

**ARE REVIEWERS IN THE ENGLISH-
SPEAKING WORLD IGNORING THE
WORK OF TRANSLATORS?
A CASE STUDY OF TRANSLATIONS OF
HARUKI MURAKAMI'S WORK**

Anthony Tobin

Abstract

This paper examines the concept of translator 'invisibility' within reviews of translated literature. I explore the reasons for this invisibility as set out by Lawrence Venuti, and I investigate the tendency of translators to adopt a 'domesticating' strategy in order to make translated works read as though they are the originals. The influence of editors and publishers on translator invisibility is also taken into account. I shall then explain how adopting a domesticating strategy may result in translators being underpaid, and leaving readers with a false impression of the country being depicted in the literary work. The alternative to adopting a domesticating strategy, a 'foreignizing' strategy, is also examined. In the case study, I will analyse reviews of several of Haruki Murakami's novels to see to what extent reviewers in the English-speaking world acknowledge or ignore the work of the translators of these novels. I conclude by suggesting that many of the reviews ignore the work of the translators, but that when attention is drawn to the fact that a novel is a

ARE REVIEWERS IN THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD IGNORING THE
WORK OF TRANSLATORS? A CASE STUDY OF TRANSLATIONS OF HARUKI
MURAKAMI'S WORK (Anthony Tobin)

translation, there is a tendency by the reviewer to mention the translator or the fact that the novel is a translation.

**ARE REVIEWERS IN THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD IGNORING
THE WORK OF TRANSLATORS?
A CASE STUDY OF TRANSLATIONS OF HARUKI MURAKAMI'S
WORK**

ARE REVIEWERS IGNORING TRANSLATORS?

The American scholar of Translation Studies, Lawrence Venuti tells us that translators are rarely mentioned in reviews and when they are, the usual mention is no more than a brief aside in which the reviewer talks about how transparent the translation is (Venuti 1995). Venuti also mentions the work of Ronald Christ (1984 cited in Venuti 1995 p8), who on examining reviews of translated literature found that many newspapers, such as the *Los Angeles Times*, did not even list translators in headnotes to reviews and often did not bother to mention that a book was a translation. Venuti also points out that reviewers who are themselves writers or poets are capable of glaring omissions when reviewing translated work. He gives the example of the American novelist John Updike who upon reviewing two foreign novels for the *New Yorker* in 1981 hardly acknowledged the work of the translators. In the lengthy review of Italo Calvino's *If On a Winter's Night a Traveller* and Günter Grass's *The Meeting at Telgte*, only the slightest mention was made of the translators, with their names appearing in brackets after the first mention of the English-language titles (Venuti 1995).

In her article on the reception of Dutch literature which has been

translated into English, Vanderauwera notes that in reviews the fact that a book is a translation is sometimes not even mentioned (Vanderauwera 1985 p 202). Is this through ignorance on behalf of reviewers or is there, perhaps, a deeper reason for this lack of acknowledgement of translators? Could it be that translators have only themselves to blame for their lack of 'visibility' in reviews.

TRANSLATOR INVISIBILITY

Venuti points to 'invisibility', as being the main reason for the translator's diminished position in contemporary Anglo-American culture and hence the reason for translators being ignored in reviews. Behind 'invisibility' he identifies two mutually determining phenomena:

One is an illusionistic effect of discourse, of the translator's own manipulation of English; the other is the practice of reading and evaluating translations that has long prevailed in the United Kingdom and the United States, among other cultures, both English and foreign language (Venuti 1995 p1).

Most publishers, reviewers and readers only accept a translated text when it reads fluently without any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities adding to the feeling of transparency and that it looks like an 'original' with all the writer's personality included (ibid.p1). When a text reads like an 'original' it is understandable that a reader may not realise they are reading a translation, but surely a reviewer should not overlook such an important point. There are two strategies connected with the concepts of translator 'invisibility' and 'visibility; these are 'domesticating' and 'foreignizing' strategies.

ARE REVIEWERS IN THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD IGNORING THE
WORK OF TRANSLATORS? A CASE STUDY OF TRANSLATIONS OF HARUKI
MURAKAMI'S WORK (Anthony Tobin)

TRANSLATORS ADOPTING A DOMESTICATING STRATEGY

In the introduction to *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*, Venuti quotes a translator:

“When a translation is reviewed,” says the Italian translator William Weaver, and “a reviewer neglects to mention the translator at all, the translator should take this omission as a compliment: it means that the reviewer simply wasn’t aware that the book had been written originally in another language. For a translator this kind of anonymity can be a real achievement” (cited in Venuti 1992 p4).

This is certainly not a statement with which Venuti would agree, but for many translators making a translation readable and transparent is the goal. They wish to create fluent translations by adopting a strategy of, what Venuti terms, ‘domestication’, whereby the more fluent a translation is, the more ‘invisible’ the translator becomes (Venuti 1995).

Under the regime of fluent translating, the translator works to make his or her work ‘invisible’ producing the illusory effect of transparency that simultaneously masks its status as an illusion: the translated text seems ‘natural’, i.e., not translated (Venuti 1995 p5).

Eugene Nida, the translation consultant to the American Bible Society and influential theorist in Translation Studies, favoured, what he called, ‘dynamic equivalence’. He defined this in terms of :

The degree to which the receptors of the message in the receptor

language respond to it in substantially the same manner as the receptor in the source language. This response can never be identical, for the cultural and historical settings are too different, but there should be a high degree of equivalence of response, or the translation will have failed to accomplish its purpose (Nida 1982 p24).

Nida aims for a fluent strategy and Venuti (1995) argues that this involves 'domestication'. In 1964 Nida wrote:

A translation of dynamic equivalence aims at complete naturalness of expression and tries to relate the receptor modes of behaviour relevant within the context of his own culture (cited in Venuti 1995 p21).

Venuti points towards Nida's expression, 'naturalness of expression' as particular evidence that dynamic equivalence means domestication.

If a translated literary text reads much like any literary text written originally in English, with all the idioms and nuances you would expect to find in such a text, and without the feeling that you are reading something overtly 'foreign', then we can assume that a translator has striven to create a text which reads fluently without making the task of reading it difficult for the reader. He has, in other words, adopted a domesticating strategy. The German theologian and philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher argued that the translator had two choices when creating a translation:

Either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him; or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author towards him (cited in Venuti

ARE REVIEWERS IN THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD IGNORING THE
WORK OF TRANSLATORS? A CASE STUDY OF TRANSLATIONS OF HARUKI
MURAKAMI'S WORK (Anthony Tobin)

1995 p19).

When domesticating a text the latter strategy is chosen.

We will now look at some of the translations of the Japanese author Haruki Murakami's work to see to what extent his novels have been domesticated. Murakami's English translations are generally very readable and, in terms of language, do not present much of a challenge. In Murakami's *Norwegian Wood* (2000a), translated by Jay Rubin, the dialogue is written in idiomatic, natural, and, for the most part, Americanised English. One character says of herself, "And I was cute, too. Not as cute as Naoko, but pretty damn cute" (Murakami 2000a p153). The text has not been domesticated to the point of changing the name of 'Naoko' to a more western name, but the text would not look out of place in any American novel. Phrases such as "I guess not" (ibid. p140), "so far so good, right" (ibid. p159), "I guess he's a lot sicker in the head than I am" (ibid. p145), all add to a feeling that the characters inhabit a very American Japan. If anything *Kafka on the Shore*, translated by Philip Gabriel, feels even more American. Phrases such as, "where're you headed?" (Murakami 2005 p 23), "we can go out for a bite or whatever" (ibid. p 39), "why the hell don't you beat it, Grandad?" (ibid. p253) all point towards domestication.

INFLUENCE OF EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS

It is obvious that editors and publishers want to produce translations that people will want to read and, more importantly, purchase. Translation of literature which displays its foreign origins may well be popular when a literature is in a phase of expanding and including, when it is likely to be on

the look out for new influences (Gaddis Rose 1997). However, this is hardly the case with English literature. In the English speaking world translated works which sound too foreign may not prove to be big sellers.

The marketplace or the patronage system, which can include state censorship, publishing economics and dominant mores, will influence the tolerable degree of strangeness. If a translation sounds too strange, it may not be accepted (*ibid.* p28).

Editors tend to prefer natural idioms and often proper names are the only feature which betrays the fact that a novel is of foreign origin. Gaddis Rose wrote how she served on the committee of the MLA Translation competition from 1994 to 1997 and how in 1994 all the novels submitted by one particular publisher read as if they had been written by the same author regardless of the language of origin (*ibid.* p29). Jeremy Munday conducted interviews with publishers and confirmed that editors were often not fluent in the language of the literature being translated and that producing translations which 'read well' was their main concern (cited in Munday 2001 p154).

Demanding translators to write fluent translations is not the only way in which editors and publishers have enforced a domesticating strategy. The very books which editors and publishers choose to have published also add to the invisibility of the translator.

An illusionism produced by fluent translating, the translator's invisibility at once acts and masks an insidious domestication of foreign texts, rewriting them in the transparent discourse that prevails in English and that selects precisely those foreign texts amenable to

ARE REVIEWERS IN THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD IGNORING THE
WORK OF TRANSLATORS? A CASE STUDY OF TRANSLATIONS OF HARUKI
MURAKAMI'S WORK (Anthony Tobin)

fluent translating (Venuti 1995 p17).

By choosing foreign texts which lend themselves to translation, publishers are pushing the role of the translator further into the background. Foreign texts are also selected by publishers for reasons other than their ease of translation. For publishers it is easy to:

... play to the gallery by translating and promoting works that fit assumed demand and taste at the target pole, thus neutralising aesthetic as well as commercial objections (Vanderauwera 1985 p209).

Publishers seek out foreign works which will fit in with what is already popular in English literature, avoiding risks, and trying to cash in on what they forecast will be a profitable translation.

Every step in the translation process – from the selection of foreign texts to the implementation of translation strategies to the editing, reviewing, and reading of translations – is mediated by the diverse cultural values that circulate in the target language, always in some hierarchical order (Venuti 1995 p308).

It seems no matter how successful a novel may be in, say, Japan, France, Russia, or anywhere else in the world, if it does not fit in with what is popular among English-speaking readers, it is unlikely to be translated into English.

In the case of Haruki Murakami, he was already a household name in Japan before making it big in the broader world. He was so successful, in fact, that he chose to leave Japan after *Norwegian Wood* became such a phenomenal

success. As Jay Rubin wrote in the translator's note of *Norwegian Wood*:

Fame was one thing, superstardom another, and the craziness of it sent him back to the anonymity of Europe (Rubin 2000 p387).

Murakami's publishers in the English-speaking world, and indeed in the French-speaking world, Chinese-speaking world and so on, seized upon an author who was already a success in his own country and who they believed could be an international success, too. Murakami recently had four of his books which had been translated into English among the top five-thousand ranking books in terms of sales on amazon.com. In a 2008 interview published in *Japan Today*, an English news and entertainment website which caters mainly to English speakers living in Japan, Murakami said:

Two-thirds of the work done by people at my office is now about dealing with foreign publishers (cited in Koyama 2008).

The reporter also said that Murakami earns more from books sold abroad than from books sold in Japan, where almost all the books he publishes become bestsellers (ibid.).

Of course, it is not easy to say exactly why Murakami is such a hugely successful author in the English-speaking world, but, as we have already seen, a domesticating strategy helps to make his novels more readable. But has the publishing world also selected his work because it lends itself to fluent translation? This certainly seems very possible as Murakami himself has said the following:

ARE REVIEWERS IN THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD IGNORING THE
WORK OF TRANSLATORS? A CASE STUDY OF TRANSLATIONS OF HARUKI
MURAKAMI'S WORK (Anthony Tobin)

My writing style rarely depends on the character of the Japanese language. So I think what is lost in the process of translation is relatively little (ibid.).

The characters in Murakami's novels do seem extremely westernised. The reference points in his novels are nearly all western and Japanese traditional and indeed pop culture is largely absent. The characters in *Sputnik Sweetheart* read Joseph Conrad novels (Murakami 2001 p90), listen to Mark Bolan (ibid. p47) and watch *From Russia with Love* (ibid. p147). The very title of Murakami's *Norwegian Wood* comes from a Beatles song (Murakami 2000a). One of the characters in *Norwegian Wood* enjoys reading the works of Truman Capote, John Updike, F. Scott Fitzgerald and Raymond Chandler (ibid. p37).

In *Kafka on the Shore* the protagonist, who is named after the Czech writer, listens to music by western artists such as Radiohead (Murakami 2005 p76) and Prince (ibid. p 181). There are also characters named after western brands such as Johnnie Walker (ibid. 165) and Colonel Sanders of Kentucky Fried Chicken fame (ibid. p355). All of these references make it easier for Murakami's English-speaking audience to identify with his characters; they feel included, and not alienated, despite reading books which come from a culture which is actually very different to their own.

IMPLICATIONS OF DOMESTICATION

As we have already seen, adopting a domesticating strategy, or indeed being forced to adopt such a strategy, can lead to reviewers ignoring the work of translators. But besides affecting the vanity of translators, are there any

other implications for translators when they are being made 'invisible'? Venuti argues that by adopting a fluent strategy, translators are doing themselves no favours economically.

A fluent strategy aims to efface the translator's crucial intervention in the foreign text: he or she actively rewrites it in a different language to circulate in a different culture, but this very process results in a self-annihilation, ultimately contributing to the cultural marginality and economic exploitation which translators suffer today (Venuti 1992 p4).

Venuti also mentions that according to British and American law translation is defined as:

... an 'adaptation' or 'derivative work' based on an 'original work of authorship,' whose copyright, including the exclusive right 'to prepare derivative works' or 'adaptations,' is vested in the 'author' (Venuti 1995 p8).

This all adds up to translators of literary works being paid per amount of words per page, and not receiving any royalties. It seems incredibly unfair that a best selling writer, who has the translator to thank for opening his or her work to a new market, should not share the spoils.

The cultures of some English-speaking countries are also negatively affected by the prevalence of a fluent domesticating strategy for translating literature. Venuti points towards the cultures of the UK and US which have become:

ARE REVIEWERS IN THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD IGNORING THE
WORK OF TRANSLATORS? A CASE STUDY OF TRANSLATIONS OF HARUKI
MURAKAMI'S WORK (Anthony Tobin)

... aggressively monolingual, unreceptive to the foreign, accustomed to fluent translations that invisibly inscribe foreign texts with English-language values and provide readers with the narcissistic experience of recognizing their own culture in a cultural other (Venuti 1995 p15).

Readers are not truly being opened up to a foreign culture when reading a translation which has been domesticated, rather they are seeing a version of the culture which is probably closer to their own than the very culture that is supposedly being represented.

There are also serious implications associated with the form of domesticating which seeks out works from foreign cultures which fit the domestic canon for foreign literature. This may mean publishers choosing to translate foreign literature which uses styles or themes which are also common in current English literature, or it may mean choosing texts which fit the common stereotypes of the culture being represented. Venuti gives the example of how, until very recently, a great many of the Japanese novels and story collections being translated into English showed a very traditional Japan and were not at all representative of the majority of books being published in Japan (Venuti 1998). Edward Fowler said that Japan was represented as:

An exoticized, aestheticized, and quintessentially foreign land quite antithetical to its prewar image of a bellicose and imminently threatening power (Fowler 1992 cited in Venuti 1998 p72).

Perhaps this accounts for the perception among many westerners to this day that all Japanese people wear kimonos and live in quaint wooden houses. Of course, this is all a far cry from the Japan represented in Haruki

Murakami's novels and short stories. However, Venuti reminds us that if this new wave of translated fiction from Japan, which includes writers such as Murakami and Banana Yoshimoto, "brings about an enduring canon reformation, it too may harden into a cultural stereotype of Japan" (Venuti 1998 p75). Thus, perhaps in ten or twenty years from now the prevailing stereotype of Japan may be that of a highly Americanised society.

FOREIGNIZATION

The alternative to writing a translation which reads fluently and aims to pass for a text originally written in English is to adopt a 'foreignizing' or, as Venuti also refers to it, a 'resistant' strategy. It is, to quote Schleiermacher once more, when "the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him" (Venuti 1995 p19). For the translator this can mean either choosing a marginal discourse to translate the text, or choosing to translate a foreign text which is not included in domestic literary canons (ibid. p20). A translation of a text which differs from the contemporary canon of foreign literature can challenge existing stereotypes towards a particular culture and bring fresh perspectives to readers.

Choosing a marginal discourse is to translate a text in such a way as to show that the text is a translation. It should sound alien and show the linguistic and cultural differences which exist in a foreign text (ibid. p23).

Contemporary translators of literary texts can introduce discursive variations, experimenting with archaism, slang, literary allusion and convention to call attention to the secondary status of the translation and signal the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text

ARE REVIEWERS IN THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD IGNORING THE
WORK OF TRANSLATORS? A CASE STUDY OF TRANSLATIONS OF HARUKI
MURAKAMI'S WORK (Anthony Tobin)

(ibid. 1995 p311).

Readers are brought out of their comfort zone, challenged and faced with the foreign, albeit through their own language. According to Antoine Berman the ethical aim of translation is to receive “the Foreign as Foreign” (Berman 2000 p285).

By avoiding fluency in translation and going for a strategy which shows the foreignness of a text, translators are able to make their own work more visible. By doing this, perhaps reviewers will take note and include more than just a passing mention of the translator in reviews of translated literature. Translators may also be able to benefit economically from adopting foreignizing strategies:

Such strategies can help to make the translator's work visible, inviting a critical appreciation of its cultural political function and a re-examination of the inferior status it is currently assigned in law, in publishing, in education (Venuti 1992 p13).

Although Murakami's work is translated with a fluent strategy, which points towards a domesticating strategy being used, it should not be ignored that there are elements of a foreignizing strategy also evident in some of his translations. In the English version of *Norwegian Wood* the chapter numbers are written in Japanese; thus Chapter 1 is written as 第1章. Obviously most readers will not be able to read the characters but the meaning should be understood from the context and readers are reminded that they are reading a translation of a Japanese novel. The presence of a translator's note by Jay Rubin at the back of the book also shows the book's foreign origins. However,

apart from these two factors, and the use of Japanese proper nouns in the novel, *Norwegian Wood* reads like it could have been set anywhere in the Western world. In *Kafka on the Shore*, while the two factors which give away the foreign elements of *Norwegian Wood* are missing, the translator does keep certain uniquely Japanese elements in Romanised Japanese. The Japanese styles of poetry, *tanka* and *haiku* (Murakami 2005 p 450), are written in italics, as is *udon*, a type of Japanese noodle (ibid. p70). These are what Snell-Hornby refers to as culture-bound elements (Snell-Hornby 1995 p107).

CASE STUDY

This case study investigates whether the domesticating fluent strategy used, making the translator largely ‘invisible’ in the text, in Murakami’s translations has actually led to translators being ignored and thus being made ‘invisible’ in reviews, and also whether anything is said about the translations themselves. The twenty-five reviews are from the online pages of newspapers and magazines from across the English-speaking world. However, the majority of reviews are from British and American publications as it was rather difficult to find many reviews from other English-speaking countries. The reviews consist of the English translations of the three Murakami novels which I have read: *Norwegian Wood* (2000a), *Kafka on the Shore* (2005), and *Sputnik Sweetheart* (2001), as well as *IQ84*, the latest of Murakami’s novels to be translated into English.

Norwegian Wood

The first reviews investigated were those of *Norwegian Wood*. In *The New York Times*’ review the translator’s name, Jay Rubin, is written under that of the author’s in a caption to the right of the article. The reviewer not

ARE REVIEWERS IN THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD IGNORING THE
WORK OF TRANSLATORS? A CASE STUDY OF TRANSLATIONS OF HARUKI
MURAKAMI'S WORK (Anthony Tobin)

only praises the work of Murakami but also that of the translator, too:

Jay Rubin's superb translation is the first English edition authorised for publication outside Japan (Nimura 2000).

The Times of London shows the translator's name next to Murakami's on the headnote of the article and the reviewer talks about how the novel had previously been translated for Japanese students of English by Alfred Birnbaum, but how Jay Rubin's translation was the first official translation for the international market. The translator's note is also mentioned when the reviewer talks of Murakami's attitude towards the novel (Quinn 2000).

In the UK's *The Guardian*, *Norwegian Wood* is reviewed along with one other Murakami title; *Underground* (Murakami 2000b). The translators' names for both books are listed along with the author's under the books' titles on the headnote. The reviewer mentions that this is the first English translation of *Norwegian Wood* aimed at a Western audience, despite having been first published in Japan thirteen years earlier (Poole 2000). *The Village Voice* of New York does not list the translator's name, but does say there is "frustration over the sporadic publication of his work in English" (Handler 2000). No mention is made of the act of translation or translator and this is the first case where we can say the translator is completely 'invisible'.

Kafka on the Shore

The next reviews to be investigated were those for *Kafka on the Shore*. In *The Times*' review, unlike the review for *Norwegian Wood*, the translator's name is omitted from the top of the article. The reviewer says of Murakami (and not the translator): "He writes in a style more American than that of

many American writers” (Hill 2005). This points towards a very successful domesticating strategy. However, the translator is not entirely invisible as the reviewer does mention him in the last paragraph:

Philip Gabriel’s translation is carefully done and Murakami’s prose is all the richer – and pleasantly weirder – for the translator’s fidelity to it (Hill 2005).

John Updike (2005) reviewed *Kafka on the Shore* for *The New Yorker*. Similarly to the review from 1981 which Venuti (1995) mentioned, this review was also very lengthy and only the merest mention of the translator was given. Philip Gabriel’s name was listed in a caption which showed the book’s cover, the author’s name, publisher and price in a caption on the left, and the translator’s name also appeared in brackets in the first paragraph along with the publisher and price. No further mention of translator or translation is given, and clearly Updike and *The New Yorker* had not changed their policy towards reviewing translations in the twenty-four year period.

The New York Times’ review also makes only the most fleeting mention of the translator in their review of *Kafka on the Shore*; Philip Gabriel’s name appears in a caption on the left with the novel’s name, author and publisher. The reviewer praises Murakami’s use of metaphors:

Murakami can turn a pretty metaphor when he chooses – headlights that ‘lick’ the tree trunks lining a dark road, the ‘whooshing moan of air’ from a passing truck ‘like somebody’s soul is being yanked out’ (Miller 2005).

ARE REVIEWERS IN THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD IGNORING THE
WORK OF TRANSLATORS? A CASE STUDY OF TRANSLATIONS OF HARUKI
MURAKAMI'S WORK (Anthony Tobin)

Miller goes on to criticise Murakami's use of clichés, but nowhere is the translator mentioned in this praise or criticism. Surely the translator should be acknowledged or criticised for bringing such metaphors and clichés to life in the English language. The translator really does seem to be invisible in the body of this review. Tim Adams of the UK's *The Observer* (2005) continues this trend of ignoring the translator in his review. The translator's name does appear next to Murakami's at the top of the page but no mention of translator or translation is mentioned in the body of the review. The translator is well and truly invisible in *The Village Voice* review of *Kafka on the Shore*. Nowhere does the reviewer, Paul Lafarge (2005), make any mention of translator or translation. *The Boston Globe* (Wittes Schlack 2005) seems equally oblivious to the fact that someone had to translate the novel from Japanese. The translator's name does not appear anywhere on the page and no mention of translation is made in the review.

The Financial Times' review (Hunter-Tilney 2005) includes the translator's name next to Murakami's at the top of the article, but there is no mention of the translator or translation in the review itself. The reviewer praises Murakami's writing, singling out phrases such as "(a) bit like a parade that disappears down a street, then marches back on the same street towards you again" as a description of someone's face going blank and then reawakening. Once again, however, the reviewer has failed to mention the translator who brought this phrase to life in the English language.

The Guardian's David Mitchell, a very successful novelist himself, does the reviewer a little more justice by acknowledging that the novel is a translation in the review and also mentions the Americanisation of the translation:

The degree of Americanisation in the translation is rather sobering. Non-Americanophones may have to swallow “Jeez Louise!” under majority Rules, but surely literate North Americans can handle Japanese characters buying and thinking in their own currency rather than dollars and bucks, as here (Mitchell 2005).

Mitchell seems to be a reviewer who would be open to more foreignizing in translation and clearly does not like translations which domesticate too much.

Sputnik Sweetheart

The Guardian's review (Myerson 2001) of *Sputnik Sweetheart* includes the name of the translator next to Murakami's in the headnote, but no mention of the translator or translation is made in the text itself. Zoe Green of the UK's *The Observer* seems to have reservations about the domesticating strategy in *Sputnik Sweetheart*, as well as the cultural references:

Murakami omits direct Japanese cultural references – the friends listen to Bach, love Marc Bolan and discuss Kerouac which, combined with the American English translation, gives the novel a strange flavour (Green 2001).

The only mention of the translator's name is under the title next to the author's, but at least the reviewer has an opinion on the translation and not just the novel.

In the reviews for UK title *The New Statesman* (Loose 2001), New York's *The Village Voice* (Lim 2001), and *Salon* of the USA (Miller 2001) there

ARE REVIEWERS IN THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD IGNORING THE
WORK OF TRANSLATORS? A CASE STUDY OF TRANSLATIONS OF HARUKI
MURAKAMI'S WORK (Anthony Tobin)

is no mention whatsoever of the translator. The translator has been reduced to 'invisibility' in all three reviews. *The San Francisco Chronicle* does a little better by at least listing the translator's name next to Murakami's under the novel's name at the top of the page and mentioning previous "translations" (Lin 2001).

1Q84

Murakami's latest book to be translated into English is *1Q84*. This book was released as three separate volumes in Japan, but the English version was published in a single volume in the United States, and in Britain the novel was published in two volumes, with the translation work being shared by two translators; Jay Rubin and Philip Gabriel.

Writing for *The Guardian*, Steven Poole is once again tasked with reviewing Murakami's work and acknowledges the fact that two translators have made this English version a reality:

Murakami's translators Rubin and Gabriel, assigned a volume each to meet a rush publishing schedule, have also conspired successfully in producing an English version of limpid consistency (Poole 2011).

In *The Washington Post* review by Philip Dirda this unusual method of translation is also mentioned:

Murakami's novels have been translated into a score of languages, but it would be hard to imagine that any of them could be better than the English versions by Jay Rubin, partnered here with Philip Gabriel (Dirda 2011).

Boyd Tonkin of the UK's *The Independent* also brings attention to the fact that two translators were used:

The third part might strike many readers as an afterthought or anticlimax. Philip Gabriel takes over at the translator's wheel from Jay Rubin. Both do sterling work in keeping up with Murakami's lurching shifts of mood, tone and register, and no gears crash with the changeover.

In *The Sydney Morning Herald* review of *IQ84* the reviewer mentions in the text that Jay Rubin is the translator of books one and two as he writes about how Rubin commented that because of Murakami's fame there would be no paring back his prose in translation, but the other translator is not mentioned (Flynn 2011).

So far the translators have been quite visible in the reviews of *IQ84* and this trend continues with the UK's *The Telegraph*. This review also mentions that Murakami's translator said that he "can get away with anything" editorially speaking (Cummins 2011). The reviewer also compares this novel to works by other translated authors, Stieg Larsson and Roberto Bolaño.

In Canada's *National Post* the translators' names are listed in a headnote, but no mention is made of the translators within the text. However, the reviewer does acknowledge the fact that it is a translation in the following sentence:

IQ84 is the only of Murakami's translated works that's ever struck me as overwritten (Teodoro 2011).

ARE REVIEWERS IN THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD IGNORING THE
WORK OF TRANSLATORS? A CASE STUDY OF TRANSLATIONS OF HARUKI
MURAKAMI'S WORK (Anthony Tobin)

The New York Times review of *IQ84* by Janet Maslin made no mention of the translators or the translation, and there wasn't even a caption mentioning the translators' names. This was the only review of *IQ84* in which the translators were completely invisible.

CONCLUSION

From the reviews we can say that many, but by no means all, reviewers ignore the work of translators. In twelve of the twenty-five reviews absolutely no mention of the translator or the fact that the book is a translation is mentioned in the review – though in several of these cases the translator's name was listed in the headnote or a caption on the page. Reviewers from both the US and UK were guilty of ignoring the translator completely – there were too few reviews available from other English speaking countries to draw any conclusions.

It seemed common amongst British reviewers to be put off by the American English found in Murakami's translations. Perhaps if the language had been more neutral, or more British, the reviewers might not have had so much to say about the translation. The reviews of *Norwegian Wood* and *IQ84* had a higher rate of reviewers mentioning the translation. In five out of the seven reviews of *IQ84* the translators were mentioned explicitly and often praised, while only one review totally neglected to mention the fact that the novel was a translation. The case of *IQ84* is unusual in that two different translators were used for the translation of the three different volumes. This may have caught the attention of many of the reviewers and led them to conclude that it was worthy of inclusion in the reviews.

On the other hand, most of the reviews of *Sputnik Sweetheart* did not bring attention to the fact that the novel was a translation; in fact, four out of the six reviews do not mention anything about the translator or translation within the text of the review. This was also the case in the *Kafka on the Shore* reviews, where only two of the eight reviewers wrote about the translator or the translation.

In the case of *Norwegian Wood* three out of four of the reviews mentioned something about either the translation or the translator. Perhaps this was because of the translator's note and the inclusion of Japanese in chapter headings. Perhaps even introducing such a limited foreignizing strategy into otherwise fluent domesticated translations could add to awareness of translators among reviewers and readers.

REFERENCE LIST

Adams, T. 2005. Kafka on the Shore Review. *Observer* [Online]. Books section. 2 January 2005. Available from: <<http://books.guardian.co.uk/>>

Amazon. (Homepage). [Online]. Available from: <<http://amazon.com/>>

Berman, A. 2000. Translation and the Trials of the Foreign *IN*: Venuti, L (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London - New York: Routledge.

Cummins, A. 2011. 1Q84 Review. *The Telegraph* [Online]. Books section. 21 October 2011. Available from: <<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/>>

Dirda, M. 2011. 1Q84 Review. *Washington Post* [Online]. Books section. 19

ARE REVIEWERS IN THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD IGNORING THE
WORK OF TRANSLATORS? A CASE STUDY OF TRANSLATIONS OF HARUKI
MURAKAMI'S WORK (Anthony Tobin)

October 2011. Available from: <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/>>

Flynn, C. 2011. 1Q84 Review. *Sydney Morning Herald* [Online]. Books section.
29 October 2011. Available from: <<http://www.smh.com.au/>>

Gaddis Rose, M. 1997. *Translation and Literary Criticism: Translation as
Analysis*. Manchester. St. Jerome

Green, Z. 2001. Sputnik Sweetheart Review. *Observer* [Online]. Books section.
3 June 2001. Available from: <<http://books.guardian.co.uk/>>

Handler, D. 2000. Norwegian Wood Review. *Village Voice* [Online]. Books
section. 26 September 2000. Available from: <<http://www.villagevoice.com/>>

Hill, T. 2005. Kafka on the Shore Review. *The Times* [Online]. Books section.
1 January 2005. Available from: <<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/>>

Hunter-Tilney, L. 2005. Kafka on the Shore Review. *Financial Times* [Online].
Books section. 14 January 2005. Available from: <[http://www.ft.com/home/
europe](http://www.ft.com/home/europe)>

Koyama, T. 2008. Murakami sees story telling as common language. *Japan
Today* [Online]. Features section. 2008. Available from: <[http://www.
japantoday.com/](http://www.japantoday.com/)>

Lafarge, P. 2005. Kafka on the Shore Review. *Village Voice* [Online]. Books
section. 11 January 2005. Available from: <<http://www.villagevoice.com/>>

Lim, D. 2001. Sputnik Sweetheart Review. *Village Voice* [Online]. Books section. 5 June 2001. Available from: <<http://www.villagevoice.com/>>

Lin, F. 2001. Sputnik Sweetheart Review. *San Francisco Chronicle* [Online]. Books section. 29 April 2001. Available from: <<http://www.sfgate.com/>>

Loose, J. 2001. Sputnik Sweetheart Review. *New Statesman* [Online]. Books section. 4 June 2001. Available from: <<http://www.newstatesman.com/>>

Maslin, J. 2005. 1Q84 Review. *New York Times* [Online]. Books section. 9 November 2011. Available from: <<http://www.nytimes.com/>>

Miller, L. 2001. Sputnik Sweetheart Review. *Salon* [Online]. Books section. 19 April 2001. Available from: <<http://www.salon.com/>>

Miller, L. 2005. Kafka on the Shore Review. *New York Times* [Online]. Books section. 6 February 2005. Available from: <<http://www.nytimes.com/>>

Mitchell, D. 2005. Kafka on the Shore Review. *Guardian* [Online]. Books section. 8 January 2005. Available from: <<http://books.guardian.co.uk/>>

Munday, J. 2001. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. Abingdon - New York: Routledge

Murakami, H. 2000a. *Norwegian Wood*. London: Harvill

Murakami, H. 2000b. *Underground*. London: Harvill

ARE REVIEWERS IN THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD IGNORING THE
WORK OF TRANSLATORS? A CASE STUDY OF TRANSLATIONS OF HARUKI
MURAKAMI'S WORK (Anthony Tobin)

Murakami, H. 2001. *Sputnik Sweetheart*. London: Harvill

Murakami, H. 2005. *Kafka on the Shore*. London: Harvill

Murakami, H. 2011. *1Q84*. New York: Knopf

Myerson, J. 2001. Sputnik Sweetheart Review. *Guardian* [Online]. Books section. 26 May 2001. Available from: <<http://books.guardian.co.uk/>>

Nida, E. 1982. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill

Nimura, J. 2000. Norwegian Wood Review. *New York Times* [Online]. Books section. 24 September 2000. Available from: <<http://www.nytimes.com/>>

Poole, S. 2000. Norwegian Wood and Underground Review. *Guardian* [Online]. Books section. 27 May 2000. Available from: <<http://books.guardian.co.uk/>>

Poole, S. 2011. 1Q84 Review. *Guardian* [Online]. Books section. 18 October 2011. Available from: <<http://books.guardian.co.uk/>>

Quinn, P. 2000. Norwegian Wood Review. *The Times* [Online]. Books section. 2 June 2000. Available from: <<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/>>

Rubin, J. 2000. Translator's Note *IN*: Murakami, H. *Norwegian Wood*. London: Harvill

Snell-Hornby, M. 1995. *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. 2nd ed.

Amsterdam – Philadelphia: Benjamins

Teodoro, J. 2011. 1Q84 Review. *National Post* [Online]. Arts section. 28 October 2011. Available from: <<http://www.nationalpost.com/>>

Tonkin, B. 2011. 1Q84 Review. *Independent* [Online]. Books section. 21 October 2011. Available from: <<http://www.independent.co.uk/>>

Updike, J. 2005. Kafka on the Shore Review. *The New Yorker* [Online]. Books section. 24 January 2005. Available from: <<http://www.newyorker.com/>>

Vanderauwera, R. 1985. The Response to Translated Literature: A Sad Example IN Hermans, T (ed.) *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. London: Croom Helm

Venuti, L. 1992. *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. London - New York: Routledge

Venuti, L. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London - New York: Routledge

Venuti, L. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London – New York: Routledge

Wittes Schlack, J. 2005. Kafka on the Shore Review. *Boston Globe* [Online]. Living/Arts section. 17 January 2005. Available from: <<http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/>>