

Translating Cohesion in Journalistic Texts, between Japanese and English

KATORI Yoshikazu

(Freelance Translator & Instructor)

U sing journalistic texts, this paper contrasts English norms for cohesion with Japanese norms. One major difference found is that English texts make much heavier use of anaphoric reference items than do Japanese texts. Second, in Japanese, predicates play an important role in giving a sequence of sentences a sense of unity. Third, English journalistic texts tend to have cohesive devices between paragraphs, more so than their Japanese equivalents. Fourth, the Japanese writer often repeats an identical word or phrase for a referent to maintain lexical cohesion, while the English writer has more options – the use of a synonym, metonymy, or superordinate – made available by the definite article. Fifth, translators putting English expository paragraphs into Japanese may have to use discourse markers that are implicit in the original, a difference created by the presence, or absence, of a code for paragraph organization. In either direction, translation done without regard for those differences creates texts that are unnatural at best, unintelligible at worst.

1. Introduction

Texts produced by major newspapers or broadcasters, printed or aired, are, by and large, written in a way that provides the reader or the listener with information he wants, in as much detail as is required, and in a manner that he will find satisfactory, with one idea in a paragraph relevant to all the others. In other words, they usually live up to the four maxims – the maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation and Manner – that comprise Grice's (1975) Principle of Cooperation.

Translated into another language for a culturally different readership and audience, however, they can be found in violation of one or more of the maxims (Katori 2005). With

KATORI Yoshiaki, "Translating Cohesion in Journalistic Texts, between Japanese and English."

Interpretation Studies, No. 6, December 2006, Pages 69-90.

(c) 2006 by the Japan Association for Interpretation Studies

respect to the maxim of Manner, for instance, Westerners often make critical remarks about “the Japanese style.” Baker, for one, notes “the Japanese favourite ‘dot-type’ pattern in which anecdotes are strung together without an explicit link or conclusion can infuriate western readers” (Baker, 1991: 236). Kato & Hardy quotes an unnamed Western academic as saying, “essays and theses written by Japanese are often out of focus,” and another as saying, “It is not that Japanese essays and theses have no focus. In fact, they often have too many focuses all over them in a scattershot fashion” (Kato & Hardy, 1992: 10, translation—Katori). The same point was made by English-speaking participants in a study conducted by Hinds (1983) involving English translations of the *Asahi Shimbun* column *Tensei Jingo ‘Vox Dei, Vox Populi’*.

At the same time, a tightly-woven English text, translated as it is into Japanese, often strikes Japanese readers as stifling. Nakayama (1998) concedes that the nature of the Japanese language, coupled with the attitude in which the Japanese use it, makes ambiguity one of the characteristics of the Japanese language in daily use, but he sees the “dot-type” pattern in a more favorable light. Many Japanese passages may be “a dotty sequence of ideas,” says Nakayama, but that fragmented style creates a void which readers are free to fill with what they think is implied there. Put another way, a close-knit text does not give readers enough room to work their imagination; it denies them freedom of interpretation. To quote novelist Inoue on this, “Folk tales rewritten for children are often boring because they have had any deep and wide gaps between sentences narrowed or closed by the officious editors—blanks which the kids would otherwise enjoy filling for themselves” (Inoue, 1984: 97, translation—Katori).

2. Contrasting different norms for achieving cohesion

It is not that English texts are cohesive and Japanese texts are not: a text, be it a newspaper editorial or a folk tale, in Japanese or English, has cohesion, for a sequence of sentences without cohesion is just that, a sequence of sentences. However, preferred types of cohesive ties and degrees of cohesion differ between Japanese and English as well as between different genres in the same language. Using the analytical framework developed by Halliday & Hasan (1976), where possible, this section contrasts a *Financial Times* editorial with a *Yomiuri Shimbun* editorial in terms of cohesion between sentences. Written in July 2005 in response to the release by the U.S. Department of Defense of a report on China’s military power, both editorials discuss a threat posed by Chinese military expansion.

2.1 Cohesion in English

2.1.1 Dissecting an English editorial for analysis of cohesive devices

Financial Times

(a)China has (b)reacted angrily to (c)the US defence department's (d)report to (c)Congress on (a)Chinese (e)military power, (b)condemning (c)the Pentagon for “(b)unreasonably” and “(b)rudely” (b)attacking (a)Beijing's modernization of its (e)armed forces.

(a)Beijing (b)protests too much. (d)The US document—neither as (b)hawkish as (c)Pentagon (b)hardliners nor as (b)accommodating as (c)State department (b)doves would like—is measured and clearly written. It does not reach (b)alarmist conclusions but summarises what is known about (a)Chinese strategy and (e)the People's Liberation Army and sets out a range of plausible scenarios. The (d)report talks of a possible future (b)threat to Asia but also says (a)China's ability to project its (e)power is currently limited and declares that (c)the US would welcome the (f)rise of a (b)peaceful and (f)prosperous (a)China.

Yet there is a grain of truth in the (a)Chinese (b)complaint. (c)The US establishment as a whole—after all, it is (c)Congress that commissions these (d)public annual assessments, not (c)the Pentagon that wants to hand them out—seems to assume that there is something inherently (b)abnormal and disturbing about (a)China's attempts to modernise its old-fashioned (e)military forces.

Nothing is more (b)reasonable or predictable than a (f)rising economic power such as (a)China using some of its newly earned (f)wealth to enhance its (e)military might. What matters is how that (f)strength is used. (f)Increased influence requires increased responsibility.

Here (a)China's Communist rulers have much to learn. The statement last week by Major-General Zhu Chenghu, a (b)hawkish (e)commander, that (a)China was prepared to countenance the (b)nuclear destruction of hundreds of (c)US and (a)Chinese cities if (c)the US (b)attacked (a)China in a (b)conflict over Taiwan was the opposite of responsible. The theory that his (b)wild threats are part of a campaign to deter (c)the US from (b)defending Taiwan hardly justifies such (b)inflammatory rhetoric.

A more immediate (b)threat to (c)US interests is (a)China's willingness to use its (h)power in diplomatic rather than (e)military (b)contests. (c)Washington is (b)alarmed at the speed with which (a)China is (b)befriending unsavoury regimes (b)hostile to (c)the US, including Iran and Venezuela, simply because they have oil. [The article continues]

(“The Pentagon and China's rising power”, July 21, 2005)

a) Lexical cohesion:

- (a) the Chinese government
- (b) hostility and friendliness: war and peace
- (c) the US government
- (d) report
- (e) military
- (f) the rise of China

b) Reference:

anaphoric *the* in “the US document,” “the report,” and “the Chinese complaint.”

anaphoric *it* (=the US document) in “It does not reach alarmist conclusions...”

anaphoric *these* in “these public annual assessments”

anaphoric *that* in “that strength”

deictic *here* in “Here China’s Communist rulers have ...”

personal pronoun *his* in “his wild threats”

comparative reference *such* in “such inflammatory rhetoric”

comparative with an implicit standard of reference in “A more immediate threat to US interests”

c) Conjunction:

yet (at the beginning of the third paragraph)

In the above example, cohesion is achieved in part through reiteration, a form of cohesion “which involves the repetition of a lexical item, at one end of the scale; the use of a general word to refer back to a lexical item, at the other end of the scale; and a number of things in between—the use of a synonym, near-synonym, or superordinate” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976: 278). Reference items, including demonstratives and the anaphoric *the*, add greatly to the cohesion of the passage. Located at the beginning of a sentence, five of the eight referential items listed above exert an even stronger cohesive force, establishing a close link between that sentence and what has gone before.

Special attention should be paid to cohesive devices used between paragraphs. The use of synonyms (China has reacted angrily→Beijing protests too much) links the first paragraph with the second, and the conjunction *yet* serves as a link between the second and the third paragraphs. What the deixis *here* does at the beginning of the fifth paragraph, the comparative *more immediate* does at the beginning of the sixth paragraph. The link between the third and fourth paragraphs is more subtle. It is achieved through the use of antonyms:

abnormal and disturbing in the last sentence of the third paragraph, set against *reasonable and predictable* in the first sentence of the fourth paragraph.

2.2 Cohesion in Japanese

2.2.1 Dissecting a Japanese editorial for analysis of cohesive devices

The Yomiuri Shimbun

- [1]^(a)軍拡路線をひた走る^(b)中国の^(c)脅威を浮き彫りにする内容だ。
 [2]^(d)米国防総省が^(b)中国^(a)軍事力に関する^(e)年次報告書を発表した。
 [3]^(e)報告書は、「急速な^(a)軍近代化が続けば、^(f)周辺地域の確実な^(c)脅威になる」と**結論づけている**。[4]昨年までにはなかった、踏み込んだ表現だ。[5]^(d)米国の強い^(c)危機感を示す内容と言える。
 [6]^(b)中国の^(a)軍事情報は、^(a)軍事費一つとっても、秘密のベールに包まれてきた。
 [7]^(e)報告書によれば、実際の^(a)軍事費は^(b)中国政府の公表額の2~3倍で、^(d)米国、ロシアに次ぐ世界第3位の^(a)軍事大国だ。[8]この傾向が続けば2025年までに^(a)軍事力は今の3倍以上になると^(b)警告している。
 [9]^(a)装備面では、特に^(a)海空軍力の増強について強い^(c)警戒感を**示している**。
 [10]近年の^(b)中国^(a)軍は、^(f)台湾^(c)有事に主眼を置いてきた。[11]^(e)報告書は、^(f)台湾海峡の^(a)軍事バランスは^(b)中国優位に傾きつつある、と断定するとともに、「^(b)中国は^(f)台湾との^(c)紛争に必要な^(a)戦力以上の能力を得ようとしている」と、**指摘している**。
 [12]^(b)中国政府は^(a)国防白書などを通じ、「^(b)中国は^(a)防御的な^(a)国防政策を堅持し永遠に^(c)覇権を求めない」と再三強調している。[13]だが、最近の^(b)中国の^(g)動向を見ると、明らかに「^(g)言行不一致」である。
 [14]^(b)中国は^(f)外洋^(c)進出の^(g)動きを強めている。[15]^(a)原子力潜水艦による^(f)日本領海の^(c)侵犯も、**そうした**^(g)活動の一環だ。[16]^(e)報告書は日中関係を念頭に、資源探査で^(c)緊張が高まれば「^(c)紛争発生もあり得る」との懸念を示した。[17]^(f)ベトナム、フィリピンなどとの^(c)領有権争いも明記した。
 [18]^(d)報告書は触れていないが、^(f)ミャンマーやパキスタンで、^(b)中国は^(a)軍事転用も可能な港湾整備に力を注いでいる。[19]^(f)地域周辺国への^(c)軍事的進出を目指す^(g)動きだ。
 [20]^(d)米政府の^(b)中国の^(a)軍事力に対する^(c)警戒感は、多くの^(f)周辺国に共通するものだ。[The article continues]

(『脅威』を浮き彫りにした米報告書」2005年7月21日)

a) Lexical Cohesion:

- (a) 軍 (military)
- (b) 中国 (China)
- (c) 敵意・紛争 (hostility, conflict)
- (d) 米国 (the U.S.)
- (e) 年次報告書 (report)
- (f) 周辺地域 (neighboring countries)
- (g) 活動・動き (movements)

b) Reference:

(demonstrative) “この” in “この傾向” and “そうした” in “そうした活動”

(themes introduced by the participle “は”): The participle “は” is used to bring in given information, and “報告書は” does not refer to just any report, but “the report.” It is therefore accompanied by the definite article in English translation (see section 3). In this sense, the phrase “報告書は” in Sentences 3, 11, 16 and 18 can be considered a reference item as well as a lexical item.

c) Conjunction:

“だが” in “だが、最近の中国の動向を見ると”

d) Ellipsis:

The notion of ellipsis put forth by Halliday & Hasan (1976)—substitution by zero—is hard to apply to the analysis of Japanese texts. By definition, an elliptical item is “one which, leaves specific structural slots to be filled from elsewhere” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976:143), but it is hard to decide if Sentences 4 and 5, for example, have an opening at the beginning to be filled (with “報告書は”, the report), or if they are full sentences by themselves, just supplying extra information about the theme—報告書—of the preceding sentence. To the extent that they cannot be interpreted without some information provided from what has gone before, however, the sentences can be said to have an elliptical item to be filled anaphorically. By the same token, Sentence 9 has an elliptical item (報告書は) at the beginning, and so do Sentences 13 (中国は), 17 (報告書は), and 19 (中国は).

e) Predicate:

The *Yomiuri Shimbun* editorial opens abruptly with “軍拡路線をひた走る中国の脅威を浮き彫りにする内容だ” (Its content throws into bold relief the threat posed by ever-accelerating military expansion of China. / Translation—Katori), without first clarifying

what the pronoun “its” refers to, leaving the reader wondering, what content? That question is resolved cataphorically by Sentence 2, which supplies the context on which the interpretation of Sentence 1 depends, a device often exploited by Japanese newspaper editorials at the opening to engage readers’ interest. The rheme of Sentence 2—published an annual report—reappears at the beginning of Sentence 3 as its theme, the report. To this given information is added new information by Sentences 4 and 5, on the content of the report. In other words, Sentence 2 supplies new information, which is consistently held thereafter as the theme of the rest of the paragraph.

In the succeeding paragraph, the theme of Sentence 6—Chinese military information (中国の軍事情報) has what is called a split rheme, supplying one theme—China’s actual military spending—for Sentences 7 and 8, and another—China’s military equipment—for Sentence 9.

A similarity in the form and content of predicates located close-by also enhances cohesion. The closing of Sentence 1 “内容だ” is similar, in form and content, to “表現だ” (Sentence 4), and “結論づけている” (Sentence 3) corresponds to “警告している” (Sentence 8), “示している” (Sentence 9), and “指摘している” (Sentence 11) all of them making a statement about "the report."

2.2.2 Other elements enhancing cohesion

Another unifier, not present in the editorial quoted above, is the participles “のだ” and its variant “のである。” Used at the end of a sentence, they indicate that the proposition is the judgment the speaker has formed about the situation described earlier, that it is an explanatory statement about that situation or that it is the speaker’s decision about it. In the following example, “のだ” at the end of the passage indicates that this last sentence is the writer’s judgment about the G7 joint communiqué.

ワシントンで開かれた主要7カ国財務相・中央銀行総裁会議（G7）は、名指しこそ避けたものの、中国に為替政策の見直しを促すことなどを盛り込んだ共同声明を採択した。

声明は「為替レートの柔軟性を欠く主要な国・地域」について、より柔軟性を高めることが望ましい、とした。持って回った表現だが、言いたいことは明らかである。人民元について、変動相場制のような貿易の実態や市場の見方を映す仕組みに変えるよう求めたのだ。 [underlined added, The article continues]

（「人民元だけの話ではない」『朝日新聞』社説 2005年4月18日）

2.3 Summary

At first glance, the English editorial is not that different from the Japanese editorial in

its use of lexical cohesive items and overall number of cohesive ties. It feels tighter, however, probably for three reasons. One is the definite article serving as a reference item. In the *Financial Times* editorial, “the report” in “The report talks of a possible future threat to Asia...” is doubly cohesive, through the reiteration of the lexical item “report” and anaphoric reference directed by the definite article. In semiotic terms, its cohesive potential is created through both indexicality (the definite article) and iconicity (lexical reiteration). The second reason is the links between paragraphs, as noted already. Located at the beginning of a paragraph, those cohesive ties ensure a smooth flow of discourse from one paragraph to the next. The third reason is a stronger code for organization that governs English journalistic paragraphs (see 4.4).

The cohesion of Japanese journalistic writing is mainly achieved through lexical items, the succession of a theme from one sentence to the next, the forms and contents of predicates and the participle “のだ” used at the end of a sentence. It does not rely so much on such reference items as demonstratives and pronouns or on substitution.

3. Translating Japanese cohesion into English

3.1 Translating loose texture into tight texture

In the light of the different norms outlined in the previous section, this section looks at how translators turn a loosely cohesive sequence of Japanese sentences into tighter English texture, by comparing two sections from the *Yomiuri Shimbun* editorial quoted earlier and its English translation carried by the *Daily Yomiuri*.

The first five sentences, translated one by one without any attempt at adjusting the level and nature of cohesion for English readers, might indeed create a discourse that deserves the reputation of the Japanese style as “the dot-type pattern.”

軍拡路線をひた走る中国の脅威を浮き彫りにする内容だ。
米国防総省が中国軍事力に関する年次報告書を発表した。
報告書は、「急速な軍近代化が続けば、周辺地域の確実な脅威になる」と結論づけて
いる。昨年までにはなかった、踏み込んだ表現だ。米国の強い危機感を示す内容と言
える。

A sentence-by-sentence translation would go like this: “Its content throws into bold relief the threat posed by ever-accelerating military expansion of China. The U.S. Defense Department released an annual report on Chinese military power. The report concludes that ‘If the rapid modernization of the Chinese military should continue unabated, it could be a threat to neighboring countries.’ The wording of the report is more direct than that of

any previous report. It indicates heightened alarm on the part of the U.S.”

Instead, the translator put together a tighter English passage, by changing the order of the first two sentences and turning the last sentence into a participle phrase that was then incorporated into the preceding sentence.

In its annual report to Congress on China’s military capabilities, the U.S. Defense Department said Tuesday that China’s ongoing military buildup policy could pose a threat to other countries.

Should China’s rapid modernization of military power continue, it could certainly present a threat to its neighboring areas, the Pentagon report said.

The language used in the report to refer to China’s military expansion is much more direct than that in previous Pentagon reports, indicating the strong concern harbored by the United States over the issue. (“U.S. report points to risks posed by China’s military” *The Daily Yomiuri*, editorial, July 21, 2005)

…報告書は日中関係を念頭に、資源探査で緊張が高まれば「紛争発生もあり得る」との懸念を示した。ベトナム、フィリピンなどとの領有権争いも明記した。
(ST-1) 報告書は触れていないが、ミャンマーやパキスタンで、中国は軍事転用も可能な港湾整備に力を注いでいる。 (ST-2) 地域周辺国への軍事的進出を目指す動きだ。

Taking into account the recently soured Japan-China relations, the report also expresses concern that if tensions between China and other countries escalate over China’s claims to disputed territory or resource rights, crises and conflicts could erupt. The report also refers to territorial disputes China has with such countries as Vietnam and the Philippines.

(TT-1)Not mentioned in the report is the fact that China is throwing its energy into improving ports and harbors in Myanmar and Pakistan that could be converted for military use. (TT-2)This indicates China’s aim to extend the reach of its military into its neighboring countries. [underlines and sentence markers added] (“U.S. report points to risks posed by China’s military” *The Daily Yomiuri*, editorial, July 21, 2005)

The sentence marked (TT-1) in the translated text is inverted to follow the word order of the original. Without the use of inversion, the resulting English sentence—China is throwing its energy into improving ports and harbors in Myanmar and Pakistan that could be converted for military use, although the report says nothing about it—would not only obscure the contrast between what is written in the report and what is not, but it would

also weaken the lexical cohesion achieved by the repetition of “the report,” by placing the two occurrences of the lexical item farther apart. The translator took care that “the report” in this sentence was located as close to the preceding sentence as it could be. The number of words between two lexical items matters.

The link between the sentences marked (ST-1) and (ST-2) is strengthened in the translated text. The new information given in the latter half of (TT-1) is condensed into a reference item (“This”), which is then not only integrated into (TT-2) as the subject/theme of that sentence but also placed at the beginning.

The following two passages, from an *Asahi Shimbun* editorial on terrorist bombings in central London, have wide gaps between sentences: how each of the underlined sentences is logically related to the preceding sentence is not immediately clear. The gaps are so wide, in fact, that even native readers of Japanese would have to make conscious effort to fill them – if they were meant to be filled at all.

ロンドンに備えがなかったわけではない。世界有数の大都市である。9・11以降、こうしたテロに攻撃された時に備え、住民の退避や交通機関の制御などの緊急対処計画が作られていたという。・・・

ニューヨーク、マドリードに続いて今度はロンドンが襲われた。イラク戦争への報復が直接の動機なのかもしれない。だが、G8 に代表される先進諸国への憎悪が背景にあると見るべきだ。[The article continues]

(「あの悪夢がよみがえる」『朝日新聞』社説 2005年7月8日)

The translator apparently felt the need to fill the gaps.

It was not that London was unprepared for terror. As one of the world’s leading cities, London reportedly put together a set of emergency plans after 9/11 for the evacuation of citizens and control of mass transit systems in case terrorists struck. ...

The fact that London was targeted after New York and Madrid may suggest this attack was in retaliation for the invasion of Iraq. But we believe it is more reasonable to assume the perpetrators were motivated by their hatred for the developed world represented by the G-8 nation.

(“Terror in London” *The Asahi Shimbun*, editorial, July 9, 2005)

3.2 Choosing words for reiteration

To return to the *Yomiuri Shimbun* editorial on China’s military capabilities, there is one aspect of lexical cohesion that is of some interest to translators: the choice from among a repetition, a synonym or near-synonym, a superordinate, and a general word.

Compare:

(*Financial Times*) the US defence department's report→the US document→the report→these public annual assessments

(*Yomiuri Shimbun*) 年次報告書→報告書→報告書→報告書→報告書→報告書→報告書

(*Daily Yomiuri*) annual report→the Pentagon report→the report→Pentagon reports→the report→the report→the report→the report→the report→the report→the U.S. report

The *Financial Times* avoids repeating the word "report" though admittedly it makes mention of the referent only four times. The *Yomiuri Shimbun*, by contrast, has six 報告書 (report) and no other noun phrase used in its place. The paper's English translation, *The Daily Yomiuri*, has even more repetitions of the word "report" because, for syntactic reason, several elliptical 報告書 in the original had to be made explicit in English.

Keene (1980) contrasts Japanese writers' choice of words with English writers'. One of the problems faced by a translator putting a piece of Japanese literary work into English is that "Japanese writers seem free to use the same word several times in a piece of writing, but a good English writer will not repeat on the same page a word with low overall frequency in the system of the English language" (Keene, 1980: 172, translation – Katori).

Translators have to become creative if they are to avoid sounding monotonous, but in general they seem to prefer following the original closely to making attempts at rewording, apart from substituting reference to the government of a country by the name of that country's capital, e.g. the Chinese government by Beijing and the U.S. government by Washington.

3.3. Summary

As quoted in section 1, Nakayama notes that the Japanese favorite dot-type pattern "creates a void which readers are free to fill with what they think is there." Observations of this sort are often made in Japanese-English contrastive rhetoric studies, but it may be worthwhile examining them.

Do Japanese readers have the freedom to fill the gaps between sentences with their imagination? The present author doesn't think they do. Japanese readers do not have the freedom to fill the blanks, because they do not see them. The absence of something creates a semiotic phenomenon only when it is marked. When it is marked, the receiver of a message—in this case the reader of a passage—sees it as a signifiant to be interpreted in one way or another. Unmarked, the absence just doesn't exist. In the earlier example from the *Asahi Shimbun* editorial dated July 8, 2005, the gaps between the sentences are not marked for Japanese readers; they would be for English readers were they left unfilled in translation.

Professional translators rendering Japanese into English often feel the necessity to create a tighter text than the original, making implicit cohesion in the original explicit in translation or sometimes creating cohesion at their own risk.

4. Translating English cohesion into Japanese

4.1 Choosing words for reiteration

One reason—there are certainly other reasons—that Japanese writers in general repeat an identical noun phrase for a referent throughout a piece of writing is that doing otherwise—using a synonym or a superordinate, for example—can undermine the cohesion of the text. An article from the *Nihon Keizai Shimbun* provides an interesting example:

1948年、大阪市内で奇妙なニセ札を持った男が逮捕された。記番号 234797 の拾円札。すでに二十数枚使っていた。病身の図案工が技能を悪用して手作りした紙幣だった。記番号は「兄さんよ泣くな」と読み、戦死した長男に犯行を詫げる印だった。
[underlines added, the passage continues]

(“春秋” *The Nihon Keizai Shimbun*, January 13, 2005, morning edition, p.1)

This passage is the opening paragraph of a column, *Shunju* (春秋), *Nihon Keizai Shimbun*'s equivalent of *Asahi Shimbun*'s *Tensei Jingo* 'Vox Dei, Vox Populi.' The problem is that the link between “男” (man) in the first sentence and “病身の図案工” (sick draftsman) in the third sentence is not immediately clear, and for many readers who didn't bother to re-read the passage, it probably remained forever unestablished. The only endophoric clue to concluding that the “男” is the “病身の図案工” is that there is nothing in the entire column to suggest the presence of another person implicated in the currency counterfeiting case. An alternative to risking confusion would have been to use a demonstrative (e.g. その病身の図案工), but that descriptive phrasing would not match the literary flavor of the column. The surest way to maintain lexical cohesion, then, would have been to use the same noun (e.g. 病を患いつつ男が図案工の技能を悪用し・・・).

In English translation, that metonymy would not cause confusion, because it would be accompanied by the definite article (e.g. They were banknotes forged by the sick draftsman abusing his skills.)

Here is another example, also from the *Nihon Keizai Shimbun*.

(九州大宰府天満宮の) 境内で合格祈願の絵馬に記す志望大学に今年、経済系の学部が目立つのはホリエモン効果大きい。自分の学生時代を「ニート」に例えた若者は、

既存の秩序や規則に守られた大企業中心のビジネスに裸一貫で挑んで成功した時代の寵児として若い世代の共感を集めた。その浮薄な熱狂が失敗の土壌となった。

[underline added]

(“春秋” *The Nihon Keizai Shimbun*, January 25, 2006, morning edition, p. 1)

It must have taken a few moments for many readers to realize that the author meant Takafumi Horie, a.k.a. Horiemon (ホリエモン), by the phrase “youngster who said he/she might as well have been a NEET in his/her student days” (自分の学生時代を「ニート」に例えた若者).

In English, writers have broad options, made available by the definite article. As Halliday & Hasan put it, “we can [interpret reference] as a means of avoiding the repetition of lexical items and thus making it clear that if the lexical item had been reiterated it would have the same referent” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976: 281). Hence, the *Yomiuri Shimbun* editorial sticks with the same word “報告書” throughout the editorial, the *Financial Times* has three different noun phrases for a single referent, and a summary Japanese translation by the *Asahi Shimbun* of the *Financial Times* editorial has “報告書” for every occurrence of the referent.

米国防総省が発表した中国の軍事力に関する年次報告書 (the original phrase: the US defence department’s report) に対し、中国は軍備近代化を「理不尽」に攻撃するものだ、と怒りをあらわにした。

中国の反発は過剰だ。報告書 (the original phrase: the U.S. document)は、中国の軍事力は今のところ限定的だとし、米国は平和的で繁栄した中国の台頭を歓迎すると明言している。[notes in brackets, added] [article continues]

(「中国、軍事力の使い道」『朝日新聞』2005年7月24日, morning edition, p.10)

4.2 Translating English reference items into Japanese

That the type of cohesion preferred by Japanese speakers is different from the one familiar to English speakers is also obvious from a quick perusal of the following text, on the impact of overpopulation on human behavior.

こうした学者やジャーナリストたちは、齧歯類の行動から人類の行動へと論理を飛躍させていた。人間の集団を見れば、こうした単純な推定ではなぜそれほど疑わしいかという理由が分かる。例えば、一人あたりの殺人発生率と1平方キロメートルあたりの人口密度とを数カ国で比べてみよう。その際、かつてしたように、『1996年版国連人口統計』のデータを使ってみよう。もし物事が単純明快なら、その2つは連繫し

て変化するはずだが、実際にはそうならず、統計学的に重要な相関性はない。

しかし、このような相関性はおそらく国民所得レベルや政治組織、その他変動要素によって分かりにくくなるのだという主張もあるだろう。だが、少なくとも収入に関してはそうとはいえないようだ。我々は、これらの国々を自由主義国、旧東側ブロック、第三世界という3つの範疇に分類し、再度分析を行なった。今回はある重要な相関性を発見したが、それは全く逆の方向の結果だった。つまり、旧東側ブロックの最も人口密度の低い国々の方が、凶悪犯罪が多いことが示されたのだ。 [underlines added]

Actually, the passage above is a translation from English, done by a student in a translation training course. The article opens with the authors' criticism of several journalists and commentators who cited an experiment using rats, conducted by experimental psychologist John B. Calhoun, to predict disastrous effects of overpopulation on human behavior. In Calhoun's experiment, the rats in a cramped room set about killing, sexually assaulting and, eventually, cannibalizing one another.

In extrapolating from rodents to people, however, these thinkers and writers were making a gigantic leap of faith. A look at human populations suggests why such a simple extrapolation is so problematic. Compare, for instance, per capita murder rates with the number of people per square kilometer in different nations—as we did, using data from the United Nations's 1996 Demographic Yearbook. If things were straightforward, the two ought to vary in tandem. Instead there is no statistically meaningful relation.

But, one could argue, perhaps such a relation is obscured by variation in national income level, political organization or some other variable. Apparently not, at least for income. We divided the nations into three categories—free-market, former East Block and Third World—and did the analysis again. This time we did find one significant correlation, but it was in the other direction: it showed more violent crime in the least crowded countries of the former East Block. [underlines added] (“Coping with Crowding” by Frans B. M. de Waal, Filippo Aureli and Peter G. Judge, *Scientific American*, May 2000, pp. 76-81)

English cohesive devices rendered as they are into Japanese create a text that feels stilted or, worse, frustratingly unreadable. A glance over the student's translation will leave native readers of Japanese with the impression that there is something about the passage that slows their reading speed: excessive use of “こそあ” demonstratives. Checking them with the original shows that they correspond to English referential items such as *these*, *such*, *other* and *the*, and an ellipsis *Apparently, not*.

One obvious problem in the student's translation stems from shifts in word order. A good translator does his or her best to arrange ideas, words and phrases in the order in which they are presented to the reader of the original. For syntactic reasons, however, there are limits to how closely a translator can follow the original word order, with the result that demonstratives and the words, phrases or ideas that they refer to have to be placed at longer distances in translation than in the original, creating a wide gap that obscures the link between the index and the referent. The use of a deictic element in “そうとはいえない” in the second paragraph is a case in point. A more competent translator would have repeated “国民所得” (national income) and rendered the line as “少なくとも国民所得については当てはまらない”.

Still, given that Japanese texts do not rely so heavily on referential items for cohesion as do English texts, the student used far too many demonstratives. There are 11 “こそあ” deictic elements in the student's 443-letter translation, compared with only two in the *Yomiuri Shimbun* editorial on China's military expansion, which is more than 1.5 times as long. Some of the student's “こそあ” phrases can be rephrased (e.g. その2つは→両者は), and some others can simply be deleted (e.g. これらの国々を→国々を). Many writer's manuals in Japanese—including 『書き方の技術』 (Shinoda, 1989) and 『日本語文章力』 (Watanabe, 2003)—counsel against excessive use of “こそあ” demonstratives. Translators are advised to keep their use to a minimum.

That said, blaming translators for more-than-normative occurrences of demonstratives may be unfair. Part of the phenomenon is a natural consequence of translating “an English expository paragraph,” which “usually begins with a topic sentence, and then, by a series of subdivisions of that topic statement, each supported by example and illustrations, proceeds to develop that central idea and relate that idea to all the other ideas in the whole essay” (Kaplan, 1966: 4-5). In short, English paragraphs are organized in a way that every statement refers back to what has preceded, making anaphoric reference a far more significant feature of cohesion than it is in Japanese.

4.3 Dealing with changes of subject/theme

Another insight that can be gained from the comparison in section 2.2.1 is that since cohesion in Japanese is in part supported by the succession of a theme from one sentence to the next, explicit on the first occurrence and implicit on subsequent occurrences, it may be more easily disrupted by a thematic change in mid-sentence, more so than cohesion in English. The following is a passage from an article in the *Foreign Affairs* November/December 2003 issue. Titled “The Baby Trade,” it discusses how international adoption of children should be regulated..

An American agency that helped bring 600 Russian children to the United States in the 1990s admitted giving orphanages clothing and medical supplies in order to establish preferential relationships with them. But the agency claimed that because it did not pay the orphanages, the Russians had not been “selling the children.”

(“The Baby Trade” by Ethan B. Kapstein, *Foreign Affairs*, November/December 2003)

Its translation reads:

例えば、1990年代にロシアの子ども600人の養子縁組をあっせんしたアメリカの業者は、孤児院に優先的に対応してもらうために衣類や医薬品を提供したことを認めたが、この業者は、孤児院には金銭を支払っていないのだから、ロシア人に「子どもを売ってもらった」のではないと主張した。[underline added]

(「国際的養子縁組のための多国間ルールを強化せよ」『論座』2004年8月号 p. 294)

The translator, rightly, is consistent in her viewpoint from which to describe the event. Tracing the thematic shift of the original (e.g. この業者は、孤児院には金銭を支払っていないのだからロシア人は「子どもを売っていたのではない」、と主張した) would have disturbed the flow of the discourse.

4.4 The unifying force of a paragraph

One aspect of English cohesion not fully discussed by Halliday & Hasan (1976) is the unifying force of a paragraph. The course of development for English journalistic paragraphs is governed by a code with a far greater binding force than that for their Japanese equivalents. This explains relatively few occurrences of the discourse markers *for example* and *for instance* in English paragraphs, and the need to use “例えば” (for example) in their Japanese translations

In the Japanese translation of “The Baby Trade,” that appeared in the August 2004 issue of *Ronza* (『論座』), a bimonthly published by the Asahi Shimbun Company, there are six “例えば,” only two of them having a corresponding phrase in the original. Compare the following original paragraph with its translation:

It is also difficult at times to distinguish child trafficking from legitimate adoption; the difference may be clear conceptually, but it is not always clear in reality. An American agency that helped bring 600 Russian children to the United States in the 1990s admitted giving orphanages clothing and medical supplies in order to establish preferential relationships with them. But the agency claimed that because it did not

pay the orphanages, the Russians had not been "selling the children." (p. 120) [The paragraph continues]

合法的な養子縁組と子どもの人身売買を見分けるのが難しい場合もある。概念的には明らかに区別できるのだが、現実にはそれほどはっきりしないこともある。例えば、1990年代にロシアの子ども六百人の養子縁組をあっせんしたアメリカの業者は、孤児院に優先的に対応してもらうために衣類や医薬品を提供したことを認めたが、この業者は、孤児院には金銭を支払っていないのだから、ロシア人に「子どもを売ってもらった」のではないと主張した。(以下省略) [underline added]

(「国際的養子縁組のための多国間ルールを強化せよ」『論座』2004年8月号 p. 294)

Why the translator felt it necessary to use the phrase “例えば” at the beginning of the third sentence, or, to put it another way, why the original writer didn’t use a similar discourse marker, is revealing. English readers have the expectation that a general assertion made at the beginning of a paragraph will be followed by a few specific examples, while Japanese readers don’t. For Japanese readers, the logical relationship between the second and the third sentences in the paragraph above would not be as obvious without “例えば” used in between.

The difference noted above can be explained in semiotic terms. Ikegami (1983) postulates a code for syntagmatic text organization. “The stronger the binding force of a code, the less the need to turn to the context for interpretation of a message,” writes Ikegami (Ikegami, 1983: 173, translation—Katori). “The producer of a message, in the expectation that the interpreter will activate the same knowledge system as his own, can decide not to give explicit linguistic expression to certain information, and the interpreter of the message can read that information that has not been made explicit, on the assumption that the producer has produced the message under the same knowledge system.” (ibid.:182, translation—Katori).

In many English paragraphs, the middle position is a slot to be filled with an example or two. In Japanese it can be filled with a paraphrase of the first sentence, another argument building on the preceding one, or an example of the author’s observation just made. In short, without a code with as much binding force, the course of development for a Japanese paragraph is much less predictable, an unpredictability that Nomura (2000), in effect, attributes to the nature of the Japanese topic sentence.

This difference probably explains fewer-than-expected occurrences of other conjunctions in English journalistic texts, as well. A writer feels a greater need to use some link word(s) when contradicting or canceling a statement he or she has just made, than when adding another piece of information to the statement. In the following example from

The Economist, on the accident of the Space Shuttle Columbia, the unifying force of the topic sentence, underlined, eliminates the need for a contrastive conjunction, such as *but*, between Sentences 4 and 5.

Could the astronauts have been saved had the damage been noticed sooner? Probably not. It is unlikely that a rescue mission involving another shuttle could have been prepared in time. [4] Audiences fed on a diet of science fiction are used to astronauts hopping into waiting spacecraft. [5] Preparing a shuttle for flight requires about 1.2m separate procedures. So the shuttle may have been doomed from the moment of take-off. Others, though, say it was doomed a lot earlier than that. [underline and sentence numbers added, the article continues]

(“And then there were three” *The Economist*, February 8, 2003, p. 76)

A translator rendering this paragraph into Japanese would be advised to use “しかし” (but) between the two sentences for the reason explained above.

4.5 Summary

In translating English reiteration items, translators have two options: 1) repeat the same word, whatever else the original has for reiteration (e.g. *The Asahi Shimbun*'s translation of the *Financial Times* editorial has “報告書” for all references to the report in question: “the U.S. defence department’s report”, “the U.S. document” and “these annual assessments”). 2) give different translations for different reiteration items (e.g. 「米政府報告書」「国防総省の文書」「年次評価書」). However, since literal translation of the synonym, superordinate or general word used in the English original can confuse the Japanese reader and often requires the use of an anaphoric reference item (e.g. 「この」「そうした」「そうした」「同」), which can grate on the reader, translators are advised to use the same word for all occurrences of the same referent throughout the text. (Generally speaking, the need for an anaphoric reference item in Japanese translation depends on the need for contextualization: the more general a noun is, the greater the need for contextualizing it with an anaphoric reference item. But it also differs between the repetition of the same word and the use of some other reiteration item: in the *Asahi Shimbun* translation, “報告書” is used several times unaccompanied by an anaphoric reference item, but the use of other reiteration items would have required one, e.g. 「国防総省のこの文書」「その年次評価書」).

Second, entry-level students of English-to-Japanese translation should be careful with the use of “こそあ” demonstratives. Although translating English expository paragraphs often requires their heavier use than is normative in Japanese newspaper editorials for the

reason explained in 4.2, entry-level students tend to use them where they are not necessary or where they can be associated with the wrong word or idea in the preceding passage.

Third, since the succession of a theme from one sentence to the next, explicit on the first occurrence and implicit in the succeeding sentences, plays an important part in Japanese cohesion (see 4.3), translators would do well not to change the theme, particularly in mid-sentence, if this is at all possible.

Finally, translators should use conjunctions, as defined by Halliday & Hasan (see notes), including 例えば (for example) and しかし (but), where appropriate, to guide the Japanese reader through the paragraph organization that is familiar to the English reader but not to the Japanese reader.

5. Directions for future research

Halliday & Hasan (1976) discussed cohesive devices, some of them syntactically obligatory and others less so, that the speaker/writer uses to give a sequence of sentences a sense of unity. In other words, they discussed cohesion from the production side.

A cohesive text thus produced has to be received by the hearer/listener as such, however, and the inclusion of the hearer's (reader's) role in the discussion will expand the scope of research. It will be based on the assumption that the speaker (writer) creates a cohesive potential, and the hearer (reader) realizes it. In the following example, the tacit agreement between writer and reader that an opinion will be followed by a reason seems to play at least as important a role as the lexical item "the station" in achieving cohesion, putting the two underlined sentences tightly together.

Experiments requiring microgravity can be done on cheap unmanned rockets with no risk to human life. In fact, Andrew Coates, at University College London, argues that microgravity research on the space station is a positively bad idea. The station is a big throbbing structure with human occupants rattling around in it, and this distorts any results.

(“And then there were three” *The Economist*, February 8, 2003, p. 78)

When a story, narrative, discussion or an argument unfolds in the expected course, the text feels strongly cohesive, and there will be less need for discourse markers. However, English readers and Japanese readers may not have the same expectations about what idea will be followed by what. In the example above, the logical relationship between the underlined sentences would not be as obvious to Japanese readers as it must be to English readers, and it would, therefore, have to be made explicit in Japanese translation (e.g. 内部で人間の居住者がバタバタ動き回っており、ステーションは揺れる構造物である。そのため実験結果がゆがめられてしまう、と言うのだ。)

Discussion in section 4.4, on translating English expository paragraphs into Japanese, focused on other such cases. There will be more to be explored.

About the Author: KATORI Yoshikazu (香取 芳和) has 16 years' experience as a freelance translator and instructor. Books he translated for publication include *Women in Islam* and *Look Me in the Eye*. Teaches a translation course at Inter School, a training institution for interpreters and translators, and conducts an English reading workshop for adult learners. Received an MA in intercultural communication studies from Rikkyo University.

E-mail: katori.ws@nifty.com

Notes:

1. Halliday & Hasan (1976) classifies cohesive relations into five types: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. "Reference" is an item with the property of reference; "that is to say, instead of being interpreted semantically in their own right, they make reference to something else for their interpretation. (Halliday & Hasan, 1976: 31). "Substitution" is "the replacement of one item by another." (ibid.: 89). The authors use the term "ellipsis" to refer to "sentences, clauses, etc whose structure is such as to presuppose some preceding item, which then serves as the source of the missing information. An elliptical item is one which, as it were, leaves specific structural slots to be filled from elsewhere" (ibid.: 143). They define "conjunction" as "a specification of the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before" (ibid.: .227) and "lexical cohesion" as "the cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary" (ibid.: .274).

References:

- Baker, M. (1992). *In other words: a coursebook on translation*. London: Routledge.
- Grice, P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. Cole, P., Morgan, L. (editor) *Syntax and Semantic*, Vol. 3 (pp. 41-58). London: Academic Press, Inc.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Hinds, J. (1983). Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. *Text*, 3, pp. 183-195.
- Katori, Y (2005). *A Gricean Analysis of Journalistic Texts in Translation Between Japanese and English*. Unpublished master's thesis, Rikkyo University, Tokyo, Japan.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural Thought Patterns in Inter-Cultural Education. *Language Learning: a quarterly journal of applied linguistics*, Vol. XVI, Nos. 3&4, pp. 1-20.

- 池上嘉彦 (2002). 『記号論への招待』 岩波書店
- 井上ひさし (1987). 『自家製 文章読本』 新潮文庫
- 加藤恭子、ハーディ・V. (1992). 『英語小論文の書き方：英語のロジック・日本語のロジック』 講談社現代新書
- キーン・D. (1980). 「日本近代文学の外国語訳」 岩波書店『文学』 編集部 (編)『文学：1980』 (pp. 168-173) 岩波書店
- 野村眞木夫 (2000). 『日本語のテキスト－関係・効果・様相－』 ひつじ書房
- 篠田義明 (1989). 『書き方の技術：“文章が苦手”な人のための実戦マニュアル』 ゴマ書房
- 渡辺富美雄 (2003). 『日本語文章力』 かんき出版
- 山中桂一 (1998). 『日本語のかたち：対照言語学からのアプローチ』 東京大学出版会

Sources of data quoted in the body

- Asahi Shimbun, The, “Terror in London,” editorial, July 9, 2005, p. 17.
- Daily Yomiuri, The, “U.S. report points to risks posed by China’s military,” editorial, July 21, 2005, p. 4.
- Economist, The, “And then there were three,” February 8, 2003, pp. 76-78.
- Foreign Affairs, “The Baby Trade,” Kapstein, E. B (2003), Vol. 83, pp.115-125. New York: Council on Foreign Relations.
- Financial Times, The, “The Pentagon and China’s rising power,” leader, July 21, 2005, p. 12.
- Scientific American “Coping with Crowding” by Waal, F. B. M. de, Aureli, F. & Judge, P.G. (2000). May 2000, pp. 76-81.
- 朝日新聞 社説「G7 人民元だけの話ではない」 2005年4月18日、日刊、p. 3.
- 朝日新聞 社説「あの悪夢がよみがえる」 2005年7月8日、日刊、p. 20.
- 朝日新聞「中国、軍事力の使い道」2005年7月24日、日刊、p. 20.
- 日本経済新聞、春秋、2005年1月13日、日刊、p. 1.
- 日本経済新聞、春秋、2006年1月25日、日刊、p. 1.
- 論座「国際的養子縁組のための多国間ルールを強化せよ」イーサン・K (2003) (訳者不明) 2004年8月号 pp. 291-299. 朝日新聞社
- 読売新聞「『脅威』を浮き彫りにした米報告書」社説2005年7月21日、日刊、p. 3.

