

# The *-ta* Form as *die reine Sprache* (Pure Language) in Futabatei's Translations

Hiroko Cockerill

## 1. Introduction

In his essay “The Task of the Translator,” Walter Benjamin clarifies his concept of *die reine Sprache* (pure language) by citing the following passage from Rudolf Pannwitz’s *Die Krisis der europäischen Kultur* (The crisis of European culture):

Our translations, even the best ones, proceed from a wrong premise. They want to turn Hindi, Greek, English into German instead of turning German into Hindi, Greek, English. Our translators have a far greater reverence for the usage of their own languages than for the spirit of the foreign works. . . . The basic error of the translator is that he preserves the state in which his own language happens to be instead of allowing his language to be powerfully affected by the foreign tongue. Particularly when translating from a language very remote from his own he must go back to the primal elements of language itself and penetrate to the point where work, image, and tone converge. He must expand and deepen his language by means of the foreign language. It is not generally realized to what extent this is possible, to what extent any language can be transformed. . . .<sup>1</sup>

Benjamin published this extraordinary essay as a preface to his 1923 translation of Baudelaire. Little did he know at the time that in Japan nearly two decades earlier another translator had already demonstrated the transformative power translation held over a native language. That translator was Futabatei Shimei, whose early translations had a profound impact on the development of the Japanese literary language. This article will demonstrate this impact through a close examination of Futabatei’s use of *-ta* as a past-tense and aspectual marker.

Benjamin’s “The Task of the Translator” inspired Karatani Kōjin to write “Hon’yakusha no Shimei” 翻訳者の四迷 (The translator Shimei).<sup>2</sup> Citing Benjamin, Karatani asserts that, in his translations from Turgenev, Futabatei Shimei 二葉亭四迷 (1864–1909) released “that pure language

which is under the spell of another,” and liberated “the language imprisoned in a work in his re-creation of that work.”<sup>3</sup> The translation to which Karatani makes particular reference is Futabatei’s first published translation “Aibiki” あひびき (The tryst, 1888) made from Turgenev’s “Svidanie” (The rendezvous).

Karatani then draws attention to an interesting anomaly concerning Futabatei’s translations. Futabatei’s translations from works by Turgenev conformed to an extremely “literal” (*chikugoyaku-teki na* 逐語訳的な) method and made such a strong impression on young writers of the naturalist school, Karatani observes, that they completely determined the direction of modern Japanese literature.<sup>4</sup> Futabatei’s translations from Gogol, on the other hand, though relying on a similarly literal approach, did not have any influence on contemporary writers. Karatani also asserts that Futabatei’s first original work *Ukigumo* 浮雲 (Floating clouds, 1887–1889), which shows some stylistic resemblance to his translations from Gogol, had little impact at the time of publication either. Karatani concludes that Futabatei’s translations from Gogol and his original work *Ukigumo* were ignored because most writers during the Meiji period did not value the Renaissance novel, with its internal narrator, but preferred realistic novels with no apparent narrator within.

While I fully concur with Karatani’s conclusion, I would like to raise several issues to further clarify the significance of Futabatei’s translations. First, why is it that Futabatei’s first two published translations, which constitute a relatively small part of his published work, and which he himself revised some years later, had such a disproportionate influence on contemporary writers? The translations which Karatani has identified as having had such a profound influence on young writers, and which he credits with releasing the “pure language” of the original, were, in fact, two out of nine translations Futabatei made from Turgenev: “Aibiki” (mentioned above) and “Meguriai” めぐりあい (A chance encounter, 1888–1889), a translation of “Tri vstrechi” (Three encounters). Futabatei’s seven other translations from Turgenev exemplify a different translation style. Although they were still “literal” and “word for word” translations, Futabatei significantly altered his translation method. Futabatei’s later translations from Turgenev’s works continued to be popular with the young naturalist writers, simply because they were translations from Turgenev, but their style was not imitated.

Second, why is that Futabatei’s first published translation from Gogol, “Shōzōga” 肖像畫 (The portrait), went largely unnoticed, and that sub-

sequent translations from Gogol and Gorky had so little influence? This is especially curious in the light of Karatani's assertion that Futabatei shows himself at his best in his translations from Gogol. Was it simply that "Shōzōga" was not a translation from Turgenev? Is Karatani right in asserting that "Shōzōga" was ignored because it was a translation from Gogol, written in a style similar to that found in *Ukigumo*? It is doubtful whether Futabatei's contemporaries even noticed the stylistic similarities between the Futabatei's translation from Gogol and *Ukigumo*.

"Shōzōga" was translated from Gogol's "Portret" (The portrait). It is one of three translations Futabatei made from Gogol, and the only translation from the first half of Futabatei's literary career (1887–1898) which was not made from a work by Turgenev. In the following section I will clarify the stylistic resemblance between *Ukigumo* and "Shōzōga" and offer support for Karatani's view that Futabatei shows himself at his best in the translations from Gogol. In the process I will show that Futabatei created a totally different translation style in "Shōzōga" from that found in "Aibiki" and "Meguriai," despite the fact that in each he applied an equally "literal and word for word translation method."

## 2. Futabatei's "Aibiki" and "Meguriai" (Translated from Turgenev's "The Rendezvous" and "Three Encounters")

Futabatei translated a total of nine works by Turgenev, mainly concentrated during the first half of his literary career. Futabatei translated three stories by Gogol and five by Gorky, mostly during the second half of his literary career (1899–1908). Araya Keizaburō notes that the very first translation Futabatei made was of a work by Gogol.<sup>5</sup> However, this translation was never published, but only shown to Futabatei's mentor Tsubouchi Shōyō 坪内逍遙.<sup>6</sup> "Aibiki" and "Meguriai" appeared in 1888 and 1889, concurrently with the serialized publication of *Ukigumo*, and were received with extraordinary enthusiasm by young writers of the naturalist school such as Kunikida Doppo 國木田獨歩 and Tayama Katai 田山花袋. Kunikida Doppo wrote his famous essay "Musashino" 武蔵野 under the influence of "Aibiki." He copied the following sentence directly from "Aibiki."

林の奥に座して四顧し、傾聴し、睥視し、黙想す。<sup>7</sup>

I sit in the grove, look around, listen, cast my eyes down and contemplate.

Compare this with the opening sentence from Futabatei's original:

自分は座して、四顧して、そして耳を傾けてみた。<sup>8</sup>  
I sat, looked around and listened.

Doppo famously declared that he began appreciating the beauty of the Musashino forest upon reading Futabatei's translation "Aibiki." Tayama Katai also spoke repeatedly of the striking impression he received from it. In his essay "Kindai no shōsetsu" 近代の小説 (Modern novels) Katai makes this point by referring to the following sentence, which appears towards the end of "Aibiki":

"Aa, aki da! Karaguruma no oto ga kokū ni hibiki watatta . . . [Yes, it is fall! The rattle of an empty wagon echoed in the clear air . . .]" The last sentence of "Aibiki" evoked an inexplicable feeling, and years later I still remembered this line when I went to the fields.<sup>9</sup>

Later translations from Turgenev's works such as "Katakoi" 片恋 (One-sided love, 1896) and *Ukikusa* 浮草 (Floating weed, 1897) were also well-received by writers of the naturalist school.

Accordingly, research on Futabatei's translations has concentrated on those from Turgenev, which have been admired by Japanese Slavists and translators from Russian, such as Jinzai Kiyoshi,<sup>10</sup> Kimura Shōichi,<sup>11</sup> Yonekawa Masao,<sup>12</sup> and Yanagi Tomiko,<sup>13</sup> and others.<sup>14</sup> Jinzai, in particular, determined the direction of research on Futabatei's translations by emphasizing the "faithfulness" found in those made from Turgenev, noting that most were made during his early years, and that "Aibiki" and "Meguriai" explicitly demonstrate Futabatei's faithfulness to the originals. He concluded that "for Futabatei, Turgenev was the most congenial writer" and that "he was the writer whose style was most suited to Futabatei's own."<sup>15</sup>

Interestingly, all these researchers unanimously value Futabatei's fidelity in reproducing the tone (*onchō* 音調) of Turgenev's originals when writing "Aibiki" and "Meguriai." Jinzai gives "Meguriai" unstinting praise, which he credits with being a translation that is not only "word-for-word" (*chikujiyaku* 逐字譯), but also "tone-for-tone" (*chikuchōyaku* 逐調譯).<sup>16</sup>

Kimura Shōichi also praises "Meguriai," suggesting it is the most literal and faithful translation he has ever seen. He notes the following features:

1. The number of periods in Futabatei's translations is almost the same as in the Russian original.

2. “Past tense verbs *-ta*” are frequently used in his translation, corresponding to the usage of the past tense in the Russian original.
3. Futabatei attempts to adhere to the word order of the original as far as Japanese syntax permits. Occasionally he even violates that syntax in order to adhere to the original word order.<sup>17</sup>

Yanagi makes a detailed examination of the punctuation used in “Aibiki” and “Meguriai,” comparing it with the punctuation in Turgenev’s originals. She praises Futabatei’s adherence to the variety and number of punctuation marks found in the originals. In so doing she supports the author’s own account of his approach to translation. The following is taken from an oft-cited lecture he gave in 1906:

If you think solely of the meaning when translating a foreign language, and attach excessive importance to it, you will take the risk of harming the original. I have always believed that you must saturate yourself with the rhythm of the original for some time, then transfer it to your own work. In my attempt to use Russian rhythms in my translations, I did not omit a single comma or period. **If the original contained three commas and one period, the translation also had three commas and one period.**<sup>18</sup>

Yonekawa Masao, who is generally critical of Futabatei’s translations, simply states that Futabatei tried but failed to adhere to these guidelines, as it is utterly impossible to follow such a method in literary translations.<sup>19</sup>

All these studies of “Aibiki” and “Meguriai” concentrate on the technical side of Futabatei’s translation method, mainly punctuation marks, in order to prove how “faithful” he was in making these translations, but they fail adequately to account for their historical context. Comparing Futabatei’s “Aibiki” and “Meguriai” to other contemporary translations,<sup>20</sup> it is clear that his use of western punctuation marks was, indeed, a revelation for most young writers. Tayama Katai wrote, “Futabatei’s new style, containing punctuation marks such as ‘?’ , ‘!’ and ‘—’ , stood out amongst conventional styles such as *para-kanbun kundoku*, Chikamatsu-like or Kōson-like styles. None of these styles had punctuation marks and their sentences meandered endlessly.”<sup>21</sup> Thus, what young writers marvelled at in Futabatei’s translations was not the fact that the original punctuation was meticulously reproduced but rather more simply that western punctuation marks, including basic marks such as commas and periods, were used at all. Significantly, western punctuation marks are not employed in Futabatei’s novel *Ukigumo*.

As previously noted, most scholars in the field of Russian literature put such emphasis on Futabatei's meticulous translation method in "Aibiki" and "Meguriai" that they pay little attention to how these translations were received. In contrast, Sugiyama Yasuhiko examines the enormous impact "Aibiki" had on young writers. What impressed these writers was not the rendezvous (during which an arrogant servant spurns a poor peasant girl), which forms the core of Turgenev's story, but the depiction of the beauty of the forest where the narrator witnesses their rendezvous. Sugiyama suggests that the novelty of "Aibiki" lies in the clear narrative point of view induced by the faithful rendition of the first-person singular pronoun *ya* (я) as *jibun* (自分), which he demonstrates in the close reading of the opening paragraph:

"Svidanie" (The rendezvous)

Я сидел в березовой роще осенью, около половины сентября . . . Я сидел и глядел кругом, и слушал.<sup>22</sup>

I was sitting in a birch grove in autumn, around the middle of September . . . I sat and looked around, and listened.

"Aibiki" (The tryst)

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つた。(中略)自分は座して、四顧して、そして耳を傾けてゐた。<sup>23</sup>

In autumn, around the middle of September, there was a day when I sat in a birch grove . . . I sat, looked around and listened.

Sugiyama concludes that the description of nature in "Aibiki" and "Meguriai" is more personal than the formulaic descriptions of nature that had been typical of Japanese literature prior to Futabatei. In Futabatei's translation nature is shown to be untamed and independent of human existence. The colloquial style of Futabatei's narrative was also unprecedented in its intimacy, as shown by the following reaction from Japan's leading symbolist poet Kanbara Ariake 蒲原有明:

I first came to know Futabatei's name through "Aibiki," which appeared in *Kokumin no tomo* (Friend of the nation). I was then in my first year of middle school, and my ability to appreciate literature was, of course, undeveloped. I was still at a stage where I enjoyed reciting *Kajin no kigū* (Strange encounters with beautiful women). A translation from the work of the Russian novelist Turgenev sounded very exotic. I thought I would have a look at it. Futabatei's *genbun itchi* style, with its masterly use of colloquial language—that unique style—sounded so fresh, its echoes seemed to go on whispering endlessly in my ears. A nameless joy filled me. At the same time I was so moved that

something deep within me almost wanted to shut it out. I just did not want to be spoken to so intimately.<sup>24</sup>

Futabatei faithfully reproduces the personal retrospective viewpoint specific to the memoir format of the original<sup>25</sup> by translating most of the first-person pronouns and by an extraordinarily consistent use of *-ta* when translating Russian past-tense verbs. It is these stylistic features that give rise to the intimate tone to which Ariake reacted so strongly.

In their zealous observation of Futabatei's technical fidelity, most Slavists fail to recognize that he was the first literary translator to employ *-ta* as a past-tense marker. Kimura Shōichi, for example, observes that Futabatei made use of "the Japanese past tense ending *-ta*" in his attempt to translate Russian past tense verbs faithfully. But he neglects to acknowledge that prior to Futabatei's use of *-ta* in this way there was no standard past-tense marker in written Japanese. Futabatei's use of the *-ta* form to express the meaning of the past tense was a profoundly influential innovation. It was the imitation of Futabatei's innovation in numerous translations and works of literature that led to the consolidation of *-ta* as a past-tense marker.

The *-ta* form, however, carries out another function as well: it serves as an aspectual marker indicating completeness. There used to be six classical endings that expressed the meaning of the past tense or **perfective** aspect: *-ki*, *-keri*, *-tsu*, *-nu*, *-tari*, *-ri*. Of these only *-tari* survives, in its abbreviated form *-ta*. In its classical form *-tari* expressed the state of being which results from the successful completion of an action. It might thus be more accurate to say it originally expressed **perfective** aspect rather than past tense, and it was often used in isolation following a string of non-past verbs. Interestingly, this original use of *-ta* is clearly presented in part 1 of *Ukigumo*.

Futabatei's unprecedentedly faithful translation methods in "Aibiki" and "Meguriai" apparently influenced his original writing. Parts 2 and 3 of *Ukigumo* show a sudden increase in the use of *-ta*. Part 2, which appeared just before the publication of "Aibiki" and "Meguriai," shows not only an increase in the number of forms ending in *-ta*, but also an increase in its consecutive use, indicative of it being a past-tense marker. There is another significant difference in the use of *-ta* in Part 2, compared with its use in Part 1. In Part 1 the subjects of sentences in which *-ta* is employed are hardly ever indicated. In Parts 2 and 3 Futabatei consciously employs the particles *wa* or *ga* to indicate the subjects of

consecutive sentences in which *-ta* is employed as a past-tense marker. The following passage from part 2 illustrates this point:

跡で文三は暫らくの間また腕を拱んで黙想してゐたが、フト何歎憶出したやうな面相をして、起上ツて羽織だけを着替へて、帽子を片手に二階を降りた。奥の間の障子を開けて見ると、果して昇が遊に來てゐた。加之も傲然と火鉢の側に大胡座をかいてゐた。その傍にお勢がベツタリ坐ツて、何かツベコベと端手なく嘯ツてゐた。少年の議論家は素肌の上に上衣を羽織ツて、仔細らしく首を傾げて、ふかし甘薯の皮を剥いて居、お政は囂囂敷針箱の前に控へて、覺束ない手振りでシャツの綻を縫合はせてゐた。<sup>26</sup>

For a few minutes **Bunzō** continued to sit in the same position, his arms folded. Suddenly struck with an idea, he rose, changed his *haori*, and went down holding his hat in his hand.

He slid open the door of the sitting room. There was Noboru, sitting cross-legged beside the *hibachi*. Osei was sprawled beside him, chattering foolishly away. Our young dialectician was concentrating on peeling the skin from a steamed sweet potato, his head cocked to one side. He wore a coat with nothing underneath. Omasa was awkwardly stitching the torn shirt, the sewing box before her.

Noguchi Takehiko in his book *Sanninshō no hakken made* (Till the discovery of third-person) draws our attention to the similarity in the use of *-ta* found at the end of *Ukigumo* and at the beginning of “Aibiki.” Noguchi concludes as follows.

“Aibiki” is a first-person narrative. In it the subject *jibun* corresponds to the sentence ending *-ta*. *Ukigumo* is a third-person narrative. In it the protagonist Utsumi Bunzō corresponds to the sentence ending *-ta*. There is no difference between their uses. After all, *-ta* is a person marker. That is, *-ta* is a new sentence ending discovered by modern Japan which indicates the “third-person.”<sup>27</sup>

This difference in the usage of *-ta* is illustrated in the following two sentences. The first one is taken from the opening of *Ukigumo*, where *-ta* is used in isolation following a string of non-*-ta* verbs. The second sentence is found in the last chapter, where *-ta* is employed amongst a sequence of sentences all ending with *-ta*.

途上人影の稀れに成つた頃、同じ見附の内より兩人の少年が話しながら出て参つた。<sup>28</sup>

The crowd had thinned out by the time **two young men** engrossed in conversation came through the gate.

出て行くお勢の後姿を見送<sup>みおく</sup>つて、文三は莞爾<sup>にっこり</sup>した。(如何<sup>どう</sup>してかう様子<sup>かほ</sup>が滃<sup>にっこり</sup>つたのか、其を疑<sup>いどま</sup>つて居るに違<sup>な</sup>なく、ただ何となく心嬉<sup>にっこり</sup>しくなつて、莞爾<sup>にっこり</sup>した。)<sup>29</sup>

**Bunzō** smiled as he watched Osei go. (Wasting no time wondering why her attitude towards her maidservant had changed so much, he felt happy somehow and so he smiled.)

What has changed in the second passage, taken from the end of *Ukigumo*, is not only the meaning of the *-ta* forms, but also the narrative stance. In the first sentence the verb *mairu*, to which *-ta* is attached, normally refers in humble form to the speaker's own actions. Here, when used to describe the actions of the two young protagonists, Bunzō and Noboru, it should be understood to express "humbleness to the listener when the speaker is describing the action of a third person on the speaker's side."<sup>30</sup> This sentence thus might literally be translated: "I notice two of **our** young men, engrossed in conversation, have come through the gate now that the crowd has thinned out." Hence, together with *-ta* expressing the meaning of **perfective** aspect, the verb *mairu* carrying the meaning of the speaker's humbleness towards the listener reveals the presence of the narrator in the story. In the second passage, on the other hand, the use of *-ta* as a past-tense marker conceals the narrator. The *-ta* forms used successively in "Aibiki" reproduced the meaning of the past tense. However, when used successively in *Ukigumo*, the *-ta* forms allowed the narrator to adopt a retrospective viewpoint so that the story was now related "from a certain point in time."

Karatani Kōjin, in *Sōseki ron shūsei* (A collection of articles about Sōseki), explains the role of *-ta* in the final chapter of *Ukigumo* as follows:

The auxiliary verb *-ta* is essential in neutralizing [the role of] the narrator. . . . *-Ta* eliminates the direct-address narrator and gives the novels [a sense of] reality. It also guarantees the flow of time in novels; incidents are seen retrospectively from a certain point in time.<sup>31</sup>

Once the pre-modern narrator of *Ukigumo* began to describe the protagonist's actions from a retrospective point of view, he became a modern narrator. Technically this involved the use of *-ta* in successive sentences as a past-tense marker, and the replacement of the particle *ga*, in-

dicating an unknown, with the particle *wa*, indicating something already known.<sup>32</sup> It took another two decades before the writers of the Japanese naturalist school began to employ a narrative stance like that found at the end of *Ukigumo*. For example, Tayama Katai's *Futon* 蒲團 (The quilt, 1907) opens as follows:

小石川のきりしたんざか切支丹坂からごくらくすい極楽水おに出る道のだらだら坂をお下りやうとしてかれ渠は考へた。<sup>33</sup>

As he started down the gentle slope of that road in Koishikawa that leads from Kirishitanzaka to Gokurakusui, **he thought** things over.<sup>34</sup>

Katai's third-person narrative (*kare wa kangaeta* 'he thought') clearly mimics the first-person narrative of the earlier "Aibiki" (*jibun wa suwatte ita* 'I was sitting'). The key point here is that the narrator immediately uses the particle *wa*, indicating that the subject (in this case the protagonist Tokio) is well-known to him, and that he is telling the story of his unreciprocated love as something that happened in the past.<sup>35</sup>

We may now return to the idea of "pure language" with which we began. Futabatei did indeed release the "pure language" of Turgenev's original in his translation, and in so doing allowed his own language to be "powerfully affected by the foreign tongue." In consequence the Japanese literary language was "transformed." The forms in which Turgenev's pure language was captured were the first-person pronoun *jibun* and *-ta* used as a past-tense marker, in support of a retrospective narrative point of view. This was Futabatei's first major contribution as a translator. Twenty years later writers of the Japanese naturalist school used the third-person pronoun *kare* and the past-tense marker *-ta* when constructing their own fictional autobiographical novels.

Futabatei made another major contribution as a translator, however, which has also gone largely unnoticed. In 1896, some eight years after the publication of "Aibiki" and "Meguriai," Futabatei published revised translations of the same two works. He retained the title "Aibiki" when re-translating "The Rendezvous," but he adopted a new title, "Kigū" 奇遇 (A fortuitous encounter), for "Three Encounters." There are significant differences in style between "Meguriai" and "Kigū." For one thing Futabatei modified all the features Kimura noted (cited earlier):

1. The number of periods in “Kigū” is significantly reduced, and many are replaced with commas. Futabatei now frequently combines two sentences in one.
2. The number of *-ta* form verbs is dramatically reduced and the predominant verb form is now *-(r)u*.
3. In “Kigū” Futabatei no longer follows the word order of the original as rigorously as he did in “Meguriai.”

These revisions may have been made in response to criticism of the monotony produced in the earlier translations by the repetition of sentences ending in *-ta*. One of Futabatei’s contemporaries, Saitō Ryokuu 齋藤緑雨, wrote the following parody of Futabatei’s style in the first versions:

きせる 煙管を持つた煙草を丸めた雁首へ入れた火をつけた吸つた煙を吹いた。<sup>36</sup>

He held a pipe, rolled some tobacco, filled his pipe with it, lit it, drew on it, and blew out some smoke.

In spite of all the modifications, however, Futabatei’s revised versions were recognized as faithful “word-for-word” translations. Kimura values them highly for their meticulous accuracy, along with two other translations that Futabatei made at the time: “Katakoi” and *Ukikusa*. Indeed, he considers Futabatei to have made remarkable progress in improving his translation style. He suggests that Futabatei’s translation style was fully developed by the time he translated “Kusare-en” くされ縁 (The mismatch) from Turgenev’s *Petushkov* in 1898, and that from that date on there were no further developments in his style of any significance.<sup>37</sup>

To clarify in what ways the revised translations of “The Rendezvous” and “Three Encounters” remain faithful to the original, I will summarize the results of detailed comparisons I have made between the two versions. I paid particular attention to Futabatei’s use of verb forms, and observed the following pattern:

1. Futabatei often changed *-te ita* to *-te iru* when the corresponding verbs in the Russian original are past imperfective, indicating continuous actions or states of being.<sup>38</sup>
2. Futabatei frequently combined sentences when past perfective verbs are used in the original to describe a sequence of consecutive actions carried out by the protagonists.

These modifications combine to reduce dramatically the number of *-ta* sentence endings, and the consequent monotony of the earlier versions. The following passages from “Meguriai” and “Kigū” illustrate the way in which Futabatei changed verb endings from *-te ita* to *-te iru*. All the underlined verbs are past imperfective in the Russian original. (Hereafter, a single line under a verb indicates that the original Russian verb is imperfective aspect, while a double line indicates it is perfective aspect.)

First Version (“Meguriai”)

および腰になつて垣の内を窺いて見ると、つひ鼻の端さき まつか のけしに真紅な野罌粟がこんもり生へ茂ツてゐたが、そのぼつと開いた花の底に夜露の圓い大きな玉が薄暗く光ツてゐた。何も角もうつらうつらとしてゐた、何も角も四邊の物はだらりとしてとろ鎔けてゐた（注、省略）何も角も宛然虚空を視詰めてゐるやうで有ツた、延び上ツて、身動きもせず、何をか待ちながら……何を待ちわびてゐたこの暖かなこの眠入りもせぬ夜は？

With my back bent I peeped through the fence; under my very nose pure red field poppies were growing thickly, at the bottom of a fully open flower a big round drop of evening dew was shining darkly. Everything was slumbering, everything nearby was melting languidly [long commentary]. It looked as if everything was gazing at the sky, stretched out, not moving, and waiting for something. What was this warm and awake night longing for?<sup>39</sup>

Second Version (“Kigū”)

垣の内を覗いて見ると、つひ鼻の頭さき まつか のげしに真紅な野罌粟の莖ぢく くきむらが草叢の中からすつと出てゐて、そのぼつと咲いた花の底には大粒の圓い夜露が薄光りに光つてゐる。何も彼も恍惚としてだらけて、宛然延上つて、身動をもせず、何をか待ちながら、空をみあ向上げてゐるやうである……此生よ暖な夜に眠入もせず何を待つてゐるのであらう？

I peep through the fence; under my very nose there is a pure red field poppy, its stem protruding from the grass; at the bottom of its fully open flower a big round drop of evening dew is shining darkly. Everything is enraptured and lies languidly. It seems as if everything is stretched out, not moving, but waiting for something, and gazing at the sky. On this warm night, being awake, what is [everything] waiting for?<sup>40</sup>

By changing the verb forms in “Kigū” from *-te ita* to *-te iru*, Futabatei succeeds in producing a more graphic and immediate image of the garden where the narrator’s first encounter with a mysterious and beautiful

lady unfolds. Futabatei then continues to translate past imperfective verbs using mainly *-te iru* form verbs, to describe the settings where the narrator's recurrent encounters with the same lady occur.

The *-te iru* form was first recognized as an aspectual marker in Japanese by Kindaichi Haruhiko in 1947, in his essay "Kokugo dōshi no ichibunrui" (A classification of Japanese verbs). Kindaichi grouped Japanese verbs into four categories, on the basis of whether or not they can be marked by *-te iru*.<sup>41</sup> In the above example Futabatei has emphasized the aspectual meaning of the original Russian verbs at the expense of tense. As the imperfective aspect is used to describe states of being and continuity of action, Futabatei's emphasis on conveying the aspect of the original leads to a more graphic description in which we find ourselves absorbed in the moment, as if present in the garden at the time when the narrator experienced its beauty.

The second example, given below, is taken from the narrator's conversation with an old emancipated serf, the keeper of the house where the narrator first meets the female protagonist of the story. In this example, Futabatei combines four sentences into one, and the verbs in the original are mostly past perfective.

#### First Version ("Meguriai")

「よろしう御座りまする」と遂に云ツた。—かう來さツしやりませ。といつて、屈んで、角門の闕を跨いだ。自分も續いて這入ツた。餘り廣くも無い庭を通過ぎて、共に露階のゆらゆらする（壊れかかつて）段を昇ツた。老人は戸を突き開けた、ガ戸には關鎖といふものがなくて、唯圈に結んだ繩が鍵の孔から出てゐた……打連れて家の内へ這入ツた。

"All right," he finally said. "Please come in," he said, and, bending over, he stepped across the threshold of the gate. I went in after him. Passing through a rather small courtyard, we went up the shaky (half-broken) steps of the porch. The old man pushed the door open, there was no lock for it, a rope with a knot was sticking out from the key-hole. . . . We went into the house together.<sup>42</sup>

#### Second Version ("Kigū")

「よろしう御座りまする。入らつしやりませ。」老爺が屈むで耳門の闕を跨いだから、跟に隋いて入つて、餘り廣くも無い玄關先を通つて、ゆらつく階を昇ると、老爺が戸を突き開けたが、戸には錠前もなく、唯繩を圈に結んだ奴が鍵の穴から出てゐる……そこで一所に内へ入つた。

“All right. Please come in.” The old man bends over and steps across the threshold of the gate, I follow him, and go through a small courtyard, then go up the wobbly stairs, the old man pushes the door open, there is no lock on the door, only a rope tied round is sticking out from the key-hole . . . The next moment we have gone through the door with him.<sup>43</sup>

We can see that by substituting commas for periods, Futabatei succeeds in not only eliminating many repetitive *-ta* endings, but also in using the *-ta* ending that remains in sentence-final position as a vehicle for conveying the perfective aspectual meaning of the original Russian verb. By changing *dete ita* (was sticking out) to *dete iru* (is sticking out) as the translation of the only imperfective verb in the original, Futabatei removes the past tense meaning from the sentence, which has now grown lengthy as a result of combining the four sentences of the original. Again he is sacrificing tense in order to be true to aspect.

This kind of revision, where commas are substituted for periods, is often found in passages preceding the reporting of direct speech between the protagonists, and also in the narrative itself, when the action is advanced step by step, through a sequence of consecutive actions, a situation which calls for the use of perfective verbs in Russian. In this case, the substitution of commas for periods seems a better option than the replacement of *-ta* forms with *-(r)u* forms, being more faithful to the sense of the original.

In the revised version of “Aibiki,” the shift from *-ta* to *-(r)u* is observed more frequently than the substitution of commas for periods, even when translating perfective verbs. It is thus understandable that a Japanese scholar might suggest that in the revised version of “Aibiki” Futabatei “freely mixed *ru*-endings (non-past form) and *ta*-endings in a way that had been and still is the most common mode of expression in Japanese narratives.”<sup>44</sup>

It is clear, however, that in 1896 Futabatei was taking a new stylistic direction in his translations, one that placed emphasis on the aspectual meaning of the original Russian verbs rather than their tense. The new style is characterized by the effective use of *-te iru* forms when translating past imperfective verbs, and restrained use of *-ta* forms when translating past perfective verbs. The *-te iru* forms emphasize the continuity of actions in progress, while most *-ta* forms convey the notion of completion.

Because Futabatei sacrificed tense to aspect in the revised versions, the later translations are often considered to be “free” and less faithful to the

originals. I have tried to show that he was simply faithful in a different way, that he was addressing another facet of the language of the originals. But the fact remains that the revised versions lacked the striking novelty of the earlier translations. The second version of “Aibiki” lost the retrospective viewpoint of the first version and provoked little response from contemporary writers. While the use of *-ta* endings as past-tense markers was born of an attempt to release the “pure language” of Turgenev’s original, the use of *-ta* to convey the perfective aspect was most probably motivated by an effort to avoid the repetitiveness which had provoked ridicule. It bore little relation to Turgenev’s original intention and cannot be seen as an act of releasing *die reine Sprache*. Futabatei’s new translation style turned out, though, to be a perfect vehicle for releasing the “pure language” of another Russian writer, Nikolai Gogol.

### 3. “Shōzōga” (Translated from Gogol’s “The Portrait”)

Futabatei’s “Shōzōga” was published in 1897, shortly after the publication of “Katakoi” and the revised translations “Aibiki” and “Kigū.” “Shōzōga” was not only Futabatei’s first published translation from Gogol, but also his first translation of a third-person narrative. It was for the most part ignored by the reading public at the time of its publication, and for a long time ignored by scholars, until a heated discussion arose about a striking resemblance between the opening of *Ukigumo* and that of another story by Gogol, “Nevsky Avenue.” In 1982 Hatano Kazuhiro<sup>45</sup> and Isahaya Yūichi,<sup>46</sup> both Slavists, simultaneously published articles about Futabatei’s debt to Gogol. While Isahaya simply found stylistic and structural similarities between the two openings, Hatano found many general stylistic similarities between *Ukigumo* and Gogol’s stories. Most significantly, Hatano commented on the role of Gogol’s narrator, who appears to be a simpleton and provokes laughter (a stylistic device known to Slavists as *skaz*).

The following passage is taken from the opening of Gogol’s “The Portrait,” and shows the presence of Gogol’s narrator. I have followed the English translation with Futabatei’s translation. In the original Russian, a single line shows that the verb is imperfective aspect, while a double line shows that it is perfective. An unbroken line indicates past tense, while a dotted line indicates present tense.

Нигде не останавливалось столько народа, как перед картинною лавочкою на Щукином дворе. Эта лавочка представляла, точно, самое разнородное собрание диковинок: картины большею частью были писаны масляными красками, покрыты темнозеленым лаком, в темножелтых мишурных рамах . . . Покупателей этих произведений обыкновенно немного, но зато зрителей—куча. Какой-нибудь забулдыга-лакей уже, **верно**, зевает перед ними, держа в руке судки с обедом из трактира для своего барина, который, **без сомнения**, будет хлебать суп не слишком горячий. Перед ним уже, **верно**, стоит в шинели солдат, этот кавалер толкучего рынка, продающий два перочинные ножика; торговка-охтенка с коробкою, наполненною башмаками. **Всякой восхищается по-своему**; мужики обыкновенно тыкают пальцами; кавалеры рассматривают серьезно; лакеи-мальчики и мальчишки-мастеровые смеются и дразнят друг друга нарисованными карикатурами; старые лакеи во фризových шинелях смотрят потому только, чтобы где-нибудь позевать; а торговки, молодые русские бабы, спешат по инстинкту, чтобы послушать, о чем калякает народ, и посмотреть, на что он смотрит. В это время невольно остановился перед лавкою проходивший мимо молодой художник Чартков.<sup>47</sup>

Nowhere were so many people standing as in front of the picture shop in Shchukin Court. The shop, indeed, presented the most heterogeneous collection of marvels: the pictures were painted for the most part in oil colours, covered with dark-green varnish, in dark-yellow tinsel frames. . . . Buyers of these works are normally few, but there are heaps of spectators. Some debauchee lackey is, **I suppose**, already gaping before them, holding in his hand a set of dishes from the eating house for his master, who, **without doubt**, will drink his soup not very warm. In front of him, **I suppose**, a soldier in a great coat is standing, this cavalier of the second-hand goods market normally sells two penknives; and a market woman from Okhta with a box full of shoes. **Each one admires them in his own way**: the peasants usually poke their fingers at them; the cavaliers examine them seriously; the footboys and apprentices laugh and tease each other over the painted caricatures; the old lackeys in frieze overcoats look at them simply to have something to gape at; and the market women, young Russian peasant women, hurry here by instinct, to hear what people are gossiping about, and to see what they are looking at. At this moment, a young artist, Chartkov, who was passing by, involuntarily stopped in front of the picture shop.

何處と云つて、シチウキン長屋の繪屋の前ほど、人の群聚る處は有るまい。  
 それも其筈で、此處には種々珍しい物がある。繪は大抵油繪で、青黒い  
 漆を塗つて、濁黒い金縁を付けてある。(中略)かうした繪ではあるが、買  
 手は少ない、其代り見物は常も山を成してゐる。道草を喰ふことの甚い好き  
 さうな誰家の僕が店頭で欠びをしてゐるが、辨當の入つた仕出屋の岡持を

提<sup>さ</sup>げてゐるからは、旦那殿は餘り熱くない肉羹<sup>ソツプ</sup>を吸はれるに違ひない。其前に立つてゐるのは外套を着た兵士、常も古着市へ小刀二挺を賣りに行くと云ふ先生で、其次は半靴を一杯詰めた箱を抱へた女商人<sup>をんなあきうど なき</sup>お泣といひさうな女である。さて賣方だが、これが人に由つて違ふ。百姓は兎角指を指したがる。兵士は眞面目な面<sup>まへ</sup>をして見る。丁稚小僧は鳥羽繪を覽て高笑をして調戯ひ食ふ。フリーズ（織物の名）の外套を着た年老つた僕は何處かで閑を潰したいばかりで視てゐる。若い鼻衆は人が饒舌<sup>かかしゆ</sup>てゐる事なら、何でも聴きたい、視てゐるものなら、何でも視たい、といふ一心<sup>いつしん</sup>で嗅付けて急いで來る。

此時チャルトコフといふ通りすがりの若い畫家が何心なく店頭<sup>みせさき</sup>に立止つた。<sup>48</sup>

Nowhere are so many people crowding as in front of the picture shop in Shchukin tenement house. It is no wonder, as various marvels are presented here. The pictures are almost all oil paintings, covered with dark-green Japanese lacquer in murky gold frames. . . . Pictures are such, and buyers are few, but spectators are always crowding around. Some servant who likes loitering on the way is yawning in front of the shop. As he is holding a take-away lunch box from the caterer his master **must suck** not very warm soup. The fellow standing in front of him is a soldier in a great coat, who always goes to sell two penknives at the second-hand clothes shop. The next is a woman, whom we might call market woman Onaki (Mrs. Sobbing) with a box full of shoes. **Now the way of looking at the pictures varies**, depending on the person. The peasants **tend to poke** their fingers at them. The soldiers **gaze** at them seriously. The apprentices laugh and **tease** each other over the Tobastyle caricatures. The old servants in frieze (the name of the material) overcoats are **looking** at them simply to kill time. The young peasant women **hurry** here by instinct only to want to listen to what people are gossiping about and to see what people are looking at.

At this moment a young artist called Chartkov, who was passing by, **has** involuntarily **stopped** in front of the shop.

Gogol's *The Portrait* opens with a detailed description of the shop where by chance a poor but talented young artist named Chartkov purchases a striking portrait of an old man, in which the eyes seem incredibly alive. He finds a large sum of money in the frame of the portrait, but it only leads to the corruption of his talent and to his ultimate downfall. Gogol's description of the shop begins in a neutral tone, with the use of past imperfective verbs. Then the tone becomes livelier, as Gogol starts to use the present tense. We might characterize this as a use of the historical present, which Terrence Wade has defined as follows:

The use of the present tense with past meaning brings the action more graphically before the mind's eye of the reader or listener. It is a device commonly found in literary works and is much more widely used in Russian than in English.<sup>49</sup>

The use of the present tense also makes the narrative more personal, especially when it appears in association with words such as *verno* (I suppose), *bez somneniya* (without doubt), and *vsyakoi voskhishchaetsya po-svoemu* (each one admires them in his own way). We can sense the presence of the narrator in the story as an ironic witness to the action. A detailed description of the pictures on display in the shop (omitted in the above citation), and a similarly detailed description of the crowd outside the shop, are graphically presented through the use of present imperfective verbs.

Futabatei translates the whole passage using *-(r)u* and *-te iru* form verbs, except for the final, past perfective verb *ostanovilsya* (stopped), for which he uses the *-ta* form. In this translation there is an almost perfect match between Futabatei's choice of verb forms and the verb forms of the original. By employing *-(r)u* and *-te iru* forms for present imperfective verbs, Futabatei succeeds in reproducing the graphic, first-hand images of the crowd. When Futabatei had revised "Aibiki" and "Meguriiai," there was an arbitrariness in the way he substituted *-te iru* for *-te ita* in order to reduce the number of *-ta* forms, and a disregard for the tense of the original. In "Shōzōga" a very similar method leads to a much happier result, as the use of *-te iru* is now prompted by Gogol's use of the historical present.

Futabatei does go on to use *-(r)u* and *-te iru* forms to translate past imperfective verbs expressing states of being and the continuous and habitual actions of the main characters. At the same time he uses *-ta* endings (more specifically than in "Aibiki" and "Kigū") to translate past perfective verbs, and these endings clearly function as perfective aspectual markers.

When Futabatei produced the revised translations of "Aibiki" and "Kigū," he found it impossible to limit the use of *-ta* forms to the translation of past perfective verbs, because of the firmly retrospective nature of Turgenev's memoir form. The opening sentence of the revised version of "Aibiki" is almost identical to that of the first version, and it is clear that *-ta* is still being used as a tense marker:

秋は九月中旬なかばの事ことで、一日ひとひ自分じぶんががさるさる樺林うちの中に中に坐まつてつゐたたことことがが有あつた。<sup>50</sup>

It was autumn, around the middle of September, there was a day when I sat in a birch grove.

The *-te ita* form, which is the past tense of *-te iru*, and the word *hitohi* (one day) inserted by Futabatei, both emphasize the past tense meaning of the *-ta* in *koto ga atta* (there was). Turgenev himself had simply written *Ya sidel v berezovoi roshche osen'yu . . .* (I was sitting in a birch grove in autumn . . .), where *sidel* is a past imperfective verb.

The *-ta* form used at the end of the passage cited from “Shōzōga” contrasts with those used in “Aibiki”:

此時チャルトコフといふ通りすがりの若い畫家が何心なく店頭みせさきに立止つた。<sup>51</sup>

At this moment a young artist named Chartkov, who is passing by, has involuntarily stopped in front of the shop.

This *-ta* form verb clearly expresses the perfective aspect, not only because it is used to translate a past perfective verb, but also because it appears in isolation after a sequence of non-past verbs.

It is also worth noting that this use of the *-ta* form is identical with that found in the opening of *Ukigumo*:

途上ひとけ人影の稀れに成つた頃、同じ見附の内よりふたり兩人のわかもの少年が話しながら出て  
參つた。<sup>52</sup>

I notice that two of our young men, engrossed in conversation, have come out through the gate now that the crowd has thinned out.

This may be indicative of an affinity between Futabatei’s style and Gogol’s, and may also indicate the early influence Gogol had on Futabatei, as we know the latter attempted to translate one of Gogol’s works prior to publishing *Ukigumo* and his translations from Turgenev. It is possible that “The Portrait” itself may have been the work which influenced the opening of *Ukigumo*.

#### 4. Conclusion

Critics and scholars have dubbed Futabatei the founder of the modern Japanese novel, because of the innovative *genbun-itchi* style he created in *Ukigumo*. As Karatani points out, the colloquial style of part 1 of *Ukigumo* and the translation style developed in “Shōzōga” share striking similarities. In both, *-ta* form verbs are used in isolation, following a

string of non-*ta* verbs, and express the perfective aspect. When Teramura Hideo first recognized *-ta* as an aspectual marker, he illustrated his finding with the following highly colloquial interrogative sentence:

もう昼飯を食べたか？<sup>53</sup>

Have you had lunch yet?

It would seem that the use of *-ta* to convey the perfective aspect is more likely to be encountered in colloquial language. The *-ta* forms used in part 1 of *Ukigumo* often imply that the previous utterances come directly from the narrator, who is present as a witness within the story. The *-ta* forms consistently used to translate past perfective verbs in “Shōzōga” also serve to make the narrator’s voice more prominent. During one climactic scene, when the protagonist suffers from a most convincing hallucination that the old man in his portrait is climbing out of the frame, *-(r)u* and *-te iru* forms are used to translate imperfective verbs of both present and past tenses, while *-ta* forms are used for past perfective verbs. The descriptions become so vivid that the narrator’s point of view merges with that of the protagonist.

One could imagine that had Futabatei been working on “Shōzōga” while writing Parts 2 and 3 of *Ukigumo* (rather than “Aibiki” and “Meguriai”), he might have found a narrative stance more in harmony with the first part of his novel, and he might have completed his unfinished masterpiece. The voice of the narrator in part 1 might have merged with the voice of the protagonist Bunzō, and it might have been possible to reveal Bunzō’s inner thoughts and bring them to some resolution. As it was, the changing perspective induced by a retrospective narrative viewpoint, and the externalization of the narrator himself, left Futabatei with no natural means of revealing Bunzō’s inner world.

There does seem to be some affinity between Futabatei and Gogol, both of whom tried to find a mission higher than literature and were dissatisfied with the products of their own genius. I consider Futabatei’s second translation style, in which verbs are translated more on the basis of aspect than of tense, to be peculiarly suited to a Gogolian narrative, and to have released the “pure language” of Gogol’s originals. The use of *-ta* as an aspectual marker is clearly motivated by the language of Gogol’s original, and is not the result of some caprice on Futabatei’s part. Futabatei’s translation faithfully captures the voice of the Gogolian narrator. I would argue, contrary to Jinzai’s view cited earlier, that it was

Gogol, rather than Turgenev, who was for Futabatei the “most congenial writer,” and the one “whose style was most suited to Futabatei’s own.”

Futabatei continued to apply this “Gogolian” style in further translations of narratives by Gogol and also Gorky, the latter of which I have elsewhere characterized as “Gogolian.”<sup>54</sup> Although “Shōzōga” and subsequent translations did not appear to influence the styles of Futabatei’s contemporaries, they did influence the style of his final two novels, *Sono omokage* 其面影 (In his image) and *Heibon* 平凡 (Mediocrity), in which the *-ta* form is used primarily as an aspectual marker.

Futabatei thus bequeathed two distinct styles of narrative to Japanese literature. One is based on the use of *-ta* as a past-tense marker, and resulted from his early translations from Turgenev. This is the style that was taken up by young writers of the naturalist school, and which continues to be the dominant style in Japanese literature. The other style is based on the predominant use of non-past forms, with *-ta* serving as an aspectual marker, and was used most effectively in the translation of Gogolian narratives.

#### NOTES

1. Cited in Walter Benjamin, “The Task of the Translator: An Introduction to the Translation of Baudelaire’s *Tableaux Parisiens*,” in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. by Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2000), 22.
2. Karatani Kōjin, “Hon’yakusha no Shimei: Nihon kindai bungaku no kigen to shite no hon’yaku,” *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kyōzai no kenkyū* (September 2004): 6–13.
3. Benjamin, “The Task of the Translator,” 22.
4. Karatani Kōjin, “Hon’yakusha no Shimei,” 10.
5. Araya Keizaburō, “Futabatei yaku ‘Aibiki’ no mondai,” *Waseda daigaku hikaku bungaku nenshi* (July 1967): 46–68.
6. These facts indicate that while Futabatei’s interest in Turgenev manifested itself early, but abated towards the end of his career, his interest in Gogol’s works persisted. It is particularly significant that his last two translations from Gogol, “Mukashi no hito” むかしの人 (Olden day people) and “Kyōjin nikki” 狂人日記 (A madman’s diary), appeared just before the writing of his final two original works: *Sono omokage* 其の面影 (In his image, 1906) and *Heibon* 平凡 (Mediocrity, 1907).
7. Kunikida Doppo, *Musashino*, in *Kunikida Doppo shū* 國木田獨歩集, *Meiji bungaku zenshū* (66) (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1974), 4.

8. I. S. Turgenev, “Aibiki,” translated by Futabatei Shimei, in *Futabatei Shimei zenshū* 二葉亭四迷全集 (1) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1964), 158.
9. Tayama Katai, “Kindai no shōsetsu,” in *Shiryō ni yoru kindai nihon bungaku*, ed. by Hasegawa Izumi and Isogai Hideo (Tokyo: Meiji Shoin, 1979), 18.
10. Jinzai Kiyoshi, “Futabatei no hon’yaku taido: Toku ni Tsurugēnefu mono no hon’yaku ni tsuite,” in *Futabatei Shimei zenshū* (9) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1965), 172–189.
11. Kimura Shōichi, “Futabatei no Tsurugēnefu mono no hon’yaku ni tsuite,” *Bungaku* (May 1956):41–49.
12. Yonekawa Masao, “Futabatei no hon’yaku,” *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō* (May 1963):88–96.
13. Yanagi Tomiko, “Futabatei no shoki no yakugyō: Hon’yaku sanbun ron,” in *Kōza hikaku bungaku* (2) (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppan Kai, 1973), 83–117.
14. Nakayama Shōzaburō and Nobori Shomu also put a strong emphasis on Futabatei’s translations from Turgenev. See Nakayama, “Futabatei to Roshia bungaku: Nōto,” *Bungaku* (September 1937), 56–80 and Nobori, “Nihon bungaku to Roshia bungaku,” in *Hikaku bungaku: Nihon bungaku o chūshin to shite* (Tokyo: Yajima Shobō, 1953), 237–286.
15. Jinzai, “Futabatei no hon’yaku taido,” 176.
16. Jinzai, “Futabatei no hon’yaku taido,” 185.
17. Kimura, “Futabatei no Tsurugēnefu,” 44.
18. Futabatei Shimei, “Yo ga hon’yaku no hyōjun,” in *Futabatei Shimei zenshū* (5) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1965), 174. English translation by Marleigh Grayer Ryan, *Japan’s First Modern Novel: Ukigumo of Futabatei Shimei* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), 120. The emphasis is added.
19. Yonekawa, “Futabatei no hon’yaku,” 90.
20. See Hiroko Cockerill, *Style and Narrative in Translations: The Contribution of Futabatei Shimei* (Manchester: St. Jerome, 2006), 16–29, for more detailed comparison between Futabatei’s “Aibiki” and other contemporary translations such as *Ōshū kiji: Karyū shunwa* 歐洲奇事 花柳春話 (A marvelous affair in Europe: A springtime tale of blossoms and willows, 1878), translated by Niwa Jun’ichirō, and *Shinsetsu: Hachijū nichi kan sekai isshū* 新説 八十日間世界一周 (A new story: A tour of the world in eighty days, 1878) by Kawashima Chūnosuke.
21. Tayama Katai, “Kindai no shōsetsu,” 18.
22. I. S. Turgenev, *Sochineniya* (Works), 1844–1864 (Karlsruhe: Brothers Saelaev, 1865), 1–2:12. The English translation is mine. Single underlining is used to highlight past-tense verbs, and the corresponding verbs used in the

English translations are also underlined. First-person pronouns are highlighted in bold.

23. I. S. Turgenev, “Aibiki,” translated by Futabatei Shimei, 158. The English translation is mine. Single underlining is used to highlight *-ta* used as a past-tense marker, and the corresponding verbs in the English translation are also underlined. First person pronouns are highlighted in bold.
24. Kanbara Ariake, “‘Aibiki’ ni tsuite,” cited in *Futabatei Shimei zenshū* (1), 413. In making this translation I consulted the translation by Marleigh Grayer Ryan, *Japan’s First*, 117–118.
25. Turgenev’s “The Rendezvous” is a brief episode taken from *Zapiski okhotnika*, a work which brought him fame in Russia and abroad. Its title is usually translated into English as *A Sportsman’s Sketches*.
26. Futabatei Shimei, *Ukigumo*, in *Futabatei Shimei zenshū* (1), 80. English translation by Marleigh Grayer Ryan, *Japan’s First*, 284. (Subjects are highlighted in bold, and *-ta* endings are underlined.)
27. Noguchi Takehiko, *Sanninshō no hakken made* (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1994), 264.
28. Futabatei Shimei, *Ukigumo*, 5. The English translation by Ryan, *Japan’s First*, 198. Double underlining is used to highlight *-ta* with the meaning of perfective aspect, and the corresponding verb used in the English translation is also underlined. The subject of the sentence is highlighted in bold.
29. Futabatei Shimei, *Ukigumo*, 152. The English translation is mine. Single underlining is used to highlight *-ta* with the meaning of past tense, and the corresponding verbs in the English translation are also underlined. The subject of the sentence is highlighted in bold.
30. Nihon Daijiten Kankō-kai, ed., *Nihon kokugo daijiten* (18) (Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1975), 284–285.
31. Karatani Kōjin, *Sōseki ron shūsei* (Tokyo: Daisanbunmeisha, 1992), 242.
32. Ōno Susumu has identified this differentiation in the use of the particles *wa* and *ga*. See Ōno Susumu, *Nihongo no bunpō o kangaeru* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1978), 21–50.
33. Tayama Katai, *Futon* in *Tayama Katai shū* 田山花袋集, *Meiji bungaku zenshū* (67) (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1968), 71. The use of underlining and bolding is the same as in previous instances.
34. This English translation is taken from Kenneth Henshall’s translation *The Quilt and Other Stories by Tayama Katai* (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1981), 35.
35. As a matter of fact, Futabatei’s *wa* is used in the second reference to the narrator-protagonist, having used *ga* in the first reference. It is possible that he felt compelled by the conventions of the time to use *ga* in the first instance, but gravitated to *wa* under the influence of Turgenev’s original.

36. Saitō Ryokuu, “Shōsetsu hasshū” 小説八宗 (Eight schools of the modern novel), in *Saitō Ryokuu shū* 齋藤緑雨集 (1) (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1990), 5. Single underlining is used to highlight the *-ta* forms.
37. Kimura Shōichi, “Futabatei no Tsurugēnefu,” 46–49.
38. The Russian verb system is characterized by a strong sense of aspect. The infinitive forms of verbs generally come in pairs, one of imperfective aspect and the other of perfective aspect. Imperfective verbs are typically used to describe continuous or repeated actions and states of being, while perfective verbs are typically used to indicate the completion of an action, or a sequence of consecutive actions. Present-tense verbs are always of imperfective aspect, whereas past- and future-tense verbs may be of either aspect. (See Terence Wade, *A Comprehensive Russian Grammar* [Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell, 1992], 283–286.) Comrie explains the difference between tense and aspect by suggesting that while tense indicates the time of a situation with reference to some other time, usually the moment of the utterance, aspectual expressions indicate different ways of viewing the internal temporal constitution of the situation. (See Bernard Comrie, *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976], 1–3.)
39. I. S. Turgenev, “Meguriai,” translated by Futabatei Shimei, in *Futabatei Shimei zenshū* (1), 174–175. The English translation is mine. Single underlining is used to highlight *-te ita* form verbs, and the corresponding verbs used in the English translation are also underlined.
40. I. S. Turgenev, “Kigū,” translated by Futabatei Shimei, in *Futabatei Shimei zenshū* (1), 272. The English translation is mine. Single dotted underlining is used to highlight the verb forms which Futabatei translated mainly using *-te iru* forms and the corresponding verbs used in the English translation are also underlined.
41. Kindaichi Haruhiko, *Nihongo dōshi no asupekuto* (Tokyo: Mugi Shobō, 1976), 7–26.
42. I. S. Turgenev, “Meguriai,” translated by Futabatei Shimei, 191. The English translation is mine. Double underlining is used to highlight the *-ta* form verbs employed to translate past perfective verbs, whereas single underlining is used to highlight the *-te ita* form verb used to translate the single past imperfective verb.
43. I. S. Turgenev, “Kigū,” translated by Futabatei Shimei, 287–288. The English translation is mine. Double wavy underlining is used to indicate instances where sentences are combined. Single dotted underlining is used to highlight the *-te iru* form verb.
44. Yoshihiro Ohsawa, “Amalgamation of Literariness: Translation as a Means of Introducing European Literary Techniques to Modern Japan,” in *Asian Translation Traditions*, ed. by Eva Hung and Judy Wakabayashi (Manchester: St. Jerome, 2005), 142. As must be clear from what has gone before,

I question the notion that use of *-ta* had been the common mode of expression prior to Futabatei's work.

45. Hatano Kazuhiro, "Futabatei to Gōgori: 'Ukigumo' no buntai o megutte," *Waseda daigaku hikaku bungaku nenshi* (March 1982):64–80.
46. Isahaya Yūichi, "Futabatei to Roshia bungaku: Gōgori o chūshin ni," *Shinshū daigaku jinbun kagaku ronshū* (March 1982):51–61.
47. N. V. Gogol, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, tom tretii, Povesti* (Complete works, vol. 3, novellas), (Akademiya Nauk, 1938; reprint, Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus, 1973), 79–80. The English translation is mine. Underlining in the translation corresponds to that used for the Russian.
48. N. V. Gogol, "Shōzōga," translated by Futabatei Shimei in *Futabatei Shimei zenshū* (1), 316. The English translation is mine. Underlining in the translation corresponds to that used for the Japanese.
49. Wade Terrence, *A Comprehensive Russian Grammar*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 287.
50. I. S. Turgenev, "Aibiki," translated by Futabatei Shimei, 304.
51. N. V. Gogol, "Shōzōga," translated by Futabatei Shimei, 316–317.
52. Futabatei Shimei, *Ukigumo*, 5.
53. Teramura Hideo, *Nihongo no shintakusu to imi* (2) (Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan, 1984), 322.
54. Hiroko Cockerill, *Style and Narrative in Translations*, 191–204 and 230–246.