DISCREPANCIES AMONG TRANSLATION

A Comparison Between English and Japanese Linguistic Properties

Johnathan Dewey   5/3/24   Japanese 470U

Table of Contents

DISCREPANCIES AMONG TRANSLATION
A Comparison Between English and Japanese Linguistic Properties
・ Johnathan Dewey ・ Furman University ・ B.A. Japanese Studies ・

1 - Abstract

Millions of people rely on computational translators to facilitate communication between languages, but even with powerful computational structures, translators produce unreliable translations. Conversely, multilingual humans have always produced reliable translations with corresponding meaning and nuance—making it one of the few tasks in which humans outperform computers. To understand this outperformance, one must understand humans' capability in identifying and managing discrepancies between languages that manifest in an array of unique linguistic attributes. Therefore, for computational translators to advance, they must account for discrepancies and manipulate them, which will produce translations with one-to-one correspondence in meaning and nuance.

2 - Introduction

For people of different ethnic and linguistic identities to effectively communicate, an intimate knowledge of both languages is needed to facilitate communication. This fact has been recognized throughout history—manifested through the communication of nations, cultures, and the translation of influential texts—making it one of the oldest skills still practiced. Therefore, translation has—and always will be—a task performed by devoted learners of language.

Since translation is such a widespread and venerable skill, many procedures have been theorized and employed to provide natural translations. These techniques vary in purpose and difficulty, but they all have the goal of converting phrases from a source language (SL) to an equivalent phrase in a target language (TL). Some procedures modify translations to make the most sense in a TL; other procedures cater translations to preserve nuanced meanings of SL phrase.

Natural translations are translations that represent in the TL the full meaning of a phrase in the SL that preserve lexical and cultural nuances. These natural translations are preferred outcomes of the translation process because they are well understood by the TL and facilitate the cultural exchange of some phrases. Natural translations are preferred more than literal translations which represent in the TL the literal meaning of SL's phrase which loses cultural meaning and has unpredictable meanings.

The reason that translation is asserted as a task that has and will always be performed by speakers of the language is because despite modern advancements in computation, translation is one of the few tasks in which humans outperform computers. While computers can translate texts at a faster pace, they lack the production of natural translations that quick-thinking humans with an intimate knowledge of both languages can provide. This assertion might come as a surprise to some. In the modern age, with advancements in AI and computation improving each year, people

are convinced that computation is the solution to any problem. I do not necessarily disagree with this notion as computational tools are useful in mitigating human error. However, for a computational system to represent language effectively, it needs to be well-defined. Since language contains irregularities and unique properties that are not present in all languages, there is a prohibition to the extent of what computational translators can achieve. Computational structures which identify and manipulate regularities in data are unable to find a single streamlined algorithm that represents the task of translation.

In computing, complexity refers to the amount of data used (data complexity) and the maximum amount of time needed (time complexity) to achieve a desirable output. In terms of data, a massive amount of information (such as words, parts of speech, and even frequency) needs to be accessed to provide accurate translations—rendering this complexity inefficient. In terms of time, numerous routines and subroutines must be created to effectively translate linguistic properties, especially the properties that do not exist fully in the other language—which also renders time complexity inefficient. Considering the prerequisites needed for a translation system, the task of translation from a computing context is inherently complex, and the likelihood of a translator with desirable efficiency seems unattainable. This fact makes sense in the context of human translators in which they forgo many years of language training to also handle the complex task. Despite the provided explanation on computational translation, it will not be the focus of this paper as we will focus on the comprehension of linguistic properties and techniques of translation.

Despite the infeasibility of an efficient translator, there are many ways to improve current translation systems through the mimicry of linguistic knowledge that human translators possess. The main benefit that human translators possess is the recognition and management of linguistic discrepancies. Linguistic discrepancies are attributes of languages that prohibit or impede the natural translation of a text from a SL to a TL. They manifest as irregularities between languages, which can range from simple internal properties (such as word order) to more complex internal properties (such as idiomatic language) and external properties (such as culture). Discrepancies are the focus of this research, in which we identify common and difficult discrepancies, followed by the inclusion of their respective translation procedures provided by linguistic literature.

The approach of this research focuses on the comparison of the English and Japanese discrepancies as a case study. The English and Japanese languages evolved in isolation of each other until the modern era, which makes them ideal candidates in identifying linguistic discrepancies because of their perceived diversity. Conversely, if we were to compare English to one of its Germanic or Romantic counterparts, or Japanese to other East-Asian languages like Korean, the amount of identifiable discrepancies decreases as many of those languages share similar linguistic properties. Furthermore, much is to be gained from the cultural influences of linguistic discrepancies. As we will see with idiomatic phrases and culturally specific terminology, culture exhibits a key function in the representation of language. Therefore, Japanese and English are theorized to be good case studies to identify the widest range of meaningful discrepancies.

Once again, this research will derive what kind of discrepancies exist between languages and how they can be managed in the context of natural translation.

3 – The Task of Translation

Given the venerable age of translation as a profession, it is understandable that a plethora of literature has been completed to advance linguistic thought. This section will provide a general overview of translation and the requirements to being a good translator, as well as an explanation on the execution of the translation task.

3a - Traits of a Good Translator

To provide good translations of a SL's phrases, a translator must be "good" enough in both the SL and TL. The important fact of translation is that there is a responsibility to provide accurate translations sensitive to the nuanced meaning in the SL that the translator must honor. According to Akbari (Akbari 2013), To become a "good" translator one must attain:

(1) an extensive reading of SL and TL materials (i.e., literature, periodicals).
(2) an extensive knowledge on the linguistic and lexical properties of the
   SL and TL (language education, native speaking).
(3) a thorough record of translation writing practice.
(4) a thorough record of listening practice (conversation, media).

To effectively translate one *must* attain fluency in both the TL and SL. Fluency is important because to effectively understand nuanced speech of an SL, one must understand and experience the several types of speech in the SL (such as casual speech, formal speech, slang, etc.). Therefore, a good translator with these qualities would want to use translation strategies that allow for natural translations.

The difference between the novice and expert translator lies in reaction to difficult translations. While a novice translator would default to a word level translation in the absence of a fixed translation, an inquistitive expert other methods such as inquiring speakers of the SL for linguistic wisdom [Inoue 2008]. Also, there are many contextual discrepancies between languages, such as the "age range of the readers, the use of language appropriate to the time period, and the lack of information about the target audience," that need to be understood well by the translator (Inoue 2008). A novice translator would see these issues as time consuming, and would favor translation of simpilier parts or generalize these difficult parts [Inoue 2008]. On the other hand, a expert translator would be senstive to the importance of contextual discrepancies that can affect the whole text, and treat them as important to exhibit effort toward providing natural translations [Inoue 2008]. Therfore, the difference in the novice and expert translation skill levels are determined by the aptitude of a translator who perserves to a equivalent translation and does not take shortcuts.

3b - Translation Excecution

Translation strategy is a term that has many definitions as all strategies vary in nature depending on what they are attempting to achieve. Objectively speaking on translation strategy, Jaaskelainen (1991) from Akbari (Akbari 2013) gives the most complete definition on what a translation strategy consists of:

> *a series of competencies, a set of steps or processes that favor the acquisition, storage,*
> *and/or utilization of information. [strategies are] heuristic and flexible in nature, and*
> *their adoption implies a decision influenced by amendments in the translator's objectives.*
> *[Thus, translation strategies are individualistic in nature because it is influenced by the]*
> *translator's objective.*

This "individualistic nature" in strategies is what enables translation strategies to be variant and with different implementations reflecting the translator's goal. However, all translation strategies are a series of processes or steps—which implies an algorithmic approach to translation. Therefore, this research refers to translation strategies as procedures which are rules for managing specific linguistic discrepancies. In terms of these procedures' product, they are geared towards the "(1) acquisition, (2) storage, and/or (3) utilization of information." Therefore, procedures utilize the information present in a phrase to produce translations.

Furthermore, individuality in strategies implies that procedures can be molded to fit a translator's needs. However, humans are predictable, and complete tasks in similar ways that require the least amount of effort for a result that yields the most success. Therefore, there are three main translations strategies that are commonly employed. The first strategy, the "freehand" strategy, attempts to maximize the amount of time a translator can translate without interruption (Akbari 2013). The second, the "preprocessing" strategy, attempts to correct visible errors first (Akbari 2013). And finally, the third, the "post-processing" strategy, translates straightforward text first and later revises errors (Akbari 2013). The commonality of these three global techniques is in the acknowledgment that translation of phrases will eventually run into errors that the translator must recognize and manage.

4 – Type of Discrepancies

Discrepancies manifest in all properties of language and are unavoidable in the context of translation. The existence of discrepancies derives from the fact that all languages are diverse in how they view and represent the world. In Guerra (Fernández Guerra 2012) she eloquently asserts that:

> *All languages can say (or are capable of saying) the same things; but, as a rule, all of*
> *them say it in a different way. Indeed, should two languages say it in the same way, then*
> *we would not be speaking of two languages, but of one and the same language.*

Therefore, discrepancies should not be treated as negative hindrances but nuances in describing the phenomena of life. A natural translator of the SL will treat these discrepancies with care, removing themselves from the translation itself, and think through a similar equivalent. The

danger of overlooking a discrepancy's function as a simple subvert the SL's original meaning. In this section I provide a comprehensive list of discrepancies, their difficulty, and their function within language.

4a – Idiomatic Phrases

Universally, across all languages, idiomatic language exists as a common and difficult discrepancy to translate. They are culturally specific expressions and are only clearly understood in the SL. In Adelnia (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011), a concise definition for idioms explains the scope and purpose of idioms:

Idioms are linguistic expressions or lexical items representing objects, concepts, or phenomena of material life particular to a given culture. They are necessary to any language to keep the local and cultural color of that language.

Idioms are therefore limited to the concepts and objects of a culture that shares the same language and are "necessary" to preserve "cultural color" of the language. Therefore, due to their culturally sensitive and necessary nature, idiomatic language is not something that can be treated as something "easy" to translate. Since idiomatic language represents how distinct cultures observe the world, they are amongst the most difficult to replicate in a TL (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011).

Literal translations of idiomatic phrases will most often lead to an unpredictable meaning in the TL. For example, the Japanese idiom *juunintoiro* (十人十色) translates literally as "ten people, ten colors." A novice translator would assume from the literal translation that no such idiom exists in English. However, an expert translator would begin to make connections in the concepts of the phrase to provide an equivalent phrase. The phrase can be modified to think of the phrase as "ten (individual) people, ten (individual) colors." From here the translator could recognize the phrase as explaining a context of ten individual people independent in their choice of color. The expert translator would then draw connections to the English idiomatic phrase "different strokes for different folks." Unrecognizable idioms like the *juunintoiro* example are far more common in literal translation than recognizable idioms—but they do exist. For example, the phrase *koiwamoumoku* (恋は盲目) translates literally as "love is blind" whose literal translation has the same meaning as the "love is blind" idiom in English. Therefore, there is a directly proportional relationship between the perceptibility of idioms and the difficulty of translating them.

Another misleading attribute of idiomatic phrases is the heterogeneity of idioms in form and function. Idiomatic phrases are the parent for more specific phrases. The commonality of these phrases is that they use complex forms of language and cultural objects which makes them unrecognizable in translation. There are five main idiomatic phrases that exist and convey different purposes (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011): (1) Colloquialisms (2) Proverbs (3) Slang (4) Allusions (5) Phrasal Verbs. For the remainder of this section, I will describe and explain each idiom, as well as its untranslatability.

(1) Colloquialism

Colloquialisms are casual phrases used in primarily within a limited geographical area, and not appropriate for formal speech or writing (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011). The most important attribute being its limited geographical area, where even speakers of the same language may not recognize colloquialisms. This is evident in the American English where historically disconnected regions have a rich and unique linguistic culture that shares different colloquialisms from other regions of the country. For example, regions like the Deep South are known for their unique archaic words like "ain't" or "y'all." They also have unique phrases like "He's fixin' to…" or "bless your heart." Colloquialism's main feature is the ability to say something that is not evident or contrary to the meaning of lexical items. In "He's fixin' to," most American southerners know that nothing is being fixed, but rather the speaker is contemplating (in a fixed position of thought) to do something or is about to do something. Similarly, in "bless your heart," the speaker could be showing empathy to what has just been said, or they could be masking judgement as well-wishes. Of course, the nuanced meaning of these phrases is best understood by speakers of American English from the same culture limited to a geographical area. Therefore, some other English speaker from outside that geographical area would not necessarily understand a colloquialism's meaning at first. Therefore, the difficulty of colloquialisms derives from their geographical specific nature and their informal use.

(2) Proverbs

Proverbs are short phrases of wisdom often handed down from elders to younger speakers of a language. They are used to express facts smoothly, carry intellectual influence in a discussion, and/or convey a certain aesthetic to their speech (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011). For example, the Japanese proverb *jikoujitoku* (自業自得), "one's action, one's gain," can be understood as "you reap what you sow" In English. This proverb, like others, expresses an empirical fact of hard work founded through wisdom in a concise manner. These concise proverbial phrases are easy to learn and repeat and carry a larger important message in a more sophisticated or "smooth" manner. However, the short nature of proverbial phrases is difficult to translate due to the lack of appropriate context for a translator to find an equivalent meaning in the TL.

(3) Slang

Slang are very informal phrases or words that are often not considered official lexical items in the SL (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011). They are a way to use inappropriate words and are associated with a lower dignity in the speaker's speech, or an intent to add humor or emphasis to one's speech (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011). Since they are not official lexicons, it is difficult to translate them into equivalent slang in the TL. For example, *hanpanai* (半端ない) literally translates to "not incomplete" or "not half-done" but the slang is used by Japanese speakers to convey an English slang equivalent of something that is "awesome" or "outrageous." Slang has many different properties that can also make speakers of the same language unable to predict

meaning. For one, slang is constantly evolving and can often be associated with generations than a specific culture. For example, the younger generations have invented words like "rizz" (A seductive demeanor) which are used widely on online platforms used by younger generations and replicated in casual speech; if a speaker from an older generation were to hear that word, it might be just as alien to them as slang from a different language. Also, like colloquialism, slang can be limited to a specific geographical area, and can even vary in different subregions of that geographical area. For example, the city of New York has many different ethnic groups that have influenced many different slang words. Different boroughs within New York have different slang for the same concept. Take the culturally important space that is the corner store which many citizens interact with daily. In Harlem, one might refer to this as a "corner store," while someone in the Bronx might call it a "deli," while a Brooklynite might refer to it as a "bodega" which comes from the Spanish word for "wine store." Thus, slang is an exceedingly difficult concept to translate, especially in the same language.

(4) Allusions

Allusions are phrases that mostly compare an objective thing to a culturally specific concept. They reference things like places, events, and other objective through direct or indirect comparisons to mythological, religious, or historical stories or even cultural iconography (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011). Direct allusions like, "my back yard is my Garden of Eden," directly reference the subject of the phrase to a cultural object (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011). In the Garden of Eden example, the speaker is comparing their mundane space to that of magnificence by making the comparison to the biblical story of the Garden of Eden—which many speakers of English understand. Indirect allusions like, "I wish a White Rabbit would show me the way," indirectly references the subject of the sentence to a cultural object and forces the listener to deduce the subject of the sentence (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011). In the White Rabbit example, the speaker is explaining how they want some type of sign for direction in life by referencing the culturally popular story of Alice in Wonderland. Therefore, translation of allusions is difficult because one is expected to translate cultural objects which are a sperate challenging task aside from translating idioms.

(5) Phrasal Verbs

Finally, Phrasal Verbs are informal combinations of a verb with prepositions, adverbs, or both. They are used to convey a contrasting meaning from the original verb (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011). For example, a speaker who says, "my friend backed me up" uses the verb "backed" and the preposition "up" to modify the object of the verb which is the speaker. The sentence is not that the speaker's friend made them back up, but rather their friend defended them in some way. The issues with translating phrasal verbs are embedded in the informal usage of verbs and their meanings.

4b - Culturally Specific Words (CST)

Culture is a unique concept that has various adaptations and is conceptually different between peoples. Komissarov (1991) from Neshkovska (Neshkovska and Kitanovska-Kimovska 2018) provides a succinct definition for culture:

> *People who belong to the same linguistic community are members of a certain type of culture, and, consequently, they share many traditions, habits, ways of doing and saying things. In fact, they have much common knowledge about their country, its geography, history, climate, its political, economic, social, and cultural institutions, accepted morals, taboos, and many other things, and all of that enables them to produce and understand messages, i.e., to establish meaningful communication with other people.*

Komissarov asserts that a culture shares language, traditions, and common knowledge regarding historical, political, economic, and social events. However, culture is not necessarily just an overarching identity that similar people fall under. Many people who belong to a culture also belong to subcultures within it. For example, in the United States, many immigrant communities share a culture that is influenced from their native country, while other Americans who have been assimilated to mostly an American culture might not understand the languages, traditions, or common knowledge associated with such culture. Furthermore, people who have different personal identities such as sexuality, gender, or race share a subculture that is different from everyone else. Therefore, culture is inherently a subjective term that defines an individual and is verified by acceptance from other individuals in said culture.

Criteria for CST

Given the diversity of cultures and the concepts they hold, it is apparent that distinct cultures usually see the world in diverse ways depending on certain influences of that culture. This uniqueness of culture creates Culturally Specific Terms (CST) in language, which are often associated with difficulty during translation and are identified as a major discrepancy among languages. Because CST are sensitive terms and mean a great deal to the individuals of a culture, handling CST requires a special degree of treatment. In the cases where CST are not treated as sensitive terms—such as literal translations—translations have the potential to be understood as a subversion against the source culture (Fernández Guerra 2012). There are three primary attributes that define a CST (Neshkovska and Kitanovska-Kimovska 2018):

(1) *Unrecognizable*: A CST representing a concept in the Source Culture (SC) that are completely unknown in a Target Culture (TC).

(2) *Inequivalence*: An expression containing a CST will not have a true equivalent in the TL.

(3) *Cultural Link*: A CST representing a concept in the SC is linked directly to a SC's habits, language, or environment.

These three features define a CST and can be used for verification in recognizing CSTs. For example, consider the Japanese word *kimono* (着物); A *kimono* in its objective sense is an article

of clothing, and if a translator were to define it as such, that would be a subversion toward Japanese culture. A *kimono* has extremely specific applications and connotations in Japanese culture that is unknown to English-speaking cultures and satisfies the **unrecognizable** feature of a CST. *Kimonos* are utilized in cultural professions such as *geishas*, who are required to wear it when hosting clients and make public appearances; there is no form of attire in English culture that carries the same meaning of a *kimono*, which satisfies the **inequivalence** feature of a CST. Lastly, the kimono is linked directly to the habits () and language () of Japanese culture, which satisfies **cultural link** feature of a CST.

Conversely, the word *fuku* (副) is a more appropriate translation of the concept of clothes since the application of such a word in Japanese can refer to Western-style clothing as well. Since *fuku* has an equivalent in the English language, it violates the **inequivalence** and **unrecognizable** features of a CST, making it a word that can be translated literally without potentially undermining the SC.

Realia

In addition to the criteria for a CST, there is realia, which are the specific categories of a CST used as criteria to satisfy a **cultural link** to the SC. Realia refers to "objects, customs, habits, and other cultural and material aspects that have an impact in shaping a certain language" (Fernández Guerra 2012). There are four major types of realia provided by Guerra that compiles the ideas of other translators works and theories (Fernández Guerra 2012):

> (1) Geographic and Ethnographic Terms
> (2) Words or expressions referring to folklore, traditions, and mythology.
> (2) Names of everyday objects, actions, and events: such as food and drinks, clothes, housing, tools, public transport, dances and games, units of measurement, money, etc.
> (3) Social and historical terms denoting territorial administrative units or divisions, Such as departments, professions, titles, ranks, greetings, and treatments; institutions, patriotic and religious organizations."

4c – English to Japanese Specific Discrepancies

The type of discrepancies explained in sections 4a and 4b are general discrepancies that exist in English, Japanese, and many other languages. They were noted for being the hardest discrepancies to manage. However, by investigating Japanese and English we are exposed to much more discrepancies.

(1) English and Japanese CST

Picking up from Section 4c, there is a particular subset of geographic and ethnographic CST that are extremely hard to translate. The most prominent examples of which are the translation of institution names, positions, and people [Inoue 2008]. The reason for this difficulty is because of the lack of these terms existing in a dictionary or other language sources [Inoue 2008]. For example, word pertaining to Japanese government such as *shugiin* (衆議院) House of

Representatives or *sangiin* (参議院) House of Councilors are composed of morphemes called *kanji* (漢字) whose objective meaning does not discern the meaning of the compound of kanji. both contain the combination *giin* (議院) which is an "deliberation institution" if we take the literal meanings of the kanji. This compound combination with *shu-* (衆) or *san* (参) can produce the literal translations of "deliberation institution of the masses" and "deliberation institution of participation." Neither of these translations of ethnographic terms are conducive of their equivalent meaning in English which was "House of Representatives" and "House of Councilors," respectively. Now we can see in the context of English and Japanese how hard it is to recognize and understand CST for non-native speakers and how potential careless translations can produce noisy translations.

(2) Word Order

One of the most prominent discrepancies between English and Japanese exists in the word order of their sentences. English sentences follow a Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) construction, whereas Japanese sentences follow a Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) construction. For example, the sentence, *watashiwa miseni itta* (私は店に行った) is "I went to the store" in English, but if we transpose to a Japanese SOV, it would be "I to (the) store went."

A novice translator would assume that simple transposals of the verb and object of a SL's phrase will reorder the lexical items. The expert translator will realize that specific parts of speech (POS) would require some degree of reordering. For example, "She took a test last Friday" translates to *kanojowa saigo no kinyoubi ni tesutowo ukemashita* (彼女は最後の金曜日にテストを受けました). The English phrase in a Japanese word order produces the phrase: "She last Friday (the) test took." Observe how "last Friday" and "(the) test" also switch position. This is because of their relation to the verb in which "(the) test" is the direct object and "last Friday" is an adjunct phrase. Therefore, word order is a discrepancy that requires the careful reordering of specific POS.

The specific POS that are a discrepancy to sentence order are "adverbs, adverbial phrases, participial constructions, and subordinate clauses;" which usually exist after the subject in Japanese, whereas in English they usually appear at the start of the sentence (Wakabayashi 2020). word order discrepancies also include the ordering of nouns. Within noun phrases, both languages tend to order nouns by prioritizing positive elements first before negative elements (Wakabayashi 2020). Of course, there are exceptions, for example, *shirokuro* (白<u>黒</u>) instead of "<u>black</u> and white" in English where "black" is usually uttered first (Wakabayashi 2020). Both languages also order nouns that prioritize the word with fewer syllables first and the more syllables second (Wakabayashi 2020). For example, in English its "trials and tribulations" not "tribulations and trials" due to the speaker's tendency to say longer words last. Similarly in Japanese, they say <u>*migi*</u>*hidari* (<u>右</u>左) because *migi* (右) "right" has less syllables than *hidari* (左) "right."

There are special phrases in both Japanese and English that purposefully violate word order to emphasize or achieve a particular stylistic effect (Wakabayashi 2020). Inversions are a

form of these phrases which emphasizes the subject (Wakabayashi 2020). In English this is achieved by placing the subject after a verb. For example, the phrase "In the forest ran <u>the deer</u>" and "At midnight comes <u>the complete darkness</u>" are sentences that exhibit this inversion behavior (Wakabayashi 2020). By reordering the subject to the end of the phrase, it sounds odd to the listener, therefore tactically adding emphasis to the noun. In Japanese, similar inversions exist in afterthought construction of sentences. In these constructions the subject of the sentence comes after the verb of the sentence. For example, *itsumo iku <u>toshokanni</u>* (いつも行く<u>図書館に</u>) "(I) go the all the time, the library" is a transposed afterthought of the sentence *<u>toshokanni</u> itsumo iku* (<u>図書館に</u>いつも行く) "(I) go to the library all the time."

(3) Phrase Representation and Orientation

Another discrepancy manifests in their conceptualizations of a phrase, in which Japanese and English are separate, and tend to be reflective of their respective SOV and SVO word orders. In English—which utilizes nouns on either side of the verb—sentences usually favor noun-based constructions, whereas in Japanese—which use verbs to describe an array of nouns—favor verb-based constructions (Wakabayashi 2020). This means that in Japanese meanings are derived mostly from the function of the verbs in a sentence, whereas in English meaning is derived from constituent noun phrases (Wakabayashi 2020). For example, "During the <u>construction</u> of the bridge" is an English phrase where "construction" is a noun. Conversely, in Japanese *tatemono ga <u>kenzō sa rete iru</u> toki ni* (建物が<u>建造されている</u>時に) in which <u>*kenzō sa rete iru*</u> is the verbal noun for construction. So, English favors using Noun POS when applicable and Japanese favors using Verb POS when applicable.

(4) Respectful Language

English and Japanese have a huge discrepancy in the context of respectful language. Japanese has complex structures to exhibit respect in referring of oneself and others. Conversely, such complex structures do not exist.

One discrepancy in respectful language is the usage of indirect expressions. In English, indirect expressions exhibit hesitation or insincerity when interpreted by a listener (Wakabayashi 2020). However, in Japanese indirect expression are consciously used to portray the speaker as polite by avoiding direct expressions that can come off as presumptuous (Wakabayashi 2020). Therefore, this conscious usage of indirect expressions is often culturally conditioned (Wakabayashi 2020). Therefore, this is a discrepancy where translation depends on the usage of indirect expressions and if they are culturally conditioned.

Aside from indirect expressions, the greatest challenge in translating respectful language manifests within the Japanese structures of *keigo* (敬語) and *kenjōgo* (謙譲語). These structures utilize linguistic and cultural properties to convey phrases of the upmost respect (Wakabayashi 2020). *Keigo* is the "respectful" part of the Japanese language which conveys a higher respect or honor when used to refer to someone else. Both structures use different conjugations for verbs to convey respect toward the speaker. In English such a structure does not exist

Keigo is not always used in the context of respect. In some instances, keigo is used as irony or sarcasm by adding unnecessary formalities to add humorous emphasis (Wakabayashi 2020). This is similar in English where we use formal language to emphasize humor. For example, to someone who is high maintenance we might say "yes, your highness." In no way do we establish that the subject is honorable, but rather exhibits qualities that are comparable to people from a posh lifestyle. Therefore, it is not necessarily easy to deduce whether keigo is used to convey respectful or informal language.

(5) Particles

Japanese particles are treated in Japanese as a separate part of speech due to their vital role in conveying meaning in Japanese [Vance 1993]. they have unique functions are a recognized as unique class of affixes called clingers (Vance 1993). Clingers are separate from ordinary affixes and includes sentence-final *ne/yo/ka* (ね・よ・か), conjunction *shi/ga/kara* (し・が・から), conditional *nara* (なら), copula affixes *da* (だ) (Vance 1993). Even with this unique class of affixes, it still does not cover the entire class of Japanese particles. There are three more subdivisions to be made. The first are case particles *ga/wo/ni* (が・を・に which are widely used as lexical markers in sentences [Vance 1993]. Then there are focus particles *wa/mo/dake* (は・も・だけ) which are used to draw attention to a specific subject in the sentence [Vance 1993]. Then finally, there are conjoining particles *to/ya/ka/toka* (と・や・か・とか) which are used to string together phrases. It is important to recognize that most particles are used in the context of a noun to add meaning to its function [Vance 1993]. Because of particles wide-spread use in Japanese and its lack thereof in English, we consider particles as a linguistic discrepancy.

5 – Handling Discrepancies

We have now procured a wide array of linguistic discrepancies with varying difficulty in translation. The purpose of this section is to provide procedures of translation that appropriately addresses each linguistic discrepancy.

5a - Translating Idioms

Idioms are among the toughest discrepancies to translate because of the irregular use of language that can cause confusion and an unpredictable meaning when literally translated in the TL. The source of issues pertaining to idiom translation does not manifest in grammatical structures but the function of lexical items [Neshkovska , Kitanovska-Kimovska 2018]. The reason idioms are difficult is because it is extremely difficult to "match equivalence of meaning with equivalence of frequency," which means that it is extremely difficult to find lexical items in the TL that produce an equivalent meaning in idiomatic language. In conjunction with meaning equivalence, it is difficult to find lexical items in the TL that appear the same amount in the SL's idiom. Therefore, translating idioms is interested in managing the lexical information of a phrase and not the grammatical structure (Neshkovska and Kitanovska-Kimovska 2018).

The main pitfalls of idiom translation are that (Akbari 2013):

(1) the TL is unable to recognize the idiom.
(2) no equivalent idiom in the TL.
(3) similar counterpart but with different context in the TL.
(4) idiom in the SL is used literally and idiomatically.
(5) the existence of differences in convention, context, and frequency of use
    in the SL and TL.

This class of problems defined by Akbari (Akbari 2013) suggest that there is a spectrum of difficultly distributed among idioms. This is the case entirely. There are some examples where a literal translation of a SL's idiom has the same meaning and lexical units in the TL idiom. However, such cases are rare, and because literal translations of idioms often result in phrases with unpredictable meanings in the TL—or even amusing nonsensical meanings—a constant practice of literal translations should be avoided (Akbari 2013). But on the other end of the difficultly spectrum there are cases where there is simply no equivalent idiom in the TL (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011). In such cases it is appropriate for the translator to employ strategies of translation.

It is important to remember the translator's responsibility to provide natural translations sensitive to the nuanced meanings of an SL's phrase. To produce these natural translations, there are conditions that translators should adhere to (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011):

(1) Individual words of an idiom cannot be reordered.
(2) Individual words of an idiom cannot be omitted.
(3) No extra words can be inserted into the idiom.
(4) Individual words of an idiom cannot be changed into another word.
(5) The grammatical structure of the idiom cannot be changed.

In this section I will list and discuss diverse strategies for producing natural translations of idiomatic language from a SL. These procedures will consider the conditions for translating idioms by Adelina (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011). The ordering of the procedures is listed in descending order where the first method honors all of Adelina's (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011) conditions, while the last honors none of the conditions.

(1) Producing Idioms of Similar Meaning and Form:

In this strategy the translator tries to find an equivalent idiom in the TL with the same meaning and lexical items. While the most difficult strategy owing to the radical differences in languages identification of concepts, it is the ideal translation that is sensitive to the SL's meaning. It is most ideal because none of Adelina's conditions are broken.

In English, when we complete a task efficiently that we manage to do two things during the same experience, we might say we killed "two birds with one stone." In Japanese, there exists a translation that matches the form and meaning of the phrase. *issekinichou* (一石二鳥, lit. one stone, two birds) which matches both the lexical items of the phrase and English and preserves the form of two individual noun phrases: "two birds" and "one stone."

(2) Producing Idioms of Similar Meaning but Dissimilar Form:

In this strategy the translator tries to find an equivalent idiom in the TL with the same meaning but uses different lexical items (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011) (Akbari 2013). This procedure violates Adelina's first condition where "Individual words of an idiom cannot be reordered," and third condition where "individual words of an idiom cannot be changed into another word."

Humans find comfort from avoiding the unknown as new things can damage their perception of life. This concept is realized in proverbs like "ignorance is bliss." Similarly in Japanese we can find a phrase of similar meaning but a dissimilar form that uses different lexical words whose meanings do not match up. The phrase *minuga hana* (見ぬが花) which does not use equivalent words to "ignorance" and "bliss" but is understood by Japanese speakers to have the same equivalent meaning.

(3) Producing a Paraphrased Translation:

In this strategy the translator tries to explain the idiom of the SL to the listeners of the TL in the most effective way they can understand (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011) (Akbari 2013). There are some dangers to this approach; there is the possibility that the same intended meaning in the SL's audience is lost when transferring over to the TL's audience; the resulting translation will lose all cultural significance from the SL (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011) (Akbari 2013). This procedure violates the first and third condition, as well as the fourth condition of "No extra words can be inserted into the idiom."

mono no aware (物の哀れ) is a phrase in Japanese that does not have clear translation into English. The literal translation is "the compassion of things" which does not make much sense and is not recognizable as an idiom in English. Therefore, a translator must try to understand its usage in Japanese and replicate its same situation in English. Therefore, a paraphrased version of this phrase would be "phrase used for the appreciation of the fleeting nature of beauty."

(4) Producing an Omitted Translation:

In this strategy the translator tries to eliminate certain lexical items or the whole idiom to remove potential confusion in the TL (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011) (Akbari 2013). While this approach is unpopular—and arguably the worst—it can serve as a last option for when the translator deems the idiom too difficult. This procedure violates all of Adelina's conditions, including the second condition where "Individual words of an idiom cannot be omitted."

Before Japanese people eat a meal, they turn to each other and say *itadakimasu* (いただきます). This phrase has no clear usage but is understood as a speaker showing appreciation to the provider of the meal, saying "I humbly receive." In an English translation, inclusion of such a culturally nuanced phrase might produce a noisy translation that might seem odd to speakers of the TL. In such cases, a translator might omit the phrase due to the exhaustion of all other procedures.

5b – Translating Culturally Specific Terms

CST are hard discrepancies to translate because they are unrecognizable to the TL, have no equivalent word in a TL, and are culturally linked to a SC's habit or environment. Therefore, translators are left with a difficult task because the task of translation has become not only a transfer of meaning from a SL to a TL—but also a transfer of culture from a SC to a TC (Neshkovska and Kitanovska-Kimovska 2018). Therefore, the translation procedures of CST should pertain to the preservation or modification of the CST. In this section, I will provide the procedures of translation for CST and organize them into their respective categories: the foreignizing and domesticating approaches.

The Foreignizing Approach

The first approach is the "foreignizing" approach. In this approach translators favor the SC and preserve the CST in the TL's translation (Neshkovska and Kitanovska-Kimovska 2018). The motivation of this approach is to ensure exposure of the SC to the TC, where the speakers of the TC might not understand the term but are exposed to it putting them in a setting to potentially learn more about the SC (Neshkovska and Kitanovska-Kimovska 2018). Such an approach relies mostly on the reader's desire to learn more about the SC and search on their own the cultural meaning of a CST, and if a text is full of them, it might deter the reader from completing a text. For these reasons, the "domesticating" approach exists. There are two types of this approach known as borrowing:

(1) Pure Borrowing

When no word in the TL can describe the CST from the SL, the translator can preserve the word without any changing to its morphological or phonetic properties (Fernández Guerra 2012). This method respects the SC the most but largely are not understanded in the TL.

(2) Naturalized Borrowing

When no word in the TL can describe the CST from the SL, the translator can preserve the word, and modify the morphological or phonetic properties (Fernández Guerra 2012). This procedure still respects the SC but changes the CST to make sense grammatically in the TL.

(3) Calque

When no word in the TL can describe the CST from the SL, the translator can perform a special form of borrowing where the structure and lexical properties of a CST or phrase is preserved but provides an understanding in the TL through a literal translation (Fernández Guerra 2012). This procedure of translation fringes on the classification of a foreignizing approach because they retain core features of the CST but redacts morphological and phonetic properties which sacrifices some of the cultural significance (Fernández Guerra 2012). However, since the literal translation's meaning might still be unrecognizable, there is the foreignizing attribute that exposes readers to the SC through their own inquisitive search to understand the meaning.

(4) Compensation

When the translator wants to include a CST from the SL but deduces that semantic losses are to occur if the CST remains in the same location, the translator can compensate by including

it in a different location in the TL text (Fernández Guerra 2012). This procedure is useful in situations where culturally and linguistically difficult discrepancies appear in the form of dialects, irony, politeness value, etc. (Fernández Guerra 2012).

(5) Explication

When the meaning of a CST in the SL is implicit to a translator, they can express in TL something with the same context of the SL to supplement the CST (Fernández Guerra 2012). Through the inclusion of additional information or even a translator's note, the original CST is still preserved and respects the SC (Fernández Guerra 2012).

(6) Transposition

To achieve a translation that sounds natural in a TL, a translator can change the grammatical category or part of speech of a CST—which requires necessary morphological and syntactic adjustments (Fernández Guerra 2012). This is done so that a translation of a CST can come off as sounding correct in the conventions of the TL.

(7) Variation

The translator changes elements of a CST that affect linguistic variation, especially changing it to sound correct in different social and geographic dialects (Fernández Guerra 2012). This procedure is specific to trying to make a certain subgroup of the TL understand the text best which might imply a certain intended social or geographic audience in the TC.

Domesticating Approach

The "domesticating" approach favors the TL and tries to relate CST to other concepts and objects that exist in the TC (Neshkovska and Kitanovska-Kimovska 2018). This attempt helps fix the problem in the foreignizing approach where readers are forced to find meanings for a CST but sacrifices the possibility of a transfer of culture (Neshkovska and Kitanovska-Kimovska 2018). Ther are many types of procedures for translating in a domesticating approach that vary in modification to the SL's CST.

(1) Adaptation

When the meaning in the TL of a CST is unknown, the translator can achieve a situational equivalence where a new situation is created in the TL to explain naturally to a TC the situation a CST is representing (Fernández Guerra 2012). This procedure of translation respects the SC to a degree by trying to match it in situational equivalence, but not cultural equivalence (Fernández Guerra 2012).

(2) Compression

When the CST is deemed unnecessary due to a lack of relevance in the function of a phrase, the translator might choose to omit or synthesis SL information into the TL (Fernández Guerra 2012). This method is not used often due its inappropriate nature, but in cases where a CST is misleading in meaning or repeated through a text, this procedure of translation can help aid readability at the cost of subverting the SC (Fernández Guerra 2012).

(3) Description

Instead of including an unrecognizable CST, the translator can describe the term itself as a paraphrase or an explanation (Fernández Guerra 2012). This procedure of translation respects the SC to a degree if it still includes the CST but will lose cultural retention if not. Furthermore, if the explanation is not thorough or well understood by the translator, there might be a misleading representation of the CST. In texts with many CST, it might be an expensive procedure due to the description losing its concise nature and creating confusing sentences.

(4) Equivalence

If there exists a term or phrase in the TL that is an established equivalent for a CST, then the translator can use this equivalent instead to retain meaning (Fernández Guerra 2012). However, due to the loss of the CST this equivalent is still a domestic approach that optimizes the understanding of a CST's meaning.

(5) Generalization

If the CST is unnecessary for stylistic reasons, the translator might take a more general approach to the CST and convert it into a neutral term or hypernym (Fernández Guerra 2012). This procedure of translation is not very appropriate and will subvert the CST meaning from the SC. However, this procedure helps avoid ambiguity and repetition in texts by providing similar and understandable words in the TL (Fernández Guerra 2012).

(6) Literal Translation

Disregarding style, a CST can be translated literally with minimal modifications so that it sounds familiar to a TL through adaptation of syntactic rules to the CST from the TL (Fernández Guerra 2012). As asserted throughout the paper, literal translations are often unrecognizable which makes this procedure of translation not preferrable.

(7) Modulation

Similar to adaptation, a translator can find a phrase that conveys the same idea as a CST in the SL, but through the translator changing their point of view or focus on a CST phrase to try to understand the objective relative meaning for the TL (Fernández Guerra 2012). This procedure allows a translator to liberally translate a phrase and requires an intimate understanding of the SC to effectively provide a phrase that conveys the same cultural meaning in the TL.

(8) Particularization

When a clear translation for CST pertaining to gender is untranslatable, translator in the TL will use hypernyms or concrete terms to disambiguate gender—turning male or female into a gender neutral option (Fernández Guerra 2012).

(9) Substitution

This procedure can convert linguistic elements (syntax, morphemes, phonetics) into paralinguistic elements (intonation, gestures, etc.) or vice versa to achieve a translation that can decrease the difficultly for readers in a TL (Fernández Guerra 2012). For text, this procedure is hard because most paralinguistic elements are best understood in a speech setting.

The procedures covered by Guerra (2012) are concise, with many procedures pertaining to a certain situation of translation (i.e., Transposition). However, Guerra also conducted research

among students to see which methods of translation are preferred. The students were given texts to translate from English to Spanish and from Spanish to English. Of the 1920 students tested, they seem to prefer Adaptation (24.32%), Borrowing (18.23%), and Description (22.02%) for English to Spanish translation, while for Spanish to English they preferred Borrowing (37.55%), Description (28.43%), Equivalence (10.00%) (Fernández Guerra 2012). These findings imply that many techniques such as Description and Borrowing are common and useful between both languages. However, for some languages that may lack the same linguistic properties which cause a translation discrepancy, might use a more specific technique (Such as Adaptation or Equivalence) to achieve a translation equivalency.

5c – Translating Japanese and English Discrepancies

In section 4c we described many English and Japanese specific discrepancies such as word order, phrase representation and orientation, and respectful Language. In this section procedures for translating these discrepancies are provided.

(1) Translating Word Order

When translating word order there are many changes a translator must make to achieve an acceptable ordering of words for both languages. Verbs need to be transposed toward the end of the sentence, and adjunct phrases need to be reordered so that the object exists next to the verb. This rule can achieve representations that make sense in both languages, but as section 4c outlines, there are many discrepancies within word order that need to be addressed.

Sometimes an unusual word order is used intentionally in the SL to add emphasis, impact, or rhythm to the speech (Wakabayashi 2020). This unusual word order appears in sentences that use adjectives to modify nouns after the existence of a noun (Wakabayashi 2020). For example, "The man, tired and despondent, commutes to work every morning" is a sentence that breaks the conventional use of adjectives, which usually exist before the noun, to add emphasis to the fact that he is indifferent toward work. This arguably would not achieve the same effect as the phrase "The tired and despondent man commutes to work every morning" which removes emphasis when following word order conventions in English. Furthermore, a similar effect is achieved when an adjective is represented as an introductory clause followed by a comma (Wakabayashi 2020). For example, "Tired and despondent, the man commutes to work every day" is a phrase that emphasizes the emotions of the man before the reader learns why he is "tired and despondent." In such instances, it might be appropriate to adopt this word order in the TL even though it breaks regular word order conventions.

When it comes to the ordering of nouns and verbs in succession of each other, like in the phrase "black and white" or "eating and drinking," we explained in section 4c that languages tend to order positive elements first and negative elements last, as well as order low-syllable words before high-syllable words (Wakabayashi 2020). However, word order can be subjective to the TL rather than what was expressed in the SL (Wakabayashi 2020). For example, "sooner or later" is ordered that way because "sooner" is conceptually a positive element and "later" a

negative element—despite "sooner" having more syllables and letters than "later." However, in Japanese such a phrase would be represented as *osokare hayakare* (遅かれ早かれ, lit. later or sooner) because within the Japanese syllables *osokare* (遅かれ) has less kana than *hayakare* (早かれ). Therefore, when translating such phrases, a translator should break unusual word order to mitigate distractions from the real meaning—ultimately taking a TL subjective approach to the meaning (Wakabayashi 2020). Furthermore, a similar subjective approach to word ordering exists in the representation of proper nouns (Wakabayashi 2020). For example, "US-Japan relations" is something that an English newspaper would read, whereas a Japanese newspaper would say *nichibeikankei* (日米関係, lit. Japan-US relations). This difference in representation is due in part to the likelihood of speaker from the US or Japan to consider what they are most familiar with first and the other second. Therefore, word reordering of lexical items in independent phrases can be tricky to achieve, but a translator should be concerned with providing translations that stresses on the flow of pronunciation (words with less syllables before words with more syllables), the magnitude of elements (positive words before negative words), and the viewpoint of the TL (US-Japan v. Japan-US).

For adverbs, adverbial phrases, participial construction, and subordinate clauses—which are ordered differently—needs to be reordered to aid understanding in the TL. Japanese phrases preserving word order in these cases would "delay the punchline," while preserving word order in English reveals earlier whether something is negative or positive (Wakabayashi 2020). Therefore, a restructuring of sentences and entering a period, when necessary, can overcome this issue (Wakabayashi 2020). Restructuring can be achieved through iconicity, where there is a matching of form and meaning that reflects the meaning or experienced described in the SL— usually in chronological order (Wakabayashi 2020). However, iconicity should be applied to instructional materials to ease the following of instructions without having to backtrack (Wakabayashi 2020). In cases where literary effects such as flashbacks, flashforwards, or zoom-ins are used, it is appropriate to preserve word order as much as possible within the constraints of the TL.

In terms of non-instructional texts, it is good to give a reason first for the reader so that the impact of a statement is understood. On such occasions an inversion of the sentence in the TL (Wakabayashi 2020). Inversions are understood as phrases of emphasis in both languages, so when translating them it is appropriate to retain word order to keep the emphatic meaning. However, it is always appropriate to reorder lexical items if it is for the purposes of removing ambiguity or improve understanding in the TL (Wakabayashi 2020).

To summarize there are a few considerations a translator should use when reordering lexical items. For English, Wakabayashi (2020) provides common guidelines when translating Japanese phrases into English:

> (1) End phrases on a strong note—avoiding ending with a prepositional phrase.

(2) Order words of fewer syllables first, when the syllables are the same count the letters to compare

(3) Order phrases with fewer words first

(4) For adjectives:

    (a) Must be followed by a noun preceded with an optional article; order adjectives by quantifier first and descriptors second.

    (b) When more than one descriptor exists, order in terms of: size, properties, shape, color, materials.

(2) Translating Phrase Representation and Orientation

As discussed in section 4c, English and Japanese mainly use noun-based and verb-based structures—respectively—to drive meaning in a phrase. Thus, translation might require a transposition into the appropriate phrase in the TL (Wakabayashi 2020). It might require a transposition because even transposition can cause unnatural outcomes (Wakabayashi 2020). When translating verb-based structures into noun-based ones it often makes the translation appear "sophisticated and objective" (Wakabayashi 2020). They also result in abstract or verbal nouns that convey a more robust impression while they mask active verbs (Wakabayashi 2020). Therefore, the choice to transpose verb-based and noun-based structures in specific contexts should derive from an intuition based of the translator's knowledge and not hardcoded rules (Wakabayashi 2020).

Japanese transitive verbs often imply their human subjects and leave them out in a phrase which warrants special treatment when translating into English (Wakabayashi 2020). Cases where translation into an English verb-based phrase occurs, an insertion of a subject could be useful to incorporate a personal tone or subjectivity that might be appropriate to use in English and not Japanese (Wakabayashi 2020). Unless the translator chooses to use a noun-based phrase instead, then the translator would leave out the subject as noun-based phrases avoid subjectivity in turn for concision, which generally conveys the meaning more effectively (Wakabayashi 2020).

In terms of the pseudo-topics from section 4c, they are Japanese verb-based structures that are known for being effectively transposed into an English "non-verb structures" with a natural sound. Such transpositions sometimes require the insertion of verbs belonging to the change, cause-effect, or direct variation class of verbs (Wakabayashi 2020).

(3) Translating Respectful Speech

In section 4c we discovered that there are many forms of communication used to convey respect in English and Japanese. Indirect expressions are widely used in Japanese as a culturally conditioned form of speech to convey a respectful tone by not making direct impositions from the speaker (Wakabayashi 2020). However, in English, indirect expressions might come off as hesitant or insincere which implies a deliberate use of evasion. (Wakabayashi 2020).

Therefore, translating indirect expressions require a recognition whether an indirect phrase is deliberately used to express hesitation or culturally conditioned to be polite

(Wakabayashi 2020). This can be deduced from clues in the phrase. In the SL, if the phrase is using hedges, disclaimers, lack of details, or unclear expressions, then indirect expressions in the TL should be expressed as a deliberate attempt at evasion (Wakabayashi 2020).

When translating into Japanese, it may be appropriate to use indirect forms of the English phrase to make it polite. There are many techniques that can help soften the blow of English statements. At the sentence-final position of the phrase, a translator can add a double negative, negative rhetorical question, tentative expression, or modals indicating supposition (Wakabayashi 2020). On a particle level, *mo* (も) and *demo* (でも) can produce a circumlocutionary effect, which marks unnecessary lexical items used to avoid discussing the point (Wakabayashi 2020). Additionally, the particle *tari* (たり) makes a statement less direct by including other possibilities (Wakabayashi 2020).

However, the biggest discrepancy among respectful language is the use of keigo and kenjōgo which are both used in Japanese as systems of sophisticated verb constructions to show honor and humility, respectively. When translating into English it is best to disconnect from keigo and kenjōgo and imagine what an English speaker would say in the same context (Wakabayashi 2020). However, there are a few considerations to take in so that the cultural meaning and nuance in Japanese is not misrepresented in English. Like when formality is conveyed in Japanese, the translation in English should refer to it explicitly by inserting lexical items that describe an action as polite or humble (Wakabayashi 2020). For example, translating *ukagatta* (伺った) as "asked humbly" instead of "asked." Also, when speakers shift between formal and informal language in Japanese, this must be reflected in English (Wakabayashi 2020). This can be difficult if it cannot be portrayed through mode of speech, thus the insertion of phrases (or footnote) indicating the shift in speech can indirectly improve understanding in English (Wakabayashi 2020).

It is important to remember that *keigo* and *kenjōgo* can be used conversely as an impolite phrase by over-exaggerating one's respect or humility toward another. In such cases, it is important to identify the purpose of *keigo* and *kenjōgo* in a sentence before defaulting on its main usage as respectful speech.

(4) Translating Particles

In Japanese, particles are considered a lexical item categorized under the part of speech known as *jōshi* (助詞). However, English lacks a similar POS that has the same function as particles. Therefore, translating particles requires the understanding of contextual usages for particles and the understanding of when to translate particles as lexical items into English or not.

There are some particles that when translated into English still retain lexical items. For example, prepositional particles *de/ni/kara* (で・に・から) can be translated into their respective English prepositions because they are strictly ordered in the context of the word, they modify [Vance 1993]. For example, "at home" is translated as *uchide* (家で) where the prepositional modifiers are within the same strict context, but word order changes their position.

Similarly, conjoining particles can retain their lexical items [Vance 1993]. For example, "me and Mr. Jones" is translated as *watashito jōnzusan* (私とジョーンズさん) where the same lexical items appear in the same structure, but English uses a lexical item, and Japanese uses a clinging particle to *watashi* (私), or "I" in English.

Also, some focus particles like mo (も), meaning "also," and dake (だけ), meaning "only," have clear equivalents to lexical items in English that can be used during translation. However, certain case particles and focus particles whose function does not have a clear representation in English may not retain lexical items. In the context of English language, these particles are known as pseudo words, which are added words which correspond to particles that do not exist in English [Vance 1993]. Therefore, many case and focus particles can be omitted from translation to reduce noise.

For focus particles like *wa* (は) which marks the topic or subject of a sentence [Vance 1993], can be used to deduce the position of the lexical item in translation (subject at the beginning of a sentence), but doesn't need a lexical item in English to represent the meaning of the particle. Similarly, case particles like *ga* (が) or *wo* (を), which represent the subject of a sentence (when the subject is different from the topic *wa*) and the direct object respectively, do not need a lexical item in English to represent the meaning of the particle.

For some particles it is difficult to deduce its function due to the ambiguous usage of the particle in Japanese. For example, the case particle *ni* (に) it has a wide variety of usages and can represent English lexical items like "at," "to," "for," "because," "by," "as," and "if."

6 - Results and Conclusions

The original intent of this project was to identify and provide translation procedures for language discrepancies that impede the flow of translation due to diverse representations of similar linguistic functions. These procedures are geared toward the production of a natural translations that represent in the TL the full meaning of a phrase in the SL that preserve lexical and cultural nuances, rather than a literal translation that represents in the TL the literal meaning of SL's phrase which loses cultural meaning and has unpredictable meanings. As a result of finding these natural translation procedures, the project yields a wide array of language discrepancies among universal translation and English Japanese translation.

In the context of universal translation, it was discovered that idiomatic language, which includes colloquialisms, proverbs, slang, allusions, and phrasal verbs, is an extremely difficult discrepancy to mange due to its culturally specific usages and its informal usages of language. Similarly, we discovered CSTs as another extremely difficult discrepancy due to the intimate knowledge of both language's culture and discerning whether a word truly belongs to a culture through classification. Furthermore, for CST's it is difficult whether to choose a domesticating or foreignizing approach to translation as both as benefits and detriments to the SC and TC.

In the context of English Japanese translation many discrepancies were discovered. Once again, the choice of English and Japanese as case studies expanded the scope of potential

discrepancies to discover due to the isolated linguistic histories of English and Japanese. One finding was that English and Japanese syntax was diverse and found that translation of a SVO and SOV language requires the careful reordering of lexical items. Also, English tends to use more nouns, whereas Japanese uses more verbs, which requires the conversion of some verb-based structures into verb-based ones during translation—and vice versa. Additionally, Japanese language has much more complex structures for displaying humility and respect that pales in comparison to English structures. Finally, Japanese particles are a major discrepancy where they are clear lexical items in Japanese that do not always translate to clear lexical items in English.

In the search for these translation procedures, most guidelines on translation stressed the important attributes of a translator needed to produce natural translations. Translation is a complex task, and therefore cannot be carried out efficiently with shallow knowledge of the languages present in translation. Therefore, the dichotomy of the good/novice and expert translators were made. All translators should at least attain the qualities of a good translator which essentially requires the extensive knowledge on the linguistic and lexical properties of the SL and TL acquired through an extensive record of reading, listening, and translating SL and TL materials (Adelnia and Dastjerdi 2011). However, to become an expert translator, one must treat translation as something that can never be warded off as easy. Translation is hard, and before a phrase is translated, there can be no doubts in the translator's mind about what a phrase in a SL is saying. Therefore, expert translators will go to great lengths to find the accurate meaning to translate while a novice will settle for the "good-enough" meaning they discover.

Returning to the original concern for computational translation and their shortcomings in producing natural translation compared to the efficiency of multilingual humans, many conclusions can be drawn. For one, the existence of systems for identifying discrepancies (such as idiom and CST recognition) and corresponding translation procedures, implies the potential for recognition and translation algorithms in computational translation. However, the discrepancies identified in this project range in difficulty, and therefore will range in complexity if encoded as algorithms.

Some discrepancies are relatively easy and can be solved with clear rulesets for translation. For example, English SVO and Japanese SOV can be achieved through the modification of a SL's syntax to achieve an equivalent TL syntax. However, other discrepancies are relatively difficult and might require much more complex algorithms to achieve a natural translation. For example, idioms and CSTs would require a system that can recognize the speech as different from normal speech, understand in the SL what the idiom means, filter through a TL's idioms to deduce a similar idiom, or create on the fly a new idiom. These systems would require much more complex models that can mimic the linguistic knowledge and cultural knowledge of a multilingual human.

In addition to the discrepancies, it is important to reassert why human translators outcompete computer translators. A human translator who produces natural translation holds a repository of knowledge pertaining to language's linguistic structures and culture. This repository exists in the mind of a translator, in which their understanding of linguistic concepts

cannot be objectified or organized. Therefore, a human translator implicitly translates with accuracy supplemented by their knowledge, whereas a computer translates based on data about how humans use language. These computational translators interpret translation as an algorithm that needs to be optimized, and not a cultural and linguistic exchange between speakers of a language—like humans do. Understanding translation as a cultural and linguistic exchange undoubtedly yields natural translations because discrepancies are managed sensitively with respect to a source and target's language and culture. In CST and Idioms, culture is used extensively so as to find a phrase that would make sense in the TC—as well as the TL. Similarly, respectful speech in Japanese is used in a cultural context alone, therefore requiring a cultural approach to translation. These specific idioms are handled implicitly by human translators with relative ease, while computers are yet to encode a translation model that handles all discrepancies between a SL and TL.

Despite potential complexities with building a computational translation model, the fact remains that computational translation will require a method for translation that achieves natural translations through the management of linguistic discrepancies if they are to mimic the same translations of multilingual humans. This mimicry can be achieved through encoding translation procedures for specific discrepancies that will bring irregular language into the class of sentences covered by a computational translator. Until then, computational translation would be best equipped with simple applications of translation, whereas a human translator would be the best option for natural translations for important applications.

Works Cited

Adelnia, Amineh, and Hossein Vahid Dastjerdi. 2011. "Translation of Idioms: a Hard Task for the Translator." *Theory and Practice in Language Studies 1, no. 7* 879-883.

Akbari, Monireh. 2013. "Strategies for Translating Idioms." *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies 3, no. 8* 32-41.

Fernández Guerra, Ana. 2012. "Translating Culture: Problems, Strategies and Practical Realities." *SIC: Časopis za Književnost, Kulturu i Književno Prevođenje 3, no. 1.*

Inoue, Izumi. 2008. "英日翻訳者が直面する問題点 翻訳学習者とプロ翻訳者にみる差異を中心に." *Invitation to Translation Studies, 2* 159-174.

IsozakiHideki. 2010. "英日翻訳における語順について." 言語処理学会第 16 回年次大会発表論文集, B4-2 884-887.

Neshkovska, Silvana, and Sonja Kitanovska-Kimovska. 2018. "Translating Culture." *Horizons A 22, no. 1* 165-174.

Risku, Hanna. 2012. "Cognitive Approaches to Translation." *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics.*

Vance, T. J. 1993. "Are Japanese Particles Clitics?" *The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese, 27(1)* 3-33.

Wakabayashi, Judy. 2020. *Japanese–English Translation: an Advanced Guide. .* Routledge.