

Lund University
Centre for Languages and Literature
Handledare: Lars Larm

BA Thesis
Spring 2012
JAPK11

P.G. Wodehouse in translation to Japanese

Petronella Stille

Abstract

Those familiar with the various comically inclined works of P.G. Wodehouse are, or should be, well aware of his idiosyncrasies, particularly in terms of his usage of specific expressions and his inventiveness in using imagery to bring across his point. Therefore, those aware of the existence of said inclined-to-make-you-smile works of fiction should be pleasantly surprised to find that many of his works have been translated to Japanese. This paper aims to explore and analyse the to-Japanese translation of above mentioned elements of Wodehouse's humour as it appears in *Right Ho, Jeeves* and *The Inimitable Jeeves*, accompanied by a general inquiry into how much the translation alters the humorous intent of the original. Prior to the divulgence of said research, however, some general information regarding humour, from both English and Japanese perspectives, will be provided in a precursory manner. Following this, a look at what it is that makes Wodehouse's style so unique will also be presented.

What has been found is this: expressions such as 'What ho', 'Dash it' and 'Right-ho' have all been translated based on context, and the various words substituted are constant in their use. The only expression awarded with its own unique designation is Right-ho - '*Yoshikita*'. A frequent occurrence in the translation is the adding of Japanese onomatopoeic expression to enhance the original imagery created by Wodehouse. Concerning translations for any humour lost in the act, it is found to be surprisingly similar in both word use and humour contained within. Further, on the subject of the translation of synonyms, imagery and transferred epithets, it has been found that, when possible, most cases have been literally translated. In comparing the various representatives of the humour genre, Japanese *manzai* seems to be the one most relatable to the comedy of Wodehouse. Lastly, a look at reviews of '*Yoshikita, Jeeves*' is provided for some insight into the response from its intended readers.

Keywords: P.G. Wodehouse, Humour, Translation, Japanese

Table of Contents

Abstract	II
Table of Contents	III
Conventions	1
1. Introduction	1
1.1 The Topic	1
1.2 Structure and Methodology	1
2. Humour	2
2.1 Introduction	2
2.2 General English	2
2.3 Modes of Humour	4
2.4 General Japanese	6
2.5 Manzai	7
2.6 A Comparison of the Two	11
3. P.G. Wodehouse	12
3.1 Introduction	12
3.2 General	12
3.3 Elements of Humour	13
3.4 In Translation and Analysis: Expressions and Letters	15
3.4.1 Introduction	15
3.4.2 Expressions	15
3.4.3 An Exchange of Telegrams	22
3.5 In Translation and Analysis: Elements	27
3.5.1 Imagery	27
3.5.2 Transferred Epithets	29
3.5.3 The Wodehouse Synonym	30
3.5.4 Wodehouse Sundry	30
4. Customer Reviews	35
5. Conclusion	36
6. References	37
7. Appendices	38
7.1 Appendix A: Further Translations	38
7.2 Appendix B	40

Conventions

Romanization

The examples provided make use of a slightly modified version of the Hepburn system of romanization. Rather than indicated with macrons, long vowels will be transcribed using double vowels - '*benkyoo*', for example, will be transcribed as '*benkyou*'.

Typographical Conventions

When transcribed, words of Japanese origin will be marked with italics and single quotes.

1. Introduction

1.1 The Topic

The topic of this paper is that of how the written works of P.G. Wodehouse have been handled in translation to Japanese. How has the translator, Morimura Tamaki (2005), adapted such atypically Japanese/typically English, or Wodehouse-ian as the case may be, expressions such as 'Right ho', 'By Jove', 'Tinkerty Tonk', 'Dash it' or 'What ho'? Does the utterance expressed through either conversation or the written exchange of words (letters, telegrams), retain its humorous indication even in translation? If so, has it been adapted or localized to match its Japanese audience, or has he, Morimura (2005), kept modification to a minimum in order to preserve as much of the original as possible? An original whose author, as Folgado (2011) puts it, in order to extract humorous response from the reader "debases the apparent coherence of discourse" (2011:64) - does such an act cause complications in translation? How literally can Wodehouse's transferred epithets and synonyms be translated to maintain both humour and meaning without becoming nonsensical? What of the ambiguity of the English language, which Wodehouse uses to create humorous confrontations between characters - certainly these must be localized to Japanese to make even a whit of sense. Such is the topic of this paper.

1.2 Structure and Methodology

Before delving into the actual research, some general insight into both Japanese and English humour will be provided. Following this, a look at Wodehouse's use of language would seem appropriate, and has thusly been added. What is it that makes the humour in his books so intrinsically his own? Subsequently, in order to answer the questions that may or may not have risen during your perusal of this figurative quagmire of words, many a example and excerpt will be chosen from the original book, followed by the transcribed and analyzed Japaese equivalent of said passages.

2. Humour

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter an overview of what humour entails will be provided, followed by a list of various recognized types of humour and their definitions. This in turn will be followed by a short commentary on Japanese humour and a closer look at ‘*manzai*’, a type of Japanese style of comedy which bears comparison to certain elements of Wodehouse’s humour. The chapter is concluded with a comparison of usage of jokes in Japanese and American media done by Takekuro (2006).

2.2 General English

Let us first take a look at some standard dictionary definitions of *humour* and *comedy*, as they are words that are closely linked to the author of the works soon to be analyzed.

In The New Oxford American Dictionary, henceforth referred to as the NOAD, *humour* is described as follows:

- 1** the quality of being amusing or comic, esp. as expressed in literature or speech: *his tales are full of humor.*
 - the ability to perceive or express humor or to appreciate a joke: *their inimitable brand of humor* | *she has a great **sense of humor**.*
- 2** a mood or state of mind: *her **good humor** vanished* | *the clash hadn’t improved his humor.*
 - *archaic* an inclination or whim.

In this paper the focus will be on the first of the two definitions. Further, *comedy* is defined as:

Professional entertainment consisting of jokes and satirical sketches, intended to make an audience laugh.

- a movie, play, or broadcast program intended to make an audience laugh : *a rollicking new comedy.*
- the style or genre of such types of entertainment.
- the humorous or amusing aspects of something : *advertising people see the comedy in their work.*
- a play characterised by its humorous or satirical tone and its depiction amusing people or incidents, in which the characters ultimately triumph over adversity : *Shakespeare’s comedies.*

In his book *Aspects of Verbal Humour in English* (1997), Alexander describes *humour* as “a widely attested and intuitively grasped aspect of human social communication.” (1997:3) He further states that humor is an essential element of human language behavior; the ability to understand, appreciate and engage in humour is tantamount to successfully communicating in your mother tongue. (Alexander, 1997)

Another description is given by Colebrook (2004), she states that “Humour is not the reversal of cause and effect but the abandonment of the ‘before and after’ relations - the very line of time - that allows us to think in terms of causes and intentions, of grounds and

consequents.” (2004:134) Further, Critchley (2002) writes somewhat similarly that “We might say that humour is produced by a disjunction between the way things are and the way they are represented in the joke, between expectation and actuality. Humour defeats our expectations by producing a novel actuality, by changing the situation in which we find ourselves.” (2002:1).

In tone with this forthcoming attempt at differentiating between the typical humour of the British (the literary works of P.G. Wodehouse in particular) and that of the Japanese (in that his works have been translated), Alexander’s (1997) statement that the realisation of humorous texts varies from society to society is highly relevant. Texts here pertain to both spoken and written material (and though mentioned in somewhat different circumstances, the quote by Kress (1985) mentioned by Alexander ((1997) is related): “Texts are the material form of language” (1997:3)). This leads to curiosity concerning the to-Japanese translation of some very intrinsically British/Wodehouse-ian expressions. It matches further with his statement that most societies have varying sensibilities where humorous discourse is concerned, and that an abrupt contact with something very foreign often leads to experiencing the phenomenon of culture shock (Alexander, 1997). Of course, this shock cannot logically be as pronounced when it comes to fiction, as it is an action chosen by the reader to experience, but the question is to what extent must expressions, speech and locales be localized to not only make sense, but also remain humorous in translation?

Alexander (1997) brings forth another relevant point in stating the following: “the manner in which particular aspects of humour and accordingly, too, their appreciation are ‘keyed onto’ the culture in which they are found ... entails us asking, in the case of English verbal humour, how far a knowledge of more than the systemic properties of English in the narrow sense must be presupposed; in short, how far sociocultural and pragmatical knowledge is also required.” (1997:8-9) This statement ties together with the previous question - does the reader require to boast a prior knowledge of the settings and characteristics, similar to those of the author, or does he or she simply learn and adapt to the style as the story progresses? Or is it simply assumed that the reader knew what he or she was getting into, prior the act of getting in it?

There is also, on occasion, call for specifying when going from non-seriousness to seriousness and vice versa. Alexander (1997) refers to this as the metalanguage (a language or set of terms used to describe or analyze another language) of humour. Phrases like ‘Kidding aside...’ and ‘Now, I’m not really serious about this’ are examples of just such markers of returning talk to the ‘serious’ level. Whilst in the state of non-seriousness, statements such as ‘Can’t you take a joke?’ and ‘I was only joking, I didn’t mean it.’ also bring the speaker back. Cues that do the opposite by bringing the audience into the ‘non-serious’, that is to say they enable a swift crossing from serious to funny discourse, is often in the repertoire of the professional comic. (Alexander, 1997) Personas such as Jay Leno and other American late night show hosts come to mind. For example: ‘Have you heard the one about the..’, ‘Have you ever stopped to think why...’, ‘Did you know that...’, ‘What’s got x goes y and sounds like z?’. Alexander (1997) claims that this is something the native speaker understands intuitively, whereas second language learners must master these signals actively.

There are times, however, when a shift indication such as the one above is unnecessary. This is the case with irony, it infiltrates ‘regular conversation’ without any marker that it is about to do so. Alexander (1997) suggest that in cases when the listener is unsure whether a shift has taken place or not, questions such as “are you kidding?” and “are you pulling my leg? ..taking the mickey? ...having me on?” (1997:13) usually bring about clarification. Rejecting the the ironic statement with “you’re not being serious!”, “you’re kidding! you’ve got to be joking!” also tests the intention of the speaker. (Alexander, 1997)

In discussing the humour of Wodehouse's works, Folgado (2011) notes that a recurring method in his stories is, relevantly, the contrast between two kinds of discourse use - one serious, the other non-serious. He, Wodehouse, successfully alternates between these during the course of the verbal exchange partaken-in by his characters - the serious, logical utterances interrupted by another, whose tone is in conflict with the former's. Folgado (2011) describes it as a sudden playful gimmick.

2.3 Modes of Humour

Alexander (1997) presents to us a table of several modes of humour (joke, gag, pun etc.). According to this table, he writes, the humorous modes can be divided into three groups, or 'clusters' as he describes them. The first group, consisting of mainly intentional and witty modes, includes 'joke', 'gag', 'epigram' and 'crack' (as in wisecrack). Some of these may require further clarification, therefore definitions will be provided below.

Joke:

a thing that someone says to cause amusement of laughter, esp. a story with a funny punchline: *she was in a mood to tell jokes.*

- a trick played on someone for fun.
- [in sing.] *informal* a person or thing that is ridiculously inadequate: *the transportation system is a joke.*

Gag:

a joke or an amusing story or scene, esp. one forming part of a comedian's act or in a film or play.

Epigram:

a pithy saying or remark expressing an idea in a clever and amusing way.

- a short poem, esp. a satirical one, having a witty or ingenious ending.

Wisecrack:

a clever and pithy spoken witticism.

Pithy refers to when language or style is expressed concisely and forcefully. Alexander (1997) mentions that though 'Pun' could be included in this group, it is not due to the common occurrence of unintentional puns. The second group consists of unintentional modes, in that they may appear witty despite not originally setting out to amuse. (Alexander, 1997) These are 'spoonerisms', 'howlers' and 'misprints' - again, these will be defined.

Spoonerism:

a verbal error in which a speaker accidentally transposes the initial sounds or letters of two or more words, often to humorous effect, as in the sentence *you have hissed the mystery lectures*, accidentally spoken instead of the intended sentence *you have missed the history lectures*.

Howler:

a stupid or glaring mistake, esp. an amusing one.

Misprint:

an error in printed text.

Pun:

a joke exploiting the different possible meanings of a word or the fact that there are words that sound alike but have different meanings: *the pigs were a squeal (if you'll forgive the pun).*

To expand on the pun, Prasad (2004) writes that, as stated by Max Eastman, there are three kinds of puns: pointless, witty, and poetic. A pointless pun, he describes, merely plays on words and not on their meanings, whereas a witty pun always comes with a point. The poetic pun, he describes, is the best in that it “tricks our mind, deceives expectations, occasionally deflates our intelligence, and finally juggles-up twin images that refuse to jell with one another.” (2004:193)

The third group contains modes which unmistakably set out to ridicule and make fun of people - these types of modes usually appeal to those sharing similar views, particularly in the social, cultural and political sense. Meaning whether or not they are witty depends on, though this certainly applies to most modes of humour it particularly rings true in this case, “personal taste, politics, inclination and a whole host of further considerations and factors” (1997:11), as Alexander (1997) succinctly puts it. The modes included in this group are: ‘irony’, ‘satire’, ‘lampoon’, ‘caricature’, ‘parody’, ‘impersonation’, ‘sarcasm’ and ‘sardonic’. Below you will find definitions.

Irony:

the expression of one’s meaning by using language that normally signifies the opposite, typically for humorous and emphatic effect : *“Don’t go overboard with the gratitude,” he rejoined with heavy irony.*

- a state of affairs or an event that seems deliberately contrary to what one expects and is often amusing as a result : [with clause] *the irony is that I thought he could help me.*

Satire:

the use of humor, irony, exaggeration, or ridicule to expose and criticize people’s stupidity or vices, particularly in the context of contemporary politics and other topical issues.

- a play, novel, film, or other work that uses satire: *a stinging satire on American politics.*
- a genre of literature characterized by the use of satire.

Lampoon:

publicly criticize (someone or something) by using ridicule, irony, or sarcasm : *the senator made himself famous as a pinch-penny watchdog of public spending, lampooning dubious federal projects.*

Caricature:

a picture, description, or imitation of a person or thing in which certain striking characteristics are exaggerated in order to create a comic or grotesque effect.

- the art or style of such exaggerated representation: *there are elements of caricature in the portrayal of the hero.*
- a ludicrous or grotesque version of someone or something: *he looked like a caricature of his normal self.*

Parody:

an imitation of the style of a particular writer, artist, or genre with deliberate exaggeration for comic effect: *the movie is a parody of horror genre.*

- an imitation or a version of something that falls far short of the real thing; a travesty: *he seems like a parody of an educated Englishman.*

Impersonation:

pretend to be (another person) as entertainment or in order to deceive someone: *it's a very serious offense to impersonate a police officer.*

Sarcasm:

the use of irony to mock or convey contempt: *his voice, hardened by sarcasm, could not hide his resentment.*

Sardonic:

grimly mocking or cynical: *Starkey attempted a sardonic smile.*

Wells and Davis (2006) further add to this discussion by saying that all genres of comedy deal with conflict, be it verbal abuse, battles of wit, quarrels, plots, deceits and trickery, even real fights. Here they also state that “the results of [the conflict] are not intended to be taken too seriously, and after which harmony is generally restored” (Davis, 2006:127). However, whether or not harmony is restored must depend on the situation and intention of the speaker, as well as the relationship he or she has to the hearer.

In terms of British humour and its specific features, Prasad (2004) writes that the use of ‘understatement’ is a particularly strong quality - often used to produce sly humour. And according to Prasad (2004), Wodehouse is almost unmatched in this field - “When a thing is laughable” he quotes, “his ability to enhance the laughter, by pinning some meticulously inadequate expression on it, is unfaltering.” (Prasad, 2004:177) The author provides an example to support this claim:

“Except for that slight bias towards dishonesty which led her to steal everything she could lay her hands on which was not nailed down, Aileen Peavey’s was an admirable character.” (2004:177)

The above statement is further strengthened by Folgado’s (2011) claim that Wodehouse’s three main mechanisms are ‘understatement’, ‘overstatement’ (or hyperbole) and sudden turns of style or register. Understatement is defined by the NOAD as “the presentation of something as being smaller, worse or less important it actually is, whereas overstatement is the exact opposite: exaggeration.

2.4 General Japanese

Many unfamiliar with Japanese culture believe, according to Davis (2006), Japanese humour to be uncommon, obscure, incomprehensible, and even nonexistent. She states, however, that the opposite is true. Indeed, she continues, the humour is, in general, nothing of the sort. It is frequent, well signaled and often very, in her own words, “in your face”. Wells (2006) even states that Japan has an immensely rich comic tradition. She, Davis (2006), introduces to us the word ‘*Share*’, the Japanese word for linguistic puns or wordplay, and states that it is not necessary to understand the subtlety in order to appreciate the humorous sentiment. The Progressive Japanese-English dictionary, hereafter referred to as PJ-ED, defines ‘*Share*’ as not only a pun, but also as a joke, a witty remark and a wisecrack. Davis (2006) also mentions, with relevance to this paper, the issue of universal humour. Her example here is that of a pair of stand-up *manzaishi* comedians, a Japanese stand-up comedy team, appearing on a television show - she claims that the nature of certain types of humour is so universal that, if you were to turn off the sound, you would be unable to ascertain as to their country of origin despite not hearing a word. (Davis, 2006) She also states, quite wonderfully, that “humour is an irrepressible force” (2006:1) no matter where in the world you are - as long as you know where and when to look for it. The difference between the countries, in terms of humour, lies in where it is permitted to appear, and

under which conditions. Davis (2006) gives the example of newspapers - in an American or British newspaper one can find comic strips, gossip columns and humorous articles, whereas in, for example, *Asahi Shimbun* these types of components are more difficult to locate. Inoue (2006) further adds that it seems that newspapers, and Japanese ones in particular, are not interested in covering the news by using laughter and humour; that they are trapped in the idea that newspapers should be serious and tense, and that laughter is taboo. (Davis, 2006:179) Japanese newspaper are not completely void of humour, however. Inoue (2006) explains that they contain, though written by individual readers rather than regular news writers, such things as political caricatures in articles on politics, comic strips, and also '*senryuu*', which is, as Inoue (2006) explains, "a seventeen-syllable poem that is often mildly satirical about contemporary times and issues" (2006:179). Though, she says, there are similarities between East and West in terms of entertainment, the difference between conversational norms affect the use of humour as a conversational strategy and therein lies the contrast. (Davis, 2006)

2.5 Manzai

Due to the similar nature of the following type of Japanese comedy and that of the occasional appearance of a similar style in Wodehouse's works, it will be explored further.

Originating from Osaka, Inoue (2006) tells us, is '*manzai*', a popular stand-up comedy in which a duo of comedians, one taking the role of the '*boke*' (meaning fool) and the other taking the role of '*tsukkomi*' (meaning wit), whose friendly antagonism and use of quick-fire banter aim to amuse the audience. Inoue (2006) describes to us that the '*tsukkomi*' believes that polite conversation is important and always uses '*tatemae*', whereas the '*boke*' uses '*honme*' (the first meaning what a person really feels (and has thusly taken on the characterization as the individual's voice) and the second meaning the official position of the group that person represents (the group's voice) (2006:29)) - the contradiction between these two roles is very humorous for the audience, Inoue (2006) informs us. Stocker (2006) adds that '*manzai*' often reflects the special qualities of the inhabitants of Osaka. He further explains that the '*manzai*' genre has changed very little since it came to existence in the 1930s - it still holds true to the humorous dialogue, adding to that the comic tension caused by said dialogue, between the two participants. This type of dialogue-based *manzai* is still popular in Japan, according to Stocker (2006).

To better understand the way dialogue *manzai* comedy works, let us take a look at Stocker's (2006) explanation:

"The implicit rules of the genre are that the *tsukkomi* nods and says filler words (*aizuchi kotoba*) in response to the *boke*'s relatively normal-sounding statements, but, more importantly, he also "digs into" (*tsukkumu*) the *boke* - to criticize, to correct, and to point out the illogic or stupidity of the *boke*'s crazy, silly, off-the-wall, or ignorant remarks, gestures, and movements. Thus the *tsukkomi* tends to be the one who frames the overall routine and its progress, acting as the commonsense voice of social order in the face of the trickster-like *boke*'s chaotic utterances and behaviour which upset that order.. The normal routine will consist of a conversational theme or a series of unrelated or tangentially related anecdotes, broadly held together by being portrayed as "real" personal experiences, by *manzai* performers who are basically performing "themselves".." (Davis, 2006:61)

Though I have stated previously that the aim of the forthcoming study is that of a comparison between British humour and the to-Japanese translation, I find that '*manzai*' brings about thoughts of early 1900s American entertainers such as the Marx Brothers - thoughts which are further enabled when Stocker (2006) mentions that Entatsu, considered the founder of modern *manzai*,

was perhaps influenced by Vaudevillian double acts during his (albeit undocumented) several year long trip to the United States as the head of a theatrical troupe in 1923. Though *manzai* is a form of stand-up comedy, and the movies were, as movies tend to be, scripted - in watching scenes from their films the roles of ‘*boke*’ and ‘*tsukkomi*’ can be still be seen. Stocker (2006) provides us with an example of a dialogue-based ‘*manzai*’, performed by Entatsu and Achako (duo formed in the early 1930s). He explains that “the routine illustrates how the *boke* (in this case, Entatsu - E), misconstrues what is said, while the *tsukkomi* (Achako - A), tries to clarify both the name of the event (which is a combination of the characters for the names of the two schools) and who is competing:” (Davis, 2006: 60)

E: *Soukeisen, nan to itte mo zettai no mon desu na.*

The Soukeisen...it’s, whatever’s said about it, something else.

A: *Mattaku, mojidouri tenka no Soukeisen desu na.*

Indeed, it’s THE Soukeisen.

E: *Shikashi, are, aite wa doko deshita kai na?*

But who’s the opponent?

A: *E(tt), aite? Ie, Soukeisen no hanashi o shiterun desu ga na*

Huh...opponent? No, we’re discussing the Soukeisen.

E: *Soukeisen wa wakattemasu kedo, sono aite desu ga na. Tsumari, Soukei tai dokosoko to ka...*

I understand “the Soukeisen.” But what about their opponent? In other words, Soukei versus someone or other...

A: *Tayorinai hito ya na. Soukeisen wa ya ne Waseda to Keiou ga shiai o suru kara, Soukeisen to iun ya nai ka.*

You’re impossible. The Soukeisen is called the Soukeisen, ya see, because Waseda and Keiou are matched up.

E: *Sore wa wakkatteru yo. Sore ga wakarazu ni nani o mi ni iku no ya.*

I understand that. Without understanding that, what would I go to watch?

A: *Sonnara, Soukei tai dokosoko ya, nante nasakenai koto o iu na.*

Then don’t say stupid things like “Soukei versus someone or other.”

E: *Chotto share o ite mitan desu.*

I was trying to do a little play on words.

A: *Sonna share wa toran.*

That doesn’t pass as a play on words.

E: *Share ga wakaran no ya kara, hontou ni kimi wa atsukainikui*

You’re a really hard one to deal with because you don’t get wordplays.

Stocker (2006) continues explaining that the conversation above is structured for a battle of words, in which the ‘*boke*’s errant interpretations are “corrected”, or at least attempted to, by the ‘*tsukkomi*’. His next statement regarding the ‘*boke*’ are very reminiscent of the Marx Brothers dialogue from *A Night at the Opera* (1935) below. In this scene, Groucho (who would be the *tsukkomi*) in an attempt to get Chico (*boke*) to sign a contract, reads through it with him (it should

also be noted that they have a contract each). If you so wish it, rather than read the below, seeking out this particular clip is a very easy task and thoroughly enhances the experience.

G: Pay particular attention to this first clause because it's most important.

It says, "The party of the first part shall be known in this contract as the party of the first part." How do you like that? That's pretty neat, eh?

C: No, it's no good.

G: What's the matter with it?

C: I don't know. Let's hear it again.

G: "The party of the first part shall be known in this contract as the party of the first part."

C: Sounds a little better this time.

G: It grows on you. Would you like to hear it once more?

C: Just the first part.

G: What? "The party of the first part"?

C: No. The first part of "the party of the first part."

G: It says, "The first part of the party of the first part shall be known in the contract as The first part of the Party of the first part shall be known in this contract as-"

Look, why should we quarrel about this? We'll take it out. [tears off part of the contract]

C: Yeah. It's too long anyhow. [tears off part of the contract]

C: Now what do we got left?

G: I got about a foot and a half.

It says, "The party of the second part shall be known in this contract as the party of the second part."

C: I don't know about that.

G: Now what's the matter?

C: I don't like the second party either.

G: You should have come to the first party. We didn't get home till around four in the morning. I was blind for three days.

C: Why can't the first part of the second party be the second part of the first party? Then you got something.

G: Look, rather than go through that again, what do you say... [tears off part of the contract]

C: Fine. [tears off part of the contract]

G: I've got something you're bound to like. You'll be crazy about it.

C: No. I don't like it.

G: You don't like what?

C: Whatever it is, I don't like it.

G: Don't let's break up an old friendship over a thing like that. Ready?

C: Okay. [both tear off part of the contract]

C: The next part, I don't think you're going to like.

G: Your word's good enough for me. Is my word good enough for you?

C: I should say not.

G: That takes out two more clauses. [tears off part of the contract]
"The party of the eighth part..."

C: No, that's no good. [both tear off part of the contract]

G: "The party of the ninth..."

C: No, that's no good, too. [both tear off part of the contract]
How is it my contract is skinnier than yours?

G: I don't know, you must have been out on a tear last night.
We're all set now, aren't we?

C: Sure.

G: Just you put your name down there, and then the deal is legal.

C: I forgot to tell you, I can't write.

G: That's all right, there's no ink in the pen.
But it's a contract, isn't it?

C: Sure.

G: We've got a contract, no matter how small it is.

C: Wait. What does this say here?

G: That? That's the usual clause. That's in every contract.
That just says, "If any of the parties participating in this contract are shown not to be in their right mind, the entire agreement is automatically nullified."

C: I don't know.

G: It's all right. That's in every contract.
That's what they call a sanity clause.

C: You can't fool me.
There ain't no Sanity Claus.

G: You win the white carnation.

What Stocker (2006) wrote was this: “The *boke*'s ideas seem to run freely with the perspectives of his own unique, absurd world, while the *tsukkomi* tries to apply a line of reasoning or common sense to the dialogue. The *boke* constructs what appear to be foolish or absurd interpretations of “reality” or of what the *tsukkomi* has opened for discussion; he twists these things into an entirely different logic, often wandering off into what appears to be a completely different matter.” (Davis, 2006:61)

‘*Manzai*’ also bears resemblance to the slapstick sometimes utilized in Wodehouse’s works, as is noted in chapter 3.2, in analysing a telegram exchange between two characters. It is found there that the two fill the roles of *boke* and *tsukkomi* quite well. One twisting the situation in ways that may seem logical to him, whereas in actuality the other participant of the conversation grows more and more vexed with the nonsense being spouted by the other. This exchange is available in full on page 22.

2.6 A Comparison of the Two

As I will be comparing how, specifically, British/Wodehouse-ian humour is handled in translation, the chapter entitled ‘Conversational Jokes in Japanese and English’ in Davis’ book ‘Understanding Humour in Japan’, written by Takekuro (2006) may contain pertinent information. Takekuro (2006) initially asks several questions - What makes people say that the Japanese lack a sense of humour? If the Japanese do indeed exchange jokes, when and with whom do they do so? How are jokes used in Japanese? And finally, how does the usage differ from English usage in joking, and here she deviates from my preferred British English and chooses usage in American English. She further explains that in order to answer these questions what she needs to do is distinguish typical Japanese joking from similar joking in American English. She concludes her introduction by stating that in order to discover some fundamental differences in communicative strategies in the act of joking between Japanese and American English she will compare what she refers to as conversational jokes in the two languages. (Davis, 2006: 85).

The material Takekuro (2006) has used for her study includes Japanese movies, television dramas, American movies, as well as conversations among friends, both in Japanese and English. She explains that using both scripted material and discourse lends itself to more data from a more diverse range of social contexts, a comparison of real-life, if you will, and scripted joking.

Her analysis regarding the context in which the jokes were uttered show that the usage of jokes in Japanese vary depending on how close a relationship the participants had - in the scripted material she chose the jokes were mostly exchanged among friends, family and partners, rather than between business partners, new people joining a group or strangers. The difference to the English material, where jokes were used regardless of relationship, she calculated to be a ratio of twenty-four to one. The major difference was that, though just like the Japanese counterpart many jokes were only uttered when in the presence of someone ‘close’, twenty-seven out of sixty-

one jokes were used between business acquaintances, new people and strangers - something which did not occur even once in the Japanese material. She explains that this discrepancy is due to the fact that Japanese jokes are sensitive to contextual formality where English jokes are not. She therefore surmises that Japanese conversation is more limiting in terms of jokes - and limited to situations with a low degree of formality and a close relationship with the other participants. She concludes her thoughts on this particular matter with the suggestion that it is customary, in Japan, even in informal situations, to not tell jokes when in the presence of business acquaintances, new people, and strangers, contrary to the English trend of jokes being acceptable regardless of formality and relationship.

3. P.G. Wodehouse

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the author P.G. Wodehouse will be introduced to the reader. A look at the general feel and setting of his works, as well as an outline of the various elements of his humour will be provided in order to assemble parameters and prepare the reader for the forthcoming comparison.

3.2 General

“The problem in approaching Wodehouse, says Strong, lies in the fact that ‘we tend not to notice how good the writing is because we’re so busy laughing’.” (Prasad, 2004:151)

Before the venture into comparative research, perhaps a look at the style, characters, settings and expressions used in the works of P.G. Wodehouse (1881-1975) might be appropriate. Not only for a better understanding of the subject matter, but also to realize how vastly it differs from the culture of the translated works. Prasad (2004) has authored a book by the name of ‘Laughing with the Master: In Praise of P.G. Wodehouse’, in which he advocates the delights experienced by the reader upon reading the works of Wodehouse. He writes “The world chiselled-up by Wodehouse is a never-never land on which a benign sun shines always. It is a world in eternal spring and enveloped in ‘perpetual hammock weather’.” You will also find that “on the lawns of ancient, moss-covered castles, tea is always waiting under the great Cedars.” (2004:63) Prasad (2004) also tells us that Wodehouse himself described his writing method as “Making the thing in a sort of musical comedy without music, and ignoring real life altogether”, and that such a statement was a reflection of his own, Wodehouse’s, approach to life and his relation and attitude to life’s problems. Prasad (2004) describes the personality of Wodehouse as one of a “kindly, happy man with an instinctive distaste for the seamier aspects of existence. His natural inclination was toward a preferred dwelling on life’s simple joys and studiously ignoring its multiple sorrows.” (2004:64)

This world of his, as agreed upon by critics, was based on, or at least reminiscent of, the Edwardian period (1901-1910), the early Georgian periods (1714-1837) and the 1920s. (Prasad, 2004) In Japan these eras encompass the end of the Meiji era (during which Japanese society moved from being an isolated feudalism to its modern form), the Edo period (a period attributed

by the rule of the Tokugawa shoguns) - and among many other aspects, the 1920s marked a period where different western philosophies and literature styles entered the country.

The main element of the humour in his books is constructed around the, as Prasad (2004) puts it, self-satisfied and comfortable classes of Britain. The characters, some of which are described below, in whose undemanding lives there exists “port for the gentleman and fluttery gossip for the ladies, the paragon of a butler hovering in discreet attendance, a vicar coming to call, [and] the village constable paying his respects” - Prasad (2004) calls them all “a trifle laughable and ludicrous, but no one is ever rendered contemptible” (2004:67)

The characteristics of the denizens of Wodehouse’s world are described as, and here once more we quote: “carefree, idle-rich youths who sport morning-coats and spatter-dashes, employ valets, frequent fashion-joints and clubs, engage in juvenile contests and silly pastimes, untiringly pay court to winsome young things, walking incessantly into engagements with (and disengagements from) them, and generally lead lives of lazy purposelessness.” That is not all, however, for there also exists “... young fellows who work conscientiously hard and struggle in life, young women who are wealthy debutantes but also those who are impecunious and industrious. There are American senators, movie-magnates, lawyers, film-stars and bishops, priests, curates and deacons. There are butlers, from doddering to dark and subtle, many valets, a brilliantly observed ship’s steward as a major character. The millionaires from across the Atlantic have irascible tempers, inflexible wills, and as often, incurable dyspepsia and impulsive young beauties for daughters”. (2004:66)

One of the curiosities faced when contemplating the to-Japanese translation of Wodehouse’s works lies in the use of certain expressions. Utterances such as ‘What-ho’, ‘Don’t-you-know’, ‘Bird’, ‘Rannygazoo’, and ‘Oojah’ are so very not-Japanese that even the mere thought of expressing them in a language other than English perplexes those even just casually interested in the Japanese language. Prasad (2004) states that a David Cannadine has pointed out that the usage of expressions such as the ones above were in the habitual vocabulary of every young man in the early 1900s. (Prasad, 2004)

3.3 Elements of Humour

Prasad (2004) states that breaking down Wodehouse’s humour into individual components is difficult - yet he makes the attempt. He begins with quotes, chosen at random, that he claims speak for themselves. A chosen few of these will be displayed here, in a precursory fashion, so as to realize what should be focused on in the translated version, in terms of what makes Wodehouse’s humour so intrinsically his own. The sections below, Prasad (2004) states, focus on Wodehouse’s use of language. It is unfortunate that not all works mentioned below were easily available in their translated version, for seeing all these examples in translated form would have been interesting to say the least.

“And there, as the door opened, he lay, [under the bed] holding his breath and trying to keep his ears from rustling in the draught.” (2004:153)

“Bingo swayed like a jelly in a high wind.” (2004:153)

“Unlike the male codfish, which, suddenly finding himself the parent of three million five thousand little codfish, cheerfully resolves to love them all, the British aristocracy is apt to look with a jaundiced eye on its younger sons.” (2004:154)

“Oofy, thinking of the tenner he had given Freddie, writhed like an electric fan.” (2004:154)

“That peculiar numbed sensation, so like that caused by repeated blows on the head from a blunt instrument.. it was as though he had been for an extended period shut up in a Frigidaire with the first Queen Elizabeth.” (2004:154)

“An evening so tranquil that you could hear a sheep clearing its throat on a distant mountainside.” (2004:161)

“A conscience as tender as a sunburned neck.” (2004:161)

“When aunt is calling to aunt like Mastodons bellowing across primeval swamps.” (2004:161)

Prasad (2004) writes that, with his inventiveness he, Wodehouse, seems to almost “weave an intricate verbal web around the reader” (2004:156) and further adds that Wilfrid Sheed has written how interesting it is to note “how tyrannically Wodehouse uses language to steer us through objectively wretched situations like a guide with a fixed smile, or a nurse determined that we shall enjoy ourselves.” (2004:156). Prasad (2004) continues with a quote from Hilaire Belloc, on explaining why he rated Wodehouse as high as he did, said: “now, the end of writing is the production in the reader’s mind of a certain image and a certain emotion. And the means towards that end are the use of words in any particular language ... choosing of the right words and putting them into the right order. It is this which Mr. Wodehouse does better in the English language than anyone else alive ... To present the laughable ... with such mastery and skill that he nearly approaches, and often reaches, perfection.” (2004:156)

Prasad (2004) aptly puts it that “Wodehouse’s entire output comprises in part an exhaustive series of experiments in the comic possibilities of the spoken and written word” (2004:158).

Next he, Prasad (2004), has chosen to describe Wodehouse’s use of imagery to bring across his point. Again, he has provided examples taken from a variety of Wodehouse’s written works.

“A medicine with a slightly pungent flavour like old boot-soles beaten up in sherry” (2004:163)

“A Duke’s moustache rising and falling like seaweed on an ebb-tide.” (2004:163)

“A low, throaty growl, like the far-off gargling of an octogenarian with bronchial trouble.” (2004:163)

Another aspect that, upon contemplation, seems hard to translate is that of transferred epithets. The NOAD defines an epithet as “an adjective or descriptive phrase expressing a quality characteristic of the person or thing mentioned”. To clarify, Prasad (2004) describes the transferring of epithets thus: “It is a syntactic device allied to what is sometimes called the hypallage. The trick is simply to apply, by transfer, an epithet from a more appropriate to a less suitable noun in a line or sentence.” (2004:184) Hypallage is “a transposition of the natural relations of two elements in a proposition, for example in the sentence “*Melissa shook her doubtful curls.*” according to the NOAD. Prasad (2004) tells us that this is a device sometimes used by Wodehouse throughout his career, and gives us examples of such instances.

“Smoking a sad cigarette.” (2004:184)

“Waved a concerned cigar.” (2004:185)

“Slipped a remorseful five-pound note.” (2004:185)

“Took a moody spoonful of marmalade.” (2004:185)

Will these, in translation, be literally translated?

Hyperbole is also employed, as per this example sentence, in which a character describes the arrival and exit of no more than a handful characters during a brief span of time: “I had got more or less used by now to my bedroom being treated as a sort of meeting-place of the nations.” (2004:208)

Prasad (2004) also mentions the Wodehouse synonym - often used when there arises a need to “evoke an exotic image”. (2004:190) For example:

“an eye in twin formation (eyes, that is) with a starry gleam in them becomes simply ‘a dreamy look coming into her twin star-likes.’ ” (2004:191)

“a surging sea of aunts.” (2004:193)

There also exists the expressive utterances often utilized by his characters, Prasad (2004) refers to these all as surrogates for a simple ‘good-bye’: ‘don’t-you-know’, ‘what-ho’, ‘pip-pip’, ‘toodle-oo’ and ‘tinkerty-tonk’. (Prasad, 2004)

3.4 In Translation and Analysis: Expressions and Letters

3.4.1 Introduction

In examining how humour, specifically that of Wodehouse, is handled in translation, a selection of elements will be chosen as parameters. As mentioned by Prasad (2004), Wodehouse employed a certain way of language to make an utterance or statement seem humorous. The books that will be compared are *Right Ho, Jeeves* (1934) and, in part, *The Inimitable Jeeves* (1923). How instances of specific word use, creative word-formations, synonyms, slang, and expressions are translated will be sought out and analyzed. Further, whole conversations will be transcribed and analyzed to see the effect/impact, both negative and positive, translation has had upon the humour contained within. It should be noted that any analysis done will be done from the perspective of student of the Japanese language, not a native speaker, and that therefore conclusions as to the appropriateness of certain word substitutions, as well as whether or not they fit, will be limited. What will be approached, however, is how expressions and words have been translated, and what their counterparts mean.

3.4.2 Expressions

Dash (it)

This is an expression frequently used by various characters in the Wodehouse books, it is, according to the NOAD, though now dated, an exclamation used to express mild annoyance. The PJ-ED also describes it as a *‘Igirisu Yōuhou’*, a word of English usage - a euphemism for ‘damn it’, the Japanese equivalent given is *‘chikishou/chikushou’* - an expletive.

The translation of this expression varies, it is not constant, rather it often reliant on context. What is constant, however, is that whatever expression is used, it always correctly conveys the exasperation or amazement, depending on the context, behind the words. For example, “‘Why, dash it,’ I said astounded’ (1934:104) was translated to “‘*Doushite da, mattaku*’ *boku ha bikkurishite itta.*’ (177) (“Why, really,” I said, surprised.) ‘*Mattaku*’ in this case strengthens the amazement the character feels at what he has just had said to him. The Japanese dictionary Daijisen, further provides us with, relevant to the utterance in question, words ‘indeed’ and ‘really’ as satisfactory equivalents.

Another example can be found when examining the word when used as an adjective, here the character states that the person in question should consider herself “dashed lucky”. (1934:112) This he, Morimura (2005), has translated to “‘*tondemonaku rakkü* (lucky)’”. ‘*Tondemonai*’ can be taken to mean that something is unexpected, outrageous or very offensive, according to Daijisen. To clarify, some of the examples given will be provided here as well: ‘*Tondemonai youkyuu*’ - a *preposterous* demand, or ‘*Kare ha tondemonai sakushi da*’ - “He is a *terrible* schemer”. The sentiment expressed by the character that the woman of whom he speaks should be dashed lucky, is thus translated to that she should consider herself outrageously lucky - a very similar statement, in terms of meaning.

‘*Ittai zentai*’ is another Japanese expression used to translate ‘dash-it’. In this example, the character is astounded at the way his relationship with someone he has known ‘since she was so high’ is being perceived as suddenly-romantic. He is dumbfounded at the accusation. For him, it is unthinkable. “Why, dash it, I’ve known Angela since she was so high. You don’t fall in love with close relations you’ve known since they were so high. Besides, isn’t there something in the book of rules about man may not marry his cousin? Or am I thinking of grandmothers?” (1934:118) This ‘dash-it’ as previously mentioned, was translated to ‘*Ittai zentai*’ - a stronger version of ‘*Ittai*’, both translating as the *What on earth* in sentences such as ‘*What on earth/in the world* is the matter?’ or *Whatever* is the matter? Therefore the translation reads something along the lines of ‘What are you saying?’ with an implied “Are you out of your mind?”.

As stated in the beginning, ‘*chikishou/chikushou*’, was given as a direct equivalent of ‘dash-it’ according to Daijisen. This translation is further proved by Morimura (2005). When ‘dash-it’ is preceded by a ‘but’, often indicating an argument, the word ‘*chikishou*’ comes into use. The main character, about to argue his case, is cut off “But, dash it-” (153) “‘*Dakedo, kon chikushou.*’” (Morimura, 2005:262) The *kon* here is written in katakana - according to Daijisen this ‘*kon*’ is a simple sound change from ‘*kono*’ meaning ‘this’ - indicating the recipient of his words to be his current speaking partner. Further, ‘*kon chikushou*’ is explained as an expletive particularly used when angry. The words ‘*Dakedo, kon chikushou*’ can therefore translate to “But, damn you!/you bastard!”. Perhaps a bit stronger than what, my own assumption, the original author had intended, but nevertheless fitting.

A final translation that is used somewhat frequently is ‘*Nante kotta*’, though Daijisen provides no definition of this expression, it has come to my attention that this is an abbreviation of ‘*Nan to iu koto da*’, roughly translating to ‘What is this supposed to mean’. Wordreference.com sheds some further light on the situation. It displays a chosen number of English expressions, such as ‘cripes’, ‘good grief’, ‘for crying out loud’ and ‘holy cow’, all of which can be translated to ‘*nante kotta*’. It can therefore be surmised that ‘*nante kotta*’ is an expression used to express either exasperation, surprise or alarm. It is used then in the translation of Right-Ho, Jeeves (Wodehouse, 1934), in situations in which the character is alarmed at the way a situation or conversation has turned out - usually to his or her disadvantage.

Quite

Though this word has several uses, the one in focus in this endeavour is that of the British exclamation which “expresses agreement with or understanding of a remark or statement” rather than the submodifier one can find in sentences such as “Are you quite certain about this?”. Despite being an expression more of a general British nature, rather than a typical Wodehouse-ian one, how such an expression would read in Japanese is still of interest. The PJ-ED defines ‘Quite’ and ‘Quite So’ as instances of ‘*Aite e no Aidzuchi*’. ‘*Aite*’ refers in this case to the person to whom one is engaged in conversation, whilst ‘*Aidzuchi*’ is defined as back-channeling, that is to say “a sound or gesture made to give continuity to a conversation by a person who is listening to another” as defined by the PJ-ED, or as it is stated on Jim Breen’s JWWDIC: ‘*Aidzuchi*’ is “sounds given during a conversation to indicate comprehension”. And it is in that spirit that ‘Quite’ has been translated.

“*Sou da*” *sukoshi awatete boku ha itta.* (:273) Thus is our first ‘Quite’ translated. “‘Quite’ I said, a little hurriedly’ (Wodehouse, 1934:159). ‘*Sou*’ in this context is defined as meaning ‘So’, ‘Really’ or ‘Seeming’. In this case, ‘Seeming’ would seem most appropriate. In this situation, the character speaks hurriedly in order to prevent being overly much spoken to of things he would rather forget. The translator’s use of ‘*Awateru*’, in this case ‘to hurry’ or ‘to rush’, further indicates at the desire of the character to wish of the speaker to refrain herself from speaking further on the matter. ‘*Sou da*’ also translates well, in this scenario, to ‘You’re right’, affirming its ‘*Aidzuchi*’ capabilities.

The next instance chosen was translated quite differently. The original text reads: - “‘Quite’ I said. Dashed reasonable, was my verdict.”(Wodehouse, 1934:166) This verdict he has reached is one of agreement to a argument presented to him just then - he is agreeing that the agitated venting of the man is called-for and, indeed, reasonable. This ‘Quite’ has been translated to “*Juu Juu Gomottomo*” (Morimura, 2005:285). Jim Breen’s WWWWJDIC informs us that ‘*Gomottomo*’ is an expression which translates to ‘You are quite right’, while the ‘*Juujuu*’ of this context is defined as making a statement ‘plenty’, as in “I am *well* aware of it” or “I *fully* understand’. Therefore, ‘*Juujuu gomottomo*’ can be interpreted as an empathic - in that the character sympathises with the other’s plight - and fortified ‘You are quite right’.

Another case presents us with the translation of ‘*un*’, which would translate to an equally eloquent ‘yeah’ or ‘uh huh’ according to Jim Breen’s WWWWJDIC. In this situation, the character, rather than agreeing to what is being said to him, is recounting the conversation to himself, and coming to the conclusion that he has now fully understood what was spoken at him moments ago, utters the ‘Quite’ or ‘*Un*’ to himself, before asking for some further clarification.

Other instances of various expressions used include the previously mentioned ‘*Sono toori*’, and ‘*Yoku wakatta*’. The latter being dependant on certain precursory conversation, in that it means ‘I understand’. Both expressions lending themselves to explaining that what has been said has been noted and, usually, understood.

What-ho

The Online Slang Dictionary defines ‘What Ho’ as an exclamatory greeting, a version of the colloquial ‘What’s up’. The PJ-ED, much like the NOAD has two senses of what ‘What’s up?’ can translate to. The first is that of ‘*aisatsu*’, greetings, such as ‘*dou desu ka*’ or ‘*yaa*’, and the second is that of ‘*Doushita no?*’. Both in agreement with the English definition of ‘What’s Up’ -

defined as either asking someone ‘What is going on?’ or asking ‘What is the matter?’, ‘*Doushita no*’ is defined as the second of those senses. The example given is ‘*Kaairo ga warui kedo, doushita no*’ - ‘You look pale, what’s up with you?’. This expression is thus, in that sense, not in complete accordance with ‘What ho’. However, the ‘*yaa*’, as described further down, is accurate in certain cases.

‘What-ho’ is chiefly translated as ‘*Yahhoo!*’. The PJ-ED defines this as a means of calling attention to people, and the to-English translation given is ‘Yoo-hoo!’. Further, the English definition of ‘Yoo-hoo’ is “a call used to attract attention to one’s arrival or presence” - it can thus be stated that, in most cases, ‘Yahhoo’ is a suitable substitute for ‘What-ho’.

As was the case in the previous translated expressions, the translation often varies depending on the context. An example can be given with the translation of this line: “What ho, Angela, old girl.” (Wodehouse, 1934:108). The ‘old girl’ translation will have its own section further down. Morimura (2005) has translated this sentence to “*Yaa, Angela, kawaii ojousan.*” This ‘*Yaa*’ is, surprisingly enough, defined in the PJ-ED. It is an utterance made in surprise at seeing, or meeting someone or something unexpected. We are provided with examples ‘*Yaa, Yamada, shibaraku*’, ‘*Yaa, odoroi*’ and ‘*Yaa, suteki da naa*’, respectively translated to ‘*Hey [Hi], Yamada!* I haven’t seen you for [a long time/ages] ‘*Oh, what a surprise!*’ and ‘*Oh [Ohh], how nice!*’. Instead of using the greeting form used in the original, or the ‘*yahhoo*’, he has replaced it with an expression that, in this context, feels very natural and flows very well. In this context, rather than meeting suddenly, the character has sought out Angela and finds to his surprise her not looking as happy as she previously had been (“Frankly, I was shocked by the unfortunate young prune’s appearance” (Wodehouse, 1934:108)), and therefore the use of ‘*yaa*’ is to the scenario befitting.

One further expression is used to express ‘What-ho’. Namely ‘*Nanda(i), hoo!*’ ‘*Nanda*’ is not given an explanation in the PJ-ED. However, we are provided with example sentences on its use. ‘*Nanda, kimi ka*’ is the first of these. The translation given is ‘Oh, was it only you?’ It should be mentioned that the ‘*Nan*’ means ‘What’. In this example the ‘*Nanda*’ is of a dissatisfied nature, the speaker was perhaps expecting someone held, by him, in much higher esteem. Another example is ‘*Nanda, mada ita no ka*’. While perhaps not as negative sounding as the last, this one translates to more of a bemused utterance ‘*Why, are you still here?*’ ‘*Nanda*’ seems to be a very versatile expression - however, the nuance it carries is appropriate for the contexts in which it was used. The line prior to the utterance of the greeting reads as follows “The last person, of course, whom I would have wished to meet after a long evening in the saddle, but I vouchsafed a courteous “What ho!” ”(Wodehouse, 1934:197). Despite the somewhat negative connotation the character feels the situation brings, the utterance could be interpreted ‘*Why, look who it is!*’, with the unspoken implication of ‘*At this moment, I wish for you to not exist*’, with a post-‘*nanda*’ ‘*hoo*’ gentling the blow of the implication somewhat. The translator gives us this complete sentence: “*to ha ie boku ha reigi tadashiki “nandai hoo!” wo, tokubetsu ni kashi shite yatta.*” (Morimura, 2005:340). As is the case with ‘*Yoshikita*’ the translator occasionally adds ‘*hoo*’ to this expression as well.

What? / Eh?

This is not the ‘What?’ one encounters when confused, rather the ‘What?’ the NOAD explains, at the very bottom of the page, as an informal and dated interrogative adverb “used for emphasis or to invite agreement” also providing the sentence “*pretty poor show, what?*”.

The PJ-ED does not mention this form of ‘What?’, however there does exist an entry for ‘Eh?’, which is similarly used. The NOAD defines the ‘Eh’ as an exclamation “used to represent a sound made in speech in a variety of situations, in particular to ask for something to be repeated or explain or to elicit agreement”. The PJ-ED confirms this usage by stating it to represent mild surprise or doubt, often spoken in a rising tone.

The ‘What?’ has been translated to various utterances, ranging from a simple questioning ‘*ka?*’, a ‘*dou da?*’ asking for the other’s opinion on the matter, a shortened version of ‘*to iu wake da*’ - an expression meaning, according to Jim Breen’s WWWJDIC, ‘this is why’ or ‘this means’, used at the end of the sentence one is unsure one has interpreted correctly to mean “- is this what you mean?”. He has also translated several ‘What?’s to ‘*Naa!*’, indicating a more excited and forceful use of the expression. The final translation encountered is that of ‘*ii na?*’, which could be stated to mean the character is asking for acceptance or permission regarding what he or she has just spoken - or to see if the speaking partner is on board with the way things are going to go down in whatever they are planning to do.

Ass/Old Thing/Blighter

It is often the case that the characters in Wodehouse’s works succumb to name-calling. However, depending on the characters involved, it is more often than not done in a I’m-very-fond-of-you-despite-your-stupidity sort of way. Bertie, the protagonist of the Jeeves series, is often referred to in such ways. ‘Ass’ seems to be the most frequently occurring example. This informal word is defined as referring to a “foolish or stupid person” - which seems to be how Bertie is perceived by those even closest to him. ‘Ass’ in most cases is translated to ‘*Baka*’, which is in accordance with the PJ-ED definition. ‘*Baka*’ according to that same PJ-ED is fittingly translated to mean: ‘a fool’. ‘Ass’ spoken tersely in aggravation by a friend is translated to ‘*Baka!*’, whereas a meeting in which his aunt Dahlia, who is in very good spirits, greets him with a “Hallo, Bertie, You old ass,” (Wodehouse, 1934:161) is translated to ‘*O-baka-chan*’. Once more the translation changes according to context. Because the author describes the way in which she speaks those words as friendly - “I was relieved to find her in a genial mood. Nothing could have exceeded the cordiality with which she waved her fork.” (Wodehouse, 1934:161) the translator has chosen to make the sentiment even stronger by using the affectionate ‘*chan*’ suffix, as well as, in the spirit of humorous contradiction, the respectful ‘*-o*’ prefix. This Aunt is not always so genial however, and on the occasion of this statement the translation reflects no affection: “Wake up, Bertie, you old ass!” she cried, in a voice that hit me between the eyebrows and went out at the back of my head” (Wodehouse, 1934:25) - the translation given is “*Kono oo-baka!*”. Rather than adding respectful or affectionate suffixes or prefixes, the adding of ‘*oo*’ - meaning ‘big’ or ‘large’ gives the sentence a completely different meaning, which could translate to something similar to “You great fool”.

Sometimes a character is referred to as, regardless of age, ‘old thing’. In this instance of Bertie speaking to his cousin, it has been translated to ‘*kawai ko-chan*’ - perhaps the translator found no appropriate way to convey the affection in referring to someone as an old thing in Japanese, and instead chose to use words of a kinder nature. He instead calls her a ‘dear’, ‘cute’, or ‘lovely’ child, with the addition of the ‘*-chan*’ suffix - playing up their close, almost sibling-like, relationship. Another instance of their interaction being translated in this way can be found in the previously mentioned ‘old girl’ statement. ‘Old girl’ is translated to ‘*Kawaiï ojousan*’, meaning ‘dear’ or ‘cute’ young lady.

Another commonly found word is ‘Blighter’ - originally stemming from the charming word ‘Blight’, a plant disease. ‘Blighter’ is defined by the NOAD as “a person who is regarded with

contempt, irritation, or pity”. The PJ-ED defines it as a *‘iya na yatsu’*. When employed in conversation it has been translated to a variation of expressions. In the case of a character being described as ‘Unfortunate blighter’ (“Tuppy has been chasing him for two hours and a half. We must save the unfortunate blighter, Jeeves” (Wodehouse, 1934:155)), he has been, by the translator, according to context, described instead as a *‘fukou na otoko’* - an unhappy or unfortunate man, as he indeed must be considering his circumstances.

The next instance concerns unruly school children who, a character worries, “... will come up on the platform” and “Suppose they make faces at me” (Wodehouse, 1934:124). The “little blighters” are referred to in the translation as “*Akutou no gaki renchuu*”. Breaking the sentence down we will find that *‘Akutou’* means ‘scoundrel’ or ‘rascal’, *‘gaki’* means ‘brat(s)’ or ‘kid(s)’ and *‘renchuu’* in this instance derogatorily refers to ‘company’, ‘a lot’ or ‘those guys’, according to Jim Breen’s WWWJDIC. This wording is much more descriptive than the original, however it cannot be considered out-of-character, rather just more coherent than what can often be expected of this particular character.

By Jove

‘By Jove’ - Jove being another name for Jupiter - is a dated exclamation which, according to the NOAD, indicates surprise or is used for emphasis. This exclamation has been translated to various Japanese surprise-indicating expressions, such as: *‘Nanto!’*, *‘Hontou ni’*, *‘Sugoi!’*, and *‘Nantekotta’*. The first situation’s original line reads: “And, by Jove, he was absolutely right” (Wodehouse, 1934:155) and was translated thus: “*Nanto! Mattaku kare no iu toori datta.*” (Morimura, 2005:266), which could be interpreted as *‘Nanto! It was exactly just like he said’*. The PJ-ED’s example sentences of this word’s use include: *‘Soko de atta no ga nanto Tanaka-san deshita’* - ‘Who should I meet there but Mr. Tanaka!’ and *‘Nanto rippa na ie darou’* - ‘What a fine [splendid] house!’. Though the Japanese expressions used lack the archaic nuance of the original, they serve their purpose in indicating the correlating emotions/sentiments/feelings behind the utterances.

‘Hontou ni’ translates to mean ‘really’, ‘truly’ and ‘actually’. and was used in translating “By Jove, Bertie, I don’t know how to thank you.” (Wodehouse, 1934:37). The Japanese sentence reads “*Bertie, hontou ni, nante kansha shite ii ka wakaranai yo*” (Morimura, 2005:61) thus making it a sentence more akin to: ‘Bertie, truly, you don’t know much I appreciate this/I don’t know how to show my appreciation’. However, on the very same page the expression is used once more, By Jove that is, and another translation is given - namely, *‘Sugoi!’*. “By Jove, I believe you’re right.” (Wodehouse, 1934:37) was translated to “*Sugoi! Kimi no iu koto ha tadashii na*” (Morimura, 2005:62). The context in which By Jove is uttered for the second time, by the same person, is slightly different. The first utterance was spoken after realizing how much luck he was in, whereas in the the second he realizes, astonished, that Bertie knows what he’s talking about and that despite his own qualms, a positive outcome is heading his way. Therefore the *‘Sugoi’*, which is described by the PJ-ED as an expression which represents marvel, is contextually appropriate.

‘Nantekotta’ was described earlier, in explaining its use re: ‘Dash it’.

Right-Ho

The original title of the book gives the first clue-in as to how the translator has decided to handle this particular expression. The NOAD defines Righto as (Right-ho being the form

used by Wodehouse) as a, chiefly British, informal exclamation and an expression of agreement or assent. This is in concurrence with the Japanese expression chosen: 'Yoshikita'. An expression described as *All Right / O.K., I'll do it!* - *Yoshikita, Boku ga Yaru Yo*. The expression is further explained in the the PJ-ED as words used when agreeing to a request from another, a version of 'Leave it to me' if you will. The official titles are Right Ho, Jeeves and 'Yoshikita, Jeeves'.

The expression 'Yoshikita' is, accordingly, used throughout the book. However, perhaps as a manifestation of the sometimes whimsical behaviour adopted by the main character, the translator uses not only 'Yoshikita', but also 'Yoshikita Hoo' - 'Yoshikita' written in hiragana, and 'hoo' written in katakana. There is no clear indication as to the difference in meaning between the use of these. They are employed thusly: 'Yoshikita, name' in closing or opening of a conversation, or 'Yoshikita Hoo da' (sometimes with a name spoken thereafter), interspersed with the word inserted in the middle of a sentence, as demonstrated in this snippet "Oh? Well, right-ho, of course" (Wodehouse, 1934:152) which was translated as: "*Sou ka, yoshikita sono toori da.*" (Morimura, 2005:261) 'Sono toori', Jim Breen's WWWJDIC tells us, is an expression meaning 'just like that', 'quite so' or 'I agree'.

Morimura (2005) has chosen to employ a Japanese word with similar meaning to that of the original, rather than simply using the English word - which could be done by writing it in katakana. This approach proves dedication on the part of the translator, to seek out a word so befitting of the original - as well as adding variation by connecting the 'hoo' from the original to play up to the original British English and its readers.

Viz.

Viz. is, the NOAD informs us, an adverb which means 'namely' or 'in other words (used esp. to introduce a gloss or explanation). Originally an abbreviation of the latin 'videlicet' - videre 'to see' and licet 'it is permissible.'. We are given an example sentence: *the first music reproducing media, viz., the music box and the player piano*. According to the PJ-ED, appropriate translations are 'sunawachi' and 'tsumari'. In all instances of 'Viz.' found in 'Right Ho, Jeeves', it has been translated to the former of the two: 'sunawachi'. Both original and translated sentences will follow: "And I'll tell you something else I'll call it -- viz. a dashed low trick. I'm surprised at you, young Angela" (Wodehouse, 1934:159) - "*Sore ja betsu no ii kata mo sasete morau yo. -- sunawachi, tonda osomatsu na gukou da. Kimi ni ha odoroiya yo, Angela.*" (Morimura, 2005:272).

The 'dashed' here, in reference to 'Dash-it', is translated to "viz. *an unthinkable poor and foolish move*".

Tinkerty Tonk

'Tinkerty-Tonk' is one of the many, as Prasad (2004) puts it, surrogates for a simple 'good-bye' utilized in Wodehouse's works. Not as frequently used in 'Right-ho, Jeeves' as it is in other works, only two instances of this slang could be found. The first of these makes its appearance at the end of a telegram, a simple "Tinkerty-tonk. Bertie" (Wodehouse, 1934:41) which has been translated to 'Chan-chan'. The second occurrence is spoken in parting after an unpleasant argument: "Very good," I said coldly. "In that case, tinkerty tonk." And I meant it to sting." (Wodehouse, 1934:161) - "*Yoku wakatta*" boku ha tsumetaku itta. "*Sou iu koto nara, suttonton da*" mune ni tsukisasu tsumori de boku ha itta." (Morimura, 2005:275) This 'suttonton' is somewhat perplexing. Searches indicate that this expression comes from onomatopoeia for 'something rolling very quickly' or 'tumbling' sung by mice in the Japanese folktale 'Omusubi kororin'. If

this, however, infers that Bertie takes leave of his cousin with such fervor that he wishes his figurative reprimand of ‘rolling away’ to ‘stab her chest’ (as ‘to sting’ was translated) - as though he is rolling down a steep hill just to get away from her - I am uncertain.

3.4.3 An Exchange of Telegrams

In examining how the particular humour of Wodehouse translates to Japanese, several excerpts of humorous conversation and writing have been chosen as representatives of the genre. Attempts at matching what is found with previously mentioned parameters will also be made - parameters such as those of Alexanders (1997) modes of humour and shift indicators, those of whether familiarity is required or modified in translation and the existence of roles similar to those of Japanese ‘*manzai*’ and ‘*share*’.

The first example comes in the shape of a telegram exchange between Aunt, Dahlia Travers, and Nephew, Bertie Wooster - henceforth known as T and B, respectively. As names are as they were in the original, katakanized form has been reverted to the English spelling. As the exchange continues, T grows more and more weary of B’s antics.

T: Come at once. Travers.

T: *Sugu koi, Travers.*

T: 《すぐ来い、トラヴァース》

B: Perplexed. Explain. Bertie.

B: *Rikai funou, setsumei motomu. Bertie.*

B: 《理解不能、説明求む。パーティー》

T: What on earth is there to be perplexed about, ass? Come at once. Travers.

T: *Nani ga ittai rikai funou yo, baka. Sugu koi, Travers.*

T: 《何が一体理解不能よ、バカ。すぐ来い、トラヴァース》

B: How do you mean come at once? Regards. Bertie.

B: *Nande mata sugu koi nandai? Keigu Bertie.*

B: 《何でまたすぐ来いなんだい？ 敬具 パーティー》

T: I mean come at once, you maddening half-wit. What did you think I meant? Come at once or except an aunt’s curse first post tomorrow. Love. Travers.

T: *Dakara sugu koi-tte itteru no, kono kichigai no nounashi. Ittai nan da to omotteru no? Sugu konai nara ashita no ichi bin de oba ga noroi wo okuru wa yo. Shin'ai naru Travers.*

T: 《だからすぐ来いって言ってるの、このキチガイの能無し。一体なんだと思ってるの？すぐ来ないなら明日の一旦で叔母が呪いを送るわよ。親愛なるトラヴァース》

B: When you say “Come” do you mean “Come to Brinkley Court”? And when you say “At once” do you mean “At once”? Fogged. At a loss. All the best. Bertie.

B: *“Koi” tte iu no ha “Burinkurei Kooto ni koi” tte koto? Sorekara “Sugu” tte iu no ha “Sugu” tte koto? Fushin. Kaimoku wakarazu. Yoroshiku Bertie.*

B: 《「来い」っていうのは「ブリンクレイ・コートに来い」ってこと？ それから「すぐ」っていうのは「すぐ」ってこと？ 不審。皆目わからず。よろしく バーティー》

T: Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes. It doesn't matter whether you understand or not. You just come at once, as I tell you, and for heaven's sake stop this back-chat. Do you think I am made of money that I can afford to send you telegrams every ten minutes. Stop being a fathead and come immediately. Love. Travers.

T: *Sou, sou, sou, sou, sou, sou yo. Anta ni wakarou ga wakaru mai ga dou datte ii kara. Tonikaku sugu kinasai. Tonikaku kono baka-baka-shii yari tori ha onegai dakara yame ni shite. Ittai watashi ga okane de dekitete juubun oki ni denpou wo utsu nante nandemo nai to demo omotteru no? Boke atama ha shimai ni shite ima sugu kinasai. Shin'ai naru Travers.*

T: 《そう、そう、そう、そう、そう、そうよ。あんたにわかろうがわかるまいがどうだっていいから、とにかくすぐ来なさい。とにかくこのバカバカしいやり取りはお願いだからやめにして。いったい私がお金でできてて十分おきに電報を打つなんて何でもないとでも思ってるの？ ボケ頭はしまいにしで今すぐ来なさい。親愛なる トラヴァース》

After this exchange there is a temporary cease-fire of telegrams during which T pays B a visit in order to make her nephew see sense re her wishes, as her telegrams “seemed to produce no effect”. To summarize, T tells B she has a job for him at Brinkley Court, her place of residence, handing out prizes at a grammar school, a task originally intended to be officiated by the vicar, but due to unforeseen ‘fetlock spraining’, she had to find an alternative. As everybody else refused the task, she was left with no other choice than to call upon her nephew. Post-bodily threats to his person, Bertie agrees. However, after being paid a visit by troubled school-friend Augustus Fink-Nottle (who is very knowledgeable about newts), Bertie decides that in order to solve all troubles in one swift go -T’s requiring of an officiator, Fink-Nottle’s wish to further acquaint himself with a lady he met who just happens to be staying at Brinkley Court, and Bertie’s wish to have no part in any of it - the best plan of action is to send Fink-Nottle to Brinkley Court and have him do the deed asked of B. The following exchange takes place after Fink-Nottle has been sent on his way.

T: Am taking legal advice to ascertain whether strangling an idiot nephew counts as murder. If it doesn't look out for yourself. Consider your conduct frozen limit. What do you mean by planting your loathsome friends on me like this? Do you think Brinkley Court is a leper colony or what is it? Who is this Spink-Bottle? Love. Travers.

T: *Aho no oikko wo shimekorosu no ga houritsu jou satsujin ni atehamaru ka dou ka benshi ni kiiteiru tokoro yo. Youjin nasai. Anta no kouji ha junin gendo wo koeteru wa. Ittai anta no doushiyou mo nai tomodachi wo nan datte atashi ni moushi tsukeru no? Burinkurei Kooto wo kakuri byouin da to demo omotteru no? Supinku Botoru-tte ittai dare yo? Ai wo komete Travers.*

T: 《アホの甥っ子を絞め殺すのが法律上殺人に該るかどうか弁士に聞いているところよ。用心なさい。あんたの行為は受忍限度を超えてるわ。一体あんたのどうしようもない友達を何だってあたしに申しつけるの？ ブリンクレイ・コートを隔離病院だとでも思ってるの？ スピンク = ボトルって一体誰よ？ 愛を込めて トラヴァース》

B: Not Bottle. Nottle. Regards. Bertie.

B: Botoru janakute Notoru da. Keigu Bertie.

B: 《ボトルじゃなくてノトルだ。敬具 バーティー》

T: Well, this friend of yours has got here, and I must say that for a friend of yours he seems less sub-human than I had expected. A bit of a pop-eyed bleater, but on the whole clean and civil, and certainly most informative about newts. Am considering arranging series of lectures for him in neighbourhood. All the same I like your nerve using my house as a summer-hotel resort and shall have much to say to you on subject when you come down. Expect you thirtieth. Bring spats. Love. Travers.

T: Ee, anta no otomodachi ga touchaku shita wa. Anta no tomodachi ni shicha omotteta yori mo katou ningen janai-tte iwanakya naranai wa ne. Me ga chotto tobideta kunkun iu ko hitsuji chan ne. Demo soutai-teki ni ha seketsu de reigi tadashii wa. Imori no chishiki nante taishita mono yo. Kinrin no hito wo atsumete kare ni nankai ka kougi wo shite moraou-tte kangaeteru tokoro yo. Dakedo uchi wo natsu no hoteru rizooto atsukai shite kureta anta no shinkei ha ki ni itta wa. Kono mondai ni tsuite ha anta ga kite kara utai koto ga takusan arimasu kara ne. San-juu-nichi ni matsu. Supattsu wo motte kuru koto. Ai wo komete Travers.

T: 《ええ、あんたのお友達が到着したわ。あんたの友達にしちゃ思ってたよりも下等人間じゃないって言わなきゃならないわね。目がちょっととび出たクンクンいう仔ヒツジちゃんね。でも総体的には清潔で礼儀正しいわ。イモリの知識なんてたいしたものよ。近隣の人を集めて彼に何回か講義をしてもらおうって考えてるところよ。だけどうちを夏のホテルリゾート扱いしてくれたあんたの神経は気に入ったわ。この問題についてはあんたが来てから言いたいことが沢山ありますからね。三十日に待つ。スパッツをもって来ること。愛を込めてトラヴァース》

B: On consulting engagement book find impossible come to Brinkley court. Deeply regret. Toodle-oo. Bertie.

B: Sukeju-ru chou wo kakunin shita tokoro Burinkurei Kooto ni ikarenai koto hanmei. Makoto ni ikan. Pippi- Bertie.

B: 《スケジュール帳を確認したところブリンクレイ・コートに行かれないこと判明。まことに遺憾。ピッピー バーティー》

T: Oh, so it's like that, is it? You and your engagement book, indeed. Deeply regret my foot. Let me tell you, my lad, that you will regret it a jolly sight more deeply if you don't come down. If you imagine for one moment that you are going to get out of distributing those prizes, you are very much mistaken. Deeply regret Brinkley Court hundred miles from London, as unable hit you with a brick. Love. Travers.

T: Ara, sou na no. Sukeju-ru chou ga ne. Fun. Makoto ni ikan, masaka ne. Anta kocchi ni konai to motto ikan na omoi wo suru koto ni naru wa yo. Hyoushou-shiki kara nigerareru to isshun demo omottara dai machigai da wa. Burinkurei Kooto ga London kara hyaku go juu kiro mo hanaretete anta no atama renga de buchinomashite yarenakute, makoto ni ikan. Ai wo komete Travers.

T: 《あら、そうなの。スケジュール帳がね。フン。まことに遺憾、まさかね。あんたこっちに来ないともっと遺憾な思いをすることになるわよ。表彰式から逃げられると一瞬でも思ったら大間違いだわ。ブリンクレイ・コートがロンドンから百五十キロも離れててあんたの頭レンガでぶちのめしてやれなくて、まことに遺憾。 愛を込めて トラヴァース》

B: No, but dash it, listen. Honestly, you don't want me. Get Fink-Nottle distribute prizes. A born distributor, who will do you credit. Confidently anticipate Augustus Fink-Nottle as Master of Revels on thirty-first inst. would make genuine sensation. Do not miss this great chance, which may never occur again. Tinkerty-tonk. Bertie.

B: *Dame da. Dakedo kiite yo. Shoujiki na tokoro boku nanka ja dame darou. Fuinku Notoru wo hyoushou-shiki ni tsukae. Umare nagara no hyoushou-shiki otoko da. Shin'you shite ii. Shukusai no dai meijin Oogatasu Fuinku Notoru ha san-juu-ichi-nichi ni machigai naku kandou no arashi wo makiokosu darou. Kougo kitai. Nidoto ha nai kono chansu wo o-minogashi naku. Chan chan Bertie.*

B: 駄目だ。だけど聞いてよ。正直なところ僕なんかじゃ駄目だろう。フィンク = ノトルを表彰式に使い。生まれながらの表彰式男だ。信用していい。祝祭の大名人オーガスタス・フィンク = ノトルは三十一日にまちがいなく感動の嵐を巻き起こすだろう。乞うご期待。二度とはないこのチャンスをお見逃しなく。 チャンチャン パーティー》

T: Well, all right. Something in what you say, I suppose. Consider you treacherous worm and contemptible, spineless cowardly custard, but have booked Spink-Bottle. Stay where you are, then, and I hope you get run over by an omnibus. Love. Travers.

T: *Sou ne, wakatta wa. Anta no iu koto ni mo ichiri aru kamoshirenai wa ne. Anta ha uragirimono imo mushi, hiretsu de ikuji nashi de okubyoumono no kasuta-do otoko dakedo, Supinku Botoru san wo okutte kureta mono ne. Jaa soko ni inasai. Basu ni demo hikarereba ii wa. Ai wo komete Travers.*

T: 《そうね、わかったわ。あんたの言うことにも一理あるかもしれないわね。あんたは裏切り者イモ虫、卑劣でいくじなしで臆病者のカスタード男だけど、スピंक = ボトルさんを送ってくれたものね。じゃあそこに居なさい。バスにでも轢かれればいいわ。愛を込めて トラヴァース》

Thus ends their exchange. But before we begin this foray into 'how', let us trackback to the previous chapters. The above exchange is ripe with ventures of rapt switches from serious to non-serious territory (and vice versa) and, though the lines may be somewhat blurred, the roles of *boke* (Bertie) and *tsukkomi* (Dahlia) can be identified.

To continue, let us look at how certain aspects of these telegrams have been translated. Despite whatever name-calling has occurred within, the amusing sign-off of love or regards remains, untouched even in translation. Bertie's proclamations of 'regards' or 'all the best' as

though he had not just sent a telegram to his aunt containing what most would consider gibberish have all been translated accordingly. Morimura (2005) has used the words '*Keigu*' - translating to 'Yours truly' and other similar expressions, and '*Yoroshiku*' - a sentiment expressing regards. His aunt's continual sign-off of 'love' despite just prior wishing bodily harm upon him has been chosen to be represented by '*Ai wo komete*' - 'With Love'.

Humorous lines such as "Am taking legal advice to ascertain whether strangling an idiot nephew counts as murder. If it doesn't look out for yourself." (Wodehouse, 1934:40) retain their humour even in translation: "*Aho no oikko wo shimekorosu no ga houritsu jou satsujin ni atehamaru ka dou ka benshi ni kiiteiru tokoro yo. Youjin nasai.*" (Morimura, 2005:67) translates to something to the effect of "Am asking lawyer regarding whether or not it is murder to strangle an idiot nephew. Don't let your guard down/Please beware." This translation is very similar in both meaning and word-execution, there is a slight difference however, in that the translator has chosen to forego the "if it doesn't" and just gone right to "Look out for yourself" - it doesn't alter the sentence much, but perhaps adds the nuance that even if it should turn out to count as murder, at this moment, she doesn't much mind so long as she gets the satisfaction of performing the deed. One can but speculate. It is certainly still very in-character.

Several amusing exchanges have been translated to the letter and are not, in the opinion of the author, in any way less humorous for it. The Fink-Nottle/Spink-Bottle gag comes to mind. Further, regarding the Fink-Nottle character, T's descriptive "Pop-eyed bleater" (Wodehouse, 1934:40) makes one curious for the to-Japanese translation. According to the NOAD 'pop-eyed' indicated either (of a person) "having bulging eyes" or "having their eyes wide open, typically in surprise or fear", and a "bleater" and must surmise has something to do with resembling, physically or otherwise, a sheep, goat or calf, in that 'to bleat' is the characteristic cry of aforementioned animals. The translator has indeed added mentions of sheep in his translation: "*Me ga chotto tobideta kunkun iu ko-hitsuji chan ne*" (Morimura, 2005:68) - "He's like a sniffing lamb with slightly popped-out eyes, isn't he" is perhaps not the most articulate of translations, nevertheless it gets the point across. She also includes the '*chan*' suffix for added effect.

In the very next exchange, if you recall, B 'deeply regrets' being unable to make it to Brinkley Court, '*makoto ni ikan*' in translation. Her response of 'Deeply regret my foot' he translates to '*Makoto ni ikan, masaka ne*', which similarly echoes his words, followed by an implied 'I don't believe a word of it'. To bring this particular analysis full-circle, the way 'deeply regret' is utilized in both original and translation is equally humorous, as seen in the final sentence of the telegram in question: "Deeply regret Brinkley Court hundred miles from London, as unable to hit you with a brick. Love. Travers" has been translated to "*Brinkley Court ga London kara hyaku go juu kiro mo hanaretete anta no atama renga de buchinomashite yarenakute, makoto ni ikan. Ai wo komete Travers.*" (Morimura, 2005:69) She has, in both cases, used his own phrasing against him to create an amusing turn-of-phrase. 'What it is that is '*makoto ni ikan*' is that Brinkley Court is more than 150 kilometres away, and that I cannot beat you up/hit you with a brick. With Love Travers' is the hopefully understandable translation. What Morimura succeeded in doing is, without losing any of what is implied, giving the characters their own Japanese voices while still maintaining their undeniably un-Japanese characteristics.

The final telegram does not disappoint. B has rescinded his previous acquiescence, and T is, understandably, unhappy. "Consider you treacherous worm and contemptible, spineless cowardly custard" and "Stay where you are, then, and I hope you get run over by an omnibus." certainly convey such a sentiment. "*Anta ha uragirimono imo-mushi, hiretsu de ikuji nashi de okubyoumono no custard otoko*" (Morimura, 2005:70) 'You are a traitorous caterpillar and a cowardly custard of a man', followed by '*Jaa soko ni i-nasai. Bus ni demo hikarereba ii wa.*'. "Then,

stay where you are. I wouldn't mind if you were run over by something like a bus/It would be fine with me if you were to be run over by something like a bus.” He has chosen to interpret T's use of ‘omnibus’ to mean an actual ‘bus’, whereas its other meaning (which also provides a most amusing mental image - that of B being plowed down by just such a tome) is that of a, often very, heavy book.

3.5 In Translation and Analysis: Elements

3.5.1 Imagery

As Prasad (2004) mentions, Wodehouse often employs imagery to bring across how he wishes the reader to visualize how certain characters speak, move and act. Here are some examples, accompanied by their to-Japanese translated counterparts. For further translations not included below see Appendix A.

[T1]

I clutched at it [tea] like a drowning man at a straw hat. (Wodehouse, 1934:25)

Boku ha oboreru mono ga mugiwara boushi ni shigamitsuku mitai ni soitsu wo washizukami ni shita.

僕はおぼれる者がムギワラ帽子にしがみつくみたいにそいつをわしづかみにした。(Morimura, 2005:43)

[T2]

He quivered like a mousse. (Wodehouse, 1934:36)

Yatsu ha mu-su mitai ni furu furu to furueta.

奴はムースみたいにふるふると震えた。(Morimura, 2005:61)

[T3]

She looked like an aunt who has just bitten into a bad oyster. (Wodehouse, 1934:44)

Warui kaki wo kuchi ni irete shimatta oba mitai ni mieta.

悪い牡蠣を口に入れてしまった叔母みたいに見えた。(Morimura, 2005:74)

[T4]

She looked like a tomato struggling for selfexpression. (Wodehouse, 1934:168)

Kanojo ha marude jiko hyougen ni kutou suru tomato mitai ni mieta.

彼女はまるで自己表現に苦闘するトマトみたにに見えた。(Morimura, 2005:288)

[T5]

Her words did not appear to make sense. They seemed the mere aimless vapouring of an aunt who has been sitting out in the sun without a hat. (Wodehouse, 1934:26)

Kanojo no kotoba ga imi wo nashiteiru to ha omoenakatta. Boushi mo kaburazu hinata ni suwatteita oba ga kuchi ni suru tokoro no, mu-mokuteki na youta-banashi de aru you ni omoeta.

彼女の言葉が意味をなしているとは思えなかった。帽子もかぶらず日向に座っていた叔母が口にするところの、無目的なヨタ話であるように思えた。

(Morimura, 2005:45)

The examples above have all been translated to retain their original meaning, with, in some cases, added Japanese nuance. For example, “He quivered like a mousse”, ‘*Yatsu ha mu-su mitai ni furu-furu to furueta*’. The ‘*furu-furu*’ is onomatopoeic for ‘tremble’ or ‘quiver’, which gives the sentence an even more descriptive feel. The last example of the five above has been somewhat differently translated: the ‘Aimless vapouring’ was translated to ‘Aimless idle gossip’, and in that translation, some meaning is lost. The NOAD defines ‘vapouring’ as “talking in a vacuous, boasting, or pompous way”, a way of speaking which does not come across in the Japanese version.

[T6] *Literal*

According to Angela, the finny denizen kept snapping at her ankles virtually without cessation, so that by the time help arrived, she was feeling more like a salted almond at a public dinner than anything human. (Wodehouse, 1934:46)

Angela ni yoru to, sono hire no aru ikimono ha, hobo yasumi nakute kanojo no kurubushi wo kajitteita sou da. Sore de tasuke ga touchaku suru made, kanojo ha ningen to iu yori ha koukai dina- no shio-tsuki a-monodo ni natta mitai na kimochi datta to iu koto da.

アンジェラによると、そのヒレのある生き物は、ほぼ休みなく彼女のくるぶしをかじっていたそう。それで助けが到着するまで、彼女は人間というよりは公開ディナーの塩つきアーモンドになったみたいな気持ちだったということだ。

(Morimura, 2005:78)

Though it has been labeled ‘literal’ it bears mentioning that in [T6] a shark is referred to as a “finny denizen” - ‘*hire no aru ikimono*’ in translation, meaning, essentially, ‘a creature with fins/finny creature’. The subsequent part of the excerpt resembles the original to the extent that it is not necessary to re-translate it.

[T7]

Bertram Wooster is not accustomed to this gluttonous appetite for his society. (Wodehouse, 1934:21)

Bertram Wooster shi ha kare to no kouyou wo motomeru, kakumo donran na yokubou ni ha nareteinai no da.

バートラム・ウースター氏は彼との交友を求める、かくも貪婪な欲望には慣れていないのだ。(Morimura, 2005:36)

Here, Wodehouse once more utilizes imagery to truly make the reader aware of how unusual it is for Bertie’s company to be sought out in such a manner. In translation, appetite is lost and replaced with ‘seeking of companionship’, as in ‘Bertie Wooster is not familiar with such an insatiable desire to seek out his companionship’.

[T8]

There was one of those long silences. Pregnant, I believe, is what they’re generally called. Aunt looked at butler. Butler looked at aunt. I looked at both of them. An eerie stillness seemed to envelop the room like a linseed poultice. (Wodehouse, 1934:164)

Isshu no nagai chinmoku ga atta. Ima shinchou na——datta to omou——to, ippan ni iwareru yatsu da. Oba ha shitsuji wo mita. Shitsuji ha oba wo mita. Boku ha ryousha wo mita. Etai no shirenai chinmoku ga, amani no shippu gusuri mitai ni kono heya wo tsutsumikonda.

一種の長い沈黙があった。意味深長な——だったと思う——と、一般に言われる奴だ。叔母は執事を見た。執事は叔母を見た。僕は両者を見た。得体の知れない沈黙が、亜麻仁の湿布薬みたいにこの部屋を包み込んだ。

(Morimura, 2005:281)

A pregnant pause, in other words a pause which is full of significant or suggestive meaning, is similarly expressed in Japanese. The silence which Bertie describes as ‘pregnant’ has been substituted with the word ‘*imi shinchuu*’ - an adjective added to mean that something either has profound (often hidden) meaning, is suggestive or pregnant with significance. Taking a closer look at the meaning of the kanji, we find, appropriately enough, ‘meaning/significance’ and ‘profound’. Further we also have this sentence, which perhaps should have been featured earlier, along with others of its kind: “An eerie stillness seemed to envelop the room like a linseed poultice.” To clarify, a linseed poultice is, perhaps not so much in modern times, used to apply prolonged heat or cold to skin, a compress of sorts. The imagery this provides is most illustrative. The translation given to us by Morimura (2005) reads: ‘A strange silence wrapped itself around the room like a linseed poultice’

[T9]

And giving me the sort of weak smile Roman gladiators used to give the Emperor before entering the arena, Gussy trickled off. (Wodehouse, 1934:19)

Are-na ni nyuujou suru mae no rooma no kentoushi ga koutei ni yatta you na yowayowashii egao wo boku ni mukete, Gussy ha dete itta.

アリーナに入場する前のローマの剣闘士が皇帝にやったような弱々しい笑顔を僕に向けて、ガッシーは出て行った。(Morimura, 2005:32)

It might be interesting to note that the ‘trickled off’ here was disregarded and replaced with a simple “Gussy left.”. After Wodehouse has likened Gussy’s smile to that of a none-too-excited and perhaps-soon-to-be-no-more gladiator, he extends it by describing his leave-taking as slow, as trickling characteristically tends to be. Instead Morimura (2005) has translated the sentence thus: “Gussy aimed a weak smile, like a roman gladiator would give the emperor upon entering the arena, at me, and left.” As the whole sentence retains its original meaning, the translation of ‘trickled off’ is quite insignificant - it was, however, a point of interest, how this particular expression would translate, prior to research performed.

3.5.2 Transferred Epithets

The excerpts below are examples of what Prasad (2004) refers to as ‘transferred epithets’ - which he describes as transferring an epithet from “a more appropriate to a less suitable noun in a line or a sentence” (2004:184)

[T10]

She flushed again, and took a rather strained forkful of salmon. (Wodehouse, 1934:175)

Kanojo ha mata hoho wo someta. Soshite gikochinai yousu de sa-mon wo fouku de kuchi ni hakonda.

彼女はまた頬を染めた。そしてぎこちない様子でサーモンをフォークで口に運んだ。(Morimura, 2005:300)

[T11]

A moment later I was out in God's air, fumbling with a fevered foot at the self-starter of the old car. (Wodehouse, 1934::146)

Isshun no ato, boku ha soto ni dete, koufun de gikochinaku furueru ashi de kuruma no serufu suta-ta- wo sagutteita.

一瞬の後、僕は外に出て、興奮でぎこちなく震える足で車のセルフスターターを探っていた。(Morimura, 2005:251)

The Japanese translation of the first excerpt reads as follows: “Her cheeks colored once more. And then with an awkward/a constrained appearance [she] carried/moved the salmon to her mouth with her fork”. Here Morimura (2005) has, instead of using the transferred epithet, decided to describe how *she* brought the salmon to her mouth, rather than describing the ‘forkful of salmon’ as ‘strained’. According to Hall (1973) in his analysis of The Transferred Epithet in P.G. Wodehouse (1973), this translation is intrinsically what the original sentence means - he writes that, for example, ‘He was now smoking a sad cigarette’ is simply a way of saying ‘he was now sadly smoking a cigarette’. What is missing, however, is the comic effect.

The second instance of a to-Japanese translated transferred epithet [T11] is that of the ‘fevered foot’. Unlike the previous case, the salmon if you recall, this has been translated in a manner that more resembles the original, in that he describes the feet in such a way, rather than the action of ‘fumbling’. The whole sentence translates to “After a moment I was out and fumbling for the car’s self starter with feet clumsily trembling with excitement.”

3.5.3 The Wodehouse Synonym

In the example below we will find Prasad’s (2004) aforementioned Wodehouse synonym:

[T12]

I took another oz. of the life-saving [tea] and inclined my head. (Wodehouse, 1934:26)

Boku ha mou hitokuchi seimei no moto wo susuri, unazuite miseta.

僕はもう一口生命の素をすすり、うなずいて見せた。(Morimura, 2005:45)

Earlier, ‘Twin star-likes’ was used to describe a pair of eyes, but in this example ‘tea’ is being referred to as ‘the life-saving’, which in itself is a reference to the earlier occurrence of Jeeves bringing Bertie ‘the vital Oolong’ which, “after a sip or two ... made him feel sufficiently like the old Bertram to be able to bend the mind on this awful thing which had come upon him” (Wodehouse, 1934:25) (Meaning: his aunt, Dahlia Travers). The Japanese translation reads ‘*seimei no moto*’ - ‘*seimei*’, Jim Breen’s WWWJDIC informs us, means ‘life’ or ‘existence’, and ‘*moto*’ in this case could mean ‘source’ or ‘ingredient’ - “I took another sip of the source of life, [and] nodded”.

3.5.4 Wodehouse Sundry

The following quotes and excerpts are more of what Prasad (2004) earlier referred to as being what makes Wodehouse’s humour so intrinsically his own. If called-for, analysis of translation will be provided below said excerpt. Unless noted otherwise, analysis will only pertain to example directly above. Several examples will be marked ‘*literal*’ - this indicates that the translation is so similar to the original that, as far as keeping with the original author’s intent, not much further can be said. These examples must surely indicate that Wodehouse’s style of writing and humour translate well to match the Japanese language - or perhaps the translation done by Morimura (2005) is just particularly praiseworthy.

[T13]

We stayed at Cannes about two months, and except for the fact that Aunt Dahlia lost her shirt at baccarat and Angela nearly got inhaled by a shark while aquaplaning, a pleasant time was had by all. (Wodehouse, 1934:4)

Dahlia oba-san ga bakara de migurumi hagareta no to, Anjera ga akuapure-n chuu ni same ni osowarete mou sukoshi de musha musha kuwarete shimau tokoro datta hoka ha, mina, kimochi no ii hi wo sugoshiteita.

ダリア叔母さんがバカラで身ぐるみはがれたのと、アンジェラがアクアプレーン中にサメに襲われてもう少しでむしゃむしゃ食われてしまうところだったほかは、皆、気持ちのいい日を過ごしていた。(Morimura, 2005:4)

Above you will find another usage of earlier-mentioned understatement as well Japanese onomatopoeia. What Wodehouse described as “Angela nearly getting inhaled by a shark while aquaplaning”, Morimura (2005) has used the words ‘*musha-musha*’ to provide further imagery. ‘*Musha-musha*’ is defined in the PJ-ED as, when eating, ‘chomp-chomp’ or ‘munch-munch’ - the whole translated sentence can therefore be read as: “Angela, while aquaplaning, was attacked by a shark and almost got munched on and eaten”. While the ‘*musha-musha*’ feels somewhat forced in literal translation, it only adds to the descriptive imagery provided when read in Japanese - it adds what is taken away with the removal of the ‘inhaling’.

[T14] *Literal*

Certainly I remembered Angela’s Shark. A man of sensibility does not forget about a cousin nearly being chewed by monsters of the deep. (Wodehouse, 1934:46)

Muron oboeteiru. Shiryo no aru otoko dattara itoko ga shinkai kaibutsu ni mou sukoshi de kuwareru tokoro datta no wo wasure ha shinai.

無論憶えている。思慮のある男だったら従姉妹が深海怪物にもう少しで食われるところだったのを忘れはしない。(Morimura, 2005:77)

In the case of [T21], the difference in translation lies in that, instead of being “nearly chewed on by monsters of the deep” she was ‘nearly eaten by (a) deepsea monster(s)’. In other words, this, and other translations marked ‘literal’, may be somewhat rephrased and certain words replaced with close equivalents, however they are still intrinsically what they were prior to translation.

[T15]

We do not tell old friends beneath our roof-tree that they are an offence to the eyesight. (Wodehouse, 1934:14)

Wareware ha jitakunai de furui yuujin ni mukatte, omae ha shikaku ni taisuru bijokuda nado to ittari ha shinai.

我々は自宅内で古い友人に向かって、お前は視覚に対する侮辱だなどと言ったりはしない。(Morimura, 2005:24)

In this instance, ‘roof-tree’ has been substituted with ‘*jitakunai*’ - ‘in the home/inside one’s home’, which conveys the meaning aptly. Further, the ‘offence to the eyesight’ has been almost literally translated - ‘We do not face old friends in our own home and tell them “you are an insult to the vision”’. It would seem, more often than not if these chosen examples are anything to go by, that many of Wodehouse’s humorous lines translate very well to Japanese.

[T16]

Gussie, a glutton for punishment, stared at himself in the mirror. (Wodehouse, 1934:15)

Gussie ha to ieba, utare tsuyoi bokusa- mitai ni kagami ni utsutta jibun no sugata wo mitsumeteita.

ガッシーはといえば、打たれ強いボクサーみたいに鏡に映った自分の姿を見つめていた。(Morimura, 2005:25)

Here we have an instance of something being translated to imply, rather than state, what was originally written. “Speaking of Gussie” the translation begins, “he was looking at his reflection in the mirror like a boxer who has been struck hard/badly beaten boxer”. The fact that he is looking at himself in the mirror after an undoubtedly unsuccessful boxing match indicates that he indeed is a “glutton for punishment”. Perhaps this translation is due to such statements in Japanese, about another’s actual thoughts, feelings actions, can be considered inappropriate. Cloaking it in a simile seems, upon reflection, appropriate.

[T17]

Aunt is calling to Aunt like mastodons bellowing across primeval swamps

(Wodehouse, 1923:116)

Genshi jidai no numachi de houkou wo kawasu masutodon mitai ni, oba-san ga oba-san ni denwa wo shi ...

原始時代の沼地で咆哮を交わすマストドンみたいに、伯母さんが伯母さんに電話をし... (Morimura, 2005 :239)

In above, [T17], we have a line much anticipated. For those familiar with the works of Wodehouse, the simile is found to be both amusing and apt. However, in translation we find that Morimura (2005) has used ‘*denwa wo suru*’ which, while it does mean to call, it is a call made with a telephone. Would not ‘*yobu*’ have been a better, if not a more appropriate, choice? The difference between ‘Aunt calling Aunt’ and, as is written in the original, ‘Aunt calling to Aunt’ is what makes ‘*yobu*’ the more suitable alternative. The rest of the translation, however, does not disappoint: “Like Mastodons exchanging roars in a primeval swamp, Aunt calls Aunt”.

[T18]

You know how it is with some girls. They seem to take the stuffing right out of you. I mean to say, there is something about their personality that paralyses the vocal cords and reduces the contents of the brain to cauliflower. (Wodehouse, 1934:10)

Aru shu no onna no ko ga dou iu mono ka ha gozonji darou. Kanojo-ra ha hito wo nukegara ni shite shimau. Tsumari, kanojo-ra no ningensei ni ha hito no seitai wo mahi sase, noumiso wo karifurawaa ni henkei saseru chikara ga aru no da.

ある種の女の子がどういうものかはお存じだろう。彼女らは人をぬけがらにしてしまう。つまり、彼女らの人間性には人の声帯を麻痺させ、脳みそをカリフラワーに変形させる力があるのだ。(Morimura, 2005:16)

[T18] uses the expression ‘take the stuffing out of’, which the NOAD tells us means to “severely impair the confidence or strenght of (someone)”. Morimura (2005) has translated this, very literally, to ‘turn into an empty shell/husk’. The rest of the sentence is almost exactly like the original, with the exception that he refers to this ‘ability’ as part of their human nature rather than their personality.

[T19]

She had turned away and was watching a duck out on the lake. It was tucking into weeds, a thing I've never been able to understand anyone wanting to do. Though I suppose, if you face it squarely, they're no worse than spinach. (Wodehouse, 1934:77)

Kanojo ha furimuite, mizuumi ni ukabu ahiru wo mitsumeteita. Soitsu ha mizukusa wo morimori tabeteita. Anna shiro mono ga suki na yatsu ga iyou to ha mattaku boku ni ha rikai dekinai. To ha ie omou ni, seijitsu ni mukiaeba, hourensou yori waruku ha nai no kamoshirenai.

彼女は振り向いて、湖に浮かぶアヒルを見つめていた。そいつは水草をもりもり食べていた。あんなしろ物が好きな奴がいようとはまったく僕には理解できない。とはいえ思うに、誠実に向き合えば、ホウレン草より悪くはないのかもしれない。(Morimura, 2005:129)

[T19] provides us with the interesting expression of ‘tucking into’ something (weeds, in this case), which Morimura (2005) has translated to ‘*mori mori tabeteita*’. ‘*Mori mori*’, according to the PJ-ED, in terms of eating expresses doing so ‘with gusto’ or ‘like a wolf’, which is very similar to the definition of ‘tuck in’ which means to “eat food heartily”. The next point of interest lies within the final sentence. Morimura (2005) has translated ‘face it squarely’ to ‘*seijitsu ni mukiaeba*’ - “if you face it honestly/sincerely”, a translation in which implication has remained unchanged.

[T20] *Literal*

Beginning with a *critique* of my own limbs, which she said, justly enough, were nothing to write home about, this girl went on to dissect my manners, morals, intellect, general physique, and method of eating asparagus with such acerbity that by the time she had finished the best you could say of Bertram was that, so far as was known, he had never actually committed murder or set fire to an orphan asylum. (Wodehouse, 1934:102)

Boku no te-ashi no hihan ni hajimatte——kanojo ha soitsu wo seitou ni mo, toru ni taranai tsumaranai shiro mono-tte ittanda ga——sorekara boku no mana-, doutokusei, chisei, takaku zenpan, sorekara asuparagasu no tabekata ni itaru made, kiwamete shinratsu ni bi ni iri sai wo ugatta kokuhyou wo kuwaete kuretanda. Sore de shimai ni ha, Bertram-shi ni tsuite ieru saizen no koto ha, ima no tokoro hontou ni hito wo koroshite wa nai toka, koji-in ni houka shita wake janai to iu dake ni natte shimatta.

僕の手足の批判に始まって——彼女はそいつを正当にも、とるに足らないつまらないしろ物っていったんだが——それから僕のマナー、道徳性、知性、体格全般、それからアスパラガスの食べ方に至るまで、きわめて辛辣に微に入り細をうがった酷評を加えてくれたんだ。それでしまいには、バートラム氏について言える最前のことは、今のところ本当に人を殺してはないとか、孤児院に放火したわけじゃないとkいうだけになってしまった。(Morimura, 2005:173)

Though [T20] has been very nearly literally translated, certain aspects of the translation are still viable for some slight analysis. “Nothing to write home about”, an informal expression referring to an event being unexceptional or mediocre, Morimura (2005) has translated to ‘*Toru ni taranai tsumaranai shiromono*’. ‘*Toru ni taranai*’ is an expression in itself, meaning, according to Jim Breen’s WWWJDIC, ‘worthless’ or ‘valueless’. Further the PJ-ED gives us the example of “*Toru ni taranai yatsu*” - “a person who is not worth bothering about”. ‘*Tsumaranai*’ can refer to many a sentiment: ‘boring’, ‘uninteresting’, ‘unimportant’, ‘insignificant’ or ‘pointless’, to name a few. We can therefore surmise that what she is saying, even in translation, is that his

limbs are “worthless, insignificant things” in the sense that, others issued with similar equipment pull of the look more appealingly than he.

[T21]

"What a pest you are, you miserable object," she sighed. "I remember years ago, when you were in your cradle, being left alone with you one day and you nearly swallowed your rubber comforter and started turning purple. And I, ass that I was, took it out and saved your life. Let me tell you, young Bertie, it will go very hard with you if you ever swallow a rubber comforter again when only I am by to aid." (Wodehouse, 1934:172)

“Anta te hito nante yakkaimono na no. Kono mittomonai ikimono-ttara” kanojo ha tameiki wo tsuita. “Omoidasu wa. Nan-nen mo mae ni, anta ga mada yurikago no naka ni ita koro no hanashi dakedo, aru hi anta to futarikkiri de ita toki ga atte ne, anta-ttara gomu no oshafuri wo nomikonde, murasaki iro ni nari hajimeta no. Sore de atashi-ttara, baka datta no ne, soitsu wo totte yatte anta no inochi wo tasukean da wa. Iwasete choudai, Bertie-chan. Moshi anta ga mo ichido gomu no oshaburi wo nomikomu youna koto ga atte, sono toki ni tsuiteru no ga atashi dake datta to shitara, anta zuibun komatta koto ni naru wa yo.

「あんたって人は何て厄介者なの。このみっともない生き物ったら」かのじょはため息をついた。「思い出すわ。何年も前に、あんたがまだ揺りかごの中にいたころの話だけど、ある日あんたと二人つきりでいたときがあつてね、あんたったらゴムのおしゃぶりを飲み込んで、紫色になり始めたの。それであたしったら、バカだったのね、そいつを取ってやってあんたの命を助けたんだわ。言わせてちょうだい、バーティーちゃん。もしあんたがも一度ゴムのおしゃぶりを飲み込むようなことがあつて、その時そばについてるのがあたしだけだったとしたら、あんたずいぶん困ったことになるわよ」(Morimura, 2005:296)

[T21] reacquaints us with Bertie’s aunt, Dahlia Travers. Here she refers to him as a ‘miserable object’, which upon translation saw him turned into a ‘disgraceful’ or ‘unseemly’ creature. Most of this example is translated very closely, yet despite this let us take a look at her highly amusing closing statement. Similar to the original, she states that if he once more swallows a rubber pacifier when only she is by his side, he will find himself in a troubling situation indeed. It can be surmised both from this excerpt and that of the previous telegram exchange that Dahlia’s voice translates very well to Japanese.

[T22]

The discovery of a toy duck in the soap dish, presumably the property of some former juvenile visitor, contributed not a little to this new and happier frame of mind. What with one thing and another, I hadn't played with toy ducks in my bath for years, and I found the novel experience most invigorating. For the benefit of those interested, I may mention that if you shove the thing under the surface with the sponge and then let it go, it shoots out of the water in a manner calculated to divert the most careworn. Ten minutes of this and I was enabled to return to the bedchamber much more the old merry Bertram.

(Wodehouse, 1934:58)

Osoraku ha izen ni shukuhaku shita kodomo no taizai kyaku ga nokoshite itta mono de arou. Sekken sara ni omocha no ahiru wo hakken shita koto mo, kono arata na, yori koufuku na seishin joutai ni yokunakarazu kiyo shita. Boku ha mou nan-nen mo furoba de ahiru to asonde inakatta. Soshite kono shinsen na taiken wo kiwamete genki tsukerareru mono to kanjita. Kaishin wo motareta shoken no tame ni, ika no koto wo shirushite okou. Soitsu wo suponji to issou ni suimenka ni shizume, shikaru ato ni te wo hanasu to, ikani nayami yatsureta mono demo kokoro nagusamerareru you na shikata de sore ha suimenjou ni tobiagaru no de

aru. Juppun hodo kore wo yatte, boku ha gen no you ki na Bertram ni daibu modotte shinshitsu ni kaeru koto ga dekita.

おそらくは以前に宿泊した子供の滞在客が残して行ったものであろう。石鹸皿におもちゃのアヒルを発見したことも、この新たな、より幸福な精神状態に好くならず寄与した。僕はもう何年も風呂場でアヒルと遊んでいなかった。そしてこの新鮮な体験をきわめて元気付けられるものと感じた。開心を持たれた諸賢のために、以下のことを記しておこう。そいつをスポンジといっしょに水面下に沈め、しかる後に手を放すと、いかに悩みやつれた者でも心慰められるような仕方ではそれは水面上に飛び上がるのである。十分ほどこれをして、僕は元の陽気なバートラムにだいぶ戻って寝室に帰ることができた。(Morimura, 2005:98)

To end this display of examples in the most lighthearted manner possible, chosen as the best representative was the above example. In it, Bertie describes how shoving a toy duck under the bathtub water, together with a sponge, and then letting go is a most from-matters-unpleasant distracting activity. ‘However troubled and haggard a person is, [having the toy duck] jump out of the water surface, is the method to divert yourself.’ In times of troubling thoughts, let us all heed this most sound piece of advice.

4. Customer Reviews

Throughout this thesis there has been no mention of how the translated works have been received by their intended audience, rather only the opinion of an avid reader of the original. On Amazon customers have the option/opportunity to write reviews on products they have purchased, accompanied by a star rating system, five stars being the highest. On the product page of ‘*Yoshikita, Jeeves*’ on Amazon.co.jp reviews ranging from three to five stars can be found. Reviews can be found in their original form in Appendix B.

The lowest scoring review (entitled ‘*Shitsuji comedy*’, Butler comedy) doesn’t comment on why he/she gave it a three-star rating, rather he/she just provides a succinct summary of events.

The first of the two four-star reviews, however, is helpful in gaining insight into how ‘*Yoshikita, Jeeves*’ was received by this particular intended reader. This sentence in particular stands out: “Similar to previous work, the tensioning of Jeeves’ wit and Bertie’s opposing willpower invites laughter/is hilarious”. What can be deduced from this review is that the plot has not suffered in translation, and through this particular reviewer’s statement that it is an “‘*joushitsu no humor*’ *wo juubun tannou dekiru issatsu*’, a book in which “fine quality humour” can be enjoyed, the humour intended must have translated well. The last of the four-star reviews provides another summary of the book, personal opinion only appearing at the very end where he/she states that ‘Though somewhat verbose, it was definitely interesting/amusing’.

Lastly we have two five-star reviews. The first of which contains this statement, corroborating an earlier hypothesis addressed in this thesis regarding Wodehouse and ‘*manzai*’: ‘*Kaiwa ga manzai no you ni keimyou na node, tontonton to monogoto ga susunde ikki ni yomi oete shimau kanji.*’, “Because conversation is light and easy/witty just like manzai, everything moves forward (ton-ton-ton) and it’s as though you’ve finished reading in one sitting/without resting”. This reviewer further states that he/she is relieved/glad that it is not an uncomfortable translation, as is common, and with conversation with such good flow he/she wonders what the original is

like and wishes to attempt reading it. The last of the reviews, five-star number two, is more a comment on the character of Jeeves than anything else, and doesn't provide any further insight.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, what is it that has been determined subsequently to finding and analyzing the excerpts above? And how well does the analysis represent both information provided in early chapters as well as research performed in the latter half? Upon concluding this research, it can be stated that regarding humour being dependent on the relationship between speaker and listener, as the book is in the narrative of Bertie, whose personality could be described as whimsically eccentric, there is not much basis for such an analysis. He seems incapable of self-censorship, regardless of whom he is in the presence of - with few exceptions. Further, most characters share some form of history, hence any restrictions, in the sense of being strangers, are not presented for analysis.

It has been noted by both Prasad (2004) and Folgado (2011) that understatement and hyperbole are fixtures prominent in Wodehouse's works, and examples have proved this valid. [T13] is an apt example of just such an instance: "... and except for the fact that Aunt Dahlia lost her shirt at baccarat and Angela nearly got inhaled by a shark while aquaplaning, a pleasant time was had by all" (Wodehouse, 1934:4), the to-Japanese translation of which was very close to the original, with the reinforcement of onomatopoeic 'munching'. This is a somewhat frequent occurrence in the example translations - Morimura (2005) has on several occasions added onomatopoeic expression on top of original phrasing, adding another 'layer', if you will, of imagery.

There is a distinct lack of puns in *Right Ho, Jeeves* (1934), hence no correlation between Japanese *share* and the written humour of Wodehouse could be made. There is, however, similarities between the type of verbal humour utilised by '*manzai*' comedians, and the banter or conversation between his characters. An example of this can be found in the telegram exchange between Bertie and Dahlia in chapter 3.4.3. There is a certain repartee reminiscent of just such a type of humour as '*manzai*'.

The expressions utilised by the characters (Right ho, dash it, etc.) have been translated based on context, though that is not to say that the several different expressions substituting for the one original aren't constant in their use. Their use neither detract nor add to the general feel of the book. Among the interesting words introduced and substituted are: '*Nantekotta!*', '*Nandai hoo*', '*Yoshikita*', '*Ittai Zentai*', '*Sunawachi*' and many more. See chapter 3.4.2 for more detailed information.

In analysing the translations for any humour lost in the act, it is found to be surprisingly similar in both word use and humour contained within. Often the Japanese words substituting the English ones are as close to equivalents as seems possible without succumbing to the nonsensical, sometimes so close to the original that re-translation has been deemed unnecessary. As questioned at the very beginning, it can be said that Morimura (2005) has not localised or adapted the content or speech of the book to be more easily understood by non-English audience - and that he has done his utmost for it to retain as much of Wodehouse's style as possible. Another thing to note is that the times Wodehouse has had his character express themselves with particular French expressions (as they have a tendency to do), these

have been written in Katakana and then, in author notes, subsequently had their use and origin described in detail.

Concerning the translation of synonyms, imagery and transferred epithets, it has been found that, when possible, most cases have been literally translated. On occasion, certain typically English (or unusual) words have been replaced with a more common word, for example "aimless vapouring" was replaced with "words without meaning/meaningless words/aimless words". Some meaning is lost in translation. Regarding transferred epithets, their translation has varied. One instance was translated to what the sentence meant, rather than what it stated, whereas another was translated in the way it was originally intended by Wodehouse. Lastly we have the Wodehouse synonym. The one instance of such a synonym located in Right Ho, Jeeves, was translated, once more, to resemble the original. The deviation however was that "the life-saving" (indicating tea) was replaced with "the source of life".

In the opinion of the author, Morimura's (2005) translation does not disappoint. As stated earlier, he has succeeded in giving the characters their own Japanese voices while still maintaining their undeniably un-Japanese characteristics, and done so without losing any of what was implied. Indeed, from this point of view he has done the original justice. To further add to this claim, Japanese reviews of the book found on Japanese Amazon seem to all agree that is indeed a humorous work of fiction, and through their summaries of the book it can be stated that the plot has remained intact après-translation. Though these reviews were in no way numerous, they did provide some insight into how the translated version has been received by its intended readers.

As the focus of this paper has been more of a general study of the to-Japanese translation of Wodehouse's work, perhaps a future venture could concern just one of the elements presented by Prasad (2004), as well as encompassing a larger number of translated volumes.

To end with a Wodehouse quote seems appropriate. Fortunately, one, that perhaps even reflects the current feelings of the reader, was located.

"It was one of the dullest speeches I ever heard. [She] told us for three quarters of an hour how she came to write her beastly book, when a simple apology was all that was required." (Wodehouse, 1970)

6. References

- Alexander, R. (1997). Aspects of verbal humour in English. Germany: Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.
- Colebrook, C. (2004). Irony. New York: Routledge.
- Critchley, S. (2002). On humour. London: Routledge.
- Daijisen. (1995/1998). Tokyo: Shogakukan.
- Davis, J. (2006). Understanding humor in Japan. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
- Folgado, V. (2011). "A musical comedy without music": P.G. Wodehouse's sense of humour. In Valero-Garcés, C (Ed.), *Dimensions of Humor: Explorations of Linguistics, Literature, Cultural Studies and Translation* (pp. 55-78). Valencia: Valencia University Press.
- Hall, R. (1973). The transferred epithet in P.G. Wodehouse. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 4 (1), 92-94.
- Inoue, H. (2006). Osaka's culture of laughter. In Davis, J (Ed.), *Understanding humor in Japan* (pp. 27-35). Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
- Jim Breen's WWWJDIC. <http://www.jdic.org>. Monash University.
- Maynard, S. (2005). Expressive Japanese: A reference guide to sharing emotion and empathy. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Morimura, T. (2005). *Hirui naki Jūvusu* [The Inimitable Jeeves]. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankou Kai Press.
- Morimura, T. (2005). *Yōshikita, Jūvusu* [Right Ho, Jeeves]. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankou Kai Press.
- Prasad, H. (2004). Laughing with the master: In praise of P.G. Wodehouse. Bloomington, IN: AuthorHouse.

- Progressive English to Japanese Dictionary. (1987). Tokyo: Shogakukan.
 Progressive Japanese to English Dictionary. (1993). Tokyo: Shogakukan.
 Stevenson, A., & Lindberg, C. (Eds.). (2010). New Oxford American Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 Stocker, J. (2006). Manzai: Team comedy in Japan's entertainment industry. In Davis, J (Ed.), *Understanding humor in Japan* (pp. 51-74). Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
 Takekuro, M. (2006). Conversational jokes in Japanese and English. In Davis, J (Ed.), *Understanding humor in Japan* (pp. 85-98). Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
 Thalberg, I. (Producer), & Wood, S. (Director). (1935). *A Night at the Opera* [Motion picture]. United States: Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.
Tsukaikata no wakaruru ruigo reikai jiten. (2003). Tokyo: Shogakukan.
 Wodehouse, P.G. (1923/1989). The inimitable Jeeves. *The Jeeves Omnibus: Vol 1*. (pp. 401-590). London: Random House Group Limited.
 Wodehouse, P.G. (1970). The girl in blue. London: Barrie & Jenkins.
 Wodehouse, P.G. (1934). Right ho, Jeeves. Retrieved from <http://www.gutenberg.org>.
 Yoshikita, Jeeves (Wodehouse Collection) Customer Reviews. Retrieved May 30, 2012, from <http://www.amazon.co.jp/gp/product/433604676X>.

7. Appendices

7.1 Appendix A: Further Translations

Imagery

[T1] *Literal*

According to Angela, the finny denizen kept snapping at her ankles virtually without cessation, so that by the time help arrived, she was feeling more like a salted almond at a public dinner than anything human. (Wodehouse, 1934:46)

Angela ni yoru to, sono hire no aru ikimono ha, hobo yasumi nakute kanojo no kurubushi wo kajitteita sou da. Sore de tasuke ga touchaku suru made, kanojo ha ningen to iu yori ha koukai dina- no shio-tsuki a-monodo ni natta mitai na kimochi datta to iu koto da.

アンジェラによると、そのヒレのある生き物は、ほぼ休みなく彼女のくるぶしをかじっていたそうだ。それで助けが到着するまで、彼女は人間というよりは公開ディナーの塩つきアーモンドになったみたいな気持ちだったということだ。(Morimura, 2005:78)

[T2] *Literal*

I turned to Aunt Agatha, whose demeanour was now rather like that of one who, picking daisies on the railway, has just caught the down express in the small of the back. (Wodehouse, 1923:28)

Boku ha Agatha oba-san no hou ni muki naotta. Ima ya senro de hinagiku wo tsundaitara kudari no kyuukou ga yattekite senaka ni shoutotsu sareta hito mitai na yousu da.

僕はアガサ伯母さんのほうに向き直った。いまや線路でひなぎくを摘んでいたら下りの急行がやって来て背中に衝突された人みたいな様子だ。(Morimura, 2005:56)

[T3] *Literal*

He had been looking like a dead fish. He now looked like a deader fish, one of last year's, cast up on some lonely beach and left there at the mercy of the wind and tides. (Wodehouse, 1934:35)

Yatsu ha mae kara shinda sakana ni nita otoko datta ga, ima ya sono sakana ha motto shindeita. Kyonen shinda sakana da. Doko ka no sabishii kaigan ni uchiagerare, kaze to nami no nasumama ni sareta sakana da.

奴は前から死んだ魚に似た男だったが、今やその魚はもっと死んでいた。去年死んだ魚だ。どこかの寂しい海岸に打ち上げられ、風と波のなすままにされた魚だ。(Morimura, 2005:59)

[T4] *Literal*

Gussie, on arrival, proved to be still showing traces of his grim experience. The face was pale, the eyes gooseberry-like, the ears drooping, and the whole aspect that of a man who has passed through the furnace and been caught in the machinery. (Wodehouse, 1934:35)

Arawareta Gussy ha, osorubeki taiken no konseki wo izen todometeiru yousu datta. Kao ha aojiroku, medama ha suguri no you. Mimi ha shiori, ka mado no mae wo kayottara, ro no naka ni hourikomarete shimatta otoko no shoujou wo subete sonaete ita.

現れたガッシーは、恐るべき体験の痕跡を依然とどめている様子だった。顔は青白く、目玉はスグリのよう。耳は萎れ、かまどの前を通ったら、炉の中に放り込まれてしまった男の症状をすべて備えていた。(Morimura, 2005:58)

[T5]

"Jeeves," I said, and I am free to admit that in my emotion I bleated like a lamb drawing itself to the attention of the parent sheep, "what the dickens is all this?"

(Wodehouse, 1934:91)

"Jeeves" boku ha itta. Boku ha oya hitsuji no chuui wo hikou to kunkun naku ko-hitsuji ni natta you na kibun datta. "Ittai zentai dou shitan da?"

「ジーヴス」僕は言った。僕は親ヒツジの注意を引こうとクンクン鳴く仔ヒツジになったような気分だった。「一体全体どうしたんだ？」(Morimura, 2005:153)

[T6]

I eyed him narrowly. I didn't like his looks. Mark you, I don't say I ever had, much, because Nature, when planning this sterling fellow, shoved in a lot more lower jaw than was absolutely necessary and made the eyes a bit too ken and piercing for one who was neither an Empire builder nor a traffic policeman. (Wodehouse, 1934:151)

Boku ha yatto no omoide yatsu wo mita. Yatsu no kao tsuki ha iya datta. Kūte itadakitai. Ima made datta boku ha yatsu no kao ga daisuki datta wake de ha nai. Naze nara dai shizen ga kono rippa na otoko no sekkeizu wo kaita sai, zetsutaiteki ni hitsuyou na bun yori mo haruka zutto kahou ni shita ago no ichi wo oki, teikoku no kensetsu-sha de mo nakereba koutsuu keikan de mo nai jinbutsu ni shite ha sukoshi bakari ei sugiru, hito wo inuku youna gankou wo koitsu ni ataeta kara de aru.

僕はやっとの思いで奴を見た。奴の顔つきは嫌だった。聞いていただきたい。今までだった僕は奴の顔が大好きだったわけではない。なぜなら大自然がこの立派な男の設計図を描いた際、絶対的に必要な分よりもはるかずっと下方に下あごの位置を置き、帝国の建設者でもなければ交通警官でもない人物にしては少しばかり鋭すぎる、人を射抜くような眼光をこいつに与えたからである。

(Morimura, 2005:258)

[T7] *Literal*

She cried in a voice that hit me between the eyebrows and went out at the back of my head. (Wodehouse, 1934:25)

Kanojo ha boku no miken ni tsukisasatte koutoubu ni tsukinukeru you na koe de sakenda.

彼女は僕の眉間に突き刺さって後頭部に突き抜けるような声で叫んだ。(Morimura, 2005:42)

Wodehouse Sundry

[T8] *Literal*

Jeeves lugged my purple socks out of the drawer as if he were a vegetarian fishing a caterpillar out of his salad. (Wodehouse, 1923:51)

Kare ha, marude saishoku shugi-sha ga sarada ni kuttsuita aomushi wo tsumami dasu you na yousu de hikidashi kara kutsushita wo toridashita.

彼は、まるで菜食主義者がサラダにくっついた青虫をつまみ出すような様子で引き出しから靴下を取り出した。(Morimura, 2005:105)

[T9] *Literal*

And as for Gussie Fink-Nottle, many an experienced undertaker would have been deceived by his appearance and started embalming him on sight. (Wodehouse, 1934:66)

Sore de Gussie Fink Nottle ha to iu to, jukuren wo tsunda sougiya demo ichimoku de shitai to machigaete boufu shori wo hajime sou na ikio datta.

れでガッシイー フィンク ノトルはというと、熟練を積んだ葬儀屋でも一目で死体と間違えて防腐処理を始めそうな勢いだった。(Morimura, 2005:112)

7.2 Appendix B: Amazon.co.jp Customer Reviews

3.0 out of 5 stars 執事コメディー, 2006/12/11

By

[吉右エ門 "吉右エ門"](#) (京都府) - [See all my reviews](#)

レビュー対象商品: よしきた、ジーヴス (ウッドハウス・コレクション) (単行本)

英国貴族のパーティーと執事のジーヴスに、今回も難問珍事が雪崩式に...

前回は短篇集でしたが、これは長篇です。

お人良しのパーティーのもとに、たくさんの相談者が訪れます。

ただし、本当の目的はジーヴスの明晰な頭脳。

それにふて腐れるパーティー。

一方、いつもはすすんでアドバイスをするジーヴスも今回は冷たいです。

なぜなら、パーティーが趣味の悪い(ジーヴスにとって)服を買ってきて、着ようとするからですw

好きな物を着る！そして相談は自分が解決するんだ！

と鼻息の荒いパーティーですが、動けば動くほどやっかいなことになり、考えは全て裏目に出て、自体は悪くなるばかり...

ジーヴスの腹黒さに笑わせてもらいましたw

毎度のことながら、鮮やかにパーティーをやりこめてしまう敏腕執事・・・一人欲しいもんですw

4.0 out of 5 stars ジーブスものは短編も長編も味わい深い。 , 2005/8/2

By

[natsuki](#) - [See all my reviews](#)

レビュー対象商品: よしきた、ジークス (ウッドハウス・コレクション) (単行本)

国書刊行会のウッドハウスコレクション第2弾。

「比類なきジークス」は短編集を編集したものであったがこちらは長編となっている。前作と同様、ジークスの機知とそれに対するパーティーの意地の張り方が笑いを誘う。今回ジークスの不興の原因はパーティーの白いジャケットであり、それ故パーティーは叔母の屋敷で巻き起こる金銭問題や恋愛騒動を自分で解決しようと奮闘した結果、ますます事態の混乱を招いてしまうことになる。

最後にはジークスが見事に事態を収めるのであるが、じっくりと作品と取り組みたい人には前作の短編集よりこちらの方がおすすめできるように思う。

長編ゆえに所々中だるみがあるのはいたしかたないが、それでも

「上質のユーモア」を十分堪能できる一冊である。

4.0 out of 5 stars はやくジークスにまかせちゃえ、と何度も言ってしまいました, 2009/1/12

By

[九月](#) - [See all my reviews](#)

レビュー対象商品: よしきた、ジークス (ウッドハウス・コレクション) (単行本)

有能で、問題をたちどころに解決する執事・ジークスとものごとをひっかきまわすおぼっちゃま・パーティー。ウッドハウスの名コンビが活躍するヒューモアの、長編。

パーティーの白いジャケットをめぐって、ちょっと対立状態のパーティーとジークス。

そんなときに訪れたパーティーの友人・フィンク＝ノトルがパーティーではなくジークスに相談事を持ちかけたから、パーティーはご機嫌ななめ。叔母の娘の婚約問題もいっしょに、自分が解決しようとするけれど事態はますます混乱するばかりで。

短編ではさくさくジークスが解決するお話が、意地をはるパーティーがジークスに解決させず、自分が手を出すため混乱に混乱をよぶ事態に。あちらこちらから引用されるセリフは、パーティーが教養ある人物と示しているけど実際の問題についての手腕は、逆の意味ですごい。ちょっと冗長な感じはありますが、やっぱり面白かったです。

5.0 out of 5 stars よしきたホーだ, 2006/7/25

By

[cranston](#) - [See all my reviews](#)

レビュー対象商品: よしきた、ジーヴス (ウッドハウス・コレクション) (単行本)

「ヤッホー」と挨拶し、「よしきたホーだ、ジーヴス」と気合を入れるご主人様パーティーと、あくまで三歩下がってご主人様を敬いつつ、実はうまく手綱を握っている執事ジーヴスのコンビが魅力的なシリーズ。

仲たがいした恋人に夕食を抜いてみたらいいと真面目に提案したり、それを真面目に受け取って実行した結果余計事態が悪化したりと、言ったらとてもくだらないことを真剣にやっているところが楽しいです。

会話が漫才のように軽妙なので、トントントンと物事が進んで一気に読み終えてしまう感じ。

読んだあと心に残る類ではありませんが、楽しい読み物としては最高でした。

イギリスの社交界への皮肉がエッセンスのように効いていて、つい噴出してしまうような箇所もちらほら。

翻訳物にありがちな違和感もなくよかったですのですが、このテンポのいい会話は原文ではどうなっているのか、原書を読みたいなあと思いました。

5.0 out of 5 stars よしきた、ジーヴス, 2005/10/26

By

["sherifen"](#) - [See all my reviews](#)

レビュー対象商品: よしきた、ジーヴス (ウッドハウス・コレクション) (単行本)

紳士のための紳士、決して執事ではありません。誇りが高い代わり、自分の仕事は十二分にする、プロ中のプロです。若主人を助けながら、「私も少し・・・」とちゃんと自分の利益も忘れない。「大英帝国が輝いております」の世界は最高に面白い。