitted, often subject to limitations. Next, free variation is allowed, possibly with one form privileged over another but not necessarily. Finally, the older H form is quietly dropped without ever being proscribed; it is first labeled archaic or formal and eventually left out altogether. The 1958 *Rules*, for example, comment:

> The School edition of the *Rules* conveys this variety for the most part, but it cannot, given its size, encompass all the subtle differences in the usage of individual forms, and thus in some places restricts itself to the forms most common and basic in the literary language; alongside those it is sometimes possible to use, in certain phrases or with a particular

> stylistic coloring, forms not listed in the *Rules*, without needing to regard them as incorrect (1958, 7; translation by Bermel).

Dismantling can also be a creative process that gives rise to new hybrid forms not originally found in either variety. For example, the original LitC verbs *míti* (to have), *péci* (to bake) show the use of the infinitive in *-ti* for regular verbs and *-ci,* found with many irregular verbs. These correspond in ComC to the forms *mít, píct* (note that LitC/é/: ComC/í/).

By the 1950s an infinitive in *-t* is introduced alongside the existing *-ti: mít*/*míti, péci*. By the 1980s, when the old infinitive in *-ti* was regarded as archaic, a new hybrid LitC form was introduced to make the irregular verbs parallel with the regular conjugations: *mít, péct*. Note that this newly minted form *péct* is not found in any Czech dialect. The L code in most of the country would dictate *píct*; elsewhere we find forms like *pect,* but neither of these appears. The form codified for use appears to be not a ComC form, but a neologism incorporating elements from both LitC and ComC.

In a similar vein, some examples of dismantling involve the appropriation of hypercorrections, which show overgeneralization of a "good" form at the expense of a "bad" form; an example of this in English is the ubiquitous overuse of subject pronouns in contexts such as *between* '*he*' *and* '*I*.' In Czech, the pre-eminent example is the LitC 3 pl. forms of three verb classes whose infinitives end in *-it*/*-et*/*-ět*. Where the rest of the conjugation pattern is identical, the 3 pl. of some verbs ending in *-et*/*-ět* is *-í,* whereas for other verbs it is *-ejí* or *-ějí*:

prosit$_{INF}$ (to ask) > prosí$_{3PL}$ (they ask)
vidět$_{INF}$ (to see) > vidí$_{3PL}$ (they see)
BUT sázet$_{INF}$ (to sow) > sázejí$_{3PL}$(they sow)

The ComC 3 pl. forms, on the other hand, are predictable and regular and always utilize the ending *-ej*/*-ěj*, cognate to the LitC endings *-ejí*/*-ějí*:

prosit$_{INF}$ (to ask) > prosej$_{3PL}$(they ask)
vidět$_{INF}$ (to see) > viděj$_{3PL}$(they see)
sázet$_{INF}$ (to sow) > sázej$_{3PL}$(they sow)

Other dialect forms are similarly predictable and regular, and so this feature was felt to be a candidate for "intervention." In the 1990s a new hybrid LitC form was thus coined:

sázet$_{INF}$ (to sow) > sází$_{3PL}$ (they sow).

Modeled on the syncretism seen in the L code, it made use of forms from the H code and drew on features of a relatively minor Czech dialect (southern Bohemia) that also occurred frequently as a hypercorrection.

We might rightly ask why the Czech cultural establishment pursued a dismantling agenda. The answer seems to lie with the dominance of functionalism in language planning circles after 1947. Functionalism attempted to combine the continuity of the H code with a modern, scientific approach to language that focused

on L as primary or natural. This resulted in the doctrine of *pružná stabilita* (flexible stability). Although dismantling activity predated 1947 and the Communist era that immediately followed it, the functionalist agenda dovetailed neatly with the political agenda of 1948–1989, and its adherents were careful to ensure that their interests as linguists coincided with that of the powerful state apparatus and its ideological commitment to building a society based on mass mobilization and thus employing mass literacy. Havránek, the head of the Czech Language Institute and Mathesius's successor as chief spokesman for the functionalist movement, succinctly formulated the balance early in the Communist period as follows:

> Our task is to take practical care to ensure that our national language fully meets the requirements placed upon it, both as a tool of thinking and understanding and as a means of social combat, by the construction of socialist society (Havránek 1953, 26; translation by Bermel).

Once a dismantling agenda has begun, a culture of ongoing change is set in motion that is then difficult to arrest. The existence of a commission promulgating reform suggests in and of itself that reform is needed or desirable. In this way, dismantling activity becomes institutionalized and insinuates itself into the fabric of language culture.

Pressures Leading to Dissolution

Alongside the official dismantling activities we also need to consider outside pressures that feed this activity. Among the most important of these are the rise of hybrid situations that combine elements previously viewed as preconditions for the use of H and L. In each situation we can identify three axes distinguishing them: the *mode*, the *setting*, and the *message*; we will consider first spoken situations and then written ones.

Take a situation such as formal public speaking, where the mode is spoken (not written), the setting is public (not private), and the message is non-personal (not intimate). The choice of code for Czech is H, following the *setting* and the *message*. New forms of formal presentation, such as television reporting, may not in fact be done in public but are nonetheless intended for public consumption. By metaphorical extension, they also adopt the H code.

However, we can also find situations in which the spoken mode exists in a public setting and an informal register, such as in a play or by extension a film. Here the choice of code in Czech has, increasingly over the last 100 years, tended towards L or contained significant elements of it, following the *mode* and the *message*. New forms of "intimate publicness," such as infotainment shows on television, also adopt the L code by extension; although an audience may in fact be present while the show is taped, the message is that this is a conversation between a small, intimate group.

While technology has created many more opportunities for the transmission of spoken language than previously existed, the spread of hybrid written situations is also notable. Ferguson talked about the variety of types of letters that could be written, but this genre has now been substantially extended to include e-mails, texts, and instant messaging. A letter exists in the written mode, is generally in a private setting, and can contain either impersonal or intimate messages and thus appear correspondingly in either H or L; the same is true of e-mails, but some of the other new means of communication, such as texts and instant messaging, are perceived almost universally as person-to-person and thus more intimate in their scope, meaning that in these media, H is actively avoided in Czech where possible. Even when the setting moves to a more public one, on the model perhaps of advertisements, we find new forms such as graffiti and forums where L tends to predominate.

The decisive member of this set of factors thus appears to be the message rather than the mode or the setting. This makes the contemporary situation seem much more like a case of highly elaborated register variation. Given the numerous ways in which Czech diglossia has been eaten away at over recent years, we are within our rights to ask what remains of it.

Contemporary Attitudes

If diglossia in its formal aspect seems to be weakening, it is useful to consider attitudes towards it as well. If we look back at the criteria enumerated in section "Diglossic Retreat", we can see that even where the actual examples of diglossia have become attenuated, the criteria that are subjective or attitudinal in nature remain firmly diglossic.

In criterion 2, we stated that H has a prestige lacked by L. Research into the two varieties confirms the high standing of H and—more interestingly—the continued low standing of L. Bayerová-Nerlichová, for example, concludes in her study of the usage of H and L forms:

> The Czechs' positive attitude towards 'Literary Czech' need not automatically imply a negative attitude towards 'Common Czech' as it does today. This attitude is almost grotesque when measured against reality: We all speak this way, even though we don't want to (2004, 191; translation by Bermel).

The third criterion concerned the 'heritage' of H. To this day, LitC is considered to be the heritage of the Czech people: an H code that embodies the aspirations of a nation, such that the use of ComC in H spheres becomes an attack on Czech nationhood (for examples see Bermel 2007, 205–210).

Criterion 4 stated that H is acquired through formal learning, while L is acquired naturally in the home. In the Czech context, the formal nature of the route to acquiring LitC is presented as a positive feature, and it engenders a discourse of LitC as a rare native cultivar needing protection/care. For an earlier work (Bermel 2007), I collected dozens of examples of this from the press in the form of

metaphors; one such is a quote from Petr Fidelius's article (Fidelius 1993) in the weekly literary newspaper *Literární noviny* from 16 December 1993, in which he writes:

> The literary language does not grow like wood in a forest; it is formed as the result of deliberate cultivation and refining. The question, of course, is. . . who should have the role of chief cultivator.

(One might then ask whether ComC can metaphorically be seen as a weed in the garden, which the discerning gardener will pluck out.)

Criterion 6 was the stability of the diglossic situation. Here we can say that the details of what is admissible in which variety have changed, but attitudes towards the two varieties have evolved very little: LitC is still the protected, codified, prestigious variety, and ComC is still uncodified and unfavorably compared with LitC (but indispensible in certain situations).

Curiously, the high degree of observable mixing between the codes does not alter public attitudes towards this mixing; the general prejudice against the inappropriate use of codes is such that a mention of such a transgression can prompt an exaggerated response.

Čmejrková records one such transgression in her 1996 work on broadcast language. An actress was discussing with the moderator of a television programme her feelings regarding a role she had played recently. She slipped into a more colloquial register and was followed by other actors. The moderator remained in the standard, but after a phone call from an audience member, the mood changed abruptly:

> While certain listeners were probably grateful that this person was willing to let them look into her authorial workshop and to share her creative approaches with them, the listener who phoned the broadcast sharply criticized the moderator for the sort of participants he had invited onto the program and the lack of respect they had shown to their mother tongue by speaking so non-literarily (*tak nespisovně*). When the program participants realized that they had let themselves be seduced by an atmosphere of intimacy, by a tone of mutual trust and confession that had not been accepted, they felt taken aback, even deceived. They could not settle back into the original mood; they did not even seem capable of making the effort. The thread of assumed understanding [with the audience –NB] had fallen silent; it had literally snapped (Čmejrková 1996, 192; translation by Bermel).

Conclusions

The Czech case offers an interesting perspective on diglossia in the modern nation-state. Under pressure both from technological innovation and progressive approaches to language regulation, it nonetheless remains a resilient concept that informs and shapes people's attitudes, sometimes long after its features have faded.

The case against diglossia would focus clearly on the way features distinguishing H and L are being reduced in number through regulatory action (dismantling), while the zone of overlap between H and L is widening (dissolution). The fact that LitC and ComC are not uniform constructs but agglomerations of

features more or less acceptable in conveying certain types of messages makes it easy for regulators to focus on first one feature, then the next, distinguishing them from each other and picking apart the notion that these features are connected with a coherent H or L discourse.

The case for diglossia would, on the other hand, focus on the constants. Attitudes are resistant to change, and central to these are images of H as weak, unsupported, in need of protection, but also embodying the national spirit. L, on the other hand, is not simply left unremarked, but becomes an object of avoidance—one that everyone uses, while refusing to admit how central it is to their daily speech.

What is left after the objective parameters of diglossia are removed is not necessarily a non-diglossic system. In the case of Czech, it is an oddly post-diglossic system, where strong elements of prescriptivism and conservatism combine to produce a striving to produce and reproduce a variety that is in reality nowhere near as well-defined as the bulk of the nation believes.

References

Auty, Robert. 1956. "Language and Society in the Czech National Revival." *Slavonic and East European Review* 35: 242–248.

Bayerová-Nerlichová, Lenka. 2004. "Jazykový úzus vs. postoj k jazyku v Čechách: výsledky empirického a sociolingvistického výzkumu v západních Čechách a v Praze." *Slovo a slovesnost* 65: 174–193.

Bermel, Neil. 2007. *Linguistic Authority, Language Ideology, and Metaphor: The Czech Orthography Wars*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Čermák, František. 1987. "Relations of Spoken and Written Czech (With Special Reference to the Varying Degree of Acceptability of Spoken Elements in Written Language)." *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach* 20: 133–150.

———. 1993. "Spoken Czech." In *Varieties of Czech: Studies in Czech Sociolinguistics,* edited by Eva Eckert, 27–41. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Cvrček, Václav. 2008. *Regulace jazyka a Koncept minimální intervence*. Prague: Nakladatelství Lidové Noviny.

Čmejrková, Světla. 1996. "Spisovnost a nespisovnost v současné rozhlasové a televizní publicistice." In *Spisovnost a nespisovnost dnes,* edited by Rudolf Šrámek, 225–247. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

Čmejrková, Světla and Jana Hoffmannová, eds. 2011. *Mluvená čeština: hledání funkčního rozpětí*. Prague: Academia.

Čuřín, František. 1985. Stručná charakteristika prvních obrozenských gramatik. In *Práce z dějin slavistiky,* edited by Jaroslav Porák, 191–198. Prague: Univerzita Karlova.

Daneš, František. 1999 [1988]. "Pojem „spisovného jazyka" v dnešních společenských podmínkách." Reprinted in *Jazyk a text: výbor z lingvistického díla Františka Daneše, část 2,* 289–296. Prague: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy. Originally published in *Dynamika současné češtiny z hlediska lingvistické teorie a školské praxe,* edited by Radoslava Brabcová and František Štícha (Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1988, 21–29).

Dickins, Tom. 1995 "Linguistic Varieties in Czech: Problems of the Spoken Language." *Slavonica* 1: 20–46.

Dobrovský, Josef. 1792. *Geschichte der böhmischen Sprache und Literatur*. Prague: Johann Gottfried Calve.

Eckert, Eva. 1993. “Introduction.” In *Varieties of Czech: Studies in Czech Sociolinguistics,* edited by Eva Eckert, 3–26. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Ferguson, Charles. 1959. “Diglossia.” *Word* 15: 325–340.

Fidelius, Petr. 1993. “Labutí píseň normalizace.” *Literární noviny*, 12 December.

Fishman, Joshua. 2002. “Diglossia and Societal Multilingualism: Dimensions of Similarity and Difference.” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 157: 93–100.

Gammelgaard, Karen. 2002. “Approaching the Rise of Spoken Standard Language: The Case of Polish, Czech, and Slovak, 1800–1918.” *Slavonic and East European Review* 80: 601–623.

———. 1996. “Dobrovský’s Czech Standard Language Norm.” In *Two Studies on Written Language,* 22–36. Oslo: Universitet i Oslo Slavisk-baltisk avdeling.

Giger, Markus. 2003. “Standard und Nonstandard in der Tschechischen Republik und der deutschsprachigen Schweiz.” In *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity, A51,* 83–98. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

Grygar-Rechziegel, Adela. 1990. “On Czech Diglossia.” In *Czech Studies: Literature, Language, Culture*, edited by Mojmír Grygar, 9–29. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Halliday, Michael. 1968. “The Users and Uses of Language.” In *Readings in the Sociology of Language,* edited by Joshua Fishman, 139–169. The Hague: Mouton.

Hattala, Martin. 1877. *Brus jazyka českého: příspěvek k dějinám osvěty vůbec a slovanské i české zvlášť.* Prague: I. L. Kober.

Havránek, Bohuslav. 1953. “Vybudování nové Československé akademie věd a Ústav pro jazyk český.” *Naše řeč* 36: 19–27.

———. 1979. Vývoj ceského spisovného jazyka. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství

———. 1980 [1936]. *Vývoj českého spisovného jazyka.* Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství. Originally published in *Československá vlastivěda. Řada II. Spisovný jazyk český a slovenský.* Prague: Sfinx, 1936

Hudson, Alan. 2002. “Outline of a Theory of Diglossia.” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 157: 1–48.

Janda, Laura. 2005. “Czech.” In *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, 3. 2nd edition,* edited by Keith Brown, 339–341. Oxford: Elsevier.

Janda, Laura and Charles Townsend. 2000. *Czech.* Munich: Lincom Europa.

Jelínek, Milan, 1971. “O českém purismu.” In *Přednášky ve XIV. běhu Letní školy slovanských studií v roce 1970,* 18–37. Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.

Mathesius, Vilém. 1932. “O požadavku stability ve spisovném jazyce.” In *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura,* edited by Bohuslav Havránek and Miloš Weingart, 14–31. Prague: Melantrich.

Micklesen, Lew. 1978. “Czech Sociolinguistic Problems.” *Folia Slavica* 1: 473–455.

Nebeská, Iva. 1996. *Jazyk, norma, spisovnost.* Prague: Karolinum.

Newerkla, Stefan. 2003. “The seamy side of the Habsburgs’ language policy: Intended and factual reality of language use in Plzeň’s educational system.” In *Diglossia and Power: Language Policies and Practice in the Nineteenth Century Habsburg Empire,* edited by Rosita Rindler Schjerve, 167–198. Amsterdam/Munich: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pelcl, František Martin. 1795. *Grundsätze der böhmischen Grammatik*. Prague: F. Gerzabek.

Pravidla českého pravopisu. 1941. Prague: Školní nakladatelství pro Čechy a Moravu.

Pravidla českého pravopisu. 1958. Školní vydání. Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.

Pravidla hledící k českému pravopisu a tvarosloví s abecedním seznamem slov a tvarů. Přehlé dnuté vydání větší. 1902. Prague: Školní knihosklad.

Redakce *Naší řeči*, 1925. “Z našich časopisů.” *Naše řeč* 9: 20–22.

Sgall, Petr. 1990. “Chceme spisovnou češtinu ochuzovat a činit nemluvnou?” *Slovo a slovesnost* 51: 60–63.

———. 1994. “Sociological Issues of Spoken Language.” In *Writing vs. Speaking: Language, Text, Discourse, Communication,* edited by Světla Čmejrková, 137–143. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

———. 1998–1999. “Neochuzujme spisovnou češtinu.” *Český jazyk a literatura* 49: 29–39.

Sgall, Petr, Jiři Hronek, Alexandr Stich and Ján Horecký. 1992. *Variation in Language: Code Switching in Czech as a Challenge for Sociolinguistics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Short, David. 1991. "Living Czech: The Language of the He(a)rd." *Slavonic and East European Review* 69: 502–510.

Svozil, Bohumil. 2008. "Slovník české literatury. Bohumil Hrabal." Last modified 31 October. http://www.slovnikceskeliteratury.cz/showContent.jsp?docId=1244 (Ústav pro českou literaturu AV ČR).

Starý, Zdeněk. 1995. *Ve jménu funkce a intervence.* Prague: Univerzita Karlova.

Stich, Alexandr. 1987. "On the Beginnings of Modern Standard Czech." In *Eksplitsitnoe opisanie iazyka i avtomaticheskaia obrabotka tekstov/Explizite Beschreibung der Sprache und automatische Textbearbeitung 14*, 121–128. Prague: Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Univerzita Karlova.

Thomas, George. 1991. *Linguistic Purism.* London: Longman.

Tomsa, František Jan. 1782. *Böhmische Sprachlehre*. Prague: Verl. der K.K. Normalschule.

Townsend, Charles. 2003, "Currently Spoken Czech Through the Eyes of a Foreign Bohemist." *Czech Language News* 20: 2–6.

Diglossia and Its Discontent: The Linguistics of National Crisis in Early Twentieth-Century China

Elisabeth Kaske

Abstract Chinese language debates during the first two decades of the twentieth century were part of a discourse of national crisis when Chinese culture seemed unfit for competition in the modern world, and the time-honored state of diglossia began to appear as "schizoglossia" (Haugen, Einar. 1972. "Schizoglossia and the Linguistic Norm." In *The Ecology of Language: Essays by Einar Haugen*, edited by Anwar S. Dil, 148–189. Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press.) to proponents of reform and universal education. Under the strong influence of Japan's *genbun itchi* movement, Chinese efforts to promote "the unity of speech and writing" showed some remarkable similarities with Japan but also many differences given the peculiar linguistic situation and political circumstances. This paper develops a new model for reassessing the state of diglossia and examines how various reform proposals and their critics understood the linguistics and social consequences of diglossia and its abolition.

Keywords Schizoglossia • Baihua • Baihuawen • Literary revolution • Class character of language

The Renaissance War

Chinese language reforms have long captivated sociolinguists and historians, but in American and Western scholarship this topic has often been dominated by what I would dub the "Renaissance War." At the center of this discussion was Hu Shi's (胡適 1891–1962) claim that his so-called literary revolution proclaimed in 1917, which demanded the replacement of the literary language by the vernacular, was comparable with the Latin-Italian shift of the European Renaissance (Hu 1934).

E. Kaske (✉)
Department of Modern Languages, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh
e-mail: ekaske@andrew.cmu.edu

J. Árokay et al. (eds.), *Divided Languages?*, Transcultural Research – Heidelberg Studies on Asia and Europe in a Global Context, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-03521-5_3,

Following the political upheavals of the 1910s that culminated in the demonstrations of 4 May 1919 and a movement of cultural renewal known as the May Fourth Movement, Hu Shi's vernacular project has become inextricably linked to the debates over the meaning of modernity for China.

In his 2006 response to an article entitled "The Chinese Renaissance" by Zhou Gang, the linguist John DeFrancis once again deplored Hu Shi's equation of Dante's concept of the vernacular with his own efforts to enhance the status of the Chinese vernacular. DeFrancis's objection was that what Dante was referring to as "vernacular" was actually the spoken language learned by children when they began to speak while Hu Shi only distinguished two styles of writing, the 'literary language' (*wenyan* 文言) of the Confucian Classics and the 'plain language' (*baihua* 白話) of the vernacular literature. DeFrancis contended that the modern Chinese literary language, far from being the living spoken language of the people, was in fact a hybrid style that mixed vernacular and literary elements and that this undermining of the vernacular by literary styles could only be prevented by abolishing the Chinese character script. "Hu Shi made the wrong comparison," DeFrancis wrote. "The comparison is not writing in Italian versus writing in Chinese in the misnamed 'vernacular' style. It should be Italian written in an alphabetic script versus Chinese also written in an alphabetic script" (DeFrancis 2006, 299; the article under discussion was Zhou 2005). Zhou Gang politely defended Hu Shi's position, arguing that the key to a fruitful comparison is diglossia, a hierarchic state of multilingualism defined by Charles Ferguson as a functional division between two languages in the same speech community each occupying a distinct domain: one the higher domains of religion, scholarship, or formal conversation, the other the lowly domains of everyday conversation or popular entertainment (Zhou 2006, 299–300).

The argument between John DeFrancis and Hu Shi began as early as 1950 with DeFrancis's book *Nationalism and Language Reform in China* (DeFrancis 1950), for which Hu Shi wrote a review in the *American Historical Review*. Ridiculing DeFrancis's advocacy of the Communist-devised Roman alphabet script for Chinese, the Latinhua Sin Wenz, Hu Shi wrote:

> Did the famous Lu Hsün [Lu Xun (魯迅1881–1936)] ever write any prose in the Sin Wenz? Did Mao Tse-tung [Mao Zedong (毛澤東1893–1976) ever write anything in it? Did . . . any of the Communist advocates of Sin Wenz ever write anything in it? Even the people in the Communist-controlled areas will not learn a script in which a Mao Tse-tung or a Liu Shao-ch'i [Liu Shaoqi (劉少奇 1898–1969)] is unable or unwilling to write his own speeches or articles. And Mao Tse-tung and Liu Shao-ch'i will not write their speeches or articles in the new phonetic script because they know very well that, if they do, nobody will be able to read them. So they continue to write their speeches and articles in *paihua* [*baihua*] (the living spoken language written in characters), which they had learned through stealthily reading and loving the great *paihua* novels in their boyhood days, and which has been made respectable by the Literary Revolution. (Hu 1951, 898)

Interestingly, the struggle over Hu Shi's legacy is not yet over. It took its latest turn in a review of my own book (Kaske 2008) where—Zhou Gang's article unknown to me—I made a very similar argument, namely that Hu Shi's

appropriation of the term "renaissance" was rather narrow and largely limited to the language shift from Latin to Italian. Secondly, I argued that this appropriation was not new at all but received wisdom in the Chinese reform discourse since Huang Zunxian's *Description of Japan,* which was popular in the 1890s. And thirdly, I suggested that this comparison is fruitful because it challenges the notion of Chinese exceptionalism and places the Chinese language alongside other national languages that either emerged out of the lower variety of diglossia, such as Greek, Amhara, Japanese, or post-Renaissance European languages, or continued to exist in a diglossic state like Arabic or Tamil. At least the reviewer gave me the benefit of the doubt when he wrote that he did not believe I would endorse Hu Shi's "factititious" comparison between the literary revolution and the European Renaissance. However, he challenges this comparison for a different reason, namely because it appears to "endorse a teleological model of development in which the reduction or elimination of diglossia becomes an inevitable part of the transition to modernity" (Gibbs Hill 2010, 522). Thus, we see two alternative attacks on Hu Shi's vernacular project: one claiming that his *baihua* failed to promote sufficient vernacularization to make a contribution to modernization; the other objecting that any link between vernacularization and modernity is mere "teleology," implying that the latter could well have been achieved without the former.

Between these two, DeFrancis's assessment of Chinese language reforms as a failure has long dominated academic discourse. This has had two consequences: First, it strengthened the impression of Chinese exceptionalism, as expressed in Eric Hobsbawm's *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*:

> It is thus clear that, except for the rulers and the literate, language could hardly be a criterion of nationhood, and even for these it was first necessary to choose a national vernacular (in a standardized literary form) over the more prestigious languages, holy or classical or both, ... That choice admittedly was made everywhere sooner or later, except perhaps in China where the *lingua franca* of the classically educated became the only means of communication between otherwise mutually incomprehensible dialects in the vast empire, and is in the process of becoming something like a spoken language. (Hobsbawm 1990, 56)

In contrast to Hobsbawm, I do not believe that there is anything exceptional in making "the *lingua franca* of the classically educated" into a universal means of communication, since the same can be said for Italian. Second, for many years the emphasis in research was on the script reform rather than on language reforms in general. Now this is about to change through my own work and through that of Zhou Gang, whose book on vernacular literature from a sociolinguistic perspective was published in January 2011 (cf. Zhou 2011).

In the meantime, the Chinese discourse on the May Fourth Movement since the 1990s has seen a shift from unfettered endorsement of its progressive nature to growing skepticism and revisionism. And with it has come criticism of Hu Shi's vernacular project. Hu Shi has always been denied the role of progenitor of *baihua* in mainland Chinese discourse, but this has not diminished the general endorsement of vernacular Chinese written in Chinese characters (much to the detriment of proponents of an alphabetized vernacular as shown above). By contrast, we now find voices that decry the loss of Classical Chinese and advocate the recitation of

the Confucian Classics by school-age children—a chief target of attack for the original literary revolutionaries (Zhang 1997, 101–121; Makeham 2008, 319–323). This tendency, I believe, is indirectly reflected in the review of my book.

Teleological or not, we cannot deny that the Chinese language today is a vibrant language with high literacy rates, a burgeoning publication sector, a huge presence on the internet, and a huge potential to become a major language of scholarship and science. Any pondering over the advantages of an alphabetized written language or of making Classical Chinese into a national language are thus of a purely counterfactual nature. In this article I will trace the origins of Hu Shi's vernacular project back to the late Qing crisis of cultural consciousness. I will reexamine Hu Shi's place in the creation of modern written Chinese, and I will attempt to define what sort of written language emerged out of the May Fourth era and how it contributed to modern standard Chinese.

Towards the Unity of Speech and Language

Despite a few earlier calls to action, it is reasonable to argue that the idea that the Chinese language and writing system was in need of reform was born out of the national crisis that followed the Sino-Japanese War of 1894/1895. Initially, the basic goal of reformers was not so much national unification but nation-building through greater participation of the population in ongoing social change. In other words, reform-minded elites were looking for more effective ways to communicate their social agenda to the masses. For these intellectuals the classical literary language, which ruled supreme in the diglossic state of Chinese, began to appear dysfunctional because it was hampering their efforts to reach a wide audience.

The incentives and models for reform were provided by both Western and Japanese influence. Japan provided the slogan "the congruence of speech and language" (*genbun itchi* 言文一致), which was originally a denomination for a vernacular literary style written in a mixture of Japanese *kana* and Chinese characters. The second half of the 1880s saw the Japanese language reform movement at its zenith. Several clubs advocated phonetic scripts—either Japanese *kana* or Latin romaji. Tsubouchi Shōyō (坪内逍遥 1859–1935) elevated the vernacular novel, which was formerly regarded as vulgar entertainment, to the most valuable genre of literature. The first professor of comparative linguistics at Tokyo University, Basil Hall Chamberlain, urged the *kana* and romaji clubs to apply the new vernacular style to their orthographies. There was also the first backlash against these developments from the conservatives. In 1886, when Huang Zunxian, a Chinese diplomat in Japan, wrote his *Description of Japan*, he defended the phonetic script, claiming "if speech and writing are diverging, only few people become literate, whereas if writing and speech are congruent, many people become literate" (Huang 1974, 2: 815).

This view on the dysfunctionality of diglossia would later make him famous among reform advocates in China, but it was not before the crisis of 1895, when

people were desperate to make sense of Japan's success over China and some turned to deeper cultural and linguistic explanations, that his book was published. Huang Zunxian set the stage for much of the Chinese debates around language and script reform during the 1890s. First, he linked the writing system to literacy rates and literacy rates to national strength. Second, he was the first to link the "unity of speech and writing" to the shift away from Latin toward the European national languages, mainly in order to explain European successes in education. Third, he defined the "unity of speech and writing" as either the vernacular written in Chinese characters or the vernacular written in a phonetic script. Subsequently, two basic approaches towards language reform were struggling for hegemony; I have labeled these "vulgarizers" and "alphabetizers." On the other hand, more cautious reformers, whom I have labeled the "modernizers," were demanding a simplification of the literary language by relaxing its rather rigid standards of propriety, while a group of anti-reformers, the "historicizers," responded to all these demands by insisting on the status quo of diglossia in China. In fact, a modernized version of the literary language became the mainstream language of the press and most publications during the first two decades of the twentieth century, not least due to the inexorable influx of foreign terms and idiom. Most of what the so-called *wenyan* May Fourth activists fought against was, in fact, this modernized style. But while the debate between the "modernizers" and "vulgarizers," which was the essence of the "literary revolution" proclaimed by Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu (陳獨秀 1879–1942) in 1917, gradually faded after the 1930s and has only recently produced new headlines in China following the Confucian revivalists' love for Classical Chinese, the argument between the latter and the "alphabetizers" continued for a long time. I believe that the "Renaissance War" between Hu Shi and John DeFrancis can be seen as a distant echo of this debate.

The "Alphabetizers": Making a Living

The crisis of 1895 also resulted in a greater interest in missionary Romanization schemes, but it was not the superiority of a phonetic script as such that attracted reformers. China had seen phonetic writing of its language before, such as the Xiaoerjin script of the Chinese Muslims in Gansu and Shaanxi, although I doubt that Han Chinese elites in the south were aware of it (cf. "Corpus of "Xiao-Er-Jin" Script of Muslim Chinese: Collection and Digitalization" under the supervision of Machida Kazuhiko 2012). However, some of them might have known Manchu transliterations of Chinese syllables in imperial dictionaries or at least seen them on public inscriptions and on every copper coin. The new interest in phonetic scripts was born rather out of the new idea of progress and its necessary prerequisites and out of the fear of losing the social Darwinist competition with the aggressive foreign powers pounding on the gates of the country. As Lu Zhuangzhang put it in his much read article "The Origins of Reform:"

> Except from the eighteen provinces of China and the savages without writing, everywhere else, where the sun and the moon are shining, and the morning dew falls, there is nobody who doesn't use a phonetic script, so that the phonetic script is the general rule in the countries of the whole world. (Lu 1896, 15815)

I have identified 29 competing schemes for phonetic scripts created by 24 different people until 1911 alone (Kaske 2008, 152–160). I am sure with some digging we would find even more, but most of them remained obscure. Only two schemes were of any importance, that of the pioneer Lu Zhuangzhang (盧戇章 1854–1928) in Fujian and Wang Zhao's (王照 1859–1933) Mandarin syllabary in Beijing.

The creators of these two schemes shared a few important characteristics: They were both the first professional language reformers in China. Both were educators who operated schools and made education in their phonetic scripts their profession. Both sought the patronage of powerful figures—Wang Zhao that of the eminent scholar and phonologist Lao Naixuan (勞乃宣 1843–1921), Lu Zhuangzhang that of the Japanese governor of Taiwan. And both competed to promote their schemes with the Board of Education in Beijing in order to be approved for introduction into the national educational system. Wang Zhao reportedly had an almost paranoid sense of copyright, which reveals how much he depended on his Mandarin syllabary for a living. None of them advocated abolishing either the Chinese characters or the literary language. Actually, they cannot be regarded as enemies of diglossia because instead of abolishing diglossia they added an element of digraphia to it, as DeFrancis remarked in one of his articles (DeFrancis 1984, 59–66). However, their efforts anticipated the fate of phonetic scripts in China to this day: they never became anything more than an educational tool.

The "Vulgarizers" or What Is "*Baihua*"?

In his letter to the PMLA, John DeFrancis sharply criticized Hu Shi for advising authors to follow the style of outdated novels instead of sticking to the spoken language. Moreover, he deplored that "the overwhelming preponderance of academic, journalistic, and general writing" had turned *baihua* from a style meant to represent the spoken language into an undistinguishable hybrid of vernacular and literary elements (DeFrancis 2006, 299). But what exactly is "*baihua*"?

Hu Shi claimed that *baihua* dated back to the Tang Dynasty and that the novels of the Ming and Qing dynasty were actually *baihua* novels. However, the identification of the vernacular of the novels as "*baihua*" did not happen before the early twentieth century. The novel *Jiu wei gui* (九尾龜*Nine-tailed Turtle*) by Zhang Chunfan (張春帆d. 1935) stands as one of the most well-known late Qing *baihua* novels today, even though it has been characterized by May Fourth intellectuals as a "depravity novel of the worst kind" (Wang 1997, 82). Its author might have agreed with the latter, but he would hardly have considered his book a "*baihua* novel." The only instances in which the author uses the term were in its original meaning in the

Beijing dialect, where it was pronounced "*baihuo*" and "*kongkou shuo baihuo* (空口说白话)" meaning "talk nonsense" (Zhang 2000, passim).

Novels like *Nine-tailed Turtle* were entertainment for the elites, and the author's choice of style was not dictated by a wish to enlighten the masses; rather, he used a dirty style to address dirty topics. That is to say, he gave preference to the vernacular in order not to contaminate the sanctity and purity of the literary style with lowly topics. Before the 1890s a strict dichotomy of *baihua* versus *wenyan* did not exist. "*Wen* 文" in itself was a category so heavily charged with normative value that there could be only (good) "*wen*" and (bad) "non-*wen*," at best the latter was called "vulgar" (*su* 俗).

The term "*baihua*" assumed a new meaning only in the late nineteenth century. In 1897 and 1898 a group of reformers close to Liang Qichao (梁啟超1873–1929) and Wang Kangnian (汪康年1860–1911) founded a number of enlightenment journals and newspapers in the Shanghai region that were directed at less educated readers, among them the *Yanyi Baihuabao* (演義白話報 *[Popular] Renditions Vernacular Newspaper*, 1897). The term became further politicized thanks to a famous polemical essay entitled "*Baihua* is the foundation of reform" published by Qiu Tingliang (裘廷梁 1857–1943) in his *Wuxi Baihuabao* (無錫白話報 *Wuxi Vernacular Journal*, 1898). Qiu emphasized the importance of an educated people for the development of China, and for the first time established *baihua* as an educational style in opposition to the commonly used *wenyan*, which only catered to a small literati audience (Kaske 2008, 273–274). Further research may reveal another earlier reference, but I believe that my finding holds that "*baihua*" was a reform slogan rather than a technical denominator.

After 1898 "*baihua*" became the euphemism used to denominate an educational style that imitated speech. The style of these early *baihua* texts was quite different from the style of vernacular novels and a far cry from the "academic, journalistic, and general writing" of the May Fourth era. Their emergence and enduring appeal was closely related to a surge in public speaking, a trend that also came from Japan, where Fukuzawa Yukichi (福澤諭吉 1835–1901) had emphasized the importance of public speeches in his *Gakumon no Susume* (学問のすすめ *An Encouragement of Learning*) and where Chinese students learned to appreciate public speeches as a means of propaganda and lecturing as a mode of teaching (Chen 2009, 270–320).

Baihua was mostly written for the uneducated and its style completely imitated speech, but since the authors were all literati this required a special effort, as expressed in the *Jinghua Ribao* (京華日報 *Beijing Speech Daily*) of 1905:

> Yesterday, I received a letter from Mr. Wang . . .saying that if you talk to people without education, you should be as accessible as possible. Words from the literary language should be used very little. . . .We will of course be careful to revise our texts. ("Yuyan he wenzi butong de binggen" April 1, 1905)

Authors had to consciously revise their text in order to expurgate elements of the literary language, a process that required constant reminder and effort. Although the written language had existed in a diglossic state for centuries, this did not mean that most people were bilingual in their writing habits. In the 1911 novel *Shangjie*

xianxing ji (商界現形記 *Exposure of the Business World*), the family of a merchant protagonist faces difficulties in finding a suitable marriage partner for his younger sister because they insist on finding a successful literatus. Among other requirements, the candidate was also to be well versed in both *wenyan* and *baihua* styles (cf. *Yunjian Tianzhuisheng* 2012, Chap. 4). Most literati never wrote a novel, one of the very few genres open to the vernacular language: the majority of literati were monolingual in writing, although they spoke their own dialect in addition, or perhaps multiple dialects. With the emergence of *baihua* newspapers, manuals, and textbooks, more literati became bilingual in writing than ever before, but this did not necessarily mean that they abandoned their diglossic attitudes easily.

The Class Character of Language

What was really at stake in these debates was the relationship of the educated elite, who was in command of the literary language, with the illiterate or semi-literate masses. How could the elite communicate change to the masses? Should they be taught reading in the elite language? Or should elite messages be communicated to the masses using the lower language registers? Or should elite language be abandoned for the sake of meeting the masses on lower ground? For the latter project, a new question arose: The educated elite and their high language variety had for centuries secured the standards and thus ensured the unity of China. If the unified norm provided by the literary language was abandoned, what would replace it to secure the unity of the country?

This does not mean that everybody actually wished to communicate with the masses or make changes to the status quo. The class character of language is beautifully expressed in a story from Zhang Chunfan's Late Qing novel *Nine-Tailed Turtle*, which also illustrates that the enlightenment value of the vernacular is in no way self evident.

> Zhang Qiugu. . .realizing that there was an argument going on in front of the gate looked outside and saw Gong Chunshu talking to a cart driver. Qiugu could not help laughing about Chunshu's use of refined literati language. How would a man who is like an animal of the wild be willing to listen to him? As expected, this rickshaw puller not only did not listen, but he even bluntly rebuffed Gong Chunshu. Zhang then saw Xin Xiufu stepping forward [in support of Chunshu] and reciting a gust of new words to the cart driver. Qiugu was even more amused. . . .Laughingly he said [to Chunshu and Xiufu]: "Using such language to persuade this sort of unconscious cattle, is literally like 'playing the zither to an ox,' you totally waste your time, since he will not understand you anyway. Do you really believe that a cart-pulling moron deserves such dignity? (Zhang 2000, Chap. 43)

The protagonist observes two friends in an argument with a cart driver and he ridicules their use of cultivated speech in talking with him. Although this is about speech, not writing, it does show that elements of the literary language actually did infiltrate the speech of the educated elite. It is also notable to observe the shift in elite language. The first friend is using a language influenced by Chinese classical

literature, whereas the second uses new expressions learned from translations of foreign works, most likely via Japanese. A traditional and a modern elite language coexisted at that time. Yet in both of the two elite idioms the two friends were talking in an idiom far above the comprehension of a simple, illiterate cart driver whom the author likens to a stupid animal.

Who Had the Greater Revolutionary Potential?

How can we compare the revolutionary potential of the two approaches used by the "Alphabetizers" and the "Vulgarizers" when it comes to changing the class bias of Chinese diglossia? Although on the surface abolishing the time-honored Chinese characters appears to be a revolutionary act, in fact I believe that the revolutionary potential of phonetic scripts was amazingly low. The schemes were only used to teach the illiterate poor; the elites were not interested, and none of the schemes surveyed actually advocated abolishing the characters. When a Qing official from the Board of Education reviewed Lu Zhuangzhang's scheme for the Beijing dialect, his main concern was not the phonetic character of the script but the fact that Lu's alphabet transcribed the spoken Beijing dialect and was not based on Song Dynasty rhyme book categories. The official document does not simply rebuff Lu's proposal but goes into a very detailed and elaborate exposition of the principles of phonology ("Xuebu zi waiwubu wen" 1906, 67–71). One of the reasons that so many schemes were developed may have been that it was much easier for most Late Qing literati to understand phonetics than to write a decent *baihua*.

By contrast, the vernacular was potentially more dangerous to the literary language precisely because it already had a relatively developed entertainment literature and wide currency. The socially explosive power of reigning in the supreme hegemony of the classical written language was well perceived by contemporary writers, Chinese and foreign alike. Qiu Tingliang was the first to openly challenge the hegemony of the literary language. In detailing eight advantages of replacing the literary language by *baihua* he puts eradicating the arrogance of the literati in the second place.

> Second, it expurgates arrogance. One of the bad habits of the literati is to esteem [only] themselves and disrespect others, this poisons the whole empire. If we take the basis [of their self-esteem] away, this would dampen their spirits and they would strive for practical sciences. (Qiu 1963, 121)

In Qiu Tingliang's ranking of the advantages of using *baihua*, the promotion of elementary education came only fifth and the benefits for the poor, eighth. Qiu's statement, published in 1898, was the most radical assertion of the vernacular to be found before the literary revolution of 1917, and it firmly established the term "*baihua*" as a battle slogan challenging the supremacy of the classical language *wenyan*.

Conservatives sensed that the danger coming from *baihua* was of a political nature. Gu Hongming, the apologist of an idealized traditional China, claimed in 1915 that the dichotomy between the literary language on the one hand and illiterate vernaculars on the other was a good thing precisely because it kept the plebs out of politics:

> . . .let us understand what we mean by the Chinese language. There are, as everybody knows, two languages—I do not mean dialects—in China, the spoken and the written language. . . .In China, as it was at one time in Europe when Latin was the learned or written language, the people are properly divided into two distinct classes, the educated and the uneducated. The colloquial or spoken language is the language for the use of the uneducated, and the written language is the language for the use of the really educated. In this way half educated people do not exist in this country. That is the reason, I say, why the Chinese insist upon having two languages. Now think of the consequences of having half educated people in a country. . . . In Europe and America since, from the disuse of Latin, the sharp distinction between the spoken and the written language has disappeared, there has arisen a class of half educated people who are allowed to use the same language as the really educated people, who talk of civilization, liberty, neutrality, militarism and panslavism without the least understanding what these words really mean. People say that Prussian Militarism is a danger to civilization. But to me it seems that half educated man, the mob of half educated men in the world today, is the real danger to civilization. (Ku 1915, 97–98)

On the other hand, it is also true that *baihua* did not live up to its potential during the Qing dynasty. The impact of Qiu's article was limited by the very fact that it was published in a local vernacular journal. Moreover, most journalists and editors of *baihua* periodicals, instead of following Qiu Tingliang's call to challenge the literary language, made painstaking efforts to simplify their style in order to speak to the uneducated people.

Late Qing reformers—alphabetizers and vulgarizers alike—did not advocate principally abolishing diglossia. They were merely concerned about alleviating its obvious disadvantages for communicating social change to the cart drivers of China. They continued to use the literary language to communicate among themselves. Late Qing *baihua* newspapers have been described as the immediate predecessors of May Fourth *baihua*, thus denying that the "literary revolution" of Hu Shi and Chen Duxi was revolutionary at all. However, the impact of these newspapers and journals in fact remained indirect. Seen from a long-term perspective, there is evidence that they served a new generation of school children and students as informal textbooks and socialized them in the context of *baihua*. But the diglossic state of the Chinese language was not yet seriously challenged.

What Was "Revolutionary" About the Literary Revolution?

Instead of dwelling on the Renaissance analogy we should therefore rather ask ourselves what was "revolutionary" in the "literary revolution" proclaimed in 1917 by Chen Duxiu and Hu Shi in their journal *New Youth*? Jack Goldstone, who has

argued in favor of a fourth generation of revolutionary theory, defines a revolution as "an effort to transform the political institutions and the justifications for political authority in society, accompanied by formal and informal mass mobilization and non-institutionalized actions that undermine authorities" (Goldstone 2001, 142). Revolutions are not just popular uprisings but may emerge out of elite conflict and start with collapse at the center if opposition elites are seeking to reform or replace the regime.

The revolutionary act in the "literary revolution" was not Hu Shi's vindication of the novel as a valuable literary genre. Hu Shi used the term "*wenxue geming*" (文學革命 'literary revolution') in an almost innocent way, much as Liang Qichao, chief advocate of modernizing the literary language, had used it earlier when he spoke of a "*wenjie geming*" (文界革命 'revolution in the literary field') (Ma 2000, 62; 99–100). It was directed at intra-literary developments (Hu 1990, 862–867). The true call for revolution in the sense of Goldstone's definition as an "an effort to transform the political institutions and the justifications for political authority in society" came from Chen Duxiu rather than Hu Shi. Chen Duxiu had published a *baihua* newspaper in 1904 in order to propagate revolutionary ideas, but at that time he did not care about eliminating diglossia, rather he used language selectively depending on the audience, and he continued elite practices of communicating in the literary language with his peers. This was different in early 1917, when Chen, under the impression of the failed political revolution of 1911 and his intensive study of the French Revolution, redefined the literary revolution as part of a larger social revolution. Knowing that this would make him many enemies within the literati class, he defined three goals of the literary revolution as

1. to overthrow the ornate and flattering literature of the nobility and to establish a simple and lyrical national literature;
2. to overthrow the stale and flamboyant classical literature and to establish a fresh and honest realist literature;
3. to overthrow the pedantic and difficult to understand elitist literature and to establish an easily readable and popular social literature. (Chen 1917)

Although Chen Duxiu does not mention *baihua* here, it is clear from his reference to literary styles that the prevalent literary language has to be revolutionized as well. We sense here already that Chen Duxiu's and Hu Shi's political ways would part very soon—Chen Duxiu became one of the founders of the Chinese Communist Party, while Hu Shi remained true to his American liberal ideas.

The "literary revolution" was in fact not a revolution of the people but one of the elites. Its most significant result was that the intellectual elites in China started to see the vernacular not as complementary to the classical language but as a competitor for prestigious literary writing. While late Qing *baihua* established a bilingual mode of writing, the literary revolution made writers shift back to a monolingual mode with the difference that they now would write in the vernacular. At the same time, political changes added impetus to the movement. Yuan Shikai's (袁世凱 1859–1916) death liberated the cultural scene in Beijing. Chen Duxiu, Hu Shi, and other reformers were appointed as professors of Beijing University. They became a crucial group of intellectuals who saw it as their responsibility to study

and elaborate the vernacular in order to develop it into a viable, multi-functional modern national language.

Yet, in the initial 2 years the "literary revolution" was not yet "accompanied by formal and informal mass mobilization and non-institutionalized actions that undermine authorities," the second condition Goldstone cites as defining a revolution. This mobilization came after May Fourth 1919 when the "literary revolution" finally left the narrow confines of academic and educational discourse and entered politics with scores of radical student publications written in this style (cf. Chou 1963). It was exactly because of the importance of the literary language for the reproduction of the elites that this movement, unlike the earlier Japanese "*genbun itchi* movement," assumed the dimensions of a social movement against the whole traditional system.

Baihua Versus Baihuawen

So what about DeFrancis's criticism of May Fourth *baihua* as a hybrid language instead of a pure spoken language that was understandable to the uneducated masses? I believe that DeFrancis, and with him Eric Hobsbawm, commit an intellectual fallacy here because they seem to think that a language has just to be chosen and used. However, language is a social construct that has to be created, and this is even truer for modern national languages. All modern national languages are hybrid constructs that include classical and contemporary, as well as foreign, elements (Haugen 1983, 269–289).

The group of literary revolutionaries at Beijing University quickly became aware of this fact, and they developed self-confidence as creators of the new national literary language of China. In January 1918, Hu Shi conceded that his former attempt to exclude all literary expressions from his *baihua* poems had failed and that a mixed style using both literary and vernacular expressions was preferable. This made him reflect on the meaning of *baihua*. His conclusion led him to state that *baihua* did not necessarily mean the vulgar tongue but simply "*mingbai*" or 'clear.' He thus declared literary elements to be acceptable as long as they were clear enough (Hu 1918; Hu 1916, 567). The linguist Qian Xuantong (錢玄同 1887–1939), concerned about integrating elements from Chinese dialects and European languages into this new literary language, compared it with Esperanto, which was a planned language composed of elements of various European languages (Qian 1918, 286). As a result of these efforts, the new literary language required a new name. Peng Qingpeng in 1917 called it "*jicheng guanhua*" (集成官話 'Integrated Mandarin') (Peng 1917), but soon thereafter a new name came into use, "*baihuawen* 白話文."

When DeFrancis spoke of a hybrid style that is not "*baihua,*" he was correct. According to deeply ingrained diglossia patterns, early twentieth-century Chinese considered speech and writing to be completely different categories with writing not thought to be a mirror of speech. In 1918 Qian Xuantong conceded that it was

nonsense to juxtapose "*baihua*" and "*wenyan*" because one was speech and the other denominated writing. He noted that it would be better to say that "modern people use modern language (*jinyu* 今語) to write essays, ancient people used ancient language (*guyu* 古語) to write essays" (Qian 1919, 91). Only after 1919 did the term "*baihuawen* 白話文" finally appear in the linguistic discourse and become the technical term for the new hybrid style created and elaborated during and after the May Fourth New Culture Movement. DeFrancis criticized the results of the "literary revolution" under the influence of Communist attempts to erase the May Fourth heritage in the 1930s and 1940s. Yet, I believe that the revolutionary aspect of the "literary revolution" should not be sought in creating a language accessible to the masses, but in the fact that it created a new literary language for the elites that was contemporary and close to spoken language but could also be used for high-end purposes like philosophy and sciences. Although Late Qing *baihua* was created as an imitation of uneducated speech, it did not fulfill these purposes.

In 1909 the textbook editor of Commercial Press Du Yaquan (杜亞泉 1873–1933) objected to the use of *baihua* in textbooks for elementary math education. There were two reasons for this: First, a concern for stylistic propriety. He thought that students would not be able to use proper literary expressions once their perception of style was contaminated by *baihua* elements. The second reason was that *baihua* expressions appeared cumbersome and less clear. Du Yaquan admitted that the dichotomy between the written and spoken languages was an obstacle to national communication in China. His solution was not to use *baihua* but the implementation of a simplified and standardized literary style. As a Jiangsu man, who in 1912 also developed a phonetic notation in Roman letters for the Jiangsu dialect (Du 1912, 1–7), Du believed that there was not one *baihua* but many, and that a simplified classical style was the only way to ensure that the written language of China remained unified. The goal of national unification should be to upgrade spoken language in order to make it closer to the written language not to degrade the standards of the written language (Du 1909, 802). Here we once again return to our cart driver in the story from *Nine-tailed turtle* but from a completely different perspective. Rather than talking to the cart driver in his own primitive language, the cart driver should be educated to be able to speak in a language that approximates that used by the elites.

On the other hand, if we compare the examples given by Du we might wonder from our modern perspective what exactly constitutes the difference between *wenyan* (called *wenci* 文辭 by Du) and *baihua* (Table 1):

In these examples the difference is merely in the use of the verbs, but today's grammarian would not hesitate to include Du's *wenyan* examples with modern *baihua* grammar. The answer to this puzzle may be that *wenyan* and *baihua* are entirely constructed categories. Du Yaquan would count as a "modernizer" in my very rough categorization of reform approaches, because he was advocating the modernization of the literary language rather than the use of *baihua*. But what Du Yaquan identifies as *baihua* here is actually the Late Qing newspaper style that imitates speech, and what he identifies as the literary language in fact more closely resembles the hybrid *baihuawen* created during the May Fourth era.

Table 1 Examples

	Baihua	Wenci
Use a certain amount of money	使錢若干 shǐ qián ruò gān	用錢若干 yòng qián ruò gān
Break three bowls	打了三隻碗 dǎ le sān shuāng wǎn	打破三隻碗dǎ pò sān shuāng wǎn

Conclusion

The "literary revolution" proclaimed by Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu played a crucial role in the dissolution of diglossia in China. It did not emerge out of the blue but was the result of two decades of rethinking the roles of language and writing in Chinese society, an era when national crisis made the dichotomy between the classical literary language and the "vulgar" language appear to be what Haugen has called "schizoglossia" (Haugen 1972, 148–189). The literary revolution and the subsequent May Fourth Movement were indeed a turning point because they concluded a process of status choice and began the process of corpus planning in which *baihuawen* became the modern Chinese literary language (Haugen 1983, 269–289). Although the results of this linguistic shift—a contemporary literary language written in Chinese characters—have been criticized by both proponents of the classical language and a phonetic script, whatever the outcome of these and any subsequent debates might be, we have to admit that the results of Chinese language policy have been quite impressive. Today, literacy rates in China are high, and in recent years Chinese has become a vibrant language of science and academic publishing. While at the same time the declining status of German as a scientific language has become a matter of debate even though it emerged from diglossia centuries earlier (Ammon 2010, 400–404; Jha 2011; Zhou Ping et al. 2009).[1]

References

Ammon, Ulrich. 2010. "Über Deutsch als Wissenschaftssprache." *Forschung und Lehre* 6: 400–404.

Chen Duxiu 陳獨秀. 1917. "Wenxue Geminglun" 文學革命論 (A theory of the Literary Revolution). *Xin Qingnian* 2 (6), February 1.

Chen Pingyuan. 2009. "An Audible China: Speech and the Innovation in Modern Chinese Writing." *Frontiers in Literature Studies in China* 3 (2): 270–320.

Chou Tse-tsung. 1963. *Research Guide to The May Fourth Movement; Intellectual Revolution in Modern China, 1915–1924*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

[1] The issue of German as a language of science (Deutsch als Wissenschaftssprache) has been a matter of concern for the past decade and has even been a topic for a hearing of the Bundestag (see Vilmar et al. 2001; "German as a Scientific Language—Joint Statement by the Presidents of the AvH, the DAAD, the Goethe Institute, and the HRK" 2012).

DeFrancis, John. 1984. “Digraphia.” *Word* 15: 59–66.
DeFrancis, John. 1950. *Nationalism and Language Reform in China*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
DeFrancis, John. 2006. “To the editor,” *PMLA* 121.1: 298–299.
Du Yaquan杜亞泉. 1909. “Du Yaquan zhi mouren shu” 杜亞泉致某人書 (Du Yaquan’s letter to someone). *Jiaoyu Zazhi* 1 (9): 802.
———1912. “Lun Qieyin Zimu” 論切音字母 (About a phonetic script). *Dongfang Zazhi* 9 (5): 1–7.
“German as a Scientific Language—Joint Statement by the Presidents of the AvH, the DAAD, the Goethe Institute, and the HRK.” 2012. *DAAD*, February 18. Accessed March 21, 2012. http://www.daad.de/portrait/presse/pressemitteilungen/2009/10005.en.html
Gibbs Hill, Michael. 2010. “The Politics of Language in Chinese Education, 1895–1919.” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 70.2 (December): 516–524.
Goldstone, Jack. 2001. “Towards a Fourth Generation of Revolutionary Theory.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 4 (1): 139–187.
Haugen, Einar. 1972. “Schizoglossia and the Linguistic Norm.” In *The Ecology of Language: Essays by Einar Haugen*, edited by Anwar S. Dil, 148–189. Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press.
Haugen, Einar. 1983. “The Implementation of Corpus Planning: Theory and Practice.” In *Progress in Language Planning*, edited by Juan Cobarrubias and Joshua A. Fishman, 269–89. Berlin: Mouton.
Hobsbawm, Eric. 1990. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*. London: Cambridge University Press.
Hu Shi 胡適. 1918. “Da Qian Xuantong Shu” 答錢玄同書 (Answer to Qian Xuantong) (November 20, 1917). Xin Qingnian 4 (1), January 15.
Hu Shi 胡適. 1990. “Wuguo Lishishang de Wenxue Geming” 吾國歷史上的文學革命 (The literary revolution in the history of our country) (April 5, 1916). In *Hu Shi Liuxue Riji*, 862–867. Shanghai: Shanghai Shudian.
Hu Shih. 1934. *The Chinese Renaissance (The Haskell Lectures, 1933)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Hu Shih. 1951. “Nationalism and Language Reform in China.” *The American Historical Review* 56 (4): 897–899.
Hu Suh [Hu Shi]. 1916. “The Problem of the Chinese Language: III. The Teaching of Chinese as it is.” *The Chinese Students’ Monthly* XI (8): 567–593.
Huang Zunxian 黃遵憲. 1974. *Riben Guozhi 日本國志 (Description of Japan)*. vol. 69 of Jindai Zhongguo Shiliao Congkan Xubian 近代中國史料叢刊續編. Taibei: Wenhai.
Jha, Alok. 2011. “China poised to overhaul US as biggest publisher of scientific papers.” *The Guardian*, March 28. Accessed March 21, 2012. http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2011/mar/28/china-us-publisher-scientific-papers
Kaske, Elisabeth. 2008. *The Politics of Language in Chinese Education, 1895–1919*. Leiden: Brill.
Ku, Hung-ming. 1915. *The Spirit of the Chinese People*. Peking: Peking Daily News.
Lu Zhuangzhang 盧戇章. 1896. “Biantong Tuiyuan Shuo” 變通推原說 (On the Foundations of Reform). Wanguo Gongbao 85 (February):15811–15817.
Ma Chunlin 馬春林. 2000. *Zhongguo Wan Qing Wenxue Geming Shi* 中國晚清文學革命史 (A History of the Literary Revolution in Late Qing China). Shenyang: Liaoning Daxue.
Machida Kazuhiko. 2012. “Corpus of "Xiao-Er-Jin" Script of Muslim Chinese: Collection and Digitalization.” Tokyo University of Foreign Studies: Research Institute of Languages of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa. Accessed February 26, 2012. http://www.aa.tufs.ac.jp/~kmach/xiaoerjin/xiaoerjin-e.htm
Makeham, John. 2008. *Lost Soul: “Confucianism” in Contemporary Chinese Academic Discourse*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center.
Peng Qingpeng 彭清鵬. 1917. “Ping zhenggao jin zhi suowei jiaoyujia” 評正告今之所謂教育家 (A critical reply to ‘Telling today’s so-called educators’). Beijing Ribao, March 3.

Qian Xuantong 錢玄同. 1918. “Da Wu Zhihui” 答吳稚暉 (Reply to Wu Zhihui). *Xin Qingnian* 4 (3, March 7): 284–286.
Qian Xuantong 錢玄同. 1919. “Da Cha Zhaozhong” 答查釗忠 (Reply to Cha Zhaozhong). *Xin Qingnian* 6 (1, January): 90–92.
Qiu Tingliang 裘廷梁. 1963. “Lun baihua wei weixin zhi ben” 論白話為維新之本 (On *baihua* as the root of modernization). In “Qing mo baihuawen yundong ziliao” 清末白話文運動資料 (Materials of the baihua movement during late Qing dynasty), compiled by Jian Chengwen 翦誠文. *Jindaishi Ziliao* 2: 120–123.
Vilmar, Fritz; Klingemann, Hans-Dieter; Wey, Christian and Gerhard Sticket. 2001. “Zur Debatte: Deutsch als Wissenschaftssprache.” Discussion paper P 01–003, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung. Accessed February 17, 2012. skylla.wzb.eu/pdf/2001/p01–003.pdf.
Wang, David Der-wei. 1997. *Fin-de-siècle splendor: repressed modernities of late Qing fiction, 1849–1911*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
“Xuebu zi waiwubu wen” 學部咨外務部文 (Board of Education to Foreign Ministry, 1906). 1958. In *Qingmo Wenzi Gaige Wenji* 清末文字改革文集 (Collected writings of the script reform in late Qing), edited by Wenzi Gaige Chubanshe, 67–71. Beijing: Wenzi Gaige Chubanshe.
Yunjian Tianzhuisheng 雲間天贅生. 2012. *Shangjie Xianxing Ji* 商界現形記 (Exposure of the business world). Project Gutenberg. Accessed February 26, 2012. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/24079/24079-0.txt
“Yuyan he wenzi butong de binggen” 語言合文字不同的病根 (The lingering effects of the incongruence of language and writing). 1905. Jinghua Ribao 221, April 1.
Zhang Chunfan 張春帆. 2000. *Jiu wei gui* 九尾龜 (Nine-tailed turtle). Beijing: Zhongguo Xiju Chubanshe.
Zhang Xudong. 1997. *Chinese Modernism in the Era of Reforms: Cultural Fever, Avant-garde Fiction, and the New Chinese Cinema*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Zhou Gang. 2011. *Placing the Modern Chinese Vernacular in Transnational Literature*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Zhou Gang. 2005. “The Chinese Renaissance: A Transcultural Reading.” *PMLA* 120.3: 783–795.
Zhou Gang. 2006. “Reply.” *PMLA* 121.1: 299–300.
Zhou, Ping, Bart Thijs, Wolfgang Glänzel. 2009. “Is China also becoming a giant in social sciences?” *Scientometrics* 79:3 (June 2009): 593–621.

Diglossia in China: Past and Present

Jinzhi Su

Abstract This article discusses the state of Chinese diglossia throughout history. It describes its emergence, its rise and fall, shows its development, and the process of its dissolution. The article further examines the present state of the modern Chinese language and regional diglossic situations. In the past, Chinese diglossia consisted of various elements: There was the unchallenged H-position of Classical Written Chinese as opposed to the Vernacular Written Chinese, which occupied the L-position on the written level. At the same time, there were spoken regional varieties of Chinese that were regarded as L-varieties as well. Since the 1920s, during the course of China's modernization, the Vernacular Written language replaced Classical Chinese as the H-variant and came into use by all the speakers of those regional varieties. Thus, its position shifted from L to H with regard to the spoken varieties. This development shows that the former kind of diglossia came to its dissolution, while a new diglossic situation was created through the shift of the Vernacular Written Chinese from L to H. It can be concluded that there are different kinds of diglossic situations that demonstrate different development in different settings. In some languages diglossia can be multi-layered, and it is also possible for several L-varieties to coexist.

Keywords Baihua movement • Classical Chinese • Guoyu • Putonghua • Vernacular written Chinese

J. Su (✉)
Institute of Applied Linguistics, Ministry of Education, Beijing
e-mail: sjzhi@sina.com.cn

J. Árokay et al. (eds.), *Divided Languages?*, Transcultural Research – Heidelberg Studies on Asia and Europe in a Global Context, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-03521-5_4,

Introduction

In 1959, in a paper in the journal *Word*, Ferguson characterized a certain type of language situation as "diglossia." This evoked many heated discussions. Fishman (1967), for instance, has revised the idea many times over a period of more than 20 years. Hudson (2001, 229) comments that Fishman's account of diglossia differs from Ferguson's in two respects: First, Fishman extends the term 'diglossia' to include cases where the H and L varieties are not genetically related in any immediate sense; that is to say, the H and L varieties can be two genetically unrelated languages. Second, Fishman recognizes two types of compartmentalization of varieties in diglossia: a functional compartmentalization, where different varieties are assigned by social consensus to non-overlapping speech contexts within a single speech community, and a territorial or political compartmentalization (one which Ferguson did not recognize) where varieties are distributed along population lines within social or political entities comprised of multiple speech communities.

This study will provide both an outline of the formation, development, and dissolution of diglossia in Chinese situation in the past, based on the diglossic theories of Ferguson and Fishman, and an outline of the new Chinese diglossic situation at present.

The Formation, Development, and Dissolution of Diglossia in the Past

According to Ferguson's theory of diglossia (1959, 327), there are two varieties of a language, the High variety (H) and Low variety (L), which coexist in a diglossic situation. The H variety is generally regarded with more esteem than the L. The H is formal and in written form while the L is informal and in spoken form (Ferguson 1959, 328). Ferguson has declared that the Chinese language probably represents diglossia on the largest scale of any attested instance (1959, 146). Before the early 1920s, the Chinese diglossic situation did not change. The Classical Chinese corresponded to H, while Mandarin colloquial or Vernacular Written Chinese was a standard L, although there were also other regional L varieties. Vernacular Written Chinese refers to forms of written Chinese based on spoken Chinese, in contrast to Classical Chinese.

During the Zhou Dynasty (1046 BC–256 BC), "old Chinese" was the spoken and written form of Chinese, and was used to write Classical Chinese texts. Starting with the Qin Dynasty (221 BC–206 BC), however, spoken Chinese began to evolve at a faster pace than the written Chinese. The difference gradually grew larger with the passage of time. In the Eastern Han period (25 AD–220 AD), a differentiation between the spoken and written Chinese appeared, and the division between the two registers grew with time. It can be assumed that the formation of diglossia in China

took place during the Han period and the Kingdom of Wei Dynasties (220 AD–265 AD).

Two important factors in the formation of Chinese diglossia should be mentioned: one is the Chinese writing system and the other the literati who controlled the written language usage. The general nature of Chinese graphs is exemplified in the accompanying chart. There are three basic forms: The first is pictographic, a conventionalized picture-symbol of an object, such as *rì* (日 the sun) and *yuè* (月 the moon). The second form is ideographic, an idea-symbol, such as elementary numerals *yī* (一 one), *èr* (二 two), and *sān* (三 three). The third form is phonographic, representing not ideas but specific words as spoken. The phonograph combines a pictographic or ideographic element of relevant meaning with another element whose pronunciation is applicable. An example is *lù* (露 dew), which combines an ideographic element *yǔ* (雨rain)and a phonographic element *lù* (路 road). 露 is pronounced as 路, but it does not have any relevant meaning with the meaning of the element "road." From the above example it can be seen that the Chinese writing system is not a system for recording spoken Chinese. This might have been one of the reasons that written Chinese diverged early on from the pattern of spoken Chinese and inevitably resulted in the formation of diglossia in China.

Diglossia can be best understood as a phenomenon entirely generated by writing (Coulmas 2002, 62). In addition to the Chinese writing system itself, the literati, who control the use of the written language, are another important factor for the formation of Chinese diglossia. Classical Chinese was a test language for the imperial examination, by which Chinese feudal dynasties from the Sui Dynasty (581 AD–618 AD) to the Qing Dynasty (1644–1912) selected candidates for civil posts. According to Ferguson, diglossia is likely to have emerged as a consequence of the long-term monopoly of a small elite on literacy and, therefore, on direct access to the literary heritage of speech community (1959, 338). At the time of the emergence of Chinese diglossia, the linguistic difference between the literati and the general population was probably a result of the lengthy accumulation of literary tradition. Only a few people could read and write, and literacy was extremely low. As a result, a small number of educated elite employed at least two varieties including H variety, in some cases more, but the general population did not have any opportunities to acquire the H variety.

With the development of the Chinese diglossic situation, spoken Chinese developed its written form in literature. By the Tang (618 AD–907 AD) and Song (960 AD–1279 AD) dynasties, people began to write in their vernacular dialects of *biànwén* (变文 altered language) and *yǔlù* (语录 language record) in the form of Buddhist lectures and a comparatively small number of plays and novels from the Yuan dynasty (1206–1368). The spoken language was completely distinct from the still-maintained written standard of Classical Chinese. Those not educated in Classical Chinese—almost the entirety of the population—could understand only very little of the language. During the Ming (1368–1644) and Qing (1616–1911) dynasties, Vernacular Written Chinese called *baihua* (白话) began to be used in novels widely. It is estimated that there are 1,160 novels written in *baihua* and most

of them are written during the Ming and Qing dynasties, except a few dozen that were written during other dynastic periods.

In fact, the Chinese diglossic situation seems to be a "triglossia," made up of Classical Chinese (CC) as an H variety and Vernacular Written Chinese (VWC) and Vernacular Spoken Chinese (VSC) as an L variety.

Vernacular Written Chinese was refined by intellectuals associated with the Literary Revolution or the Vernacular Literature Movement of 1917 spearheaded by Hu Shi (胡适 1891–1962) and by the May Fourth Movement of 1919. These two movements resulted in the dissolution of the old diglossia in Chinese. Classical Chinese became increasingly viewed as a fossil that hindered education and national progress. The works of Lu Xun (鲁迅 1881–1936), such as *The True Story of Ah Q* (*A Q Zhengzhuan* 阿Q正传) and *KongYiji* (孔乙己), among other works by writers of fiction and non-fiction, did much to advance this view. Vernacular Written Chinese soon came to be viewed as mainstream by the majority of the new social elite. Along with the growing popularity of vernacular writing in books during this period, came the acceptance of punctuation, which was modified from Western languages (traditional Chinese literature had been almost entirely unpunctuated), and the use of Arabic numerals. As a result, someone who used more elements of Classical Chinese in his writing might be taken as a pedantic person just like Kong Yiji in Lu Xun's fiction.

Chao (1948, 9) describes the course of diglossia dissolution in his book *Mandarin Primer*:

> As things stand now, the movement has penetrated most deeply in the field of literature. Novels and plays, which formerly had to be read furtively from inside half –open drawers, are now placed on the top of classroom desks as part of courses in literature. New novels and plays, and to a lesser extent poetry, are written in the colloquial idiom. More than half of the publications on scientific subjects and translations of foreign books are in the colloquial. In the schools, the colloquial is taught through the sixth grade, and wenli (Classical Chinese) is taught only from the seventh grade, or junior middle school, on. It is in the government, in business, and in the non-academic professions that the change has been slowest, due in part no doubt to the difficulty of disturbing well-established phraseology and familiar conventional forms. A paradoxical result of this is that while news dispatches, official notices, and even advertisements are in the literary idiom, the so-called literary section and frequently the editorial section of newspapers are in the colloquial. In increasing degrees, however, the written colloquial has come to stay.

Hudson (2002, 35) explains the reasons for the decline of Classical Chinese in two respects: (1) The old social order of the Qing Dynasty had begun to crumble allowing Chinese script to be subjected to critical scrutiny (DeFrancis 1972, 10); and (2) the eventual victory of the vernacular *baihua* movement appears to have been associated with the replacement of the traditional scholar-bureaucracy with a republican form of government in 1911 (Barnes 1982, 261). These were the two most important social factors that contributed to the fall of Chinese diglossia. It was clear that the decline of Classical Chinese resulted from the admission of the Vernacular Written Chinese into domains formerly reserved exclusively for the H variety, and that the rise of the Vernacular Written Chinese was motivated by

political factors, especially the Vernacular Literature Movement and the May Fourth Movement.

With the dissolution of diglossia, Vernacular Written Chinese increasingly replaced Classical Chinese in most of the registers, but some elements of Classical Chinese were still used widely. In Classical Chinese, *zhī* (之) has a different meaning according to function, for instance, when acting as a verb, a pronoun, or as a function word. As a verb, it means "leave for," for instance, *yóu mǐn zhī jīng* (由闽之京) can be translated into "leave Fujian for Beijing." As a pronoun, it has three usages. The first can be used as a demonstrative pronoun: *zhī èr chóng* (之二虫) can be translated into "these two creatures." The second can be used in certain set phrases without a definite designation: *jiǔ ér jiǔ zhī* (久而久之) can be translated into "with the passage of time" or "for a long, long time." The last is its use in place of an objective noun or pronoun: *qǔ ér dài zhī* (取而代之) can be translated as "replace someone." As a function word, it usually has two usages: first, it can be used between an attribute and the word it modifies. For instance, *zhōng gǔ zhī shēng* (钟鼓之声) can be translated into "sound of drums and the tolling of bells" and *shí fēn zhī jiǔ* (十分之九) can be translated into "nine tenth." Second, it can be used between the subject and the predicate in an S-P structure so as to nominalize it, *dàdào zhī xíng yě, tiānxià wéi gōng* (大道之行也,天下为公) can be translated into "when the great doctrine is followed, all the world belongs to the people." In the Standard Written Chinese (SWC, see below), *zhī* (之) as a verb and as a demonstrative pronoun is not found in the Corpus of Modern Chinese. This Corpus was established by the Institute of Applied Linguistics under the Ministry of Education in Beijing, and it includes more than 100 million raw data dating from 1919 to 2003. Other usages of *zhī* (之) can be found in the Corpus and in SWC or spoken Chinese, as mentioned above.

The New Diglossic Situation at Present

Along with the 'old Chinese' diglossia dissolution, a new diglossic situation has been established since the early 1920s. Vernacular Written Chinese has become the standard style of writing for speakers of all varieties of Chinese throughout mainland China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Macau. As the written counterpart of Modern Standard Chinese, it is commonly called Standard Written Chinese or Modern Written Chinese to avoid the ambiguity of the word 'vernacular' in the modern context. After the 1950s, mainland China began to view the standardization of the Chinese language as an important project for cultural and educational departments. During this period the government issued a directive that inaugurated a three-part plan for language reform. This plan sought to establish universal comprehension of a standardized common language, simplify written characters, and introduce, where possible, romanized forms based on the Latin alphabet. In 1956 *Putonghua* was introduced as the language of instruction in schools and in the national broadcast media; spoken Chinese, standard *Putonghua* or *Putonghua* with some accents, was

being used by the majority of mainlanders. The continuing campaigns to eradicate illiteracy were also a part of basic education. In general, language reform intended to make written and spoken Chinese easier to learn, which in turn, would foster both literacy and linguistic unity and serve as a foundation for a simpler written language. Therefore, generally speaking, Classical Chinese was and is no longer used as the standard written language in the publications of any governmental organizations, educational institutions, publishing houses, and departments or institutes for public services. The test language in all schools is SWC, not Classical Chinese. College entrance examinations held every year also use SWC as the test language, especially in the Chinese composition test. In contrast to mainland China, the SWC used in Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Macau has more Classical Chinese elements than mainland China. Tang (2001) lists 451 lexical items from Classical Chinese used in Taiwan SWC that are rarely used in mainland China. There are also regional L varieties such as '*Guanhua*' (Mandarin dialect), *Yue* dialect (Cantonese), *Min* dialect, *Wu* Dialect, *Kejia* dialect, *Gan* dialect, *Xiang* dialect, *Jin* dialect, *Pinghua* dialect, and *Hui* dialect. The spoken form of Cantonese and *Min* dialects also have some written forms that include additional characters for writing, especially in Hong Kong and in Taiwan. These written forms have not been standardized and are used in informal contexts only. They are most commonly used in commercial advertisements, song lyrics sung colloquially in native dialect, and legal records for accurately recording dialogue and colloquial expressions. They are often mixed to varying degrees with Classical Chinese and Modern Standard Chinese; see Table 1.

In the study of Hong Kong Written Chinese (HKWC) (Su 2008), a multi-level-diglossic system (see Table 2) is used to analyze and interpret linguistic borrowing in the Hong Kong speech community based on Ferguson's theory and Fishman's revisions. The term diglossia is used here to describe situations in which a speech community uses two distinctive language varieties (the High variety and the Low variety), which are either genetically related or unrelated for different social purposes. The H variety usually tends to be used for formal and widely-used purposes, and the L variety for informal or specific purposes. The H variety and the L variety have their own respective functional allocation. The concepts of H and L variety used here overlap slightly and the functional compartmentalization of codes does not seem to be as strict as what Ferguson described, mainly because of the changing language situation in the Hong Kong speech community in recent years (e.g. Spoken Cantonese has become the High variety and Written Cantonese has become the Low variety). It seems that assigning the role of H variety to Spoken Cantonese has broken the rule under which written languages are usually designated as the H varieties and spoken languages as the L varieties. This is one of the ways in which the linguistic situation has been changing in postcolonial Hong Kong. Although written Cantonese is developing further, its function remains limited. Written Cantonese cannot be used in government documents and other formal occasions where Standard Written Chinese should be used. The reason Spoken Cantonese has such a high status is because it has become the community's predominant spoken form and it can be used in formal situations, such as

Table 1 New Chinese diglossic situation in mainland China

Diglossia	H	
	Standard Written Chinese	
	L	H
	Spoken Chinese	Putonghua
		L
		Guanhua (Mandarin dialect)
		Cantonese
		Min dialect
		Wu dialect
		Xiang dialect
		Kejia dialect
		Gan dialect
		Jin dialect
		Pinghua dialect
		Hui dialect

Table 2 Chinese diglossic situation in Hong Kong

Diglossia	H			
	English			
	L	H	H	H
	Chinese	Standard Chinese	Written Form	Standard Written Chinese
				L
				Hong Kong Written Chinese
			L	
			Spoken Form (Putonghua)	
		L	H	
		Cantonese	Spoken Cantonese	
			L	
			Written Cantonese	

government press announcements and instruction language in classroom. It will be argued that this Table 2 provides a better description of the Hong Kong language situation.

From the above table we can see that within the "Standard Chinese," PTH as a spoken language is the L variety, while SWC is the H variety. However, within Cantonese, Spoken Cantonese is the H variety while Written Cantonese is the L variety. The importance of PTH has obviously soared in the post-1997 Hong Kong speech community, but its function is still limited in comparison with SWC.

In contrast to the Hong Kong speech community, the diglossic situation of the Taiwan speech community is different. In 1945, following the end of World War II, "*Guoyu*" (Mandarin) was introduced as the official language and made compulsory in schools. Until the 1980s the Kuomintang administration heavily promoted the use of "*Guoyu*" and discouraged the use of other dialects, such as *Min* dialect and *Kejia* dialect, at times even considering them inferior. After the 1980s the

Table 3 Chinese diglossic situation in Taiwan

Guoyu mixed with some foreign words H_1
Guoyu H_2
Taiwanese M (including all dialects)
Taiwan Guoyu L

discrimination against dialects gradually disappeared. As far as diglossic situation is concerned, there are some similarities between the mainland and Taiwan: SWC is the H variety while spoken Chinese is the L variety. Huang (1994, 16) describes the Taiwanese speech community as a four-level diglossic system based on the use of spoken Chinese as depicted in the following Table 3.

According to Huang's description, "*Guoyu*" mixed with some foreign words is the highest variety, and is used by intellectuals who have some background of study at overseas universities, while "Taiwan *Guoyu*" used by the middle and lower class is of the lowest variety. *Min* dialect and other dialects are between "*Guoyu*" (H2) and "Taiwan *Guoyu*." The fact that the position of dialects in Taiwan is higher than "Taiwan *Guoyu*" shows that dialects in Taiwan speech community are no longer considered inferior.

Some Perspectives for the Near Future

With the development of Chinese education and modernization, Vernacular Written Chinese has risen from the status of an L variety to an H variety as opposed to the regional L varieties, and Classical Chinese is no longer considered as an H variety in comparison with Vernacular Written Chinese. Some suggestions for the revival of Classical Chinese have been proposed by fans of Classical Chinese culture, but it does not seem to have any effect on the present diglossic situation mainly because of the modernization of education and culture in China.

The revival of Classical Chinese appears in the tourist industry, in advertisements, and in the Chinese composition test in the College Entrance Examination. The examiners often have disagreements over the student use of Classical Chinese to write Chinese composition during the College Entrance Examination, some think it should be admitted and others think it should be discouraged.

Conclusion

The diglossic situation in which Classical Chinese was the H variety and Vernacular Chinese was the L variety lasted for more than a 1,000 years. The eventual stabilization of Chinese diglossia had its roots in various endogenous linguistic

factors, such as the characteristic of Chinese script, the rich literature of Classical Chinese, and exogenous factors, such as the H variety used only by social elite and the L variety used by all members of the Chinese speech community. It can be concluded that different types of diglossia emerge through time and rise and fall in different social situations. One H variety may coexist with one or more of the L varieties on the same level, and there may be a multi-level diglossic system in the speech community of some languages.

References

Barnes, D. 1982. "Nationalism and the Mandarin Movements: The First Half-Century." In *Language Spread: Studies in Diffusion and Social Change* edited by R. Cooper, 260–290. Bloomington: Indiana University Press and Center for Applied Linguistics.

Chao Yuen Ren. 1948. *Mandarin Primer: An Intensive Course in Spoken Chinese*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Coulmas, Florian. 2002. "Writing is Crucial." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 157: 59–62.

DeFrancis, John. 1972. *Nationalism and Language Reform in China*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ferguson, Charles. A. 1959. "Diglossia." *Word* 15:325–40.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1967. "Bilingualism With and Without Diglossia; Diglossia With and Without Bilingualism." *Journal of Social Issues* 23(2): 29–38.

Huang Xuanfan 黄宣范. 1994. *Yuyan, Shehui yu Zuqun Yishi: Taiwan Yuyan Shehuixue de Yanjiu* 语言、社会与族群意识:台湾语言社会学的研究 (Language, Society and Ethnic Group Consciousness: A Study on the Linguistic Community in Taiwan). Taibei: Wenhe Gongsi.

Hudson, Alan. 2001. "Diglossia." In *Concise Encyclopedia of Sociolinguistics*, edited by Rajend Mesthrie, 226–31. Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.

———. 2002. "Outline of a Theory of Diglossia." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 157: 1–48.

Su Jinzhi. 2008. "Language Contact and Morphosyntactic Borrowing: A Case Study of Hong Kong Written Chinese". PhD Diss., Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

Tang Zhixiang 汤志祥. 2001. *Dangdai Hanyu ciyu de gongshi zhuangkuang jiqi shanbian: 90 niandai Zhongguo Dalu, Xianggang, Taiwan hanyu ciyu xianzhuang yanjiu*当代汉语词语的共时状况及其嬗变:九十年代中国大陆、香港、台湾汉语词语现状研究 (The lexical variation among different Chinese communities in 1990's (Mainland, Hong Kong and Taiwand). Shanghai: Fudan University Press.

Shifting Patterns of Chinese Diglossia: Why the Dialects May Be Headed for Extinction

Chris Wen-Chao Li

Abstract Over the past 100 years, the paradigm under which Chinese diglossia operates has undergone significant change, morphing from a system using literary Chinese for writing and regional vernaculars for speech to a setup in which Mandarin and its new offshoots replace both the literary language and spoken dialects in both written and oral modes. This paper traces the transition from writing in the literary language to the use of Mandarin for all manner of communication and shows how higher literacy and education in Mandarin and English are sounding the death knell for the regional dialects. Many of these dialects are going from mainstream to obsolete in the course of a generation, especially in the younger segment of the population in urban centers traditionally regarded as bastions of regional speech, sparking backlash (e.g., pro-Cantonese demonstrations in Guangzhou) and attempts to revive dying vernaculars (e.g., Taiwan's indigenous language education movement). By examining the balance of power between Mandarin and dialect in Guangzhou, Shanghai, Taiwan, Singapore, and Malaysia, it will be shown that unless there is a counterbalance of prestige or economic utility, attempts to reverse the proliferation of Mandarin will prove futile, although the speech varieties being replaced will ultimately resurface in the phonology, lexicon, and syntax of the standard language, giving rise to new regional varieties of Mandarin.

Keywords Diglossia • Language change • Language planning • Standard languages • Chinese dialects • Mandarin

C.W.-C. Li (✉)
Department of Foreign Languages, San Francisco State University, San Francisco
e-mail: wenchao@sfsu.edu

J. Árokay et al. (eds.), *Divided Languages?*, Transcultural Research – Heidelberg Studies on Asia and Europe in a Global Context, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-03521-5_5,

Introduction

Chinese society has long been diglossic, but in dramatically different ways at different stages of its development. When Ferguson (1959, 337–338) spoke of Chinese being an instance of "diglossia on the largest scale of any attested instance," he was using the term in the classic sense in reference to the strict compartmentalization of function between the literary language and the vernacular in pre-modern China; whereas Peyraube (1991) and T'sou (1980) apply the same label in a more liberal sense to relations between spoken varieties of Chinese in contemporary times that are best described as a form of societal bilingualism and are regarded as diglossia only in the most marginal sense. This gives an idea of how, over the past 100 years, the paradigm under which Chinese diglossia operates has shifted dramatically, from one in which literary Chinese reigned as the sole written medium and regional dialects served oral communication purposes, to one in which Mandarin (in its many varieties) has replaced both literary Chinese and the regional dialects in both written and oral modes.

This paper charts the development of Chinese from the age of writing in the literary language to the rise of Mandarin as the standard medium for communication. It will demonstrate how factors generally believed to precipitate the downfall of classic diglossia were brought to bear during China's transition to modernity over the past century, resulting in the development of a new standard language based on the educated vernacular. It will become evident that pre-modern Chinese diglossia is classic in every sense: from the archaic nature of the H-language and its origins in canonical literature, to its restricted use by elites in an illiterate civilized society and the patterns and circumstances of its eventual decline. In stark contrast, it will be demonstrated that the multiglossic setup in which China currently finds itself is unorthodox and anti-classic in every way, especially considering the overlap of domain and function between high and low languages and the acceleration of diglossic dissolution that this inevitably brings about. It will also be shown that increased literacy and widespread education in Mandarin (and English, in some instances) will hasten the demise of the Chinese regional dialects—many of which are going from mainstream to obsolete in the course of a generation, especially among the younger segment of the urban population. This trend, however, is not without its backlashes: anti-Mandarin demonstrations in Guangzhou and Taiwan's indigenous language education movement are but a few of the many often futile attempts at stemming the tide of Mandarin's ascendency.

In weighing the balance of power between Mandarin and dialect in Guangzhou, Shanghai, Taiwan, Singapore, and Malaysia, a consistent picture emerges of a younger generation fluent only in the Mandarin überlanguage and holding the local vernacular of earlier generations in contempt. It will be argued that without a counterbalance of prestige or economic utility, no post-factum measures will suffice to reverse the trend of Mandarin domination, although the local dialects being replaced will leave their mark in the phonology, lexicon, and syntax of the standard language, contributing to the creation of new prestige varieties of

Mandarin. Furthermore, as the standard language spreads over larger territories, the status of Mandarin's northern core may eventually be challenged by newer prestige varieties spoken in the wealthier south, thus allowing the shift in power to come full circle.

Literary Versus Vernacular Chinese

The linguist Charles Ferguson, who coined the term "diglossia" in 1959, described Chinese as "represent[ing] diglossia on the largest scale of any attested instance" (1959, 337–338). He was referring to the categorical division between literary and vernacular Chinese in the early twentieth century. Indeed, the complementary roles served by the literary and vernacular languages in pre-modern China are in many ways typical of the roles of H and L languages in classic diglossia. Classic or "narrow" diglossia requires specialization of function for H and L, namely that "in one set of situations only H is appropriate, and in another only L, with the two sets overlapping only very slightly" (Ferguson 1959, 328). Such is the case with literary and vernacular Chinese, the former of which was "perceived as being a language suited to the expression of sophisticated and elegant thought" (Snow 2010, 160). It was the only vehicle deemed suitable for writing, as it was the language of "all works making the least claim to correctness, propriety and chasteness," and "no person would deem his productions fit for the public gaze, and worthy of imitation, who did not write in this style" (Letter from Walter Medhurst, Alexander Stronach, and William Milne to the London Missionary Society (1851), in Zetzsche 1999, 93). Furthermore, "narrow" diglossia stresses that the H language is "a written variety which is the mother tongue of nobody" (Coulmas 1987, 117)—a designation that applies fittingly to literary Chinese, which is described in the literature as "a classic written language that was learned in school by those fortunate enough to have the chance for education," and was "not spoken by anyone as a native language" (Snow 2010, 160). Never in the history of China was literary Chinese used by any community for daily conversation (Snow 2010, 160).

With regard to the origins of the H language in classic diglossia, which in many traditions consist of "an archaism, a stage which the language reached some centuries ago, when it became 'frozen' by social conventions" (Bright 1976, 66), literary Chinese likewise traces its roots to canonical writings of the Warring States (403–255 BC) period, after which time "writers continued to model their prose on this early literary language, and the written languages thus began to take on an archaic aspect as the spoken language underwent a very different and by and large independent development" (Norman 1988, 83). Perpetuation of this prestige language was helped along by its social prestige and literary heritage. Furthermore, as "access to those more formal situations in which H is appropriate is asymmetrically distributed in favor of those educationally privileged, literate, or otherwise specialized classes in society most likely to have had the opportunity to acquire H formally" (Hudson 2002, 5–6), the result was that H became part of "a tradition

of restricted literacy involving the written variety of a language that becomes increasingly distant (and therefore distinct) from the native variety of language spoken in a speech community that is overwhelmingly illiterate" (Walters 1996, 161–162, parentheses in original). Similarly, in China mastery of literary Chinese was "closely connected with political power as well as cultural prestige" (Snow 2010, 160) and was viewed by the general populace as "quite literally a road to power for aspiring candidates in the imperial examinations" (Snow 2010, 161), except that

> the fact that most people did not have sufficient schooling to compete in the examinations served to limit the number of potential rivals the elite had to contend with. . . the difficulty of [literary Chinese] helped keep the uneducated masses out. The situation meant that social elites had relatively little interest in promoting knowledge of H among the population at large. (Snow 2010, 161)

Classic diglossia, unlike its broader-based cousin, is believed to "typically persist at least several centuries, and evidence in some cases seems to show that it can last well over a thousand years" (Ferguson 1959, 332). The example of literary Chinese, which was "the language used in an enormous heritage of philosophical, religious and literary texts stretching back well over two thousand years" (Snow 2010, 160), attests to this claim. Literary Chinese had played the role of "the pre-eminent language for writing in China for the past two thousand years" (Fuller 2004, 1), but it has also been observed that classic diglossia tends to thrive in pre-industrialized civil societies with restricted literacy and "is most often removed at an early stage of modernization" (Neustupny 1974, 40) since "the processes of modernization, urbanization, mercantilism, and industrialization . . . create [demands] for a literate labor force." This is accompanied by "the disestablishment of small ruling groups, the breakdown of rigid class barriers and increased fluidity of role relationships, and the democratization of education, literacy, and knowledge that tend to accompany these" (Hudson 2002, 32), the result being that "H . . . tends to be displaced by L through a process of structural convergence resulting in the emergence of a new standard more closely related to certain educated varieties of the vernacular" (Hudson 2002, 30). The process is a well-documented one in China that is best reflected in the writings of European missionaries who in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries initially spoke of translating the Protestant Bible into literary Chinese. The missionaries saw literary Chinese as "the chaste and correct style of language" and "the classical style in which the Commentaries on the Sacred Books are written," and resorted to various compromises between the literary and vernacular languages, before finally discarding the literary translations in favor of the now widespread Union Bible version in colloquial Mandarin (Zetzsche 1999).

In diglossic speech communities, "decline of a classical variety is often accompanied by catastrophic political events involving the breakdown of classical society itself" (Hudson 2002, 34), and "the new socio-historical structure creates a new literary language out of the spoken language then current" (Pulgram 1950, 461–462). As China faced increasing encroachment from Japan and the West in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, there was a growing sentiment that

> China needed to strengthen itself by promoting mass literacy and education, and that [Literary Chinese] was an unsuitable language to use for modern mass education, partly because of its close association with a traditional civilization that did not offer China a way forward into modernity and national power, and partly because it was simply too difficult to teach. (Snow 2010, 161)

The subsequent wholesale replacement of literary Chinese with vernacular writing coincides largely with the end of imperial rule in China, culminating in the *Baihua Yundong* (白話運動 Vernacular Language Movement) of 1917. This happened within two short decades of the introduction of Western education in China, the abolition of Confucian-style civil service examinations, and the overthrow of the Qing dynasty (1644–1912). The result of this paradigm shift, which was officially sanctioned in 1917, was "the decision to write in such a way as to approximate contemporary vernacular speech, discontinuing the centuries-old practice among literate individuals of writing in the classical style, which had centuries earlier ceased to function as a medium of communication"; in other words, the elevation to prominence of vernacular writing—"a writing style long available within the society but previously unsanctioned for serious writing purposes" (Barnes 1982, 262).

While the Vernacular Language Movement is viewed today as largely successful, the end result, as is the case in many post-diglossic communities, is not complete displacement of the literary language with the vernacular, but rather a "merger of the original two norms" (Wexler 1971, 345–346, note 22). It has been noted that when H is replaced or partially merged with the vernacular to produce a new standard, the lexicon, in particular, lives on in the new standard in the form of a "large-scale transfer of terminology" in the realms of upper-class civilization, abstractions, and professional technologies (Kahane and Kahane 1979, 194). Lexicon aside, stylistic constraints serve to further distance the new written language from its colloquial counterpart as "sociocultural norms operative in contexts where writing is appropriate commonly dictate that the grammatical structure of written text be less casual and in some sense more elevated than the grammatical structure of spoken utterances" (Hudson 2002, 24), such that speech communities "generally do not feel that ordinary, everyday speech is appropriate for written use" (Ferguson 1968, 29–30). Such is the case with Modern Standard Chinese, in which "the grammar of the standard written language includes not only the syntax of the vernacular, but also elements of Classical Chinese convention that have made their way into modern standard writing" (Zhu 1988, 132). Furthermore, in the contemporary language "there is often considerable incorporation of classical elements—stereotyped phrases, truncated terms, even classical constructions—into what is ostensibly a vernacular piece of writing" (DeFrancis 1984, 244). Unique to Chinese is that phonology plays a role in the choice between literary and colloquial registers because the modern language is subject to metrical constraints requiring quasi-literary disyllabic forms in certain word formation templates (Duanmu 1999; Feng 2005). In other words, Modern Standard Chinese is characterized by "ways of amalgamating Classical Chinese with modern writings [that] are essentially motivated and licensed by prosody" (Feng 2005, 17). The

result of this is a "distinction between the written and spoken languages" which, while not as great as that in pre-modern times, nevertheless, in the words of early Republican philologist Huang Kan (黃侃 1886–1935), "is anything but coincidental," and to which Huang (2001, 199) attributes such general tendencies as reverence for the past, the need for formality, and the conservative nature of the written medium.

Varieties of Spoken Chinese

In contrast with the distinct and functionally-complementary varieties of Chinese language used respectively for writing and speech in pre-modern times, in present-day Chinese society it is speech itself that is split among different dialects for use in different domains. Depending on region and locale, present-day societies can be (1) monoglossic—as is the case in Mandarin-speaking regions where the local dialect differs minimally from Modern Standard Chinese; (2) diglossic—in regional urban centers where speakers master a mainstream dialect in addition to Mandarin; or (3) triglossic—in rural areas where in addition to the local vernacular, speakers have the need to acquire not only Mandarin but also the mainstream dialect of the regional administrative or cultural hub. An example of a monoglossic community would be the capital Beijing, where spoken Pekinese exhibits considerable overlap with the modern standard language. The southern city of Guangzhou, on the other hand, exemplifies the diglossic setup where, in addition to Mandarin, standard Cantonese is spoken and held in high regard; whereas natives of other villages and towns in the southern Guangdong and Guangxi provinces need to master not only their local dialect, but also standard Cantonese for communication across the region, and standard Mandarin for exchanges at the national level, making for an instance of triglossia.

That spoken Chinese should alternate between standard and dialect appears to be a longstanding tradition. The *Analects* (7:18) write of Confucius (孔子 551–479 BC) switching from his native tongue into an "elevated register" (*yayan* 雅言) when "conducting rituals and reciting poetry or history" (*shishu shili* 詩書執禮). Likewise, the Jesuit missionary Matteo Ricci wrote in his travel journals (1582–1610) of

> a spoken language common to the whole Empire, known as the Quonhoa, an official language for civil and forensic use.... The Quonhoa dialect is now in vogue among the cultured classes, and is used between strangers and the inhabitants of the provinces they may visit. With a knowledge of this common language, there really is no necessity for the members of our Society to learn the dialects of the provinces in which they work. A province dialect would not be used in polite society, although the more cultured classes might use it in their home province as a sign of neighborliness, or perhaps outside the province from a sense of patriotism. This national, official tongue is so commonly used that even the women and children understand it. (Gallagher 1942, 46–47)

The division of labor between local dialect and the standard language described above is termed by Ferguson (1959, 336) as a "standard-with-dialects" setup, which

is regarded as diglossia in only the most marginal sense, if at all. Most crucially, standard Mandarin—the H-language in this instance—is a language with real native speakers, unlike literary Chinese in the prior example, which is a purely learned language that nobody speaks natively. The presence of native H-language speakers in the midst of the diglossic community implies that, given the right conditions (e.g., if the H-language is used in education and media), the H-language may encroach upon territories previously occupied by the L-language. With leakage in function and mixture in form as H and L compete for use in the same domains, situations, and role relations, "without separate though complementary norms and values to establish and maintain functional separation of the speech varieties, that language or variety which is fortunate enough to be associated with the predominant drift of social forces tends to displace the other(s)" (Fishman 1967, 36, parentheses in original). There is consensus that co-existence of language varieties within a given speech community "will not survive beyond a three-generational span if H and L are unable to carve out non-overlapping functional niches within the communicative ecology of the community" (Hudson 1991, 14). The end result is usually for "the higher-prestige language eventually to invade the domain of the home, ultimately displacing the language of lesser prestige as a first language in the community" (Hudson 2002, 30). That is to say, whereas in classic diglossia it is the H-language that is subverted by the L-language under the pressures of popular developments and nativist rebellions (Kahane 1986, 498), in instances of societal bilingualism with partial overlap of function between languages, it is the L-language that eventually loses ground, driven out by younger generations educated in the more prestigious and economically more viable H-language (Hudson 2002, 30). Time and again, the H-language, as "the language with stronger rewards sanctions associated with it" (Fishman 1980, 8; 1985, 45), always wins out, as we will see below in the case of Standard Mandarin versus the Chinese regional dialects in a number of different locales.

Diglossia in Taiwan

The general demise of the Chinese regional dialects in modern times has largely coincided with the accelerated promotion of Mandarin as a national language since the mid-twentieth century. T'sou (1980, 278) predicted back in the 1980s that, as Mandarin becomes more widespread, "the regional H languages are clearly losing ground and may be reduced to the status of L languages in times to come," effectively reducing triglossia in rural areas to diglossia. More recently, it would appear that as Mandarin steadily gains ground the mainstream dialects themselves are under threat even in urban regional centers.

Of the many Chinese-speaking regions that have seen tensions between standard and indigenous language varieties, Taiwan stands out as being the first to systematically promote and thoroughly implement Mandarin instruction and usage, to the point where the entire population is now close to fully Mandarin-speaking. But in

many ways, success in Mandarin promotion appears to have led to attrition in local languages—the indigenous tongues of the island's longtime inhabitants—a development that has had political and cultural implications, many of which are only recently coming to light. By and large, language policy in Taiwan and its subsequent developments offers an early glimpse into what may lie ahead in the language development of China proper, albeit on a smaller scale.

Before examining Taiwan's recent linguistic developments, however, it may be instructive to provide an overview of the island's linguistic history. The earliest inhabitants of Taiwan are speakers of Austronesian languages and descendants of populations that are believed to have lived on the island for the last 6,000 years (Blust 1999, 69). Now commonly referred to as the aborigine population, these non-Chinese inhabitants number just under half a million, accounting for roughly 2 % of the island's current population.

Following brief spells of Dutch and Spanish occupation in the early to mid-1600s, which left little visible linguistic imprint, large-scale Chinese immigration to the island began in the mid-seventeenth century, with the majority of settlers coming from Hokkien and Hakka-speaking regions of China's eastern seaboard. By the early twentieth century, Taiwan's population had grown to 2.5 million, with ethnic Chinese settlers accounting for a good 97 % of the island's total inhabitants.

In 1895, as a result of China's defeat in the First Sino-Japanese War, Taiwan and its outlying islands of Penghu were ceded in full sovereignty to the Empire of Japan, thus beginning the island's formative period of Japanese colonial rule. Although they occupied the island for only 50 years, the Japanese left a lasting mark in terms of both industrial and linguistic development on the island. In the early years of Japanese occupation (1895–1918), Chinese dialects were tolerated while instruction in Japanese language was promoted in schools. However, starting in 1919 the use of Japanese language was made mandatory in all public spheres, where the use of all other tongues was outlawed (Beaser 2006, 3). This gave rise to a state of diglossia where Japanese served as the H-language and was viewed as the language of social mobility, while the indigenous dialects were demoted to L-language status and restricted to more intimate familial gatherings.

By the 1940s the use of Japanese among Taiwan's educated population was so thoroughly ingrained that in 1945 when the island reverted to Chinese rule upon Japan's defeat in World War II, one of the Republican government's top priorities was the eradication of the Japanese language through the promotion of Mandarin. In 1946 the *Guoyu Tuixing Weiyuanhui* (國語推行委員會 Mandarin Promotion Committee) was formed to implement a new *Guoyu Zhengce* (國語政策 National Language Policy), in which Japanese was outlawed and limited use of Chinese dialects encouraged as a means to aid in the acquisition of the standard language—Mandarin (Chen 2010, 85–86). Two years later, as Japanese language use waned and dialect use burgeoned, the dialects were declared "inadequate for academic and cultural communication" (Cheng 1979, 560) through fear of their interference with Mandarin promotion. Repression of the local dialects continued throughout the next two decades: in 1956 Mandarin was declared the sole medium of instruction in schools (Chen 2010, 86), and a series of bills were drafted by the legislation to ban

dialect movies and limit dialect programming on television, eventually culminating in the Broadcast Bill of 1975, in which severe restrictions were placed on the use of indigenous languages and dialects in broadcast media (Huang 2000, 144).

Mandarin promotion in Taiwan is, by all accounts, a tremendous policy success: by the 1990s, the island had become 90 % Mandarin-speaking, up from only 4 % half a century ago (Li 2009, 136–137; Her 2009, 385–386), and the majority of the population had long since shifted to using Mandarin in all domains (Chen 2010, 86). But amid this success came the realization that, after harsh enforcement of a Mandarin-only policy for over 40 years, Taiwan's indigenous languages and dialects were in rapid decline. This awareness, coinciding largely with the lifting of martial law and the liberalization of Taiwan's political party system in the late 1980s, led to the *Huan Wo Muyu Yundong* (還我母語運動 Mother Tongue Language Movement) of 1988 (Yang 2007, 1–5) and to subsequent appeals to promote local dialects and languages in education and media. The government of the ruling Kuomintang party was largely responsive to these popular movements. In 1993 the Broadcast Bill was repealed and an apology for the failings of its past Mandarin-only policy was issued. In 2001, under the rule of the nativist Democratic Progressive Party, language instruction in the indigenous languages and dialects was incorporated into the mandatory 9-year Integrated School Curriculum, and in 2003, the *Yuyan Pingdeng Facao'an* (語言平等法草案 Language Equality Bill) was drafted, which grants equal status to the Hokkien and Hakka dialects and indigenous Austronesian languages. In 2007, the *Guojia Yuyan Fazhan Facao'an* (國家語言發展法草案 National Languages Development Bill) was passed, which enshrines in law the official status of all indigenous languages and dialects, and encourages the preservation of minority languages.

Despite the scurry of policy initiatives to preserve local dialects and indigenous languages beginning in the 1990s, among linguists there is a sense that all of this may have been too little too late (Chen 2010, 86–89; Li 2009). Most noticeable is the steep decline in the number of speakers proficient in the local dialects and languages. For instance, Tse (2000, 156, parentheses in original) remarks, "the general complaint among most Southern Min and Hakka speakers with regard to language matters in the recent decade has been that their children (who very often can only speak Mandarin) can no longer talk to their grandparents (who can only speak the dialects)." Beaser (2006, 16) goes so far as to conclude that "Taiwanese [dialect] has already started its decline towards inevitable extinction. . .the outlook for Taiwanese [dialect] is very poor . . . there is a good chance that the local languages will become obsolete as typewriters."

To illustrate the extent of dialect decline in Taiwan, we look at recent developments in the Hakka dialect—Taiwan's second-largest dialect group, claiming 12 % of the island's population. Huang and Chen's 2002 analysis of Taiwan's most recent Hakka census paints an alarming picture of intergenerational dialect attrition. As can be seen in Table 1, the percentage of speakers claiming full proficiency in Hakka dialect decreases in inverse proportion with age, starting with close to the full population in the 60+ age group, easing to 89 % in the 50–59 age group, then lowering to 79 % and 69 % in the 40–49 and 30–39 age groups respectively, before

Table 1 Hakka dialect attrition (from Huang and Chen 2002, 57)

	Full proficiency (listening + speaking)	No proficiency (listening + speaking)
19 & under	19.2	28.9
20–29	44.1	13.2
30–39	69.7	5.2
40–49	79.2	4.7
50–59	89.4	1.4
60+	93.5	1.4

dropping to 44 % in the generation in their twenties and finally plummeting to a mere 19 % among teens and younger speakers—a whopping 74 % decrease over a span of 40 years by which trajectory we would expect 0 % fully proficient Hakka speakers born after 2006. Similarly, we see the percentage of the population claiming no proficiency in the Hakka dialect rise from a negligible 1.4 % in the 50+ age group to a significant 29 % in the population 19 and under. That Hakka dialect is losing ground with each successive generation is evident from the data, and signals a trend that is most likely representative of other indigenous Taiwanese languages and dialects.

The decline of Taiwan's indigenous languages is often blamed on early prohibition and subsequent neglect in the areas of education and media. While the national government has been mandating language instruction in the indigenous languages and dialects since 2001, the policy appears to appeal predominantly to nativist political enthusiasts and has little traction among parents who would rather their children spend time learning Mandarin or English, believing that "Mandarin is the common language of today, and English is the language that will bring them to a prosperous future" (Beaser 2006, 11). Some experts even propose that dialects need to be taught to children while young because "as they get older they will realize how useless these languages are and lose all motivation to learn" (Chiang and Ho 2008, 99). As a result, the distribution of instruction hours for the languages currently taught in elementary schools is lopsided: 17+ hours for Mandarin, 12+ hours for English, and 1 h for indigenous languages/dialects (Ma 2011). The predicament is exacerbated by the lack of unified writing systems for the majority of the languages and dialects taught, and a shortage of qualified teachers trained in indigenous language instruction.

In broadcast media, while the airwaves have since 1993 been opened to dialect broadcasting in all forms, the reality is that 40 years of prohibition has resulted in a vacuum of qualified dialect broadcasters capable of producing quality programming, and hence the difficulty in attracting a large enough audience to generate sufficient advertising revenue (Chen and Lin 2004, 10). What audience these stations are able to garner tends to be aging and uneducated, contributing to the perception among the younger segment of the population that dialect broadcasting is for illiterate old people (Chen and Lin 2004, 4).

As intergenerational dialect attrition hastens, the process is accompanied by subtle changes in language attitude among younger speakers. J. Huang (2009, 8–10)

notes that the choice between Mandarin and dialect correlates with perceived differences in age, prestige, sophistication, social class, and domain of use: Mandarin is used by elegant urban young people, whereas dialect is spoken by old vulgar, rural folk; Mandarin is white-collar whereas dialect is blue-collar; Mandarin is befitting of formal occasions, whereas dialect is appropriate only for informal exchanges. A similar conclusion is reached by Liao (2008, 402), who finds negative perceptions associated with dialect accents in Mandarin: "if a person is judged as speaking Mandarin with a more standard accent, he or she would be more likely to be considered as highly-educated, high-class, smart, having higher income."

Diglossia in Shanghai

Turning to developments in China proper, we begin with a survey of Mandarin and dialect use in Shanghai—a metropolis similar to Taiwan in its level of industrial and commercial development and also sharing a colonial past that has imparted the city with a cosmopolitan flavor.

Renowned Shanghai linguist Qian Nairong (錢乃榮born 1945) is known to have remarked that in his hometown, "the majority of primary and high school students can't speak the Shanghai dialect" (Yin 2011, 17). His observation is borne out by a 2007 study by Sun, Jiang, Wang, and Qiao, in which the authors surveyed some 8,661 elementary, middle school, high school, and college students in the Shanghai metropolitan area, and within an 8-year age span found significant differences in the choice of preferred language.

With regard to language used in the home, use of the Shanghai dialect appears to decrease with age: while 71 % of college freshmen conversed with family members in dialect, the percentage falls to 58 % among high school freshmen, and again to 45 % among seventh-grade middle schoolers, and is as low as 23 % among fifth-grade elementary school pupils. Showing the reverse trend is the percentage of students choosing Mandarin for home conversation: from 7 % among college students to 11 % in the high school population, growing to 20 % among middle school students, and 23 % in elementary school pupils (see Table 2). Note the 48 % drop in the use of Shanghai dialect between the oldest and the youngest age groups in the survey. Also significant is the fact that use of Mandarin increases threefold from the oldest to the youngest age group.

With regard to language used with peers, shown in Table 3, we see more or less the same pattern, with older age groups showing a higher preference for dialect and lower preference for Mandarin, while populations younger in age exhibit the reverse pattern. Differences in the choice of Mandarin or dialect correlate in a largely linear fashion with the age of the subject group. Again, comparing the two ends of the spectrum, the differences are striking: twice as many college students converse with their peers in Shanghainese as their primary school counterparts; similarly, the percentage of elementary school pupils speaking Mandarin with their peers is close to double that of college-age subjects.

Table 2 Language used in the home (Sun et al. 2007, 3)

	College freshmen	10th grade	7th grade	5th grade
(Approximate age)	19 (%)	16 (%)	13 (%)	11 (%)
Shanghainese	71	58	45	23
Both Shanghainese and Mandarin	22	29	33	36
Mandarin	7	11	20	23
Other	0	2	2	3

Table 3 Conversations with peers (Sun et al. 2007, 5)

	College freshmen	10th grade	7th grade	5th grade
(Approximate age)	19 (%)	16 (%)	13 (%)	11 (%)
Shanghainese	44	43	22	20
Both Shanghainese and Mandarin	29	32	37	33
Mandarin	27	25	39	44
Other	0	0	2	3

When asked what they perceived to be the most dominant language in the Shanghai metropolitan area in the near future, in all age groups Mandarin is seen as the pre-eminent force, with Shanghainese coming in second, and English a distant third. Note that regardless of language preference in the home or in peer conversations, Mandarin is seen as the predominant language of the future. Also interesting is the difference between the age groups, with younger subjects seeing a greater role for Mandarin and English than their older counterparts, who, on the whole, assign greater value to Shanghainese dialect—the differences largely correlating with age (Table 4).

In interpreting the data from the three tables, the authors of this study see a promising future for the survival of Shanghainese dialect, concluding that "as students get older, the more they are willing to speak Shanghainese dialect" (Sun et al. 2007, 5).

However, it is necessary here to point out the error in the authors' analysis: the study appears not to be a longitudinal study tracking the same group of subjects over time, but rather, a cross-sectional study querying different age groups at a fixed point in time. As such, differences between subject groups cannot be attributed to different stages of development in a lifetime, but instead, must be interpreted as differences across generations. In other words, when interpreting the data in Table 2, we are not seeing fifth graders who converse with family members in Mandarin gradually switching to Shanghainese as they get older, as the authors would have us believe, but rather, fewer and fewer students choosing to use Shanghainese in the home with each successive generation, hence the drop in the percentage of Shanghainese dialect use. Similarly, in Table 3, the data ought to be interpreted not as primary school pupils choosing not to speak to their peers in Mandarin as they get older, but instead, as an increase in the percentage of Mandarin usage with each newer generation.

Table 4 Most dominant language in Shanghai metropolitan area (Sun et al. 2007, 7)

	College freshmen	10th grade	7th grade	5th grade
(Approximate age)	19 (%)	16 (%)	13 (%)	11 (%)
Shanghainese	22	15	18	23
Mandarin	34	36	37	40
English	7	10	12	11

Viewed in this light, the data from Shanghai is not very different from the data for Hakka dialect use in Taiwan (see Table 2). Both sets of data show precipitous drops in dialect use correlating largely with differences in age. Both groups show significant differences between the oldest and the youngest age groups, with the youngest groups most reluctant to speak in dialect. Applying linear regression, both sets of data suggest that their respective populations may become monolingual Mandarin speakers within the next 20 years; that is to say, gradual hegemonic advance of the H-language will result in displacement of the L-language within the three-generational span predicted by sociolinguistic theory (Hudson 1991, 7; Hudson 2002, 14).

Similar observations have been made in neighboring Suzhou, where the local dialect has fallen from favor: once a speech variety used "one hundred percent of the time in all domains" (Wang 2003, 30), it is now a "stigmatized system of communication with an ever-shrinking domain of use" (Wang 2003, 35). In a survey of over a 100 students between the ages of 8 and 18, Wang (2003, 33–34) found that 70 % of younger generation Suzhou natives rank Mandarin as their most proficient language and 60 % hold a more favorable view of Mandarin than the local dialect. School-age children now complain, he writes, when grandparents speak in the Suzhou dialect, which they find hard to understand (Wang 2003, 31). English, also, appears to be making inroads, as students in elementary, middle, and high school have been found to be more proficient in English than in the local tongue (Huang 2011, A6), prompting scholars to predict that "the end is only a few generations away" (Yin 2011, 17) for the Suzhou dialect.

Diglossia in Singapore and Malaysia

In the two locales examined so far, while Mandarin appears to be the main hegemonic force threatening the existence of the local dialects, the prestige status of English has also been hinted at: in Taiwan, English is "the language that will bring [students] to a prosperous future" (Beaser 2006, 11), whereas in Shanghai, English is listed among the languages predicted to be most dominant in the Shanghai metropolitan area, despite having yet to play a significant role in the battle between Mandarin and dialect. Such is not the case in Singapore, where English is an official language and is playing a significant role in the decline of the Chinese dialects.

Table 5 Predominant household language (Kwan-Terry 2000, 97; reference to 1990 population census)

	Dialect (%)	Mandarin (%)	English (%)
1980	59.5	10.2	11.6
1990	38.2	23.7	20.8

For this we turn to Singapore's 1990 population census (Kwan-Terry 2000), which documents a marked rise in the household use of Mandarin and English at the expense of dialect. As seen in Table 5, between 1980 and 1990 use of Chinese dialects in all households dropped 21.3 %, while Mandarin and English each saw increases of over 10 % in household usage. The trend is even more marked in Chinese households—traditional bastions of the Chinese dialects—where dialect usage sees a precipitous 28 % drop, while Mandarin usage increases 26.9 % and English 11.2 % (Table 6).

In meritocratic Singapore, there is little doubt that the heavy hand of government is responsible for steering the nation towards Mandarin and English, and that parents not wanting their children to fall behind contributed to this shift in language usage pattern.

That English paves the way to economic prosperity in this former British colony is a widely accepted view. Then Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew emphasized back in 1978 that

> the way our economy has developed has made it necessary for those who want to reach executive or professional grades to master English, spoken and written. The earlier in life this is done the easier and better the mastery. (Kwan-Terry 2000, 99)

Lee's vision is borne out by statistics showing that English speakers generally command higher income. As seen in Table 7, monolingual English speakers account for 66.1 % of the highest income group in Singapore, followed by English-Chinese bilinguals with 20.5 %, while speakers of Chinese account for only 2 %.

Singapore's shift towards Mandarin began in earnest in 1979, when the government launched its "Speak Mandarin" campaign, in which, much like Taiwan's Mandarin-Only Movement of the 1960s and 1970s, dialects were banned in radio and television while use of Mandarin (in addition to English) was encouraged in the home to assist in the development of literacy. In the process, Chinese-medium schools traditionally offering instruction in the various dialects began to teach Mandarin only, and dialects were perceived by the general populace to be of "low status" (Kwan-Terry 2000, 102).

What with Chinese parents wanting a more prosperous future for their children, the shift towards English and Mandarin in the 1980s is especially pronounced in primary school ethnic Chinese pupils, among whom we see levels of change much more drastic than in the general population. Table 8 gives a breakdown of the language usage percentages of first grade pupils of Chinese descent, in which the first half of the decade saw a 38 % decline in dialect usage coupled with a 33 % rise

Table 6 Predominant language in Chinese households (Kwan-Terry 2000, 97; reference to 1990 population census)

	Dialect (%)	Mandarin (%)	English (%)
1980	76.2	13.1	10.2
1990	48.2	30.0	21.4

Table 7 Composition of Singaporeans in the highest income group (Kwan-Terry 2010, 100)

English only	66.1 %
English and Chinese	20.5 %
Chinese only	2.0 %
Malay only	0 %
Tamil only	0 %

Table 8 Language most frequently spoken at home for Primary One Chinese pupils (Kwan-Terry 2000, 98; reference to *Business Times* survey of October 4, 1989)

	Dialect (%)	Mandarin (%)	English (%)
1980	64.4	25.9	9.3
1984	26.9	58.7	13.9
1989	7.2	69.1	23.3

in Mandarin usage; in the next 5 years the dialects lost another 19 % while English and Mandarin each gained 10 %.

In neighboring Malaysia, where government-led campaigns to promote English and Mandarin are absent, we nevertheless see the erosion of dialects in the Chinese community while Mandarin as a global language arrives in full force. Like in Singapore, Mandarin has replaced the dialects as the medium of instruction in Chinese-language primary schools, contributing to the perception that the dialects have become "outdated and unfashionable" (Ng 2010, 28). Furthermore, with China's rise to world power status, Mandarin is seen as a language with economic value, appealing to the Chinese community's penchant for pragmatism, so much so that among ethnic Chinese in Malaysia, "most of the younger generation now could not speak dialects in their pure and uncorrupted form. They tend to use Malay, English or Mandarin words because they do not know the word in dialect for certain terms, especially modern and technological terms." (Ng 2010, 28)

Interestingly, in Malaysia it is the smaller dialects that are the first to fade away, while the mainstream varieties hang on. Ng (2010, 28) notes that despite the rapid loss of dialects, Hokkien and Cantonese stand out as two last diehards that are still widely used in the Chinese community today. This she attributes to the influence of mainstream Chinese entertainment: popular music and television drama from Taiwan keeping Hokkien in contention, while Cantonese movies and pop stars from Hong Kong buoy the Cantonese dialect.

Diglossia in Guangzhou

While Cantonese dialect appears to be enjoying a period of relative calm in Malaysia, its position is decidedly less secure in its birthplace of Guangdong province. X. Chen (2010, B4) chronicles the decline of the dialect in the Cantonese city of Nanning:

> From the mid-1990s onwards, in the name of promoting Mandarin, Cantonese dialect was gradually forced out of various spheres of life. First, Cantonese was banned from broadcast media, then from public service announcements—for example, recorded announcements on buses ceased to be bilingual and were given in Mandarin only. Finally, Cantonese retreated from the home: nowadays couples speak to each other and to their children in Mandarin, and use Cantonese only to speak to elderly relatives.

The Nanning data shows a pattern of intergenerational language shift and changes in attitudes to dialects much reminiscent of dialect loss in Taiwan, Shanghai, and Singapore:

> Statistics show that less than 30 % of the population of Nanning still speak Cantonese dialect, most of which consist of the elderly. Of the younger generation, those born in the 1970s are proficient still in both listening and speaking, whereas those born in the 1980s can understand Cantonese but have trouble speaking the dialect—contributing to the perception that Mandarin is classy whereas Cantonese is uncouth. (Chen 2010, B4)

In other Cantonese cities, however, the dialect is refusing to go down without a fight. In Guangzhou, the birthplace of Standard Cantonese, government attempts to push for more Mandarin-language broadcasts at the local station Guangzhou Television (GZTV) in the summer of 2010 for the benefit of the Asian Games met with stiff resistance from the public, with 80 % of the population opposing the switch of primetime broadcasting to Mandarin and 90 % preferring that programming be in Cantonese only (He 2010, 7). A subsequent opinion editorial in the local paper *Yangcheng Evening News* bemoaning Mandarin-only policies in schools leading to Mandarin-speaking pupils losing the ability to converse with their Cantonese-speaking grandparents (Hu and Zi 2010, A17; Lai 2010, 12), and the removal of a Cantonese-language plaque from a park in Dongguan commemorating a local hero, together sowed the seeds of public outcry at a perceived government-led conspiracy to eradicate Cantonese language and culture. This resulted in a series of large-scale demonstrations in Guangzhou and neighboring Hong Kong in July and August of 2010.

Hong Kong's *Apple Daily* reports that on the afternoon of 25 July 2010, "tens of thousands of young people of the 80s and 90s generation, mobilized via internet, gathered at Jiangnanxi Subway Station in Guangzhou in protest of government plans to curb use of Cantonese dialect," chanting slogans such as "*Guangfuhua Qimao*" (廣府話起錨, "Cantonese takes off") and "*Baodonggua Shoupi*" (煲冬瓜收皮—"to hell with winter melon"; "winter melon" being homophonous with "Mandarin" in the local pronunciation) ("Guangzhou Wanren Shangjie" 2010, 1). The following weekend, on 1 August 2010, protesters rallied again in the hundreds, this time in two cities—Guangzhou and Hong Kong—calling for Cantonese

solidarity and the protection of the local language, culture, and identity. Interestingly, official Chinese media deny that the mass protests ever took place, choosing instead to characterize the August gathering as "the work of a small number of people with ulterior motives" and emphasize in a statement published on the website of the Guangzhou Public Security Bureau that "individual troublemakers would be punished" (Mudie 2010).

Dissolution of Diglossia

Throughout Greater China, the future of Chinese diglossia looks to be one dominated by "changes in language use in the direction of the standard language," as the dialects "are moving towards endangerment" (Yu 2010, 1). Accounts of the dialect attrition process gathered from Taiwan, Guangdong, Shanghai, Singapore, and Malaysia share many commonalities, key among which are the roles of education and media. In all five locales, the switch to Modern Standard Chinese as the language of instruction in schools appears to have tipped the balance in favor of Mandarin, also adding to the perception of the dialects as uncouth and outmoded manners of speech that are the reserve of the uneducated classes and the older generation. The prominent role of media in this shift can be seen in the banning of dialect programming from broadcast outlets in Taiwan, Singapore, and Guangzhou. Whether these bans are implemented or merely attempted, they are seen as being instrumental in the demise of the local tongues.

Of particular interest for the theory of diglossia is that from our accounts we have identified a particular tipping point for language shifts in this context: accounts from Taiwan, Suzhou, and Guangzhou all make reference to the inability of grandchildren to communicate with their grandparents as an issue of particular concern, giving credence to the hypothesis that non-compartmentalized societal bilingualism seldom extends beyond a three-generation span (Hudson 1991, 14; Fishman 1985, 45). We believe the three-generation limit is motivated by the fact that as second-generation learners become proficient in the standard language, there is an economic impetus to educate their (third generation) offspring in the standard language, a task which they, unlike their first generation parents, possess the linguistic competence to carry out.

We see this tendency played out again and again in Chinese diglossic contexts. Beaser (2006, 12–13) writes of Taiwanese parents: "as the [younger generation] starts to create their own households and have children, what will the language of their home be? Based on this model, we would assume it would become Mandarin, the language they are most comfortable speaking." In the southern strongholds of Cantonese and Min dialects in China, attitudes are no different as "more and more parents are abandoning their native dialects in favour of Putonghua, believing this will give their children better access to education and jobs" (Yu 2010, 1). Yu quotes subjects from the Min region who "feel the southern Min dialect is useless so they opt for Putonghua when speaking to their children," and others from Cantonese-

speaking regions who conclude that "children have to speak Putonghua at school anyway, so it's better for them to get used to it at home too" (Yu 2010, 1). Furthermore, with modernization comes greater geographical mobility and the prevalence of intermarriage between dialect groups, giving rise to conditions in which married couples "may not understand each other's dialect, and will end up speaking another language, which is most likely to be . . . Mandarin" (Ng 2010, 28).

That triglossic situations may reduce to diglossia as Mandarin takes root was predicted by T'sou back in the 1980s, but the reduction sequence appears to have played out differently from T'sou's formulation. T'sou predicted the demise of the mid-level language, that is, the regional H language intervening between Standard Mandarin and the local L language:

> the emerging scene is one in which individuals tend to become bilingual in their home language or mother tongue, and Putonghua. The regional H languages have gradually fallen victim to this realignment. Various reports based on personal experiences in such regions as those surrounding Shanghai and Canton have indicated a trend in which younger school children, besides being conversant in the local dialects at the village level, are more conversant in Putonghua than in standard Shanghainese or Cantonese. (T'sou 1980, 276)

Thirty years on, however, the first to lose ground appears not to be the mainstream dialects—the regional H languages, so to speak—but rather the smaller local tongues on the periphery. A microcosm of this development can be found in Chinese communities in Malaysia, where Mandarin appears to have edged out all local Chinese varieties save for the two largest dialects of Cantonese and Hokkien, which retain their chic value thanks to entertainment from Taiwan and Hong Kong.

While hegemonic H-languages like Mandarin ultimately win out in the competition with local L-languages over shared domains, situations, and role relations, over the long term, as the H-language emerges victorious, it typically ends up "incorporating certain substrate influences from L as it does so" (Hudson 1991, 10). Examples of this are abundant in the development of the regional Mandarins. As the population of Taiwan embraced Mandarin as a native tongue over the last century, the variety of Mandarin spoken on the island has been known to exhibit traits of Southern Chinese syntax (Wei 1984, 88–89; Cheng 1985; Kubler 1985) and to have absorbed much Min dialect vocabulary (Wei 1984, 88; Tang 1989, 141; Her 2010), to the extent that while "there is a good chance that Taiwanese and the other local languages of Taiwan will become extinct. . .even if this should happen, Taiwanese language has already left its mark in. . . help[ing] to shape and mold Mandarin into a language more suitable to the Taiwanese people and their culture" (Beaser 2006, 16). Similar predictions have been made for Standard Chinese spoken in the Guangdong region, where "as Mandarin spreads, it will no doubt undergo regionalization. In the future there will come to exist a type of 'Lingnan Mandarin' or "'Canton Mandarin,' which in their nature are dialects, but are just not referred to as such" (Chen 2010, B4).

Of further interest in the development of regional Mandarins is that, due to regional prosperity and connotations of wealth, upbringing, and trendiness associated with new regional urban centers, many regional Mandarin varieties may, in time, come to command greater prestige than Mandarin spoken in its northern

birthplace. Ding (1998) has observed that "many Chinese regard the Beijing accent as pompous," and notes that his fellow academics have found the Mandarin of Taiwanese newscasters to be more pleasant-sounding than that of their northern counterparts. Zhang (2005) writes that well-to-do yuppies working in Beijing's international corporate offices choose not to speak with a local Beijing accent, but instead to speak in an accent that selectively incorporates features of Mandarin spoken in Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore (Zhang 2005, 444–458). According to Zhang, the choice of this "Cosmopolitan Mandarin" over Beijing Mandarin is not for the purposes of communication, but to signal a distinction in social status. As these speakers switch between Beijing Mandarin and "Cosmopolitan Mandarin" according to interlocutor, situation, and domain of language use, as Mandarin spreads far and wide to remote dialect regions and these regions give back by replenishing the superstrate language, we are in many ways witnessing the dawn of a new type of Mandarin-based diglossia taking root in the Chinese-speaking world, perhaps the second such cycle in as little as two centuries.

References

Barnes, Dayle. 1982. "Nationalism and the Mandarin Movement: The First Half-Century." In *Language Spread: Studies in Diffusion and Social Change*, edited by Robert L. Cooper, 260–290. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Beaser, Deborah. 2006. "The Outlook for Taiwanese Language Preservation." *Sino-Platonic Papers* 172: 1–18.

Blust, Robert. 1999. "Subgrouping, Circularity and Extinction: Some Issues in Austronesian Comparative Linguistics." In *Selected Papers from the Eighth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, edited by Elizabeth Zeitoun and Paul Jen-kuei Li, 31–94. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Bright, William. 1976. "Phonological Rules in Literary and Colloquial Kannada." In *Variation and Change in Language: Essays by William Bright*, edited by Anwar S. Dil, 65–73. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Chen, Ching-ho陳清河 and Lin, Pei-chun林佩君. 2004. "Thoughts on media language policy and the right of access to minority media" 語言傳播政策與弱勢傳播接近權的省思. Paper presented at the Council for Cultural Affairs' Symposium on Ethnicities and Cultural Development文建會《族群與文化發展會議》, Taipei County Government, August 4–5, 2004.

Chen, Su-chiao. 2010. "Multilingualism in Taiwan." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 205: 79–104.

Chen, Xiaolang 陳小朗. 2010. "Tuipu de Nanning Xianxiang" 推普的「南寧現象」 (The Nanning Phenomenon in the Promotion of Mandarin). *Yangcheng Evening News* 羊城晚報 (Guangzhou), July 13, B4.

Cheng, Robert L. 1979. "Language Unification in Taiwan: Past, Present and Future." In *Language and Society: Anthropological Issues*, edited by William C. McCormack and Stephen A. Wurm, 541–587. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.

———. 1985. "A comparison of Taiwanese, Taiwan Mandarin, and Peking Mandarin". *Language* 61 (2): 352–377.

Chiang, Chao-ching 江昭青 and Chi-yu Ho 何琦瑜. 2008. "Jiunian Yiguan Kecheng: Wenti Zai Nali?" 九年一貫課程,問題在哪裡? (What is Wrong with the 9-year Integrated Curriculum?) *Commonwealth Parenting* 親子天下 6: 96–101.

Coulmas, Florian. 1987. “What Writing Can Do to Language: Some Preliminary Remarks.” In *Developments in Linguistics and Semiotics, Language Teaching and Learning, Communication Across Cultures* (Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics 1986), edited by S. Battestini, 107–129. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

DeFrancis, John. 1984. *The Chinese Language: Fact and Fantasy*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Ding, Yi 丁乙. 1998. “Guanyu Guifan Putonghua he Dazhong Putonghua de Taolun” 關於規範普通話和大眾普通話的討 (Discussion on Standard Mandarin and Popular Mandarin). *Yuwen Jianshe Tongxun* 語文建設通訊 57: 14.

Duanmu, San. 1999. “Stress and the Development of Disyllabic Words in Chinese.” *Diachronica* 16 (1): 1–35.

Feng, Shengli 冯勝利. 2005. “Lun Hanyu Shumianyu Yufa de Xingcheng yu Moshi” 論漢語書面語法的形成與模式 (On the Formation and Model of Written Chinese grammar). *Journal of Chinese Language Studies* 漢語教學學刊 1: 17–49.

Ferguson, Charles. 1959. “Diglossia.” *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 10 (1): 214–234.

———. 1968. “Language Development.” In *Language Problems of Developing Nations,* edited by J. Fishman, C. Ferguson, and J. Das Guptas, 27–35. New York: Wiley.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1967. “Bilingualism With and Without Diglossia; Diglossia With and Without Bilingualism.” *Journal of Social Issues* 13 (2): 29–38.

———. 1980. “Bilingualism and Biculturism as Individual and as Societal Phenomena.” *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 1 (1): 3–15.

———. 1985. “Bilingualism and Biculturism as Individual and as Societal Phenomena.” In *The Rise and Fall of Ethnic Revival*, edited by Joshua A. Fishman, Michael H. Gertner, Esther G. Lowy, and William G. Milan, 39–56. Berlin: Mouton.

Fuller, Michael A. 2004. *An Introduction to Literary Chinese*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Gallagher, Louis J. 1942. *The China That Was: China as Discovered by the Jesuits at the Close of the Sixteenth Century*. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Bruce Publishing Company.

“Guangzhou Wanren Shangjie Cheng Guangzhouhua: Fangbaojing Jiebei; Bianyijing Toupai; Bashihou Dingyingshang” 廣州萬人上街撐廣州話:防暴警戒備;便衣警偷拍;80後頂硬上 (Guangzhou Crowd of 10,000 March in Support of Cantonese: Riot Squad Mobilized; Undercover Agents Snoop for Evidence; Post-80s Generation out in Numbers). *Apple Daily* 蘋果日報 (Hong Kong), July 26, 2010.

He, Huifeng. 2010. “Cantonese Faces Fresh Threat in Its Birthplace.” *South China Morning Post* (Hong Kong), July 7, 2010.

Her, One-soon. 2009. “Language and Group Identity: On Taiwan Mainlanders’ Mother Tongues and Taiwan Mandarin.” *Language and Linguistics* 10 (2): 375–419.

———. 2010. “On the Indigenization of Taiwan Mandarin.” *Journal of the Macau Linguistics Association* 35 (1): 19–29.

Hu, Jun, 胡軍 and Yongting Zi資勇庭. 2010. “Tongsheng Tongqi Zusunlia Jingbian Jitongyajiang” 同聲同氣祖孫倆竟變「雞同鴨講」 (Granny Unable to Converse with Grandchild). *Yangcheng Evening News* 羊城晚報 (Guangzhou), July 9, 2010.

Huang, Ho黃河 and Hsin-mu Chen陳信木. 2002. “Quanguo Kejia Rentong yu Kejia Renkou zhi Chouyang Diaocha Yanjiu” 全國客家認同與客家人口之抽樣調查研究 (A Study of the National Census on Hakka Population and Hakka Identity). Taipei: Council for Hakka Affairs, Executive Yuan.

Huang Kan 黃侃. 2001. *Huang Kan Riji*黃侃日记 (Diary of Huang Kan). Nanjing: Jiangsu Education Press.

Huang, Jian-ming黃建銘. 2009. “Zhengshi Muyu Xiaoshi de Weiji: Bentu Yuyan Zhengce de Huigu yu Qianzhan” 正視母語消逝的危機:本土語言政策的回顧與前瞻 (Calling Attention to the Loss of Indigenous Languages: Indigenous Language Policy Past and Present). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting and Conference of the Taiwan Political Science Association, Hsuan Chuang University, Hsinchu, Taiwan, November 21–22.

Huang, Shuanfan. 2000. “Language, Identity and Conflict: A Taiwanese Study.” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 143: 139–149.

Huang, Xianjun 黃□君. 2011. “Putonghua, Yingyu, Fangyan Dabipin: Suzhou Xianhua Nandao Xiaonan” 普通話、英語、方言大比拼:蘇州閑話難倒蘇州小囡 (Vying for Supremacy in Mandarin, English and Dialect: Suzhou Children Stumped by Suzhou Dialect Use). *Chengshi Shangbao* 城市商報 (Suzhou), August 9, 2011.

Hudson, Alan. 1991. “Toward the Systematic Study of Diglossia.” *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 10 (1): 1–22.

———. 2002. “Outline of a Theory of Diglossia”. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 157: 1–48.

Kahane, Henry. 1986. “A Typology of the Prestige Language.” *Language* 62: 495–508.

Kahane, Henry and Renée Kahane. 1979. “Decline and Survival of Western Prestige Languages.” *Language* 55: 183–198.

Kubler, Cornelius C. 1985. *The Development of Mandarin in Taiwan: A Case Study of Language Contac*t. Taipei, Taiwan: Student Book Co.

Kwan-Terry, Anna. 2000. “Language Shift, Mother Tongue, and Identity in Singapore.” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 143: 85–106.

Lai, Chloe. 2010. “TV Switch to Putonghua Rekindles Fight Over a Voice for South,” *South China Morning Post* (Hong Kong), July 11, 2010.

Li, Chen-ching. 2009. “Multilingualism in Action: Language Education Policy in the Rapidly Changing Society of Taiwan.” In *Global Perspectives on Multilingualism: Unity in Diversity*, edited by Maria Torres-Guzmán and Joel Gómez, Joel. 134–143. New York: Columbia University Teachers College Press.

Liao, Silvie. 2008. “A Perceptual Dialect Study of Taiwan Mandarin: Language Attitudes in the Era of Political Battle.” In *Proceedings of the 20th North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics* (NACCL-20) 1, edited by Marjorie K. M. Chan and Hana Kang, Hana, 391–408. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University.

Ma, Lydia. 2011. “Social and Church Groups Concerned for Future of Taiwanese as Mother Language.” *Taiwan Church News* (e-news edition), Issue 3094, June 16, 2011, accessed March 22, 2012, http://english.pct.org.tw/enNews_tcn.aspx?strBlockID=B00177&strContentid=C2011061900003.

Mudie, Luisetta. 2010. “Cantonese Protests Spread”. *Radio Free Asia*, August 2, 2010, accessed March 22, 2012, http://www.rfa.org/english/news/china/cantonese-08022010104101.html.

Neustupny, Jiri Vaclav. 1974. “The Modernization of the Japanese System of Communication.” *Language in Society* 3: 33–50.

Ng, Si Hooi. 2010. “Keeping the Dialects Alive,” *The Star* (Malaysia), March 21, 2010.

Norman, Jerry. 1988. *Chinese*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peyraube, Alain. 1991. “Some Diachronic Aspects of Diglossia/Triglossia in Chinese.” *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 10 (1): 105–124.

Pulgram, Ernst. 1950. “Spoken and Written Latin.” *Language* 26: 458–466.

Snow, Don. 2010. “Hong Kong and Modern Diglossia.” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 206: 155–179.

Sun, Xiaoxian 孫曉先, Bingbing Jiang 蔣冰冰, Yijia Wang 王頤嘉, and Lihua Qiao喬麗華. 2007. “Shanghaishi Xuesheng Putonghua he Shanghaihua Shiyong Qingkuang Diaocha” 上海市學生普通話和上海話使用情況調查 (Survey on the Use of Standard Mandarin and Shanghainese Dialect Among Students in the Municipality of Shanghai). *Yangtze River Academic* 長江學術 15: 1–10.

Tang, Ting-Chi 湯廷池. 1989. “Xinci Chuangzao yu Hanyu Cifa” 新詞創造與漢語詞法 (Neologisms and Chinese Morphology). *The Continent* 大陸雜誌 78.4: 5–91 and 78.5: 27–34.

Tse, John Kwock-ping. 2000. “Language and a Rising New Identity in Taiwan.” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 143: 151–164.

T'sou, Benjamin. 1980. "Critical Sociolinguistic Realignment in Multilingual Societies." In *Patterns of Bilingualism*, edited by E. Afendras, E., 261–286. Singapore: Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMO).

Walters, Keith. 1996. "Diglossia, Linguistic Variation, and Language Change in Arabic." In *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics VIII: Papers from the Eighth Annual Symposium on Arabic Linguistics*, edited by M. Eid, M., 157–197. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wang, Ping 汪平. 2003. "Dangjin Suzhouhua he Putonghua zai Suzhou de Xiaozhang Yanjiu" 當今蘇州話和普通話在蘇州的消長研究 (A Study of the Growth and Attrition of Putonghua and Suzhou Dialect in Suzhou). *Language Teaching and Linguistic Studies* 語言教學與研究 99: 29–36.

Wei, Xiuming 魏岫明. 1984. "Guoyu Yanbian zhi Yanjiu" 國語演變之研 (Changes in the National Language of Taiwan). Taipei: National Taiwan University.

Wexler, Paul. 1971. "Diglossia, Language Standardization, and Purism: Parameters for a Typology of Literary Languages." *Lingua* 27: 330–354.

Yang, Chung-long 楊忠龍. 2007. "Cong Muyu Yundong dao Shequ Yingzao: Chutan Taiwan Kejia Yundong de Zhuanbian" 從母語運動到社區營造:初探台灣客家運動的轉變 (From Indigenous Language Movement to Community Building: On the Transformation of the Taiwan Hakka Movement). Paper presented at the Symposium on the 20th Anniversary of the Taiwan Hakka Movement, National Taiwan University, Taipei, December 8.

Yin, Yeping. 2011. "Diminishing Dialects: Sixty Years of Putonghua and English Drown Out Local Tongues." *Global Times*, July 31, 2011 (Vol. 3, No. 598), 16–17.

Yu, Verna. 2010. "Cultural Heritage of China at Risk with Decline of Dialects." *South China Morning Post* (Hong Kong), July 24, 2010.

Zetzsche, Jost Oliver. 1999. *The Bible in China: The History of the Union Version or the Culmination of Protestant Missionary Bible Translation in China*. Sankt Augustin, Germany: Monumenta Serica Institute.

Zhang, Qing. 2005. "A Chinese Yuppie in Beijing: Phonological Variation and the Construction of a New Professional Identity." *Language in Society* 34: 431–466.

Zhu, Dexi朱德熙. 1988. "Hanyu" 漢語 (Chinese). In *Encyclopedia of China—Language Volume*, edited by Yi Mei, 128–133. Shanghai: Encyclopedia of China Publishing House.

Part II
Linguistic Awareness and Changing Perceptions of Varieties

Discourse on Poetic Language in Early Modern Japan and the Awareness of Linguistic Change

Judit Árokay

Abstract Until the end of the nineteenth century in Japan a linguistically complex situation existed where written Classical Chinese (*kanbun* 漢文), written Classical Japanese (*bungo* 文語), and many spoken variants of Japanese coexisted. While *bungo* conserved Classical Japanese over the centuries, the spoken language gradually changed. Beginning around 1700 elements of spoken language began to be integrated into written texts: partly in prose, to some extent in drama, and also in haiku poetry. However, these genres belonged to popular entertainment and were considered low and vulgar (*zoku* 俗) as opposed to the elegant (*ga* 雅) classical written language. Around 1800 an argument was presented which suggested that contemporary spoken language was the only effective means of writing poetry. A century before the *genbun itchi* movement, a group of poets pleaded for the use of the contemporary vernacular in elegant poetry and at the same time emphasized that poetry could not be restricted to elite groups.

Keywords Poetics • Poetology • Treatises on poetry • Diglossia • Unification of spoken and written language • Nativism • Neo-Confucianism

The phenomenon of *genbun itchi* (言文一致), the unification of written and spoken language, which we would now equate with the dissolution of diglossia, is strongly tied to the late nineteenth century in Japan. For the establishment of democratic institutions, the reform of the educational system, the distribution of newspapers and journals, and the exercise of political rights and political participation, the linguistic situation in the late nineteenth century was a heavy hindrance. The model of Western language communities in the nineteenth century, in comparison to which the diglossic situation in Japanese appeared a historical relict, was of central importance to the discussion. In pre-modern Japan a linguistically complex

J. Árokay (✉)
Institute of Japanese Studies, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg
e-mail: judit.arokay@zo.uni-heidelberg.de

J. Árokay et al. (eds.), *Divided Languages?*, Transcultural Research – Heidelberg Studies on Asia and Europe in a Global Context, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-03521-5_6,

situation existed where written Chinese (*kanbun* 漢文) dominated administrative, scholarly, religious, and literary texts, written Japanese (*bungo* 文語) was used for literary, in some cases scholarly texts, and for private writing, and many spoken variants existed that hardly ever appeared in written texts. The written Japanese style that dominated poetry and narrative literature corresponded to the language that we assume to have been spoken at the Heian court in Classical Japan (ninth to twelfth century), and this unity of spoken and written language fragmented with the language change that occurred during the Middle Ages. The classical written language was conserved in prose literature and poetry and was held in high esteem until the end of the nineteenth century when a call for unity of written and spoken language (*genbun itchi*) was voiced. Originally, the *genbun itchi* movement was, in its first phase during the 1870s, politically motivated and was strongly influenced by translations—literary, political, and technical translations alike (Twine 1991; Yamamoto 1971; Tomasi 1999).[1] The changes that can be attributed to Western influence not only affected the Japanese written language but also the way language, language change, literature itself, literary genres, and forms were conceptualized. However, the emphasis on the influence from the West combined with the zeal of Japanese modernizers in rejecting old traditions in favor of imported concepts tend to obfuscate the indigenous roots that formed the basis for the rapid transformation of Japan. One of the examples of this is in the concept of language. The awareness of the gap between written and spoken language and of the elitist character of the diglossic situation that enabled only a few to take part in writing is attributed to the model of Western languages where diglossia had dissolved centuries earlier. But what about the traditional Japanese awareness of the diglossic situation?

Although language change did not, of course, go unnoticed during the previous centuries in Japan, older forms conserved in writing were definitely valued more highly than the heterogeneous and ever-changing vernacular. Spoken language began to be integrated in some genres by around the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. However, these texts were intended for popular entertainment and were generally considered low and vulgar (*zoku* 俗) works, while classical written language and its genres represented elegance (*ga* 雅). This discourse dominated the linguistic explorations that we encounter in poetic treatises and manifests in a reverence for the past and a contempt for the contemporaneous. After around 1800, however, some poets, writers, and proto-linguists presented the argument that contemporary spoken language was the only effective means of transmitting emotions authentically. A century before the *genbun itchi* movement, these authors pleaded for the use of the contemporary vernacular in elegant poetry, and they were convinced that poetry cannot be restricted to elite groups of society because it was only through the vernacular that humans could communicate their emotions directly.

[1] The influence of translation on the modern written language is one main focus of the present volume. For details see Kawato in particular.

During the late seventeenth century, when Neo-Confucian thinkers started to question the linguistic surface, so to say, of classical texts and were challenging the validity of former interpretations, a focus on language in philosophical, ethical, and historiographic discourse became prevalent. They also put into question the validity of Chinese definitions in a Japanese context. Schools like the "Ancient Learning" (*kogaku* 古学) and "Study of Ancient Texts" (*kobunjigaku* 古文辞学), Itō Jinsai (伊藤仁斎 1627–1705) or Ogyū Sorai (荻生徂徠 1666–1728) drew attention to the fact that the concept of the "Way" (*michi* or *dō* 道; a kind of ideological axis of Japanese intellectual discourse from the Middle Ages) was no ontological reality but a discourse that had proved both vague and susceptible to historical change. The exploration of history was thus connected to the history of language—or at least to the history of terms—and was strongly motivated by an interest for reconstructing the original meaning of words. In the Tokugawa period Confucian thinkers were searching for an ideal language that would help to overcome the linguistic, moral, and political alienation that Tokugawa society was suffering under. Questioning the validity of well-established interpretations gave rise to a critique of China as a model for Japan, and a new school emerged in the first half of the eighteenth century that turned to the foundations of Japanese history—the *kokugaku* (国学) or Nativist school (Harootunian 1978, 63–104).[2] This new school attempted to reconstruct the meanings not of Chinese but of ancient Japanese texts, prose, and poetry and concentrated heavily on the concept of sincerity. They explored how not just emotions and intentions but also facts were translated into language and conveyed authentically to the audience during ancient times. This Old Japanese that had been used before the "intrusion" of Chinese became the new model for sincerity in language. In the context of Nativism—as opposed to the Neo-Confucian discourse—the study of poetic language was highly important because the earliest written Japanese sources were poetry. Poetic language itself was seen to derive from song and this again was seen as the clue to reconstructing the most ancient layers of the Japanese language. A historic view of language evolved at this time, and the first theories—at least the first non-Buddhist theories—of the function of language and the grammatical and syntactic structure of Japanese emerged.[3]

[2] Harootunian describes Nativism as the "eruption" of a new mode of discourse in a situation when the "ordering capacity of language had failed to account for a proliferation and dispersion of sensory experience" and contemporary language was perceived as being opaque and not able to touch on reality directly (1978, 63; 85).

[3] One of the exponents of early linguistics was Fujitani Nariakira (富士谷成章, 1738–1779), the first scholar in the Tokugawa period to develop a comprehensive system for classifying the elements of the Japanese language according to their grammatical functions. He distinguished four parts of speech, which he labeled *na* (names, i.e. nominal or indeclinable parts of speech), *kazashi* (挿頭hairpins, i.e. particles and connectives), *yosoi* (装clothing, i.e. declinable parts of speech), and *ayui* (脚結cords, i.e. particles and auxiliary verbs). His linguistic treatises include *Kazashishō* (挿頭抄 *On Particles and Connectives*), 1767, and *Ayuishō* (脚結抄 *On Particles and Auxiliary Verbs*), 1778. He also studied the inflection of Japanese verbs and the syntax, and proposed a periodization of the Japanese language in six periods, which was used widely thereafter

The eighteenth century produced a discourse on history, on myths, and on language that was to shape modern Japan and would become the basis for modern scientific thinking. One of the richest sources for all of these topics are the poetic treatises on Japanese poems (so-called *waka* 和歌 and *renga* 連歌), a sort of text that is often neglected by both Japanese and foreign scholars because they are mistakenly reduced to their function of supplying rules and regulations for the composition of poetry. We tend to evaluate poetry by the poems produced and not by the treatises that are written about them—which is quite understandable—and reading the *waka*-poems of the time can be quite a tedious affair. One of the main reasons for disregarding these texts could be this clash between the theory of poetry and of poetic practice. Most of the Edo poets who were so critical of medieval poetic practice were unable to demonstrate their own ideals in actual verse because they were more or less adhering to traditional poetic diction and imagery; to this day they are often dismissed as dull poets.[4] However, their theoretical texts make for very interesting reading in that Edo poetic theory is not treated as *eigaron* (詠歌論)—as instructions for composing poetry—but as *honshitsuron* (本質論), theories about the essence of poetry. Their desperate attempts at defining concepts like sincerity (*makoto* 誠, *magokoro* 真心), emotion (*jō*/*nasake* 情), sympathy and empathy (*dōjō* 同情, *aware* あはれ, *mono no aware* 物のあはれ), and rhythm (*shirabe* 調) should be understood more as contributions to language theory, to the history of language, to historical theory, or to religious studies than to poetic practice. As the actual poems fail to demonstrate clearly the concerns of the poets, it is difficult to capture the differences between highly programmatic terms like sincerity or empathy—conjured up by virtually every poet in the Edo period—and therefore it is more effective to read these texts as contributions to a language theory than as poetic keywords.

In the context of the present volume on diglossia and language awareness, I would like to concentrate on the following questions:

1. What do poetic treatises from around 1800 tell us about language awareness?
2. How is the diglossic situation reflected in these texts?
3. Which arguments in the debate anticipate the dissolution of the diglossic situation we normally associate with the "modern" period?

The critique of traditional poetic expression—and this includes literary expression—is directed against the medieval poetic practice that survived into the early modern period in certain aristocratic families and schools. This critique produces two strands: The Nativist School, with Keichū (契沖1640–1701),

(Loosli 1985). Motoori Norinaga, the other seminal figure of Japanese linguistics and a contemporary of Nariakira, will be treated in more detail below.

[4] Roger K. Thomas' English language introduction to the history of Edo period *waka* and *waka* theory deplores the indifference towards and dismissal of *waka* poetry by general histories of Japanese literature and emphasizes the ties with contemporary social, intellectual, and literary currents. His book is the first comprehensive English language introduction to the history of the *waka* poetry of the Edo period. (Thomas 2008).

Kamo no Mabuchi (賀茂真淵1697−1769), and Motoori Norinaga (本居宣長 1730−1801) as its most famous representatives, which idealizes ancient forms of language. The mainstream view encompassed reverence for the past and linguistic explorations on the basis of ancient or classical texts. And a second group of poets and writers that was enthusiastically presenting the argument that contemporary vernacular was important. In the following discussion their arguments will be contrasted with the more traditional views from eighteenth-century debates with a focus on the question of how language and language change was conceptualized in these texts.

In 1765 Kamo no Mabuchi (賀茂真淵 1697–1769), one of the main figures of Nativism, formulated some of the central tenets of *kokugaku* poetics in his *Niimanabi* (にひまなび New Learning):

- That poetry was originally sung and has lost its melodic quality over the centuries;
- That the Yamato period (historical Nara period, i.e. the eighth century) was the cultural ideal, whereas the Yamashiro period (when the capital was located in Heian-kyō, i.e. the Classical period, 794–1185) represented a decline because of the excessive Chinese influence that led to moral disintegration;
- That Yamato was a manly period where manly virtues (*masuraoburi* 丈夫風、ますらをぶり), loyalty, and faith prevailed, while Heian was feminine (*taoyameburi* 手弱女振、たをやめぶり) when even men behaved like fickle women: changeable and frivolous;
- And finally, that only the recuperation of ancient *kokoro* (心/意 spirit, meaning) and *kotoba* (言葉 language) could restore the order of values. This was to be done by analyzing ancient language, and by applying ancient language in poetry and writing (Kamo no Mabuchi 1957, 18–229).

One of the key concepts proposed by Kamo no Mabuchi was *shirabe* (調 rhythm). By his valuation, only poems that have a rhythm are able to transport feelings and to express human emotions authentically; rhythm, tone, melody are all possible translations for the word *shirabe*. According to Mabuchi, this *shirabe* is an attribute of the ideal poetic language that is documented in early Japanese poetry like the *Man'yōshū* (万葉集 *Collection of Ten Thousand Leaves*), the first anthology of Japanese poetry from the eighth century. "Ancient songs were devoted entirely to rhythm (*shirabe*). The reason for this is that they were sung," he postulated (Kamo no Mabuchi 1957, 218). According to Mabuchi, this rhythm was lost due to the language change that was effected by the intrusion of Chinese vocabulary, syntax, and phonology on the one hand and by the changes in poetic practice under the influence of sinophile court poetry on the other. The only remedy according to Mabuchi was to return to the poetic expression of the *Man'yōshū*: to learn to compose poems in the archaic style. The strand of argumentation from the Edo period that became the mainstream of the Nativist movement expressed traditionalist and revivalist—and as a consequence, later even nationalist—tendencies (*fukko* 復古): In a nutshell, it called for a return to the ancients to expel the damaging foreign influence of Chinese learning and language.

Another important theoretician of poetic language was Motoori Norinaga who launched the well-known aesthetic concept of the "pathos of things" (*mono no aware* 物のあわれ), an essential empathy with sentient beings that is the prerequisite for composing and understanding poetry. On the other hand, Motoori was also a philologist, whose main concern was to reconstruct the ancient Japanese language by reading and deciphering the oldest historical records of Japan, the *Kojiki* (古事記 *Record of Ancient Matters*, 712). Based on his studies of ancient texts he was considered a prominent participant in the discourse on grammar, which was at this time focusing on the system of auxiliary verbs and particles, the so-called *teniwoha*.[5] These grammatical markers had undergone substantial change over the course of several centuries (some had faded away from contemporary language altogether) and it was, of course, essential for poets to understand their original function if they wanted to use traditional poetic language properly.

Although he followed his master and antecedent, Kamo no Mabuchi, in his sinophobic argumentation on language change, in his explorations of Japanese aesthetics Motoori Norinaga moved in the opposite direction. As an advocate of classical literature and classical language his main focus was the eleventh and early twelfth centuries. He distilled his aesthetic concepts from the courtly tale *Genji Monogatari* (源氏物語 *The Tale of Genji*, around 1010), the first three imperially commissioned poetry anthologies (tenth to eleventh century), and the *Shinkokin wakashū* (新古今和歌集 *New Collection of Japanese Poems of Ancient and Modern Times*, imperially commissioned in 1205), arguing that the language used in these works was closest to perfection in terms of expressivity, allusive potential, and flavor (Motoori 1989b, 177). In his view, because poets are endowed with a sensibility for the "pathos of things" (*mono no aware*), a kind of all-encompassing empathy, they are stirred by external things which give rise to all sorts of feelings.[6] In order to express these feelings they have to immerse themselves in classical lyrical texts, "dye their hearts in the old style" (*kofū ni kokoro wo somu* 古風に心を

[5] The term derives from the particles *te*, *ni*, *wo,* and *wa* but it refers more generally to particles, auxiliary verbs, to the ending of verbs and of inflected adjectives, and to suffixes. It was at the end of the eighteenth century that grammarians began to use the term in the more restricted sense of particles. In the 1770s two influential scholars, Motoori Norinaga and Fujitani Nariakira, were working at the same time on particles and on verb endings and their correlation. This gave rise to a scheme of Japanese grammar that concentrated on syntax and on the system of verb inflection. Motoori Norinaga was especially interested in the correlation of particles and on the specific sentence endings that were governed by them. This system of *kakari musubi* (correlating sentence ending) had already faded away in the spoken language by the Tokugawa period and was thus an important topic for the discourse on language change—or the "flaws" of contemporary language—and an important issue for manuals of poetic expression. Motoori devoted several studies to this topic: *Teniwoha himokagami* (てにをは紐鏡 *A Mirror of Teniwoha Correlations*) 1771, *Kotoba no tama no o* (詞玉緒 *The Jewel Like String of Words*) 1779, where he illustrated *kakari musubi* with poems taken from the first eight imperial *waka* anthologies (tenth to thirteenth century), and explored the differences in usage in literary works from the eighth to the eleventh centuries (Yanada 1950, 474–503).

[6] For more details see the translation "On Mono no Aware" by Michael F. Marra (2007, 172–194).

染む) so that the words to express their feelings will well up in them almost automatically (Motoori 1989b, 108–109).[7] The idea that a poet had to transform himself into a representative of ages past (*kojin ni narikiru* 古人になりきる) (Motoori 1989a, 65) to find the appropriate and authentic expression for his feelings was rooted in Neo-Confucian discourse and was adopted by Nativists like Kamo no Mabuchi and Motoori Norinaga, the difference between them was in the texts that were taken as models (Hino 1994, 235).

But there were also proposals for the recuperation of authenticity in poetry that rejected classical models and emphasized the immediacy of poetic expression. Kagawa Kageki (香川景樹 1768–1843) took up the idea of *shirabe* (調 rhythm) and enlarged the term to refer to a certain quality of linguistic enunciation through which the emotions of the sender are directly transmitted to the listener. *Shirabe* is, according to Kageki's interpretation, the potential of a poem to transmit emotions authentically and at the same time the capacity of sentient beings to understand emotions and to be moved either to tears or to compose a poem. Nakamura Yukihiko has suggested interpreting this *shirabe* as literariness (*bungakusei* 文学性) or artistic quality (*geijutsusei* 芸術性) (Nakamura 1982, 323). Although *shirabe* is in this sense a specific term used only by Kageki, there are other poets and scholars like Ozawa Roan (小沢芦庵 1723–1801), one of Kageki's teachers, or Motoori Norinaga who emphasized a similar immediacy of poetic expression. Motoori Norinaga's ideal of *mono no aware* is one example that, although Kageki never explicitly mentions it, points in the same direction. Naoki Sakai has interpreted the immediacy conjured up by Motoori with the following words:

> [...] the 'meaningfulness of mono' (*mono no aware*), which Motoori thought of as the essence of literature, should signify the ultimate state of textual comprehension in which a text is completely reduced to the level of performative situation and practice (Sakai 1992, 274–275).

The idea that real poetry should be the immediate expression of the heart was a recurring motif in poetic discourse during the late Edo period; the controversial issue was determining which kind of language would be able to fulfill this function.

Kageki felt the need to criticize Mabuchi's concept of rhythm and wrote a rebuttal of his *Niimanabi* (新学*New Learning*) entitled *Niimanabi iken* (新学異見 *Objections to New Learning*; 1811, first printed 1815) where he deconstructed Mabuchi's sentences, one after the other. He argued that *shirabe* is the consonance of emotions, cosmic order, and the words of a poem, and thus opposed the view of those *kokugakusha* (国学者) who argued that rhythm (*shirabe*) in ancient times was something separate from the words, something that was external to the poems like a musical melody and a feature that had been lost. Kageki argues that *shirabe* is **in**

[7] For the medieval concept of "dyeing the heart in the old style" see Heidi Buck-Albulet (2001, 53–72). For a more detailed analysis of Motoori's understanding of the problem see Heidi Buck-Albulet's translation and commentary of Motoori's early poetic treatise *Ashiwake obune* (Buck-Albulet 2005).

language, both ancient and modern, and that it cannot be added through elaborate techniques (Kagawa 1985, 585–604).[8]

In the introduction to *Kagaku teiyō* (歌学提要 *Manual of Poetics*),[9] which sums up Kageki's teachings as they were written down by his students, the genesis of poems is explained:

> Poems emanating from sincerity (*seijitsu*誠實) have nothing less than the rhythm of heaven and earth (*tenchi no shirabe* 天地の調べ) and they produce a sound, just the same as the wind in the air sounds whenever it touches on something and would never miss the appropriate rhythm. The explanation is that this sound is effected and produced when touched by something, and thus there is not as much as a hairbreadth of distance between the emotion (*kan* 感) and the rhythm (*shirabe* 調), but it emanates from simple sincerity (*hitoe no magokoro*一偏の眞心). This spontaneous rhythm is simply unique and sounds as if it was deliberately devised and elaborated although no attention has been given to that. But in reality, it is so unique because there is nothing more elaborate and graceful than sincerity (*makoto* 誠). If a sound emanates from such an extreme sincerity, it will be able to move heaven and earth without any effort, it will present an ethic without argumentation (*kotowari*理) and will move even fierce gods to tears (Kagawa 1966, 146–147).[10]

Although these sentences came to be revered by his followers, nobody really understood what Kageki meant by this and therefore nobody knew how to put his ideals into practice. Literary historians often dismiss this concept as confused and elusive. The immediacy of linguistic effect is, in fact, simply irritating: He equated emotion with the linguistic expression, the emotion of the sender, and the receiver who is reading the poem. His ideal does not fit our modern semiotic interpretation of language with its clear-cut differentiation between the sender and receiver, or the *signifié* and *signifiant* on the level of the sign. One interpretation could be that he was adhering to a pre-modern concept of language: that is, a mythic conception where the word is equated with the thing it stands for like in medieval theories of language where mentioning the name of a god, for example, constituted a kind of co-presence. Kageki is obviously referring to language in its presentational function as opposed to its representational function—as we are used to dealing with it.[11]

---

[8] This text was written down in 1811 by Taira no Naoyoshi (one of Kageki's students) when Kageki had fallen seriously ill. It was based on Kageki's interpretation of *Niimanabi* and was first printed in 1815.

[9] *Kageku teiyō* is a collation of notes from students taken down by Kageki's pupil Uchiyama Mayumi in 1843.

[10] Here Kageki is alluding to the Chinese preface of the first imperially commissioned *waka*-anthology the *Kokin wakashū* (古今和歌集 *Collection of Ancient and Modern Japanese Poems*, 905) where the power to move heaven and earth, steer emotions in fierce gods, and the power to evoke ethical norms is attributed to *waka* poetry (Kojima et al. 1989, 338–339).

[11] Sakai Naoki has analyzed Motoori Norinaga's attempt to reconstruct the original reading of the *Kojiki* (712) in terms of the representational language versus the practice: "[. . .] the entire project of his *Kojiki-den* can be summarized as the attempt to reclaim the text from the realm of seeing and to restore it to the realm of speaking / hearing. In many respects, this attempt coincides with the shift from representational language, where distance is inevitable (seeing also requires distance), to practice. [. . .] Thus, this shift from seeing to speaking/hearing includes not only the refusal of distance inherent in vision but also a strong impulse toward the annihilation of separation between

The discussion could end here and thus one could dismiss Kageki as simply a pre-modern thinker, but his agenda included several claims that would become "modern" and progressive only 50 or 60 years later after the Meiji restoration.

1. Kageki radically emphasized the need to transcend the differentiation between social classes in relation to poetry.
2. He opposed the differentiation of *ga* and *zoku* (elegant and vulgar) in language, especially in poetry and literature.
3. He rejected the glorification of ancient Japanese or any kind of historical language and advocated the use of contemporary language in *waka* poetry.
4. He insisted on the dismissal of poetic authorities and teachers and emphasized the relevance of relying on one's own subjective perceptions and individual linguistic competence.

The rejection of the authority of teachers and the opposition to social usurpation of poetic practice by the aristocracy are motives that we also encounter behind the actions of some of Kageki's predecessors, including Motoori, Ozawa Roan, and Ueda Akinari (上田秋成 1734–1809), but Kageki surpasses them all in his radicality. Some quotes from Kageki's instructions and interpretations will illustrate his arguments.

First of all, Kageki emphasizes the importance of poetry for all social classes:

> Among the people in the world, who would be devoid of feelings (*omou koto* 思ふ事)? Who would have nothing to say? Having emotions and expressing them in words will hardly ever cease. It is definitely misleading to argue that the way of poetry was something sublime and noble and one could fail to comply with it, or to lament one's social standing was not appropriate for composing poetry. This is not a way (*michi* 道) that the people (*aohitogusa* 青人草) should shy away from, as dew recedes from the grass. Many people hold the view that only man of rank should compose poetry, but this is wrong. To compose poetry using the Japanese language as it is means to understand that the way of poetry is perfection. And because it is a way nobody could acquire through learning, there should be no one who does not dare to compose poems because he is not supposed to (Kagawa 1966, 140–141).

Here we find an important clue that poetry does not correspond to the elaborate usage of a special kind of language but is a human potential that seeks expression in everyday words. Classical wording and grammar can be learnt, but this does not constitute poetry. Kageki emphasizes that the primary language (mother tongue) that everybody is in full control of is the only prerequisite for composing poems. The classical language one acquires by learning as the written language (*bungo* 文語) is not the right tool to express one's intentions and emotions.

He sums up his attitude towards ancient language and the contemporary vernacular in the following passage from *Kagaku teiyō*:

---

signifier and signified." It is in practice and in the performative situation that "distance and therefore disparity between speech and its meaning are supposedly absent" (Sakai 1992, 262–263). It is in this sense that Kageki refers to the performative or presentational function of language as opposed to the representational but without a critique of the written word (Kagawa 1966, 158–159, and for a more detailed analysis: Árokay 2010, 148–158).

> The vernacular (*zokugen* 俗言) of ancient times is today's classical language (*kogen* 古言). Today's vernacular will be the classical language of coming ages. Old language is there to be studied, but not to be spoken. The vernacular is there to be spoken, but not to be studied. The recent vogue of the so-called *Man'yō* style, people using a language nobody had ever heard before, is quite an awkward thing. The poems of the *Man'yōshū*, the language of the decrees of the emperors (*senmyō* 宣命) and sacred incantations (*norito* 祝辞) were easily intelligible for the people because they were formulated in contemporary vernacular language. Poems of our days will be the same in a thousand years. If you harken back to ancient times out of reverence for the past and out of contempt for the present, how would it be possible to understand the origins of the ever changing words without even being able to distinguish right and wrong [in language]. But to pretend to compose in an antique style, to use old words and to fancy oneself as an ancient poet is simply ridiculous (Kagawa 1966, 144–145).

Here we witness an awareness of language change that was far from self-evident in those times. Linguistic change had been analyzed as the decline and degeneration of language from an ideal point of departure, for example, from the ancient language of the *Man'yōshū*, the decrees of the emperors (*senmyō*), and from sacred incantations (*norito*). In mainstream Nativism, in Mabuchi's or Motoori's view, the intrusion of Chinese was to blame for the decline of the Japanese language, and decline meant, quite explicitly, that Japanese had lost its ability to touch directly upon reality. They argued that only the recuperation of the old language would ever enable a sincere expression.

Japanese was set up in opposition to Chinese or Sanskrit (anything outside Japan was considered foreign and subsumed under *totsukuni no kotoba* 外つ国の言葉), and the genius of the Japanese language was considered to be something natural, an innate quality that is detached from the historicity of language. Mabuchi and Motoori were able to develop philological methods for linguistic exploration and methods for analyzing ancient language, but they were unwilling to accept language change as a continuous process encompassing contemporary language. However, in Kageki's argumentation (and Ozawa Roan or Ueda Akinari can be also quoted in this context) every historical era had a specific language, including the present. This idea was the basis for accepting contemporary language as poetic language. Kageki wrote the following about poetic vocabulary (*utakotoba* 歌詞):

> There is no such thing as poetic vocabulary. You can only express your sincere feelings with words taken from contemporary language. This also applies to sentence ending particles like *tsutsu, kana, ran*. These are tools that help emphasize your feelings, but they have to come to the poets' mind in the right moment. What we call and use as poetic language today is nothing else than the average vocabulary used in former times. [. . .] Things have already come so far that poems without elaborate embellishment are not accepted as poems. [. . .] To compose poems in contemporary language in an intelligible style is the only solution. Poets who cling to classical language are venerating a language that is distant from the language of our august times, but as they are only stringing together words not even understood by themselves it sounds like the language of foreign people and is incomprehensible even for us today. Let alone for future generations! (Kagawa 1966, 163–164)

While Motoori Norinaga insisted that emotions expressed in words needed a high degree of rhetorical embellishment (*aya aru kotoba* 文ある言葉) to be

transmitted to the listener (Motoori 1989b, 88), Kageki was much more radical in his critique of traditional poetic language. He opposed any kind of intrusion between emotion and verbal expression that might impede the sincerity of a poem. He also went into detail about those facets of poetic language that were, in his view, the greatest impediments to a sincere expression of feelings. One of the most interesting points is his critique of the antiquated usage of particles and auxiliary verbs:

> Everybody, no matter how bright or dull, has the particles *teniwoha* under control and even if he went on talking for ten days continuously there would be not the slightest lapse. The reason why these particles are nevertheless used incorrectly in poems is that poets forget about their true sentiments, put the emphasis on the technique of poetry, and only pretend emotions. If you try to express your emotions in words that are in common usage, what should go wrong [with the particles]? In later ages, masses of books were written on the usage of particles because people thought such instructions were necessary for composing poetry. But these books are so complicated that most of them only confuse, especially young poets. It is as if you explained to a fisherman: "Look at this, this is a fishing rod. Without a fishing rod you cannot fish." Or as if you wanted to teach an ape how to climb a tree. These writings do nothing else than to tell you that if a sentence contains the particle *zo*, then the sentence is supposed to end with *–ru*, and if you use *koso* it should end with *–re*. These are the most irrelevant details about the usage of particles. Even if you mixed them up the meaning does not change at all. On the other hand, particles are not at all a bagatelle. If you want to say "to pluck a flower" (*hana wo oru*) and you mistakenly say *hana ni oru* then the meaning will change and you end up saying "to fold a flower" from paper. But whether you say *hana zo chirikere* or *hana koso chirikeru*, the meaning will be the same—"flowers are falling from the trees." Isn't it really bad to not be able to make oneself understood, because one sticks to unimportant regulations when composing poems and disregards the basics? Somebody who has gradually acquired language competence from his birth would never ever confuse them because he is using them day and night. So when the master [Kageki] said "*Teniwoha* are of no use." his words were directed against such instructions [for particle usage]. It is not because particles are superfluous but because we already have mastery over them (Kagawa 1966, 159–160).

The debate on the modernization of poetic language (*waka kakushin* 和歌革新) in the Edo period—and to a certain extent even in the Meiji period—pertained to poetic vocabulary but not to grammar: whether the words used in poems should be based on Classical or on Old Japanese models, or whether colloquial terminology like that used in *haikai* poetry was acceptable. This can be seen as the main difference from developments in the Meiji period when, in the process of the unification of written and spoken language (*genbun itchi*), the authority of classical written language was questioned and the search for a modern written language began. But even in the process of modernization that took place during the Meiji period, lyrical expression proved the most resistant to grammatical change.[12] In Kageki's sentences quoted above one can very clearly see an early instance of the rejection of antiquated grammar that had fallen out of use in spoken language and

[12] Masaoka Shiki (正岡子規1867–1902), who is considered one of the main figures in the reform movement of Japanese poetry, consequently reverted to classical written verbal endings while integrating colloquial elements like nouns or adjectives into his poems.

was preserved only in elaborate written texts. While the view that poetry was a direct expression of sentiments was shared by many poets and critics in the late Edo period, the emphasis on using contemporary and colloquial language in *waka* poetry was only emphasized by a few, including Roan, Kageki, and Ueda Akinari. The main trend in the criticism of Classical *waka* terminology that derived from the *Kokinwakashū* (古今和歌集) was to stress the originality and expressive capacities of the *Man'yōshū* diction. This argument goes back to Minamoto no Sanetomo (源実朝1192−1219), and it was taken up by Keichū and elaborated by Kamo no Mabuchi whose followers formed the Edo school in the last decades of the eighteenth century. Thus, *Man'yō-shugi* ("Man'yō-ism") goes back to the Middle Ages and is in itself traditional.

By emphasizing the poet's individual capacity for using the Japanese language, Kageki expressed a very positive and affirmative attitude towards the personality of the poet: There is no reason why Japanese natives who speak correct Japanese (that is *kōgo* 口語, spoken language) should subordinate their feelings to an elaborate language that is not their natural expression. The *shirabe*/rhythm of a poem only emanates from the unfiltered and authentic expression of feelings, and the ability to put feelings into words depends only on individual talent and the depth of sensitivity. His claim for relying on subjective language competency, his rejection of teachers and even of classical models for composing poems definitely reveals parallels with the contemporary discourse on subjectivity. Kageki's teacher Ozawa Roan had already stressed that "Nothing is more important than our own sentiments. (*waga kokoro ni sakidatsu mono nashi*.) You should not imitate others when writing poems. You should not take other poems as a model" (Ozawa 1958, 168) and that "To say what is on one's mind (feels), in words that are one's own (*waga iwaruru kotoba*), in a style that is translucent, this is what constitutes a poem" (Ozawa 1958, 171).

But why in the end were these ideals forgotten during the course of the nineteenth century? And is there any continuity to be found in Meiji discourse at all? In fact, Kageki wrote a few treatises on poetry and many commentaries on the classics, and because after around 1810 he had hundreds of students, he was forced to explicate his style. Whenever his pupils asked him which style they ought to follow, he referred them to the *Kokinwakashū*, the anthology that represented stylistic perfection for him and that he considered the ideal *waka* collection for beginners to start with. He did not intend for his students to copy the style of *Kokinshū*, but he held it in high esteem as he believed that it preserved the contemporary vernacular as it existed in its own time around 900 CE. While Kamo no Mabuchi's followers, the later Edo-school, that continued for some decades to advocate the *Man'yōshū* style, Kageki's students—quite contrary to their teachers intentions—placed emphasis on the *Kokinshū* style: From the 1850s onward, Kageki's Keien-ha (桂園派) was converted into a traditionalist school which formed the main authority on poetry until the end of the nineteenth century. In fact, the Keien-ha became the *gosho-ha* (御所派)—the poetic circle of the imperial court—in the Meiji period. This interesting side note illustrates the intricate avenues of public reception.

Japanese poetry, especially *waka* poetry, remained a subject for highbrow, even aristocratic erudition until the end of the nineteenth century. Ōkuma Kotomichi (大隈言道 1798–1868) and Tachibana Akemi (橘曙覧 1812–1868) were poets who belonged to neither of the established schools but seemed to advocate ideals that were similar to Kageki's: the democratization of poetry, use of the vernacular, and integrating everyday imagery in poetry. Neither were influential enough in their own time to have his voice heard and both were forgotten until around 1900 (Thomas 2004, 321–358). If a real continuity with the Meiji discourse on the modernization of poetry is lacking, an explanation for why Kageki was pushed aside by the exponents of modernization can be seen in the fervent criticism Masaoka Shiki (正岡子規 1867–1902) launched at the Keien-ha. Masaoka Shiki came to be revered as one of the main exponents of the renewal of poetics in Japan. In 1898 he published a series of ten "letters" addressed to the poets of his time (*Utayomi ni atōru sho* 歌よみに与ふる書) where he criticized publically the leading figures of court poetry (the Keien-ha) and questioned the authority of court poets (Masaoka 1975, 20–50). He launched his rather personal critique as an overall attack on traditional poetry, in fact advocating techniques similar to those used by the late Edo poets: democratization of traditional poetry, use of common imagery, and of colloquial expressions. Without any knowledge of Kageki's poetic writings he apparently dismissed him—together with the classical poet Ki no Tsurayuki—as a dull poet.[13] Historically, it was this polarity between the veneration of Kageki by the courtly school of *waka* poetry whose influence was rapidly fading away around the turn of the century and the rejection by those modernists who were influenced by Western concepts of literature and by the Western lyrical forms that caused Kageki's innovative poetic theory to be forgotten.

As a conclusion to this paper, which has focused on Kagawa Kageki, one person among several others who advocated innovative poetical concepts between 1780 and the 1840s, I would like to address why I think poetic texts deserve closer scrutiny in the context of the exploration of language awareness.

For the Edo period it is very important to also consider poetological texts (*kagaku* 歌学, *karon* 歌論) apart from their function as poetic instruction. As scholarly disciplines were not yet as developed or as differentiated as they are today, poetics as the site of linguistic discourse—that is discourse on language history, language change, semantics, and grammar—acquired a tremendous importance. To put it the other way around: Poetics should not only be read for its rhetorical or didactic meaning and should not be restricted to a literary appropriation but should be included in a comprehensive history of early modern thought. Finally, we should be aware of the highly differentiated views at work during the Edo period and be aware of the fact that modern discourse has erased these important differences. The introduction of the concept of literature, similar to that

[13] Nakamura Yukihiko has argued that Shiki might not have known any of the poetic writings of Kageki, and if he knew them at all he was clearly not interested in the details (Nakamura 1982, 321).

of the arts, the establishment of a modern canon of literary works, the emergence of scholarly disciplines, and the separation of political and ideological discourse from the aesthetic, has obfuscated these important interrelationships and has banished these once influential thinkers to oblivion.

References

Primary

Kagawa Kageki. 1966. “Kagaku teiyō” (歌学提要 Manual of Poetics). In *Kinsei bungaku ronshū* 近世文学論集, edited by Nakamura Yukihiko. Vol. 94 of *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 日本古典文学大系 (Anthology of Classical Japanese Literature), 131–166. Tōkyō: Iwanami shoten.

———. 1985. “Niimanabi iken” (新学異見 Objections to New Learning). In *Karonshū* 歌論集. Vol. 50 of *Nihon koten bungaku zenshū* 日本古典文学全集 (The Complete Collection of Classical Japanese Literature), 585–604. Tōkyō: Shōgakukan.

Kamo no Mabuchi. 1957. “Niimanabi” (にひまなび / 新学New Learning). In *Nihon kagaku taikei* 日本歌学体系 (Anthology of Japanese Poetics), vol. 7, 218–229. Tōkyō: Kazama shobō.

Ki no Yoshimochi. 1989. “Kokin waka shū manajo” (古今和歌集真名序 Kokin waka shū Chinese preface). In *Kokin waka shū* (古今和歌集 Collection of Ancient and Modern Japanese Poems), edited by Kojima Noriyuki et al. Vol. 5 of *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 新日本古典文学大系 (New Anthology of Classical Japanese Literature), 338–339. Tōkyō: Iwanami shoten.

Masaoka Shiki. 1975. “Utayomi ni atōru sho” (歌よみに与ふる書 Letters Addressed to Poets). In *Karon, senka* (歌論、選歌 Essays of poetry, selected poems), edited by Masaoka Chūsaburō. Vol. 7 of *Shiki zenshū* (子規全集 The Collected Works of Shiki), 20–50. Tōkyō: Kōdansha.

Motoori Norinaga. 1989a. “Ashiwake obune” (排蘆小船 The Small Boat Parting the Reeds). In *Motoori Norinaga zenshū* (本居宣長全集 The Collected Works of Motoori Norinaga), vol. 2, edited by Ōno Susumu, Kubota Jun, 1–84. Tōkyō: Chikuma shobō.

———. 1989b. “Isonokami no sasamegoto” (石上私淑言 Personal Views of Isonakami [=Motoori]). In: *Motoori Norinaga zenshū* (本居宣長全集 The Collected Works of Motoori Norinaga), vol. 2, edited by Ōno Susumu, Kubota Jun, 85–201. Tōkyō: Chikuma shobō.

Ozawa Roan. 1958. “Chirihiji” (塵ひじ Dust and Mud), “Ashikabi” (芦かび Reed Sprouts). In *Nihon kagaku taikei* (日本歌学大系 Anthology of Japanese Poetics), vol. 8, edited by Sasaki Nobutsuna, 166–194. Tōkyō: Kazama shobō.

Secondary

Árokay, Judit. 2010. *Die Erneuerung der poetischen Sprache: Poetologische und sprachtheoretische Diskurse der Edo-Zeit*. München: iudicium.

Buck-Albulet, Heidi. 2001. “’Tränke das Herz in dem alten Stil’— Kanon und Exegese in der *waka*-Poetik.“ In *Intertextualität in der vormodernen Literatur Japans*, edited by Judit Árokay, 53–72. Hamburg: MOAG.

———. 2005. *Emotion und Ästhetik. Das „Ashiwake obune“—eine Waka-Poetik des jungen Motoori Norinaga im Kontext dichtungstheoretischer Diskurse des frühneuzeitlichen Japan*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Harootunian, Harry D. 1978. "The Consciousness of Archaic Form in the New Realism of Kokugaku." In *Japanese Thought in the Tokugawa-Period,* edited by Tetsuo Najita, and Irwin Scheiner, 63–104. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.

Hino Tatsuo. 1994. "Motoori Norinaga to Ueda Akinari" (本居宣長と上田秋成 Motoori Norinaga and Ueda Akinari). In *Kinsei no waka* (近世の和歌 Waka in the Early Modern Period), edited by Ariyoshi Tamotsu et al. Vol. 8 of *Waka bungaku kōza* (和歌文学講座 Lectures on Waka Literature), 223–240. Tōkyō: Benseisha.

Loosli, Urs. 1985. *Fujitani Nariakira and his Grammar. An Approach to Linguistics in Pre-Modern Japan*. Konstanz: Selbstverlag.

Marra, Michael F., transl. and ed. 2007. *The Poetics of Motoori Norinaga. A Hermeneutical Journey*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Nakamura Yukihiko. 1982. "Kageki to Shiki" (景樹と子規 Kageki and Shiki). In *Nakamura Yukihiko chojutsushū* (中村幸彦著述集 Selected Works of Nakamura Yukihiko), vol. 1, 320–338. Tōkyō: Chūōkōronsha.

Sakai, Naoki. 1992. *Voices of the Past. The Status of Language in Eighteenth-Century Japanese Discourse*. Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press.

Thomas, Roger K. 2004. "A Voice of the Tenpō Era. The Poetics of Ōkuma Kotomichi." *Monumenta Nipponica* 59: 3: 321–358.

———. 2008. *The Way of Shikishima. Waka Theory and Practice in Early Modern Japan*. Lanham: University Press of America.

Twine, Nanette. 1991. *Language and the Modern State: The Reform of Written Japanese*. London: Routledge.

Tomasi, Massimiliano. 1999. "Quest for a New Written Language. Western Rhetoric and the *Genbun Itchi* Movement." *Monumenta Nipponica* 54: 3: 333–360.

Yamamoto Masahide. 1971. *Genbun itchi no rekishi ronkō* (言文一致の歴史論考 Historical study on the unification of spoken and written language). Tōkyō: Ōfūsha.

Yanada, S. 1950. "Motoori-Norinaga's Contribution to a Scheme of Japanese Grammar." Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London 13: 2:474–503.

Genbun itchi and Questione della lingua: Theoretical Intersections in the Creation of a New Written Language in Meiji Japan and Renaissance Italy

Massimiliano Tomasi

Abstract The written language of early Meiji (1868–1912) was extremely different from the spoken tongue, resulting in a diglossia that hampered Japan's efforts at modernization. Scholars and intellectuals debated at length the role of the vernacular in writing. The development of *genbun itchi* (unification of the spoken with the written language) was the answer to their quest for a written language that satisfied the prerequisites of both intelligibility and literary refinement.

In Italy the debate on the *questione della lingua* was drawn largely from Dante and his support of the vernacular against the supremacy of Latin. The debate gained momentum during the Renaissance period when scholar Pietro Bembo argued for the feasibility of a literary language based on fourteenth-century Tuscan.

This study analyzes the process that accompanied the creation of a new written language in both Japan and Italy, unveiling the existence of meaningful theoretical intersections in the unfolding of these debates.

Keywords Genbun itchi • Questione della lingua • Renaissance • Tuscan • Vernacular

Redefining the Vernacular and Its Role in Literature

The development of the *genbun itchi* (言文一致) movement (the movement for the unification of the spoken and written language) was a major trait of the Meiji (1868–1912) cultural and literary scene and a crucial step in Japan's transition from feudal to modern state. The written language of early Meiji was extremely different from the spoken tongue, resulting in a diglossic situation that hampered Japan's efforts at modernization. This state of affairs was further exacerbated by the

M. Tomasi (✉)
Department of Modern and Classical Languages, Western Washington University, Bellingham
e-mail: Massimiliano.Tomasi@wwu.edu

J. Árokay et al. (eds.), *Divided Languages?*, Transcultural Research – Heidelberg Studies on Asia and Europe in a Global Context, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-03521-5_7,

complex nature of the Japanese written language, a mode of expression that comprised multiple styles, each used for a specific communicative purpose. Government edicts, scholarly writings, and private epistolary exchanges, for example, differed significantly in terms of literary conventions, requiring readers to be familiar with the stylistic norms and syntactic constructions that were particular to each genre. At the dawn of the modern age, literacy in Japan did not necessarily imply the ability to read and communicate effectively in a wide spectrum of literary styles, and the vast majority of the people remained unable to fully understand the intricacies of the written medium.

The *genbun itchi* style that eventually emerged was the answer to a quest for a written language that would overcome this internal idiosyncrasy and satisfy the prerequisite of intelligibility, thus ensuring effective communication and making the exchange of information accessible to the masses. Of course, the tension between traditional and more colloquial modes of expression had already partially surfaced in pre-modern years; the presence of a more or less explicit discourse that addressed the role of the vernacular in writing can be detected even before the Meiji period. However, the intensification of the debate on the question of language is a particularly significant phenomenon of the post-Restoration (1868) era. Examples of a written language that employed the spoken tongue were rare in the pre-modern period and were limited to notes of lectures, usually of a religious, scholarly, or ethical content. Employing the vernacular in writing was in most cases regarded as an oddity and a violation of writing conventions.

The process that led to the creation of a new written language and in turn to a progressive dissolution of the existing diglossia was marked by long and strenuous debates within political, academic, and literary circles. The establishment of *genbun itchi* became one of the most important developments of Japan's recent history, an event charged with socio-political nuances that went beyond the strictly literary and linguistic domain. Similar cases of dissolution of diglossia have been attested elsewhere in history and across different language communities, and it is the purpose of this volume to compare and analyze the process that characterized such developments, albeit under completely different historical circumstances.

One of the earliest and most significant examples of similar developments occurring elsewhere is the *questione della lingua*, a Renaissance scholarly debate that addressed the feasibility of Italian standard language employed in writing. Strictly speaking, the *questione della lingua* was not a debate that can be truly confined to the Renaissance period; Dante Alighieri (1265–1321) had already addressed the issue of a *volgare illustre*, a vernacular-based written language common to the entire Italian peninsula, in his treatise *De vulgari eloquentia*. It was probably not until the unification of Italy in 1861 that, with the implementation of mandatory schooling and the increase of the literacy rate, the problem of a standard written language in Italy came close to being settled.

Yet, it is true that the debate reached its climax in the mid-1500s. The theoretical deliberations of those years shaped the future of the Italian written language, sanctioning the demise of Latin and setting in motion the progressive dissolution of a diglossic situation that had lasted for centuries. The idea of adopting a new

form of literary expression based on the spoken tongue became, in fact, a direct challenge to the authority of Latin, until then the *lingua franca* in all fields of human knowledge. This in turn generated a controversy among scholars and intellectuals over whether the Italian vernacular could rise to the rank of a literary language and as such replace its more prestigious counterpart. At the root of this controversy was the widespread belief that Latin was a dead language, a mere symbol of "fixed and static ideas of perfection," and the expression of "modes of thought that no longer corresponded to a sense of social evolution and developing experience" (Grayson 1960, 27).

The *questione della lingua* debate prompted a reassessment of the cultural tradition of the classical world and its means of literary signification. The call for a new and more vibrant form of expression that followed was construed upon and supported by political, linguistic, and aesthetic considerations that were a product of that age. The Renaissance desire to break away from a rigid and codified corpus of literary norms did not differ much from the Meiji search for a new written language in which the advocates of *genbun itchi* challenged the authority of a classical language that no longer seemed to serve the purpose of a rapidly changing society. In both cases, the diglossia in place appeared to be in conflict with the realities of an ongoing process of deep social and literary transformation, revealing the immediate need for a more transparent form of written expression that could better reflect the full extent of those changes.

Yet both the supporters of *genbun itchi* and the *volgare illustre* faced the challenging task of reversing literary practices that had been in place for centuries. Tradition had reinforced the primacy of classical language to such an extent that the gap between this and the vernacular seemed most likely insurmountable. The traditional literary language was regarded as sophisticated and refined; it was perceived as permanent and changeless, as something that could be described by a system of rules. The spoken tongue, by contrast, was held to be mutable and devoid of refinement and regularity. These suppositions led to the belief that the traditional literary language was superior to the vernacular, that the latter did not constitute a linguistic system capable of being thoroughly described, and that the elegant character of classical language was *ipso facto* antithetical to that of the vernacular (which was, in turn, coarse and unrefined).

Whether in Meiji Japan or Renaissance Italy, there was one fundamental prerequisite for the successful creation of a modern colloquial literary mode: it was the conferral of higher status on the vernacular and recognition of it as a legitimate form of literary expression. This required the vernacular to be established as equal to classical language, defined as an independent linguistic entity with its own grammar, and perceived as capable of developing its own rhetorical repertoire. This latter aspect was especially important because in order to triumph over traditional styles, regarded highly among scholars and intellectuals, the new written language also had to be aesthetically pleasing.

From this point of view, the search for a new written language became in both cases the search for a language that could be used in literature. As Dante himself eloquently put it in his work *Il Convivio* (*The Banquet*), only by binding itself with

meter and rhyme could the vernacular gain greater stability and preservation (Lansing 1990, 32). This idea was a firm belief of many Meiji intellectuals whose search for a new form of expression was inextricably linked to the establishment of the novel and the development of modern narrative. However, it was not just about refinement in writing; in the same way Renaissance writers sought to give a voice to new modes of thought and thus break free from the static world of the Latin tradition, Meiji authors envisioned the possibility of creating a simplified form of written expression. The common concern in both cases was that such literary medium be capable of sustaining contemporary trends in literature (such as Realism and Naturalism) that put growing emphasis on truth and the faithful reproduction of reality.

There was then one common trajectory in the scholarly discourse that supported these two quests: on the one hand, writers' desire to create a new form, and on the other, their aspiration to deliver a new content. The dialectical relationship between these parallel pursuits became a shared crucial aspect of this process, informing both debates on language at various stages of their development. However, as this study will show, there also existed fundamental divergences between the two cases that should not be overlooked.

Yamada Bimyō, Shimamura Hōgetsu, and the Quest for a Refined *genbun itchi* Style

At the beginning of the Meiji period the call for a simplification of the written language began to intensify.[1] There essentially existed two factions in the debate that addressed the nature and prerequisites of a modern mode of written expression: on one hand there were those who supported the "vernacularization" of the written style and therefore *genbun itchi*, and on the other those who insisted on the supremacy of the classical language, favoring a more conservative style known as *gazoku setchū* (雅俗折衷 'Mixture of elegant and colloquial'). The former faction based its advocacy of a simplified literary style on the conviction that in Western countries the written language was substantially the same as the spoken one. Most of those who wrote in favor of *genbun itchi* used this point as their chief argument against the difficulty and elitism of traditional written styles. As early as 1870, for example, philosopher Nishi Amane (西周 1829–1897) claimed that in Western countries the spoken and the written language coincided. In his view, since the spoken tongue abided by the rules of grammar in those countries, any spoken interaction could become written communication and vice versa. According to Nishi, the difference between spoken and written language represented a major hindrance to the spread of learning (Nishi 1981, 91–92). Several articles that

[1] For a discussion of the *genbun itchi* debate, see also Tomasi (2004).

appeared over the following decade construed much of their support for the *genbun itchi* style from this argument.

Accompanying the call for the employment of a more colloquial mode of written expression, however, was another important premise: unification of the spoken with the written language could only take place by first eliminating unnecessary rhetorical expressions. The journalist and essayist Fukuchi Gen'ichirō (福地源一郎 1841–1906) was one of the earliest to argue in these terms for the 'colloquialization' of the literary style. In a succession of articles he set forth the need to purge the written language of extraneous elements for the sake of clarity and simplicity (see, for example, Fukuchi 1978a, b). Many joined Fukuchi in this call. The scholar and bureaucrat Kanda Kōhei (神田孝平 1830–1898), for example, wrote in 1885 "if we wish to unite the spoken and written language that they may coincide, we must have a written language that can be immediately understood when rendered orally. For that to happen, we must use the language of everyday speech. To write in such a style means to write in *genbun itchi*" (Kanda 1978, 212–17).

In the field of literature, the literary critic Tsubouchi Shōyō (坪内逍遥 1859–1935) acknowledged the potential of the vernacular and called for a realistic approach to literature that became, at the same time, an argument for a plain, straightforward language that could describe the subtleties of human life without exaggeration or ornamentation. Shōyō's deliberations spurred experimentation with a new literary language. In 1900 the poet and critic Masaoka Shiki (正岡子規 1867–1902) called for a written style that depicted facts and things the way they had been heard or seen, without exaggeration or embellishment. A few months later, the poet and novelist Takahama Kyoshi (高浜虚子 1874–1959) postulated that the *genbun itchi* style was the most appropriate for writing in a realistic manner. It soon came to be taken for granted that a faithful approach to reality in literature could be guaranteed only by the employment of a plain form of expression. The gradual shift from Realism to Naturalism that took place in the first decade of the twentieth century further strengthened this alliance. Writers of these schools repeatedly called for the abolishment of affectation in writing and the necessity of depicting things and people in a faithful and concise manner.

However, this trend was opposed by those who favored a more elaborate and sophisticated written style. In 1886 the writer Yano Fumio (矢野文雄 1850–1931) was among the first to oppose *genbun itchi* as unfeasible. He indicated four points as the cause for his disapproval, namely the verbosity of the colloquial, the large presence of honorifics, the dialectical differences, and the allegedly false argument that the spoken and written languages of Western nations were identical (Yano 1886). In 1889 the poet and scholar Ochiai Naobumi (落合直文 1861–1903) denounced the colloquial as being too vulgar, and the scholar of Japanese language Mozume Takami (物集高見 1847–1928), who had previously been one of the strongest supporters of the *genbun itchi* style, changed his mind and pronounced himself against the movement (Ochiai 1978, 547–559; Mozume 1902, 17–19).

Accompanying the rejection of a more colloquial mode of expression was another premise: the idea that the lack of linguistic refinement was the major obstacle to the acceptance of the vernacular as a legitimate mode of literary

expression. The journal *Teikoku bungaku* (帝国文学 *Imperial Literature*) was among those publishing articles in the 1890s that condemned *genbun itchi*'s lack of refinement and rhetorical flavor. Literary critics like Takayama Chogyū (高山樗牛 1871–1902) also criticized the *genbun itchi* style for its lack of elegance, as did the poet Takeshima Hagoromo (竹島羽衣 1872–1967) who regarded *gazoku setchū* as superior in charm and prestige to *genbun itchi* (Takeshima 1978, 813–814).

This controversy was not, however, a necessarily polarized debate between extremes. Several *genbun itchi* supporters also recognized the need to take the vernacular to a higher level of refinement. As noted earlier, the conferral of higher status on the vernacular was an important condition to the successful creation of a modern form of literary expression.

Novelist and scholar Yamada Bimyō (山田美妙 1868–1910) was one of the most instrumental in this process. In 1887, at the same time when Futabatei Shimei (二葉亭四迷 1864–1909) was publishing sections of his *Ukigumo* (浮雲 *Floating Cloud*), considered by many to be Japan's first modern novel, Bimyō wrote a piece that addressed the origin of the vernacular. In this piece, which appeared as a preface to his novel *Nise daiamondo* (贋金剛石 *Fake Diamond*), Bimyō argued that modern Japanese was simply the result of a natural process of selection. He affirmed that the contemporary Tōkyō dialect was also based on a system of rules capable of being described, thus rejecting the notion from the previous era that held that classical language had a grammar while contemporary language did not. He also maintained that there were no reasons why the colloquial should not be considered functionally and artistically equal to classical modes of expression (Yamada 1978a, 362–367).

Bimyō's contribution to the debate continued in another article that appeared in 1890. He wrote: "Is classical language elegant and modern language vulgar? I believe that we do not have the means to discern between the two. That is to say, elegance or vulgarity in language does not depend on when the language was created, nor on superficial characteristics of the style, but only on the meaning and the usage. If the meaning is elegant and so is the usage, the expression will also be elegant. If the meaning is vulgar and so is the usage, the expression will also be vulgar" (Yamada 1978b, 627–30). In Bimyō's view, elegance and refinement were determined only by the way that language was used and not by adherence to archaic literary standards. This distinction implied the possibility of creating elegant expressions that were not necessarily from the classical language repertory, but rather the result of a skillful usage of the vernacular. Bimyō's argument cleared the way for a notion of rhetorical refinement that went beyond that of mere linguistic embellishment (Yamada 1978c, 631–33).

The assumption that "rhetorical refinement" was a synonym for archaic linguistic embellishment was common among Meiji writers. To overcome this assumption it was necessary to provide an alternative perspective on the possible different connotations of this concept. A key role in this area was played by the literary critic Shimamura Hōgetsu(島村抱月 1871–1918). In his piece "Shōsetsu no buntai ni tsuite" (小説の文体について On the Style of Novels) of 1898, Hōgetsu made an

important distinction between *kata* (型) and *shūji* (修辞). He described *kata* as those expressions that were reminiscent of classical language like, for example, the copula *nari* なり or the terminative *keri* けり. While these words had been regarded as "rhetorical," he claimed they were merely archaic linguistic conventions. Since they hindered the freedom of the writer, such elements should be eliminated from the contemporary written language. *Shūji*, by contrast, were defined as being "true" rhetorical expressions capable of generating connotative images on the basis of shared linguistic and extra-linguistic knowledge. Hōgetsu indicated that the difference between the *genbun itchi* style and traditional styles rich in classical elements lay indeed in the presence or absence not of *shūji*, but of *kata*. While the latter could be discarded, *shūji* were indispensable to the creation of a new written language. Thus, he emphasized two major points: first, that no written style could ever be completely devoid of rhetorical features, and second, that any call for the elimination of rhetorical elements from the sentence was merely the result of a misconception of the nature of the rhetorical process (Shimamura 1898).

In the following years, Hōgetsu continued his advocacy of the *genbun itchi* style reiterating that its main problem was of a rhetorical nature. He argued that vulgarity could not be avoided since the vernacular was still far from being established as a common all-purpose idiom and, furthermore, that it had never yet been used as a literary language, which contributed to its image as a transient and evanescent mode of expression. However, with time, even the vernacular would eventually achieve literary prestige. It was most important at this stage to promote a process of rhetorical harmonization between the classical and the contemporary style (Shimamura 1978, 452–56). For Hōgetsu the difference between the classical language and the vernacular was due not to the presence or absence of rhetorical features, but rather to a difference in the nature of those features. It was a mistake to think that the *genbun itchi* style was devoid of rhetorical features, whereas the classical language was abundant with them (Shimamura 1979, 571–78).

A few years later the scholar of rhetoric and national literature Igarashi Chikara (五十嵐力 1874–1947), acknowledged the birth of a new literary language (Igarashi 1909). This new style, he argued, was natural, realistic, and devoid of those conventional traits that were, by contrast, characteristic of pre-modern literary modes. An example of this was replacing ornamental words such as *shōkei* (小径 short cut) and *tasogare* (黄昏 dusk, twilight) with their synonyms *chikamichi* (近道) and *yūgata* (夕方), which were instead reflective of everyday language. The new style, he maintained, made ample and effective use of such everyday language and was characterized by the rise of a new artistry, one that was different in nature from that of its predecessors. Representative works of this new trend such as Shimazaki Tōson's (島崎藤村 1872–1943) *Haru* (春 *Spring* 1908), Tayama Katai's (田山花袋 1872–1930) *Sei* (生 *Life* 1908), and Masamune Hakuchō's (正宗白鳥 1879–1962) *Doko e* (何処へ *Where to* 1908) illustrated the rhetorical potential of this style and with it the new status of the vernacular. It was the first true acknowledgement in a rhetorical treatise of the profound changes the literary world was facing in those years.

As is clear the establishment of *genbun itchi* in Japan was facilitated by the development of a theoretical discourse that put emphasis not only on the necessity of, creating a vernacular-based written form of expression, but also on the prerequisite that such vernacular be polished and have the potential to develop a rhetorical repertoire of its own.

Pietro Bembo and the Rise of Tuscan

In his *De vulgari eloquentia,* Dante was the first to seriously address the problem of language in Italy. In this work, he defined the vernacular as the language that children learn from those around them, and Latin as a secondary language that the Romans had called grammar. He also affirmed the superiority of the vernacular: "of the two the nobler is the vernacular: first because it is the first language ever spoken by mankind; second because the whole world uses it though in diverse pronunciations and forms; finally because it is natural to us while the other is more the product of art" (Shapiro 1990, 48). By maintaining that the vernacular was nobler by virtue of its naturalness, Dante challenged the prevailing view of the time that Latin was superior because of its elegance and traditional authority.

Dante also identified the existence of similar languages in Western Europe where "some [speakers] say *oc*, others *oïl,* and others *si* for the affirmative," referring to these speakers as "the Spaniards, the French, and the Italians" respectively (Shapiro 1990, 54). Drawing from the observation of lexical items like "love," "God," "heaven," and "earth," Dante argued that these three languages had been most likely one in the beginning and that subsequent differences must have occurred because of natural change. Dante's recognition of the reality of language change implied that the impermanence of the vernacular was not due to an inherent instability of the language per se, but rather to a variation that, of course, could not affect Latin. For Dante, Latin was in fact "nothing but a certain unalterable identity of speech unchanged by time and place" (Shapiro 1990, 57). It was the reality of language change, Dante argued, that "motivated the inventors of the art of grammar. Since it was regularized by the common agreement of many peoples, grammar . . . became independent of individual judgment, hence incapable of variation. They invented grammar that we might not fail—because of the variation of speech that fluctuates according to individual judgment" (Shapiro 1990, 57). In the following pages Dante also identified the existence of at least 14 dialects in the Italian peninsula, and outlined his concept of a *volgare illustre*, an illustrious, cardinal, courtly, and curial Italian vernacular that would belong to every town and to none in particular.

The poet discussed the question of language in another treatise he wrote around the same time called *Il Convivio*. This work was actually written in the vernacular, something truly revolutionary for the time. Dante explained the reason for his choice, stating that since the content of his discourse was poetry written in the vernacular, using Latin to discuss it would be nonsensical. Dante did concede in this

work that Latin was the most beautiful and the most virtuous of all languages, but he also pointed out that if he had used Latin to explain his poems, this "would not have explained them except to the learned, for no one else would have understood" (Lansing 1990, 18).

Dante fully realized the importance of employing a vernacular-based mode of expression. He noted that "if we perspicaciously consider what our intention is when we speak, it is clear that we mean to communicate to others the concepts formed in our minds" (Shapiro 1990, 48). However, during the 1300s, no one seriously followed up on his deliberations. In fact, during the next century the rise of Humanism and its admiration for and idealization of the classical world meant the renewed supremacy of Latin and the consequent mortification of the spoken tongue. There were only a few notable exceptions to this state of affairs. One of these was the renowned debate between Greek and Latin scholar Leonardo Bruni (1370–1444) and Renaissance humanist Flavio Biondo (1392–1463). Bruni maintained that ancient Rome had two distinct languages, a refined language used by writers and orators—Latin—and a plebeian speech used by the common people, which was the progenitor of the contemporary spoken tongue. By contrast, Biondo affirmed that the Romans only had one language that had later evolved into the present form after "contamination" with barbaric tongues. While Biondo's theory seemed to reinforce the notion that Latin was originally pure and the vernacular a mere corrupted derivation of it, it also postulated a genetic relationship between the two that was to be the logical premise for the legitimization of the spoken tongue in the following decades.

Towards the end of the fifteenth century, prominent men of letters like Lorenzo de' Medici (1449–1492) paid further recognition to the vernacular by composing poetry in it as well as writing in its defense.[2] The debate on the question of language intensified, and the chief point of contention was no longer whether the vernacular should replace Latin, but rather which type of vernacular could be used to replace it. The *questione della lingua*, as the debate came to be known, became a dispute in which different factions argued in favor of one idiom over the other. There were essentially three major schools of thought: the Tuscan and archaistic, who believed in the purity and authority of the literary language of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio; the Tuscan and anti-archaistic, led by those who supported contemporary Tuscan; and the anti-Tuscan, who advocated the use of a courtly type of speech—a *lingua cortigiana*—that was representative of the languages used at the various courts of Italy and as such better suited to rise to the rank of literary form.

The scholar Pietro Bembo (1470–1547) was the most influential supporter of the Tuscan and archaistic view. His treatise *Prose della volgar lingua* (*Writings on the Vulgar Tongue*), a lengthy dialogue consisting of four books, gave legitimacy to fourteenth-century Tuscan, placing it in a position of absolute privilege in the

[2] Lorenzo wrote in support of the *volgare* in his famous *Comento de' miei sonetti* (1484) (see De' Medici 1992, 577–88).

developments that followed. As Carlo Dionisotti pointed out in his analysis of this work, the chief challenge for the Venetian scholar and his followers was to prove that this vernacular had its own art, that it could achieve its own perfection, and that it had its own tradition (Dionisotti 1966, 40). Accordingly, Bembo examined the literary production of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio, and in analyzing passages from their masterpieces he showed that their language had rules and thus its own grammar. He then acknowledged the existence of different dialects and the reality of language change, endorsing the theory of barbaric contamination that had been exposed almost a century earlier (Dionisotti 1966, 74; 88).

The vernacular was once one with Latin and its present form was due to natural changes that had occurred with time, Bembo explained. However, the scholar understood that the authority and reputation of this language had yet to be proved. Prestige could only come from undeniable evidence that the *volgare* had already been part of a respectable literary tradition. Bembo found important proof in the artistic achievements of thirteenth-century Tuscan poets and in the tradition that linked them to Provençal lyricism. By producing evidence of a legitimate continuity between the two traditions, he succeeded in legitimizing the spoken tongue and proving that modern written Italian had a substantial Tuscan base.

However, this did not mean that the choice of the language in which Petrarch and his colleagues had written was to be taken for granted. The presence of multiple hubs of political power in Renaissance Italy signified the existence of a complex linguistic landscape where different political realities competed for cultural and economic hegemony. The courts of Milan, Mantua, Ferrara, Urbino, and Rome were all thriving cultural centers, and the language that was spoken by their members was regarded by some as the highest expression of the literary and artistic achievements of the vernacular tradition. Furthermore, if the language of Tuscany was the one to be chosen, there was no reason why it should not be the one currently in use and not a somewhat abstract and archaic version of it.

In order to win over the skepticism of those who saw an irreconcilable fracture between the artificial language of Petrarch and the vibrant and dynamic contemporary speech, Bembo had to convincingly refute both theories in his book. He first addressed the theory of a *lingua cortigiana*. Vincenzo Colli known as Il Calmeta (1460–1508) was probably the first to theorize the existence of a courtly type of speech and to practically advocate the employment of the language used at the court of the pope. Bembo, who made the principle of imitation the central pillar of his position, rejected Calmeta's theory, arguing in the words of one of the characters in the dialogue—Giuliano de' Medici—that "a language cannot be considered such if it does not have writers who write in it" (Dionisotti 1966, 110). The courtly language used at the court of Rome, or at any other court in the Italian peninsula, he maintained, had not produced any literary work that could be used as a model and as such it did not have the authority and prestige of a literary language.

Giuliano de' Medici (1479–1516) was actually one of the strongest supporters of contemporary Florentine. In Bembo's *Prose*, Giuliano states in support of his own theory that writing like Petrarch and Boccaccio would be equivalent to writing to the dead. Many intellectuals in Florence shared this view, and the Sienese

philologist Claudio Tolomei (1492–1556), who was against a rigid principle of imitation, ironically asked in his treatise *Il Cesano* whether Petrarch and Boccaccio had actually used all possible Tuscan words in their works (Vitale 1978, 82). Addressing these criticisms, Bembo argued that the written language can never be the same as the spoken, thus suggesting that in his opinion a literary language based on the vernacular should not be a total reproduction of speech but rather a refined and polished version of the spoken tongue.

Bembo's *Prose* virtually set the norms of modern Italian grammar, but it was not exempt from fierce criticism. Baldassarre Castiglione's *Il libro del cortegiano* (*The Book of the Courtier*), another lengthy dialogue that drew from Calmeta's theory of a *lingua cortigiana*, argued against Bembo's imitation of fourteenth-century Tuscan classics, because "if any man of good judgment had to deliver an oration on weighty matters before the very senate of Florence, which is the capital of Tuscany, or had to speak privately about important business with some person of rank in that city . . . I am sure he would take care to avoid using those antique Tuscan words" (Singleton 1959, 48). Castiglione (1478–1529) discussed the *questione della lingua* within the declared object of his book—to portray the ideal courtier. It is within that framework that according to Castiglione, in order to avoid affectation, the perfect courtier should avoid using "many antique Tuscan words," and "make certain, whether in speaking or in writing, that he uses those words which are in current usage in Tuscany and in other parts of Italy and which have a certain grace when pronounced" (Singleton 1959, 49). Contrary to Bembo, Castiglione believed that Petrarch and Boccaccio did not follow any model but merely relied on their genius and natural abilities. The same should be done now, he stated, in order to create a "universal, copious, and varied" Italian language (Singleton 1959, 56). In Castiglione's view, the spoken and the written language should coincide, and no language can, by virtue of its elegance, confer authority to a written text lacking in meaning. Interestingly, despite the importance of Castiglione's theory and the fact that the vast majority of non-Tuscan intellectuals of the time supported the idea of a courtly type of speech, with a specific preference for that of the court of Rome, scholars believe today that the conditions never existed for the language spoken at the court of the pope to rise to the rank of national idiom (Giovanardi 1998, 42–43).

On the other hand, the view that pushed for the adoption of contemporary Tuscan was strongly supported by many leading figures of the Renaissance. Niccolò Machiavelli (1469–1527) actually believed that Florentine, the dialect of his native town of Florence, was the only speech that had the authority and prestige of a literary language. In a short unpublished treatise titled *Dialogo intorno alla nostra lingua* (*Dialogue on Our Tongue*) from 1515, Machiavelli imagined himself engaging Dante in a discussion on the problem of language. His discussion departed from the theory of scholar Gian Giorgio Trissino (1478–1550) who advocated the existence of an Italian language that was common to all parts of Italy and that was intelligible to all beyond the existence of dialects and regional modes of speech. Trissino had come to this conclusion after reading Dante's *De vulgari*, which he actually translated himself at the beginning of the sixteenth century, thus spurring the debate on the *questione della lingua*. The central point in Trissino's theory was

Dante's criticism of all of the dialects of the peninsula, including his own Florentine, in favor of an abstract common idiom that did not truly exist. Machiavelli's argument was to prove that despite his vilifying comments against Florentine, the language Dante had used in his *Divine Comedy* was Florentine itself, as was the language used by those who wrote after him. Machiavelli concluded "there is no language, which can be called common to Italy or a courtly tongue, because all those that might be called thus, have their foundation in Florentine writers and their language" (Landon 2005, 141).

Despite the existence of conflicting views on the validity of Bembo's theory, his position later prevailed. The fact that even Castiglione's *Il libro del cortegiano* had to be reedited into Tuscan speaks to the prestige that Bembo's model was able to gain among literary circles. In 1612 the Accademia della Crusca, one of the leading and most influential cultural centers of the time, published its first dictionary of the Italian language on the basis of Bembo's deliberations, ratifying his theory and the authority he had conferred upon the great writers of the 1300s.

Final Considerations

According to his own account, Futabatei Shimei did not know which language to employ in his novels, and it was his mentor Tsubouchi Shōyō who suggested the use of the upper class Tōkyō speech employed by professional raconteur San'yūtei Enchō (三遊亭円朝 1839–1900) in his stories. Contrary to Bembo and his followers, who found in the language used by Dante, Boccaccio, and in particular, by Petrarch, a model with sufficient authority to become a viable alternative to Latin, Futabatei Shimei and the advocates of *genbun itchi* did not have an existing literary model they could imitate. Their tradition did not offer instances of works written in the vernacular with sufficient prestige to challenge the classical language. The availability of a literary model, or lack thereof, was thus one important difference in the theoretical discourse of each debate.

On the other hand, the detractors of Latin were not in agreement on which type of Italian vernacular could be employed as literary language, this being another significant difference with the *genbun itchi* movement where the primacy of the Tōkyō dialect was never seriously questioned. Given the central importance of the new capital in the economic and political life of the nation, the Tōkyō speech was largely supported by critics and scholars, even though it was thought by some to be lacking the refinement and sophistication that were required of a written language. The scholarly contributions of Yamada Bimyō and Shimamura Hōgetsu suggested that such speech did have the potential to develop its own rhetorical repertoire and thus become sufficiently refined for use in literature.

The language that ultimately prevailed in the heated *questione della lingua* debate—Tuscan—was not the speech in use in sixteenth-century Tuscany, but rather the imitation of a language used 200 years earlier. Although the rise of Tuscan as national idiom did lead to the demise of Latin and the progressive

dissolution of the diglossia in place at the time, Bembo's model essentially replaced the old diglossia with a new one. The ratification of a literary language that was fixed in the past resulted in a lexical and syntactic fracture between the written and the spoken tongue that would be reconciled only over the following centuries amid the evolution of local dialects and the blooming of regional literature.

There was, however, one important common trait in the search for a new written language in Meiji Japan and Renaissance Italy: the attempt to recapture the value of the spoken tongue and to reconfigure the process of communication according to the needs of an evolving society. Such endeavors also became metalinguistic operations that sought to redefine the meaning of rhetorical refinement in writing according to new literary and aesthetic paradigms. The ability of the new language to be employed in literature remained a constant preoccupation for scholars and intellectuals, informing their quests at every stage of the debate.

References

De' Medici, Lorenzo. 1992. *Opere*. Torino: Einaudi.

Dionisotti, Carlo, ed. 1966. *Pietro Bembo: Prose della volgar lingua*. Torino: Utet.

Fukuchi, Gen'ichirō. 1978a. "Bunron." In *Kindai buntai keisei shiryō shūsei: hassei hen*, edited by Yamamoto Masahide, 151–53. Tōkyō: Ōfūsha.

———. 1978b. "Bunshōron." In *Kindai buntai keisei shiryō shūsei: hassei hen*, edited by Yamamoto Masahide, 173–78. Tōkyō: Ōfūsha.

Giovanardi, Claudio. 1998. *La teoria cortigiana e il dibattito linguistico del primo Cinquecento*. Roma: Bulzoni.

Grayson, Cecil. 1960. *A Renaissance Controversy: Latin or Italian?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Igarashi, Chikara. 1909. *Shinbunshō kōwa*. Tōkyō: Waseda daigaku shuppanbu.

Kanda, Kōhei. 1978. "Bunshōron o yomu." In *Kindai buntai keisei shiryō shūsei: hassei hen*, edited by Yamamoto Masahide, 212–17. Tōkyō: Ōfūsha.

Landon, William J. 2005. *Politics, Patriotism and Language: Niccolò Machiavelli's "secular patria" and the Creation of an Italian National Identity*. New York: Peter Lang.

Lansing, Richard, trans. 1990. *Dante's Il Convivio (The Banquet)*. New York: Garland.

Mozume, Takami. 1902. "Genbun itchi no fukanō." *Yomiuri shinbun*, December 17–19.

Nishi, Amane. 1981. *Hyakugaku renkan*. Vol. 4 of *Nishi Amane zenshū*. Tōkyō: Munetaka shobō.

Ochiai, Naobumi. 1978. "Bunshō no gobyū." In *Kindai buntai keisei shiryō shūsei: hassei hen*, edited by Yamamoto Masahide, 547–59. Tōkyō: Ōfūsha.

Shapiro, Marianne. 1990. *De vulgari eloquentia: Dante's Book of Exile*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Shimamura, Hōgetsu. 1898. "Shōsetsu no buntai ni tsuite." *Yomiuri shinbun*, May 9–10.

———. 1978. "Genbun itchi no sannan." In *Kindai buntai keisei shiryō shūsei: hassei hen*, edited by Yamamoto Masahide, 452–56. Tōkyō: Ōfūsha.

———. 1979. "Isseki bunwa." In *Kindai buntai keisei shiryō shūsei: seiritsu hen*, edited by Yamamoto Masahide, 571–78. Tōkyō: Ōfūsha.

Singleton, Charles S., trans. 1959. *The Book of the Courtier*. Garden City, N.Y: Anchor Books.

Takeshima, Hagoromo. 1978. "Genbun itchi tai, gazoku setchūtai." In *Kindai buntai keisei shiryō shūsei: hassei hen*, edited by Yamamoto Masahide, 813–14. Tōkyō: Ōfūsha.

Tomasi, Massimiliano. 2004. *Rhetoric in Modern Japan: Western Influences on the Development of Narrative and Oratorical Style*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Vitale, Maurizio. 1978. *La questione della lingua*. Palermo: Palumbo.
Yamada, Bimyō. 1978a. "Jijo." In *Kindai buntai keisei shiryō shūsei: hassei hen*, edited by Yamamoto Masahide, 362–67. Tōkyō: Ōfūsha.
———. 1978b. "Ware ware no genbun itchi tai." In *Kindai buntai keisei shiryō shūsei: hassei hen*, edited by Yamamoto Masahide, 627–30. Tōkyō: Ōfūsha.
———. 1978c. "Genbun itchi tai o manabu kokoroe." In *Kindai buntai keisei shiryō shūsei: hassei hen*, edited by Yamamoto Masahide, 631–33. Tōkyō: Ōfūsha.
Yano, Fumio. 1886. *Nihon buntai moji shinron*. Tōkyō: Hōchisha.

Linguistic Awareness and Language Use: The Chinese Literati at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century

Darja Miyajima

Abstract The linguistic situation in China at the beginning of the twentieth century confronted the Chinese literati with many challenges. While there was a rather clear decision in favor of the Vernacular Written Chinese (*baihua* 白話) as the new written language, which finally bridged the gap between spoken and written language that had been maintained by Classical Written Chinese (*wenyan* 文言) for centuries, it still remained unclear how the Vernacular would operate in all the domains necessary for a modern standard language since, up to that point, it had been restricted to certain domains (e.g. popular literature, private notes). One of the sources of inspiration was Western literature, which not only provided interesting theoretical ideas and new literary genres but also contained linguistic features that were eventually adopted into the modern Chinese language and have been preserved up to the present day. These features were integrated into Chinese mainly through translation works by outstanding scholars like Lu Xun, Liang Shiqiu, and Qu Qiubai. The first part of this paper focuses on their debates and arguments concerning free and literal translation methods, as well as on the differences and similarities in their attitudes. The second part will compare their theoretical points of view concerning the use of the third-person pronouns in their original and translated works and will attempt to use it as an indicator of the level of a text's Westernization. As a rule, we can see that linguistic awareness and language use have a rather close connection, but there are also exceptions that make more thorough research necessary.

Keywords Baihua • Wenyan • Westernization • Literal translation • Free translation • Third-person pronouns

D. Miyajima (✉)
Institute of Slavic Studies, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg
e-mail: darja.miyajima@slav.uni-heidelberg.de

J. Árokay et al. (eds.), *Divided Languages?*, Transcultural Research – Heidelberg Studies on Asia and Europe in a Global Context, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-03521-5_8,

Introduction

> In order to seek social progress, it is necessary to break up the prejudices that are upheld as 'inalterable principles' or as 'established from of old'. We believe that politics, ethics, science, the arts, religion and education should all meet practical needs in the achievement of progress for present and future social life. We have to give up the useless and irrelevant elements of the traditional literature and ethics because we want to create those needed for the progress of the new era and new society. (Chow 1960, 174)

These words, taken from the New Youth Manifesto (1919), are suggestive of the atmosphere in China during the times of transition. The transition began at about the end of the Qing dynasty (1644–1911) when, after having faced a long period of rebellion, unrest, and armed conflict, the Qing government took several half-hearted and rather ineffective measures to change things for the court and its subjects. Since these measures didn't reap the expected positive effects and because the government had also been defeated in several wars, the need to develop more effective technology, military, and industry became clear. At the beginning of the twentieth century, technological and industrial development was a highly urgent issue to some, while others were more concerned about the spiritual and intellectual development of the Chinese people, which they saw as the basis for any further undertaking (Chow 1960, 327). Some scholars at the time thought it best to mix Western science with the 'Chinese essence' in lifestyle and philosophy and to stay true to traditional values, others saw the need for sweeping social and educational reforms, to introduce the ideas of Western civilization, and to create a new China through the re-evaluation of traditions (Chow 1960, 173). Thus, the period was marked by both faith in the effects of progress and despair about the bulk of ancient thought and behavior patterns that seemed to hang like a millstone around the country's neck.

After having been soundly defeated by the superior technology of Western weapons, a good many Chinese scholars were willing to acquire the necessary knowledge for the sake of overcoming technical backwardness. Others who sought to fight 'intellectual backwardness' wished to learn from the West. Since there were very limited opportunities for people in those times to study abroad, the only way to learn about the West was through the printed word.

Lu Xun (魯迅 1881–1936), the prominent Chinese writer and thinker, understood quickly that literature was one of the most important tools used to enlighten people. As one of the key figures in the reform movements at the beginning of the twentieth century, he not only influenced the theoretical developments in the modern Chinese literature, but also made a veritable impact on the lexical stock and the grammatical structure of the written language through his innovative creations, some of which were eagerly copied by his followers and eventually adopted by large parts of China's population.

The linguistic situation at that time was indeed fertile soil for innovations, experiments, and discussions: The call for China's unity and political reforms also involved greater unity of its language, which would not only help in

communication with the population but also to strengthen it (Chow 1960, 244). However, the population consisted of people speaking mutually unintelligible dialects who were only able to reach the highest level of communication solely through written texts. Although Classical Written Chinese (*wenyan* 文言) was most probably based on a spoken language, in the enthusiasm for imitating the standards of ancient times it had basically ossified into an archetypal state over many centuries with the help of abundant rules, restrictions, and fixed patterns, thus creating a considerable gap between the spoken and the written language (Zhou 2003, 36–37). Writing a text in *wenyan* wasn't simply a matter of knowing characters, but also of understanding all the considerations necessary to produce an intricate composition; only a small part of the population had access to that highly refined and complex medium (Zhou 2003, 44). Nevertheless, *wenyan* couldn't completely prevent people from just recording day-to-day speech: The practice of writing down just what was meant to be said out loud and expressing through words that did not need further refinement and could be understood by 'your average Chinese recipient' had produced the Vernacular Written Chinese (*baihua* 白話), which was used in much less prestigious literary works (novels, plays) and in many areas of daily life (bills, notes, informal letters) (Zhou 2003, 46–48). Since the nineteenth century there had been scholars who considered abandoning the inflexible patterns of *wenyan* in favor of the more vivid *baihua*, and by the beginning of the twentieth century *baihua* was indeed seen as the base of a standard written language used to facilitate a faster literacy growth. But while *baihua* did provide a base for this standard written language there were still far too many unanswered questions in the domains of language system, functionality, and norms that occupied the minds of literati like Lu Xun. Those questions resulted in heated debates about where to acquire the lexical and grammatical entities that *baihua* still lacked in order to be a fully developed standard language, and what to do with *wenyan,* which was too deeply rooted in the culture to simply dismiss.

Liang Shiqiu (梁實秋 1903–1087) and Qu Qiubai (瞿秋白 1889–1935) were two of the most active participants in these debates who challenged some of Lu Xun's ideas and whose opinions and works have been taken into account for this study. Both were keen thinkers, brilliant translators and essayists, and they helped shape the modern Chinese language.

This paper will describe the views of Lu Xun and his contemporaries based on translation principles, Westernization, and Chineseness. By taking translations and original writings by the authors in question as examples, we shall compare those principles with their realization in practice and from those results draw some conclusions about the degree to which an attitude can be mirrored in works and spread not only through overall diffusion of theoretical instructions, but also through inspiring other people to imitate the execution of those instructions in a tangible application. It would be quite logical to presume that the literati were willing to take the same medicine that they prescribed to others, but practice often proved to be quite different from theory. It is for this reason that thorough examinations (in fact, more thorough than this small-scale study can provide) of concrete

texts are necessary, especially when dealing with sources that both reflect and induce language change.

Literati: Literary and Literal

In his youth, Lu Xun read the translations of predecessors like Lin Shu (林紓 1852–1924), who translated a large amount of Western fiction, and Yan Fu (嚴復 1853–1921), who translated scientific treatises. The work of these two translators was indeed outstanding, and they helped to raise the acceptance level for fiction and to introduce Western ideas, scholars, and authors to a Chinese audience. Lu Xun soon produced his first translations of works by Victor Hugo and later Jules Vernes. The scientific progress of the West was set aside when it became more important for him to find a way to influence attitudes in China. He accused the Chinese of being too passive and fatalistic, for lacking interest in the fate of others (Lundberg 1989, 86), and he sought not only to help people to correct these flaws but also to demonstrate how important the spiritual development of each individual was (Chow 1960, 309–310). Thus, he began choosing works that he deemed suitable for this goal, criticizing, for example, Lin Shu for his random choices of popular fiction (Lundberg 1989, 214). Lu Xun was able to read Japanese and some German, a skill that allowed him to enjoy original works by Japanese and German authors and served as a tool by which he could access works by writers from a number of so-called oppressed countries like Russia (Lundberg 1989, 43). Lu Xun hoped works that described the unwavering vigor of a "surging stream" that paradoxically characterized an 'oppressed' Russia (Lundberg 1989, 174) might help to revive the Chinese people's spirit. He believed that Russia's fate was something Chinese people could relate to and hoped that they would draw some precious conclusions from what they read (Lundberg 1989, 42).

After having put a lot of effort into studying domestic and foreign literature and into translation, Lu Xun began to write his own short stories, poems, and essays in *baihua*. Since he was against the concept of art for art's sake (Lundberg 1989, 188), these original works, in addition to being literature that should contribute to the greater good "for man" and "for life," were meant to facilitate the above-mentioned educational aims (Lundberg 1989, 59). Although Lu Xun is best known for his original writings and although he also became interested in translating theoretical works and in participating in politics, he never really gave up translating fiction: his last—regrettably unfinished—translation was *Mërtvye duši* (*Dead Souls*) by Nikolai Gogol'.

It is not necessary to point out here that translation is not an easy task, but we should certainly be aware of how particularly tricky it was for the Chinese literati of that time to engage in this kind of activity: Unknown concepts and lifestyles needed to be transmitted, different kinds of terminology were to be developed, peculiar grammar and style features to be puzzled together, and new words to be invented. As translators tried to cope with these challenges, all the while struggling with the

insufficiency of *baihua*, new developments in the Chinese language of some sort were inevitable. Even the aforementioned Lin Shu and Yan Fu, who both displayed a rather conservative attitude to translation and who preferred to stay true to the elegant style of *wenyan* (Zhou 2003, 52; Tsien 1954, 320) which, in their opinion, was an adequate instrument to draw the attention of the Chinese public and to transmit the necessary Western ideas, still couldn't completely avoid copying sentence structures and coining new terms (Lundberg 1989, 209–212).

The 'conservative' translation methods used prior to the nineteenth century involved a 'creative tandem' where the original text was read by someone who understood the language and who retold it to the person in charge of the writing. That person not only conveyed the essence to the passage re-narrated into beautiful *wenyan* sentences, but also often took the opportunity of adding 'adjustments' or omitting parts that were not considered suitable for Chinese readers (Tsien 1954, 307–308; Chen 2009, 95). This practice carried on until the beginning of the twentieth century: Lin Shu (one of the most prominent translators who didn't read any foreign languages) as well as Yan Fu, among others, thought it best to modify the translation text according to his own considerations (Tsien 1954, 321–322). Yan Fu justified those considerations by developing the principles of faithfulness (信 *xìn*—stay true to the original), expressiveness (達 *dá*—be accessible to the reader), and elegance (雅 *yǎ*—use the language of the educated recipient) (Lundberg 1989, 211–212; Liao 2008, 39). These principles, along with their definitions and hierarchy, sparked numerous, fervid discussions similar to the controversy surrounding foreignizing and domesticating translation methods. Was it indeed best to stick to the original no matter what (foreignization), or was it better to adapt the writing to the target language and culture (domestication)? Should the work's outcome look like a translation of the alien or like an original text in one's mother tongue?

Lu Xun, who was an active and important part of these discussions, criticized Yan Fu for trying too hard to please the Chinese readers and Lin Shu for his 'assembly-line-translations' that didn't match the original style or genre and were inaccurate, distorting the original through random changes (Lundberg 1989, 213–214). For Lu Xun, translation wasn't the easiest thing either, but he did believe that by simply transmitting ideas people could actually create texts of their own; nonetheless, a foreign work should make a foreign impression as well. Lu Xun pointed out that it was better to sacrifice elegance and stick to a truthful rendition. Even if people had trouble understanding those texts initially due to their foreignness, they would soon get used to the style and understand; indeed, in the end this understanding would help them to evolve, whereas it wouldn't do the reader any good to simply read 'domesticated' literature (Lundberg 1989, 215).

With his opinions and his writings on the topic, Lu Xun triggered the debate on literal (*zhíyì* 直譯—direct) versus free translation (*yìyì* 意譯—analogous, transmitting the ideas). He argued vehemently in favor of the literal translation method, which meant following the original to the extent of refusing to change grammatical patterns and the word order (Chen 2009, 96). He decided to deliberately introduce

foreign structures into Chinese that made those translations a mental challenge for the readers (Lundberg 1989, 218–219).

Liang Shiqiu, one of the most prominent adversaries of Lu Xun in those debates, though not a devoted supporter of free translation either (Chen 2009, 98), regarded that challenge as an unnecessary torture. He criticized the literal word-for-word translations, because he failed to see the benefits in reading meticulous copies of something that didn't make any tangible sense (Liang 1934, 65; 302). He refused to make a scapegoat of *wenyan* or of the Chinese language itself (Liang 1934, 69) and he couldn't agree with the allegation that the texts produced with less structural constraints were mere re-narrations or that the translators who emphasized the transmission of the meaning were just avoiding difficult passages (Chen 2009, 98). Despite this criticism, Lu Xun still chose to remain exaggeratedly faithful to producing a fluent, easily readable text (Chen 2009, 96). Even if a combination of these principles seemed ideal, in practice both ways were not always possible and in cases when one course of action had to be chosen, it was still most important to keep the "original atmosphere" of the text. Making a decision in favor of elegance by sacrificing the faithfulness was absolutely unacceptable (Lundberg 1989, 227). After all, Lu Xun didn't really intend to make it easy for anyone; he couldn't adapt completely to the practice of scholars who had a rather moderate view of the matter and were struggling to find a balance between fluent writing and being faithful to the content, while avoiding thoughtless word-for-word translations and fact changing. On the other hand, he did wish for readers to notice how different things were in the West and to understand that China truly needed reforms. For Lu Xun, Westernization itself was the goal because without it the writings in *baihua* wouldn't be able to meet the expectations of a modern language (Lundberg 1989, 217).

Qu Qiubai, an intellectual and translator who was highly valued by Lu Xun, and who, like Lu Xun, favored literal translations per se, contradicted him by asserting that a text could be faithful and easy to read as long as one considered each and every word of his translation (Xu 2007, 83; Wei 2010, 95–96). In his opinion, deciding about the needs of uneducated people from the point of view of the educated wasn't the right path to reach the most urgent and important goal: the education of the masses. If one really wanted the people to understand, one needed to write as they speak and to use a common language that was easy enough to decode. Qu Qiubai made the reader a part of the creation process, a part that one needed to adjust and to respond to (Wei 2010, 97). His translation principles included "absolute correctness" and "absolute *baihua*" (*juedui de zhengque, juedui de baihua* 絕對的正確, 絕對的白話), meaning faithful rendition of the original text in the written speech of people with an average education level, which would be understandable when read aloud (Xu 2007, 81; Wei 2010, 96–97). While Lu Xun kept certain *wenyan* elements in his texts on purpose, Qu Qiubai dismissed the violation of grammar rules (Liu 2004, 12; Wei 2010, 98) and regarded faithfulness and the use of *wenyan* as incompatible (Wei 2010, 95). As a relentless proponent of free translations, Lu Xun was well aware of the problems that literal translations created for the readers. His suggestion was that translations like his own were meant

to be read by educated people, while others, deprived of access to such texts, should strive to reach that education level (Wei 2010, 97). However, Qu Qiubai still emphasized the need for literature aimed at proletarians and the political goals that needed to be achieved first (Xu 2007, 81).

In fact, when we take a closer look at the different theoretical positions and concentrate on finding similarities in the attitudes and practical implementations, we can see that in all cases extremes were dreaded and heavily criticized: that is, the dangers of free translation becoming random and literal translation becoming incomprehensible gibberish were to be avoided at all costs (Chen 2009, 98–99). If we arrange the principles of Yan Fu according to priority, we would clearly see a kind of consensus among the literati who placed content first, followed by style, and then expression. Furthermore, whether one valued *wenyan* or *baihua* more, it was often difficult to keep one's preferred variety clean of 'speckles' in the form of neologisms or archaisms; both equally served the purpose of adjusting language to the extra-linguistic reality and its demands.

While others accused, for instance, Qu Qiubai of distorting and even 'murdering' the Chinese language (Xu 2007, 81), Lu Xun was certain that it had to be remodeled. He believed that not only the particularly foreign atmosphere but also the means of expression used in a foreign text should form part of the translation and that lexical entities as well as grammar should be borrowed (Liu 2004, 10). Lu Xun criticized the grammatical structure of Chinese for being vague and imprecise, and saw it as a characteristic trait of the Chinese people whom he also found weak-minded and indecisive (Liu 2004, 9; Lundberg 1989, 225). In his opinion, a language was useless if it couldn't exactly transmit what people meant to say (Wei 2010, 98), and this is why he was so eager to introduce and create elements needed for the progress of the language and the country. Long sentences, for example, were more suitable to express complicated issues compared with the short sentences of Classical Written Chinese, and through the grammaticalization of the sentences' components the language would become more flexible, reflecting the thoughts of the people (Liu 2004, 10–11).

Lu Xun's point of view was supported by Fu Sinian (傅斯年 1896–1950), a renowned linguist who has characterized Chinese sentences as being composed of simple and loose structures. By contrast the Western texts used logical and complicated sentences, strict rules, and a great stock of specialized vocabulary, while Chinese texts seriously lacked means of expression (Liu 2007, 100). Fu Sinian has also made several proposals on how to handle the new modern Chinese language and how to lead it to greater development: *Baihua* should definitely provide its base, but since it hadn't reached the state necessary for a standard national language, it must include *wenyan* elements, as well as grammatical patterns and rhetorical devices from dialects and Western languages. With the *baihua* base being nourished by other sources, an elegant language of the people could be created (Liu 2007, 99). He claimed that it was both unrealistic and unprofitable to avoid *wenyan* influences at all costs. With all efforts directed at the construction of a modern standard language, no personal cultural or ideological preferences should be taken into account and all the decisions should be made according to linguistic

and rhetoric principles. In this context, Fu Sinian supported the idea of literal translations because they formed the experimental ground for future writers (Liu 2007, 99–100).

In reality, everyone who tried to use *baihua* for translations and writings found himself on this experimental ground. The literati needed to improvise and to be inventive, to 'recycle' archaic material and to imitate novel constructions. The written vernacular comported itself like a sponge, absorbing all kinds of influences, digesting whatever it was fed, and thus providing a rather fertile research area for those who wish to examine the linguistic situation of those times and its subsequent developments. Studies like Wang's (cf. Wang 1984; see also Kubler 1985; Hsu 1994) have shown that in subsequent years, the written Chinese language incorporated Western influences introduced through the copious translation works, thus becoming structurally stricter and developing new syntactic and morphologic features. Until recently, numerous studies of the Westernization phenomenon have been produced that have further tried to examine and exhibit the whole 'impact area' of the Western languages (mostly English) on Chinese (cf. Diao 2009; Tsai 2007; Wang 2002). However, cases investigating the Westernized structures and the development of the modern Chinese language by taking translation works and principles into account are still very few and far between. I hope to add a small puzzle piece to the larger picture by taking a closer look at the texts of the aforementioned authors.

Linguistic Awareness and Him/Her/Them

In this study I intend to demonstrate how the attitude of the literati is reflected in their translated and original works. What is most important here is to find out whether the intellectuals lived up to their own standards, that is to say, for example, whether the proponents of Westernization actually included more innovative structures into their original texts after engaging in translation works and whether the opponents of Westernization were able to avoid them.

Considering the dangerously wide scope of this study, it is convenient to limit the examination of the texts to one representative phenomenon in hopes that more thorough and extensive analyses will be carried out in the future. The third-person pronouns present themselves as suitable for such a case (cf. the extensive study by Chan 2011). When we turn our attention to Classical Written Chinese, we see that there were pronouns for the first and the second person available for use but that third-person pronouns were not necessary at all. In a *wenyan* sentence one could either omit the object or repeat a preceding name or notion for a subject that wasn't a compulsory feature of a phrase (Wang 1984, 264–247; 446). In spoken language and *baihua* texts, however, the third-person pronoun 他 (tā) was used without giving any precise information about gender or number. Its increasing occurrence

in Chinese texts since the beginning of the twentieth century has already been described as an example of Westernized language use (Kubler 1985, 77; Wang 1984, 269) with the purpose of making a 'grammatically complete' sentence (cf. Chan 2011, 32). However, it must be pointed out that it wasn't Western influence that brought about the emergence of the pronouns as such (cf. Wang 1984, 436). The character 他 (formerly 佗) existed prior to the Six Dynasties (220–589 AD), though not in the function of a personal pronoun. Instead, it was used in the sense of 其他 (*qítā* other). It later became a pronoun that was interchangeable with 它 (tā) and designated a person, mentioned earlier, with a pejorative connotation that eventually became neutral with time. During the Tang dynasty (618–907 AD) its use expanded to inanimate objects, showing distinction between the singular and plural aspects; however, it was still considered polite to record a person by name, so this character hardly ever appeared as a subject and thus wasn't seen very often together. Along with tā, 伊 (yī) had also appeared as a third-person pronoun since the Six Dynasties and even when it was replaced by 他 (tā) in the Modern Standard Written Chinese to this day it hasn't lost its function as a third-person pronoun in dialect writings (Ueda and Yu 2000, 273–276). Furthermore, to some of the literati at the beginning of the twentieth century who experimented with translations (e.g. Lu Xun) it seemed like an acceptable means of rendering the female third-person pronouns. The gender specific pronouns thus developed at the beginning of the twentieth century during the 'creative quest' period and most notably after the article by Liu Bannong (劉半農 1891–1934) "The Issue of Ta" published on 9 August 1920, which described the advantages of using 她 as the feminine (tā, she) and 牠 (tā, which was eventually replaced by 它 for neutral inanimate objects) as the neutral personal pronoun (it) (Chan 2009, 1–2; Wang 1984, 476). Considering the system, it can be stated that the singular pronouns structure was adopted from English (with 'he' and 'she' for humans and 'it' for non-humans). The phenomenon of explicit plural pronoun forms is also a development that has been inspired by Western languages, though their gender differentiation was an original Chinese construction (Wang 1984, 269; 478).

In the course of the copious translation work, new linguistic features (though formed from original Chinese stock) were introduced and later went on to become a part of the original works by the authors. In translated texts those features appear more often and at times they even contradict the genuine rules of the Chinese grammar. Altogether, the general, explicit use of subjects and objects, which make the statement more precise, has increased. This demonstrates that it was accepted by great numbers of language users in the original writings (Wang 1984, 476). In such cases, an idea was obviously advertised thoroughly enough and received enough attention (both positive and negative) that it reached a high degree of topicality and found itself entering different spheres and spreading widely among members of the speech community. After this promotion and the corresponding diffusion reached its peak, the development swung back leaving the most acceptable phenomena in use and dropping the superfluous ones. In contemporary Chinese, third-person pronouns do not feel foreign anymore, and yet certain

applications have not been truly incorporated into the language system.[1] In the research of Hsu we find the proof for explicitly Westernized phenomena, which contradict the rules of the Chinese grammar and are still being met with resistance, for example the neutral third-person pronoun in the object position (Hsu 1994, 92–94; 114–115). Kubler has also listed examples from "Jia" (家 Family) by Ba Jin (巴金 1904–2005) where the neutral singular 它 (tā) was used in the subject and object position (for inanimate objects) in the earlier version and excluded in the later version (Kubler 1985, 78). If we imagine such a development and equate it with the ascent and descent of a pendulum, it should also swing back in the opposite direction, though less strongly. Practically, this would mean that the party opposing a certain actuality cannot fully escape its influence and the phenomenon itself would eventually bring the supporters of different sides closer to the 'golden mean' area, which would in turn bring about higher acceptance within the opponent group and a more differentiated handling of the proponents of a certain trend.

Altogether, examining the use of the third-person pronouns helps us to make a statement on a text's degree of Westernization, since their frequent use in addition to gender and number differentiation are a sign of Western influence. The degree of Westernization will make it possible to compare the theoretical approach with the practical application in the cases of the previously discussed authors.

For this task, a section of approximately 20,000 characters[2] in one or more texts has been examined. Ideally, to reach a more uniform outcome the items in question would all be fictional texts (novels and short stories being another innovation in the Chinese literary world) with original works preceding and following a translation. However, the mentioned authors have not produced enough fictional works to choose from, and therefore the analyzed material consists partly of essays and argumentative compositions. While the first and the second original texts stand for the points A and B in a writer's career, thus showing the beginning and the outcome of a development, the translation shouldn't be taken literally as the opus that caused a turnaround. It should be seen as an example for the entire translation work carried out by the writers (between and even beyond the points A and B), which might have brought about changes as a whole.

A Q Zhengzhuan (阿Q 正傳 *The True Story of Ah Q*) (originally published in 1921–1922) is not only one of the most representative works by Lu Xun, it is also considered very important in the canon of modern Chinese fiction since it is one of the first short stories written entirely in *baihua*. It depicts episodes in a man's life until his execution. The man (Ah Q) lives in a rural area and has a low education level. His individual actions consist of taking pride in bullying smaller and weaker people and trying to present himself as a winner in unfavorable situations, these are meant to represent the faults of the Chinese nation at large, which Lu Xun had

[1] Compare the numbers in the study of Chan (2009, 5–6): Lowest number at the beginning of the twentieth century, largest number in the 1950s, and the number decreasing in 2002–2003, which is still greater than a century earlier in both original ("indigenous") and translated texts.

[2] This is the approximate length of "A Q Zhengzhuan" (see below).

already criticized. Due to its highly experimental character and the writer's progressive attitude, the story can be expected to exhibit many Westernized features.

Most of the works translated by Lu Xun are originals written by Western authors, but in the majority of the cases he used the version written in Japanese to translate into Chinese, which in itself challenges the whole notion of Westernization. Thus, *Xiao Yuehan* (小約翰 *Little Johannes*, translation finished in 1927), a translation from the German, was chosen for examination here; its Dutch original by Frederik van Eeden (*De kleine Johannes*), first published in 1885, was translated into German by Anna Fles in 1892. The novel tells the adventures of the boy Johannes who travels through the different worlds of animals, mythical creatures, and people and has many experiences with life and death.

As a comparison with these two texts, I have chosen two stories from *Gushi Xin Bian* (故事新編 *Old Tales Retold*, pieces of fiction written and revised over a period of 13 years, where Lu Xun presents his versions of Chinese legends, 1922–1935, cf. Lu 1973), *Ben Yue* (奔月 *Flight to the Moon*, written in 1926), and *Li Shui* (理水 *Curbing the Flood*, written in 1935). *Ben Yue* retells the legend of Houyi (后羿), the legendary archer, and Chang'e (嫦娥), his wife who left him for the moon when she became disappointed with his failing to provide for her adequately. *Li Shui* deals with the flood control by Da Yu (大禹 Yu the Great), the founder of the Xia Dynasty (~ 2070–1600 BC), and describes, among others, the behavior of the elites in comparison with the commoners.

A translation of Shakespeare's *Li'er Wang* (李爾王 *King Lear*, translated in 1936, cf. Liang 1976) by Liang Shiqiu has been examined along with his original essays gathered in *Pianjianji* (偏見集 *Collection of Prejudices*, originally published in 1934, cf. Liang 1934) and *Yashe Xiaopin* (雅舍小品 *Sketches from an Elegant Residence*, originally published in 1949, cf. Liang 1987).[3] William Shakespeare's famous tragedy narrates the consequences of the king's dividing his property among his three daughters, which ultimately drives him to madness. *Pianjianji,* as well as *Yashe Xiaopin*, both contain various essays that present the author's reflections on different social, political, and cultural matters. *Pianjianji* concentrates on concrete phenomena and incidents (especially in literature), and *Yashe Xiaopin* presents a more general approach and a broader scope in subject selection.

Only one work by Lin Shu has been examined here because his translations aren't expected to exhibit significant style differences and because they were re-narrations and thus a mixture of translation and original work. *Bali Chahuanü Yishi* (巴黎茶花女逸事 *The Past Affairs of the Lady of the Camelias*, published in 1899), like the original novel,[4] tells the story of a Parisian courtesan from the point of view of her lover and is the only work written in *wenyan* in all the samples.

As for Qu Qiubai, his original works *Eguo Wenxue Shi* (俄國文學史 *History of Russian Literature*, published in 1927, first version written in 1921–1922), which, as the title suggests, gives a historical overview of the development of Russian

[3] See the detailed list of titles in the bibliography.

[4] Alexandre Dumas, fils: *La Dame aux Camélias*.

Literature, and *Luantan* (亂彈 *Random Shots*, 1932–1933, cf. Qu 1985), which consists of argumentative compositions on literature, arts, and society, are framed by translations. The first part comprises six works finished prior to 1921 and united in the compilation called *Zaoqi Yizuo Jiu Pian* (早期譯作九篇 *Nine Early Translations*, cf. Qu 1986): *Xiantan* (閒談 *Leisure Talk*, published in 1919, a sequence illustrating different people's thoughts on life and the right way to lead it)[5]; *Qidao* (祈禱 *Prayer*, published in 1920, a short story about a woman's dream rooted in her despair about her child's death)[6]; *Puyushi* (仆御室 *Lackey Room*, published in 1920, a short play showing people of different social status and occupation interacting while passing through a lackey room)[7]; *Funü* (婦女 *Woman*, published in 1920, a short but emotional essay on women)[8]; *Fuguo Gongqian Zhihou* (付過工錢之後 *After Having Been Paid Salary*, published in 1920, a short story about the agony of a woman trying to keep her husband from wasting his wage on drink)[9]; and *Kepa de Zi* (可怕的字 *Horrible Word*, published in 1921, a short story showing a simple woman's evaluation of a neighbor's political attitude and behavior).[10] Another piece that has been taken into account is the translation of the short story *Ma'erhua* (馬爾華 *Mal'va*, translated in 1933, cf. Qu 1987), which describes the complicated relationship between a woman, her lover, and his son in a rural setting.[11] In Qu Qiubai's case, a longer translation produced between 1927 and 1932 wasn't available, which is why the two translation texts produced at the same time as the original texts were taken. Their average in pronoun use should be a substitute for the single translation text between the points A and B mentioned above.

The number of all the third-person pronouns applied by one author was divided by the number of texts examined, thus providing an average of his third-person pronoun use, which was then compared with the sources mentioned below.

Haishang Hua Liezhuan (海上花列傳 *The Biographies of Shanghai Flowers*) by Han Bangqing (韓邦慶 1856–1894) is a popular novel written in *baihua* at the end of the Qing dynasty (published as a full book in 1894), depicting the life of the courtesans with an outlook on the world of merchants, officials, and people from other social levels and serving here as an example for the written use of *baihua* prior to Lu Xun and his contemporaries.

Furthermore, a comparison should be also drawn between the works by the authors in focus and contemporary works by writers on mainland China and Taiwan. Zhang Dachun's (張大春 born in 1957) novel *Lingting Fuqin* (聆聽父親 *Listening to Father*, published in 2003, cf. Zhang 2003) and Han Han's (born in

[5] Original work: Lev Tolstoj: *Beseda dosužix ljudej*.

[6] Original work: Lev Tolstoj: *Molitva*.

[7] Original work: Nikolaj Gogol': *Lakejskaja*.

[8] Original work: Nikolaj Gogol': *Ženščina*.

[9] Original work: Alphonse Daudet: *Le Singe*.

[10] Original work: Mixail Al'bov: *Strašnoe slovo*.

[11] Original work: Maksim Gor'kij: *Mal'va*.

1982) *Ling Xia Yi Du* (零下一度 *One Degree Below Zero*, published in 2000, cf. Han 2000) have been selected rather randomly. Both texts are autobiographic: *Lingting Fuqin* traces Zhang's family history as he tells it to his unborn son, putting stress on notable ancestors, while *Ling Xia Yi Du* is a collection of essays and notes on different aspects of Han Han's life. These works should hint at the development of the Westernized grammatical features from their emergence at the beginning of the twentieth century up to the present-day usage in creative writing.

Given this background information, when we examine the works of the above-mentioned authors we expect the following results:

(a) Either a rather cautious use and comparatively low number (Liang Shiqiu) or a fervent, and highly experimental use and a great number (Lu Xun and Qu Qiubai) of third-person pronouns in the first original text, which more likely formed the testing ground for a new means of expression; highest frequency of third-person pronouns in the translation, due to the extensive use of pronouns and explicit verbalization of the subject and object in Western languages (English, German, French, and Russian all merged in this term, though it would be beneficial to treat them separately in the future through more thorough studies); continuously frequent/rising use of third-person pronouns in the second original text due to familiarization with the newly introduced structures, but with a lower number (compared to the translation) based on a more differentiated application and the firm connection to the traditional grammatical patterns.
(b) The character 他 (tā) as the most frequently used, whether as the masculine singular third-person pronoun or as the generic third-person pronoun without gender and number differentiation. Others used in rather small numbers.
(c) The average number of third-person pronouns used by Liang Shiqiu should be lower than the number found in the works of Lu Xun and Qu Qiubai. It's rather difficult to make a prognosis for the correlation between the results of Lu Xun and Qu Qiubai. From Lu Xun we can expect meticulous accuracy in the rendition of the foreign text and thus a large quantity of third-person pronouns, as well as enthusiasm for linguistic experiments in his own works. On the other hand, he has also expressed a rather strong bond with *wenyan*, which was an important source for his creations. Qu Qiubai can be expected to show more consistency in his pronoun usage considering his firm principle of 'absolute *baihua*', but it is most probable that he also went through a period of experimentation, which might offer some surprises.
(d) No occurrence of 他 (tā) in the sense of third-person pronoun in *Bali Chahuanü Yishi* and rather scarce occurrence of 他 (tā) only (generic third-person pronoun) in *Haishang Hua Liezhuan*.
(e) Frequent occurrence of third-person pronouns of all sorts in the modern fiction works, though the number can be expected to have decreased in accordance with the Westernization and language modernization euphoria over the course of time.

Results and Discussion

As expected, the examination of Lu Xun's works (Table 1) reveal the highest amount of third-person pronouns in the translation of *Xiao Yuehan*, which also offers the greatest variety when it comes to gender and number differentiation. The main characters in *Xiao Yuehan*, as well as *A Q Zhengzhuan* are male, thus the high turnout for the singular masculine pronoun in both texts is not surprising. But the number of singular, as well as plural and neutral pronouns in *Xiao Yuehan* is eye-catching, especially when we compare it to his original texts where they are virtually absent. The lack of use of those pronouns in the original texts has been explained above: A neutral pronoun in the object position sounds unnatural and is preferably left out in Chinese, while it is included in German and has thus also been included into the translation by Lu Xun. As for the subject position, it might feel rather awkward to see an inanimate object or a non-human taking the role of an agent and being the subject of a sentence, but *Xiao Yuehan* is a fairy-tale and in its first part the protagonist engages in lengthy conversations with animals, insects, and flowers, all of those designated by the neutral third-person pronouns. As for the feminine pronouns, we see that in his first story Lu Xun used 伊 (yī) for singular and the analogously built 伊們 (yīmen) for plural reference, but in the translation and the other stories he eventually switched to 她 (tā) and 她們 (tāmen), as suggested by Liu Bannong. Raymond S. W. Hsü, who has examined the style of Lu Xun on the basis of his vocabulary use, states that Lu Xun gave up on 伊 (yī) or 伊們 (yīmen) in original writings and had been using 她 (tā) and 她們 (tāmen) since 1922 (Hsü 1979, 148). In *Xiao Yuehan* we find 伊 (yī) twice in a quotation from an old book, which hints that Lu Xun regarded it as obsolete. Another eye-catcher from the Table is that the original texts in comparison reveal a rather unexpected, almost 2:1 correlation. We have already speculated that there would be a high degree of Westernization and linguistic 'audaciousness' in *A Q Zhengzhuan* as well as more stylistic maturity that includes a rather measured application of means of expression in subsequent texts. However, this concrete result can also be attributed to the strikingly high number of the singular masculine pronouns that can be explained by the author's purposeful concentration on that single character (Ah Q) resulting in a lack of extensive direct speech (like dialogues that would use first- and second-person pronouns more often, cf. *"Gushi Xinbian"*), in Lu Xun's use of repetition as a stylistic device for emphasis, and in his using 他 (tā) for non-humans at that point prior to *Xiao Yuehan*, as for example in Ah Q's sassy reply to the nun who asks him about the turnips that he is about to steal:

> 你能叫得他答應你麼? (Lu Xun 1976, 121)
> Nǐ néng jiàodé **tā** dāyìng nǐ me?
> Can you make **it** answer you?[12]

[12] Translation and emphasis by Miyajima.

Table 1 Lu Xun

Lu Xun	A Q Zhengzhuan (1921–1922)	Xiao Yuehan (1927)	Gushi Xinbian (1926–1935)
他 tā Sing. Masc.	381	305	154
她 tā Sing. Fem.	—	26	18
它 tā Sing. Neut.	—	138	6
伊 yī Sing. Fem. (arch.)	14	2	—
他們 tāmen Plural Masc.	27	52	30
她們 tāmen Plural Fem.	—	4	2
它們 tāmen Plural Neut.	—	45	—
伊們 yīmen Plural Fem. (arch.)	3	—	—
Total number of personal pronouns	425	572	210

Liang Shiqiu's pronoun use (Table 2) shows the predicted considerable rise in the examined translation compared with the first original work and a considerable fall after it. Third-person pronouns are found in large numbers in *Li'er Wang*, once again covering all the potential scope with singular masculine pronouns securing the top position. Singular feminine pronouns are—interestingly enough—the runners-up (with the exception of *Pianjianji*, which obviously doesn't really concern itself with women). This is easily explained by frequent appearances of female characters in the plays and in an essay dedicated to women in *Yashe Xiaopin*. The occurrence of the singular neutral pronoun in the first original text is based on the stress put on literature as the topic of one of the essays and on a citation from another scholar's translation. Taken together the results tell us that although Liang Shiqiu didn't feel the need to include many third-person pronouns in his original work (their overall number in *Pianjianji* was amazingly low compared to *A Q Zhengzhuan* by Lu Xun), he couldn't avoid them in his translation at the beginning of the twentieth century. The rise of the pronouns in his second original text can be attributed to the general acceptance and increased usage of third-person pronouns as such.

In the case of Qu Qiubai (Table 3), we can see that his translations both present large numbers of third-person pronouns. The main difference between his translations is that in the examined texts of his early translations we mostly find masculine (singular and plural) pronouns with only one single exception, while in *Ma'erhua* only the female plural pronouns are missing. (Altogether, there is only one single female plural third-person pronoun in all the examined texts; this refers explicitly to a group consisting of women only.) The near absolute exclusivity of the masculine pronouns in the early translation texts can be explained by the fact that Qu Qiubai used them in a manner similar to old *baihua* literature—that is, in the generic sense: 他 (tā) did not represent males only, but also females and non-humans, sometimes with appropriate indications in brackets to avoid confusion:

他 (婦女) 是詩! (Qu 1986, vol. 4, 397)
Tā (fùnǚ) shì shī!
***generic pronoun* (woman)** is a poem![13]

[13] Translation and emphasis by Miyajima.

Table 2 Liang Shiqiu

Liang Shiqiu	Pianjianji (1934)	Li'er Wang (1936)	Yashe Xiaopin (1949)
他 tā Sing. Masc.	44	283	136
她 tā Sing. Fem.	0	97	28
它 tā Sing. Neut.	9	5	4
他們 tāmen Plural Masc.	29	43	6
她們 tāmen Plural Fem.	0	7	3
它們 tāmen Plural Neut.	6	1	—
Total number of personal pronouns	89	436	177

Table 3 Qu Qiubai

Qu Qiubai	Zaoqi Yizuo Jiu Pian (1919–1921)	Eguo Wenxue Shi (1921–1922)	Luantan (1932–1933)	Ma'erhua (1933)
他 tā Sing. Masc.	446	205	39	301
她 tā Sing. Fem.	—	14	2	212
它 tā Sing. Neut.	1	3	18	20
他們 tāmen Plural Masc.	54	30	86	51
她們 tāmen Plural Fem.	—	1	—	—
它們 tāmen Plural Neut.	—	—	16	5
Total number of personal pronouns	505	253	161	589

However, unlike the old *baihua* texts, he emphasized plurality by using 他們 (tāmen). In later writings he used the extra characters for feminine and neutral pronouns with the highest occurrence of singular masculine pronouns occurring in *Eguo Wenxue Shi* and *Ma'erhua*, while *Ma'erhua* also reveals a large number of singular feminine pronouns due to its female protagonist. *Luantan* is the only source where plural masculine pronouns prevail; this is rooted in the author's criticism of certain groups of people in those texts. Another interesting feature of those is a significant number of neutral pronouns that stand for inanimate objects or animals (all written as 它 tā or 它們 tāmen) and are used in the subject as well as in the object positions. Going back to the early translations, we have one singular neutral pronoun written as 它 (tā) that refers to an inanimate object in *Kepa de Zi*:

> 你們看見那屋子裡的情境,這樣的擺飾,一定能猜出它的主人是怎樣的人,他那樣的人... (Qu 1986, 4: 406)
> Nǐmen kànjiàn nà wūzi lǐ de qíngjìng, zhèyàng de bǎishì, yídìng néng cāichū **tā** de zhǔrén shì zěnyàng de rén, **tā** nàyàng de rén...
> If you saw the situation inside that house, that kind of decoration, you would certainly be able to guess what kind of person **its** owner is, **he** is the kind of person...[14]

[14] Translation and emphasis by Miyajima.

This is not so easy to explain, especially since all the other pronouns in this and the following texts (which haven't been considered for this study) refer to people, but also because another short story *Haoren* (好人 *Good people*)[15] translated in 1921 (Qu 1986, 4: 425–438) shows a male–female differentiation in the characters, we might cautiously presume that *Kepa de Zi* was the starting point for Qu Qiubai's explicit use of 它 (tā) as the singular neutral pronoun and not a simple typing error.

We should also note that the first of the original texts by Qu Qiubai presents a higher number of personal pronouns compared with the second, which can actually be explained by Qu's writing about Russian authors and thus making greater use of the pronouns. Nevertheless, the amount of pronouns in *Luantan* is peculiarly low, even lower than in *Yashe Xiaopin* by Liang Shiqiu, which also consists of short essays. We will return to this point later, but first I would like to take a look at the remaining sources (Table 4).

As expected, Lin Shu did not use 他 (tā) as a personal pronoun in his translation of *Bali Chahuanü Liezhuan*, but we still find that in the examined section he used 伊 (yī) for a female person once:

伊何人也? (Lin 1981, 18)
Yī hé rén yě?
Who is **she**?[16]

To discover the extent to which his *wenyan* writing was influenced by Western languages and the innovations introduced by scholars like Lu Xun, we need to examine a larger quantity of texts and, of course, to carry out qualitative studies that would take into account other phenomena as well.

Haishang Hua Liezhuan presents a rather moderate number of third-person pronouns, most of which are generic, even when referring to women:

秀寶也拉著樸齋袖子,說:『坐來浪。』樸齋被他一拉,... (Han 1974, Chaps. 2, 11)
Xiùbǎo yě lāzhe Pǔzhāi xiùzi, shuō: "Zuòláilàng." Pǔzhāi bèi tā yì lā,...
Xiubao pulled the sleeve of Puzhai and said: "Sit down." Puzhai being pulled by **her**, ...

However, we also find the masculine plural pronoun three times in the examined section.

Among the contemporary writers, Zhang Dachun's novel presents a number that is closest to Qu Qiubai's average of the original texts (≈ 207) and is also quite close to the second original work by Liang Shiqiu, which is not surprising. This number shows that the use of third-person pronouns had become rather common in modern written Chinese and also that their use stopped being experimental and excessive and, as suggested before, became rather moderate. While the written variety of Chinese in Taiwan is often said to cultivate closer ties with *wenyan*, it wouldn't be surprising to find more third-person pronouns in a text from mainland China; however, this was not the case with Han Han's *Ling Xia Yi Du*. We can attempt to explain this low number by virtue of the book being autobiographic and thus

[15] Original work: Anton Čexov: *Xorošie ljudi*.

[16] Translation and emphasis by Miyajima.

Table 4 Further texts

Further texts	Lin Shu: Bali Chahuanü Yishi (1899)	Han Bangqing: Haishang Hua Liezhuan (1894)	Han Han: Ling Xia Yi Du (2000)	Zhang Dachun: Lingting Fuqin (2003)
他 tā Sing. Masc.	—	46	92	158
她 tā Sing. Fem.	—	—	4	25
它 tā Sing. Neut.	—	—	2	15
伊 yī Sing. Arch.	1	—	—	—
他們 tāmen Plural Masc.	—	3	18	12
她們 tāmen Plural Fem.	—	—	—	—
它們 tāmen Plural Neut.	—	—	—	4
Total number of third person pronouns	1	49	116	214

logically including more first-person than third-person pronouns, but we also need to work with a larger corpus to make more precise conclusions, as well as take a look at more homogenous kinds of texts to be able to see a pattern connected with topics or genre.

Altogether, the use of feminine third-person pronouns does not appear frequently. First, we need to consider the fact that gender isn't explicitly shown in the plural forms of English, German, or Russian. Furthermore, the feminine forms are only applied when all the group members are female, otherwise 他們 (tāmen) is used. Another reason for the small number of feminine pronouns in original writings may have to do with the topics (protagonists) of the literature examined or with the fact that male authors tended to present their own point of view. Even if some essays or short stories dealt explicitly with females, most didn't include important female characters and didn't stress a woman's point of view. Comparing the writings of male and female authors and their use of third-person pronouns would be a great project for the future.

Final Comparison and Remarks

To make a final comparison of the authors that were examined more thoroughly, the average number of third-person pronouns used can be considered. As predicted, Liang Shiqiu's writings present the lowest number: ≈ 234 (≈ 133 in the original works). Qu Qiubai is in the middle with ≈ 377 (≈ 207), and Lu Xun turns out to be the author with the highest numbers ≈ 402 (≈ 318). Looking at the results of Liang Shiqiu and Lu Xun, we can confirm the assumption that the writings by the literati mirror their attitude. Lu Xun was keen on experiments and on imitating foreign structures and his translations and even original work offer many examples for this kind of language use, although he lost some of his audaciousness over time. Liang

Shiqiu, who didn't plan to translate word-for-word, showed a careful handling of certain structures and a differentiated use of grammatical loans. However, Qu Qiubai's case is quite ambiguous compared to his unambiguous slogan ('absolute *baihua*'). The average of all his works is closer to Lu Xun's number, but the average of his original works is closer to that of Liang Shiqiu. This leads me to conclude that he was adhering to double-standards in his translations and original texts, which isn't problematic per se, but does contradict his own call for uncompromising 'proletarian' language use. Another example that reveals Qu Qiubai didn't really practice what he preached is provided by Raymond S. W. Hsü, who compared Qu Qiubai's vocabulary with Lu Xun's, finding three times more *wenyan* elements in Qu Qiubai's text (Hsü 1979, 93–94). Apart from that, the comparison of Lu Xun and Qu Qiubai might simply be an instance where the differences between the languages become an important issue, since in Russian textual reference is possible without the explicit use of third-person pronouns (as opposed to in German or English) as seen, for example, in the following pattern:

My **ego** nakormili, napoili i spat' uložili.
Wir fütterten **ihn**, gaben **ihm** zu trinken und legten **ihn** schlafen.
We fed **him**, gave **him** something to drink and brought **him** to bed.[17]

The fact that Qu Qiubai mostly translated from Russian might be another reason for his using fewer third-person pronouns, but it is a suggestion that needs to be confirmed by further investigations where other possible sentence patterns can be considered and where comparisons between translation and original, as well as between translations into different languages, can be made.

One thing that this paper makes abundantly clear is that the subject has not yet been sufficiently examined. With this study I have attempted to gather background information on the important literati of the beginning twentieth century in China and on their (abundantly available) theoretical contribution to the development of the modern Chinese language. I have tried to connect it to the practical side of their work (such studies being a desideratum), thus providing what I hope will be a small stepping stone for further more thorough, quantitative and especially qualitative investigations in the fields of the Westernization phenomena, language change, and linguistic awareness.

References

Primary

Han Bangqing 韓邦慶. 1974. *Haishang Hua Liezhuan* (海上花列傳 The Biographies of Shanghai Flowers), edited by Wang Yizhao. Taipei: Tianyi Chubanshe

[17] Example and emphasis by Miyajima.

Han Han 韓寒. 2000. *Lingxia Yidu* (零下一度 One Degree Below Zero). Shanghai: Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe.
Liang Shiqiu 梁實秋. 1934. “Renxin yu Jiejixing” (人性與階級性 Humanity and Class Character). In *Pianjianji* (偏見集 Collection of Prejudices), 297–299. Nanjing: Zhengzhong Shuju.
———. 1934. “Shenme shi ‘Shiren de Shenghuo’?” (什麼是「詩人的生活」? What is ‘Life of a Poet’?). In *Pianjianji* (偏見集 Collection of Prejudices), 45–49. Nanjing: Zhengzhong Shuju.
———. 1934. “Wenren You Xing” (文人有行 Behavior of Scholars). In *Pianjianji* (偏見集 Collection of Prejudices), 37–44. Nanjing: Zhengzhong Shuju.
———. 1934. “Wenxue de Yanzhongxing” (文學的嚴重性 The Seriousness of Literature). In *Pianjianji* (偏見集 Collection of Prejudices), 59–63. Nanjing: Zhengzhong Shuju.
———. 1934. “Wenxue yu Dazhong” (文學與大眾 Literature and the Masses). In *Pianjianji* (偏見集 Collection of Prejudices), 283–284. Nanjing: Zhengzhong Shuju.
———. 1934. “Wenxue yu Geming” (文學與革命 Literature and Revolution). In *Pianjianji* (偏見集 Collection of Prejudices), 1–16. Nanjing: Zhengzhong Shuju.
———. 1934. “Lun Lu Xun Xiansheng de ‘Yingyi’” (論魯迅先生的「硬譯」 On the ‘Hard Translations’ by Mr. Lu Xun). In *Pianjianji* (偏見集 Collection of Prejudices), 65–69. Nanjing: Zhengzhong Shuju.
———. 1934. “Lun Shi de Daxiao Changduan” (論詩的大小長短 On the Length of Poems). In *Pianjianji* (偏見集 Collection of Prejudices), 51–57. Nanjing: Zhengzhong Shuju.
———. 1934. “Ouhuawen” (歐化文 Westernized Literature). In *Pianjianji* (偏見集 Collection of Prejudices), 301–304. Nanjing: Zhengzhong Shuju.
———, trans. 1976. *Li’er Wang* (李爾王 King Lear). Taipei: Yuandong Tushu Gongsi.
———. 1987. “Bing” (病 Illness). In *Yashe Xiaopin* (雅舍小品 Sketches from an Elegant Residence), 43–46. Shanghai: Shanghai Shudian.
———. 1987. “Haizi” (孩子 Children). In *Yashe Xiaopin* (雅舍小品 Sketches from an Elegant Residence), 5–8. Shanghai: Shanghai Shudian.
———. 1987. “Jiehun Dianli” (結婚典禮 Wedding). In *Yashe Xiaopin* (雅舍小品 Sketches from an Elegant Residence), 39–42. Shanghai: Shanghai Shudian.
———. 1987. “Nanren” (男人 Man). In *Yashe Xiaopin* (雅舍小品 Sketches from an Elegant Residence), 23–26. Shanghai: Shanghai Shudian.
———. 1987. “Nimingxin” (匿名信 Anonymous Letter). In *Yashe Xiaopin* (雅舍小品 Sketches from an Elegant Residence), 47–51. Shanghai: Shanghai Shudian.
———. 1987. “Nüren” (女人 Woman). In *Yashe Xiaopin* (雅舍小品 Sketches from an Elegant Residence), 18–22. Shanghai: Shanghai Shudian.
———. 1987. “Qianrang” (謙讓 Modest Decline). In *Yashe Xiaopin* (雅舍小品 Sketches from an Elegant Residence), 31–33. Shanghai: Shanghai Shudian.
———. 1987. “Xin” (信 Letters). In *Yashe Xiaopin* (雅舍小品 Sketches from an Elegant Residence), 14–17. Shanghai: Shanghai Shudian.
———. 1987. “Yangzui” (洋罪 Foreign Crimes). In *Yashe Xiaopin* (雅舍小品 Sketches from an Elegant Residence), 27–30. Shanghai: Shanghai Shudian.
———. 1987. “Yashe” (雅舍 Elegant Residence). In *Yashe Xiaopin* (雅舍小品 Sketches from an Elegant Residence), 1–4. Shanghai: Shanghai Shudian.
———. 1987. “Yinyue” (音樂 Music). In *Yashe Xiaopin* (雅舍小品 Sketches from an Elegant Residence), 9–13. Shanghai: Shanghai Shudian.
———. 1987. “Yishang” (衣裳 Clothes). In *Yashe Xiaopin* (雅舍小品 Sketches from an Elegant Residence), 34–38. Shanghai: Shanghai Shudian.
Lin Shu 林紓, trans., and Wang Shouchang 王壽昌, trans. 1981. *Bali Chahuanü Yishi* (巴黎茶花女遺事 The Past Affairs of the Lady of the Camelias). Beijing: Shangwu Yinshuguan.
Lu Xun 魯迅. 1973. “Ben Yue” (奔月 Flight to the Moon). In “Gushi Xinbian” (故事新編 Old Tales Retold), 467–483. Vol. 2 of *Lu Xun Quanji* (魯迅全集 Complete Works by Lu Xun). Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe.
———. 1973. “Li Shui” (理水Curbing the Flood). In “Gushi Xinbian” (故事新編 Old Tales Retold), 484–505. Vol. 2 of *Lu Xun Quanji* (魯迅全集 Complete Works by Lu Xun). Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe.

———, trans. 1973. "Xiao Yuehan" (小約翰 Little Johannes). In *Lu Xun Quanji* (魯迅全集 Complete Works by Lu Xun), vol. 14: 27–79. Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe.
———. 1976. "A Q Zhengzhuan" (阿Q 正傳 The True Story of Ah Q). In *Nahan* (吶喊 Call to Arms), 96–156. Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe.
Qu Qiubai 瞿秋白. 1985. "Luantan" (亂彈 Random Shots). In *Qu Qiubai Wenji* (瞿秋白文集 Collected Works by Qu Qiubai), edited by Qu Qiubai Wenji Bianji Weiyuanhui (The Editorial Committee of Collected Works of Qu Qiubai), vol.1: 347–393. Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe.
———. 1986. "Eguo Wenxue Shi" (俄國文學史 The History of Russian Literature). In *Qu Qiubai Wenji* (瞿秋白文集 Collected Works by Qu Qiubai), edited by Qu Qiubai Wenji Bianji Weiyuanhui (The Editorial Committee of Collected Works of Qu Qiubai), vol. 2: 135–184. Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe.
———, trans. 1986. "Fuguo Gongqian Zhihou" (付過工錢之後 After Having Been Paid Salary). In *Zaoqi Yizuo Jiupian* (早期譯作九篇 Nine Early Translations), 371–438. Vol. 4 of *Qu Qiubai Wenji* (瞿秋白文集 Collected Works by Qu Qiubai), edited by Qu Qiubai Wenji Bianji Weiyuanhui (The Editorial Committee of Collected Works of Qu Qiubai), 400–403. Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe.
———, trans. 1986. "Funü" (婦女 Woman). In *Zaoqi Yizuo Jiupian* (早期譯作九篇 Nine Early Translations), 371–438. Vol. 4 of *Qu Qiubai Wenji* (瞿秋白文集 Collected Works by Qu Qiubai), edited by Qu Qiubai Wenji Bianji Weiyuanhui (The Editorial Committee of Collected Works of Qu Qiubai), 394–395. Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe.
———, trans. 1986. "Haoren" (好人 Good People). In *Zaoqi Yizuo Jiupian* (早期譯作九篇 Nine Early Translations), 371–438. Vol. 4 of *Qu Qiubai Wenji* (瞿秋白文集 Collected Works by Qu Qiubai), edited by Qu Qiubai Wenji Bianji Weiyuanhui (The Editorial Committee of Collected Works of Qu Qiubai), 425–438. Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe.
———, trans. 1986. "Kepa de Zi" (可怕的字 Horrible Word). In *Zaoqi Yizuo Jiupian* (早期譯作九篇 Nine Early Translations), 371–438. Vol. 4 of *Qu Qiubai Wenji* (瞿秋白文集 Collected Works by Qu Qiubai), edited by Qu Qiubai Wenji Bianji Weiyuanhui (The Editorial Committee of Collected Works of Qu Qiubai), 404–414. Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe.
———, trans. 1986. "Puyushi" (仆御室 Lackey Room). In *Zaoqi Yizuo Jiupian* (早期譯作九篇 Nine Early Translations), 371–438. Vol. 4 of *Qu Qiubai Wenji* (瞿秋白文集 Collected Works by Qu Qiubai), edited by Qu Qiubai Wenji Bianji Weiyuanhui (The Editorial Committee of Collected Works of Qu Qiubai), 384–393. Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe.
———, trans. 1986. "Qidao" (祈禱 Prayer). In *Zaoqi Yizuo Jiupian* (早期譯作九篇 Nine Early Translations), 371–438. Vol. 4 of *Qu Qiubai Wenji* (瞿秋白文集 Collected Works by Qu Qiubai), edited by Qu Qiubai Wenji Bianji Weiyuanhui (The Editorial Committee of Collected Works of Qu Qiubai), 376–383. Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe.
———, trans. 1986. "Xiantan" (閒談 Leisure Talk). In *Zaoqi Yizuo Jiupian* (早期譯作九篇 Nine Early Translations), 371–438. Vol. 4 of *Qu Qiubai Wenji* (瞿秋白文集 Collected Works by Qu Qiubai), edited by Qu Qiubai Wenji Bianji Weiyuanhui (The Editorial Committee of Collected Works of Qu Qiubai), 371–375. Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe.
———, trans.1987. "Ma'erhua" (馬爾華 Mal'va). In *Qu Qiubai Wenji* (瞿秋白文集 Collected Works by Qu Qiubai), edited by Qu Qiubai Wenji Bianji Weiyuanhui (The Editorial Committee of Collected Works of Qu Qiubai), vol. 5: 23–65. Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe.
Zhang Dachun 張大春. 2003. *Lingting Fuqin* (聆聽父親 Listening to Father). Taipei: Shibao Chuban.

Secondary

Chan, Clara Ho-yan. 2009. "Third Person Pronouns in Indigenous Chinese Texts and Translated Chinese Texts: The Westernization of Modern Written Chinese." *New Voices in Translation Studies* 5: 1–15. Accessed September 26, 2011. http://www.iatis.org/oldsite/newvoices/issues/2009/article-chan-2009.pdf.

———. 2011. The Europeanization of Modern Written Chinese. A case study of the Changing Third Person Pronouns in the Twentieth Century and Beyond. Bern: Peter Lang.

Chen Yan 陳言. 2009. “Lun 20 Shiji Zhongguo Wenxue Fanyi zhong de Zhiyi, Yiyi zhi Zheng” (論20世紀中國文學翻譯中的直譯、意譯之爭 On the Debate about Metaphrase and Paraphrase in China’s Literary Translation of the Twentieth century). *Shoudu Shifan Daxue Xuebao* 2 (General Nr.187): 95–102.

Chow, Tse-tsung. 1960. *The May Fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China.* Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

Diao Yanbin 刁晏斌. 2009. “Xiandai Hanyu Wailai Xingshi Yanjiu Chuyi” (現代漢語外來形式研究芻議 The Loan Forms in Modern Chinese). *Yunnan Shifan Daxue Xuebao* 7 (6): 43–48.

Hsu, Jia-Ling. 1994. *Language Contact and Convergence: Englishization of Mandarin Chinese in Taiwan.* PhD thesis, University of Illinois.

Hsü, Raymond. 1979. *The Style of Lu Xun: Vocabulary and Usage*. Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong.

Kubler, Cornelius C. 1985. *A Study of Europeanized Grammar in Modern Written Chinese*. Taipei: Student Book Co., Ltd.

Liao, Qiyi 廖七一. 2008. “Wusi Wenxue Fanyi dui ‘Xin’ de Zhonggou” (五四文學翻譯對『信』的重構 Reconstructing ‘Faithfulness’ in Literary Translations during the May 4th Period). *Zhongguo Fanyi* 4: 39–44.

Liu Dongfang 劉東方. 2007. “Lun Fu Sinian de Xiandai Baihua Yuyanguan” (論傅斯年的現代白話語言觀 On Fu Sinian’s Linguistic View on Contemporary Baihua). *Wenxue Pinglun* 5: 98–102.

Liu Shaoqin 劉少勤. 2004. “Cong Hanyu de Xiandaihua Kan Lu Xun de Fanyi” (從漢語的現代化看魯迅的翻譯 Considering Lu Xun’s Translations from the point of the Modernization of the Chinese Language). *Shuwu* 3: 9–15.

Lundberg, Lennart. 1989. *Lu Xun as a translator: Lu Xun’s translation and introduction of literature and literary theory, 1903–1936*. Stockholm: Stockholm Univ. Orientaliska Studier.

Tsai, Ni-Yen. 2007. *Language change through Language Contact in Computer-Mediated Communication in Taiwan*. MSc diss., University of Edinburgh.

Tsien, Tsuen-hsuin. 1954. “Western Impact on China through Translation.” *The Far Eastern Quarterly* 13 (3): 305–327.

Wang Kefei 王克非. 2002. “Jindai Fanyi dui Hanyu de Yingxiang” (近代翻譯對漢語的影響 The Influence of Modern Translations on Chinese Language). *Waiyu Jiaoxue yu Yanjiu* 34 (6): 458–463.

Wang Li. 1984. *Zhongguo Yufa Lilun* (中國語法理論 Chinese Grammar Theory). Vol.1 of W*ang Li Wenji*. Jinan: Shandong Jiaoyu Chubanshe.

Wei Jianhua 韋建華. 2010. “Gailiang Dazhong, Yasu Gongshang: Lun Qu Qiubai Lu Xun Fanyi Sixiang de Gongxing yu Fenqi” (改良大眾, 雅俗共賞: 論瞿秋白魯迅翻譯思想的共性與分歧 A Study of Qu Qiubai’s and Lu Xun’s Common Points and Divergences in ‘Refined’ and ‘Popular’ Literal Translations Concerning the Target-Text Reader). *Yunnan Nongye Daxue Xuebao* 4 (5): 94–99.

Ueda, Hitoshi, and Yu Guangzhong 余光中. 2000. *Jindai Hanyu Yufa Yanjiu* (近代漢語語法研究 Studies in Modern Chinese Grammar). Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Yinshuachang.

Xu Linhai 戌林海. 2007. “Lun Qu Qiubai de Fanyiguan” (論瞿秋白的翻譯觀 On Qu Qiubai’s Views on Translation). *Changzhou Gongxueyuan Xuebao* 25 (1): 80–85.

Zhou Youguang 周有光. 2003. *Zhongguo yuwen de shidai yanjin* 中國語文的時代演進. *The Historical Evolution of Chinese Languages and Scripts*. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University.

Homogenization or Hierarchization?: A Problem of Written Language in the Public Sphere of Modern Japan

Yeounsuk Lee

Abstract Pre-modern Japanese society was in a diglossic situation, which Ferguson defines in his classical essay on hierarchical dichotomy as the existence of differing written and spoken varieties of the language. In Meiji Japan many writers and intellectuals sought to resolve this linguistic problem through a movement that aimed to unify spoken and written words, the *genbun itchi* (言文一致). However, the diglossia in Japan was not as hard-edged, for example, as the one in Korea. *Kanbun* (漢文classical Chinese writing) was read and written in the Japanese style as a high variety in traditional Japan, which also allowed for the blending of Japanese indigenous words. Furthermore, various styles of this blend could be used with different degrees of colloquial features based on the formality and function of the context. This situation allowed the survival of *kanbun* and Chinese characters in modern Japan. In fact, from the Meiji period to 1945, all official documents were written in Japanese styled *kanbun* known as *kanbun kundoku tai* (漢文訓読体) and not in the colloquial style.

Keywords Homogenization • Hierarchization • Nationalism • Genbun itchi

From Pre-modern to Modern Times: The Nation-State and Language

At present, the modern era is being reexamined from a variety of different angles. Perhaps the most controversial of these angles involves questions concerning the nation and the nation-state. When considering the question of language as well it is, of course, important to understand the position of language within the nation-state. Here, in order to initiate discussion, I would like to mention the framework outlined

Y. Lee (✉)
Graduate School of Language and Society, Hitotsubashi University, Tōkyō
e-mail: ys.lee@r.hit-u.ac.jp

J. Árokay et al. (eds.), *Divided Languages?*, Transcultural Research – Heidelberg Studies on Asia and Europe in a Global Context, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-03521-5_9,

in Ernest Gellner's *Nations and Nationalism*, which is regarded as a classic text on the theory of nationalism (Gellner 1983).

Gellner's argument is sometimes described as a "modernist" understanding of nations and nationalism. In fact, Gellner emphasizes that nations are the product of modernity and states, "[i]t is nationalism, which engenders nations, and not the other way round" (Gellner 1983, 54). In other words, rather than there being a requirement for a "nation" to first exist from which nationalism was born, the concept of nation was created from within nationalist movements led by certain intellectuals and social activists.

There is no doubt that this kind of viewpoint is somewhat extreme, and it has been criticized as such from various sides. The reason I venture to mention Gellner's argument here is that I would like to approach what Gellner regards as a process of transition from pre-modern to modern through the dimension of language.

Gellner defines nationalism as follows: "Nationalism is primarily a political principle, which holds that the political and national unit should be congruent" (Gellner 1983, 1), and considers "the convergence of political and cultural units" (Gellner 1983, 39) as the essential feature of a nation. The typical political unit is the state, and cultural units may be elements like language, customs, ceremonies, myths, traditions, etc. that are inherent to a certain group. According to Gellner, in pre-modern societies the political and cultural units did not coincide. The main reason for this was that society was clearly divided into top and bottom. A characteristic of the top group—in other words, the rulers—was that it was not confined to one specific area; rather, it traversed a wider region. By contrast, the bottom group was not grouped together on the scale of the "nation" as it exists today. Smaller, local groups were scattered about, and few horizontal connections between groups could be found.

The same was true not only of social structure but also of culture. The cultures of the top and bottom groups—that is, the elite culture and the popular culture respectively—were completely different things that coexisted without coming into contact with one another. The culture of the top group spread on a scale larger than a nation, while the culture of the bottom group existed only in each small community.

How does this compare with the modern period? According to Gellner, one characteristic of modernity is the removal of the boundary between the cultures of the top and bottom groups. This required coalescence into one unified group by people who, up until that time, had lived in completely different worlds in the top and bottom groups. This unified group is a nation. In other words, the nation was born during the process of transition from a pre-modern, hierarchical society to a modern, homogenized society.

It is certainly true that Gellner focused only on the cultural level and did not consider other political or economic dimensions; this can be seen as a weakness in his argument. However, there was good reason for Gellner's emphasis on the cultural aspect.

Gellner considered a society characterized by highly developed industry (an industrial society) to be the typical modern society. Here, I would like to focus on Gellner's characterization of an "industrial society." According to Gellner, the development of industry in a society requires improving the knowledge level of the workers. Also, it is preferable for the workers to form a homogeneous workforce. From the perspective of consumption this is more efficient if there is a unified domestic market. Therefore, in order to homogenize a society it becomes necessary to connect members of that society by way of a common culture. In pre-modern societies, the top and bottom groups lived under different cultures; in modern societies, however, it is necessary that all members of society share the same culture and education. No boundaries such as those between the cultures of top and bottom groups exist, and instead a common culture prevails within the group. This is what is called a "national culture."

It is now clear why Gellner considered nationalism to be "a political principle, which holds that the political and national unit should be congruent." According to Gellner's point of view, a "nation" is a group connected by a common culture that makes industrial society possible, and this group, moreover, coincides with the political body called the state.

So how does the question of language fit in here?

Language and Nation: From Diglossia to a National Language

With regard to the levels of language, there exists a process similar to the one considered by Gellner to be the typical process from pre-modern to modern. In pre-modern times, a high and a low language are clearly differentiated. The high language is based on traditional classic texts and is a written language mastered by only a small number of elite members of society. By contrast, the low language is not written and exists only in the form of a spoken language. Whereas the high language has an "empire-like" spread that traverses regions, the low language is not standardized and has different forms in each locality. There is a large gap between the high and low languages, and they constitute completely different varieties. This linguistic situation was termed "diglossia" by the sociolinguist Charles Ferguson (1959). According to Ferguson, a characteristic of diglossia is that the high and low languages coexist with different functions assigned to each. In fact, Ferguson's "diglossia" is a linguistic characteristic of a society considered by Gellner to be "pre-modern."

For example, Latin in medieval Europe and classical *kanbun* (漢文) in East Asia can be said to have held the rank of high languages in a diglossia. Neither Latin nor classical *kanbun* were languages that were learned by the people of a specific region through spoken language. They were written languages that were acquired by

studying standardized texts. Subordinate to these high languages were low languages that were called "vulgar languages" in the case of Europe.

In modern times, however, the position of classical languages has declined. A characteristic of modernity in language is the development of "vulgar languages" that possess various forms in different localities to form unified national languages like French and English. The decline of Latin in Europe is a typical example of this, but in East Asia as well, the status of classical *kanbun* fell, and written languages based on the spoken language in each region came into existence. Not just Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese, but also Chinese developed a written language based on colloquial language that departed from classical *kanbun*. In other words, from a situation in which the written and spoken languages were divided, the modern era required that the gap between the two shrink and that they be combined as much as possible. Thus, the "national language" model came into existence. A "national language" is a language that can be used both as a spoken language and as a written language by the people of one nation. From this perspective, in pre-modern societies neither Korean nor Japanese were "national languages."

What kinds of social processes are necessary to combine the spoken and written languages? As mentioned above with regard to pre-modern societies, while the high language had a supranational function the low language was not standardized and formed different varieties in each locality. Possible ways of combining the written and spoken languages would be to simplify the high language and use it as a spoken language, or to create an intermediate form between the two, or to adopt one of the low languages. Which ever of these paths is taken varies from one society to another. This has already been pointed out by Ferguson (1959, 338–339).

Therefore, there is an aspect of modern society that inevitably requires and propels what is called "*genbun itchi*" (言文一致), the unification of spoken and written words. However, *genbun itchi* does not come into existence by way of a natural process in society. There has to be a process that seeks a new written language to replace the traditional written language used up to that time and led by intellectuals who see the combination of the spoken and written languages as an urgent problem. This is true of both the vernacular movement in China (*baihuawen yundong* 白話文運動) and the *genbun itchi* movement in Japan.

The Historical Context of "*genbun itchi*" in Japan

The concept of "*genbun itchi*" can be understood as an attempt to match the "spoken language = *gen*" (言) and the "written language = *bun*" (文). It is not easy to grasp the historical significance of this attempt. In fact, since we are living in a linguistic world where *genbun itchi* is complete, it is difficult for people today to imagine the kind of problems that were faced in the attempt to match the spoken and written languages. Of course, it is true that even today there remains a gap between the spoken language and the written language. This comes from the fact that the act of speaking and the act of writing differ fundamentally in style and purpose. For

example, unlike the act of speaking, during the act of writing there is no reader present in front of the writer. The act of writing and the act of reading are carried out at locations that are temporally and spatially distant from each other. This temporal and spatial gap gives the language different characteristics when compared to the language used when speaking. The *genbun itchi* movement, however, was not attempting to match speaking and writing in this sense. In order to understand the aim of *genbun itchi*, it is necessary to ascertain the historical context in which the *genbun itchi* movement was set, what the movement viewed as a problem, and what the movement was opposed to. This is particularly important in the case of Japan because the problems of modernity and systematization in language appear in condensed form within the *genbun itchi* movement. (For major trends of *genbun itchi* see Yamamoto 1965)

The *genbun itchi* movement in Japan started in the Meiji period. It must be understood, however, that the existence of a significant 'distance' between the spoken and written languages was noted and elements of spoken language first began to enter literary works and other writings before the Meiji period. This is a very important point for understanding *genbun itchi*.

Before the Meiji period, the existence of this 'distance' between the spoken and written languages was considered to constitute the "nature" of language. It was taken to be inevitable that even if writing text involved transcribing the spoken language, it did not necessarily mean that text was constructed using elements of spoken language. However, the naturalness of language does not have the same literal meaning as "nature," and in fact consists of an accumulation of historical norms. The idea was not to make people conscious of a norm (since ignoring a norm is the best way of helping to maintain that norm), but to bring the existing distance between the spoken and written languages into the foreground of consciousness; G*enbun itchi* achieved this. This was accompanied by a critical look at the linguistic conventions and norms that had accumulated up until this point. Meanwhile, linguistic conventions and norms do not consist simply of words, and cannot be maintained unless there is a mode of existence in culture and society that supports them. So it was inevitable that the critical outlook of *genbun itchi* would go as far as criticism of the society and culture behind the language. At least this was the case for those who had not lost their critical consciousness—which was certainly true for only a small number of people. Specific points of this will be discussed later, but it can be said that *genbun itchi* was born out of the consciousness of a linguistic crisis and a critical consciousness of social and cultural conventions, although the degree of this critical consciousness varied.

Therefore, regardless of the many colloquial elements and elements of vulgar language that entered literary works in the Edo period, the form of supporting consciousness was different to that of the Meiji period *genbun itchi*. Of course, it is true that in implementing *genbun itchi* literary works containing many elements of vulgar language—such as comic novels (*kokkeibon* 滑稽本) portraying the lives of common people in Edo—were referred to as a kind of precursor. However, such Edo period works were certainly not aimed at *genbun itchi*. It was simply appropriate when portraying the daily lives of the common people of Edo who gathered at

the public baths and barbershops to use the vulgar language that they spoke. Accordingly, it was understood that vulgar language would not be used at all in stories with different characters, different storylines, and different intentions. In other words, the true objective of *genbun itchi* was neither to reflect the spoken language of the masses at that time in written works nor to expose spoken language in written language. If these had been the sole goals of the movement, several Edo-period works would already have achieved the objective. So what was the aim of *genbun itchi*? This question will be discussed in detail in the main discussion below.

The Picture of Written Language in Pre-modern Japan

I would like to touch on another peculiarity of the linguistic situation in Japan: the question of what the dominant language in Japan actually was.

For example, unlike Korea where *kanbun* was the dominant written language, there were various forms of written language in Japan. Even *kanbun* in Japan, instead of being read as *kanji* from top to bottom, was read by converting it to the Japanese syntax by making use of symbols indicating the order in which to read the kanji and the use of vocabulary that did not exist in *kanbun*. In this way, *kanbun kundokutai* (漢文訓読体) was established; even though it looked like *kanbun*, it was read in a Japanese way. This was a similar approach to the *idu* (吏読) script used in Korea; however, *idu* was always a peripheral phenomenon, whereas in Japan this was a legitimate way of reading *kanbun*. Taking the line of verse "春眠不覚暁" as an example, in Japan this is read as 'Shunmin akatsuki wo oboezu' (春眠、暁を覚えず). Even this short example gives us a glimpse of the 'Japanized' approach to *kanbun* in Japan. In this line, only "春眠" uses the sound of the *kanji*. "暁" is read as "あかつき" (*akatsuki*) using the *yamato kotoba* (大和言葉 or *kun-yomi* 訓読み, that is, reading by Japanese indigenous word corresponding to the meaning of Kanji). "不覚" is read using the *yamato kotoba* verb "おぼえる" (*oboeru*) with the Japanese negative auxiliary "ず" (*zu*) added.

This is how a Japanese-style *kanbun* was established. For example, one book that was often read by the samurai class at the end of the Edo period was a history book called *Nihon Gaishi* (日本外史) by Rai San'yō (頼山陽 1780–1832). Although this book is written entirely in *kanbun*, the style does not observe regular *kanbun* conventions. It was written with the expectation that it would be read as Japanese-style *kanbun*. The only people to notice that this way of reading *kanbun*, in fact, distorted it, were a small number of Edo-period Confucian scholars like Ogyū Sorai (荻生徂徠 1666–1728).

Thus, *kanbun* did not dominate the written language in pre-Meiji Japan in the same sense as in Korea. What was dominant in Japan was a unique Japanese-style *kanbun* that was read by applying *kun* readings and converting them to a Japanese word order. This made it possible for colloquial elements to enter the writing, depending on the situation. Paradoxically, this also helped to extend the life of the

kanbun-style literary language. In Japan, even after the majority of literary works came to be written in *genbun itchi-tai* (言文一致体the colloquial style), most editorials were still written using *kanbun kundokutai*. Unlike in Korea, where there was a barrier between *kanbun* and the Korean language that had been difficult to cross over, in Japan the "Japanization" of *kanbun* made it difficult to abandon the *kanbun* style of writing. In fact, the colloquialization of official documents, such as laws, had to wait until after the war. (Departing from the main subject here, the style called *guk-hanmun* (国漢文), established during the Residency-General period in Korea has aspects transplanted from Japanese-style *kanbun* under Japan's linguistic dominance and this influence extends into Korea's legal texts today.)

The peculiarities of the linguistic situation in Japan do not end there. Various forms of written language existed in Japan besides *kanbun*. *The Tale of Genji* (*Genji Monogatari* 源氏物語) of the Heian period, *The Tale of the Heike* (*Heike Monogatari*平家物語) of the Kamakura period, and popular fiction of the Edo period are all written in different styles based on different vocabulary and word usage. *The Tale of Genji* was written in Japanese style (*wabuntai* 和文体) with almost no mixing of words of Chinese origin. The *Tale of the Heike* used the *wakan konkō* (和漢混交) style, in which words of Chinese origin are mixed into Japanese-style writing. Popular fiction of the Edo period was written in an informal style that often used slang. In addition, in the Meiji period a unique, blended form of *kanbun* that was used extensively in governmental proclamations and laws also existed. These various writing styles existed alongside each other in the early years of the Meiji period, and when the colloquial writing style first appeared it was merely one of these styles. For this reason, after the birth of the colloquial style, the Saikaku-style of literary language became the rage of the times through the "rediscovery" of Ihara Saikaku (井原西鶴 1642–1693), a novelist from the mid-Edo period.

At the point of departure for modern Japan there was no single form of written language, and the conflict between the written language and the spoken language was extremely complicated. Thus, the venture of *genbun itchi*, which attempted to drastically change the structure of the written language, was like fighting a Hydra, and the influence of these various styles of writing did not disappear even after *genbun itchi* took hold. Meanwhile, the spoken language also varied according to region and social class, and there was certainly no single form of spoken language. Therefore, when attempting to align "*gen*" and "*bun*" based on the philosophy of *genbun itchi*, the picture of the spoken language and written language that would have been subject to *genbun itchi* in the first place was extremely blurred. It was almost impossible to see a common ground on which to bring "*gen*" and "*bun*" together. Rather, it would be closer to the truth to say that common ground between "*gen*" and "*bun*" became gradually apparent as *genbun itchi* progressed. When this common ground was ranked within the structure of a "national language," *genbun itchi* became incorporated into the framework of the system.

Did "*genbun itchi*" Resolve the Diglossic Situation?

During the Edo period, Japan was in a so-called closed-country state for 250 years. When the door was finally opened to foreign countries at the end of the Edo period, there was a great surge of modern Western culture and ideas into Japan. The Meiji Restoration was a political reform intended to deal with this shock from outside. Thus, with the paramount thesis being "modernization" (*bunmei kaika* 文明開化 Civilization and Enlightenment), Meiji Japan pressed forward with reforms in all areas of society. Language was no exception. In brief, the fact that the written language and the spoken language were disconnected was seen as a barrier to modernization in Japanese society. From this situation arose a movement for "*genbun itchi*," or unification of the written and spoken forms of the language.

The novel *Ukigumo* (浮雲 *Floating cloud*) by novelist Futabatei Shimei (二葉亭四迷 1864–1909), published between 1887 and 1889, is considered to be the most important milestone in *genbun itchi*. In addition, at around the same time, Futabatei Shimei translated the work of the Russian novelist Turgenev using the colloquial style; this also had a major impact. However, for a short time afterward the golden days of literary language continued until naturalistic literature overtook it in the middle of the 1890s, and the writing of novels using colloquial language was established.

On the other hand, as is immediately apparent, this applied only to the field of literature and specifically to novels. Even within the realm of literature, in the field of poetry the writing of poems using the spoken language was not established until much later, in the latter half of the 1910s. Likewise, newspaper articles were not written in the colloquial language until the 1910s. Editorials continued to be written in literary language until fairly late, and even in the most private realm of letters and diaries the literary language was sometimes used (of course, this trend varied considerably depending on social class). Thus, although *genbun itchi* was achieved in the field of literature, the traditional literary language, *bungo-bun* (文語文), continued to be used in many other areas of language in society. In the public sphere, in particular, the predominance of the literary language continued as before. The literary language was still used in official documents, such as legal and administrative documents, and various types of contracts and documents delivered to public offices were also written in the literary language.

Looking at it in this way, it is difficult to say that Japan's diglossic situation was eliminated as a result of *genbun itchi*. It took a considerable amount of time for the various areas of society to transition from the literary language to the colloquial language. The field in which the literary language remained rooted for the longest was in the field of law. The Constitution of Japan published in 1946 was written in colloquial language using *hiragana*, but for a long period following this, a wide variety of laws were still written using the traditional literary language. Colloquialization of the Penal Code was finally accomplished in 1995, the Civil Code in 2004, and the Commercial Code in 2005. From this point of view, the elimination of diglossia in Japanese society took more than 100 years. It is impossible to fully

grasp this situation by looking only at *genbun itchi* in the field of literature. In this article I would like to point out that there are problems concerning *genbun itchi* that are often overlooked.

Genbun itchi and Social Critical Consciousness

It is not the case that the existence of a large gap between the spoken and written languages in Japan was first recognized in the Meiji period. However, prior to the Meiji period using different words when speaking and when writing was considered inevitable. The gap was, in a sense, ascribed to the "nature" of language. *Genbun itchi* in the Meiji period was the first time that the gap between the spoken and written languages was recognized as a problem to be resolved. As stated earlier, this was associated with critical consciousness regarding the conventions of society and culture that had supported the existing naturalness of the language. At the very least, this was true in the case of Futabatei Shimei.

Among Edo-period literary works were those that made liberal use of the spoken language and slang of the time. However, these works were not written in the spirit of *genbun itchi*. It was simply appropriate to use the language of the common people to portray the common people who gathered at the public baths and barbershops. In other words, the level of common, spoken language was simply one attribute of the characters in a story. The goal of *genbun itchi* was not to reproduce the spoken language; one of Futabatei Shimei's aims was to break with traditional rhetoric, and another was to make the maximum representation of reality through language possible. This was Futabatei Shimei's sharp critical consciousness of real society. His aim was not the bringing together of the spoken language and the written language in itself.

Futabatei Shimei's *Ukigumo* has an important significance in the history of modern Japanese literature. This is not simply because it was written entirely in the colloquial style. Readers were astonished at the minute portrayal of anomalies existing in Japanese society in the early Meiji period through the psychological descriptions of characters using the techniques of realism. By closely depicting typical figures at various levels of society at that time and the human relationships that existed between them, Futabatei Shimei attempted to reveal the true reality of Japanese society.

Futabatei Shimei studied Russian at the Tōkyō School of Foreign Languages. At that time all subjects were taught by Russians in Russian. Thus, Futabatei Shimei, who became a rare master of Russian, became familiar with the works of Turgenev, Gogol, and Lermontov, and was influenced by the literature theory of the literary critic Belinsky. According to the "Diary" kept by Futabatei while he was writing, the mission of a novel is "to depict the general trend of the nation by transcribing the temperament, manners, and aspirations of the people, or, to dig out the truth in places that are out of sight of scholars and moralists by describing human life" (Futabatei 1986, 75). Therefore, novels must be based on representative types as

nodes of society, rather than on the description of specific people as they really are. With this, novels can reach deep layers of reality that external depictions cannot. Futabatei clearly had an accurate understanding of the theory of realism in Western European literature; however, the Japanese language of that time did not have a style of writing that allowed for this kind of realism, and Futabatei had to carry out the difficult undertaking of creating a "realistic" language almost entirely on his own.

The three volumes of *Ukigumo* were published in a periodical; the first in 1887, the second in 1888, and the third in 1889, with the volumes then compiled and published as a book in 1891. *Ukigumo* was not written all at once but was the fruit of Futabatei's labor over several years. The course of the novel traced a process of growth in the work. This is clear in the fact that the style of writing is different in volume 1, volume 2, and in volume 3. In order to facilitate a closer look, I shall cite the opening passages of each volume:

Vol.1
Chihaya buru kan'na zuki mo mohaya futsuka no yoha to natta nijū-hachi nichi no gogo san ji goro ni Kanda-mitsuke no uchi yori towataru ari, chiru kumo no ko to uyo'uyo zoyozoyo waki idete kuru no wa izuremo otogai wo ki ni shitamau katagata
千早振る神無月も最早跡二日の餘波となツた廿八日の午後三時頃に神田見附の内より塗渡る蟻、散る蜘蛛の子とうようよぞよぞよ沸出でゝ来るのは孰れも顕を気にし給ふ方々 (Futabatei 1984, 7)
Now on October 28, with only two days left this month, about at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, those who spring out one after another from within Kanda-mitsuke just like ants walking in line or spiders scattering away are all officials who care much about their living.
Vol.2
Nichiyōbi wa chikagoro ni nai tenka-bare, kaze mo odayakade chiri mo tatazu, koyomi wo kutte mireba kyūreki de kiku-zuki shojun to iu jū-ichi gatsu futsuka no koto yue, monomi yusan niwa motte koi to iu hiyori
日曜日は近頃に無い天下晴れ　風も穏かで塵も起たず暦を繰て見れば舊暦で菊月初旬という十一月二日の事ゆゑ物観遊山には持て来いと云ふ日和 (Futabatei 1984, 64)
On Sunday it is very fine weather we rarely have had these days. The wind is mild and dusts do not drift in the air. Looking in an almanac, today November 2 turns out to be on early Kiku-tsuki, the month of chrysanth, in the lunar calendar. So, it is very good time to go sightseeing or on a picnic.
Vol.3
Shinri no ue kara mireba, chi-gu no betsu naku hito kotogotoku omoshiromi wa aru. Uchimi Bunzō no shinjō wo mireba sore wa wakarou.
心理の上から観れバ、智愚の別なく人成く面白味ハ有る。内海文三の心状を観れバ、それハ解らう。(Futabatei 1984, 137)
Psychologically speaking, every person has something interesting whether he is wise or stupid. If you look into the mind of Uchimi Bunzō, you will be able to catch it.

It is evident from these citations that as we go from volume 1 to volume 2 to volume 3, the style moves gradually closer to the entirely colloquial style of *genbun itchi*. Volume 1 is still influenced considerably by the popular fiction of the Edo period. "千早振る" (chihaya-furu) is a *makurakotoba* (pillow word) acting on "神無月(=陰暦十月)" (kamina zuki), and "塗渡る蟻、散る蜘蛛の子と" (towataru ari, chiru kumono koto) is an expression describing people forming a line and

walking together like a procession of ants or scattered baby spiders. The style of volume 2 is quite close to the colloquial style, but even so the literary usage of a noun at the end of a sentence (*meishidome*) appears frequently. Finally, in volume 3 a colloquial style that could almost pass today took shape. In particular, punctuation marks first arrived at the current usage in volume 3.

What did Futabatei discard and what did he gain during this process of searching for a new writing style? This point is connected directly to the fundamental question of what kind of understanding Futabatei had of *genbun itchi*. When novelists of that time took up their pens, a literary style consisting of rhythms like 五七調*go-shichi-chō* (five syllables + seven syllables) and 七五調*shichi-go-chō* (seven syllables + five syllables) flowed "naturally."

What Futabatei tried to do was consciously break away from this "naturalness" of language. The "naturalness" of language is a system that has built up unconsciously and consists of norms with long-forgotten origins. Writing in the traditional literary language meant following the norms of past style in terms of source and of usage of phrases and methods of structuring the writing. In other words, it was like taking words from a word storehouse. Before confronting reality, the speaker had to know what had been said and how it was said in past traditions. As long as this process is followed, however, it is forever impossible for words to arrive at reality. Rather than creating words from words, Futabatei worked desperately to make words that could get at reality—internal mentality and external reality. That stipulation displayed Futabatei's sharp critical consciousness.

Allegedly, when his writing was not going well during the writing of *Ukigumo*, Futabatei would try writing in Russian and then translate it into Japanese. In fact, the work that had the most influence as a style of writing embodying the ideal of *genbun itchi* was not *Ukigumo* but *Aibiki* (あひびき *Secret Meeting*), along with other translations of Turgenev by Futabatei Shimei. In particular, depictions of nature like the one in the following opening passage astonished readers at the time:

> Aki kugatsu chūjun to iu koro, ichi nichi jibun ga saru kaba no hayasi no naka ni zashite ita koto ga atta. Kesa kara kosame ga furi sosogi, sono harema niwa ori'ori nama atatakana hikage mo sashite, makotoni kimagurena sora'ai. Awa'awashii shirakumo ga sora ichimen ni tanabiku kato omouto, futo mata achikochi matataku ma kumogire ga shite, murini oshi waketa yōna kumoma kara, sumite sakashigeni mieru hito no meno gotokuni hogarakani hareta sōkyū ga nozokareta.
> 秋九月中旬といふころ、一日自分がさる樺の林の中に座してゐたことが有ッた。今朝から小雨が降りそゝぎ、その晴れ間にはおりおり生ま暖かな日かげも射して、まことに気まぐれな空ら合い。あわあわしい白ら雲が空ら一面に棚引くかと思ふと、フトまたあちこち瞬く間雲切れがして、無理に押し分けたやうな雲間から澄みて怜悧し気に見える人の眼の如くに朗かに晴れた蒼穹がのぞかれた。
> (Futabatei 1985, 5)
> Toward mid-September, in autumn, I seated myself in a forest of birches all day long. Since that morning, it had been raining lightly, but, when the sky cleared up, even warm sunshine poured over. It was indeed changeable weather. Faint white clouds flew across the sky, and then, in a moment, they drifted away here and there, when between clouds, as if forcedly open up, appeared bright blue sky, just like an eye of a person who looked pure and smart.

Efforts to somehow establish the rhythm of thought from the original text in the Japanese can be clearly perceived in Futabatei's written translations. Indeed, when Futabatei translated Russian into Japanese he also tried to transfer the intonation of Russian to the Japanese. The reason for this was not to reproduce the external sound, but because Futabatei believed that thought and rhythm of prose are closely connected. In any case, when Futabatei Shimei tried to get out of the "nature = system" of language, intermediary work between different languages in the form of translation work was necessary. This introduces an important perspective when thinking about the modernization of language.

Genbun itchi Applied to Language Policy

Let us now return the discussion to the problem of *genbun itchi*.

As pointed out by Ferguson, in a diglossic situation the high variety is strictly standardized whereas the low variety is extremely diverse. The spoken language is divided into various regional dialects that differ according to locality and into social dialects that differ according to class; there is no unified form. This also applies to Japan. When we talk about unifying the written and spoken languages, which language should we have in mind? If each locality's dialect was to be used in writing, multiple written languages would come into existence, making communication difficult. In reality, this question was raised several times in debates about *genbun itchi* during the Meiji period, although this was often done in order to reject the use of the colloquial language and advocate the legitimacy of the traditional literary language. Nevertheless, it was necessary to settle on some sort of standard for the colloquial language in order to assert the necessity of *genbun itchi*.

It was in some sense inevitable that this debate would lead to an argument advocating the necessity of a standard language at the spoken language level. During the period when Japan's sense of nationhood was elevated as a result of the Sino-Japanese War (1894–1895), it was asserted that Japan should create a unified "national language" appropriate to a modern nation by promoting a strong language policy. A standard language always becomes the focus when unifying a language, and it was thought that this standard language would be created as a result of *genbun itchi*.

In an attempt to unify educational circles, the Japanese government formed the Educational Society of Japan in 1883. This was renamed the Imperial Educational Society in 1896. The Imperial Educational Society established the "*Genbun itchi-kai* (言文一致会)" (*Genbun itchi* Society) as a subsidiary organization in 1900 and carried out activities, such as hosting lectures, aimed at implementing *genbun itchi*. Then, in 1901 the Imperial Educational Society submitted a "petition for the implementation of *genbun itchi*" to the National Diet. In this petition, *genbun itchi* was a means for "national unity," "expansion of national strength," and "improving the destiny of the nation," and it was regarded as a linguistic weapon for competing with the Western powers. In addition, it demanded the establishment

of a national language research council in order to "make *genbun itchi* a national undertaking."

This petition was approved and the National Language Research Council was established within the Ministry of Education in 1902. The person who essentially spearheaded the National Language Research Council was Ueda Kazutoshi (上田萬年 1867–1937), an Imperial University linguistics professor. At the start of the Sino-Japanese War, Ueda gave a lecture entitled "National Language and the Nation," encouraging strong linguistic nationalism (Ueda 1968a). He also introduced the idea of a standard language into Japan for the first time and worked towards putting this idea into practice. In an editorial published in 1900, he argued for establishing the Tōkyō dialect as the standard language as soon as possible and making it "the national language in a strict sense," and by teaching it in elementary schools nationwide, making it the "sole means for citizens to read, write, speak, and listen" (Ueda 1968b). Under Ueda's leadership, the National Language Research Council published resolutions in 1901. In the second resolution, it was stated "texts shall adopt the colloquial style (*genbun itchi-tai*)." This not only meant that elementary school textbooks should adopt the colloquial style, it was also aimed at making the populace learn the standard language through *genbun itchi* rather than the dialects spoken throughout the country. In other words, it was not enough for students to read and write the standard language, it was required that they also speak it correctly. In prewar Japan, a standard language policy that strictly controlled the use of dialects was promoted. *Genbun itchi* within the language policy became a means for this (cf. Lee 2010 in detail).

"Literary language" Established in Modern Times

So far, the subject has been pursued on the assumption that a diglossia existed in pre-modern Japan, but what was the high variety in Japan's diglossia?

In Korea, a country that also used the Chinese writing system, *kanbun* (text written entirely in *kanji*) was the high variety. However, the situation was quite different in Japan. As I have mentioned earlier, a unique style of *kanbun* was dominant in Japan. In Japan, rather than reading the *kanji* from top to bottom, *kanbun* was read by converting it to the Japanese syntax by making use of symbols indicating the order of reading *kanji* and symbols indicating the use of vocabulary that did not exist in *kanbun*. In this way, "*kanbun kundokutai*" was established which, although it looked like *kanbun*, was read in a Japanese way. In Korea there was also a way of creating a Korean-style *kanbun* for government officials who were not proficient at using *kanbun*, but this was always a peripheral phenomenon. However, in Japan this Japanese-style *kanbun* was a legitimate way of reading, and for this reason *kanbun* did not dominate the written language in pre-Meiji Japan as it did in Korea. This unique *kanbun kundokutai*, a Japanese-style *kanbun*, was dominant in Japan. Because this style of writing was made up of *kanbun* plus elements of Japanese it was possible for a certain amount of colloquial elements to

enter the writing, depending on the situation. Paradoxically, this helped to extend the life of the *kanbun*-style literary language.

Looking at the debates of the time, in addition to reconciling the spoken and written languages by bringing the written language closer to the spoken language, there was also considerable support for drawing both the written and the spoken languages closer to each other. The writing style that resulted from this was called *futsūbun* (普通文widely understood style), and it was used in fields ranging from newspaper and magazine editorials to official documents. *Futsūbun* was a style of writing that incorporated elements of colloquial language in *kanbun kundokutai*. Of course, the style became more colloquial or more literary depending on the extent to which colloquial elements were incorporated, but it was always distinctly different from the colloquial language. From this perspective, it is clear that the conflict between the colloquial and literary languages was not equivalent to the conflict between tradition and modernity. This is because this Meiji period literary language, *futsūbun*, was also a modern style of writing.

It has been mentioned earlier that of the various domains of written language, it was in novels where the colloquial language permeated completely. As is evident from the existence of the genre of "I-Novel" (*shishōsetsu*私小説), modern Japanese literature demonstrated its potential in portraying events in the private sphere, such as human relationships in everyday life and the inner workings and emotions of individuals. However, when dealing with problems in the public sphere, such as social and political questions, it was felt that literary language was more appropriate than colloquial language. It is as though function was divided between private emotions and public authority. The question of why this kind of language consciousness came about is a very interesting one, but here I will just give one example.

Kōtoku Shūsui (幸徳秋水 1871–1911) was a socialist who was sentenced to death and executed as a result of the High Treason Incident of 1910 (it has since become clear that this High Treason Incident was a frame-up). Kōtoku, who worked as a newspaper reporter, attempted to use the colloquial style in editorials from 1898 until the following year. In fact, Kōtoku is one of the first journalists who began to write in *genbun itchi* style. However, he ultimately concluded that it would be difficult to change all articles to the colloquial style immediately and therefore the colloquial style should be implemented in general news columns first and then gradually spread to other articles (Kōtoku 1968). Kōtoku subsequently launched the *Heimin Shinbun* (平民新聞) in 1903, and he boldly advocated pacifism in defiance of larger social trends immediately before the Russo-Japanese War. This newspaper formed an illustrious page in the history of Japan's socialist movement. Kōtoku did not use the colloquial style of writing in this newspaper, however, and the articles were written entirely in the traditional literary style. For example:

> Ā rokoku ni okeru warera no dōshi yo, kyōdai shimai yo, warera shokun to tengai chikaku, imada te wo ichidō no ue ni torite kaidan suru no ki wo ezarishi to iedomo, shikamo warera no shokun wo shiri shokun wo omou koto ya hisashi. [omit] Shokun yo, imaya nichi-ro ryōkoku no seifu wa ono'ono sono teikoku teki yabō wo tassen ga tameni, midarini heika no tan wo hirakeri. Shikaredomo shakai-shugisha no ganchū niwa jinshu no betsu naku, chiiki

no betsu naku, kokugo no betsu nashi. Shokun to warera towa dōshi nari, kyōdai nari, shimai nari. Danjite tatakau beki no kotowari aru nashi.
嗚呼露国に於ける我等の同志よ、兄弟姉妹よ、我等諸君と天涯地角、未だ手を一堂の上に取て快談するの機を得ざりしと雖も、而も我等の諸君を知り諸君を想ふことや久し[中略]諸君よ、今や日露両国の政府は各其帝国的欲望を達せんが為めに、漫に兵火の端を開けり、然れども社会主義者の眼中には人種の別なく地域の別なく、国語の別なし、諸君と我らとは同志也、兄弟也、姉妹也、断じて闘ふべきの理有るなし
(Editorial on March 13, 1904; Hayashi and Nishida 1961, 21–22)
Oh, our Comrades in Russia! Brothers and sisters! Though we have ever had no chance to talk joyfully hand in hand with you, it has been a long time since we have known you and thought of you. [omit] Comrades! Now both governments of Japan and Russia imprudently plunged into war in order to satisfy their imperialistic desire. However, difference of races, countries, and languages does not matter to our socialists at all. You and we are comrades, brothers, sisters. There is no reason to fight against each other.

The fact that a socialist newspaper addressing the workers was written in a traditional literary style that was difficult for them to fully understand represents one of the anomalies of the linguistic situation in modern Japan. It could be said that there existed large discrepancies between social consciousness and linguistic practice even in forward-thinking intellectuals.

The Japanese Language in the Constitution and Law

It may seem surprising when viewed from a present-day perspective, but the Meiji-period journalist Fukuchi Gen'ichirō (福地源一郎 1841–1906) declared that a clear deterioration of writing style can be seen when one compares writings from the start of the Meiji period with those from around Meiji 12 (1879) (Fukuchi 1964). This was because a large number of words of Chinese origin had been coined haphazardly in an attempt to express things that had entered Japan from the West. As a result, strange changes occurred in the writing style and it became impossible to grasp the true meaning of a text. As specific examples of this, Fukuchi mentions the text announcing the proclamation of the Constitution of the Empire of Japan and the imperial rescript on the occasion of the Constitution. The beginning of the above imperial rescript reads as follows:

Chin kokka no kōshō to shinmin no keifuku wo motte chūshin no kin'ei to shi, waga soshū ni ukuru no taiken ni yori, genzai oyobi shōrai no shinmin ni taishi kono fuma no taiten wo senpu su.
朕国家ノ隆昌ト臣民ノ慶福トヲ以テ中心ノ欣栄トシ朕カ祖宗ニ承クルノ大権ニ依リ現在及将来ノ臣民ニ対シ此ノ不磨ノ大典ヲ宣布ス
I, emperor, find glory of the State and welfare of subjects to be my greatest pleasure. Based on the Sovereign Right I inherited from my great ancestors, I declare this imperishable Constitution to my subjects of present and future time.

Fukuchi argued that there is almost no citizen of Japan who could correctly interpret this kind of proclamation or imperial rescript. Although this style of writing follows the most elegant style among "ancient writings" that is standard

in China, even expert scholars of the Chinese classics cannot correctly understand it. The reason for this is that even though it follows the form of classical *kanbun* it does not do so in terms of semantic content. Because it is put together using "secret terms" containing "special meanings," this type of writing is a unique style that can only be understood by certain people or perhaps by no one at all. Fukuchi was scathing in his identification of this as "a bizarre, ghost style."

Throughout the prewar period, the written language used in the public sphere, such as in legal and official documents, was the literary language comprising a mixture of *kanji* and *katakana*. The zenith of this was found in the imperial edicts and rescripts issued by the emperor. Rescripts were seen to have more power than laws and they had a magical effect on "*shinmin*" (臣民Japanese subjects). One example of this is the well-known "Imperial Rescript on Education" (1890). Most rescripts were written using the difficult literary style, *kanbun kundokutai*. An opinion frequently asserted in debates about *genbun itchi* was that there were texts that could not possibly be subjected to *genbun itchi* and those texts were imperial rescripts. When the sovereignty of the emperor was denied after the war, however, imperial rescripts were renamed as "*okotoba*" (お言葉) and published in the colloquial language using *hiragana*. This event symbolized a major change in the language regime in Japan.[1]

The present Constitution of Japan (published in 1946) is written in a colloquial language that uses a mixture of *kanji* and *hiragana*. However, it is important to understand that this did not come about spontaneously. After defeat in August 1945, a tone of argument that was critical of prewar Japan arose in Japan. Within this, some advocated the colloquialization of the Constitution, but this did not receive much attention from the governmental Constitutional Issue Investigation Committee that was working on constitutional reform. Rather, the first proposal made by the Committee was the "Outline of Constitutional Revision Draft" (March 1946) written in the *katakana* literary style. The representatives of the "People's National Language Movement," which aimed to "democratize the national language," were fiercely opposed to this and insisted on the creation of the Constitution using the *hiragana* colloquial style. Because there were people in the Cabinet Legislation Bureau who agreed with this, the "Constitutional Revision Draft" published on 17 April of the same year was written using the *hiragana* colloquial style. In other words, the actual work on colloquialization of the Constitution took place during a period of less than one month (Takami 2009, 7). Newspapers and other media welcomed this colloquial-style Constitution unanimously. For example, an article entitled "From *Hiragana* Constitution towards a New National Language" appeared in the *Asahi shinbun* on 18 April, and this triggered the expression of the opinion that "all official gazettes and other government documents should be

[1] Though both are syllabic phonogram derived from Chinese characters, *hiragana* and *katakana* have different functions in written Japanese. The former has been used to transcribe Japanese indigenous words, while the latter were originally auxiliary signs used in reading Chinese texts. From the Meiji period to 1945, all the official documents were written in the literary style using *kanji* and *katakana*. Presently, *katakana* is mainly used for foreign loan words.

converted into clear, simple language that anyone can understand" (Ashibe et al. 2009, 104–6).

Although the actual work took less than one month, needless to say, the background for that was an accumulation of prewar language policy that aimed at expanding the colloquial language. However, in the prewar period these attempts were always frustrated because they came up against the dominance of the literary language. In the end, the shock of defeat was needed for a sweeping colloquialization of the Constitution to take place.

Conclusion

As mentioned at the start of this paper, a further 60 years had to pass before laws like the Civil Code, the Penal Code, and the Commercial Code were rewritten in colloquial style. The reasons for this endurance of the literary language are complex. One reason was that rather than being a traditional writing style in existence before the Meiji period, the literary language was formed during the Meiji period and met a certain level of need for modernity. Another reason was that, the diglossic situation in Japan had quite a flexible structure and did not form the kind of strict hierarchy described by Ferguson. The high variety and the low variety were not completely disconnected but were influenced by each other. Furthermore, *kanbun* itself, which was in the dominant position, had an understandable Japanized form. *Kanbun kundokutai* had penetrated the interior of the Japanese language and it was impossible to abandon it easily. From this perspective, it is clear that although we use the single word 'diglossia' to describe these language situations, the picture could be quite different depending on the society. The framework that Ferguson created can be used as a fixed frame of reference but, of course, the actual linguistic reality cannot be understood without looking at the specific circumstances of an individual society.

References

Ashibe, Nobuyoshi 芦部信喜 et al. 2009. *Nihon-koku kenpō seitei shiryō zenshū (5)* 日本国憲法制定資料全集(5). *Kenpō no kōgoka, Sūmitsuin shinsha, GHQ tono koshō* 憲法の口語化　枢密院審査　GHQとの交渉. Tōkyō: Shinzan sha.

Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. "Diglossia." *Word* 15: 325–340.

Fukuchi, Gen'ichirō 福地源一郎. 1964. Meiji konnichi no bunshō 明治今日の文章. In *Meiji ikō kokugo mondai ronshū* 明治以降国語問題論集, edited by Yoshida, Sumio 吉田澄夫 and Inoguchi, Yūichi 井之口有一, 264–282. Tōkyō: Kazama Shobō. Originally published in *Kokumin no tomo* 国民の友 13 (204–206): 208.

Futabatei, Shimei 二葉亭四迷. 1984. *Futabatei Shimei Zenshū* 二葉亭四迷全集, Vol.1. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō.

———. 1985. *Futabatei Shimei Zenshū* 二葉亭四迷全集, Vol.2. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō.

———. 1986. *Futabatei Shimei Zenshū* 二葉亭四迷全集, Vol.5. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō.

Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hayashi, Shigeru 林茂 and Nishida, Taketoshi 西田長寿, eds. 1961. *Heimin shinbun ronsetsu shū* 平民新聞論説集. Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten.

Kōtoku, Shūsui 幸徳秋水. 1968. “Genbun itchi to shinbunshi” 言文一致と新聞紙. In *Kōtoku Shūsui Zenshū* 幸徳秋水全集, vol. 3, 391–96. Tōkyō: Meiji bunken. Originally published in *Shinbun* 新文 1 (2) May 20, 1901.

Lee, Yeounsuk. 2010. *The Ideology of Kokugo. Nationalizing Language in Modern Japan*. Translated by Maki Hirano Hubbard. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

Takami, Katsutoshi 高見勝利. 2009. “Kaisetsu” 解説. In *Nihon-koku kenpō seitei shiryō zenshū (5)* 日本国憲法制定資料全集(5). *Kenpō no kōgoka, Sūmitsuin shinsa, GHQ tono koshō* 憲法の口語化 枢密院審査GHQとの交渉, edited by Ashibe Nobuyoshi et al., 3–12. Tōkyō: Shinzan sha.

Ueda, Kazutoshi 上田萬年. 1968a. “Kokugo to kokka to” 国語と国家と. In *Ochiai Naofumi, Ueda Kazutoshi, Haga Yaichi, Fujioka Sakutarō Shū* 落合直文、上田萬年、芳賀矢一、藤岡作太郎集. Vol. 44 of *Meiji Bungaku Zenshū* 明治文学全集, edited by Hisamatsu Sen’ichi 久松潜一, 108–113. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō. Originally published in Ueda Kazutoshi 上田萬年, *Kokugo no tame*国語のため (Tōkyō: Fuzanbō, 1895).

———. 1968b. “Naichi Zakkyo go ni okeru gogaku mondai” 内地雑居後に於ける語学問題. In *Ochiai Naofumi, Ueda Kazutoshi, Haga Yaichi, Fujioka Sakutarō Shū*落合直文、上田萬年、芳賀矢一、藤岡作太郎集. Vol. 44 of *Meiji Bungaku Zenshū* 明治文学全集, edited by Hisamatsu Sen’ichi久松潜一, 131–137. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō. Originally published in Ueda Kazutoshi 上田萬年, *Kokugo no tame vol.2* 国語のため第二 (Tōkyō: Fuzanbō, 1903).

Yamamoto, Masahide 山本正秀. 1965. *Kindai buntai hassei no shiteki kenkyū* 近代文体発生の史的研究. Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten.

Part III
Diglossia and Translation

Modeling the Shifting Face of the Discourse Mediator

Olga T. Yokoyama

Abstract This paper proposes a discourse model of translation activity with the mediator (translator/interpreter) as its agent. It captures both oral and written translation, as well as professional and lay translation, and provides a universal explanatory mechanism for shifts in the theories and benchmarks of translation practices over time. The model rests upon the basic claim of the underlying cognitive unity of oral and written discourse, whether monolingual or multilingual and whether mediated or unmediated. The differences between these discourse types, as well as differences in the product of translation activities, follow from differences in the discourse situations, which in turn include the cognitive features (including linguistic and cultural competence, norms, intentions, and identities) of given discourse participants.

Keywords Interpreting vs. translation • Oral versus written discourse • Mediated discourse • (Im)partial discourse mediators • Transactional discourse model • 'Equivalence' in translation/interpreting • Internet and the vernacularization of discourse

Introduction

The impetus for this study comes from considering the implications of the move of translation theory away from primarily linguistically oriented issues of 'equivalence' to primarily literature-oriented issues of post-structuralist intellectual discourse. Between the 1940s, when the first theoretical works on translation began to appear (Nida 1947; Brower 1959) and the 1980s, when this move took place, the dominant concern of translation scholars was 'equivalence.' Their focus was on the

O.T. Yokoyama (✉)
Department of Applied Linguistics, University of California, Los Angeles
e-mail: olga@humnet.ucla.edu

J. Árokay et al. (eds.), *Divided Languages?*, Transcultural Research – Heidelberg Studies on Asia and Europe in a Global Context, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-03521-5_10,

text—specifically, on the linguistic and philosophical possibilities and limitations of achieving 'interlingual equivalence.' During this period, some scholars enthusiastically embraced new developments in theoretical linguistics, as they sought ways of providing a solid basis for encoding meaning in languages with differing grammatical structures (Nida 1964; Catford 1965), while others focused on empirical questions of structural differences affecting translation (Vinay and Darbelnet 1977).

When the post-structuralist explosion of theory occurred in literary studies, translation theory in the West followed the lead of literary criticism and turned away from linguistics. The focus shifted from the text to its context (a "cultural turn") and then to the target text in the receiving society.[1] This was accompanied by a rapid expansion into a number of novel topics, from the exploration of past and present translation practices, to the examination of the political, economic, and cultural contexts of the source and receiving languages involved in a given translation. In a striking departure from the previous approaches that set 'equivalence' as their benchmark, feminist translation theorists not only advocated that feminist translators should make their presence in the translated text "visible" by flaunting their presence and agency in it (Godard 1990, 89–91), but also challenged the value of fidelity in translation (Simon 1996, 12–14) and called for retranslation of all works of literature from a feminist perspective.[2] In a parallel move, queer translation theorists argued that "faithfulness can no longer be regarded as an absolute concept" (Mira 1999, 109) and that homosexuality and gay identity in translations must be brought out of the closet, making explicit any allusions found in the original texts (Keenanghan 1998).

This move away from 'equivalence' did not result in the elimination of linguistically oriented studies of translation, which continued to occupy a significant number of researchers. Among more recent developments, the growing accessibility of electronic corpora has notably provided new tools for textual analysis and a renewed impetus for examining the linguistic differences between the originals and translations (Anderman and Rogers 2008). The resulting state of translation studies today is multifarious and eclectic, and this eclecticism itself, to my mind, is a sign of a field in search of an identity. This paper is thus a contribution towards a metatheory of translation that proposes a discourse model of all translation activity, written and oral, as well as a way of modeling various shifts in translation theories.

[1] For overviews of translation theories, see Bassnett and Lefevere (1990, 1998); Toury (1995); Hardwick (2000), inter alia.

[2] See Flotow (1997, 5–34) on the relationship between translation and feminist politics.

The Relationship Between Interpreting and Translation

Before we examine the phenomenon of translation, the relationship between interpreting and translation must be addressed. English uses two distinct terms for these activities, but this usage is far from universal: cf. *perevodit'*, the Russian verb for *to translate/interpret*, or *tafsiri*, the Swahili noun for *translation/interpretation*, or Japanese *yaku*, a noun that also stands for either concept.[3] My first claim is that translation and interpreting are essentially a single communicative phenomenon. Interpreting is to translation as speech is to writing. The difference is in the medium: one is spoken, the other is written; but both are manifestations of linguistic communication based on a single linguistic system of a given language.

That said, the distinction between the two is not insignificant, and most of the obvious features that distinguish oral speech from writing are identical to those that distinguish interpreting from translation. The following familiar contrasts hold, prototypically, between the spoken and written modes; and being prototypical, they in practice allow, of course, some deviations [4]:

Most of the characteristics in this table are self-explanatory. The only category requiring a special comment is the last one, "receiver": in OD, the addressee (hearer) *As*, posited by the speaker in face-to-face communication, and *A*, the one who actually receives the message, are identical; in contrast, the addressee (reader) *As*, presupposed by the writer in WD, and the actual reader *A* are assumed here not to be identical. This difference is a direct corollary of the fact that in face-to-face communication the participants by definition share the time and space of the transaction, whereas in written communication, when the time and space are not identical, the writer (for instance, Leo Tolstoy) has no knowledge of who the reader may be (for instance, I).

These characteristics of the receiver in Table 1 are only working approximations, because the actual situation is more complex. In real discourse situations, before undertaking an utterance, the *S* (speaker) posits the addressee's state of mind. This cognitive act is called *assessment* (Yokoyama 1986, 44–52). Since the true state of the addressee's mind is not accessible to the speaker, *S*'s assessment of

[3] There are two separate nouns in Japanese that refer to translation and interpreting, *honyaku* and *tsūyaku*, respectively (note the identical second half *-yaku*), which can be verbalized by adding the suffix *-suru*. These nouns differ from the stand-alone noun *yaku* in their formality and in their professional connotation: a professional translator is *honyaku-sha* or *honyaku-ka* and a professional interpreter is *tsūyaku(-sha)*; the product of both activities is nevertheless the stand-alone *yaku*: e.g., a word, phrase, or a longer "text" translated into Japanese, whether in oral or written form, would be referred to as *nihongo-yaku*. The presence of the basic lexeme *yaku* in all of the derivatives underscores the unified status of both oral and written translation activities.

[4] Strictly speaking, in any transaction, the interlocutors can mix oral and written modes, or, for that matter, any other codes. An orally delivered question can be answered with a nod or a shrug, and it can also be responded to in writing some time later. Here we consider only the simplest cases, in which the interlocutors use the same codes/modes in a single transaction. We also exclude sign language, Braille, and other less frequently used codes.

A is always the best possible approximation of reality. Thus *A*, the real addressee, and *As*, the addressee posited by *S*, are strictly speaking, not identical. In face-to-face communication, thanks to multiple visual, contextual, and cultural clues available to *S* while assessing *A*'s cognitive state, as well as because of the possibility that *S*'s erroneous assessments may be corrected on the spot by *A*, *A* and *As* are as close as they can be. This maximal proximity of *A* and *As* in face-to-face oral discourse is treated in Table 1 as the 'equivalence' $A = As$, with the understanding that it is only a 'near-equivalence.' In written communication, due to the separation in time and space, the gap between the reader as posited by the writer and the real reader is substantially greater than in face-to-face communication; hence in the written mode I have posited $A \neq As$. This is also, however, an oversimplification. The gap between *A* and *As* in written discourse actually varies: it is minimal, for example, in secure intimate personal correspondence, and maximal when the reading is done by unspecified multitudes at an unspecified place and time (as in political manifestos, fiction, or translated literature).[5]

While speech and interpreting share the prototypical features of the oral mode, ordinary oral discourse does differ from discourse that involves interpreting. I will call the former monolingual[6] oral discourse (MOD) and the latter bilingual[7] oral discourse (BOD)[8]; the features of each are proposed in Table 2 (*T* stands for the translator):

A few comments are in order about the categories in Table 2. The code is in principle not limited to the linguistic one but includes paralinguistic and cultural codes as well. In MOD all three codes are largely shared, but in BOD linguistic codes are not shared by *S* and *A* even though the other two codes may be at least partially shared (since *S* and *A* see each other's body language and hear each other's intonation, and since they may belong to the same larger cultural realm). The "sharing" in Table 2 refers to the linguistic code. The message being communicated belongs to *S* in both MOD and BOD. This means that in translation, as in ordinary dialog, it is *S* whose communicative intention determines the content of his/her utterance, regardless of what *A*'s expectations or preferences may be and regardless of whether S's message needs to be translated into another language in order to reach the intended *A*. The agency of the actual production of the message intended by *S*, on the other hand, differs sharply between MOD and BOD; in the former, it is *S* who produces AND delivers the intended utterance, but in BOD, *S* performs only the first half of the job, as it is *T* on whom the task of delivering the message to

[5] Adams (1985) proposes a sensitive formal analysis of this gap in fiction writing.

[6] Ordinary monolingual face-to-face discourse can of course include code switching and other non-prototypical situations, which will not be considered here.

[7] The prototypical situation envisioned here is one that involves translation between two languages, but in principle, translation involving multiple languages is also possible. "BOD" is not used here to refer to discourse between two interlocutors who each speak in a language different from that of the other interlocutor.

[8] I will limit the description here to dyadic communication, with the interlocutors alternating the *S* and *A* roles as they take turns. In actuality, turns may overlap and be disrupted in other ways.

Table 1 Characteristics of oral versus written modes of communication

	Oral discourse mode (OD)	Written discourse mode (WD)
Participation	Face-to-face (share time/space)	Removed (in time and space)
Production	Spontaneous	Planned
Producer	Untrained	Trained
Vehicle	"Multimedia"	Visual
Feedback	Immediate	Delayed (if that)
Register	Informal	Formal
Product	Unedited	Edited
Receiver	As = A	As ≠ A

Table 2 Comparison of ordinary oral discourse and discourse involving oral translation

	MOD	BOD
Code	Shared by S and A	Not shared by S and A Shared by S and T Shared by T and A
Message	S's	S's
Producer	S	S and T (T "quotes" S)[a]
Receiver	As = A	As = A T (≠ As) is A's proxy At = A
Transaction	S←→A	S←→T←→A

[a]The idea that translation is a form of quotation has been proposed by a number of scholars, including Bigelow (1978) and Mossop (1998). This important aspect of translation deserves a separate study, especially in conjunction with Baxtin's (1934) discussion of heteroglossia, and cannot be pursued further here

A falls. Consequently, in MOD, there is only one receiver, *A*, for whom the message is intended and by whom it is received. In BOD, on the other hand, the reception of *S*'s intended message by *A* is delayed by *T*'s intercession, who first receives it as *A*'s proxy and then conveys it to *A* in an appropriate code. The first actual receiver *T* is then only partially presupposed by *S* (to the extent that *S* at a minimum posits *T*'s knowledge of the codes involved) but is not the primary receiver intended by *S*. Strictly speaking, just as in the case of *S*'s receiver, *T*, too, posits an addressee *At*, who may not have the relevant features *A* has. Given the position adopted here that in oral discourse the distinction between any posited *A* and the real *A* is minimal, the discrepancy between *At* and *A* will also be treated as virtually zero in BOD.

The crucial differences between MOD and BOD are thus, not surprisingly, (1) in the presence/absence of a shared code between *S* and *A*, and (2) in the presence/absence of the mediator *T*. Because of these two differences, in MOD the discourse between the interlocutors *S* and *A* is direct and a cognitive transaction is concluded without mediation by a third party (S←→A); on the other hand, in BOD the discourse between *S* and *A* is mediated, and the cognitive transaction is by definition concluded with the mediation of the third party *T* (S←→T←→A).

Just as MOD departs from BOD, ordinary monolingual written communication (MWD) also differs from written translation (BWD) in well-defined ways that can be extrapolated from Table 2. The main difference between prototypical oral and written discourse (OD and WD) consists in the removal of the addressee from the time and space of the discourse event. All of the other differences in Table 1 follow from this. The removal in time allows for planning and editing, delays the feedback, and makes the message accessible to an unintended *A*. Physical distances necessitate the written medium, the production of which calls for literacy, and messages intended for removed addressees favor preservation, which leads to formality. The main difference between prototypical monolingual and bilingual discourse (in Table 2), on the other hand, consists in the crucial involvement of *T* caused by the lack of a shared linguistic code between the producer of the intended message *S* and its ultimate receiver *A*. This is true for both oral and written modes of MD and BD. Thus BWD and MWD depart from each other exactly in the same way that BOD and MOD do: in the absence of a shared code and in the intercession by *T*. Conversely, the difference between BOD and BWD parallels that between MOD and MWD. This is summarized as follows in Table 3:

The logical continuum instantiated by these features confirms the shared nature of translation and interpreting.

Mediated Discourse

Intuition tells us that a translator or interpreter is positioned in the middle between two parties[9] who cannot otherwise communicate successfully because of the absence of a common linguistic code. *T* is thus the third person (i.e. cognitive entity) involved in knowledge transfer between *S* and *A*, the two primary interlocutors. Mediators are, of course, not limited to translators or interpreters. Commercial transactions routinely involve middlemen and adversarial situations call for arbitrators, just as many other social and political situations are facilitated by various kinds of intermediaries. Gatekeepers, messengers, spokespersons, and other people[10] playing an intermediary role all deliver another party's message to the addressee, who is ostensibly communicating with the messenger while accepting into his/her mind the information that originated in that other party to whom the communicative intention belongs. These are all relatively easily discernible "macro" mediator roles, for which we often have distinct lexical labels of the sort just mentioned.

[9] This is true both physically and metaphorically; but cognitively, the translator is not "in the space between the two languages" or in "no-man's land," as is sometimes claimed, but in the space of both languages and lands.

[10] Sociologists and anthropologists have proposed important differences among various kinds of mediators; (cf. Goffman 1959; Bailey 1969; Paine 1971).

Table 3 Discourse modes differentiated by the factors of time, space, and code

	MOD	BOD	MWD	BWD
Share time/space	+	+	–	–
Share code	+	–	+	–

There also exists, however, a much more fleeting and less obvious "micro" mediation, the kind that occurs when a mediator's intervention is more limited in terms of the role of the mediator and the bulk of the information transmitted by him/her. One of the most common instances of such "micro" mediation occurs in ordinary monolingual discourse, and this kind of discourse mediation, to the best of my knowledge, has thus far received little attention. In the case where knowledge might not be shared between the speaker and all his/her interlocutors in a party of three or more people, the one participant that does share this knowledge with the speaker and is aware that another participant does not share it, may jump in and supply that knowledge to that participant in order to help render the speaker's transaction successful. For example, in a monolingual discourse situation, when *S* mentions Stalin and one of the participants (*A*1) gives *S* a blank look, another participant (*A*2) may provide a helpful "footnote" along the lines of "Stalin was a Russian dictator in the last century." Technically, this "metinformational utterance"[11] supplies the referential knowledge of Stalin that *S* presupposes and *A*1 lacks.[12] *A*2 has then mediated the knowledge transaction between *S* and *A*1. Similarly, if *S*, a Japanese woman, disapprovingly says in perfect English that 'so-and-so served sliced fresh peaches without peeling them,' and *A*1, an American woman, looks puzzled; in that case, *A*2 may supply the associated propositional knowledge[13] that *A*1 evidently lacks, i.e., "Japanese prefer eating peaches without their skins on." In all such cases *A*2 functions as a "micro" mediator between *S* and *A*1.[14]

The absence of a shared linguistic code between the interlocutors *S* and *A*1 is only one kind of missing knowledge that the mediator *A*2 may supply. Again, this absence may be total, or it may be partial; it may even be limited to a single word. As for instance in the case of a discourse involving native and near-native speakers, when the near-native speaker *A*1 might have missed just one word in *S*'s utterance and *A*2 jumped in to provide a translation. This, in fact, happens even in monolingual discourse involving only native speakers. When the absence of a shared

[11] Yokoyama (1986, 6–15) distinguishes between informational and metinformational utterances.

[12] I assume (for instance in Yokoyama 1986, 34–38) that referential knowledge is normally assessed by the speaker to be shared prior to *S*'s utterance in which the reference is mentioned.

[13] In Yokoyama (1986, 133–135), the propositional knowledge in question would be analyzed as associated knowledge needed by the interlocutor to make sense of *S*'s disapproving intonation and facial expression; associated knowledge is usually either contextual or cultural.

[14] "Helpful footnotes" of this sort may, of course, be provided by the speaker him-/herself (i.e. without the involvement of a third mind). In such cases, the metinformational utterances produced by *S* are traditionally called digressive or parenthetical. Translators may provide them as *explication*, whereby such information is added into the text, for example, "Stalin, *a Russian dictator of the 20th century*, said that [. . .] (cf. Klaudy 1998 on this method).

linguistic code between the interlocutors *S* and *A*1 is extensive (and therefore severely debilitating for their communication), the mediation addressing this absence is usually singled out as a special concept: that of translation/interpreting. The mediator who takes on this activity as his/her role is then called a translator or an interpreter, and such a mediator, his/her role being clearly discernible, can now be considered to be a "macro" mediator. Interestingly, in some languages the agents of all discourse mediation, both "macro" and "micro," are referred to by one and the same word; cf., for example, the Turkish word *dilmaç*, which means both 'interpreter' and 'clarifier, explainer, commentator'—that is, the mediator who supplies the missing knowledge of the code as well as any other knowledge needed for understanding the message.[15]

The third cognitive entity in mediated discourse thus facilitates the transfer of a message. Significantly, the initiative of this message belongs to the speaker and the message is usually intended for the addressee and not for the mediator.

Discourse Mediators and Their Faces

A pivotal question for our analysis of translation concerns the neutrality of discourse mediators. Mediators are often thought of as neutral, faceless, and lacking influence from their own values and interests. Translators in particular have been conceived as transparent colorless glass, on one side of which information enters in one language and emerges on the other side in the other language. Such translators do not refract the incoming ray or color it in any way, but just pass it through without altering its nature. Gulliver (1979, 217) challenged the widespread notion of mediators' neutrality, calling it a myth born in Western societies. If he is right, no faceless translators should exist. Yet the notion of an impartial faceless discourse mediator persists. This putative impartial discourse mediator is, moreover, expected to command perfect competence in both languages and cultures and holds 'interlingual equivalence' as his/her benchmark.

There is indeed some evidence of translators' facelessness in our cultural history. The very custom of identifying the translator of a written text, for example, is relatively new. Western history has preserved the names of only a few translators, those of culturally important texts, and they all happen to be more famous for other activities—Cicero, St. Jerome, Luther, and Tyndale. Translators of culturally less important texts, such as royal epistles, were non-persons who remained faceless, fading before the monarchic authority of the originals. Equally anonymous are the translators of government decrees, administrative and legal documents, or

[15] This Turkish word has been borrowed into Russian as *tolmač* 'interpreter'; the derived verb, however, has broader meaning, including 'explain, make understand, provide details' (Dal' 1882, 4: 412). Steiner makes a similar point when he says (1975, 27–28) that when "a pianist gives *une interprétation* of a Beethoven sonata" he translates it for his audience. Thus the French "*[i]nterprète/interpreter* are commonly used to mean *translator*."

commercial contracts today. These professionals have effaced themselves as persons while continuing to strive for 'functional equivalence.' The tradition of the self-imposed benchmark of "equivalence" has continued as the ideal stance of translators well into the twentieth century. "Faithful" translators have deferred to the text's or its original creator's authority, and "faithful" professional interpreters today embrace the professional ethics standards stressed during their training, with their requirements of neutrality and impartiality (Baaring 1992, 60 et seq.).

However, the impartiality of the "faceless" translator is seriously undermined if we examine non-professional oral translation. Echoing Gulliver's claims about the myth of the impartial mediator, Valero-Garcés (2007) challenges "the myth of the invisible interpreter and translator" providing many examples of partiality. None of the expectations of facelessness, neutrality, or, for that matter, perfect bilingual competence can be maintained with respect to those engaged in language brokering, volunteer community interpreting, and casual personal discourse mediating by family members and friends. Work by "partial" mediators occurs daily in multilingual communities today, most of it in face-to-face discourse. Many bilingual discourse mediators are untrained and only partially competent in at least one of the languages they mediate (Tse 1996); many of them are children, heritage speakers of their family's languages, mediating for their monolingual family members.[16] Considerable research has appeared in the last two decades on these "community/liaison interpreters," "language brokers," and other partial discourse mediators (Eksner and Orellana 2005; Morales and Hanson 2005; García-Sánchez 2010), providing ample evidence of *T*s motivated by their own sympathies, views, or agenda.

Let us consider some examples of partiality in discourse mediation done by an interpreter in Sweden taken from Wadensjö (1998):

(1) S: [. . .] zdes' medicina vse-taki ne **tak**[17] razvita, kak u nas v Sovetskom Sojuze.
'medicine here is not as advanced as in the Soviet Union, after all'
T: [. . .] medicinsk utveckling är inte på samma nivå som i Sovjet
'medical development isn't at the same level as in the USSR' (157–8)

(2) S: jag vet inte om du förstår skillnaden mellan att vara- ha en viss nationalitet och att va medborgare?
'I don't know if you understand the difference between being- having a certain nationality and being a citizen?'
T: odno delo sčitat' . . . po nacional'nostjam a drugoe delo sčitat' sebja graždaninom kakogo-libo gosudarstva
'one thing is to consider in terms of nationalities and another thing is to consider oneself a citizen of some state' (111)

[16] The massive nature of this phenomenon cannot be overstated: 12.5 % of the US population was not born in the United States and 84 % of them speak a language other than English when at home; in California, 50 % of children are born into immigrant families. 84–92 % of immigrant children have the experience of serving as language brokers (Chao 2006).

[17] Boldface in the original, indicating emphasis.

In (1) and (2), a Russian-speaking immigrant obstetrician applying for a residence permit in Sweden is being interviewed by an immigration officer. In (1), *T* introduces ambiguity into the immigrant's comparison between the levels of Soviet and Swedish medicine, changing the original statement asserting the relative excellence of Soviet medicine into one that states only that there is a difference between the levels in the two countries. In doing so, *T* removes a potentially problematic assertion by the applicant. In (2), *T* removes the potentially offensive implication in the officer's wording that suggests ignorance on the part of the applicant. In both cases, *T* evidently strives for the role of the applicant's facilitator, if not protector, rather than being a "machine" that merely produces 'interlingual equivalents.'

In another example, a different interpreter omits 'BC' when translating an Armenian refugee's statement about Armenia's Christianization:

(3) S: [v Armeniju] vveli xristianstvo uže v 301 g. do našej èry.
'(to Armenia) Christianity was brought already in 301 BC.'[18] (203)

In this case, the omission was motivated by *T*'s realization of the ridiculousness of this statement and was aimed at preventing a comic effect that would have been embarrassing to the speaker and distracting for all those involved. This example, too, shows that this *T* did not strive to merely produce 'interlingual equivalents.' The subtle and, at first glance, inconsequential departures from the originals in (1–3) affect the discourse in ways that significantly alter *A*'s perceptions of *S*, potentially producing significant differences for the parties involved.

The "partial" discourse mediator has always existed and will always remain with us. The first such discourse mediator was born when the first two human dialects diverged to become sufficiently mutually unintelligible to benefit from a bi-dialectal mediator. Such a *T* predates professional interpreting and literary translation, and in fact s/he predates literature itself. I suggest that to be "with a face" and "partial" is the quintessential condition of all *T*s.

Translators "with a Face" in BWD

I now return to the question posed at the beginning of this paper: How can we account for the post-structuralist shift in translation theory? I will argue in this section that the shift is only apparent, and that translators of the post-structuralist era do not constitute a new or extraordinary phenomenon. Taking a bird's-eye view on the cultural progression in Europe over the past millennium, I will claim that these "opinionated" translators have predecessors in European history. I will examine the motivations of these translators (to the extent that this is possible) in

[18] The actual Swedish translation is not provided in Wadensjö (1998).

two areas: religious or ideological convictions (today we might call them "identities") and social or cultural standards.

Translators with Strong Ideologies

Well-documented challenges to the authorities' attempts, to regulate translation, began in Europe in the Late Middle Ages. Along with the rise of vernacular literatures throughout Europe, the movement to translate the Scriptures into local vernaculars began, in which the translators followed their convictions, ignoring Rome's proscription of unauthorized Bible translations. John Wycliffe of England translated the New Testament from Latin into English vernacular in the late fourteenth century, influencing Jan Hus, a Bohemian humanist, to translate sections of the scriptures and liturgical texts into Czech. While Wycliffe died a natural death in 1384, Hus was less fortunate and met his end at the stake in 1415.[19]

As the Reformation spread through Europe, it provided a continuing impetus for translating the scriptures into local vernaculars. Martin Luther's translation of the Bible, liturgical texts, and hymns into German by 1534 was made possible by the intervention of Frederick the Wise, who protected Luther from persecution, sheltering him in his castle and providing him with the time and security to engage in his translation work.[20] Luther used his freedom from Rome's control of his translation activity, to promote his theological position, adding the word "*alone*" into the phrase *faith justifies* (Romans 3:28). This suited his theology of salvation, an important point on which he diverged from Rome (Mullet 2004, 148–150). Around the same time, the less fortunate but no less "opinionated" William Tyndale was burned as an unauthorized heretical translator of the Bible into English.

Translating the classics into European vernaculars could be just as risky, provided these translations had the potential of introducing objectionable ideas. Thus, Etienne Dolet was burned at the stake around the same time for the heresy of adding, in a translation of Plato into French, the adverbial intensifier *rien du tout* 'not at all' to an already negative sentence about there being no life after death (Christie 1899).

[19] Wycliffe was posthumously declared a heretic, exhumed, and burned, along with his writings, a few decades later.

[20] Frederick the Wise of Germany was not the first European prince to encourage the translation of the Scriptures into local vernaculars. An event of tremendous significance for all of Slavdom was the commission of such a translation to the "Slavonic Teachers" Cyril and Methodius by the Moravian prince Rostislav, resulting in the birth of Slavia Orthodoxa in the mid-ninth century. Throughout the lives of Cyril and Methodius and their immediate disciples, the political balance in central Europe continued to fluctuate, providing sufficient time for the Slavic vernacular tradition to take root in the Scriptures and in liturgical texts, while lending dignity to both the Old Church Slavonic language and the recently Christianized Slavic people who spoke it at the time; (cf. Picchio 1984).

These are some well-known examples of "opinionated" translators who followed their convictions in the face of life-threatening control by the political (or ecclesiastic) powers in Europe in the late Middle Ages and early modern period. A different sort of ideology motivated Alexander Ross to translate the Qur'an into English (from French, since he did not know Arabic) in 1649. As he stated in the foreword to the translation, Ross took the initiative to translate the Qur'an, which he disdained, because it could underscore "the health of Christianity."[21] Although far from risking his life for this translation (and evidently undaunted by the fact that he did not know Arabic and that his knowledge of French was limited), as one of the "opinionated" translators of his time Ross responded to the cultural and political curiosity (if not hostility) of the young British Empire towards Islam; especially, at a time when the Ottomans were at the height of their power and influence on the European continent and in the Mediterranean basin.

Translators with Convictions About Social Norms

In the case of Dolet, one might argue that the fatal decision he made was more of a linguistic than theological nature. A translator is faced with linguistic decisions in every sentence or utterance s/he translates and is naturally aware of this. Luther was not only an "opinionated" theologian but also the author of *Sendbrief von Dolmetschen*, a treatise on translation.[22] With his interest in theoretical questions regarding translation and given his respect towards the vernacular, Luther continued the line of prominent translators of antiquity like the much earlier Bible translator St. Jerome who, a millennium earlier, made the difficult decision (for which he was criticized) to perform the Bible-translation task entrusted to him by the pope by translating it into Latin vernacular; this he did despite the fact that he had a full command of Ciceronian Classical Latin. Linguistic decisions of this sort were based on the translators' views of language—not only on its semantics and structure, but also its registers and its diachronic development. Moreover, translators obviously differed among themselves in these views. Let us consider here two

[21] Specifically, it is stated that: "Thou shalt finde it of so rude, and incongruous a composure so farced with contradictions, blasphemies, obscene speeches, and ridiculous fables, that some modest, and more rationall *Mahometans* have thus excused it . . . Such as it is, I present to thee, having taken the pains only to translate it out of *French*, not doubting, though it hath been a poyson, that hath infected a very great, but most unsound part of the universe, it may prove an Antidote, to confirm in thee the health of Christianity." (Ross, *The AlCoran of Mahomet*, p. A2, A3; cited in Gilchrist 1986, 215–223)

[22] Note that while today the German verb *dolmetschen* (from Turkish (via Hungarian or Slavic); Kluge 2002, 209) is rendered as 'interpret' (as opposed to *übersetzen* 'translate'), the title of Luther's treatise is translated into English as 'translation,' evidently reflecting a historical shift in the semantics of this loanword in German.

such opposing views leading to different decisions, and due, I suggest, to shifting social norms over the period of the last century.

Ackroyd, who in 2009 "retold" the *Canterbury Tales* in an intralingual translation, followed his views on translation and modernization when he took an unapologetic step towards an explicitly lower register than those into which his predecessors had translated the classic. He sacrificed fidelity in favor of modernization, rendering Chaucer's *[. . .] for what profit (purpose) was a wight (body) y-wroght (made)?[. . .] they wer (were) nat (not) maad (made) for noght (nothing)* (Hopper 1970, 391) as *Cunts are not made for nothing, are they?* (Ackroyd 2009, 149), and *Love me at-ones (instantly), or I wol (will) dyen (die)* (Hopper 1970, 209) as *Fuck me or I'm finished* (Ackroyd 2009, 84). The social norms of our times allow, or perhaps even encourage, such decisions in order for the book to appeal (and be marketed) to the target readership.

Under pressure from the power of taste and propriety, decisions in the opposite direction have been made as well. Here are a few examples of such decisions made in the Victorian age by well-known Russian translators of Shakespeare and published in 1902 by the exclusive and authoritative Brokgaus and Efron publishing house under the general editorship of S.A. Vengerov:

(4) Original: a pissing while
Translation: skol'ko nužno, čtoby vysmorkat'sja
'time needed to blow nose'
(*Two gentlemen of Verona*, Act IV, sc. 4; Vs. Miller)

(5) Original: When I have fought with the men, I will be cruel with the maids – I will
cut off their heads. [. . .] Ay, the heads of the maids, or their maidenheads.
Translation: Lupi mužčin, da pronimaj i bab! Im ne ujti ot menja celymi!
'Smack the men and get the women, too! They won't get away from me
unharmed!'
(*Romeo and Juliet*, Act I, sc. 1; Ap. Grigor'ev)

(6) Original: Thou Protector of this damned Strumpet
Translation: Ty pokrovitel' merzkoj ved'my
'you, protector of the disgusting witch'
(*Richard III*, Act III, sc. 4; A.V. Družinin)

The endnote for (4) provides the original "crude" English idiomatic expression *a pissing while* ('a short time'), which was replaced by the translator as 'time needed to blow one's nose'; the note suggests that the motivation for this replacement was the crudity of the original (549). The series of puns built around the theme of rape in (5) is obscured and considerably shortened in the translation. The endnote explains this, and supplies a full literal translation of the omitted "crude" lines (554). Regarding (6), the translator writes that the original had not *witch*, "but a different, salacious word." For those who wonder, he adds: "Lovers of precision may want to substitute it, because the verse will remain as felicitous" (561).[23] In some cases, improper material was simply left untranslated, as is explicitly noted at the end of the translation of *Love's Labor's Lost*: "Some of the too crude and indecent witticisms have been omitted" (553).

The pressure on the translators to conform to the culturally acceptable norms of the polite society these gorgeous Russian editions of Shakespeare targeted was particularly strong, evidently resulting in self-censorship of the kind we see in these examples. Although they are ostensibly opposed to one another, what the decisions by these Russian translators and those by Ackroyd have in common is the conviction underlying them regarding the need to adhere to the social norms of their assumed readership.

The Ascending Agency of T *with a Face*

By the second half of the twentieth century, various expressions of identity grew more pronounced, producing new kinds of "opinionated" translators. At the time of the Berkeley Renaissance in the 1950s, when Jack Spicer translated García Lorca's homosexual images more frankly than they were worded in the originals, it was still an act of uncommon courage comparable to that of the post-Renaissance theologians; but by the time the feminist movement was in full swing and Mary Phil Korsak had begun to retranslate the Bible incorporating the new position of women in modern societies,[24] gender and sexuality had become one of the central topics of postmodern humanistic discourse. The drive to convey what these new "opinionated" translators thought was or should be the message of the originals resulted in translation theories that called for conveying these translators' positions, rather than the ostensible "surface" meaning of the original wording. The translator felt compelled not only to show his or her face but also to assert his/her identity and values through his/her work.

There are two crucial points to note here. The first point is that although the motivations of all the "opinionated" translators considered above may have arisen

[23] Thereby informing the clever "precision lovers" that the original "salacious" word is a two-syllable Russian word with stress on the first vowel.

[24] Cf., e.g., Korsak (2002).

from convictions of varying nature—from religion to identity, to politics, to linguistics—and although their convictions did not expose them to physical danger to the same extent, the kind of force these motivations exerted on their choice of what and how they translated was in essence the same. The second and even more important point that needs to be made here is that the "opinionated-ness" of these translators, cognitively parallels the "partiality" of the language brokers and community interpreters considered in section "Discourse Mediators and their Faces". Whether it be clerics convinced of their understanding of the Scripture, or queer activists striving to bring homosexuality out of the closet, or children translating for their immigrant parents in a multicultural community, all of these discourse mediators are crucial agents who not only make communicative transactions possible but who at the same time are persons with their own views, allegiances, and values. Based on these values, they choose their stance vis-à-vis the transaction—that is, they decide what and how to translate, and even whether to assert their "faces" or not. It is this variety of *T*'s stances that a metatheory of translation must capture, and this is what I will attempt to do in the next section.

Modeling Translation

I now turn to a model that captures, I suggest, the variation in *T*'s "faced-ness" in different societies at different times in both BOD and BWD. The proposed overarching translation theory captures translation activity using the Transactional Discourse Model of Yokoyama (1986).

The Transactional Discourse Model is a dynamic face-to-face dyadic model that tracks the process of knowledge transfer as it is manifested in the concrete linguistic choices the speaker makes, while assessing the addressee and with the addressee's active engagement. This model is general, and as such it has been shown to account for various knowledge transactions involving the interlocutors' identities and opinions.[25] In this model, the interlocutors' sets of current concern (their attention sets) contain the awareness of mutual availability for contact at a given time and place.[26] This shared awareness consists of the referential knowledge of *I*, *you*, *here* and *now* (i.e. {I}, {you}, {here}, and {now}, abbreviated as {DEIXIS}). Each item of referential knowledge is accompanied by a set of associated knowledge items in the form of propositions. Consider some possible propositions associated with {I} and {you} as seen by *S* in Table 4:

The propositions activated in any given discourse transaction are not a random list but are also related to the knowledge associated with {here} and {now}, such

[25] Cf., for example, its applications to lying (Yokoyama 1988), speaker perspective (Zaitseva 1995), and identity (Zaitseva 1999).

[26] This brief introduction to the model follows Yokoyama (1986, 3–170). For synopses, see Yokoyama (1992) or Růžička (1992).

Table 4 Examples of propositional knowledge associated with {I} and {you} in MD

{I} = S	{you} = As
[[I speak English]]	[[you speak English]]
[[I am a woman]]	[[you are a woman]]
[[I am young]]	[[you are old]]
[[I am Hispanic American]]	[[you are Asian American]]
[[I am your employee]]	[[you are my boss]]
[[I am a nice person]]	[[you are a nice person]]
[[I am a customer]]	[[you are a store clerk]]

that, for example, [[I am a customer]] but not [[I am a professor]] would normally be activated when {here} happens to be associated with [[this is a grocery store]], while the reverse will be the case when {here} happens to be associated with [[this is a university library]]. Some items of associated knowledge are in an implicational relationship with some other items.[27]

Possible extensions of this to BD are given in Table 5; the associated propositions represent, of course, only some of the possibilities corresponding to the examples of translators discussed above.

The proposition [[I am a faceless translator]] may correlate with [[here is the UN]] and may further imply [[I strive for 'equivalence']]. This won't be the case when [[I am a community interpreter]] and [[I like this immigrant]] are correlated with {I}, {you} is associated with [[you are an immigration officer]], and {here} is correlated with [[this is an immigration office]]. Such a combination would lead the "partial" *T* to translate *not as advanced* as *not at the same level*, the same choice the interpreter tactfully (but inaccurately) made in example (1) above. Similarly, when the propositions [[I am a proper person]] and [[you are a proper person]] correlate with {I} and {you}, and {here} is correlated with [[this is a polite society]], *T* would translate *pissing* as *nose blowing*, the choice Miller made in example (4). It is easy to see that the propositions [[I am a feminist]], [[I am gay]], [[I am a humanist/Renaissance man]], [[I am a Czech/German nationalist]], [[I am anti-Muslim]], when correlated with appropriate propositions associated with {you}, {here}, and {now}, would lead *T* to the decisions made by Korsak, Spicer, Dolet, Hus, Luther, and Ross, and would result in translating *faith justifies* as *faith alone justifies*, or *love me* as *fuck me*, and so on.

The Transactional Discourse Model can thus formalize the discourse situations that give rise to the translation decisions made by various *T*s, whether faceless or with a face, in the past and in the present, and in oral as well as in written communication. This model has sufficient explanatory power to account for the existence of various translation theories, the question we set out to answer at the beginning of this paper. The variations in *T*'s stance are shown in this model to be determined in correlation with *T*'s perception of him/herself and the addressee, as well as with the time and place of the given discourse. Cultural assumptions are formalized in this model in the form of propositions associated with the {DEIXIS}

[27] For more details on this, see Yokoyama (1999).

Table 5 Examples of propositional knowledge associated with {I} in BD

{I} = T
[[I am a faceless translator]]
[[I like this immigrant]]
[[I am a proper person]]
[[I am a feminist]]
[[I am gay]]
[[I am a humanist]]
[[I am a Czech/German nationalist]]
[[I am anti-Muslim]]

involved in a given transaction, and as such they constitute a formalization not only of the interlocutors' psychological stances and their identities but also of their cultural notions.

A quick glance at a few concerns examined in well-known translation theories will suffice to illustrate this point. Toury's (1978) concept of *norm* can be accounted for by this formalism, as can his 1995 thesis regarding the translations being embedded within their social and historical context, since these are cultural notions. *T*'s decision whether to provide cultural "footnoting" and how to accomplish it is thus explained by the knowledge associated with {DEIXIS} activated at the point when *T* assesses *At*. This would answer, for example, Hardwick's (2000) concerns about providing cultural frameworks for the benefit of the reader. The translator's purpose (and his/her assessment of the clients' purpose) in Vermeer's (1983, 1989) *skopos* theory is also easily formalized in this model as propositions associated with {I} and {you}. In this way, the model in Table 5 captures all of the possible "hats" a translator may wear, depending on the assumed addressee and the context in which the transaction takes place. Translation thus emerges as a discourse activity shaped by its agent *T*, whether as a "faceless," "impartial" mediator striving for 'equivalence,' or a "partial," "opinionated" mediator asserting his or her identities, allegiances, and philosophies through the translation choices s/he makes.

Conclusion

I have argued here for unifying all translation theories on the basis of the discourse nature of mediated discourse. I have proposed a formal discourse model that combines the top-down Durkheimian and the bottom-up Malinowskian approaches and captures the shifting visibility of the translator, incorporating his/her context and cultural background as well as the fleeting propositions that determine the linguistic choices *T* makes at any given moment. The translator's shifting benchmarks are natural consequences of the factors captured in this model. As a consequence of this analysis, I have been able to confirm the essential similarity of the cognitive mechanism of Bible translators during the Reformation, Russian translators of Shakespeare in the Victorian age, the ideological stances of post-

structuralist translation, or community translators and language brokers in oral translation.

The Transactional Discourse Model was used here to reveal the characteristic features of translation discourse in a consistent fashion that allows for the contrastive examination of other discourse types as well. Formalism is a powerful heuristic device that forces a rigorous logic and invites strong falsifiable hypotheses, and this, in turn, leads to discovery. By assuming that BD is a type of discourse, the model cogently demonstrates that the way *T* translates is never cast in stone but is a function of time, place, and the self, and the addressee as *T* sees it. 'Equivalence' is only one of the options *T* may pursue when engaging in BD.

The model also allows us to peek into the future. The "democratization" brought about by the Internet goes hand in hand with the vernacularization of *S*'s voice. It contributes to the growth of *S*'s power to reach across time and space, a development that began with the invention of writing systems and progressed with book printing, the spread of literacy, and the affordability of printed media. In the current multilingual globalizing world, the discourse mediator, too, has more opportunities than ever before for asserting his or her identity and opinion. Along with *S*, *T* can now also be "heard" by the whole world, while eluding the watchful eye of the powers that be, be they political or cultural. The as yet unknown magnitude of the developments that began two decades ago will continue to alter our perception of ourselves and of our interlocutors. They will also continue to make accessible the interlocutors' feedback, and, as a result, the proposition sets associated with {DEIXIS} will gain in variety. Better conditions have never existed for being "partial" and "opinionated," regardless of whether *T* is engaged in MWD or BWD. It is thus to be expected that translation will continue to become more and more variegated and creative.

References

Ackroyd, Peter. 2009. *Geoffrey Chaucer. The Canterbury Tales: A Retelling*. New York: Viking.
Adams, Jon K. 1985. *Pragmatics and Fiction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Anderman, Gunilla M., and Margaret Rogers, eds. 2008. *Incorporating Corpora: The Linguist and the Translator*. Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
Baaring, Inge. 1992. *Tolkning – hvor og hvorden?* Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur.
Bailey, Frederick G. 1969. *Stratagems and Spoils: A Social Anthropology or Politics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Bassnett, Susan, and Andre Lefevere, eds. 1990. *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter.
———, eds. 1998. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Baxtin, Mixail M. 1975 [1934]. *Voprosy literatury i èstetiki*. Moskva: Xudožestvennaja literatura.
Bigelow, John. 1978. "Semantics of thinking, speaking, and translation." In *Meaning and Translation: Philosophical and Linguistic Approaches*, edited by Franz Günthner and M. Günthner-Reutter, 109–35. London: Duckworth.
Brower, Reuben A., ed. 1959. *On Translation*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.

Catford, John C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*. London: Oxford UP.

Chao, Ruth K. 2006. "The prevalence and consequences of adolescents' language brokering for their immigrant parents." In *Acculturation and Parent–child Relationship: Measurement and Development*, edited by Marc Bornstein and Linda Cote, 271–96. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Christie, Richard C. 1899. *Etienne Dolet: The Martyr of the Renaissance 1508–1543, a Biography*. London: Macmillan.

Dal', Vladimir. 1956 [1882]. *Tolkovyj slovar'*. Moskva: Gos. izdat. inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovarej.

Eksner, H. Julia and Marjorie F. Orellana. 2005. "Liminality as linguistic process: Mediation and contestation by immigrant youth in Germany and the U.S." In *Childhood and Migration: From Experience to Agency*, edited by Jacqueline Knörr, 175–206. Somerset: Transcript and Transaction Publishers.

Flotow, Luise von. 1997. *Translation and Gender: Translating in the 'Era of Feminism'*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

García-Sánchez, Inmaculada M. 2010. "(Re)shaping practices in translation: How Moroccan immigrant children and families navigate continuity and change." *MediAzioni, Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies on Languages and Cultures* 10: 182–214. Accessed October 25, 2011. http://mediazioni.sitlec.unibo.it.

Gilchrist, John. 1986. "English Translations of the Qur'an." In *Muhammad and the Religion of Islam*. http://answering-islam.org/Gilchrist/Vol1/5d.html.

Godard, Barbara. 1990. "Theorizing feminist discourse/translation." In *Translation, History, and Culture*, edited by Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere, 87–96. London: Pinter.

Goffman, Erving. 1990 [1959]. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Gulliver, Philip H. 1979. *Disputes and Negotiations: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. New York: Academic Press.

Hardwick, Lorna. 2000. *Translating Words, Translating Cultures*. London: Duckworth.

Hopper, Vincent F., ed. 1970. *Chaucer's Canterbury Tales: An Interlinear Translation*. Hauppauge: Barron's Educational Series.

Keenanghan, Eric. 1998. "Jack Spicer's pricks and cocksuckers: translating homosexuality into visibility." *The Translator* 4.2: 273–94.

Klaudy, Kinga. 1998. "Explication." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, edited by Mona Baker, 80–84. London: Routledge.

Kluge, Friedrich. 2002. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, edited by Elmar Seebold. Berlin/New York: Walter De Gruyter.

Korsak, Mary P. 2002. "Translating the Bible: Bible translations and gender issues." In *Bible Translation on the Threshold of the 21st Century*, edited by Athalya Brenner and J.W. van Henten, 132–46. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Mira, Alberto. 1999. "Pushing the Limits of Faithfulness: A Case for Gay Translation." In *The Practice of Literary Translation*, edited by Michael Holman and Jean Boase-Beier, 109–24. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Morales, Alejandro and William E. Hanson. 2005. "Language Brokering: An Integrative Review of the Literature." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 27.4: 471–503.

Mossop, Brian B. "What is a translating translator doing?" *Target* 10.2: 231–66.

Mullet, Michael A. 2004. *Martin Luther*. London: Routledge.

Nida, Eugene. 1947. *Bible Translating: An Analysis of Principles and Procedures*. New York: American Bible Society.

———. 1964. *Towards a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill.

Paine, R., ed. 1971. *Patrons and Brokers in the East Arctic*. Newfoundland: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland. Univ. of Toronto Press: Toronto.

Picchio, Ricardo. 1984. “Guidelines for a comparative study of the Language Question among the Slavs.” Vol. 1 of *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question*, edited by Ricardo Picchio and Harvey Goldblatt, 1–42. New Haven: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies.
Růžička, Rudolf. 1992. “Review of Yokoyama 1986.” *Kratylos* 37: 21–31.
Simon, Sherry. 1996. *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. London: Routledge.
Steiner, George. 1975. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. New York: Oxford UP.
Tse, Lucy. 1996. “Language brokering in linguistic minority communities: the case of Chinese and Vietnamese-American students.” *Bilingual Research Journal* 20.3/4: 485–98.
Toury, Gideon. 1978. “The nature and role of norms in literary translation.” In *Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies*, edited by James S. Holmes, Jose Lambert, and Raymond van den Broeck. Leuven: ACCO.
———. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Valero-Garcés, Carmen. 2007. “Challenges in multilingual societies: the myth of the invisible interpreter and translator.” *Across Languages and Cultures* 8.1: 81–101.
Vengerov, S.A., ed. 1902. *Šekspir*. Sankt Petersburg: Brokgauz and Efron.
Vermeer, Hans J. 1983. *Aufsätze zur Translationstheorie*. Heidelberg: Groos.
———. 1989 [2000]. “Skopos and commission in translation action.” In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 221–32. London: Routledge.
Vinay, Jean-Paul, and Jean Darbelnet. 1977. *Stylistique comparée du français et de l’anglais*. Paris: Les editions Didier.
Wadensjö, Celia. 1998. *Interpreting as Interaction*. New York: Longman.
Yokoyama, Olga T. 1986. *Discourse and Word Order*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
———. 1988. “Disbelief, lies, and manipulations in a Transactional Discourse Model.” *Argumentation* 2.1 (Rhetoric of Lying): 131–49.
———. 1992. “Teorija kommunikativnoj kompetencii i problematika porjadka slov v russkom jazyke.” *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, 6: 94–102.
———. 1999. “Russian genderlects and referential expressions.” *Language in Society* 28: 401–29.
Zaitseva, Valentina. 1995. *The Speaker’s Perspective in Grammar and Lexicon*. New York: Peter Lang.
———. 1999. “Referential knowledge in discourse: Interpretation of {I, You} in male and female speech.” In *Slavic Gender Linguistics*, edited by Margaret H. Mills, 1–26. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Translation Within the Polyglossic Linguistic System of Early Meiji-Period Japan

Jeffrey Angles

Abstract During the mid- to late nineteenth century, Japan's linguistic situation was complicated. There were multiple writing styles and literary authors would select from them based on genre and subject matter. Among the "high" literary styles used by educated people was one called *kanbun yomikudashibun-chō* (漢文読み下し文調), a style that had developed in imitation of the Japanese adaptations of Classical Chinese texts. This chapter examines the stylistic choices faced by translators as they completed some of the first important literary translations from European languages in the midst of this complicated linguistic system. As case studies, this chapter examines two famous translations dating from 1878: the translation of Jules Verne (1828–1905) by Kawashima Chūnosuke (1853–1938) and the translation of Edward Bulwer-Lytton (1803–1873) by Niwa Jun'ichirō (1851–1919). Although both were published in the same year, they reveal radically different translation strategies and a profoundly different attitude toward the use of language.

Keywords Translation • Imitation • Adaptation • Foreignization • Domesticization • Polyglossia

Language and Translation

With the Meiji Restoration in 1868, Japan embarked upon an ambitious program of modernization, which it hoped would maintain its integrity and protect its culture from the threat of the technologically dominant West. Soon after the arrival of Commodore Perry's Black Ships in 1853, it had become clear to many Japanese intellectuals and functionaries that in order to protect itself and to be able to stand

J. Angles (✉)
Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo
e-mail: jeffrey.angles@wmich.edu

J. Árokay et al. (eds.), *Divided Languages?*, Transcultural Research – Heidelberg Studies on Asia and Europe in a Global Context, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-03521-5_11,

on an equal footing with the West in terms of technology, military preparedness, and trade, Japan would need to learn from the nations of the West. In order to accomplish this, Japan began to import a large number of ideas from abroad. Perhaps at no other time in Japanese history was translation more critical than during this era when the Japanese strove to learn about the world outside their borders. As Japan worked to join the world community, translation became one of the principal conduits through which the flow of information between nations was negotiated. In fact, translation played such a central role in early Meiji-period intellectual life that this era could effectively be called the "era of translation" (See Keene 1998, 55–75).

Although a limited number of intellectuals had experience translating Dutch texts in the Edo period (1600–1867), the number of translations from Western languages exploded during the Meiji period (1868–1912). It goes without saying that this process involved a great deal of experimentation, adaptation, and development; however, if one looks at early Meiji-period translations with contemporary eyes they do not always resemble the kinds of translations we might expect to see today. As Yokoyama has mentioned in her contribution to this volume, in Europe and the Americas many assume that a "good" translation is a seamless one that conveys the contents of the original with as little interference as possible. Indeed, for much of the mid-twentieth century, creating models of "functional equivalence" between original text and translation represented a goal for translation theorists and practicing translators. The "cultural turn" that has taken place in translation studies within recent decades has meant that translation studies has become much less obsessed with issues of equivalence and has instead started to pay much more attention to the different kinds of linguistic and cultural work that the act of translation involves. For translation scholars and literary historians, the differences between original and translation permit one to think about the shifts in meaning, significance, and power as a text crosses linguistic boundaries.

Late nineteenth-century translations from Japan are often not transparent at all; the translations themselves foreground the translator's process of adapting and negotiating the meaning of the original work. Considering the massive linguistic and cultural gaps that existed between Japan and the West at that time, this only makes sense. Words did not yet exist in Japanese to represent all necessary concepts and even when they did the exact structure, content, and cultural background of the Western texts was often difficult to comprehend or to reproduce. Western writing operated on the basis of different principles from Japanese literature; thus, poetic devices and plot lines often felt radically alien to Japanese readers. As a result, many early Meiji-period translators chose to engage the original European texts on their own terms by modifying the structure and form to fit Japanese tastes. The result is that translations produced during the Meiji period represent an enormous treasure trove of information about how Japanese writers thought about and viewed cultures and concepts from beyond the boundaries of Japan (Angles 2012). Of course, all translations involve a certain degree of negotiation and reconstruction as the source text is reworked to fit the target language and culture. This is true regardless of whether one is talking about translations from Meiji-period Japan or

translations produced today. The point, however, is that the norms that govern translation—the sense of what a "good" translation is, what a translation should accomplish, how translation should be approached and so on—have changed immensely over time, and for this reason texts completed in the early Meiji period look very different from translations completed today in contemporary Japan.

Another reason that translations from the early Meiji period look so different from contemporary Japanese translations has to do with the diachronic shifts that took place in the Japanese language during and after the Meiji period. Currently in Japan there are some differences between the written language and the spoken language, most of which involve word choice, register of formality, verb endings, and particles that indicate nuance and inflection. Still, the differences between the contemporary written and spoken languages are relatively minor when compared to the linguistic situation of mid-nineteenth century Japan. Charles Ferguson's classic description of diglossia depicts a situation that is, in some ways, similar to what one found then. At that time, there was a spoken language (and many dialects) used vernacularly for daily communication, but there was also, to borrow Ferguson's words, a "divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed" language that served as a vehicle to record written texts. This literary language was not used for ordinary conversation but was "learned through formal education" and was used to write in ways that would be deemed respectable (Ferguson 1959/2003, 354). The distance between the "low" vernacular language and the "high" literary language was enormous. What makes the Japanese situation even more complex, however, was the fact that the "high" language consisted of different subcategories of language from which one could choose depending on the genre in which one was writing. One might perhaps even dare to call the nineteenth-century Japanese linguistic system "polyglossic" in that multiple styles of language co-existed simultaneously without one having absolute authority over all the others.

Among the "high" styles was the *wabun* (和文) or "Japanese text," which was used in the Japanese poetry world and had also been used in the great *monogatari* (物語 "tales") of the classical age of Japanese literature. This style tended to shy away from Chinese vocabulary by using classical Japanese diction, verb endings, and patterns that belonged more to the old language than to the modern vernacular. Meanwhile, other types of learned texts, such as government texts, certain kinds of poetry, and other texts written by the intelligentsia, were written in Classical Chinese. Letters were written in a highly codified pseudo-classical, Chinese-influenced Japanese known as *sōrōbun* (候文), which differed slightly in style between men and women. The question of which style one used depended entirely on the purpose of the text, the genre in which one was writing, and even the gender of the author.

Another of the most important "high" styles used for literary writing is called *kanbun* (漢文), or Classical Chinese. The Classical Chinese used in Japan was originally derived from the language used on the continent. However, individual Japanese writers developed their own style within *kanbun*, and Japanese poets developed their own interpretation of the rules used within *kanshi* (漢詩 poetry written in *kanbun*). As a result, there were subtle ways in which the language and

diction used in Classical Chinese writing in Japan differed from that used on the Asian mainland. Alongside *kanbun,* another style of writing emerged that reflected the specific ways that Japanese rendered Classical Chinese texts into Japanese. The traditional way of reading Classical Chinese texts in Japan involved taking the Chinese characters and adding marks alongside to indicate how they should be reordered to fit Japanese word order. Marks alongside the characters could also indicate verb endings, particles, and other parts of speech that did not exist in Chinese.[1] Readers would then use these marks to mentally rearrange the text and thus "translate" the text from the page. The result was *kanbun kundokutai* (漢文訓読体), a particular form of Classical Chinese that included notes alongside the text to show how the text should be reworked to make grammatical sense in Japanese.

At some point in their early history, the Japanese began to actually rearrange the Chinese text into a Japanese order. They did this by retaining a high density of the original characters and filling in the missing parts that did not exist in Chinese, such as verb endings, particles, and inflections, which at the time were usually written in the *katakana* (片仮名) syllabary. The result is a form of writing called *kanbun yomikudashibun* (漢文読み下し文literally "writing in which classical Chinese is read and recorded"), which goes one step further than *kanbun kundokutai* to rework Classical Chinese into Japanese. In other words, this style of writing did not involve a mental rearranging of the text; it could be read in order and in accordance with Japanese grammatical structures while retaining Chinese vocabulary at its heart. It is important to remember that Classical Chinese was a language of significant cultural value to the Japanese, as it was the language of the Buddhist classics, government texts, philosophy, moral learning, and many pieces of literature. As a result, Chinese vocabulary and modes of expression were used in many different kinds of texts for an educated audience.

Although *kanbun yomikudashibun* originally developed as a method for the Japanese to adapt and read Chinese texts, Japanese authors also began to use it directly, creating a style that has sometimes been described as *kanbun yomikudashibun-chō* ("in the *style* of Classical Chinese that has been read and recorded"). By the Meiji period, this style was used for many kinds of texts aimed at an educated audience, including newspapers. In fact, it became so common that it has sometimes been called *futsūbun,* meaning "ordinary language." Dictionaries often describe *futsūbun* as a form of writing that became dominant in the early Meiji period and reveals a mixture of Chinese vocabulary and Japanese phonetic letters. However, it is important to remember that although this style had become so common at the beginning of the Meiji period as to appear "ordinary," it emerged in the space between Classical Chinese and Japanese, and its combination of

[1] Japanese has a complex system of verb endings that indicate tense, social relationship between speaker and listener, and other important nuances of meaning. Chinese, however, does not usually encode the same information in its verbs. Likewise, Japanese uses a system of particles that follow words to indicate which part of speech they are. In annotating texts written in *kanbun,* the Japanese added a series of marks to the side of the main text to "add" these elements in order to help make the *kanbun* accessible in Japanese.

weighty Chinese words, pseudo-classical Japanese verb endings, and "high" literary status made it, in many ways, quite different from the daily, spoken language of the Japanese people. Since this style was born out of translation in the first place—or more specifically, out of the idiosyncratic Japanese method of adapting classical Chinese texts into Japanese—it seems to have become associated with translation more generally. For that reason, when the Japanese began to translate Western texts in the early Meiji period they saw *kanbun yomikudashibun-chō* as a natural stylistic choice for their translations.

As the Meiji period progressed, however, an increasing number of writers complained that none of the styles in this complicated linguistic system allowed enough freedom to accommodate the ideas and vocabulary of Western languages or to represent a neutral, socially unmarked perspective like that found in Western languages. As their calls for language reform grew, their voices coalesced around the slogan *genbun itchi* (言文一致 the unification of the written and spoken word). This is a bit of a misnomer since these writers chose the "voice" of a certain portion of Tokyo speakers as the "standard" and invented words in order to represent ideas that were not easily expressed even in spoken language. (The most important of these is the literary copula *de aru* である, discussed by Michiaki Kawato in this volume.) Still, the style caught on at a dizzying speed, and by around 1910 it had, in many literary venues, almost completely replaced the various forms of pseudo-classical "high" language used in the early Meiji period.

The immense changes that Japan has undergone in terms of language are one reason that today's translations look very different from the translations of nearly a century and a half ago; however, the changes are not the only source of this difference. The massive shifts that took place in the ideas about translation—what a translation can and should do—during the mid-Meiji period are equally important. In other words, the differences in Meiji-period translations and contemporary translations cannot merely be ascribed to stylistic differences but also, as this chapter will demonstrate, translation and these linguistic shifts—the move away from the multivalent linguistic system—went hand in hand.

In order to form a better understanding of the ways that writers thought about and conceived of translation in this critical era of cultural and linguistic negotiation, this chapter will look at two early Meiji-period translations: *Shinsetsu: Hachijū-nichikan sekai isshū* (新説　八十日間世界一周), which was a 1878–1880 translation by Kawashima Chūnosuke (川島忠之助, 1853–1938) of the 1873 novel *Le tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours* by Jules Verne (1828–1905), and *Ōshū kiji*: *Karyū shunwa* (欧州奇事　花柳春話), a 1878–1889 translation by Niwa Jun'ichirō (丹羽純一郎, 1851–1919) of the 1837 novel *Ernest Maltravers* and its 1838 sequel, *Alice*, written by Edward Bulwer-Lytton (1803–1873). The translation strategies used by Kawashima and Niwa were profoundly different; in fact, the latter is far enough from the original text that modern readers would probably consider it something closer to an adaptation rather than a proper "translation." Using these two works as case studies, this chapter will argue that in order to understand early Meiji modes of translation we must take into

account the expectations associated with the particular types of language as well as fundamental concepts about what translations are and how they should look.

Heuristic Tools

Before looking at specific examples of translation from Meiji-period Japan it would be helpful to first introduce a few key terms that have often been used in the West to speak about translation. Perhaps the piece of translation theory most often quoted in the English language is John Dryden's (1631–1700) preface for a translation of Ovid's epistles published in 1680. In it he argued that there are three types of translation, each of which has certain goals:

> 1. *Metaphrase*, defined by Dryden as "turning an author word by word, line by line, from one language into another."
> 2. *Paraphrase*, which might be described as "translation with latitude, where the author is kept in view by the translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly followed as his sense, and that too, is admitted to be amplified but not altered."
> 3. *Imitation*, in which the "translator (if now he has not lost that name) assumes the liberty, not only to vary from the words and sense, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion; and taking only some general hints from the original." (Dryden 1680/1992, 17)

Dryden notes that each type of translation has its drawbacks. Because languages use different syntax, idioms, and modes of expression, a metaphrase rendition that substitutes word for word might be difficult for the target audience to read. Conversely, a paraphrase rendition simply goes for the general meaning and thus leaves out some of the specificity of the original wording and might even miss certain important details. An imitative rendering might stray too far from the source text, thus making it difficult for the reader of the target text to see where the work of the original author ends and that of the translator begins. Dryden notes that an imitative rendering might not belong to the field of translation proper; however, in the world of seventeenth-century poetry, which provides most of Dryden's examples, imitation was one of the modes most commonly used to convey the poeticity of the original text.

Dryden's tripartite categorization is especially useful when looking at early Meiji translation because, as the following examination of Niwa Jun'ichirō's *Karyū shunwa* will show, imitation was an important strategy employed by some early Meiji-period translators. Meiji-period translation practices were not just dominated by the narrower, transparent and seemly type of "translation" that we expect today. Rather, "translation" in the early Meiji period meant rewriting a text, and this often included rewritings that were imitative and adaptive in nature. As we shall see, one reason that translators diverged from the original text so often was partly because they felt the need to follow the lead of the stylistic choices that were already set up for them by the demands of the literary language of *kanbun yomikudashibun-chō*. This is not to say that Japanese writers did not have the freedom to express what they wanted within this style. On the contrary, for in

examining the translation of Jules Verne we shall see that the translator Kawashima Chūnosuke *was* able to work with this style to express complicated foreign ideas with remarkable flexibility. It is just that many—indeed, most—other writers working with the heavily stylized language were less daring and chose to adhere to the strong conventions of the style, choosing imitation rather than metaphrase.

The principal focus of Dryden's system of categorization has to do with the degree to which the translator rearranges the structural and linguistic elements of the source text. While it is tempting to read Dryden's categorization as dealing with the degree of "fidelity" to the original text, this would be overly simplistic; if anything, Dryden complicates the notion of fidelity. Each of the three types of translation he posits is faithful to the text in one way or another. A metaphrase is most faithful to the individual words that make up the text; a paraphrase is faithful to meaning of the text in that it represents it in clause-by-clause, sentence-by-sentence units; while, an imitation can be most faithful to the "poetic" qualities of a text, especially when the original genre of the text would not be immediately recognized as "poetic" to the target culture. One thinks, for instance, of early English translations of Japanese *waka* (和歌) poetry into English, which rendered the small Japanese poems into iambic pentameter or Italian quatrains simply because unrhymed patterns of 5-7-5-7-7 sounds would not have been recognizable to nineteenth-century audiences as "poetry" (Angles 2010, 20–32).

In an 1818 speech made in Berlin, the German theologian and thinker Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834) gave us another approach to thinking about translation. During the era of German national unification, in which the boundaries of the perceived nation were being redrawn along linguistic lines, there was a strong sense among intellectuals of the age that the soul of any people lay in its language. As a result, unlike Dryden, who focused on the degree of correspondence between texts, Schleiermacher focused instead on the ways that the translator deals with the foreign culture embedded within the source text. He argued that translations fall into two categories: (1) one in which cultural elements in the source text are kept as much as possible in the translation in order to help the reader access the source culture, and (2) one in which cultural elements from the source culture are replaced with cultural elements from the target culture in order to make the text accessible to readers who know little about the source culture. Many modern translation theorists, including Lawrence Venuti, have called the former approach a "foreignizing translation" in that it makes the text seem "foreign" and the latter approach a "domesticizing translation" in that it makes the text seem domestic and familiar. Schleiermacher believed that translators should either choose one approach or the other, arguing that mixing the two approaches produces a "highly unreliable result" and the "danger that writer and reader might miss each other completely" (1818/2004, 49). In reality, however, a firm adherence to either principle is almost impossible. This is especially true in the case of longer translations, since the translator will almost inevitably include elements of the foreign culture in some places but domesticize in others.

Both Dryden and Schleiermacher's taxonomies of translation strategies are relatively crude heuristic tools, especially considering that translators often use

multiple strategies in different parts of the same work, perhaps even mixing them within the same paragraph. Moreover, there are multiple ways of producing, for example, a paraphrase or domesticizing translation. As a result, pigeonholing a translation as belonging to one of these categories provides only a rough sense of the complex processes of negotiation that take place. Indeed, as translation studies scholars working after the "cultural turn" have shown us, those negotiations are often the most interesting and revealing parts precisely because they tell us a great deal about linguistic differences and cultural conflict. That said, the concepts that Dryden and Schleiermacher have provided for us can still be useful in thinking about the larger question of what sorts of translations Japanese writers produced during the early Meiji period and how those translations are related to literary style.

Kawashima Chūnosuke's *Trip Around the World in Eighty Days*

When the Meiji Restoration took place in 1868 there were very few people in Japan who were proficient enough to translate texts from European languages, and so the numbers of translations published in the first decade of the Meiji period were rather limited. The texts that were translated tended to be non-fictional works that Japanese writers felt would give the Japanese a better sense of the history or culture of the West. Perhaps the most famous of these is the bestselling *Saigoku risshi hen* (西国立志編 *Success Stories of the West*), based upon the book *Self-Help* by the Scottish writer Samuel Smiles, and translated in 1870 by Nakamura Keiu (中村敬宇, 1832–1891, also known as Nakamura Masanao中村正直). An inspirational book written to teach people to better their lot in life and become more productive members of society, *Self-Help* offered a valuable glimpse into the ethical foundations that supported the cultural rise of the West. It was widely read as a document that showed the Japanese how to move forward in their new, rapidly changing society (Keene 1998, 17).

Translations of fiction were slower to emerge, no doubt because the production of literature was not considered an especially valuable pursuit in nineteenth-century Japan—certainly far less important than writing the factual books about the West that Japanese readers so intensely desired. The scholar Shinkuma Kiyoshi (新熊清, born 1941) noted that it took time for literary translators to come to the conclusion that literary translation was not just a pedagogical tool but also a means of creating art (2008, 65). Ten years were to pass before translations of Western literature began to appear in any large numbers. One noteworthy exception was Satō Ryōan's (斎藤了庵, dates unknown) 1872 *Robinson zenden* (魯敏孫全傳 literally "Robinson's Complete Biography"), a translation of Daniel Defoe's novel *Robinson Crusoe*. This work grew so famous that Ushiyama Ryōsuke (牛山良助 also known by his pen name Kakudō 鶴堂, dates unknown) published another

translation, *Shin'yaku: Robinson hyōryūki* (新訳 魯敏孫漂流記 literally "A New Translation: An Account of Robinson Washed Away") in 1887.

The year 1878, which fell between these two Defoe translations, was important because it marked the first significant upswing in the number of literary translations from Western languages.[2] Among the books published that year were the two books that this chapter will use as case studies, Kawashima Chūnosuke's translation of Jules Verne, and Niwa Jun'ichirō's translation of Edward-Bulwer Lytton. I have chosen these two translations not simply because they were among the first wave of Meiji literary translations and became bestsellers, but because, despite being published in the same year, they reveal two radically different approaches to translation and to the stylistics of the era. In other words, when compared to one another these translations give us a strong sense of the significantly different approaches to language and translation employed by an early Meiji writer.

Kawashima Chūnosuke was not a professional writer by trade. In fact, he is only known to have produced two major translations during his life. In what is the most detailed exploration of Kawashima's life to date, the French literature scholar Tomita Hitoshi has shown that Kawashima had a complicated work history that included working for a French shipbuilding company in Yokohama and as an interpreter for the local Kanagawa government in order to promote trade between Europe and Kanagawa (Tomita 1984, 99–174). Kawashima was first sent a copy of Jules Verne's novel *Le tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours* (*Trip Around the World in Eighty Days*, 1853) by a cousin in Paris, and although the book made an impact on him he did not think about translating it right away because he was set to go on a trade mission to the West. It was later, when Kawashima was traveling across the United States, that he discovered an English translation of the book at the train station and reread it. This second reading had a significant impact on him and he decided to translate the book (Yanagida 1961, 329–30). As Tomita (1984) has shown, Kawashima's Japanese translation includes a greatly expanded section about the United States that was included in the American translation of the novel and not present in the original French, thus suggesting that although Kawashima specialized in French, he worked at least partly from the American translation. In any case, Tomita considers this to be a landmark in translation history in that it represents the first full-length translation of a fictional work from French into Japanese.

Kawashima published the work in two volumes. The first was self-published in 1878 and was such a success that a commercial publisher released the second volume in 1880. Kawashima once noted that he earned 267 yen from the publication of both volumes, a not inconsiderable sum in early Meiji-Japan (Yanagida 1961, 330). The success of his translation was so great that many other translators

[2] Although these were not the first literary translations from Western languages, they were the first in the Meiji period. To give one example, during the Edo period there had been numerous translations and adaptations of Aesop's fables, some by Jesuits interested in learning Japanese and others by Japanese working from texts obtained from Western traders.

jumped on the bandwagon and published their own translations of Jules Verne. Of these, some worked from the original French while most worked from English translations. Over the course of the next decade, nearly all of Verne's major novels, including *Vingts mille lieues sous les mers (Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea)*, *Voyage au centre de la terre (Voyage to the Center of the Earth),* and *Autour de la lune (Around the Moon)* were published in Japanese. Verne's early Japanese translators included many of the figures who would become the most important translators of the Meiji period, including Inoue Tsutomu (井上勤, 1850–1928) and Morita Shiken (森田思軒, 1861–1897), often known as the "king of Meiji translation."[3]

Le tour du monde remained one of Verne's most popular pieces in Japan, and its stories were retold in multiple formats, including kabuki plays. One reason it appealed so strongly to early Meiji audiences had to do with the adventure and excitement that filled its pages, but at the same time it also gave Meiji readers an enjoyable lesson in world geography. Verne turned to a large number of contemporary accounts of places around the world to give his book local color; it is rich with descriptions of places few Japanese had ever seen. At the same time, because the characters travel through places like India, Hong Kong, and the unsettled plains of the United States, the book demonstrated to Japanese readers the notion that there were many places around the world at profoundly different levels of cultural development. In this way, it fit well with the early Meiji discourse about cultural development, which had quickly adopted the Spenserian notion that nations exist in a state of competition and that the ones that fare best in terms of technology and culture were most likely to succeed on the world stage.

On the cover of the Japanese translation, the names of both the original author and the translator, who were still unknown in Japan at the time, are lined up beside one another, suggesting that Kawashima conceived of the translation as a sort of dialogue between himself and Verne. When one looks closely at the text itself, one finds that although it is written in the *kanbun yomikudashibun-chō* style commonly used at the time in newspapers, magazines, and other media intended for an educated audience, Kawashima managed to achieve a high level of correspondence with the source text. In fact, the scholar Nakamaru Nobuaki has stated, "this is miraculously close to the original. . . This book is deserving of the honor of being known as the first novel translated from French in Japan not simply because it was [chronologically] the first, but because of its austere attitude toward the act of translation, which did not permit omissions, additions, or modifications" (2002, 505).

In the opening passage of the novel, one notes that Kawashima even tried to reproduce the long, run-on sentence that opens Verne's work. The following is the original French with an English gloss plus Kawashima's translation. For the purposes of comparing differences between the French original and the Japanese

[3] This appellation dates back to the Meiji period, but it is reflected in more recent scholarship, including Kurashiki Bunka Kurabu (2011).

translation, a back-translation into English appears after both. These translations should not be considered authoritative or perfect, as they also make the grammar fit the laws of English. Instead, these rough back-translations should serve as a guide to help readers understand what content was included and what was left out.

> *En l'année 1872, la maison portant le numéro 7 de Saville-row [sic], Burlington Gardens—maison dans laquelle Sheridan mourut en 1814—, était habitée par Phileas Fogg, esq., l'un des membres les plus singuliers et les plus remarqués du Reform-Club de Londres, bien qu'il semblât prendre à tâche de ne rien faire qui pût attirer l'attention.* (Verne 1874, 1).
> [In the year 1872, the house with the number 7 at Savile Row, Burlington Gardens—the same house in which Sheridan died in 1814—was inhabited by Phileas Fogg, Esquire, one of the most unusual and noted members of the Reform Club of London, even though he seemed to take pains to do nothing that could have attracted attention.]

> Sen happyaku nana-jū-ni-nenjū ni Rondon Borurinton kōen katawara Savihirurō-gai dai-shichi-ban ni oite sen happyaku-yon nenjū Sheridan ga bukko seshi ie ni dōfu Kaishinsha no shain nite jishin wa tsutomete gyōjō no hito no me ni tatanu yō chūi shi arishimo itsu to naku kihekika no meibun todorokikeru Fairīsu Foggu-shi to shōsuru ichi shinshi zo sumaikeru
> 千八百七十二年中に龍動ボルリントン公園傍サヴヒルロー街第七番ニ於テ千八百十四年中シエリダンガ物故セシ家に同府改進舎ノ社員ニテ自身ハ勉メテ行状ノ人ノ目ニ立タヌ様注意シアリシモ何時トナク奇癖家ノ名聞轟キケルフアイリース、フヲツグ氏ト称スル一紳士ゾ住ヒケル (Kawashima 1878/2002, 3)[4]
> [In the year 1872, in 7 Savile Row, at the side of Burlington Park, London, in the house where Sheridan died in 1814, lived the gentleman Phileas Fogg, a member of the Reform Society of the same government, an eccentric fellow who was well known even though he took caution not to stand out in the eyes of others.]

The Japanese fits in as much of the content as possible while attempting to maintain the same general length as the original run-on sentence. The result is a sentence that, despite the huge linguistic differences between French and *kanbun yomikudashibun-chō*, shows remarkably little shift in focus or content. Kawashima's sole addition to Verne's original was the brief mention that Burlington Gardens is in *Rondon* (龍動London), something that any French reader would have immediately recognized. Moreover, he clarifies the spatial relationship between places, indicating, for instance, that Savile Row is located to the side of Burlington Park. In order to describe the term Reform-Club, Kawashima has coined a neologism, *kaishinsha* (改進舎) made up of the three characters meaning "reform," "progress," and "organization," thus harnessing the creative powers of Japanese characters to capture non-Japanese ideas.

If one were to describe this translation using Dryden's tripartite taxonomy of translations, it would come close to a metaphrase in its almost word-for-word level of correspondence between the original text and the translation. In Schleiermacher's categorization, the translation would be a "foreignizing" translation in that it carries the reader into the world of the original text. Rather than

[4] At this point in Japanese orthographic history many Japanese texts underlined or double-underlined proper names so that the unfamiliar names stood out from the rest of the text and it was easy for readers to see where the name began and ended.

domesticizing elements of culture or erasing the offending cultural element altogether, Kawashima carefully attempted to coin words that might be understood by a Japanese reader. Nakamaru Nobuaki (2002, 506–507) has noted that Kawashima makes use of such neologisms, something that in some ways might depart slightly from the kinds of language that one might find in the style in comparable texts.

Nakamaru notes that occasionally there are places in Kawashima's text that use "low," more vernacular, or *wabun*-style (和文Japanese) turns of phrase that one would not expect to see in a *kanbun yomikudashibun-chō* text, and that in other spots, especially the dialogue, it uses expressions reminiscent of plays, storytelling, and *togaki* (ト書きstage directions) (2002, 506–07). In other words, when confronted by challenges Kawashima uses the stylistic resources at his fingertips in order to convey the content of the original without allowing it to disappear altogether. Although certain writers would soon begin decrying the literary style as too inflexible to represent new ideas or to capture the shifts in consciousness and culture that were taking place in the new, modernizing Japan, Kawashima's translation stands as a testament to the flexibility of *kanbun yomikudashibun-chō* when used creatively. Nakamaru notes that from the point of view of traditional stylistics the polyvocality of the style conveyed a newness that many readers probably associated with being "Western" (Nakamaru 2002, 505).

This is not to imply that Kawashima did not modify the text at all. In fact, one of the chapters in which Kawashima made the most striking incursions into the content of the text is in the chapter where the character Passepartout makes a stopover in Yokohama—the very same city where the translator had spent much of his adult life. If one reads the original carefully against the translation, there are a handful of noteworthy changes that Kawashima made in these scenes. These include:

1. Corrections of Verne's misrepresentations of Japan in the original.
2. Clarifications to make Passepartout's attitude toward Japan appear non-judgmental and that neutralize potentially negative language regarding Japan.
3. Inclusions that suggest the relative status of Japan vis-à-vis China. (Angles 2012)

Since Verne had never actually visited Japan, he gathered descriptions of Japan from many of his contemporaries and cobbled them together to create descriptions of what the character Passepartout saw in Yokohama. Among them are a number of small misrepresentations of Japan like, for instance, in the description of the part of town known as Benten.

> *Cette portion indigène de Yokohama est appelée Benten, du nom d'une déesse de la mer, adorée sur les îles voisines. Là se voyaient d'admirables allées de sapins et de cèdres, des portes sacrées d'une architecture étrange, des ponts enfouis au milieu des bambous et des roseaux, des temples abrités sous le couvert immense et mélancolique des cèdres séculaires, des bonzeries au fond desquelles végétaient les prêtres du bouddhisme et les sectateurs de la religion de Conficious, des rues interminables où l'on eût pu recueillir une moisson d'enfants au teint rose et au joues rouges. . .* (Verne 1874, 125)
>
> [This native portion of Yokohama is called Benten, after the name of the sea goddess worshipped on the neighboring isles. There, one finds magnificent streets of fir trees and cedars, sacred portals of a strange architecture, bridges buried in the middle of bamboo and reeds, temples protected under the immense, melancholy cover of the century-old cedars, monasteries at the bottom of which the priests of Buddhism and the followers of the religion

of Confucius vegetated, unending streets where one could run into a group of children with a pink tint and red cheeks. . .]

Kono atari wa hōjin no sonshin suru ichi shin'nyo no na o torite Benten to shō seri Robō ni kii naru kōzoku no shinmon ari Hairite mireba rōsan koshō dō o hasande shōji ikkō no bankyō chikurin ni sōte kakareri Shinden wa sono oku ni arite rōshō ussō toshite in o nashi kansei naru omomuki ari Kore yori shigai no hō e itareba sūko no jidō gun'yū suru ari Sono yōgan wa tankō o obi ryōhō wa kotoni akashi
此辺ハ邦人ノ尊信スル一神女ノ名ヲ取リテ弁天ト称セリ　路傍ニ奇異ナル構造ノ神門アリ入リテ見レバ老杉古松道ヲ狭ンデ生ジ一虹ノ板橋竹林ニ沿ウテ架レリ　神殿ハ其奥ニ在テ老松鬱蒼トシテ陰ヲ為シ閑静ナル趣アリ　是ヨリ市街ノ方ヘ至レバ数個ノ児童群遊スルアリ　其容顔ハ淡紅ヲ帯ビ両頬ハ殊ニ赤シ　(Kawashima 1878/2002, 168)
[The native people of this area call this Benten, taken from the name of a goddess they worship. Beside the road, there was a sacred gate of a strange construction. When he went inside, there were old cryptomeria trees and ancient pines growing on either side of the road, and a wood rainbow bridge had been built alongside a bamboo forest. The sanctuary was at the back, shaded by the luxurious growth of the old pines, and had a tranquil elegance about it. Going from here toward the city streets, there was a group of children playing together. Their faces were banded with pink and their cheeks were especially red.]

The description of "neighboring isles" (*les îles voisines*) must have puzzled Kawashima, judging from the fact that he left it out in favor of simply saying that Benten was a goddess who was worshipped in the area. Indeed, there are no isles in the harbor of Yokohama, although it is possible that Verne was thinking about the island of Enoshima, which was also described at some length in *Le Japon illustré,* an account by the Swiss merchant Aimé Hupert that Verne is known to have consulted. Kawashima also corrected the representation of Benten as home to "monasteries at the bottom of which the priests of Buddhism and the followers of the religion of Confucius vegetated." In fact, Benten was home to a large Shinto shrine that belongs to a tradition quite distinct from both Confucianism and Buddhism. Kawashima left that clause out altogether and translated Verne's words "*portes sacrées*" (sacred portals) in a way that could only indicate a Shinto torii gate (神門 *shinmon*). Moreover, he described the monasteries as a *shinden* (神殿Shinto sanctuary), clarifying the exact nature of the place and making it fit with reality. Finally, Kawashima corrected the descriptions of plants. Whereas Verne mentioned "bamboo and reeds" and later "century-old cedars" Kawashima mentioned "old cryptomeria trees and ancient pines" and a bridge "alongside a bamboo forest." Indeed, photographs confirm that such a place actually existed in Benten.

Another change that Kawashima made involved clarifications regarding Passepartout's attitude toward Japan. In the novel, the character Passepartout is clearly not happy to be there. The reason for his dissatisfaction is that earlier, when he boarded the ship to Japan in Hong Kong, he was accidentally separated from his master and left without money. As a result, he found himself stranded and worried upon arrival in Japan. In other words, his irritation with the place had more to do with his situation than with the place itself. Verne writes,

Passepartout mit le pied, sans aucun enthousiasme, sur cette terre si curieuse des Fils du Soleil. (Verne 1874, 125)

[Passepartout made footfall, without any enthusiasm, in this land, so curious, of the Children of the Sun.]

However, Kawashima seems to have been concerned that Japanese readers might misunderstand and perhaps even be offended by Passepartout's irritation, so he added a reminder of the reasons for Passepartout's foul state of mind.

Pasuparutsū mo yamu o ezu jōriku suredo mi wa honkon ikō nasu kotogoto ni isuka no hashi kuichigaikereba shinjū ōō toshite tanoshimazu Gyōmatsu o omofureba nan zo chinki ni tomu asahi no kuni ni kuru tomo itoma aran
パスパルツーモ已ヲ得ズ上陸スレド身ハ香港以降為ス事毎ニ鶍ノ嘴食ヒ違ヒケ レバ心中怏々トシテ楽マズ　行末ヲ考フレバ　何ンゾ珍奇ニ富ム旭日国に来ルトモ 遑アラン (Kawashima 1878/2002, 167)
[Passepartout couldn't help going on land, but since Hong Kong, everything he had done was as wrong as if he had eaten with a crossbill's beak, so in his heart, he was not satisfied and not looking forward to this. When he thought about it, he had come to the Land of the Morning Sun, rich with all sorts of novelties, but he probably didn't have time to spare.]

The *isuka* (鶍crossbill) is a bird with an unusual beak where the top overlaps the bottom as if the beak has been twisted. While this type of beak is useful for digging pine nuts out of their casing, the bird is not terribly good at eating other kinds of food; thus, it came to be used as a metaphor for something that does not go quite right. Interestingly, Verne describes Japan as a "curious" place—an ambiguous term that could represent either a neutral outlook (i.e. Passepartout finds things in Japan different from home) or a slightly negative judgment (Passepartout finds things in Japan to be "strange"). Kawashima rendered the word in a way that makes it sound much more positive, describing Japan as a place "rich with all sorts of novelties."

Passepartout found himself in a part of town that in many ways looked entirely European but for the throngs of people crowding the square, which made him feel like an alien.

Là, comme à Hong-Kong, comme à Calcutta, fourmillait un pêle-mêle de gens de toutes races, Américains, Anglais, Chinois, Hollandais, marchands prêts à tout acheter, au milieu desquels le Français se trouvait aussi étranger que s'il eût jeté au pays des Hottentots. (Verne 1874, 125)
[There, as in Hong Kong, as in Calcutta, there mingled a pell-mell of people of all races—Americans, British, Chinese, Dutch, merchants ready to buy up everything—in the middle of which the Frenchman found himself as foreign as if he had been thrown into a country of Hottentots.]

Koko mo mata Honkon to onajiku Ei Bei Shin Ran nado kakkoku no shōko ga fukusō shite issai no buppin o baibai suru ito hanjō no minato naredomo Pasuparutsū wa koko ni shiru hito nakereba Afurika nanbu "Hottento" no kuni e gazen unsai yori kudarishi mono to sarani kotonarazaru omoi o nashitari
此地モ亦香港ト同ジク 英 米 清 蘭等各国の商賈ガ輻湊シテ一切ノ物品ヲ売買スル最繁昌ノ湊ナレドモ　パスパルツーハ此地ニ識ル人ナケレバ亜弗利加南部「ホツテント」ノ国ヘ俄然雲際ヨリ降リシ者ト更ニ異ナラザル思ヒヲナシタリ (Kawashima 1878/2002, 167)
[Here too, as in Hong Kong, merchants from England, America, Qing (dynasty China), Holland, and all sorts of other countries were all milling about, forming an extremely prospering market where everything was being bought and sold, but Passepartout had no

one there whom he knew, so he felt as even stranger as if he had abruptly come down from the clouds into the "Hottentot" land of southern Africa.]

The language that Verne uses to describe the throngs of people (*pêle-mêle*) is somewhat negative in tone, suggesting an unpleasant, jumbled hustle and bustle, but in Kawashima's rendering the scene seems to be merely one of many people coming together in a thriving marketplace. The impression one takes away from the Japanese is that the place is, if anything, a sign of the rising economic development of Japan. Kawashima once again feels the need to clarify that the reason for Passepartout's alienation is his lack of friends in the place. Kawashima seems to have included this clarification as way of explaining away the parallel between Hottentots and the Japanese—something that likely struck him as quite strange and that could potentially have sounded offensive if handled badly in the translation.

However, the most telling shifts in the Japanese translation are those in the sections where Passepartout compares the Japanese to the inhabitants of Hong Kong. In one scene, Passepartout saw a significant number of military personnel in various types of clothing. The narrative explains,

. . .au Japon, la profession de soldat est autant estimée qu'elle est dédaignée en Chine (Verne 1874, 126).
[. . .in Japan, the profession of the soldier is held in as much high esteem as it is scorned in China.]

Kawashima has rendered this in a way that sounds even more grandiose.

Kore kedashi Nihon wa Shinkoku no fū ni hanshi heiji ni ōshō suru o ei to suru no fūshū nareba naran
是蓋シ日本ハ清国ノ風ニ反シ兵事ニ鞅掌スルヲ栄トスルノ風習ナレバナラン
(Kawashima 1878/2002, 168)
[This was probably because in Japan, unlike Qing (dynasty China), it was the custom that people would treat it as an honor to do military service.]

In the years before and after the Meiji Restoration, many people felt that the solution to Japan's future lay in creating a *fukoku kyōhei* (富国強兵 "wealthy nation and strong military"). Military service had been opened to the public so that it was no longer just former members of the samurai class who could serve but a much broader segment of the male population. Military service was viewed not just as an honor but also as a way of serving the nation. Here, Kawashima's augmentation seems to be subtly projecting contemporary values onto the text in a way that would make Japan sound more advanced and progressive than imperial China.

The most striking comparison between Japan and China comes in a passage where Passepartout looks out at a crowd of people. He describes the characteristics of the Japanese as follows.

. . .chevelure lisse et d'un noir d'ébène, tête grosse, buste long, jambes grêles, taille peu élevée, tient coloré depuis les sombres nuances du cuivre jusqu'au blanc mat, mais jamais jaune comme celui des Chinoise, dont les Japonais diffèrent essentiellement. (Verne 1874, 126)
[. . .smooth hair as black as ebony, big heads, long necks, spindly legs, rarely tall stature, having colorations from the somber hues of copper to a flat white, but never yellow like those of the Chinese, from which the Japanese differ in fundamental ways.]

> Danshi wa ōmune ashi hosoku shite katsu mijikaku minotake shō naru o ta to su zujō shikkoku no yuhite motodori o tsukuri yōgan arui wa dōshoku no rikoku naru mono ari arui wa shiroki mono aredomo Shinkokujin no gotoku kōi no mono wa ichinin mo arazu
> 男子ハ概ネ足細クシテ且短ク幹材小ナルヲ多トス　頭上漆黒ノ結ヒテ髻ヲ作リ容顔或ハ銅色ノ黧黒ナル者アリ或ハ白キ者アレドモ　清国人ノ如ク黄萎ノ者ハ壱人モアラズ (Kawashima 1878/2002, 168–69)
> [The men had, for the most part, thin and short legs, and many of them had small trunks. The lacquer-black hair on their heads was tied in a bundle. There were people who had faces that were either a darkened bronze or white, but there was not a single person who had the weakened yellow like the people of the Qing nation.]

The parts of Verne's description that are not entirely flattering, such as the "big heads" and "spindly legs," are rendered in slightly more neutral vocabulary in Japanese. The most striking word choice in Kawashima's rendition is the word *kōi* (黄萎), made up of the characters "yellow" and "withered" in the description of the skin color of the Chinese. This turn of phrase is unmistakably close to the word *iōbyō* (萎黄病) in Japanese, which means "chlorosis," an illness brought on by iron deficiency in the blood and characterized by weakness and paleness. Verne's relatively neutral term "yellow," which refers simply to skin pigmentation, has been rendered in an overtly offensive way that reflects a clear sense of Japanese racial superiority. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that in these passages one sees signs of the racial chauvinism that would culminate in the Sino-Japanese war little more than a decade after this translation was published.

As Lawrence Venuti and countless other scholars of translation have noted, all translations show traces of the particular moment in time in which they were created. If anything, translations that are able to speak to their moment in time sometimes strike a better chord among the reading population and find a wider audience. Venuti notes that translation "tends to privilege certain domestic values" and thus tends to establish "a canon of foreign texts that is necessarily partial because it serves certain domestic interests" (1998, 71).[5] One sees this in Kawashima's handling of the passages about the military and the Chinese, which seem to be reflecting a discourse that was circulating in Japan at the moment that he was writing. Indeed, one cannot help but wonder if the fact that the translation "confirmed" Japanese thoughts about their own place in the world didn't help sell the book to domestic Japanese audiences.

Certainly, there are a number of places in the text where Kawashima has inscribed domestic cultural values upon Verne's original, but the very fact that one is able to match passages in the translation so closely with passages in the original means that there is still a relatively strong degree of correspondence between the two, even if there are subtle but significant ways in which the texts diverge. If anything, Kawashima's translation is a remarkable testament to the ability of a skilled writer to use the stylized, Chinese-inflected style of the time to produce a vibrant rendition of a Western text. As the next section will show,

[5] Venuti shows how translations from different moments in time can be compared in order to document the changing attitudes of the target audience.

Kawashima's approach to translation is very different from one of his contemporaries—a translator who fundamentally rewrote the story, taking only the general gist of the work and retelling it in his own terms.

Niwa Jun'ichirō's *Spring Tale of Flowers and Willows*

Four months after Kawashima published the first volume of his translation of Verne, Niwa Jun'ichirō published the first volume of *Ōshū kiji: Karyū shunwa:* (literally "Strange Happenings in Europe: Spring Tale of Blossoms and Willows"), which would become one of the biggest best sellers of the early Meiji period. Like Kawashima, Niwa was not initially set on being a translator or writer by trade. He came from a samurai background, and after studying in Tokyo and Kōchi he went in 1870 to Britain to study with government support. After studying English in London, he studied administrative law at the University of Edinburgh, where he stayed until 1874. He was in Japan for only a few years before returning to Great Britain in 1877, this time staying in London, studying law, and taking the exam to become a barrister. Soon after publishing *Karyū shunwa* his career took a dramatic turn after a falling out with the Niwa family who had adopted him during his youth. He abandoned the Niwa name, took the name Oda (織田), gave up law altogether, and dedicated himself to writing full time.[6] The scholar Yanagida Izumi (柳田泉, 1894–1965) has noted that when Niwa was young he was a great admirer of Benjamin Disraeli, a British writer and politician who managed to balance his writing with a political career that took him all the way to the office of the Prime Minster. Although this model appealed to him during his youth, it is unclear how strongly Niwa was ever wedded to his hope of being a lawyer or politician himself (Yanagida 1961, 304).

In any case, the book that Niwa published in 1878 was the first volume in a multi-volume translation that combined Bulwer-Lytton's novel *Ernest Maltravers* (1837) and its sequel *Alice* (1838) into a single grandiose work. The book was an immediate hit, appealing to Japanese readers in an era when everything Western was of great interest. No doubt many readers were drawn to it by the title, with its use of the character *shun* (春 spring), which was used in both Chinese and Japanese texts to imply the flowering of adolescence and by extension romance and eroticism. Indeed, the plot describes a virtuous but poor young woman who leaves her family to go and live with a man of expectations, but after they start an affair, fate separates them. It takes them many hundreds of pages to find one another again but by then much has changed. The winding plot about separation and reunion no doubt

[6] Some literary histories refer to him by the name Oda, but since Niwa was the name that appeared on the cover of *Karyū shunwa,* that is how I shall refer to him in this chapter. For instance, Yanagida (1961, 299–320), which provides the source for much of what we know about Niwa, uses the name Oda, no doubt because Yanagida knew him personally later in life when he was using that name.

appealed to readers who had seen similar plots elsewhere in Japanese literature, and the fact that the book engages in the tendency, common in Japanese literature of the time, to *kanzen chōaku* (勧善懲悪 "advocate virtue and chastise vice") meant that the moral implications of the story were immediately comprehensible to Japanese readers. The book was such a success that it spawned numerous imitations. The translator and critic Tsubouchi Shōyō once recalled "the power of *Karyū shunwa* in those days was so great that people felt compelled to use the words 'spring' and 'talk' in their own titles" (Quoted in Yanagida 1961, 14). *Karyū shunwa* also inspired a wave of translations of Bulwer-Lytton's works in Japan. Though he was just one of many popular authors of the era, as translator after translator tried his hand at rendering Bulwer-Lytton's many novels into Japanese, the author's fame grew in early Meiji Japan to enormous proportions. (Indeed, because of these translations Bulwer-Lytton is now better remembered in Japan than in his own country, where he has completely fallen out of the canon of British literature.)

Interestingly, on the cover of the title Niwa's name appears in big letters along with a *kōetsu* (校閲 "examiner"), an established writer by the name of Hattori Seiichi (服部誠一, 1841–1908) who lent his name and cultural authority to the text. Bulwer-Lytton's name only appears inside on the very first page of the novel. One reason for this is that Bulwer-Lytton was not yet known in Japan, and his name did not yet have any cultural capital. At the same time, this is probably also a reflection of Niwa's outlook on translation. Whereas Kawashima seemed to see his work as a form of transnational collaboration and thus put both the author and his own name on the cover, Niwa takes the biggest part of the credit for himself. The word *yaku* (訳) does appear after his own name, indicating that he, or perhaps the publisher, thought of Niwa as only a translator, but as one quickly sees in comparing the English and Japanese, the latter is so free that if one were to place it into Dryden's schematic it could only be called an "imitation."

Even a brief glance is enough to show that Niwa's rendition diverges radically from Bulwer-Lytton's text. Here is one passage from the beginning of chapter eight. In this important scene, Alice, a girl from a poor family, is finally beginning to feel at home in the house of Ernest Maltravers, the man who has taken her in.

> It was a lovely evening in April; the weather was unusually mild and serene for that time of year in the northern districts of our isle, and the bright drops of a recent shower sparkled upon the buds of the lilach [*sic*]and laburnum that clustered round the cottage of Maltravers. The little fountain that played in the center of a circular basin, on whose clear surface the broadleaved water-lily cast its fairy shadow—added to the fresh green of the lawn—
>
> "And softè as velvèt the yongè grass,"
>
> on which the rare and early flowers were closing their heavy lids. (Bulwer-Lytton 1838, 44)

The text is full of detailed descriptions, and the structure of the sentences are complex enough and full of British cultural elements, such as the unexplained insertion of a line of poetry, that the passage would likely have felt unwieldy and perhaps even confusing to a Japanese audience if reproduced with the utmost attention to the syntactical relationships of the original. Niwa radically truncated

the text and captured only the main idea; namely, that a lush spring has come to England.

> Token chi ni sakende ryokuju, in o nashi ban'ō, kuchi o kanshite botan, hana o tsukentoshi atakamo kore shunmatsu kasho no ten nari
> 杜鵑血に叫ンデ緑樹、陰ヲ成シ晩鶯、口ヲ箝シテ牡丹、花ヲ着ントシ恰モ是レ春末夏初ノ天ナリ (Niwa 1878/1972, 15).[7]
> [The cuckoo cried out for all it was worth, the green trees formed shadows; after the bush warbler, chirping so late in the spring, closed its mouth, the peonies and blossoms seemed to try to come forth; the weather most befitting late spring and early summer.][8]

Niwa also omitted many portions of the source text, including details about climate, the rain upon the flowers, the fountain (something few Japanese at the time would have ever seen), and the short line of poetry. At the same time, Niwa made a number of shifts that suggest what he thought would sound poetic within the lexicon of Chinese-inflected Japanese texts. For instance, he has substituted the British flowers "lilach [*sic*] and laburnum" with "peonies and flowers," which most Japanese readers would have understood to mean cherry blossoms. Whereas the cherry blossoms represents a flower that has appealed to the Japanese imagination for centuries because of its intense beauty and short duration, the peony is a lush and beautiful flower more strongly associated with the Chinese-style arts. Niwa gave another nod to Chinese poetry by using the Chinese name for the *token* (杜鵑 cuckoo), as well as the idiom *chi ni sakende* (literally "call out in blood")—a set phrase borrowed from Chinese poetry that suggests a bird chirping with all of its might. As if these flowers and birds were not enough, he also introduced another bird, *uguisu* (鶯the bush warbler), using the poetic Chinese word *ban'ō,* which refers to a bird that sings late in the season. In other words, these short few lines present a jumbled variety of birds and flowers that readers accustomed to the conventions of the "high" literary style would have thought of as poetic. Rather than trying to introduce elements of the foreign culture, he opted instead for the poetic symbols associated in Chinese and Japanese writing with the season, thus drawing upon the assumptions of what educated Japanese readers expected to find in a text written in the "high" literary language.

The changes in the passage that immediately follows are even more dramatic. Here is the original followed by Niwa's translation:

> That twilight shower had given a racy and vigorous sweetness to the air, which stole over many a bank of violets, and slightly stirred the golden ringlets of Alice, as she sat by the side of her entranced and silent lover. They were seated on a rustic bench just without the cottage, and the open windows behind them admitted the view of that happy room, with its litter of books and musical instruments—eloquent of the POETRY of HOME. (Bulwer-Lytton 1838, 44)

[7] For ease of reading, Niwa (1878/1972), the mostly widely available version of the text, includes punctuation marks that were not present in the original text.

[8] For a different translation of this same passage see Cockerill (2006).

> Toki ni miru shūbaku nakaba hiraite sōka ni bankan no sho o tsumi heika sakan ni hokorobite shōjō ni itchō no kin o oki naka ni ka naru ichi shōjo ari. Atama ni unryoku no bihatsu o musunde mi ni senkan no bii o tsuke zashite rōchū no ōmu ni shinshi o oshiyu 時ニ見ル繍幕半バ開ヒテ窓下ニ萬巻ノ書ヲ積ミ瓶花盛ンニ綻ビテ牀上ニ 一張ノ琴ヲ置キ中に佳ナル一少女アリ。頭ニ雲綠ノ美髪ヲ結ンデ身ニ浅紺ノ美衣ヲ着テ坐シテ籠中ノ鸚鵡ニ新詩ヲ教ユ (Niwa 1878/1972, 15)
> [If one were to glance through the half-open embroidered curtain, under the window, seated among the piles of countless books and the vase full of flowers, which were blooming so profusely, on the bed among where a koto had been placed, there was a beautiful girl. She had her hair done in an lavish hairstyle, and she was wearing beautiful clothes of pale blue; she was seated, teaching her caged parrot poetry in the new style.]

Again, Niwa has captured the general point—the scene shows a beautiful young girl by her room—but beyond that, almost every detail differs from the source text. In the English source text, Alice sits with her partner just outside the open window, but in the Japanese, she sits inside, apparently alone except for her parrot. Once again, Niwa has domesticized the text, but in ways that Japanese readers would have found poetic. "Golden ringlets," if translated literally would have sounded terribly foreign to Japanese readers who had never seen blond hair. Perhaps it is for that reason that Niwa used a phrase from classical Chinese poetry to describe her hair, the word *unryoku* (雲綠 literally "cloud green"), which likens her hair to a cloud of leaves on a tree. The musical instruments have been turned into a *koto* (琴), a traditional East Asian instrument that would at the time been unknown in England where the story was allegedly taking place.

Perhaps the most amusing modification comes in the final lines, in which she speaks to her caged parrot. The parrot would no doubt have struck Japanese readers as exotic and foreign, but what is especially curious is that she is teaching it *shinshi* (新詩 "new poetry"). The term *shi* was used originally in Japan to refer to Chinese poetry, which, because of its length and interest in rhyme-like patterns, stood in stark contrast to the short unrhymed forms of poetry written in Japan. As Japanese writers came into greater contact with the West, they realized that the poetic principles at work in the West were profoundly different from those in Japan. The Japanese resuscitated the word *shi* to refer to this newly discovered form of poetry, which was typically longer than the poetry found in Japan. In short, *shinshi* refers to poetry written in the Western style, but it is a term that grew specifically out of the Japanese context and could only have been used in Japan.

The overall impression of this sentence, as well as the ones that came before, is that the narrator is Japanese and is peering through a telescope toward the West and describing what he sees there; however, whatever does not fit into the highly codified, Chinese-inflected "high" language of *kanbun yomikudashibun-chō*, he abandons, simplifies, or forces into his own set vocabulary. Unlike Kawashima's translation of Verne, which borrows occasional elements of the "low" vernacular language or uses the creative power of kanji characters to form neologisms, Niwa is less inventive and polyvocal, choosing instead to draw upon the poetic vocabulary of the Sino-Japanese classics.

If one were to think about Niwa's translation in terms of Schleiermacher, it is clear that it brings the author into the world of the reader by "domesticizing" many

elements of the text. However, this is a particular form of "domesticization" in that Niwa does not use the language and cultural elements that are close to the everyday lives of the Japanese of the era; instead he uses a form of language that was heavily inflected with classical Chinese references that could likely be understood only by educated readers. In other words, his "domesticization" is not entirely "domestic," because he did not use the vernacular language used by people in Japan for everyday interactions. The particular ways in which he modified the text—substituting Chinese elements in a story that was supposed to be about Britain—were shaped by the expectations associated with the literary language of *kanbun yomikudashibun-chō*. The resulting text is, in a sense, caught in a complicated cultural tug-of-war between three literary traditions—those of England, China, and Japan.

Just a few years later in 1884, Niwa (who by this time had changed his surname to Oda) published a modified version of the text entitled *Tsūzoku karyū shunwa* (通俗花柳春話), which softens the heavily Chinese-inflected language into a looser, more Japanese-inflected style that was more accessible to Japanese readers and one step closer to the vernacular language. This version was, in essence, a translation of his own translation into a style that was easier for less educated Japanese to read, thus suggesting that the author felt a need to bridge the distance separating the various forms of writing within the complicated polyglossia of the time. Interestingly, these changes are primarily at the level of simple diction and verb endings. Rather than retranslating the book from scratch and finding new vernacular Japanese turns of phrase, it seems that Niwa simply made minor changes to his *kanbun yomikudashibun-chō* version. If he had retranslated the text he might not have had to give in so much to the cultural expectations associated with the "high" literary language of *kanbun yomikudashibun*, but even in the new version he keeps the Chinese-inflected elements throughout.

Interestingly, in this new version Niwa explained for the first time in print why he wanted to translate the work. He stated that there are three types of history: histories of laws, histories of wars, and histories of manners and customs. The novel, which takes place within the world of British manners and customs, provides a look at that history from the inside. The translation therefore had much to teach the Japanese about the customs of the West and could assist the Japanese in understanding the history of modern England (Oda 1884, 1: 1–2).[9] In other words, Niwa saw translation as having a pedagogical function, one that allowed the reader to access information about the ways people live and behave.

From the point of view of the early twenty-first century, when imitations are rarely considered "good" translations, it may be hard to imagine how Niwa thought he could help readers learn about Britain when so many details relating to British life and culture were excised, reduced, or modified to the point of unrecognizability. Yanagida Izumi has explained that the goal of *Karyū shunwa* was not the introduction of the "symbolic, intellectual West," but rather the introduction of the *jōteki*

[9] This book does not have through pagination. The page numbering starts anew in each section.

seiyō (情的西洋 "emotional West") through concrete examples of how people behaved in certain situations (1961, 13). Shinkuma Kiyoshi has also suggested that even though many of the small cultural details in the text vanished almost completely, the book did teach people a good deal about the behavior and the literary customs of the British. He notes that *Karyū shunwa* was different from other works of Japanese literature written up to that point in that they focused on what the characters were thinking, feeling, doing, and the emotional effects of those events. The internal worlds of the characters are not just a small part of a larger tale as they might be in a Japanese novel; they are central and are in fact what construct the tale (Shinkuma 2008, 66). This is an important point that helps explain why the work continued to have a strong Western air about it, even after Niwa domesticized the text in ways that aligned it with the traditions of the *kanbun yomikudashibun-chō* literary style.

Cracks in the Polyglossic System

These two case studies show how radically different translation strategies were being used among the earliest Japanese translators. Both the metaphrase, foreignizing approach used by Kawashima in translating Verne and the imitative, domesticizing approached used by Niwa in translating Bulwer-Lytton represented equally valid approaches to "translating" a foreign text in Meiji Japan. In fact, if one were to judge from the huge commercial success of Niwa's adaptive translation, Japanese audiences seemed to like the adaptations as much if not more than metaphrase texts because the former made the Western text accessible and vibrant in ways that an educated Japanese audience could understand.

What is also clear is that Kawashima and Niwa had radically different relationships with the "high" literary language. Niwa embraces the sinified traditions of the *kanbun yomikudashibun* style, excising references to British culture and replacing them at almost every turn with elements of Chinese culture. In other words, the expectations imposed by the linguistic situation of Japan guide his hand as he brings the English text into Japanese. Meanwhile, Kawashima is much more inventive with his writing. He does not give in to the tendency to pull out codified turns of phrase or engage in flowery Chinese language; instead, he invents a crisp, clear style that attempts to get at the sense and structure of the original French. When language fails him, he invents neologisms or borrows slightly from the vernacular language and incorporates these things in ways that are not terribly intrusive. As mentioned above, Kawashima's translation of Verne stands as a testament to the flexibility of the literary *kanbun yomikudashibun-chō* style to represent new ideas and styles when used in creative ways.

As time went on, however, a number of Meiji-period writers began to decry the lack of flexibility in the stylistics of the time, feeling that the demands of the literary system to write in a "high," codified style did not give them enough freedom to represent the ideas, voices, and patterns they found in Western literature. One sees

translators beginning to rebel against the codified language of *kanbun yomikudashibun* in the introduction to the 1885 book *Kenshidan* (繋思談), a translation of Bulwer-Lytton's 1873 novel *Kenelm Chillingly* by Fujita Shigekichi (藤田茂吉, 1852–1892) and Ozaki Yasuo (尾崎康夫, dates unknown). The translators write that because *haishi* (稗史historical fiction) belongs to the language arts, one should expect "to see its finest products in the coupling of *kōan* (構案structure) and *bunji* (文辞rhetoric)." However, they note that translators in Japan do not show enough consideration for the links between structure, language, and content and argue that structure and rhetoric "should work together to create "a sort of translationese" (*isshu no yakubuntai* 一種ノ訳文体), and when the language does not permit them do so, translators should make every effort to represent the appearance of the original text. They also note, "The fine details of such a text will break the rules of our language; this is something that should happen and yet we reflect badly upon such texts. In conveying the fine nuances of thought, this is something that cannot be helped" (Fujita and Ozaki 1885, 1–2). In other words, the translators felt that when the codified language and rhetorical structures of *kanbun yomikudashibun* got in the way, they should not give in to standard formalities and pleasantries. Instead, they should work to find ways to represent the nuances of the text, even if that meant departing from the conventions of literary language and producing unusual-sounding language. Equally importantly, Fujita and Ozaki imply that it is important for readers to understand that a good translation is not necessarily one that reads smoothly as flawless prose; a good translation will attempt to capture the specificities of the original language.

The conflict between the language of the source text and the expectations of the target language once again became the main point in an essay called "Hon'yaku no kokoroe" (翻訳の心得 "What the Translator Knows") written in 1887 by Morita Shiken. Morita notes that there is an idiomatic expression in English, "take to heart," which means almost exactly the same thing as the expression *kimo ni meizu* (肝に銘ず), literally, "impress upon on the liver."[10] Morita writes, "if the original has 'take to heart,' I want to immediately translate that as *kokoro ni shirusu* (心ニ記ス)," an expression that does not exist in *kanbun yomikudashibun* or vernacular Japanese but that literally means "record on the heart." Morita argues that a translator need not necessarily translate the English expression as *kimo ni meizu* thinking only about meaning. "If you write *kokoro ni shirusu* as it is in the original, then you will not only be telling the reader that the original says something equivalent [to the already existing idiom] *kimo ni meizu*; you will also be able to convey to the reader that Westerners say 'take to heart' in situations that we would say 'impress on the liver'" (Morita 1887/1991, 284). In other words, Morita finds that the translator does not need to slavishly obey the constraints of the target language. The target language is a flexible system that can be prodded and expanded, and translators have an important role in this process. Translation, he

[10] In modern, vernacular Japanese, this expression is usually rendered *kimo ni meijiru* 肝に銘じる.

suggests, can have a pedagogical function in that translations can show readers the different ways that cultures express themselves. For that to happen the translator needs to be allowed to exercise a certain amount of freedom from the constraints of codified, literary language.

However, when one looks at Morita's translations one finds that they are often quite imitative, departing from the source text more than he implies in his arguments about metaphrase-level fidelity. Still, the argument that he advanced came to have great currency in the Meiji literary world. In 1888 Futabatei Shimei (二葉亭四迷, 1864–1909) electrified the literary world with "Aibiki (あひゞき)," his translation of Ivan Turgenev's short story "The Rendezvous." In it Futabatei experimented with the use of the vernacular language, which gave him a greater degree of flexibility in reproducing the particular idioms in the Russian original, using expressions that sounded strikingly foreign to Japanese readers but that also charmed many younger readers with their originality.

Later in 1909 the symbolist poet Kanbara Ariake (蒲原 有明, 1875–1852) wrote about his shock at encountering this translation: "Futabatei's *genbun itchi* style with its masterly use of colloquial language—that unique style—sounded so fresh [that] its echoes seemed to go on endlessly whispering in my ears. . . My reaction to the story filled my whole being; it was like music. Reading *Aibiki* was a completely new experience in my life" (Quoted in Hansen 1996, 97). With Futabatei and his translation of "Aibiki" came the first full-fledged, ambitious attempt to jettison the high, codified language of the past and to overcome the perceived limitations of the polyglossic linguistic system.[11] *Genbun itchi*, the shift away from the established "high" literary styles in favor of a more flexible system dominated by the vernacular, had started in earnest, and soon it would sweep across Japan.

References

Angles, Jeffrey. 2010. *"Yaku suru" to wa dō iu koto ka?: Hon'yaku o rekishiteki genshō toshite kangaeru* 「訳する」とはどういうことか:翻訳を歴史的現象として考える. Nichibunken fōramu shiriizu 日文研フォーラムシリーズ. Kyoto: Kokusai Nihon Bunka Kenkyū Sentā. Also available online at www.nichibun.ac.jp/graphicversion/dbase/forum/pdf/fn235.pdf.

———. 2012. "Bunkashi toshite no hon'yakugaku: Kawashima Chūnosuke no *Shinsetsu: Hachijū-nichikan sekai isshū* no jirei" 文化史としての翻訳学:川島忠之助の『新説　八十日間世界一周』の事例. *Bungaku*文学, spec. issue on translation and creativity, vol. 13, no. 4 (Jul/Aug 2012): 56–66.

Bulwer-Lytton, Edward. 1838. *Ernest Maltravers*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Cockerill, Hiroko. 2006. *Style and Narrative in Translations: The Contribution of Futabatei Shimei*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

[11] For an in-depth study of translation and its relationship to Futabatei's pioneering forays into the new stylistics see Cockerill (2006).

Dryden, John. 1680/1992. “On Translation.” In *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet, 17–31. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ferguson, Charles A. 1959/2003. “Diglossia.” In *Sociolinguistics: The Essential Readings*, edited by Christina Bratt Paulston and G. Richard Tucker, 345–58. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Fujita Shigekichi 藤田茂吉 and Ozaki Yasuo 尾崎康夫. 1885. *Kenshidan: Fūsei chōzoku* 繫思談: 諷世嘲俗. Tokyo: Buntenrō Sōsho.

Hansen, Annette Skovsted. 1996. “Leaders in Change: The Way to Official Language Reform.” In *Leaders and Leadership in Japan*, edited by Ian Neary, 89–102. London: Curzon.

Kawashima Chūnosuke 川島忠乃助. 1878/2002. “Shinsetsu Hachijū-nichikan sekai isshū” 新説: 八十日間世界一周. In *Hon’yaku shōsetsu shū ni*翻訳小説集 二, ed. Nakamaru Nobua ki中丸宣明. Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei Meiji hen新日本古典文学大系明治編第15. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2002.

Keene, Donald. 1998. *Dawn to the West: Japanese Literature in the Modern Era, Fiction*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kurashiki Bunka Kurabu 倉敷ぶんか倶楽部, ed. 2011. *Morita Shiken no sekai: Meiji no hon’yakuō, jānarisuto*, 森田思軒の世界:明治の翻訳王・ジャーナリスト. Okayama Bunko 274. Tokyo: Nihon Bunkyō Shuppan.

Morita Shiken 森田思軒. 1887/1991. “Hon’yaku no kokoroe” 翻訳の心得. In *Hon’yaku no shisō* 翻訳の思想. Nihon kindai shisō taikei 日本近代思想体系15, 285–86. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Nakamaru Nobuaki 中丸宣明. 2002. “*Shinsetsu Hachijū-nichikan sekai isshū* no ichi” 『新説 八十日間世界一周』の位置. In *Hon’yaku shōsetsu shū* 翻訳小説集. Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei Meiji hen新日本古典文学大系明治編第15, 497–506. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Niwa Jun’ichirō丹羽純一郎. 1878/1972. “Ōshū kiji: Karyū shunwa” 欧州奇事 花柳春話. In *Meiji hon’yaku bungaku shū* 明治翻訳文学集. Meiji bungaku zenshū 明治文学全集 7, 3–109. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.

Oda Jun’ichirō織田純一郎. 1884. Tsūzoku karyū shunwa通俗花柳春話. Tokyo: Sakagami Hanshichi.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. 1818/2004. “On the Different Methods of Translating.” Translated by Susan Bernofsky. In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 2nd ed., 43–63. NY: Routledge.

Shinkuma Kiyoshi 新熊 清. 2008. *Hon’yaku bungaku no ayumi: Isoppu kara Sheikusupia made* 翻訳文学のあゆみ:イソップからシェイクスピアまで. Tokyo: Sekai Shisōsha.

Tomita Hitoshi富田 仁. 1984. Jūru Verunu to Nihonジュール・ヴェルヌと日本. Tokyo: Karin Shobō.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation: Toward an Ethics of Difference*. New York: Routledge.

Verne, Jules. 1874. *Le tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours*. Bibliothèque d’Education et de Récréation. Paris: J. Hetzel et Cie.

Yanagida Izumi 柳田 泉. 1961. *Meiji shoki hon’yaku bungaku no kenkyū* 明治初期翻訳文学の研究. Tokyo: Shunshūsha, 1961.

Genbun itchi and Literary Translations in Later Nineteenth-Century Japan: The Role of Literary Translations in Forming the "*De-aru*" Style

Michiaki Kawato

Abstract In late nineteenth-century Japan, a group of literary pioneers launched the so-called *genbun itchi* (言文一致) movement. Although *genbun itchi* literally means "unification of the written and spoken language," the real objective of the group was to create a new Japanese writing style based on European languages with which they could write new European-style novels. In order to achieve this most advocates of the movement produced literal translations of European novels. However, experts on *genbun itchi* tend to focus too much on the movement's original works and too little on its translations. As a result they sometimes fail to grasp some of the essential points of the movement. One of the most conspicuous examples is the use of "*de-aru*" at the end of sentences, which is essential to the modern writing style. Without taking translations into consideration, one cannot understand the process of how the word came into existence. Because the vernacular lacked the equivalent for the English verb "be" they set their sights on the word "*de-aru,*" which was largely used in the word-for-word translations of European language textbooks.

In this paper, I will focus on the word and its variant forms including "de-atta" and "de-arō" and scrutinize the process by which they were introduced by the advocates of the *genbun itchi* movement and were extended to various forms of written communication before they finally came to be regarded as essential to the modern style.

Keywords Genbun itchi • de-aru • Futabatei Shimei • Translation • Diglossia

M. Kawato (✉)
Faculty of Science and Engineering, Chūō University, Tōkyō
e-mail: mkawato@kc.chuo-u.ac.jp

J. Árokay et al. (eds.), *Divided Languages?*, Transcultural Research – Heidelberg Studies on Asia and Europe in a Global Context, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-03521-5_12,

Introduction

Development of the written Japanese language was influenced by Chinese classics, which formed the main channel introducing Chinese culture to Japan. To read these classics more efficiently Japanese developed a unique method of reading Chinese passages according to Japanese grammar and word order that heavily influenced the written Japanese language. People continued to use the vernacular in daily conversation, however, and a significant gap developed between the written and spoken language with the passage of time. This gap was largely accepted without any sense of inconvenience and people continued to rely on Chinese classics for knowledge and learning. However, the situation changed completely in the late nineteenth century when Japan ended its 200-year-long policy of isolation and opened its doors again to Western countries. As Western books and products flooded in, the old problems with the Japanese language became apparent. The language, especially in its written form, was useful for reading Chinese classics but proved inefficient for communicating the content of Western books. A new version of written Japanese that was more compatible with Western languages would have to be developed for Japanese people to acquire the knowledge necessary to establish a new Western-style state. This was the main reason for the launch of the so-called *genbun itchi* (言文一致) movement. Contrary to the meaning of this term, which focused on unifying the written and spoken language, the real objective of the group that launched this movement was to create a new Japanese writing style modeled after European languages so that they could write novels in the European style. However, the studies that aim to research how the movement shaped a new style tend to focus on the movement's original works. Due to a lack of focus on the translations of the time, they sometimes fail to grasp some of the essential points of the movement.

The use of "*de-aru,*" (a word that was created anew in the process of *genbun itchi)* at the end of sentences was essential to the modern writing style. But only when translations are taken into consideration can we understand how this word came into existence. For example, the sentence "He is a poor workman" was easily translated into old written Japanese as "Kare wa mazushiki yōfu nari" (彼は貧しき傭夫なり) by Morita Shiken (森田思軒1861–1897) (Hugo 1890, 19). However, translating the same sentence into the vernacular would require changing it to something too polite (or honorific) like 'Kare wa mazushii yōfu desu' (彼は貧しい傭夫です) or something too rude such as 'Kare wa mazushii yōfu da' (彼は貧しい傭夫だ). Relying only on the vernacular, such phrases could not be translated into Japanese because the vernacular lacked the equivalent for the English verb "be." In order to create a new style based on European languages they had to devise a word that mediated between "*desu*" and "*da*."

In other words, the history of the new written style is, to a large degree, the history of the introduction and acceptance of the word "*de-aru*." The success of the new style largely depended on whether the word was accepted by the public or not.

Contradictions to the Prevailing View

In modern Japanese writing sentences often end with "*de-aru,*" "*desu,*" or "*da*." The word "*de-aru*" is rarely used in daily conversation but is extremely common in most types of writing, including literary works, essays, newspaper and magazine articles, and even in elementary school textbooks. This is contrary to the common belief that today's written language is based on the spoken language. Why was such a word adopted?

To find the answer we must return to the point when advocates of the *genbun itchi* movement first introduced the expression. Shimamura Hōgetsu (島村抱月 1871–1918), a contemporary critic, wrote the following about the word:

> In English, the verb "be" can be used when speaking with anyone including seniors, juniors, superiors, and inferiors. However, vernacular Japanese lacks the equivalent word. "Desu" sounds too polite and "da" sounds too impolite for general use in writing. The word "nari" in the old language was the equivalent of "be", but we decided not to use it.
>
> In trying to create a new written language based on the vernacular, Ozaki Kōyō (尾崎紅葉 1868–1903) is held to have been the first to devise the word "de-aru," which mediates between "desu" and "da." As a result, the word is now commonly used. (Shimamura 1929, 209)

In short, the word "*de-aru*" was essential to the language reform aimed at raising the spoken language to the status of the literary language. But who was actually the first to introduce the word into literary works? The prevailing view, as suggested by Hōgetsu, is that it was Ozaki Kōyō; however, various facts contradict this view. For example, Yamada Bimyō (山田美妙1868–1910), a pioneer of the new style, used "*de-atta*" (the past form of "*de-aru*") at the end of sentences five years earlier than Kōyō. His work, *Musashino* (武蔵野 1887), included at least five examples, including:

> Saburō wa jūku de Oshimo wa jūshichi de atta.
> 三郎は十九で忍藻 (おしも)は十七であつた。(Yamada 1888, 115)
> Saburo was 19 and Oshimo was 17.

Futabatei Shimei (二葉亭四迷 1864–1909), another pioneer of the new style, used "*de-aru*" and its variant forms "*de-atta*", "*de-arō,*" and "*de-attarō*" over fifteen times in *Ukigumo* (浮雲 *Floating Clouds*) part 3, more than three years before Kōyō. One example is:

> [Sore wa] . . .chichioya no kuchi kara toku to Osei ni iikikaseru to iu issaku de aru.
> [それは]. . .父親の口から篤とお勢に言い聞かせる、といふ一策で有る。 (Futabatei 1889b, 11)
> [It is] . . .an idea that he asks Osei's father to advise her to be more careful.

These facts are clearly inconsistent with the prevailing view and we must reconsider from the beginning how the word was introduced into literary works.

The Source of "de-aru"

Where, then, did "*de-aru*" come from? According to Shimamura Hōgetsu, the word "*de-aru*" was not part of the Edo dialect but was a word of foreign origin deriving from the so-called Yokohama dialect (*Yokohama kotoba* 横浜言葉). The people of Edo would not have used, what they would have considered, an awkward word, which placed "*a*" after "*de*" in this way (Shimamura 1901, 32). Thus, Hōgetsu suggests that "*de-aru*" originated from the foreigners' settlement in Yokohama.

To confirm whether this is true or not, one must consult academic studies. One of the most reliable of these was Yamamoto Masahide's (山本正秀 1907–1980) thesis on the history of "*de-aru*" and other predicative auxiliary verbs entitled "A Historical Study of the Words at the End of Sentences in the *Genbun itchi* Style." His findings on "*de-aru*" and "*da*" can be summarized as follows:

> The predicative auxiliary verbs "de-aru," "de-a," "da," and "ja" evolved in the following manner: にてあり (nite-ari) → にてある (nite-aru) → である (de-aru) → であ (de-a) → だ (da) orぢゃ (ja).
>
> By the end of the Muromachi period (1336–1573), people used "ja" in the Kansai Region (the area including Kyōto and Ōsaka) and "da" in the Kantō Region (the area including Edo). Eventually, these two words became so popular that "de-aru", especially at the end of sentences, practically stopped being used. As a result, the main predicative auxiliary verbs during the Edo period were "ja (ぢゃ)," "da (だ)," "gozaru (ござる)," and "gozarimasu (ござります)." The word "desu (です)" was also used in limited communities such as the gay quarters. (Yamamoto 1971, 485–86)

As Yamamoto points out, people stopped using "*de-aru*" at the end of sentences during the Edo period. This claim is supported by the traditional Rakugo stories of Sany'ūtei Enchō (三遊亭円朝 1839–1900), one of the leading professional storytellers of the late Edo and early Meiji periods. His stories, written in short hand, include examples of "*de-aru*" (such as "*de-atta-ga*" and "*de-arō-na*") in the middle of sentences but no examples of "*de-aru*" at the end of sentences (San'yūtei 1885, 1–22).

Why then did "*de-aru*" later reappear at the end of sentences? As Hōgetsu pointed out, "*de-aru*" was a word of foreign origin that was often seen in language textbooks used in Yokohama and in other foreigners' settlements. Here we can cite an example from the conversational textbook entitled *Eibei taiwa shōkei* (英米対話捷径 *A Shortcut to English Conversation*) edited by Nakahama Manjirō (中濱万次郎 1827–1898), a returnee from the United States.

> It is serene weather.
> それ　ある＝　うららかなる　ひよりで＿ (Nakahama 1859, 13)
> Sore　aru　urarakanaru　hiyori de

This kind of translation, then called '*chokuyaku*' (直訳 direct translation), was intended to enhance the efficiency of foreign language instruction and to simplify study. As a rule, only one Japanese equivalent was used for each foreign word, such as "*sore*" (それ) for "it" and "*aru*" (ある) for "is." One of the few exceptions to this rule was when a noun like "*hiyori*" (ひより weather) followed the verb "*aru*" ('be'

or 'is') as in the above sentence. Since the Japanese language usually requires the postpositional word "*de*" (で) to follow a noun, "*hiyori*" became "*hiyori de*" (ひよりで). And when the Japanese translation above is rearranged according to Japanese grammar, the sentence becomes "sore wa ura rakanaru hiyori de aru." This is why a word as awkward as "*de-aru* (である)" reappeared at the end of sentences after vanishing for one or two hundred years.

The Spread of "de-aru" in the Educational World

How widely did the word spread among students of foreign languages? Judging from the "Yokohama Language" that Hōgetsu referred to, the word was apparently used within foreign settlements from the beginning. However, when Japan gave up its 200-year isolation policy and opened its doors to Western countries in 1858, foreign books full of new Western knowledge flooded Japan. In order to read these books people first had to learn Western languages. Enthusiasm for learning foreign languages therefore rapidly grew, and dictionaries and reading books using the "*de-aru*" style spread far beyond the settlements of foreign residents.

As time passed enthusiasm for learning foreign languages only grew. Under the reformed educational law in 1886, English could be taught in elementary schools and even school children recited sentences such as 'Fukurō wa tori de aru' ("フクロウハ トリデ アル The owl is a bird.") (Nishiyama 1883, 10).

Things progressed to the point that the "Yokohama Language" could be more accurately called the "*kyōtsūgo*" (共通語 common language) circulating among all students trying to learn foreign languages.

In fact, when the *genbun itchi* movement started in the literary world around 1887, the textbooks written in the "*de-aru*" style were so common that they were referred to even in literary works. The heroine in Futabatei's *Ukigumo*, for example, learned English using the grammar from *Guide to Swinton's New Language Lessons,* which started with the following sentence.

> Bunpō wa kokugo no dōri ni tsuite ronzuru tokoro no gakumon de aru.
> 文法ハ国語ノ道理ニツイテ論ズル所ノ学問デアル (Saitō 1884, 126)
> Grammar is the science that treats of [*sic*] the principles of language. (Saitō 1884, 126)

Among ten different guidebooks on the same grammar, nine adopted "*de-aru*" sentences. *Guide to Swinton's New Language Lessons* was one of the most popular grammar books in those days, and many students who used it also intended to study subjects like law, economics, literature, philosophy, science, and engineering in English.

Thus, "*de-aru*" sentences were commonly used in the educational world before other communities. In other words, the educational world was the first to begin standardizing the Japanese language and adapt it to Western languages.

Once Japan took up the slogan "*seiyō ni oitsuke oikose*" (西洋を追いかけ追い越せ catch up with the West and overtake it), the influx of "*de-aru*" sentences to the

Table 1 Early literary works written in the *genbun itchi* style

Name of work	Author	Translator	Date of issue
Ukigumo dai ippen 浮雲第一篇	Futabatei Shimei		1887, 6
Seiyō kaidan kuroneko 西洋怪談黒猫	E. A. Poe	Aeba Kōson	1887, 11
Musashino 武蔵野	Yamada Bimyō		1887, 11–12
Ukigumo dai nihen 浮雲第二篇	Futabatei Shimei		1888, 2
Aibiki あひゞき	Ivan Turgenev	Futabatei Shimei	1888, 7–8
Meguriai めぐりあひ	Ivan Turgenev	Futabatei Shimei	1888, 10–1889, 1
Hakumei no Suzuko 薄命のすゞ子	Saganoya Omuro		1888, 12–1889, 3
Ryokuyō no tan 緑葉の歎	Alphonse Daudet	Mori Ōgai Miki Takeji	1889, 2
Tama o idaite tsumi ari 玉を懐て罪あり	E.T.A. Hoffmann	Mori Ōgai Miki Takeji	1889, 3–7
Ukigumo dai sanpen 浮雲第三篇	Futabatei Shimei		1889, 7–8
Kōzui 洪水	Bret Harte	Mori Ōgai	1889, 10–1890, 3

general public could not be stopped. The only remaining problem was how to generalize and refine these sentences as part of a new style. This situation made the *genbun itchi* movement inevitable in the literary world.

The Introduction of "de-aru" into Literary Works

Who was the first to introduce the word "*de-aru*" into literary works? To find the answer, I have made a list of almost all the important early literary works written in the *genbun itchi* style, the new style based on the vernacular (Table 1).

Since this list is nearly exhaustive, the first work on the list to include the word "*de-aru*" can be regarded as the first literary work written in the "*de-aru*" style. The work is *Seiyō kaidan kuroneko* (西洋怪談黒猫, *The Black Cat, A Western Horror Story*), translated by Aeba Kōson (饗庭篁村1855–1922), which includes four "*de-aru*" variants at the end of sentences like the following:

> Kokoro ga sore jishin o kurushimete mitai to iu nozomi de atta.
> 心が其自身を苦しめてみたいといふ望みで有つた (Kōson 1996, 9–17)
> His mind was anxious to torment itself.

and

> Neko o issho ni nurikonda no de arō.
> 猫を一途(いっしょ)に塗り込んだので有らう (Kōson 1996, 9–17).
> The cat might have been put into the walls with it.

Five months before this, Futabatei Shimei used a "*de-aru*" variant in his *Ukigumo* part 1:

> Mukashikatagi no hito nara iu tokoro demo arō ka.

昔気質の人なら言ふ所でも有らうか (Futabatei 1887, 66).
A stickler for old-time ideas might say so.

However, this variant is accompanied by the postposition "*ka*" (か), making it questionable whether it could be classified as a "*de-aru* word at the end of a sentence." Therefore, we can safely say that Kōson's *Seiyō kaidan kuroneko* was the first literary work to introduce "*de-aru*" at the end of sentences.

After Kōson's *Seiyō kaidan kuroneko*, the word "*de-aru*" and its variants sprouted up in literary works like mushrooms after a rain. This was not a coincidence, but an inevitable consequence of European novels being translated based on the vernacular. It is impossible to translate any European novels without the Japanese equivalent for the verb "be." We have to remember that those who wrote in the new style were also, without exception, translators of European novels. When they tried to translate the novels they encountered the vital fact that the Japanese vernacular lacked the equivalent for the verb "be," and so they turned their attention to examples in language textbooks and found the word "*de-aru*." This explains why the word and its variants suddenly began appearing in their literary works.

Although the movement started from literary translations, it did not remain within the confines of translation. Its ultimate goal was to create a new style that would enable authors to write European-style novels. To this end, they had to create a foundation for the new style in their literary translations and then refine the style in their own original works. This process is confirmed by the fact that translations and original works were mixed in the early works written in the *genbun itchi* style. In short, the literary translations of those days can be considered testing grounds for creating a new style based on the vernacular.

Futabatei Shimei, A Pioneer of the "de-aru" Style

One of the best examples confirming how the new style was formed is Futabatei Shimei's original work *Ukigumo*. It is composed of three parts written at different times, and two translations—*Aibiki* (あひゞき *Secret Meeting*) and *Meguriai* (めぐりあひ *An Encounter*)—were written between parts two and three. If one examines the details of the styles in these works, one might grasp the process by which Futabatei developed his own style first through translations and then through original works.

In these works, the most conspicuous changes in style can be seen between *Ukigumo* part two and three. The following are examples extracted from each part:

Oba wa...osoraku wa muri to shiritsutsu, muri o narabete hitori de rippuku shite, mata hitori de rippuku shita tote mata hitori de rippuku shite tsumi mo toga mo nai Bunzō ni te o tsukashite wabisashita no de arō.
叔母は...恐らくは無理と知り宛(つゝ)、無理を陳(なら)べて一人で立腹して、また一人で立腹したとてまた一人で立腹して罪も咎も無い文三に手を杖(つ)かして謝罪(わび)さしたので有らう (Futabatei 1888a, 122)

His aunt. . .apparently knew it was unreasonable and said so, knowing it was unreasonable she got angry at herself, then she became angry about getting angry at herself and after all forced innocent Bunzo to apologize with his hands on the floor.

Osei wa jitsu ni karuhazumi de aru.
お勢は実に軽躁 (かるはづみ)で有る。(Futabatei 1889b, 11).
Osei is very flippant.

The difference is very clear. The former is long-winded and drags sloppily while the latter is brief and compact enough for the reader to grasp the whole context at a glance. In addition, the "*de-aru*" sentences in part two were written without periods while those in part three contain them. In short, what distinguishes the latter from the former is a condensed style of writing and an effective use of punctuation that makes the context easy to understand.

What caused such drastic changes in the style? As mentioned before, clues to this can be found in the translations of *Aibiki* and *Meguriai*. The following is a typical example that characterizes the style of *Aibiki*:

Jibun wa zashite, shiko shite, mimi o katamukete ita.
自分は座して、四顧して、耳を傾けていた。(Futabatei 1888b, 14)
I sat looking about and listening.

Here punctuation marks are used effectively to create a poetic repetition of the sound "*shi*" (し). Such sentences cannot be written without understanding the role of punctuation in a European language. This must have been the result of strenuous translation efforts because Futabatei later said "I tried to copy the tone of the original faithfully and if there were three commas and one period in the original, then I put three commas and one period in my translation as well" (Futabatei 1965b, 174). Such meticulous considerations resulted in "*de-aru*" sentences like this:

Sore wa. . .yōyaku kikitoreru ka kikitorenu hodo no shimeyakana shigo no koe de atta.
それは. . .漸く聞取れるか聞取れぬ程のしめやかな私語の声で有つた。(Futabatei 1888b, 15).
It was. . .a scarcely audible, drowsy chatter.

This is undoubtedly the result of an attempt at faithful translation, since "even a comma or period should not be thrown away without any reason" (Futabatei 1965b, 174). We can also find more confirmation that the word "*de-atta*" was used as an equivalent for the verb "was" or "were." Since the original was written in the past tense, the equivalent for the verb "be" was changed to the past form. This explains why "*de-atta*" was used instead of "*de-aru*" in *Aibiki*. Thus, one might say that "*de-aru*" sentences in *Aibiki* originate from a word-for-word translation of the European novel.

How did these word-for-word translations influence the original works? The best way to answer this would be to compare the "*de-aru*" sentences in *Aibiki* with those in *Ukigumo* part three, which were written one year after *Aibiki*. The following are "*de-aru*" sentences extracted from *Ukigumo* part three:

[Bunzō wa] nantonaku ochitsuki ga warui yō de atta.
[文三は]何となく落ち着きが□いやうで有ツた。(Futabatei 1889c, 30)

Bunzo seemed to be nervous in some way.

[Sono shinjō wa] osoraku wa sonna koto de arō.
[其心状は]恐らくハ其様な事で有らう。(Futabatei 1889b, 11)
It may be what happened in her mind.

[Osei wa Bunzō ni] tada honno ittoki kaburete ita no de attarō.
[お勢は文三に]只ほんの一時感染れてゐたので有ツたらう。(Futabatei 1889b, 10).
Perhaps Osei was influenced by Bunzō only for a short time.

As in these sentences, we can find many examples of "*de-aru*" sentences with punctuation marks in *Ukigumo* part three. Obviously, they can be considered examples of sentences originating from translations of European novels. In other words, they are typical examples of how the new style originating from translations was applied to original works.

We can also find examples that take us a further step forward toward the development of the new style in *Ukigumo* part three where, for example, we find a "*de-aru*" sentence like:

Ima no kanai [wa] shiyoku... mujō no katamari de aru.
今の家内[は]私欲...無情の塊で有る。(Futabatei 1971, 77)
The house is now filled with selfish... and merciless atmosphere.

What draws our attention here is that for the first time Futabatei adopted the present form of "*de-aru,*" which had not been used in *Aibiki* or *Meguriai*. In *Ukigumo* part three, he used the present form four times as well as all other forms of "*de-aru*" ("*de-atta,*" "*de-arō,*" and "*de-attarō*"). This is one of the most conspicuous examples of how the new style originating from translations was evolving into a more complete style in the original works.

As for the use of the present form, it has been pointed out that Saganoya Omuro (嵯峨の屋おむろ 1863–1947) adopted it in his *Hakumei no Suzuko* (薄命のすゞ子 *Suzuko, an Ill-Fated Girl*), eight months before Futabatei where Saganoya wrote "*de-aru*" sentences like:

Kore wa hitori no musume no me de aru.
是は一個 (ひとり) の娘の目である (Sanagoya 1889, 5)
These are the eyes of a girl.

However, unlike Futabatei, Saganoya's "*de-aru*" sentences were incomplete because they lacked the punctuation mark "。", the equivalent of a full stop in English. In addition, the present form of "*de-aru*" was used in the former half of the novel (chapters one and two) but not in the latter half (chapters three and four). All things considered, Saganoya was not confident in his use of "*de-aru*" but used it as an experiment in creating a new style.

Futabatei is a different case. He had an unshakable belief from the beginning that a new written style could not be created without imitating European novels. His belief was reflected in a strict attitude toward translations as expressed in his previously mentioned comment "even a comma or period should not be thrown

away without any reason." This attitude was also reflected in his attempts to introduce the "*de-aru*" sentences acquired through his translations into *Ukigumo* part three.

What is more, he tried to refine the new style acquired through the translations in his own original work. It was during the process of refining the new style that the present form of "*de-aru*" was introduced for the first time. With this, he completed a basic third-person narrative style, as exemplified in the following:

> Osei wa jitsuni karuhazumi de aru
> お勢は実に軽躁 (かるはづみ)で有る。(Futabatei 1889b, 11).
> Osei is very flippant.

In other words, he created a basic style that allowed him to objectively, realistically, and precisely depict characters' situations and states of mind. This was a landmark achievement that ushered in a new style and a new age that would enable Japanese writers to create Western-style novels. Thus, the honor of originating the "*de-aru*" style belongs to Futabatei Shimei rather than to Ozaki Kōyō or to Saganoya Omuro.

Uchida Roan's *Crime and Punishment* Further Developed the New Style

After 1890 the *genbun itchi* movement rapidly lost its momentum and Futabatei, who had taken a leading role in the movement, abandoned his literary career to become a government official. We can cite three main reasons for this loss of momentum: First, without models to emulate, many wrote in their own coarse style and produced unsophisticated works. Second, in those days most literary readers who were exclusively nurtured by old Japanese literature preferred the old style and showed an explicit dislike for the new style. And finally, movements toward the preservation of national characteristics began in the literary world as a reaction to rapid Europeanization. Kōda Rohan (幸田露伴1867–1947) and Ozaki Kōyō, for example, wrote in a style similar to Ihara Saikaku's (井原西鶴1642–1693), which was a mixture between the classical and colloquial styles.

It was in this context that Tsubouchi Shōyō (坪内逍遥1859–1935), a pioneer of modern Japanese literature and an advocate of realistic novels, appealed to literary circles to translate the finest European literature (Tsubouchi 1891, 59–61). Shōyō believed that this would have the following three effects: First, it would set a good example for Japanese writers in creating their own works. Second, it would cultivate new readers who would show interest in their new literature. Third, it would contribute to the development of a new written style. In other words, he believed that translating European literature was indispensable in allowing a new style to take root among the public.

Shōyō's appeal evoked a response in literary circles, especially in rising literary circles. One who responded to this call to action was Uchida Roan (内田魯庵

1868–1929) who published an incomplete translation *Shōsetsu tsumi to batsu* (小説罪と罰*Crime and Punishment, A Novel*) in 1892, based on the English translation of the Russian original by F. M. Dostoevsky.

What is most striking about this translation is that the usage of "de-aru" was expanded. For example, Roan freely used the present form of "de-aru" regardless of the tense used in the original. Here are two examples extracted from the opening chapter of his translation:

Kusari wa haganesei de atta.
鎖は鋼鉄 (はがね)製であつた。(Uchida 1972, 144)
The chain was of steel. (Dostoevsky 1911, 5)

Kare no shinkei wa sukoburu senjaku de aru.
彼の神経は頗る憫弱(せんじゃく)である。(Uchida 1972, 143)
His nerves were very weak. (Dostoevsky 1911, 4)

Roan apparently varied the tense of the word "*de-aru,*" regardless of the tense used in the original to break the monotony. This was an inevitable step in the development of the new style since most Japanese sentences end with verbs such as "*de-atta,*" as in "Kare wa funanori de atta." (彼は船乗りであった. He was a sailor.) If one adheres to the past tense, one cannot escape the monotony of repeating "*ta,*" as seen in Futabatei's *Aibiki*. Roan's deliberate variation of tense is one of the most conspicuous differences between his translations and Futabatei's.

Roan also extended the usage of "*de-aru*" to words other than "be":

Kore mo onajiku itaku kumon suru tei de aru.
是も仝じく痛く苦悶する体である。(Uchida 1972, 145)
He, too, seemed considerably agitated. (Dostoevsky 1911, 8)

His translation used "*de-aru*" to represent important words like "seem," "might," "so," and "thus," as well as the verb "be." As a result, the frequency of its usage greatly increased and its status rose to the level of an essential expression in the translation.

What is more, Roan sometimes mixed "*da*" and "*da-rō*" with "*de-aru*" and "*de-arō,*" as in the following:

Oriori jibun de jibun ni futakoto mikoto tsubuyaite wa, hajimete kore ga jibun no kuse to natta o shiru yō de aru. . . . Mi ni matouta ifuku wa yare chigirete, osoraku dare de mo kono boro o sagete hirunaka dearuku koto wa itou darō to omowareru hodo da.
折々自分で自分に二言三言呟いては、初めて是が自分の癖と為ツたを知る様である。. . .身に纏ふた衣服は破 (や)れちぎれて、恐らく誰でも此襤褸 (ぼろ)を下げて白昼中 (ひるなか)出歩く事は厭うだろうと思われる程だ。(Uchida 1972, 142)
Occasionally he muttered a few words to himself; as if, as he himself had just perceived, this had become his habit. . . .His dress [*sic*] was so miserable that anyone else might have scrupled to go out in such rags (Dostoevsky 1911, 2).

This mixture was also aimed at escaping the monotony of repeating "*de-aru*" and "*de-atta*." What he tried to accomplish here was a diversification of the words at the end of sentences so they would be as consistent as possible with the new style based on the vernacular. He knew the word "*de-aru*" was not from the vernacular but from the word-for-word translations of foreign textbooks. It was for this reason

that he tried so hard to refine it and to merge it into the new style. His efforts eventually led to a style that is very similar to the modern style. We can see this as a major advance toward creating the new style. Along with Futabatei Shimei, Uchida Roan should be remembered as someone who made a notable contribution to the development of the new style.

The Influence of Ozaki Kōyō

Roan's *Shōsetsu tsumi to batsu* drew little attention and was never completed. As a result, his new style did not become well known to the public. For the style to become rooted in the public sphere someone more influential would have to devote his energies to the project. Nobody was more qualified for this than Ozaki Kōyō, who had a great deal of influence in the literary world. Kōyō was using "*de-aru*" in his novels almost concurrently with Roan. His style was as follows:

> Nani ga sore hodo osoroshii koto ga aru no de arō? . . .Kogarenuite iru onna no kao o, . . . omou zonbun mite okeba ii ni. . .nigekakureru to wa nanigoto de arō. . .Imasara hazukashii toshi de mo arumai ni./ Shikari, dare shimo sō omou sō omou no ga jōjō de aru.
> 何が其ほと恐ろしいことが有るのであらう?. . .焦れぬいてゐる女の顔を、. . .思ふ存分見ておけば可(いゝ)に. . .奔竄 (にげかく)れるとは何事であらう. . . .今更羞 (はづ)かしい年齢でもあるまいに./然 (しかり)、誰しも然う思ふ.然う思ふのが常情(じやうじやう)である。(Ozaki 1894, 124)
> What does he fear so much? He could have seen the lover's face as much as he liked. Why did he run out of her sight? He is not of an age to blush and run away from his beloved one. Yes, everyone thinks so. It is quite natural to think so.

Kōyō proceeds with the story in the present tense and uses "*de-aru*" at the end of many sentences. He does this intentionally to lend objectivity to the story. As "*de-aru*" does not contain any honorific meaning, it is natural for the narrator to keep some distance from the characters and to freely add comments about their personalities and situations. In other words, "*de-aru*" was indispensable to telling the story in the third person. Koyo knew this and used the word so often that more than 50 % of the sentences in this novel ended with "*de-aru*." His motive for adopting the style was obvious: He intended to represent things as they really were, just as European novelists did. After *Tonari no onna* 隣の女, The women next door, Kōyō continued to write a number of adaptations of European novels using the same style.

Because Kōyō was the head of an influential literary circle called *Ken'yūsha* (硯友社), many writers followed his example and adopted "*de-aru*" at the end of sentences. Thus, the *genbun itchi* style was resurrected and the "*de-aru*" style spread rapidly among the public. This was a noteworthy event because his style could also be applied to other writing that required objectivity, such as essays and articles in newspapers and magazines. As a result, Kōyō should be remembered as the greatest promoter of the "*de-aru*" style.

The Spread of the "de-aru" Style

After Kōyō's novels were published, the new writing style using "*de-aru*" became popular in various forms of writing, including literary works, newspapers, magazines, and elementary school textbooks. Some examples of how the "*de-aru*" style spread to various forms of written communication are presented by category below.

Literary Translations

In 1896 Futabatei Shimei made some alterations to the version of *Aibiki* written in 1889. One of the more notable differences between the 1889 and 1896 versions can be seen at the end of sentences such as these:

1889 version	1896 version
Makoto ni kimagure na soraai. まことに気まぐれな空ら合ひ。	Kimagure na soraai de aru. 気紛れな空合である。(Futabatei 1896, 199). The weather was unsettled.
Sore wa...shigo no koe de atta. それは...私語の声で有つた。	Sore wa...sasayagu yō na oto de aru. それは...私語 (ささやぐ)やうな音である。 (Futabatei 1896, 199). It was...a scarcely audible, drowsy chatter.

Through these alterations, various verbs at the end of sentences were changed from the past to the present tense (from "*ta*" to "*ru*"). "*De-aru,*" for example, appeared seven times in the 1896 version and zero times in the 1889 version. After these alterations Futabatei continued this policy and published more than twenty literary translations using the "*de-aru*" style.

Newspapers and Magazines

The "*de-aru*" style also spread from literary works to use in newspapers and magazines. In December 1899, Nakai Kinjo (中井錦城 1864–1924), a chief editor of *Yomiuri Shinbun* (読売新聞), a newspaper popular with the masses, wrote an editorial column in the "de-aru" style. This appears to have been the first example of an editorial column written in the style. By 1901, *Taiyō* (太陽 *The Sun*), a leading general magazine of the day, carried lots of articles written in the "*de-aru*" style in various sections ranging from the editorial column to the homemaker's column (Katō 1901, 10–15). In the years that followed writing in the "*de-aru*" style was increasingly seen in newspapers and magazines.

Elementary School Textbooks

In 1900 Tsubouchi Shōyō compiled a Japanese reading textbook for *Jinjō shōgakkō*, (尋常小学校 ordinary elementary schools) and another for *Kōtōjinjō shōgakkō* (高等尋常小学校 higher elementary schools) (Tsubouchi 1900). The former textbook included three reading sections in the "*de-aru*" style and the latter included twelve. In both, over 50 % of the reading sections were written in the new style and the rest were written in the old style. Among sections featuring the new style, about 20 % were written in the "*de-aru*" style. But what really attracts our attention is that 60 % of the sections written in the "*de-aru*" style were translations of stories extracted from foreign textbooks like "Cinderella" by Charles Perrault and "The Emperor's New Clothes" by H. C. Andersen. This illustrates the close relation between the "*de-aru*" style and literary translations.

In 1902 the Japanese-language Surveillance Commission, an advisory body to the education ministry, worked out a basic policy with which to adopt the *genbun itchi* style (Kokugo Kyōiku Kenkyū Kai 1969, 787). This further prompted the adoption of the "*de-aru*" style in elementary school textbooks. For example, the "*de-aru*" style accounted for more than 50 % of reading sections in ten to twelve textbooks compiled in 1923 (Monbushō 1922, 1923). This clearly demonstrates the vital position in elementary school reading textbooks that the "*de-aru*" style came to occupy.

Conclusion

The *genbun itchi* movement was a literary movement that sought to create and popularize a new Japanese writing style. From the beginning, its leader Futabatei Shimei recognized that it might take centuries for the style to take root in the public realm:

> What is detestable about the *genbun itchi* style is the rude expressions like "de-aru" "de-atta" and "da-rō" used at the end of sentences. In the traditional "colloquo-literary" style (*gazoku sechutai* 雅俗折衷体), however, there are unnatural expressions like "keri (けり)," "koso (こそ)," and "ramu (らむ)." They do not sound unnatural, though, because they have been used for a long time and became familiar to our ears. Similarly if we use "de-aru," "de-atta," and "da-rō" for 100 or 200 years, they might sound familiar and pleasant to our ears (Futabatei 1965a, 67).

Futabatei knew the words "*de-aru,*" "*de-atta,*" and "*da-rō*" could not be given up, however harsh they might sound, because they were indispensable to the *genbun itchi* style; the new style could not be completed without these words. As they did not contain any honorific meaning, they were suitable for stories told in the third person through narrators who kept a distance from the characters and described situations objectively. In other words, they were indispensable to the

European-style novels that he aimed to create. It was for this reason he suggested they should be used for 100 or 200 years until they were familiar to the public ear.

This demonstrates that the success or failure of the *genbun itchi* style largely depended on whether the words of "*de-aru,*" "*de-atta,*" and "*da-rō*" were accepted by the public. In other words, the history of the new style can be traced through the introduction and acceptance process of these words.

References

Aeba Kōson, trans. 1996. "Seiyō kaidan kuroneko." In *Pō shū*. Vol. 19 of *Meijihon' yaku bungaku zenshū,* edited by Kawato Michiaki and Sakakibara Takanori, 9–17. Tōkyō: Ōzorasha.

Daudet, Alphonse. 1999. "Ryokuyō no tan," translated by Mori Ōgai and Miki Takeji. In *Dōde shū*. Vol. 29 of *Meiji hon'yaku bungaku zenshū*, edited by Kawato Michiaki, Sakakibara Takanori, 9–13. Tōkyō: Ōzorasha.

Dostoevsky, Fyodor Mikhailovich. 1911. *Crime and Punishment*. London: Everyman's Library.

Futabatei Shimei. 1887. *Ukigumo* dai ippen. Tōkyō: Kinkōdō.

———. 1888a. *Ukigumo* dai nihen. Tōkyō: Kinkōdō.

———, trans. 1888b. "Aibiki." *Kokumin no tomo* 25: 14–19.

———. 1889a. "Ukigumo dai sanpen." *Miyako no hana* 18: 13–27.

———. 1889b. "Ukigumo dai sanpen." *Miyako no hana* 19: 9–17.

———. 1889c. "Ukigumo dai sanpen." *Miyako no hana* 20: 24–32.

———, trans. 1896. *Katakoi*. Tōkyō: Shun'yōdō.

———. 1965a. "Shōsetsu buntai iken." In *Futabatei Shimei zenshū,* vol. 5, 66–68. Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten.

———. 1965b. "Yo ga hon'yaku no hyōjun." In *Futabatei Shimei zenshū*, vol. 5, 173–77. Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten.

———. 1971. "Ukigumo." In *Futabatei Shimei, Saganoya Omuro shū*. Vol. 17 of *Meiji bungaku zenshū,* 3–81. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō.

Harte, Bret. 2002. "Kōzui," translated by Mori Ōgai. In *Mori Ōgai shū*. Vol. 8 of *Meiji hon'yaku bungaku zenshū,hon'yakuka hen*, edited by Kawato Michiaki, Sakakibara Takanori, 60–68. Tōkyō: Ōzorasha.

Hoffmann, E. T. A. 2002. "Tama o idaite tsumi ari," translated by Mori Ōgai and Miki Takeji. In *Mori Ōgai shū*. Vol. 8 of *Meiji hon'yaku bungaku zenshū, hon'yakuka hen*, edited by Kawato Michiaki, Sakakibara Takanori, 10–59. Tōkyō: Ōzorasha.

Hugo, Victor. 1890. "Kuraudo," translated by Morita Shiken. *Kokumin no tomo* 69:18–22.

Katō Hiroyuki. 1901. "Kokusai dōtoku no shinpo shigataki yuen" 国際道徳の進歩し難き所以 *Taiyō* 7 (8): 10–15.

Kokugo Kyōiku Kenkyū Kai. 1969. *Kokugo kokuji kyōiku shiryō sōran*. Tōkyō: Kokugo Kyōiku Kenkyū Kai.

Monbushō. 1922, 1923. *Jinjō shōgaku kokugo tokuhon*, 12 vols. Tōkyō: Tōkyō shoseki.

Nakahama Manjirō. 1859. *Eibei taiwa shōkei*. Place of publ. unknown: Shitara-shihan /Chikadō-zō han.

Nishiyama Gikō, trans. 1883. *Uiruson shi daiichi rīdoru hitori annai*. Tōkyō: Jūjiya.

Ozaki Kōyō. 1894. *Tonari no onna*. Tōkyō: Shun'yōdō.

Saganoya Omuro. 1889. "Hakumei no Suzuko." *Yamato nishiki* 1: 4–19.

———. 1971. "Hakumei no Suzuko." In *Futabatei Shimei, Saganoya Omuroshū*, vol. 17 of *Meiji bungaku zenshū,* 238–55. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō.

Saitō Hidesaburō, trans. 1884. *Suinton shi eigogaku shinshiki chokuyaku*. Jūjiya: Nisshindo.

San'yūtei Enchō. 1885. *Kaidan botan dōrō*. Tōkyō: Bunjido.

Shimamura Hōgetsu. 1901. “Genbun itchi no genzai, mirai.” *Shinbun,* vol. 1(6): 31–34.
———. 1929. “Genbun itchi to keigo.” In *Hōgetsu zenshū,* vol. 2: 209–10. Tōkyō: Hakubunkan.
Tsubouchi Shōyō. 1891. “Gaikoku bibungaku no yunyū.” *Waseda bungaku* 3: 59–61.
———. 1900. *Kokugo tokuhon jinjō shōgakkō yō*, vols. 1–8. Tōkyō: Fusanbo.
Uchida Roan, trans. 1892. *Shōsetsu tsumi to batsu* maki ichi. Tōkyō: Uchida Rokakuho.
———, trans. 1972. “Shōsetsu tsumi to batsu.” In *Meiji hon’yaku bungaku shū*. Vol.7 of *Meiji bungaku zenshū,* 141–269. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō.
Yamada Bimyō (Taketarō). 1888. “Musashino.” In *Natsukodachi,* Yamada Bimyō, 93–134. Yamada Bimyō. Tōkyō: Kinkōdō.
Yamamoto Masahide. 1971. “Genbun itchi bun no bunmatsugo no goshiteki kōsatsu.” In *Genbun itchi no rekishi ronkō*, Yamamoto Masahide, 469–502. Tōkyō: Ōfūsha.

The Role of Russian in the Dissolution of Diglossia in Japan: Translations by Futabatei Shimei

Noriyo Hoozawa-Arkenau

Abstract This paper examines Futabatei Shimei's translations from Russian into Japanese from the end of the nineteenth to the beginning of the twentieth century, during the period of the so-called *genbun itchi* (言文一致) movement. During this period, the traditional writing language variety, *bungo* (文語), was replaced by a new writing variety based on the spoken language, *kōgo* (口語); the first and most influential work written in *kōgo* was a translation from Russian by Futabatei.

We will investigate how *kōgo* was developing structurally by comparing his first two *kōgo* translations from Russian, and how it was developing functionally by following his whole translations. The paper takes a linguistic approach in order to investigate how Russian was used to promote the replacement of *bungo* by *kōgo* in Futabatei's translations.

Keywords *genbun itchi* movement • Russian-Japanese translation • Comparative translation studies • Diglossic dissolution

Introduction: The Notion of Diglossia

The language society in Japan up to in the middle of nineteenth century—that is, before the Meiji restoration—was in a specific linguistic situation known as diglossia.

Diglossia is a stable language situation where "two varieties of a language exist side by side throughout the community, with each having a distinctive role to play" (Ferguson 1959, 325), in other words, the language situation is such that the spoken and the writing varieties are structurally different, in some cases differing from each other so much that they can be considered two distinct languages. Functionally,

N. Hoozawa-Arkenau (✉)
University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg
e-mail: hoozawa@asia-europe.uni-heidelberg.de

J. Árokay et al. (eds.), *Divided Languages?*, Transcultural Research – Heidelberg Studies on Asia and Europe in a Global Context, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-03521-5_13,

however, they are complementary to each other; the high variety is used in formal and the low variety in informal situations, as was the case in pre-Meiji Japan.

In the following discussion of Japanese, I shall use the traditional terms *bungo* and *kōgo* instead of H and L respectively. *Bungo* (文語 written language) and *kōgo* (口語 spoken language) differ from each other in terms of both vocabulary and grammar, but the fundamental distinction is a grammatical one (i.e. the linguistic structure, especially inflectional forms and auxiliaries). While some refer to spoken versus writing *style* (*kōgo-tai* 口語体 and *bungo-tai* 文語体 respectively), this nomenclature does not correspond to a linguistic reality. They are different language systems as opposed to different styles.

Furthermore, I shall not use the term *kōgo* simply to refer to the spoken language but rather to the new writing variety based upon the spoken language. *Kōgo* includes some forms that are scarcely used in real colloquial situations and overwhelmingly appear in written texts; thus, *kōgo* is both spoken and written.

In the Meiji period, when the Japanese nation was in a phase of modernization, the diglossic situation dissolved as a result of a language reform called the *genbun itchi* movement, the aim of which was to assimilate the written with the spoken language—that is, to unify the two language varieties. The dissolution of diglossia (the *genbun itchi* movement) was influenced by Western language and literature in which the spoken and written varieties were unified. Among those 'Western' languages, Russian was highly influential because the author who wrote the first Japanese novel in the spoken variety was a translator of Russian, and thus, it was under the influence of Russian that he created a new Japanese writing variety based upon the spoken language.

This paper will explicitly examine translations from Russian during the diglossia dissolution process not only because Russian was the most important source language of translations at that time, but also because previous investigations of direct translations from Russian have concentrated on relatively limited works and aspects. I will try to approach these translations from a different, linguistic perspective and will investigate the dissolution process of diglossia as reflected in literary translations.

Translations from Russian and Development of *kōgo*

Futabatei Shimei's Translations

Futabatei Shimei is one of the most important figures in the establishment of *kōgo* as the written variety. He wrote his first novel in *kōgo* in 1889, but his first translations from Turgenev's *Svidanie* (*Rendezvous*) and *Tri vstreči* (*Three encounters*) into *kōgo* in 1888 were far more influential than his novel. After these translations were published, countless authors followed the style of *kōgo* that he used in his first translations. That first impact has been investigated, discussed, and

mentioned in all investigations on the *genbun itchi* movement. However, the progress made as a result of his writing in *kōgo* has not been considered in as much detail as his first translations, despite the fact that Russian went on to further influence the development of *kōgo* as the predominant written language.

It would be too simple to say that Futabatei's translation from Russian in 1888 immediately established *kōgo* as the unchallenged written variety: first, because he has had already rendered some Russian treatises into *bungo* before he published his Turgenev translations; and second, because he 'reverted' to *bungo* later, that is, he made new translations into *bungo* after he had already begun to use *kōgo* in his writing. Furthermore, some *bungo*-elements can be found in his first translations into *kōgo*. Only later did *kōgo* establish the stylistically homogeneous structure it has today.

Futabatei translated various works from Russian that can be found listed in Table 1. Only those translations for which source texts can be identified are listed, with the exception of Pavlov's treatise (Table 1: 4). The 'novel' genre includes novels, short stories, and novellas specific to Russian literature—so-called *povest*'.

The course of the dissolution of diglossia in Japan and the view of the *genbun itchi* movement as a whole in Japanese society at that time were well reflected in his translations.

Initially, Futabatei translated from the source language (Russian) into *bungo* (Table 1: 1–4) and then into *kōgo* (Table 1: 5-). However, after he began to use *kōgo* in literary translations he then reverted back to *bungo* (Table 1: 9, 27, 28). His move corresponds to the general course of linguistic change occurring at that time in Japan. According to Yamamoto (1982, 32), the *genbun itchi* movement—that is, the dissolution of diglossia in Japan—began shortly before the beginning of Meiji restoration around 1866. Prior to that, literary works were written exclusively in *bungo* and afterward, during the *genbun itchi* movement, they were increasingly written in *kōgo*. Yet the movement did not progress in a straightforward manner. According to Yamamoto, there was a phase from around 1890–1894, in which the *genbun itchi* movement stagnated. Futabatei returned to *bungo* in this stagnation phase—in 1892 he translated Filonov's treatise not into *kōgo* but into *bungo* (Table 1: 9). During this period Futabatei published no translations in *kōgo*, and he published no translations at all between 1892 (i.e. after his *bungo*-translation of Filonov) and 1896. Only at the end of 1896, 2 years after the stagnation phase postulated by Yamamoto had ended, did he translate two of Turgenev's novels for the second time into *kōgo* (Table 1: 10, 11). In 1896, with the second translations of Turgenev's novels *Svidanie* and *Tri vstreči,* he began once again to translate into *kōgo*.

Until the beginning of 1906 (Table 1: 26), Futabatei occupied himself with establishing *kōgo* as the target language (Table 1: 10–26), translating and adapting Russian literature almost always into *kōgo*[1] and developing the stylistic and functional diversity of the latter.

[1] Only the beginning part of *Kokuryūkōhan no yūfu* (黒龍江畔の勇婦 *The heroine of the River Amur*), the translation from Elec's *Amurskaya geroinja* (*The heroine of Amur*), is written in *bungo*.

Table 1 List of Futabatei's translations from Russian

	First publication	Japanese title	Original (year of the first publication)	Translating variety	Genre
1	Before 1886[a]	美術の本義 *Bijutsu no hongi*	Belinskij, V.G. *Ideja iskusstva* (1862)	*bungo*	Treatise
2	Before 1886[b]	米氏文辭の類別 *Bei-shi bunji no ruibetsu*	Belinskij, V.G. *Razdelenie poėzii na rody i vidy* (1841)	*bungo*	Treatise
3	1886/May-Jun.	カートコフ氏美術俗解 *Kaatokofu-shi bijutsu-zokkai*	Katkov, M.N. *Puškin* (1856)	*bungo*	Treatise
4	1888/Apr.	學術と美術との差別 *Gakujutsu to bijutsu no sabetsu*	Probably Pavlov, N.F. The original was not identified	*bungo*	Treatise
5	1888/Jul.–Aug.	あひびき*Aibiki*	Turgenev, I.S. *Svidanie,* (*Zapiski oxotnika*, 1852)	*kōgo*	Novel
6	1888–1889[c]	おひたち*Oitachi*	Gončarov, I.A. *Oblomov* (1859)	*kōgo*	Novel
7	1888/Oct.-1889/Jan.	めぐりあひ*Meguriai*	Turgenev, I.S. *Tri vstreči* (1852)	*kōgo*	Novel
8	1889/Apr.-May	文學の本色及び平民と文學との關係 *Bungaku no honshoku oyobi heimin to bungaku to no kankei*	Dobroljubov, N.A. *O stepeni učastija narodnosti v razvitii russkoj literatury* (1858)	*kōgo*	Treatise
9	1892/Mar.-Apr.	「アリストーテリ」悲壯體院劇論解釋 *"Arisutōteri" hisōtaiingeki-ron kaishaku*	Filonov, A.G. *Russkaja xrestomatija čast' tret'ja: dramatičeskaja poėzija* (1863)	*bungo*	Treatise
10	1896/Nov.	あひびき*Aibiki*	Turgenev, I.S. *Svidanie*, (*Zapiski oxotnika*, 1852)	*kōgo*	Novel
11	1896/Nov.	奇遇*Kigū*	Turgenev, I.S. *Tri vstreči* (1852)	*kōgo*	Novel
12	1896/Nov.	片戀*Katakoi*	Turgenev, I.S. *Asja* (1858)	*kōgo*	Novel
13	1897/Jan.-Mar.	肖像畫*Shōzōga*	Gogol', N.V. *Portret* (1842)	*kōgo*	Novel
14	1897/Apr.	夢かたり*Yume-katari*	Turgenev, I.S. *Son* (1876)	*kōgo*	Novel
15	1897/Apr.-Oct.	うき草*Ukikusa*	Turgenev, I.S. *Rudin* (1855)	*kōgo*	Novel
16	1898/Jan.	猶太人*Yudaya-jin*	Turgenev, I.S. *Žid* (1846)	*kōgo*	Novel
17	1898/Nov.	くされ縁*Kusare-en*	Turgenev, I.S. *Petuškov* (1848)	*kōgo*	Novel
18	1903–1905[d]	けふり*Kefuri*	Turgenev, I.S. *Dym* (1867)	*kōgo*	Novel

19	1904/Jan.	黒龍江畔の勇婦*Kokuryūkōhan no yūfu*	Elec, Ju.L. *Amurskaja geroinja* (1901)	*kōgo/bungo*	Novel
20	1904/Feb.	四人共産團*Yonin kyōsan-dan*	Potapenko, I.N. *Istorija odnoj 'kommuny'* (1899)	*kōgo*	Novel
21	1904/Jul.	つゝを枕*Tsutsu o makura*	Tolstoj, L.N. *Rubka lesa* (1852–1854)	*kōgo*	Novel
22	1904/Jul.	四日間*Yokka-kan*	Garšin, V.M. *Četyre dnja* (1877)	*kōgo*	Novel
23	1905/Jan.	わからずや*Wakarazuya*	Turgenev, I.S. *Zavtrak u predvoditelja* (1849)	Adaption (*kōgo*)	Drama
24	1905/Jan.	露助の妻*Rosuke no tsuma*	Ščeglov, I. *Nevozmožnyj xarakter* (1901)	Adaption (*kōgo*)	Novel
25	1905/Feb.-Mar.	猶太人(ジウ)の浮世*Jū no ukiyo*	Gor'kij, M. *Kain i Artem* (1899)	*kōgo*	Novel
26	1906/Jan.-Mar.	ふさぎの蟲 *Fusagi no mushi*	Gor'kij, M. *Toska* (1896)	*kōgo*	Novel
27	1906/Feb.	根無し草 *Nenashi-gusa*	Garšin, V.M. *To, čego ne bylo* (1882)	*bungo*	Novel
28	1906/Apr.	灰色人 *Haiiro-bito*	Gor'kij, M. *O serom* (1905)	*bungo*	Novel
29	1906/May	むかしの人*Mukashi no hito*	Gogol', N.V. *Starosvetskie pomeščiki* (1835)	*kōgo*	Novel
30	1907/Feb.-Aug.	志士の末期*Shishi no matsugo*	Polovanov, P.S. *Končilsja* (1903)	*kōgo*	Novel
31	1907/Mar.	二狂人*Ni-kyōjin*	Gor'kij, M. *Ošibka* (1895)	*kōgo*	Novel
32	1907/Mar.-May	狂人日記*Kyōjin nikki*	Gogol', N.V. *Zapiski sumasšedšego* (1835)	*kōgo*	Novel
33	1907/Jul.	乞食*Kojiki*	Gor'kij, M. *Ded Arxip i Len'ka* (1894)	*kōgo*	Novel
34	1908/Jul.	血笑記*Kesshō-ki*	Andreev, L.N. *Krasnyj smex* (1905)	*kōgo*	Novel

[a]See footnote below

[b]These texts were published only after his death (in "*Meiji-bunka Zenshū,*" 1928). However, they were probably written already before 1886 when Futabatei was still a student

[c]Although this text was published only after his death in 1913, it was probably written between 1888 and 1889

[d]This text was written between 1903 and 1906 but was not finished. Only in 1937 was the manuscript rediscovered and published

The instances in which *bungo* and *kōgo* are used in his translations are strictly divided: Treatises are translated into *bungo* (Table 1: 1–4, 9) and novels into *kōgo* (Table 1: 5–7, 10–22, 25–26, 29–34). There are certain exceptions—Dobroljubov's *treatise* (Table 1: 8) is translated into *kōgo* while Garšin's and Gor'kij's *short stories* (Table 1: 27, 28) are translated into *bungo*. Why was Dobroljubov's treatise translated into *kōgo* and why was the other monograph, Filonov's *Russkaja xrestomatija*. . ., rendered in *bungo* immediately afterward?

These translations appeared immediately after his first *kōgo*-translations *Aibiki* and *Meguriai* (Table 1: 5, 7). At that time *kōgo* was just starting to be used as a target language. It did not yet function perfectly and still needed to be developed; its use was still in an experimental phase. Only in the second translations of Turgenev's works *Aibiki* and *Kigū* in 1896 (Table 1: 10, 11) was *kōgo* stable enough to establish a linguistic equivalent with the source language. The explanation for this shift appears to be that the translator was still relying upon the traditional writing system, *bungo,* until at least 1896.

However, a *bungo*-translation appeared again in 1906 (Table 1: 27) after *kōgo* had already been established as the written variety. It was during the consolidation phase (1900–1909) when, according to Yamamoto (e.g. Yamamoto 1982, 34 et. seq.), *kōgo* was established firmly as the new written variety in the language society. The reasons for the translator reverting to *bungo* here must be different from the reasons for his having reverted in the earlier period previously mentioned (Table 1: 1–4, 9) simply because *kōgo* was already functioning as the target language in this later period and because one did not necessarily need to use the traditional *bungo* any more. In other words, Futabatei could easily have used *kōgo* here, and his choice to revert to *bungo* cannot have been a default one. For this later period one cannot speak of a purely diglossic situation as defined by Ferguson because the two varieties are no longer strictly in complementary distribution, and theoretically one could write in both varieties. Is this then a case of bilingualism in writing? Were these two written varieties equivalent, as such, at least for Futabatei?

Thus, while the development of *kōgo* in Futabatei's translations and that of the *genbun itchi* movement correspond in general, there are some subtle differences and remaining questions that necessitate a closer investigation of Futabatei's translation choices.

Transfer from bungo *to* kōgo *in Translations from Russian Between 1888 and 1996*

This chapter presents Futabatei's most influential translations—that is, his first translations from Russian into *kōgo*. He translated two works by Turgenev, *Svidanie* (*Rendezvous*) and *Tri vstreči* (*Three Encounters*), twice as *Aibiki*

(あひゞき 1888 and 1896) (from *Svidanie*) and *Meguriai* (めぐりあひ 1888) and *Kigū* (奇遇 1896) (from *Tri vstreči*).[2]

His texts are written in *kōgo* on the whole, which is recognizable from the sentence end form; however, *bungo* elements can still be found within the *kōgo* texts, especially the earlier versions. In the later versions they are usually 'corrected' and replaced with *kōgo* elements. Comparing these two texts we can follow the transfer process from *bungo* to *kōgo*. In particular, it is possible to trace which factors facilitated the dissolution of diglossia and which factors obstructed it.

Transfer of Lexical Elements from *bungo* to *kōgo*

I will trace the lexical transfer from *bungo* to *kōgo* regarding the verbs *zasu* (座す sit) and *suwaru* (坐る sit), which Futabatei used to translate the Russian verbs *sidet'* (sitting) and *sest'* (sit down). The words *zasu* and *suwaru* have a specific character that requires explanation.

It is not always the case that a clear-cut border can be drawn between *bungo* and *kōgo* systems, especially for lexical items, since lexical items can be easily borrowed between different language systems or language varieties. There are, however, words that can be determined as belonging to one or the other variety relatively easily. Ferguson (1959, 334) points out in his theory the existence of "paired items" or "doubles in diglossia" like, for example, when a pair of words mean the same thing but belong to H and to L. This is the case for the verbs *zasu* and *suwaru*.

The verb *suwa-ru* was inherited from old Japanese. It exists in Classical Japanese but was integrated into *kōgo*, is inflected according to the *kōgo* system, and is used in colloquial conversation. *Zasu*, on the other hand, is of *kanbun* origin, was not completely integrated into the *kōgo* system, and is not used in a colloquial situation. It is also important to note that from *suwaru* one can build the honorific form with the auxiliary *ni-naru* and the prefix *o-*, but the verb *zasu* cannot build the honorific form in the same way:

a. suwar-u → o-suwar-i-ni-naru.
b. zas-u → * o-zash-i-ni-naru

Thus, *zasu* cannot be combined with *kōgo*-system morphemes. In other words, the word *zasu* does not belong to the *kōgo* system.

The following table demonstrates that the *bungo* word *zasu* was used in the early version of the translations of *Svidanie* and *Tri vstreči* but was replaced by the corresponding *kōgo* word in the later version. The *bungo* word *zasu* is double and

[2] The page and line number of the tables in this chapter are from: *Aibiki* (two versions), *Meguriai* and *Kigū* (Futabatei 1981a), *Svidanie* (Turgenev 1963a), *Tri vstreči* (Turgenev 1963b). Pages in *Aibiki*, *Meguriai* and *Kigū* are printed in two columns, and the letter "o" and "u" after the page number in those works means 'over (column)' and 'under (column) respectively.' The number after the page number in Turgenev's works, for example 2 of (260.2), indicates the line number.

the *kōgo* word *suwaru* single underlined. Compare with the original Russian words (single underlined).[3]

Bungo elements are embedded in a *kōgo* sentence. In Table 2: 1 in *Aibiki* 1888, for example, the *kōgo* elements *ita koto ga atta* (ゐたことが有ツた) (underlined with a dotted line) have been added to the *bungo* word *zashite* (座して), which means as a whole ('(I) was sitting once'). Thus, the *bungo* word forms, so to speak, 'a *bungo* island' in *kōgo*. This would also have been the case with the past form *zashi-ta* (座した'(I) sat down) (The morpheme *-ta* is *kōgo*), which was not used in those two translations.

Both *zasu* and *suwaru* are used only in translating from the Russian words *sest'* and *sidet'* and are not used anywhere else.[4] Here the process of transfer from *bungo* to *kōgo* is clearly visible—in the early version of *Aibiki*, only the *bungo* word *zasu* is used and all instances were replaced by the corresponding *kōgo* lexeme *suwaru* in the later version. *Meguriai* was written in the same year (1888) but later than *Aibiki*. In it the *bungo* word was used only in two cases (Table 3: 6, 7), in all other cases the corresponding *kōgo* verb *suwaru* was used. The two *bungo* verbs used in the earlier version were both replaced with the *kōgo* verb in the later version.

Furthermore, a functional and stylistic differentiation within the *kōgo*-variety is discernible. In Table 3: 4 the expression *buttsukunan-jo-ru* (ぶつ蹲踞ぢよる sitting in a crouch)[5] is used, which has an extraordinarily colloquial color corresponding to the fact that the expression was used in an utterance made by an uneducated peasant.

The *kōgo* word *suwaru*, which was used in the earlier version, was not replaced with the exception in Table 3: 1 where *suwaru* was later replaced with the clearly more colloquial form *shagamu* (蹲踞むsquat). This can be attributed to the fact that the subject of the sentence in question is an uneducated old peasant while the other sentence's subject is the hero, 'I', an aristocrat. Furthermore, the sentence in Table 3: 1 is, in contrast to Table 3: 4, part of the narration uttered by the hero and therefore the colloquial form is not used here. Interestingly, in Table 3: 6, in which the *bungo* word was later replaced, the expression of the subject was also changed from *fujin* (婦人 lady) to *onna* (女 woman) (in bold style). In other words, the transfer from *bungo* to *kōgo* was accompanied by a 'degrading' of the subject. The Russian original word is simply the pronoun (*n*)*ee* (her). However, in Table 3: 8 this is not the case.

Which factors enabled the translator to abandon the use of the *bungo* form *zasu* (座すsit) in the later version? It is notable that the verb *sest'* (sit down) was never

[3] In these tables the verb *sidet'* and *sest'* are included. The former is 'be sitting' and the latter 'sit.' The verb *dosidela*, < *dosidet'*, inf. in 5 in b contains the root '*sidet'*' and means 'be sitting until a certain point in time.'

[4] Strictly spoken, the first *zashite-ita* in case 3 (2.3a) is the translation of the adjective *nepodvižnom* (immovable) (underlined with a dotted line) but in this context one can also interpret it as a translation of the verb *sidela* (< *sidet'*).

[5] According to *Nihon Hōgen-dai-jiten* (*Great Dictionary of Japanese Dialects* 1991, 1515), the verb *tsukunamu* is pervasive in the prefectures Shimane, Hyōgo, and Yamaguchi, and on the island of Shikoku. Futabatei had lived in Shimane during his childhood, where he had probably learned the expression.

Table 2 Use of the verbs *suwaru* and *zasu* in *Aibiki* (from *Svidanie*)

	1888		1896		
	Bungo	*Kōgo*	*Bungo*	*Kōgo*	Russian
1	一日自分がさる樺の林の中に座してゐたことが有ツた。			一日(あるひ)自分がさる樺林の中(うち)に坐つてゐたことが有つた。	Ja sidel v berezovoj rošče (. . .)
	(158.o)			(304.o)	(260.2)
	(*Ichi-jitsu jibun ga saru kaba no hayashi no naka ni zashite-ita koto ga atta*.)			(*Aru hi jibun ga saru kaba-bayashi no uchi ni suwatte-ita koto ga atta*.)	'I was sitting in a birch forest (. . .)'
	'It happened one day that I was sitting in a birch forest.'			'It happened one day that I was sitting down in a birch forest.'	
2	自分は座して、(. . .)耳を傾けてゐた。			自分は坐つて、(. . .)耳を傾けてゐると、	Ja sidel (. . .) i slušal.
	(158.o)			(304.o)	(260.9)
	(*jibun wa zashite, (. . .) mimi o katamukete-ita*.)			(*jibun wa suwatte, (. . .) mimi o katamukete-iru to,*)	'I was sitting (. . .) and listening.'
	'I was sitting (. . .) and listening.'			'I was sitting (. . .) and listening, then'	
3	自分は(. . .)フト端然と坐してゐる人の姿を認めた。(. . .) (. . .)端然と坐してゐた。			只見(とみ)ると(. . .)悄然(しよんぼり)と坐つてゐる者がある。	(. . .) vdrug glaza moi ostanovilis' na nepodvižnom čelovečeskom obraze. (. . .) (Ona) sidela (. . .)
	(160.o)			(305.u)	(262.3-5)
	(*jibun wa (. . .) futo tanzen-to zashite-iru hito no sugata o mitometa. (. . .) tanzen-to zashite-ita*.)			(*to miru to (. . .) shonbori-to suwatte-iru mono ga aru*.)	'suddenly my eyes were rested upon an immovable human figure. (. . .) She sat (. . .)'
	'I recognized suddenly a person's figure sitting neatly. (. . .) (She) was sitting neatly.'			'Suddenly I saw: there was a person that was sitting, looking downcast.'	

Table 3 Use of the verbs *suwaru* and *zasu* in *Meguriai*/*Kigū* (from *Tri vstreči*)

1888 *Meguriai*		1896 *Kigū*		
Bungo	*Kōgo*	*Bungo*	*Kōgo*	Russian
1	老人むツと面(がほ)して路傍(みちばた)に坐つてゐた。		老人さも信切(しんせつ)さうな面(かほ)をして路傍(みちばた)に蹲踞(しゃがむ)でゐる◁	Sidit on, serdečnyj, bliz dorogi;
	(173.o)		(270.u)	(233.24)
	(*rōjin mutto-gao o shite michibata ni suwatte-ita.*)		(*rōjin samo shinsetsu-sōna kao o shite michibata ni shagande-iru.*)	‘(There) he, kind, was sitting by the road.’
	‘The old man was sitting by the road with an ill-tempered face.’		‘The old man was sitting by the road, with a kind face.’	
2	自分は　(. . .)路傍に坐った。		自分は　(. . .)路傍(みちばた)に坐つた。	Ja (. . .) i sel, (. . .) na dorožke.
	(188.o)		(284.u)	(247.14)
	(*jibun wa (. . .) michibata ni suwatta.*)		(*jibun wa (. . .) michibata ni suwatta.*)	‘I (. . .) then sat (..) on the road.’
	‘I (. . .) sat down by the road.’		‘I (. . .) sat down by the road.’	
3	そこで自分は坐ッて、眼を閉ぢた.		そこで自分は坐つて目を閉(ねむ)つた——	Itak, ja sel, zakryl glaza —
	(188.u)		(284.u)	(247.22)
	(*soko de jibun wa suwatte, me o tojita. . .*)		(*sokode jibun wa suwatte, me o nemutta——*)	‘Then I sat down, closed my eyes—’
	‘Then I sat down and closed my eyes.’		‘Then I sat down and closed my eyes—.’	
4	坐ッてゐたゞア、ぶツ蹲踞(つくなん)で。		ぶつ蹲踞(つくなん)ぢよる。	**a on tam sidit,**
	(196.o)		**(292.o)**	**(254.9)**
	(*suwatte-ita daa, buttsukunande.*)		**(*buttsukunan-joru.*)**	**‘(He) is sitting there.’**
	‘(He) was sitting, sitting in a crouch.’		**‘(He) is sitting in a crouch.’**	

5		夫人は　(. . .)終まで穏に坐てゐた。 (200.o) (*fujin wa (. . .) shimai made odayaka-ni suwatte-ita*.) ‘The lady (. . .) remained sitting quietly till the end.’	∅ (それでも終(しまひ)まで平気で聴いてゐた。) (295.u) (*soredemo shimai made heiki-de kiite-ita*.) ‘nevertheless (she) remained listening without being disturbed.’	ona spokojno dosidela do konca. (257.21) ‘she remained sitting quietly till the end.’
6	自分は婦人の傍に坐してゐた、 (205.o) (*jibun wa fujin no soba-ni zashite-ita*.) ‘I was sitting beside the lady’		傍に坐つてゐる女は　(. . .)その女である、 (300.u) (*soba-ni suwatte-iru onna wa (. . .) sono onna de-aru*.) ‘The woman sitting beside me was even the woman that (. . .)’	Ja sidel podle nee, (262.7) ‘I was sitting near her.’
7	——婦人の傍に坐してゐた、 (205.o) (*—fujin no soba-ni zashite-ita,*) ‘— (I) was sitting beside the lady.’		∅ (300.u)	— ja sidel podle nee i (. . .) (262.9) ‘— I was sitting near her and (. . .)’
8		婦人は氣なしに、平氣で坐ッてゐた。 (205.u) (*fujin wa ki-nashi-ni heiki de suwatte-ita*.) ‘The lady was sitting indifferently and without being disturbed.’	女は(. . .)氣なしに、平氣で坐つてゐたが、 (301.o) (*onna wa kinashi-ni heiki de suwatte-ita ga,)* ‘The woman was sitting indifferently and without being disturbed, but’	sidela ona ravnodušno i nebrežno. (262.13) ‘She was sitting indifferently and without caring about anything.’

translated with *zasu* in any of the four translations. Only the verb *sidet'* (be sitting), with a durative meaning, was translated with *zasu*. The durative meaning, which would be expressed as a continuous form in English, causes the verb to be expressed with an auxiliary verb *iru* (いる) in Japanese (in Table 3: 2 the auxiliary *iru* occurs at the sentence end). However, the form *-iru* is a *kōgo* element. In other words, the *bungo* verb *zasu* was always accompanied with the *kōgo* form *iru* in the texts. It is possible that the translator detected a certain disunity in this translation form and replaced it with a *kōgo* + *kōgo* combination, *suwatte-iru*.

Correspondingly, the verb *suwaru* occurred for the first time in Table 3: 1 (*Meguriai*), as the compound form *suwatte-**ita*** (坐つてゐた (< *iru*)). Immediately afterward (in Table 3: 2), the verb *suwaru* occurred as the simple past form *suwatta* (坐ッた) to translate the verb *sest'*. The *bungo* verb *zasu* in the past tense, *zashita*, which could have also been used, was not employed; hereafter the *kōgo* verb *suwaru* began to be used in the simple past tense.

In the translation *Aibiki* the Russian verbs *sidet'* and *sest'* were translated exclusively with the verbs *zasu* and *suwaru*. By contrast, in *Meguriai* those Russian verbs were translated, besides *zasu* and *suwaru,* with other expressions, for example, *koshi o kakeru* (腰を掛けるsettle one's hip down → sit (down)). The latter form is also a colloquial expression and in the later version either the same verb as used in the early version was used or it was replaced with another *kōgo* verb. See the following table:

The expression *koshi o kake-**ru*** (腰を掛ける sit down, pres.) or *koshi o kake-**ta*** (腰を掛けた sat down, past), like the *kōgo* verb *suwaru*, can both be used to translate the verb *sest'* (Table 4: 5, 6, 7 and 9) (underlined by a double line) and *sidet'* (Table 4: 1–4)[6] (underlined with a simple line). Thus, these two *kōgo* verbs (or verbal expressions) fulfill both functions—namely to translate both the verbs *sidet'* and *sest'*—while the *bungo* verb *zasu* is used in a limited functional area; it translates only *sidet'*.

Here one can see how *kōgo* verbs that have a larger functional area were driving out the corresponding *bungo* element.

Transfer of Grammatical Elements from *bungo* to *kōgo*

It is much easier to determine whether grammatical elements—that is, flexional forms of adjectives and verbs or specific particles—belong to *bungo* or *kōgo*. In Futabatei's early translations such *bungo* grammatical elements do occur. Yet, in contrast to the case discussed above, there are some cases in which the *bungo* elements used in the earlier versions remained in the later version. See the following tables where *Bungo* flexional forms are underlined with a double line.

As in Tables 2 and 3 above, the *bungo* elements here also form island constructions. In Table 5: 14 and Table 5: 15, for example, the sentence end is marked as *kōgo* (underlined with a dotted line). Thus, the sentences in Table 5: 14 "*daga yamu*

[6] The verb *po-sidel* < *posidet'* (inf., 'sitting for a while') in Table 4: 4 also contains the root *sidet'* (see also footnote 7).

Table 4 Translations from *sidet'/sest'* not with 坐す (*zasu*)/座る (*suwaru*)

	1888 *Meguriai*	1896 *Kigū*	
	Bungo *Kōgo*	*Bungo* *Kōgo*	Russian
1	「ルキヤァヌイチ」は、(. . .)身動もせずに、孫屋(まごや)の前の腰掛に腰を掛けてゐた。(189.u)	ルキヤーヌイチは　(. . .)孫屋(まごや)の側の腰掛に徒爾(つくねん)と腰を掛けてゐたが、(285.u)	On (. . .) nepodvižno sidel na lavočke pered fligelem. (248.20)
	(“*Rukiyaanuichi” wa (. . .) miugoki mo sezu ni, magoya no mae no koshikake ni koshi o kakete-ita.*)	(*Rukiyaanuichi wa (. . .) magoya no soba no koshikake ni tsukunen-to koshi o kakete-ita.*)	‘He (. . .) was sitting on the bench before the wing immovably.’
	‘“Luk’janyč” (. . .) was sitting on the bench before the wing immovably.’	‘Luk’janyč (. . .) was sitting on the bench before the wing immovably, and’	
2	(. . .)若い、見識らぬ、僕らしい男が腰を掛けてゐた。(194.o)	(. . .)　若い、僕(ぼく)らしい男が腰を掛けて、(290.o)	(. . .) sidel kakoj-to molodoj dvorovyj paren’ (. . .) (252.31)
	(*(. . .) wakai, mishiranu, boku rashii otoko ga koshi o kakete-ita.*)	(*(. . .) wakai, boku rashii otoko ga koshi o kakete,*)	‘(. . .) some young court servant (. . .) was sitting,’
	‘(. . .) a young unknown man, probably a servant, was sitting,’	‘(. . .) a young man, probably a servant, was sitting and’	
3	腰を掛けて、(. . .)　居睡をしてゐたが、(194.o)	∅	On sidel, (. . .) I dremal, (252.33)
	(*koshi o kakete, (. . .) inemuri o shite-ita ga,*)	((. . .)坐睡(ゐねむり)をしてゐたが、) (290.o)	‘He was sitting (. . .) and napping,’
	‘(He) was sitting and napping, but’	(*(. . .) inemuri o shite-ita ga,*)	
		‘(He) was napping, but.’	
4	叔父貴イちツとンべえ(. . .)腰よかけてゐたツけえ、(195.u)	叔父貴い些(ちツ)とんべえ(. . .)腰よ掛けちよつたつけえ、(291.u)	posidel on malen’ko na lavočke, (254.2)
	(*oji-kii chitto-n-bee (. . .) koshi yo kakete-itakkee,*)	(*oji-kii chitto-n-bee (. . .) koshi yo kakete-chottakkee,*)	‘He was sitting on the bench for a while.’
	‘Uncle was sitting for a little while.’	‘Uncle was sitting for a little while.’	
5	と洋琴(ぴやの)に向ツた。(200.o)	とピヤノに對(むか)つた。(295.u)	I ona sela za fortep’jano. (257.18)
	(*to piyano ni mukatta.*)	(*to piyano ni mukatta.*)	‘And (then) she sat to the piano.’
	‘(She said) and turned to the piano.’	‘(She said) and turned to the piano.’	

(continued)

Table 4 (continued)

	1888 *Meguriai*	1896 *Kigū*	
	Bungo *Kōgo*	*Bungo* *Kōgo*	Russian
6	婦人は　(…)歩みを止めて、腰を掛けた。	女は　(…)停歩(たちどまつ)て腰を掛けたから、	(…) ona ostanovilas' (…) i sela.
	(201.u-202.o)	(297.o-297.u)	(259.13)
	(*fujin wa (…) ayumi o tomete, koshi o kaketa.*)	(*onna wa (…) tachi-domatte, koshi o kaketa kara.*)	'(…) she stopped (…) and sat down.'
	'The lady (…) stopped her step and sat down.'	'because the woman stood and sat down,'	
7	自分も其傍に腰を掛けた。(202.o)	自分も其側に腰を掛けると、(297.u)	Ja sel podle nee. (259.13)
	(*jibun mo sono soba ni koshi o kaketa.*)	(*jibun mo sono soba ni koshi o kakeru to,*)	'I also sat down by her.'
	'I also sat down by her.'	'I also sat down by her then'	
8	マア、下に坐(い)て下さい、(203.o)	何卒最(どうぞも)う少し下に居て下さい、(298.u)	Radi boga (…) sjad'te, (260.13)
	(*maa, shita ni ite kudasai,*)	(*dōzo mō sukoshi shita ni ite kudasai,*)	'O my God. Please sit down!'
	'O please, stay sitting.'	'I beg you. Stay sitting.'	
9	婦人は考へてゐたが、また腰を掛けた。(203.o)	女は思案して又腰を掛けた。(298.u)	Ona podumala i sela. (260.15)
	(*fujin wa kangaete-ita ga, mata koshi o kaketa.*)	(*onna wa shian-shite mata koshi o kaketa.*)	'She thought for a while and sat down.'
	'The lady was thoughtful for a while, but sat down again.'	'The woman thought (about it) and sat down again.'	

Table 5 Use of *bungo* grammatical items in *Aibiki* (*Svidanie*)

	1888		1896		
	Bungo	*Kōgo*	*Bungo*	*Kōgo*	Russian
1	澄みて怜悧(さか)し氣に見える人の眼の如くに(158.o)			美しい利口さうな眼のやうに (304.o)	kak prekrasnyj, umnyj glaz (260.7)
	(*sumite sakashige-ni mieru hito no me no gotoku ni*)			(*utsukushii rikōsō-na me no yō ni*)	‘like very beautiful and clever eyes’
	‘like man’s eyes, which are clear and look clever’			‘like beautiful and clever eyes’	
2	まばゆきまでに金色(こんじき)を放ち、(158.u)			急に斑に金色に光る◃ (304.u)	zagoralis’ červonnym zolotom, (260.22)
	(*mabayuki made ni konjiki o hanachi,*)			(*kyū-ni madara ni kin-iro ni hikaru*)	‘(they) flared up like fine ducat gold’
	‘(it) emitted dazzling golden rays,’			‘suddenly (it) shined in many spots in gold’	
3	もつれつからみつして (158.u)		縺(もつ)れつ絡(から)みつして (304.u)		**putajas’ i peresekajas’** (260.25-26)
	(*motsuretsu karamitsu-shite*)		(*motsuretsu karamitsu-shite*)		‘getting messy and crossing each other’
	‘being tangled and interwoven’		‘being tangled and interwoven’		
4	さなくば (159.u)		さもなくば、(305.o)		ili (261.22)
	(*sa nakuba*)		(*samo nakuba*)		‘or’
	‘or’		‘or’		
5	將に起ち上がりて (160.o)			起上(たちあが)らうとして、(305.u)	sobralsja bylo vstat’ (262.2)
	(*masa-ni tachi-agerite*)			(*tachi-agarō to shite,*)	‘(I) intended to stand up’
	‘(I was) about to stand up’			‘(I) tried to stand up,’	

(continued)

Table 5 (continued)

	1888		1896		
	Bungo	*Kōgo*	*Bungo*	*Kōgo*	Russian
6	流れよどみて (161.o) (*nagare yodomite*) 'was/were held up to flow'			淀み淀み流れ出て (306.u) (*yodomi-yodomi nagare-dete*) 'flowed, coming temporary to a halt'	**ostanavlivajas'** (262.38) 'coming to a halt'
7	怪しと思ふ心にほだされて、 (161.o) (*ayashi to omou kokoro ni hodasarete,*) 'was driven by a thought that (it) is strange'			如何(どん)な奴かと思つて、(306.u) (*donna yatsu ka to omotte,*) 'wondered what a guy (he) was'	s ljubopytstvom (263.12) 'out of curiousness'
8	薄白く、鼠ばみた眼を (162.o) (*usu-jiroku, nezumi-bamita me o*) 'eyes that were whitish and looked like mice's' (acc.)			薄鼠色の(. . .)眼を (307.o) (*usu-nezumi-iro no (. . .) me o*) 'light-grey eyes' (acc.)	moločno-serye glazki (263.31-32) 'milky-grey eyes'
9	黄ばみた髭を (162.o) (*kibamita hige o*) 'yellowish beard' (acc.)			黄ばむだ髭を (307.u) (*kibanda hige o*) 'yellowish beard' (acc.)	želtye volosiki (263.35) 'yellow hairs'
10	傍へ寄りて、(162.o) (*soba e yorite,*) 'got closer by'			傍へ來て、(307.u) (*soba e kite,*) 'came closer by'	podošel (on) k (nej) (263.39) '(he) came up to (her).
11	用は多し、(162.u) (*yō wa ōshi,*) 'There are many to do,'		用は多し、 (307.u-308.o) (*yō wa ōshi,*) 'There are many to do,'		Dela propast' (264.13) 'there are so many things to do.'

12	吾佛とあふぎ敬ふ氣ざしを		吾佛(あがほとけ)と崇(あが)めて、言ふなりに為つてゐる趣(おもむき)が	(. . .) stol'ko (. . .) blagogovejnoj pokornosti
	(164.o)		(309.u)	(265.33)
	(*waga hotoke to augi-tamau kizashi o*)		(*aga hotoke to agemete, iunari ni natte-iru omomuki ga*)	'so much worshipful obedience.'
	'a sign that (she) idolized (him) as her Buddha' (acc.)		'an impression that (she) idolized (him) as her Buddha and was totally subjugated by (him)' (nom.)	
13	仕替える間もあらせず、	仕改(しか)へる間(ま)もあらせず、		**ne davši** ej ispravit' svoju ošibku
	(165.o)	(310.o)		(266.23)
	(*shikaeru ma mo arasezu,*)	(*shikaeru ma mo arasezu,*)		'Not having let her correct (her) mistake'
	'(He) did not let (her) put it rightly, and'	'(He) did not let (her) put it rightly, and'		
14	だが已を得ざる次第ぢやないか?		だが仕方がねえぢやねえか?	čto že delat'?
	(165.u)		(310.u)	(266.38)
	(*daga yamu o ezaru shidai ja naika?*)		(*daga shikata ga nee ja nee ka?*)	'What to do?'
	'but it is a situation (one) cannot change, isn't it?'		'But one can do nothing against it, can one?'	
15	忍ぶ可らずだ、		怖毛(おぞけ)を振つ了ふからな。	prosto skvernost'.
	(165.u)		(310.u)	(266.40)
	(*shinobu bekarazu da,*)		(*ozoke o furucchimau kara na.*)	'(it is) simply a horror.'
	'(it) is not to be born'		'(It is) horrible.'	
16	サッパリとはしてゐれど、		爽然(さっぱり)とはしてゐるが、(313.o)	xotja svežuju
	(168.u)			(269.13)
	(*sappari to wa shite iredo,*)		(*sappari to wa shite iru ga,*)	'fresh but'
	'fresh but'		'fresh but'	

o ezaru shidai ja nai ka?" (だが已を得ざる次第ぢやないか? but it is a situation (one) cannot change, isn't it?) and in Table 5: 15 "*shinobu bekarazu da*" (忍ぶ可らずだ (it) is not to be born) are both hybrid constructions. First, *bungo* system morphemes added to lexical items (underlined with a doubled line) determine to which language variety the lexical items in question belong within the sentence structure. Then *kōgo* system morphemes are added to the sentence end to which language variety the sentence as a whole belongs (underlined with a simple line). In other words, *bungo* elements are embedded into a *kōgo* sentence.

The sentence in Table 5: 13 is also *kōgo* as a whole because the sentence end is marked with a *kōgo* form (underlined with a simple line). See:

> shikaeru ma mo arasezu, "Akuriina" no motte-ita gankyō o hittakutte-shimatta.
> 仕替える間もあらせず、「アクリーナ」の持ツてゐた眼鏡をひツたくツてしまツた。
> (Futabatei 1981a, 165)
> Not giving (her) a chance to put (them) in position, he snatched away the glasses Akulina carried.

The sentence also has an embedded structure.

In Table 5: 3, 4, 11 and 13 the *bungo* elements used in the earlier version remained in the later version. In Table 5: 3 and 13 of these cases the original Russian constructions, *putajas'* (getting messy), *peresekajas'* (crossing each other), and *ne davši* (having not given) (in bold style) are a specific verbal form called *deepričastie* (adverbial participle) corresponding to the English construction 'having done' or '. . . doing', or the German 'gemacht habend' or 'machend.' This form is an elevated literary style and is scarcely used in colloquial conversations in Russian. It is understandable that *bungo* forms were used for the adverbial participle. The translator likely wanted to transmit the original text's literary character into Japanese, but because the newly born *kōgo* system could not (yet) express such literariness the translator opted for the traditional *bungo* variety. Although in Table 5: 6 the *bungo* variety used in the earlier version to translate the adverbial participle *ostanavlivajas'* (coming to a halt) was later replaced with a *kōgo* form, the parallels between the use of *bungo* elements and the literary nature of the original items is obvious. Notice that in Table 5: 13 the finite verb was indeed translated using *kōgo*, while the adverbial participle was translated into *bungo* in the same sentence. Compare the above-mentioned example from Table 5: 13 with the original Russian sentence below. The finite verb *otnjal* (snatched away) (underlined and in bold style) is rendered with the *kōgo* form *hittakutte-shimatta* (ひツたくツてしまツた snatched away)

> **ne davši** ej ispravit' svoju ošibku, **otnjal** u nej lornet. (Turgenev 1963a, 266)
> **Not having let** her correct (her) mistake, (he) **snatched** away her lorgnette.

Furthermore, in Table 5: 3 the same strategy is used as in the case of *zashite-iru* discussed above: The *kōgo* auxiliary *shite* (して doing so) was also added to the *bungo* element *motsure-**tsu** karami-**tsu*** (もつれつ　からみつ being tangled and interwoven), which in *shūshi* form is (*-tsu*) and should therefore end with *-tsu* (c.f. note b in Table 6). That is, a *bungo* construction is embedded so that the embedding *kōgo* construction could adopt the literary color of the embedded *bungo* form.

Table 6 Use of *bungo* grammatical items in *Meguriai* and *Kigū* (*Tri vstreči*)

	1888		1896		
	Bungo	*Kōgo*	*Bungo*	*Kōgo*	Russian
1	本宅へはとんと歸りて來ぬ (173.u)			とんと本宅へ歸つて來ぬ[a] (271.o)	a domoj i ne pokazyvajutsja (234.15)
	(*hon-taku e wa tonto kaerite konu*)			(*tonto hon-taku e kaette konu*)	‘but at home (they) don’t appear’
	‘(They) don’t come home at all.’			‘(They) don’t come home at all.’	
2	えならぬ香に浸みて、 (173.u)			何やら佳(い)い香(にほひ)が紛々として、(271.u)	blagovonnyj (234.31)
	(*e-naranu ka ni shimite,*)			(*naniyara ii nioi ga funpun to shite,*)	‘fragrant’
	‘surrounded by an indescribable fragrance.			‘some fragrance was perceived around’	
3	掩ひかゝりて、 (174.u)			懸(かか)つて、 (272.o)	**naletaja** na (235.12-13)
	(*ōi-kakarite,*)			(*kakatte,*)	‘flying over (it)’
	‘(it) covered (it) (in part) and,’			‘(it) covered (it) (in part) and,’	
4	寂寞(じゃくまく)たる (174.u)			穏かな (272.o)	spokojnoe (235.13)
	(*jakumaku-taru*)			(*odayaka-na)*	‘quiet’
	‘silent’			‘calm’	
5	ぬるみわたりて、 (174.u)			生暖(なまあたゝ)かな、(272.o)	teplyj (235.15)
	(*nurumi-watarite,*)			(*nama-atataka-na,*)	‘warm’
	‘(it) became lukewarm around, and’			‘lukewarm’	
6	「タッソ」の家をも見物せずして[b] (177.u)		タッソーの宅(いへ)をも見物せずに, (274.u)		ne **posetiv** daže Tassova doma. (238.8)
	(*“Tasso” no ie o mo kenbutsu sezu shite*)		(*Tassō no ie o mo kenbutsu sezu ni,*)		‘not having visited even Tasso’s house’
	‘without visiting even Tasso’s house’		‘without visiting even Tasso’s house’		

(continued)

Table 6 (continued)

	1888		1896		
	Bungo	*Kōgo*	*Bungo*	*Kōgo*	Russian
7	堪えぬほどに (181.u.) (*taenu hodo ni*) 'so that (one) could not bear'		耳の聾(しひ)るほど (278.u) (*mimi no shiiru hodo*) 'so that ears were numbed'		nesterpimoj (241.27) 'unbearable'
8		震て、うごめいて、笑て、 (182.o) (*furuete, ugomeite, waratte,*) '(it) trembles, moves, laughs,'	戰(おのゝ)きつ揺ぎつ笑ひつして (278.u) (*ononokitsu, yurugitsu, waraitsu shite,*) '(it) quaked, flickered, laughed,'		drožit, kolyšetsja, smeetsja. (241.30) '(it) trembles, sways, laughs,'
9	倒(たふれ)る、(183.o) (*tafureru,*) '(I) am falling down,'			倒れた...(279.u) (*taoreta...*) '(I) fell down...'	padaju (242.25) '(I) am falling down'
10	拂曉前(あけがたまへ)にはもウ起き出でた。(183.o) (*akegata-mae ni wa mō oki-ideta.*) '(I) got up (and went out) already before the dawn'			拂曉 (あけがた) 前には最う床を出て了つた。(279.u) (*akegata-mae ni wa mō toko o dete-shimatta.*) '(I) went out of the bed already before the dawn'	do sveta byl uže na nogax. (242.34-35) 'By the dawn (I) was already on my feet."

11	「ミハイロフスカヤ」と稱へる事、	ミハイロフスコエと稱(い)ふさうで、	čto . . . zvali Mixajlovskim,
	(185.o)	(281.u)	(244.26-27)
	(*„Mihairofusukaya“to ieru koto,*)	(*Mihairofusukoe to iu sō de,*)	‘that (they) called (the village) Mixajlovskoe’
	‘that (the village) was called “Mixajlovskaja”’	‘(The village) was called Mixajlovskoe, I heard’	
12	如何(いか)なる人なればこそ、箇程(かほど)にまで[c]人に慕はれるので有らう、	これほど人に慕はれて(. . .)といふ者は殆どないものである. . .	kakoj čelovek zasluživaet takuju predannost’,
	(187.u)	(284.o)	(246.36-37)
	(*ikanaru hito nareba koso, kahodo made ni hito ni shitawareru no de arō,*)	(*korehodo hito ni shitawarete (. . .) to iu mono wa hotondo nai mono de-aru. . .*)	‘Such a man deserves such faithfulness,’
	‘Such a man is so loved by the other,’	‘Such a man that is so loved by the other (. . .) is rare. . .’	
13	如何に美しい心なればこそ、箇程(かほど)にまで(. . .)	如何(どん)なに美しい心を持つてゐるか知らぬが、(284.o)	kakaja samaja prekrasnaja duša . . . takoe
	(187.u-188.o)		(246.37-38)
	(*ikani utsukushii kokoro nareba koso kahodo ni made (. . .)*)	(*donna ni utsukushii kokoro o motte-iru ka shiranu ga,*)	‘what beautiful soul (is worthy of) such a (. . .)’
	‘What a beautiful soul (can . . .)’	‘(I) don’t know what a beautiful soul (he) has’	
14	強ふるは(. . .)	無理に見やうとするのを(289.o)	Svoej (. . .) nastojčivosti.
	(192.u)		(251.17-18)
	(*shifuru wa (. . .)*)	(*muri-ni miyō to suru no o*)	‘my (. . .) persistence’
	‘(it is . . .) to force (to sow it)’	‘(I thought it is . . .) to persist in seeing (the house)’	
15	隠すでもなく隠さぬでもなしと云たやうで、(194.o)	ほのめかして、	xitro i tupo
		(290.o)	(252.19)
	(*kakusu demo naku kakusanu demo nashi to itta yō de,*)	(*honomekashite*)	‘cunningly and vaguely’
	‘(it), so to speak, neither hides nor reveals completely (it completely), ‘	‘(it) (simply) indicates (it),’	

(continued)

Table 6 (continued)

	1888		1896		
	Bungo	*Kōgo*	*Bungo*	*Kōgo*	Russian
16	伝はでもの事で有らう。(194.o)			いふまでもないこと。(290.o)	čitatel' legko dogadaetsja (252.24-25)
	(*iwa-demo no koto de arō*)			(*iu made mo nai koto*)	'The reader will easily guess (it).'
	'one would not need to say.'			'It is not to mention.'	
17	さもこはごはしき顔色(がんしょく)をして、(200.u)			温順(おとなし)さうでゐて薄氣味の悪い顔色(かほつき)を(. . .)して、(296.o)	s skromno-fatal'nym vyraženiem na lice (257.35-36)
	(*samo kowagowashiki ganshoku o shite,*)			(*otonashi-sō de ite usukimi no warui kaotsuki o (. . .) shite,*)	'with a reserved and disastrous expression on the face'
	'with a rough look on the face' (acc.)			'with a quiet but eerie look on the face,'	
18	婦人は (. . .)起上(たちあが)りて、(203.o)			女は(. . .)起上(たちあが)つて (298.u)	Ona (. . .) vstala (260.9)
	(*fujin wa (. . .) tachiagarite,*)			(*onna wa (. . .) tachiagatte,*)	'She (. . .) stood up'
	'The lady(. . .) stood up and'			'The woman (. . .) stood up and'	
19	誰にか玩弄せられたやうだが、(203.o)			誰かに弄(なぶ)られたやうな (298.u)	kak budto na smex (260.21-22)
	(*dare ni ka ganrō-serareta yō da ga,*)			(*dareka ni naburareta yōna*)	'as if (I) was laughed at'
	'as if (I) was played with by someone'			'as if (I) was made a fool of by someone'	
20	黒白(あや)もなき辨解を(203.u)			文(あや)もない辨解(いひわけ)を (299.o)	sbivčivye ob"jasnenija (261.1)
	(*aya mo naki benkai o*)			(*aya mo nai iiwake o*)	'(the) confusing explanations'
	'(my) confusing explanation'(acc.)			'(the) confusing explanation'(acc.)	

21	まんざら御縁が無いでもなし。	まんざら御縁が無いでもなし。	ėto kak budto daet vam nekotoroe pravo na moju otkrovennost'.
	(204.o)	(299.u)	(261.11-12)
	(*manzara go-en ga nai de mo nashi,*)	(*manzara go-en ga nai de mo nashi,*)	'It seems as if you have a certain right to my openness.'
	'(We are) not complete strangers to each other.'	'(We are) not complete strangers to each other.'	
22	籠りて	籠つて	Gluxo
	(205.u)	(301.o)	(262.17)
	(*komorite*)	(*komotte*)	'being muffled'
	'being muffled'	'being muffled'	

[a]One should treat the auxiliary ぬ (*-nu*) carefully because *bungo* and *kōgo* share the same form. The form *-nu* used here is the negative auxiliary in the *shūshi* form (the Conclusive form) and therefore *kōgo*: The negative auxiliary in *shūshi*-form in *bungo* is *-zu*. *Nu* in *bungo* is the *rentai* form (the Attributive form), but this negative *nu*, which is *bungo* originally, is used sporadically in the modern Japanese (i.e. in *kōgo*) especially in the written texts. This is also the case for forms like ***sezaru** o enai* (せざるを得ない cannot help . . .ing) *bekarazu* (べからず may not. . .). Those *bungo* forms are used mainly as idioms in modern Japanese. On the other hand, *nu* can also be the perfective auxiliary of which the *shūshi* form is *-nu* (cf. the *shūshi* form of negative auxiliary *-zu* above), but that perfective auxiliary *nu* is *bungo* only and is not used in *kōgo*

[b]The auxiliary *-shite* here is not the same as *-shite* in the case 3 in (2.5). The form *shite* is shared by *bungo* and *kōgo*, but in *bungo* the form *-shite* can be, as seen here, combined only with the *ren'yō* form (the adverbial form) of verbs and adjectives or the *shūshi* form of the negative auxiliary *-zu*. By contrast, *-shite* in 3 in (2.5) is combined with the *shūshi* form of the perfective auxiliary *-tsu*. Therefore, the form *-shite* in 3 in (2.5) is not of the *bungo* system but of the *kōgo* system

[c]The form *de arō* is functionally the same as *darō* nowadays. See also Kawato in this volume

In Table 5: 4, a *bungo* element is also used in the later version—the expressions *sa nakuba* (さなくば or) (1888) and *samo nakuba* (さもなくば or) (1896) are both *bungo* forms. The original word, the Russian conjunction *ili* (or) (in bold style), is itself not an especially literary expression, but the whole sentence, which contains that conjunction, is highly stylistic. It describes the beauty of nature. See the Russian original:

Ona byvaet xoroša tol'ko v inye letnie večera, kogda, vozvyšajas' otdel'no sredi nizkogo kustarnika, (. . .) drožit, (. . .) — **ili**, kogda, v jasnyj vetrennyj den', (. . .) každyj list ee, podxvačennyj stremlen'jem, kak budto xočet sorvat'sja, sletet' i umčat'sja vdal'.
(Turgenev 1963a, 261)
It (the tree) is beautiful only in such evenings in the summer, when (it), standing out alone among low bushes, (..) trembles, (. . .)— **or**, when it, in a clear windy day, (. . .) its every leaf, lifted up by the air stream, looks like as if they wanted to tear oneself away, to fly away and to fly far away.

The sentence's elevated style is obvious from the use of an adverbial participle (underlined with a simple line) and a passive participle that is not used as the attribute or as the predicate (underlined with a double line). In both translations the original sentence structure was changed as a result of topicalization. Compare the following:

Example from Table 5: 4 (1888)

Kono ki no mite kokoroyoi toki to itte wa, tada seibikuna kanboku no chūō ni ichidan takaku sobiete, (. . .) kaze ni soyoide-iru natsu no yūgure ka, —— sa nakuba sora nagori naku harewatatte kaze no susamajiku fuku hi, (. . .) kaze ni fuki-nayamasareru ko no ha no imanimo kozue o mogi-hanarete tōku fuki-tobasare sōni mieru toki ka de.
この樹の見て快よい時と云ツては、只背びくな灌木の中央に一段高く聳えて、(. . .)風に戦いでゐる夏の夕暮れか、——さなくば空名殘なく晴れ渡ツて風のすさまじく吹く日、(. . .)風に吹きなやまされる木の葉の今にも梢をもぎ離れて遠く吹き飛ばされさうに見える時かで。(Futabatei 1981a, 159.o–159.u)
The only moments in which this tree looks beautiful are evenings in the summer in which it is, standing out in the midst of low bushes, (. . .) rustling in the wind, —— **or** the moment in a day the sky is very clear and the wind blows violently (. . .) and its leaves, damaged by the blowing, look as if they would be torn away from the treetop at any moment and be blown far away.[7]

Example from Table 5: 4 (1896)

Kono ki no mite kokoromochi no yoi toki to itte wa, hikui kanboku no naka ni ippon takaku sobiete, (. . .) kaze ni sawagu natsu no yūgure ka, ——samo nakuba, kaze no fuku hareta hi ni, (. . .) zawazawa-to kaze ni momitate-rareru sono ikioi ni ha ga mogarete, satto fuki-tobasare sōna toki ka de-aru.
此樹の觀(み)て心持(こころもち)の好(よ)い時と云つては、低い灌木の中に一本高く聳えて、(. . .)風に騒ぐ夏の夕暮れか——さもなくば、風の吹く晴れた日に、(. . .)ざわざわと風に揉立(もみた)てられる其勢(そのいきほひ)に葉が捥(もが)れて、颯(さつ)と吹飛(ふきとば)されさうな時かである。(Futabatei 1981a, 305.o)

[7] All the Russian and Japanese example sentences in this paper are translated by the author because in published translations the text structure is often intentionally changed so that the translation itself can become a literary work and they are therefore not always adequate to linguistic analyses, and also because I sought to keep a stylistic consistency among the translations in this paper.

The moments in which this tree looks pleasant are evenings in the summer in which it, standing out in the midst of low bushes, rustles in the wind—or the moment when, in a clear windy day, its leaves are about to be torn away and blown away, rustling, crumpled by a violent air stream.

Besides the fact that the Russian original text is written in an elevated style, one should also note its motif: the text portrays the beauty of nature. Since the earliest literary works in Japan in the early eleventh century like, for example, *Makura no sōshi* (枕草子 *The pillow book*), the depiction of the beauty of nature has been one of the most important motifs in traditional literature, which was, of course, always written in *bungo*. The example in Table 5: 1, 2 and 16 are also taken from a text describing nature. Thus, not only the original text's style but also its motif might have influenced the choice of the variety.

It is interesting that the verb *drožít* (trembles) is found here since this verb in another of Turgenev's works, *Tri vstreči*, is also translated with a *bungo* element (see Table 6: 8 below).

The example in Table 5: 11 is the utterance of a (not very educated) servant. The expression 多し could be the *bungo* form *ō-shi* (多し many), but it could be also interpreted as the description of a careless pronunciation of the form *ōi-shi* (多いし many). The discourse particle *shi* is pervasive in modern colloquial Japanese. This is therefore an exception.

In the translations from *Tri vstreči*, *Meguriai,* and *Kigū* the situation is, in general, the same:

In *Aibiki* the *bungo* elements in the earlier version were mostly replaced with another lexeme in the later version, for example *soba e* ***yorite*** (傍へ寄りて got closer by) versus *soba e* ***kite*** (傍へ來て came closer by) in Table 5: 10. Here, in contrast with *Meguriai* and *Kigū*, more *bungo* elements were replaced with the corresponding *kōgo* words in the later version: Table 6: 1 *kae**ri**te* (歸りて) versus *kae**t**te* (歸つて) (come home), Table 6: 3 (*ōi*)*kaka**ri**te* ((掩ひ)かゝりて) versus *kaka**t**te* (懸つて) (cover), Table 6: 10 ***i**de-* (出で) versus *de-* (出) (go out), Table 6: 18 *tachiaga**ri**te* (起上りて) versus *tachiaga**t**te* (起上つて) (stand up), Table 6: 20 *na**k**i* (なき) versus *na**i*** (ない) (not existing) and Table 6: 22 *komo**ri**te* (籠りて) versus *komo**t**te*. (籠つて) (being muffled).

There is a clear difference between *Aibiki* and *Meguriai* on the one hand and *Kigū* on the other regarding Futabatei's attitude towards the language system. In *Aibiki* he understood the difference between *bungo* and *kōgo* to exist mainly at the lexical level, while in *Meguriai* and *Kigū* he viewed the two language varieties as different on other systematic levels as well.

In Table 6: 6, 7 and 8 the *bungo* elements occur in the later version. In Table 6: 8 a *kōgo* element in the early version even 'reverted' to *bungo*. It can be clearly attributed to the style of this part of the original text where the hero describes in a very elevated style a dream he had the previous night. The verb *drožít* (trembles) found in the sentence, which contained a *bungo* element in the *Svidanie* translation (Table 5: 4), is here also translated with a *bungo* element.

Table 6: 6 is particularly notable: The form *sezu-shite* (せずしてwithout doing ...) and the form *sezu-ni* (せずに without doing...) are both *bungo*-forms. However, the latter is often used in the modern *kōgo* system, for example in *yomazu-ni*

(読まずに without reading) or *yarazu-ni* (やらずにwithout doing), in parallel with the corresponding *kōgo* forms *yomanai de* (読まないで) and *yaranai de* (やらないで). The use of the former is much more limited; therefore the latter is stylistically closer to *kōgo*.

The examples in Table 6: 2–5 are from a text describing the beauty of nature in an elevated style. Here again it is clear how the text's motif influenced the choice of *bungo*. In Table 6: 3, again, an adverbial participle *naletaja* (flying (over)) (in bold style) can be found. Notice that in Table 6: 6 an adverbial participle, *ne posetiv* (not having visited) (in bold style), is also translated with a *bungo* element.

The example in Table 6: 21 is the utterance of a lady. The form *nashi* (なし) is a *bungo*-element, but the form *demo nashi* (でもなし) or *wake dewa nashi* (わけではなし) (it is not the case that. . .) is used today in colloquial conversation.

Target Variety in Japanese and Use of Copula in Russian

In the previous chapter the correlation between the choice of the target variety on the one hand, and the style, motif, and function of the word(s), sentence(s), or the concerned *part* of the original text on the other was discussed. Is there, therefore, a relationship or correlation between the style of the whole source text and the choice of target language? I suggest that the use of the copula in Russian provides a clue to this.

The Russian copula has lost the paradigm of number and that of person in present tense. Only the form of the third person singular—*est'*—has remained under sentence focus and is left out otherwise. Thus, the corresponding constructions 'it is a car' or 'he is a student' are '*ėto est' mašina*' or '*on est' student*'. Moreover, if the copula *est'* is explicitly expressed in a text, the text is marked as a writing style.[8] Compare the following sentences:

a. Kommunizm **est'** sovetskaja vlast' pljus ėlektrifikacija vsej strany.
b. Kommunizm – sovetskaja vlast' pljus ėlektrifikacija vsej strany.
Communism is the power of the Soviets plus the electrification of the whole country.

For such content a writing style is considered more suitable. Thus, the variation (a), which is construction with an explicit copula, is considered a better fit. However, in a colloquial context the explicit use of *est'* is not completely acceptable. For example, in the following conversation: 'What is his occupation?—He is a student,' the usual construction is "*Kto ∅ on?—On ∅ student*." Variations with the explicit copula, for example, "*Kto **est'** on?—On **est'** student,*" are awkward.

Thus, in Russian one can measure the degree to which an expression is of a written style according to the frequency of use of the copula form *est'* (be):

[8] According to Mulisch, for example, the present forms of the copula (est' and sut', see below) are seldom used, "hauptsächlich im wissenschaftlichen oder publizistischen Stil bei Definitionen und Aufzählungen" (mainly in a scientific or journalistic style for definitions and enumerations) (Mulisch 1996, 285). A 'scientific' or 'journalistic' style could be interpreted as a non-colloquial style.

In the table below, the numbers of the texts are the same as in the Table 1 above. There is a very clear correlation between the choice of the target variety and the frequency of the use of Russian copula *est'* in the text concerned.

The table shows how often *est'* is used as copula in a text (Table 7).[9] In 24 source texts of Futabatei's 34 translations listed in Table 1 above, the use of *est'* was present. Two of those 34 works, *Svidanie* and *Tri vstreči*, were translated twice: the original of Table 1: 5 and 10 (*Svidanie*) and that of Table 1: 7 and 11 (*Tri vstreči*) are the same respectively. Thus, in Table 1: 10 and 11 it is not counted.

All of *est'* uses in every text were counted and the length of the text measured.

The text length was measured as follows: First, a representative page from the text in question was selected that was not filled in either too narrowly or too broadly and therefore can be considered to show the average word density per page. Then the number of the words in the representative page and the number of pages of the whole text was counted. In two longer works, *Rudin* (Table 1: 15) and *Dym* (Table 1: 18), five representative pages were selected and the average word number calculated on that basis. The number of words in the representative page was then multiplied by the number of the pages to obtain the total number of words in the whole text. The third digit of the total number is rounded up (e.g., 6,384 → 6,400, in *Ideja iskusstva*, Table 1: 1). When measuring text length in the case of works only partially translated, only the number of pages and words of the translated part were taken into account and not of the whole work. See for example Table 1: 3, 6 and 8.

To calculate the frequency of the use of *est'*, the length (the total number of the words) is divided by the number of the copular use of *est'*. In other words, the smaller the number in the 'frequency' column the more frequently *est'* is used.

In the works of Table 1: 1, 2, and 21 the form *sut'* is used. *Sut'* is originally the form of the third person plural, but its use is more limited than *est'*—that is, *sut'* is even more literary or more indicative of written style than *est'*. *Sut'* is counted as copula with *est'*.

There is a clear parallel between the frequency of the use of the copular *est'* on the one hand and the genre of texts and the translating variety on the other. (See the bold-styled column.)

First compare the frequency of the use of *est'* (*sut'* inclusive) in the treatises (Table 1: 1, 2, 3, 8 and 9) with that in novels and dramas (the remainders). The frequency values of the treatises are 116, 133, 800, 1,400, and 233 respectively and thus, are clearly smaller than those of the novels. With a few exceptions, the gray area (Table 1: 21, 27 and 28)—the gap between novels and treatises—is pretty clear: in most novels the frequency value of the use of *est'* is above 6,000 while in most treatises it is under 1,000.

[9] Beside the copular function the verb *est'* has two other functions: one is an impersonal expression of existence, which corresponds to constructions "there are/there is ..." in English, e.g. **Est'** ešče dva-tri soseda (**There are** another two or three neighbors.) (Turgenev 1963c, 274). Constructions of this type sometimes include a locative phrase like 'in Russia', e.g. V Rossii **est'** tri preobladajuščie tipa soldat ... (In Russia **there are** three main types of soldier...) (Tolstoj 1951, 34) and so on. The other function is an idiomatic use of *est'*, e.g., to est' ('that is'). These two kinds of *est'* were not taken into consideration here.

Table 7 The use of *est'* in the Russian original texts translated by Futabatei

					Existence-*est'*				Idiomatic *est'*			Total (+ *sut'*)
			Copula-*est'* (+ *sut'*)		Without loc.	With loc.	Total		*To est'*	Others	Total	
Work, genre	Length	Trsl. into	Num.	Frequency	Num.	Num.	Num	Freq.	Num.	Num.	Freq.	Num.
1. **trts**	6,400	**b**	51 + 4	**116**	6	1	7	914	1	—	6,400	59 + 4
2. **trts**	1,200	**b**	8 + 1	**133**	—	1	1	1,200	1	—	1,200	10 + 1
3. **trts**	2,400	**b**	3	**800**	1	1	2	1,200			∞	5
5. nv	2,800	**k**	—	∞	—	—	—	∞	—	1	2,800	1
6. nv	2,500	**k**	—	∞	—	—	—	∞	—	—	∞	—
7. nv	8,500	**k**	—	∞	—	1	1	8,500	2	—	4,250	3
8. **trts**	2,800	**k**	2	**1,400**	1	2	3	933	3	—	933	8
9. **trts**	2,100	**b**	9	**233**	1	2	3	700	3	—	700	15
12. nv	13,800	**k**	1	**13,800**	2	8	10	1,380	1	—	1,3800	12
15. nv	39,300	**k**	4	**9,825**	12	18	30	1,310	10	2	3,275	46
18. nv	52,600	**k**	8	**6,575**	8	14	22	2,391	18		2,922	48
19. nv	5,900	**k**	—	∞	—	2	2	2,950	—	—	∞	2
20. nv	12,200	**k**	2	**6,100**	3	5	8	1,525	7		1,743	17
21. nv	11,500	**k**	7 + 1	**1,438**	6	3	9	1,278	2	2	2,875	20 + 1
22. nv	4,100	**k**	—	∞	—	4	4	1,025	1	—	4,100	5
23-1. dr.	6,100	**ad.k**	—	∞	2	4	6	1,017	11	1	508	18
23-2.[a] dr.	9,100	**ad.k**	— + 1	**9,100**	2	5	7	1,300	18	2	455	27 + 1
24. nv	5,100	**ad.k**	—	∞	—	1	1	5,100	2	—	2,550	3
25. nv	9,600	**k**	—	∞	3	6	9	1,067	—	—	∞	9
26. nv	14,200	**k**	1	**14,200**	2	3	5	2,840	5	—	2,840	11
27. nv	1,400	**b**	3	**467**	1	3	4	350	2		700	9
28. nv	600	**b**	1	**600**	—	—	—	∞	—	—	∞	1

29. nv	7,700	**k**	1	**7,700**	—	—	—	∞	1	—	7,700	2
30. nv	7,100	**k**	1	**7,100**	1	1	2	3,550	1	—	7,100	4
34. nv	18,700	**k**	—	∞	2	6	8	2,338	—	—	∞	8

The abbreviations used here are as follows: ***trsl. into*** translated into, ***trts.*** treatise, ***nv*** novel, ***dr*** drama, ***num.*** number, ***freq.*** frequency, ***loc***. locative, ***ad.*** adaptation, ***b*** *bungo*, ***k*** *kōgo*

[a]There are two versions of the Turgenev drama. One was published as a book and the other is a version published in a journal and later censored; 23–1 and 23–2 represent the book and journal version respectively

There are, however, some exceptions and borderline cases—the *novels To, čego ne bylo* by Garšin (Table 1: 27), and *O serom* by Gor'kij (Table 1: 28) have a small frequency value (under 1,000). Furthermore, Tolstoj's novel *Rubka lesa* (Table 1: 21), and Dobroljubov's *treatise* (Table 1: 8) have an almost equal value (1,438 und 1,400 respectively). The former has a relatively small frequency value for a literary work (it is of a higher literary style or more indicative of a written style than many novels) while the latter shows a relatively low degree of writing style for a treatise (i.e. it is less indicative of written style than average treatises).

The treatises, texts with a small value in the column 'frequency,' or a high frequency of use of *est'*, are translated into *bungo* while novels, texts with a large value or a low frequency of *est'*, are rendered into *kōgo*. However, exceptional texts are translated in an exceptional way. First, the treatise with an *exceptionally* low frequency of *est'*, Dobroljubov's treatise, is translated *exceptionally* into *kōgo* (Table 1: 8). Second, two novels that have *exceptionally* high frequencies of *est'*, Garšin's (Table 1: 27) and Gor'kij's (Table 1: 28) short stories, are translated *exceptionally* into *bungo*.

Thus, the target variety is not arbitrarily chosen. First, there is a clear correlation between the sort of texts (novels or treatises) and the target variety (*bungo* or *kōgo*). Second, there is an even clearer parallel between the degree to which the source text is indicative of written style and the choice of the target variety—that is, there is an apparent parallel between the frequency of use of the copula in the original Russian text and the choice of the target variety in Japanese. This suggests that the areas in which each variety was used did not completely overlap at that time; *bungo* and *kōgo* varieties were still partially used in functionally complementary distribution.

On the other hand, the use of *bungo* in the latter two cases, in Table 1: 27 and 28 (see below), could not be exclusively attributed to the frequency of *est'* in the source; in other words, it cannot be attributed to the original text's writing style alone but also to the Japanese tradition as it had developed at that time.

Moreover, it is notable that those texts, especially Table 1: 28, are significantly shorter than the others. One cannot miss seeing the shrinkage of *bungo*'s functional area in relation to short texts.

The answer to the question posed in section "Futabatei Shimei's Translations"—namely, whether the two varieties were equivalent in their writing function for Futabatei at that time—is clearly 'No'.

Texts Not Based upon Russian

In some of his translations Futabatei wrote comments on the work or added a prolog. Those texts are not based upon Russian texts since they are not translations. While the *kōgo* variety in translations—texts based upon Russian, especially its narrative literary style—was developed relatively early. Those texts that were not written in direct contact with Russian, such as the prolog or comments, were not stylistically adapted at a later date. They were written either in the *desu-masu* style of *kōgo* or in *bungo*. The *desu-masu* style is closer to spoken language; it is sometimes considered redundant and therefore not used very often today as a

written style. Futabatei wrote his translation in the *da* style, which became the model for his successors. Yet, even for his successful translations he wrote his comments in the (redundant) *desu-masu* style or even in *bungo*. As a result, there is a huge stylistic difference between the main text and the prolog. The following are examples of the prolog and the beginning of the main text in *Aibiki*:

Example (a)

> Kono Aibiki wa sennen furansu de shikyo-shita, rokoku de wa yūmei-na shōsetsu-ka, Tsurugeenefu to iu hito no hamono no saku desu. (...) Watashi no yakubun wa ware nagara fushigi-to sono nan da ga, kore demo genbun wa kiwamete omoshiroi desu.
> このあひゞきは先年仏蘭西で死去した、露国では有名な小説家、ツルゲーネフといふ人の端物の作です。(...)私の譯文は我ながら不思議とソノ何んだが、是れでも原文は極めて面白いです。(Futabatei 1981a, 158)
> This "Aibiki" is a short work of the novelist Turgenev, a famous novelist in Russia, who died in Paris. (...) I myself consider my translation to be strangely, eh, what should one call it? But nevertheless the original text is very interesting.

Example (b)

> Aki kugatsu chūjun to iu koro, ichi-jitsu jibun ga saru kaba no hayashi no naka ni zashite-ita koto ga atta. Kesa kara kosame ga furi-sosogi, sono harema ni wa oriori nama-atatakana hikage mo sashite, makotoni kimagure na sora-ai.
> 秋九月中旬といふころ、一日自分がさる樺の林の中に座してゐたことが有ツた。今朝から小雨が降りそゝぎ、その晴れ間にはおりおり生ま暖かな日陰も射して、まことに気まぐれな空ら合ひ。(Futabatei 1981a, 158)
> Once, towards the middle of September, I was sitting in a birch forest. It had been raining lightly since the morning, but now and then the warm sun was shining. A very unsettled weather.

Example (a) (prolog) contains not only the highly colloquial expression *sono nan daga* (ソノ何んだが eh, what should one call it?), but also a newly coined construction. The clause *watashi no yakubun wa ware nagara fushigi-to sono nan da ga* (私の譯文は我ながら不思議とソノ何んだが I myself consider my translation to be strangely, eh, what should one call it?) and the clause *genbun wa kiwamete omoshiroi desu* (原文は極めて面白いです The original text is very interesting) are bound by the conjunction *kore demo* (是れでも but nevertheless), which would not usually correspond to the semantic relation between two clauses.

Such stylistic differences between a prolog and the main text could be attributed to the fact that the main text is based upon the Russian text but the prolog is not. Futabatei wrote his first novel *Ukigumo* (浮雲 *Floating clouds*)—a text not based on Russian—in *kōgo*. The text in *Ukigumo* is, however, clearly not fixed stylistically in comparison to his first Turgenev translation. See the following example from *Ukigumo*:

Example (c)

> (...) sate wa rōkyū-shite mo sasuga wa mada shoku ni taeru mono nano ka, shikashi nihon-fuku demo tsutome-rareru o-tegaruna o-mi-no-ue, sari to wa mata o-kinodoku-na.
> (...)さては老朽しても流石はまだ職に堪へるものか、しかし日本服でも勤められるお手軽なお身の上、さりとはまたお気の毒な。(Futabatei 1981a, 5)

(. . .) aha, it seems that he, although he is old, can still bear to work. But it is such easy work that one can do in Japanese clothes (= in casual wear). I am sorry that he is like that.

The expression *sari* < *sa-ari* (さり it/he/she is so) is a *bungo* element. The fact that a *kōgo* text contains several *bungo* elements is not unusual in his translation. But again, here the logical connection between the two-clause *nihon-fuku demo tsutome-rareru o-tegaruna o-mi-no-ue* (日本服でも勤められるお手軽なお身の上 a person that has such easy work that one can do in Japanese clothes) the clause *o-kinodoku-na* (お気の毒な I am sorry), bound with the phrase *sari-towa* (さりとは that he is so) (underlined), is not easily comprehensible. This kind of construction, in which clauses that are not logically connected are nevertheless linked with a (unusual) conjunction, was also seen in the prolog above.

Furthermore, the main text of *Ukigumo* and the prolog in *Meguriai* are stylistically very similar. Compare the beginning of *Ukigumo* with that of the prolog in *Meguriai*:

Example (d)

Chihaya-furu kamina-zuki mo mohaya ato futsuka no nagori to natta nijū-hachi-nichi no gogo sanji-goro ni, (. . .)
千早振(ちはやふ)る神無月(かみなづき)も最早(もはや)跡二日の余波(なごり)となツた廿八日の午後三時頃に、(. . .)(Futabatei 1981a, 4)
At about 3 o'clock in the afternoon on the 28th, only two days remaining until the end of the month, in which the quick and courageous gods are absent (= October)),

Example (e)

Miyako no hana no sakizome ni aoba mo hana no nigiyakashi da, nanzo hitotsu kaite miro to iu nasake aru katagata no ōse ni sugatte (. . .)
都の花の咲きぞめに青葉も花のにぎやかしだ、何ぞ一つ書いて見ろといふ情けある方々の仰せにすがツて(. . .)(Futabatei 1981a, b, 172)
Being encouraged by the suggestion from gentle people to write something, because in the capital the blossom began to bloom and the greenery is also as colorful as the blossom. . .

Both clauses written in *kōgo* contain the formulaic expressions *chihaya-furu* (千早振るquick and courageous) and *miyako no hana no sakizome ni aoba mo hana no nigiyaka**shi** da* (都の花の咲きぞめに青葉も花のにぎやかしだ in the capital the blossoms began to bloom and the greenery is also as colorful as the blossoms). In the latter the *bungo* ending *-shi* (in bold style) can be found. In fact, they are simply traditional idioms that give a poetic color to the text without adding any informative content. Such idioms are frequent in traditional Japanese literature. In the poetic sense they are effective, but in the purely informational sense they are redundant. The main text of the translation *Meguriai* does not contain such redundant forms. Compare:

Example (f)

Doko e to itte natsu no uchi ni wa "Gurinnoe"-mura e hodo yoku yūryō ni itta tokoro wa nakatta,
何処へと云ツて夏の中には「グリンノエ」村へほどよく遊獵に往ツた所はなかツた、(Futabatei 1981a, b, 172)
There was no village that I visit as often as Glinnoe in the summer to go hunting.

In translations from Russian such traditional poetic vocabulary is not used.

Thus, the direct contact with Russian promoted the stylistic development of *kōgo* in Futabatei. Without contact with Russian texts his *kōgo* remained fluid. It is only in 1907 that he wrote his prolog in the *da* style for the translation of Polivanov's *Končilsja* (*Finished*), although he had already established the *da* style in 1888 in the actual translation. In the following table (Table 8), the language used by Futabatei in prologs, main texts, and epilogs is listed. The numbers are the same as those in Table 1. The symbol '*da*' means the *da* style and '*desu*' is the *desu-masu* style. Both styles belong to the *kōgo* variety.

The variety (*bungo* or *kōgo*) used in the prolog and that of the main text mainly correspond, so that if the main text is written in *bungo*, the prolog is also written in *bungo* (Table 8: 1, 3, 9 and 28), and if in *kōgo* (in the *da* or *desu* style) the prolog is, in most cases, also written in *kōgo* (Table 8: 5, 6, 7, 8 and 30). A *bungo* prolog or a *bungo* epilog can also introduce a *kōgo* main text (Table 8: 19 and 24)[10] but not vice versa. There is not one case in Futabatei's translation works where the main text is written in *bungo* and the prolog (or the epilog) in *kōgo*. This indicates that *kōgo* and *bungo* were not considered functionally equivalent for a long time. Only in 1907 with the translation from Polivanov did the *da* style accept the *bungo* function completely (Table 8: 30 in bold style).

Here again one might answer the question posed in section "Futabatei Shimei's Translations", "Were *bungo* and *kōgo* equivalent in their writing function?" with a simple 'No.'

Conclusion

This paper has investigated the processes by which Russian, after its first impact, further influenced the progress of the modern Japanese writing variety, *kōgo*.

The developing process of the *kōgo* variety as the writing language in translations from Russian corresponds to the course of the *genbun itchi* movement in the language society in general. Its progress was not straightforward but went through a stagnation phase both in Futabatei's translation activity and in the *genbun itchi* movement throughout larger society. However, after a closer examination of the translations it cannot be overlooked that even in the stagnation phase the traditional writing variety, *bungo*, was in decline.

On the other hand, investigating Futabatei's early translations more closely shows us that *bungo* did not relinquish its traditional functional area easily—when translating texts written in an elevated style or a motif that had been used often in traditional literature, *bungo* elements were used even when the whole text itself was written in *kōgo*.

[10] Such text patterns were also found in the Edo period. In some texts from Edo-literature the prolog was written in *bungo* (mainly in the *kanbun*-style) while in the main text the spoken language was used.

Table 8 Language variety and style in prologs and epilogs in Futabatei's translation

	Written in	Japanese title	Author of the original	Prolog	Main text	Epilog	Genre (sort of translation)
1	Before 1886	美術の本義 *Bijutsu no hongi*	Belinskij	*bungo*	*bungo*	—	Treatise (Translation)
2	Before 1886	米氏文辭の類別 *Bei-shi bunji no ruibetsu*	Belinskij	—	*bungo*	—	Treatise (Translation)
3	1886/May-Jun.	カートコフ氏美術俗解 *Kaatokofu-shi bijutsu zokkai*	Katkov	*bungo*	*bungo*	—	Treatise (Translation)
4	1888/Apr.	學術と美術との差別 *Gakujutsu tobijutsu to no sabetsu*	Pavlov?	—	*bungo*	—	Treatise (Translation)
5	1888/Jul-Aug.	あひびき *Aibiki*	Turgenev (Translation)	*desu*	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
6	1888–1889	おひたち *Oitachi*	Gončarov	*desu*	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
7	1888/Oct.–1889/Jan.	めぐりあひ *Meguriai*	Turgenev	*desu*	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
8	1889/Apr.-May	文學の本色及び平民と文學との關係 *Bungaku no honshoku oyobi heimin to bungaku to no kankei*	Dobroljubov	*desu*	*desu*	—	Treatise (Translation)
9	1892/Mar.-Apr.	「アリストーテリ」悲壯體院劇論解釋 *"Arisutōteri" hisōtaiingeki-ron kaishaku*	Filonov	*bungo*	*bungo*	—	Treatise (Translation)
10	1896/Nov.	あひびき *Aibiki*	Turgenev	—	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
11	1896/Nov.	奇遇 *Kigū*	Turgenev	—	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
12	1896/Nov.	片戀 *Katakoi*	Turgenev	—	*da*/*desu*	—	Novel (Translation)
13	1897/Jan.-Mar.	肖像畫 *Shōzō-ga*	Gogol'	—	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)

14	1897/Apr.	夢かたり *Yume-katari*	Turgenev	—	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
15	1897/Apr.-Oct.	うき草 *Ukikusa*	Turgenev	—	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
16	1898/Jan.	猶太人 *Yudaya-jin*	Turgenev	—	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
17	1898/Nov.	くされ縁 *Kusare-en*	Turgenev	—	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
18	1903–1905	けふり *Kefuri*	Turgenev	—	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
19	1904/Jan.	黒龍江畔の勇婦 *Kokuryūkōhan no yūfu*	Elec	*(bungo)*	*desu*	*bungo*	Novel (Translation)
20	1904/Feb.	四人共産團 *Yonin kyōsan-dan*	Potapenko	—	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
21	1904/Jul.	つゝを枕 *Tsutsu o makura*	Tolstoj	—	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
22	1904/Jul.	四日間 *Yokka-kan*	Garšin	—	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
23	1905/Jan.	わからずや *Wakarazuya*	Turgenev	—	(*da*/*desu*)	—	Drama (Adaptation)
24	1905/Jan.	露助の妻 *Rosuke no tsuma*	Ščeglov	*bungo*	*da*	—	Novel (Adaptation)
25	1905/Feb.-Mar.	猶太人の浮世 *Jū no ukiyo*	Gor'kij	—	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
26	1906/Jan.-Mar.	ふさぎの蟲 *Fusagi no mushi*	Gor'kij	—	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
27	1906/Feb.	根無し草 *Nenashigusa*	Garšin	—	*bungo*	—	Novel (Translation)
28	1906/Apr.	灰色人 *Haiiro-bito*	Gor'kij	*bungo*	*bungo*	—	Novel (Translation)

(continued)

Table 8 (continued)

	Written in	Japanese title	Author of the original	Prolog	Main text	Epilog	Genre (sort of translation)
29	1906/May	むかしの人 *Mukashi no hito*	Gogol’	—	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
30	**1907/Feb.-Aug.**	志士の末期 ***Shishi no matsugo***	**Polivanov**	***da***	***da***	—	**Novel (Translation)**
31	1907/Mar.	二狂人 *Ni-kyōjin*	Gor’kij	—	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
32	1907/Mar.-May	狂人日記 *Kyōjin-nikki*	Gogol’	—	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
33	1907/Jul.	乞食 *Kojiki*	Gor’kij	—	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)
34	1908/Jul.	血笑記 *Kesshō-ki*	Andreev	—	*da*	—	Novel (Translation)

The contribution to the development of *kōgo* as a new written language that resulted from contact with Russian is illustrated by a number of factors. First, by comparing Futabatei's first two *kōgo* translations one can follow how Russian was instrumental in replacing *bungo* elements with *kōgo* elements, and how the translator developed his consciousness of the difference between the two language varieties. Second, texts that were not based on Russian (i.e. texts that were not translations) and texts translated from Russian reveal a huge stylistic difference even when they are written by the same person and in the same period. The latter is noticeably more homogeneous and stylistically fixed.

Contrary to popular opinion, Futabatei did not establish *kōgo* in 1888 when translating Turgenev's *Svidanie* and *Tri vstreči* for the first time nor in 1896 when translating the same works for the second time but in 1907 when he translated Polivanov's *Končilsja* (*Finished*) as *Shishi no matsugo* (志士の末期 *Death of a patriot*). In this translation, the *da* style, the neutral *kōgo* writing style, was used for the first time in the prolog. Thus, *kōgo* was established here as the dominant variety not only structurally but also functionally.

References

Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. "Diglossia." *Word: Journal of the Linguistic Circle of New York, 15*: 325–340.

———. 1996a. "Language Development." In *Sociolinguistic Perspectives: Papers on Language in Society, 1959–1994 Charles A. Ferguson,*" edited by Thom Hueber, 40–47. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 1996b. "Then They Could Read and Write." In *Sociolinguistic Perspectives: Papers on Language in Society, 1959-1994 Charles A. Ferguson*, edited by Thom Hueber, 216–226. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Futabatei, Shimei. 1981a. *Futabatei Shimei Zenshū 1*. Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten.

———. 1981b. *Futabatei Shimei Zenshū 2*. Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten.

Mulisch, Herbert. 1996. *Handbuch der russischen Gegenwartssprache*. Leipzig: Langenscheid.

Nihon Hōgen-dai-jiten. 1991. Tōkyō: Shōgakukan.

Tolstoj, L.N. 1951. *Sobranie sočinenij v četyrnadcati tomax tom vtoroj: povesti i rasskazy (1852–1856)*. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo xudožestvennoj literatury.

Turgenev, I.S. 1963a. *Sočinenija tom četvertyj: Zapiski ochotnika 1847–1874*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk SSSR.

Turgenev, I.S. 1963b. *Sočinenija tom pjatyj: povesti i rasskazy 1844—1854*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk SSSR.

Turgenev, I.S. 1963c. *Sočinenija tom šestoj: povesti i rasskazy, rudin, stat'i i vospominanija 1853—1856*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk SSSR.

Yamamoto, Masahide. 1982. *Kindai buntai hassei no shiteki kenkyū*. Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten.