Translating Modern Japanese Literature

Translating Modern Japanese Literature

By

Richard Donovan

Translating Modern Japanese Literature

By Richard Donovan

For Jo, Peter, Sarah, Rosa, Sylvie, Mika and Milly

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The purposes of this book

I am trying to fulfil three perceived needs with this book. First, there is a need for in-depth and systematic treatment of the kinds of stylistic issues that arise for the translator of Japanese literature into English.[1] Second, I saw a place for a primer about the translation of the particular qualities of modern—as opposed to contemporary—Japanese literature.[2] Third, and perhaps most importantly, from a wider perspective, I am attempting to reconcile the roles of literary translator and linguist. On this point, Susan Bassnett's words are as relevant now as they were at the turn of the millennium:

> The need for systematic study of translation arises directly from the problems encountered during the actual translation process and it is as essential for those working in the field to bring their practical experience to theoretical discussion, as it is for increased theoretical perceptiveness to be put to use in the translation of texts. To divorce the theory from the practice, to set the scholar

---

[1] While Yoko Hasegawa's *The Routledge Course in Japanese Translation* (2012), the closest in terms of pedagogy in the field, considers a wide range of relevant issues, and is definitely of benefit to the student of literary translation, it uses only short excerpts from literary and pragmatic texts, and does not focus on style per se.

[2] The closest existing work is probably Giles Murray's *Exploring Japanese Literature* (2007), which provides parallel translations of Mishima, Tanizaki and Kawabata short stories, with commentary mainly confined to vocabulary issues. There is more (literary) commentary in the *Read Real Japanese* series (2008, ed. Janet Ashby and Michael Emmerich) and *New Penguin Parallel Text Short Stories in Japanese* (2011, ed. M. Emmerich), but both of these treat contemporary literature.

against the practitioner as has happened in other disciplines, would be tragic indeed. (2002, 16)

Natsume Sōseki, who features in Chapter 3, is a useful champion for such an approach, since his literary output was informed by his own theories of fiction—and indeed represented the considered practice of his theoretical "project" (Bourdaghs, Ueda & Murphy 2010, 6–35). His essay on Kyoto is thus an exemplar of the application of such a self-aware literary mindset to one's own writing, a philosophy that is readily applicable to the work of a literary translator, whatever the language.

Selection criteria for the literature in this book

I am taking 'modern Japanese literature' to encompass the period stretching from the beginning of the Meiji era (1868) to the end of World War II. The four pieces translated and analysed in this book cover only a small part of this period, concentrated coincidentally as they are in the late-Meiji and early-Taishō periods—that is, in the early decades of the twentieth century. Yet as you progress from one piece to the next, you will likely sense the inexorable transition to a new era of modernisation. I have chosen the works based on the following criteria: level of difficulty, length, subject matter, author, and the prevalence of literary devices.

Meiji-era writing has a reputation for impenetrability, partly due to the density of difficult kanji, so I have been careful first to select works that are accessible to a student of Japanese with fairly advanced reading skills (preferably NLPT1). While all the stories feature older kanji, obscure characters have furigana readings that allow one to read or look them up without great difficulty. (The furigana is as it appeared in the original story.) Furthermore, some obsolete kanji have been converted to their modern-day kana versions.

The first story, "Tani", differs from the other works in that it has been left with its Meiji-era kana orthography intact, which will initially seem odd to those unfamiliar with such older sound

values, but all such kana have been glossed with their modern forms in the margin. Apart from kanji readings, only Sōseki's essay "Kyō ni tsukeru yūbe" presents any sustained challenges in terms of antiquated grammatical structures such as verb endings and particles, as well as complex clausal sequences. But I urge you to stick with Sōseki on his journey across Kyoto: you will likely find that the irrepressible momentum of most of his sentences will carry you through to the point where you become aware that many of his expressions—and the notions they represent—are surprisingly contemporary, moving, and often funny.

Note that all original texts come from the open-access online repository 青空文庫 *Aozora Bunkō*. Students who wish to look up a kanji electronically can thus refer to the online version of each text at aozora.gr.jp. There are thousands more out-of-copyright works accessible there, some with archaic kana/kanji orthography, and some in modernised forms, as indicated.

This raises a further reason for my choice of the pieces of this collection: the fact that, though all but one are by famous authors, none of them to my knowledge has been published in English before. There is a wealth of interesting stories and essays just sitting there waiting for translators to discover them.

Style in literary translation

What is literary style? Is it a set of verbal idiosyncrasies attributable to given authors at a certain point in their career? Is it entirely reduceable to Strunk & White's ever-popular *Elements of Style* (originally published in 1918) or its source-language equivalent? Furthermore, how granular is it: if style amounts to diction (choice of words), does it reside in a particular phrase, sentence, paragraph, or entire text? And, indeed, if the grammatical and lexical features of a language are the kernels from which its literary features flower, can we extend talk of 'style' out to an entire language and its practitioners?

Since style is such a fraught, and freighted, term, I shall confine the discussion to clearly identifiable textual features that are seen as complementing the content of the story. When I talk about literary style and, more generally, literary stylistics in this book, I choose not to address the specifics of authorial 'style' so much as the features of a given text—in other words, I start from the words on the page, identifying what stylistic features they appear to manifest, and then considering analogous or complementary features in the target text, rather than starting by describing what critics have discerned as a given author's stylistic qualities, locating them in the source text (ST), and then trying to find equivalents in the target text (TT), or translation. While it has its own caveats, a text-driven approach is one way to avoid some of the vexed issues outlined further below.

Given my focus on style-in-the-text, the most useful definition of style for our purposes may be David Crystal's in his *Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*: "the (conscious or unconscious) selection of a set of linguistic features from all the possibilities in a language" (1987, 66). This definition raises three germane considerations: (1) style is a (paradigmatic and syntagmatic[3]) selection of linguistic features to form a set of such features; (2) this selection is a conscious or unconscious process (meaning the author is either deliberately choosing stylistic elements or assembling them without being fully aware of doing so); and (3) the linguistic possibilities of a given language delimit potential style selections—that is, a language's lexis and grammar (what *can* or *cannot* be used in an utterance, and the form that the utterance can or cannot take) shape its conventions and devices (what *should* or *can most efficaciously* be used). These considerations apply whether the writer is the source-text writer (the original author) or the target-text re-writer (the translator).

---

[3] Saussure introduced the terms *paradigm* and *syntagm* in the linguistic context (1916, 22). 'Paradigm' refers to individual lexical selections, 'syntagm' to the combination of such items to form concatenation. We produce language through such selections and combinations; translation can be seen as a process of *re*selection and *re*combination.

I want to emphasise that, in arising from repeated acts of selection from among the possibilities, style is about *choice*. While "the obligatory structure of a language … such as the use of the article before the noun" (ibid, 67) in languages like English clearly influences the style of an author in the delimitations it sets, writers construct their style through their choices within these limits. And as these limits differ with language, so they will be different for original author and literary translator. "Where there is no choice, there is no basis for making a stylistic contrast. Style is thus seen as an author's regular selections from the *optional* features of language structure" (ibid, original emphasis). (However, translators as re-writers have additional constraints placed on their choices, in that they are working from the choices of the original authors and usually must not stray far from them.)

What, then, is stylistics? Again, Crystal provides a concise definition:

> The effects these features convey can be understood only by intuitively sensing the choices that have been made … and it is usually enough simply to respond to the effect in this way. But there are often occasions when we have to develop a more analytical approach…. Here … our intuition needs to be supplemented by a more objective account of style. It is this approach which is known as stylistics. (ibid, 66)

As readers, we respond, consciously and unconsciously, to the stylistic features of a text, and usually this response remains at a subjective, felt level, without us trying, or needing, to specify these features or see them in overview. However, sometimes we do want to systematically analyse these stylistic features—and such analysis is stylistics. In order to be anything like objective (or at least systematic) in our analysis, rather than starting from what we intuit are features of the author's style and looking for evidence of such, we should examine the text itself, record what we find, and then see what patterns take shape.

Ultimately, however, there is no such thing as objectivity in literary analysis—a given set of patterns to be found—because, as Weber outlines in describing the viewpoint of those espousing

linguistic contextualisation,

> meaning and stylistic effect are not fixed and stable, and cannot
> be dug out of the text as in an archaeological exercise, but they
> have to be seen as a potential which is actualised in a … reader's
> mind, the product of a dialogic interaction between author, the
> author's context of production, the text, the reader and the
> reader's context of reception—which context includes all sorts of
> sociohistorical, cultural and intertextual factors. (1996, 3)

If we reframe the discussion for literary translation, the
translator becomes the 'prime reader', charged with actualising
the potential of the source text for the target-language reader and
thereby evoking a new chain of production and reception contexts,
each with their own effects on the rendering of the text.

I'm well aware that analysing my own translations as I do in
this book precludes any claims to objectivity, but then objectivity
is hard to claim in any literary analysis. By systematically
studying the stylistics of each target text in relation to its source
text, targeted at two specific issues for each work, I am at least
able to identify the kinds of translation choices I tend to make
(consciously or unconsciously) and consider the possible rationale
behind them. I hope this sustained self-analysis will benefit other
translators. Furthermore, Chapter 3 provides greater objectivity
in comparing two different translations of Sōseki's piece.

To explain why I generally avoid talking about a particular
author's style, I shall use the example of a famous contemporary
of one of the authors represented in this collection. Yokomitsu
Riichi's friend Kawabata Yasunari (1899–1972) became Japan's
first Nobel laureate for literature in 1968, thanks in no small part
to Edward Seidensticker's English translations of his works.
While Kawabata's stylistic elements varied greatly over his career
as he explored by turns naturalistic, impressionistic and
expressionistic approaches to narrative fiction, he is nonetheless
often described as a quintessentially 'Japanese' writer. Starrs, for
example, goes so far as to coin the interlingual term
"Kawabataesque" (1998, 85, 180) to betoken such qualities:

> Among the major Japanese fiction writers of the twentieth century, Kawabata is often perceived as one of those who were most deeply rooted in the native literary tradition—and therefore, one might think, most immune to Western influence. His exquisitely imagistic or impressionistic style reminds many of haiku. The associative leaps in his narrative structures are frequently said to resemble those of the medieval poetic form of renga or linked verse. (ibid, 69)

Starrs goes on to characterise Kawabata's formal characteristics as a reflection of such traditional Japanese poetic forms, describing him as "elliptical", his style "pervaded by an air of mystery and ambiguity" (ibid, 157). However, a little ironically, Starrs turns to a Western counterpart to provide one rationale for Kawabata's 'Japanese' concision: "Like Hemingway, he believes in the power of the 'thing left out'" (ibid, 144).

Many of Kawabata's most famous novels, including 『雪国』 *Yukiguni* (*Snow Country*, 1937) and 『山の音』 *Yama no oto* (*The Sound of the* Mountain, 1949), indeed can be seen to demonstrate a haiku-like brevity and the occasional associative leaps of renga; much of consequence is to be found in the unsaid, in the moments of silence that resound between the main characters and the seemingly uncommented-upon, yet 'telling', juxtaposition of incidents. But as Starrs' allusion to the arguably equally 'quintessential' American writer Hemingway illustrates, these are neither necessarily exclusively Japanese stylistic elements nor ones unique to Kawabata.

Thus I believe it is more fruitful for the present discussion to frame issues of style as questions of form at the discourse level (i.e., the words on the page), and treat these formal manifestations as they arise in the texts—both the source text (the original), and the target text (the translation). Such formal elements present themselves as much in micro-level stylistic devices as in overarching patterns of narrative organisation— thus at once at the level of individual words, phrases, sentences, paragraphs and even entire chapters.

At the same time, however, Starrs' equating of stylistic characteristics of a Japanese and a Western writer bespeaks an

inherent compatibility of literary features. Despite the linguistic and cultural gulf, there is in fact a remarkable degree of correspondence of formal elements and their effects—across figurative language, rhetorical devices, and so on. Certainly, Japanese makes little use of rhyme, but it does employ rhythm and sonic effects like alliteration. English sound-symbolic language, including onomatopoeia, usually takes the form of a verb, while Japanese 擬態語 *gitaigo* is mostly adverbial—but both languages harness the power of imitative language. Thus we should probably be thinking in terms of different emphases in the deployment of literary devices rather than radical differences in the forms they take.

This brings us back to the question of the 'style' of a particular language. The student of literary translation should be particularly observant of the micro-level adjustments that a translator makes to produce more normative prose. These 'tweaks' are often crucial to preserving 'literariness'; but they should always be made out of need rather than habit. Let us take the example of *repetition*. Martin makes the following distinction between Japanese and English:

> In English we avoid repeating a noun once it has been mentioned, substituting an anaphoric pronoun after the first mention. In Japanese there is no stricture against repeating the noun any number of times; on the other hand, obvious elements [e.g., a subject that would be replaced by a pronoun in English] are freely omitted from a sentence. (1975, 1075, my interpolation)

Thus the translator needs to come up with alternative synonyms and paraphrasing that can be cycled through to provide so-called 'elegant variation',[4] and/or replace some nouns with pronouns,

---

[4] Leech and Short (1981, 244) call such an English cohesive device "elegant variation", presumably after Fowler & Fowler (1922), although ironically the Fowlers call the device a "vice" (1922, 211), stating that "'elegant variation' is generally a worse fault than monotony" (ibid, 217). This is another caution against over-use of a given technique in (re-)writing.

which are *unmarked* (considered stylistically unremarkable) in English. The moment one reaches for English's marvellous grab-bag of synonyms, however, the form of the original is put at risk. If an author uses repetition deliberately, say for rhythmic or euphonic accentuation, swapping some words for synonyms in the translation will attenuate the effect. Thus the translator might be prudent not to convert something deliberately marked into something smoother to read, unmarked—and unremarkable. (Repetition is so important a stylistic element that it is addressed at some point in the analysis of all the works in this collection.)

Approaches to translating the texts

Following on from the previous sub-topic, I suggest that students take their cues from the literary devices used 'on the ground' in the source texts when they approach their translations. Where you see a form of repetition, say, be it of a single word or a grammatical structure, try to come up with something analogous in the translation—if you believe the author has used such a device for a reason. On the other hand, sometimes trying to preserve every little wrinkle of a sentence is not only going to be impossible in the target grammar or lexis, it will also result in awkward phrasing that disqualifies the translation as 'literature'. So there is a happy medium to be found—a balance between being faithful to the source text and responsive to the stylistic expectations of the target text.

When language pairs are as dissimilar lexically and syntactically as Japanese and English are, the temptation for translators is to throw up their hands and claim anything approaching a faithful translation is impossible. The result may be a fluid, readable text that bears little relationship to the original, especially in terms of literary qualities—one where the 'voice' of the author has been drowned out by the voice of the translator. On the other hand, an equally likely outcome is that the text yields to the conservatism of a translator and becomes a series of generic phrases and plodding syntax that apes the form

of the original but has little left of the literary about it.

Both these extremes are manifestations of so-called 'translationese', and while most published translators are sophisticated enough to avoid their worst manifestations, there doubtless remains room to enhance approaches to literary style in translation. I believe that the freedom that linguistic and cultural disparity between languages gives us can lead us to this aforementioned balanced middle position—that this freedom can be used to play on the strengths of the target language *in service of the original text*.

A final note about how to approach a literary translation. Some translation instructors exhort their students to read through the whole text before translating. This is a perfectly valid approach, particularly given that the texts at times contain archaic usage and vocabulary, a barrier that requires time, and patience, to break through. You may therefore prefer to take the time to understand the source text thoroughly before attempting to translate it. On the other hand, if you think of the translator as the prime reader, representing the interests of readers in the target language, then it may make sense to do a first draft of the translation 'cold', without having read through the whole text first. This preserves something of the excitement and uncertainty of the source-language reader without precluding necessary later revision to ensure textual consistency and to address any issues that do not become apparent until later in the text.

This prime-reader approach is in fact how I usually work. I start translating as I read, responding to the text without any preconceptions. Invariably by the end of the text I am reassessing my translation choices, but this is the beauty of a written translation—it can be revised as much as required. Paralleling this, I have avoided doing in-depth research about the authors and the background to the works in question. This book is not so much about literary analysis as it is about the analysis of literary translation stylistics. Some translations do of course require background research to make them work in the target language, but most source texts should be allowed to speak for themselves.

You may wish to try my approach when you translate, simply leaving placeholders in the text (such as a string of Xs or question marks) anywhere you are unsure of the meaning, and building up your understanding of the text as much from its overall narrative structure as from its individual components. If you type directly into a file, as I do, you may find it salutary to switch on Track Changes in your word-processing software after completing your first draft so that you can eventually toggle between the first and final drafts and observe what has changed in the self-editing process—an exercise that can be quite revelatory.

Whatever your approach, no translator produces a fully formed translation on the first pass. It is a long, tortuous, fascinating and rewarding process, usually entailing a number of drafts, and innumerable tweaks right up until the day of submission. I hope, like me, you gain something from looking back at the experience.

The structure of this book

The book is divided into two sections with overarching themes: Childhood and Place. It is my hope that by pairing two literary works with each theme, we are able to learn something useful through a comparison of the different approaches each text takes to the topic, and the corresponding approaches of the translations.

I have tried to turn my experience of translating these four works into an exercise in literary translation stylistics that can be used in the postgraduate classroom. To that end, in each chapter I provide a brief introduction to each author and work followed by the original Japanese text, which students are encouraged to translate before reading my translation and commentary. [5] (However, some instructors may find it helpful to have students read part of the commentary before attempting a translation. And, in fact, less able students may wish to read my translation before attempting their own—though inevitably they will then be

---

[5] The source texts have line numbers, but these are mainly there to aid classroom discussion; I rarely refer to them.

influenced by my version to some extent.)[6]

The commentary consists of an in-depth analysis of two key issues in literary translation as exemplified in each work, paired with a discussion of how I dealt with these elements in my translation. In other words, we first analyse key elements of the source text (ST) and then corresponding elements of the target text (TT). Each chapter ends with a list of additional questions regarding the ST and TT, which can be used to extend the analysis of one work to several class weeks. (It is envisaged that this book will provide the basis for a fifteen-week-semester class, perhaps supplemented by an individual student translation project based either on one of the four works showcased in this book, or on another short work from Aozora Bunkō, with the project consisting of a translation of the work plus an analysis of some salient features of the ST and TT.)

In Chapter 1, we read Miyazawa Kenji's little-known bucolic childhood tale "Tani" and discuss its use of mimetic (onomatopoeic) language and the different narrative and character voices it establishes. In Chapter 2, Yokomitsu Riichi's story "Akai kimono" explores the interior world of a lonely young boy living in a family-run inn. We examine its use of structural parallelism and figurative language. Chapter 3 presents the only non-fiction work in this collection: an essay by Natsume Sōseki about Kyoto entitled "Kyō ni tsukeru yūbe". We trace his extended figurative passages and the culturally specific items they contain. The final work in Chapter 4 is Tokuda Shūsei's story "Aojiroi tsuki", the longest piece in the book, set in a seaside suburb in Kobe. We consider issues of textual cohesion and the use of double negatives.

A note on terminology and related punctuation: I sometimes provide reference translations that are as close as possible to the ST (*ST-orientated*). For such reference translations I prefer the term 'direct translation' to 'literal translation', since the latter is often misleading, and should, I think, be confined to expressing the distinction between literal language and figurative language.

---

[6] My translations are in no way definitive, but it is hoped they offer coherent possible approaches to rendering the works.

Such direct translations are in single quotation marks, while final translations are in double quotation marks.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the kind assistance of Associate Professor Sarah Frederick of Boston University, who allowed me to compare key parts of her translation of Natsume Sōseki's essay with mine in Chapter 3. This comparison adds a whole new dimension to the discussion of the process of translating, one that I'm sure will prove enlightening for students of literary translation.

Section 1

Childhood

Childhood is a perennial literary theme, a time of life that paints the world in vivid colours, both cheerful and horrid, and has a profound impact on the adults we become. The ghosts of childhood haunt us all, and there is great poignancy in the transitory nature of the state of being a child. In literature, we must distinguish between writing *for* children and *about* children, and it is the latter that I am treating in this collection. These two stories by Miyazawa Kenji and Yokomitsu Riichi, born two years apart at the close of the nineteenth century, present very different portraits of two young boys living in late-Meiji Japan. What the stories share is the conviction that these boys are real individuals with vivid imaginations who interact with the world on their own terms. I hope that in reading the original texts and my translations you will be drawn into their worlds and experience the universality of the human condition they represent.

CHAPTER 1

宮沢賢治「谷」

MIYAZAWA KENJI, "TANI"

Introduction

Miyazawa Kenji (1896–1933, by convention known by his given name), though a great poet, is particularly beloved for his children's stories, especially the novella 『銀河鉄道の夜』*Ginga tetsudō no yoru* (Night on the Galactic Railroad, 1934). His tales are often fantastical, featuring anthropomorphic animals and wild, eerie settings. What adds immeasurably to the stories' atmosphere and visceral, propulsive quality is his widespread and innovative use of onomatopoeia, or, more properly, mimetic expressions. The word *onomatopoeia* mostly refers to verbal representations of sounds, or 'phonomimes', to use Martin's term, but mimetics very often go beyond this to form 'phenomimes' (expressing physical phenomena, actions, and states), and 'psychomimes' (expressing psychological and mental states) (1975, 1025). While present in both English and Japanese, they appear more widespread in Japanese, with such mimetics common in both child's language and general literary expression: in a sense, then, the words of childhood haunt the literary texts of adulthood. Kenji pushed the boundaries of such mimetic expressions by creating emphatic and repetitive non-standard forms whose consequent phonic impact enhances their viscerality and/or psychological depth.

   This likely autobiographical story, apparently not published in Japan until 1979, is framed as being narrated by an adult looking back on his childhood, which for Kenji was the first decade of the

twentieth century. We thus encounter a mixture of levels of discourse, with childlike and more-adult language coexisting in the narrative space, even if at times it feels like the adult narrator is being 'possessed' by the recollections of his boyhood self. There is also a contrast between the youthful language of the narrator character as a child and his best friend, Keijirō (who is based on Kenji's real childhood friend Kenjirō), and the rough adult speech of the stable-hand Risuke. These discursive dualities need to be carefully preserved in translation.

Miyazaki uses repetition, whether it be lexical or structural, to emphasise this sometimes childlike quality of the narrative, and, perhaps, to induce a semi-trancelike state in the reader, as the story takes on the qualities of a fairy tale—the callow protagonist and his unreliable guide hunting for elusive mushrooms in a dense oak wood teetering on the edge of a blood-red, muttering cliff-face. The story has a timeless quality, which should not be punctured either by the injection of modern-day anachronisms or, equally, archaisms.

One final note on the language of the source text. As the content is relatively straightforward in terms of vocabulary and discursive structure, I have chosen to retain the original kana orthography: thus, for example, the verb *iu* 'to say' is written as 云ふ rather than 云う (modern kanji form 言う). This may be slightly disconcerting for the novice translator at first, but I have provided modern readings of the first instance of each archaic form in the margin, and you will soon become used to and discern the predictable orthographic patterns in them.

Exercise

Translate the story 「谷」 into English, paying special attention to the mimetic expressions and the distinctions between child and adult narrators and characters. Then compare your translation with mine.

谷

本文	注
1　　楢渡（ならわたり）のとこの崖（がけ）はまっ赤でした。	
2　　それにひどく深くて急でしたからのぞいて見る	
3　と全くくるくるするのでした。	
4　　谷底には水もなんにもなくてたゞ青い梢（こずゑ）と	ただ
5　白樺（しらかば）などの幹が短く見えるだけでした。	こずえ
6　　向ふ側もやっぱりこっち側と同じやうでその	向こう
7　毒々しく赤い崖には横に五本の灰いろの太い線が	よう
8　入ってゐました。ぎざぎざになって赤い土から喰（は）み	いました
9　出してゐたのです。それは昔山の方から流れて走っ	
10　て来て又火山灰に埋（うづ）もれた五層の古い熔岩流（ようがんりう）だっ	
11　たのです。	
12　　崖のこっち側と向ふ側と昔は続いてゐたのでせ	でしょう
13　う	
14　がいつかの時代に裂けるか罅（わ）れるかしたのでせう。	
15　霧のあるときは谷の底はまっ白でなんにも見えま	
16　せんでした。	
17　　私がはじめてそこへ行ったのはたしか尋常三年	
18　生か四年生のころです。ずうっと下の方の野原でた	
19　った一人野葡萄（のぶだう）を喰べてゐましたら馬番の理助が	野ぶどう
20　欝金（うこん）の切れを首に巻いて木炭の空俵をしょって	すみ
21　大股（おほまた）に通りかかったのでした。そして私を見てずゐ	おおまた

22 ぶんな高声で言ったのです。

23 「おいおい、どこからこぼれて此処（ここ）らへ落ちた？

24 さらはれるぞ。 蕈（きのこ） のうんと出来る処へ連れてって

25 やらうか。お前なんかには持てない位蕈のある処へ　｜やろう

26 連れてってやらうか。」

27 　私は「うん。」と云（い）ひました。すると理助は歩き　｜言いました

28 ながら又言ひました。

29 「そんならついて来い。葡萄などもう棄（す）てちまへ。　｜ちまえ

30 すっかり 唇（くちびる） も歯も紫になってる。早くついて来　｜（捨ててしま

31 い、来い。後（おく）れたら棄てて行くぞ。」　｜え）

32 　私はすぐ手にもった野葡萄の房を棄ていっしん

33 に理助について行きました。ところが理助は連れて

34 ってやらうかと云っても一向私などは構はなかっ

35 たのです。自分だけ勝手にあるいて途方もない声で

36 空に嚙ぶりつくやうに歌って行きました。私はもう

37 ほんたうに一生けんめいついて行ったのです。　｜本当

38 　私どもは 柏（かしは） の林の中に入りました。

39 　影がちらちらちらちらして葉はうつくしく光り

40 ました。曲った黒い幹の間を私どもはだんだん潜（くぐ）っ

41 て行きました。林の中に入ったら理助もあんまり急

42 がないやうになりました。又じっさい急げないやう

43　でした。傾斜もよほど出てきたのでした。

44　　十五分も柏の中を潜ったとき理助は少し横の方

45　へまがってからだをかゞめてそこらをしらべてゐ　｜かがめて

46　ましたが間もなく立ちどまりました。そしてまるで

47　低い声で、

48　「さあ来たぞ。すきな位とれ。左の方へは行くなよ。

49　崖だから。」

50　　そこは柏や楢の林の中の小さな空地でした。私は

51　まるでぞくぞくしました。はぎぼだしがそこにも

52　こゝにも盛りになって生えてゐるのです。理助は炭　｜ここ

53　俵をおろして尤らしく口をふくらせてふうと息を

54　ついてから又言ひました。

55　「いゝか。はぎぼだしには茶いろのと白いのとある　｜いい

56　けれど白いのは硬くて筋が多くてだめだよ。茶いろ

57　のをとれ。」

58　「もうとってもいゝか。」私はききました。

59　「うん。何へ入れてく。さうだ。羽織へ包んで行け。」　｜そう

60　「うん。」私は羽織をぬいで草に敷きました。

61　　理助はもう片っぱしからとって炭俵の中へ入れ

62　ました。私もとりました。ところが理助のとるのは

63　みんな白いのです。白いのばかりえらんでどしどし

64 炭俵の中へ投げ込んでゐるのです。私はそこでしば

65 らく 呆（あき）れて見てゐました。

66 「何をぼんやりしてるんだ。早くとれとれ。」理助

67 が云ひました。

68 「うん。けれどお前はなぜ白いのばかりとるの。」

69 私がききました。

70 「おれのは漬物（つけもの）だよ。お前のうちぢゃ葦の漬物なん じゃ

71 か喰べないだらうから茶いろのを持って行った方

72 がいゝやな。煮て食ふんだらうから。」

73 　私はなるほどと思ひましたので少し理助を気の

74 毒なやうな気もしながら茶いろのをたくさんとり

75 ました。羽織に包まれないやうになってもまだとり

76 ました。

77 　日がてって秋でもなかなか暑いのでした。

78 　間もなく葦も大ていなくなり理助は炭俵一ぱい

79 に詰めたのをゆるく両手で押すやうにしてそれか

80 ら羊歯（しだ）の葉を五六枚のせて繩（なは）で上をからげました。

81 「さあ戻るぞ。谷を見て来るかな。」理助は汗をふ

82 きながら右の方へ行きました。私もついて行きまし

83 た。しばらくすると理助はぴたっととまりました。

84 それから私をふり向いて私の腕を押へてしまひま 押してしま